

The "Spring of the Year" (2 Chronicles 36:10) and the Chronicler's Sources

MICHAEL AVIOZ



THE “SPRING OF THE YEAR” (2 CHRONICLES 36:10) AND THE CHRONICLER’S SOURCES

MICHAEL AVIOZ
BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY

The matter of the extra-biblical sources that were available to the Chronicler, as well as of the historical reliability of the book, remain much debated.¹ The main questions are, as Peltonen puts it: “What were his sources? What was their historical nature and value? How did Chronicles use them?”² In the following paper, I will discuss a text that may possibly bear on such issues, namely, the record of Jehoiachin’s deportation to Babylon (2 Chr 36:10).³

In 2 Chr 36:10 we read: “*In the spring of the year* (Heb. ולהשובת השנה) King Nebuchadnezzar sent and brought him [i.e. Jehoiachin] to Babylon, along with the precious vessels of the house of the LORD, and made his brother Zedekiah king over Judah and Jerusalem” (NRSV).

The parallel account in 2 Kgs 24:10–17 is much more elaborate, and there are several key differences between the two texts.⁴

¹ The most thorough study of this issue was done by Macy. See H. Macy, *The Sources of the Books of Chronicles: A Reassessment* (unpublished PhD diss., Harvard University, 1975). See also S. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 14–23; G. N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9* (AB, 12; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 118–20 and the literature cited therein. See further G. Galil, “The Historical Reliability of the Book of Chronicles,” in Y. Avishur and R. Deutsch (eds.), *Michael: Historical, Epigraphical and Biblical Studies in Honor of Prof. Michael Heltzer* (Tel Aviv/Jaffa: Archaeological Center Publications, 1999), 55*–62* (Hebrew).

² K. Peltonen, “Function, Explanation and Literary Phenomena: Aspects of Source Criticism as Theory and Method in the History of Chronicles Research,” in M. P. Graham and S. L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture* (JSOTSup, 263; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 18–69 (69).

³ Scholars also debate the year in which this deportation took place (598 or 597 B.C.E.). See the literature cited in O. Lipschits, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem: Judah under Babylonian Rule* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 55–61.

⁴ Other differences are as follows: In contrast to Kings, in Chronicles

For our purposes, we will focus on one such divergence between the two accounts. Unlike the phrase in the Chronicles account shown above, the version in 2 Kgs 24:10 states: “*At that time* (Heb. בעת ההיא), the servants of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon came up to Jerusalem, and the city was besieged.”

Some commentators ignore this difference entirely⁵, while others refer to it only briefly.⁶ The difference between the two parallel texts has been previously explained as an interpretation by the Chronicler in order to clarify the obscure datum appearing in Kings—בעת ההיא.⁷

What was the Chronicler’s source for the version לתשובת השנה? This term appears in two additional places: 2 Sam 11:1 (/ / 1

Nebuchadnezzar is not present in Jerusalem; Chronicles does not mention the treasures taken from both the palace and the temple; Chronicles views Zedekiah as Jehoiachin’s brother while in Kings he is his cousin; in Chronicles Jehoiachin ruled for three months and ten days, while in Kings he ruled for only three months. The representation of Zedekiah is very complex. See the different views on this question of Klein, *1 Chronicles* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 11; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 1069–70; and Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 327.

According to McKenzie, “Where C [= Chronicles] contains different or additional information from SK [=Samuel-Kings] that does not derive from textual variation or from Chr’s bias, it is certainly reasonable to propose that Chr has used a source unknown to us.” See S. L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler’s Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM, 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984), 28 and cf. p. 186. Cf. also Macy, *Sources*, 115–65, 169–72. McKenzie’s hypothesis was generally refuted. See, e.g., H. G. M. Williamson’s review of this work in *VT* 37 (1987), 107–14.

⁵ E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1910), 522; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 1067; I. Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005). This topic is also missing from J. Hughes, *Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology* (JSOTSup, 66; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

⁶ H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 414. He writes that the term “in the spring of the year” was supplied by the Chronicler “to indicate that a military campaign was involved.” However, what does it mean that the Chronicler “supplied” this piece of data?

⁷ Concerning the formula בעת ההיא, “at that time,” see M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, *II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 11; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1988), 186; T. Kronholm, “*et, עת,*” in G. J. Botterweck et al. (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament Vol. 11* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2001), 434–51, esp. 439–40; G. Brin, *The Concept of Time in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 39–45. Regarding the change in 2 Chr 36:10, Brin writes on p. 41: “We either find here a difference in the information given in the two passages, or, on the other hand, this indicates the artificial nature of the use of this formula.”

Chr 20:1) and 1 Kgs 20:22.⁸ Theoretically, these texts could have been his source for replacing **לְתִשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה בַּעַת הַהֵיִא** with **בַּעַת הַהֵיִא**.

However, the difficulty with this option is that the Chronicler left the term **בַּעַת הַהֵיִא** in both the synoptic⁹ and non-synoptic¹⁰ texts. If this term was considered indefinite, why did he not replace it in all of these instances?¹¹ Since he failed to do so, these narratives cannot be the basis for his comments on Jehoiachin’s deportation.

Accordingly, another possibility needs to be considered. The Chronicler’s version is consistent with the Babylonian Chronicles, and it is surprising to discover that this similarity is usually not mentioned by most commentaries on 2 Chronicles.¹² In the Babylonian Chronicle, we read:

Year 7: in Kislev the king of Babylonia BCE called out his army and marched to Hattu. He set his camp against the city of Judah [*Ya-a-bu-du*] and on 2nd Adar he took the city and captured the king. He appointed a king of his choosing there, took heavy tribute and returned to Babylon.¹³

⁸ The Septuagint translates similarly in all three places: ἐπιστρέφοντος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ (“after the year had turned”). In 4QSam^a, verse 1 in 2 Sam 11 is missing. There is no textual evidence from Qumran regarding the verses from Kings and Chronicles.

⁹ 2 Chr 7:8 (//1 Kgs 8:65); 2 Chr 28:16 (//2 Kgs 16:6); 2 Chr 21:10 (//2 Kgs 9:22).

¹⁰ 1 Chr 21:28–29 (unparalleled in 2 Sam 24:17); 2 Chr 13:18; 2 Chr 15:5 (in plural form); 2 Chr 16:7, 10.

¹¹ It seems probable that the Chronicler was familiar with the David-Bathsheba narrative. See H. G. M. Williamson, “A Response to A. G. Auld,” *JOT* 27 (1983), 33–39 (36); G. N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29* (AB, 12A; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 737–40; Idem, “Changing History: Nathan’s Dynastic Oracle and the Structure of the Davidic Monarchy in Chronicles,” in M. Bar-Asher et al. (eds.), *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, Its Exegesis, and Its Language* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), 99*–123* (Hebrew). Regarding the story of the battle of Ahab (1 Kgs 20), although it is not paralleled in Chronicles, it seems that the Chronicler had knowledge of it. On Ahab in Chronicles, see E. Ben Zvi, “The House of Omri/Ahab in Chronicles,” in L. L. Grabbe (ed.), *Ahab Agonistes. The Rise and Fall of the Omri Dynasty* (LHBOTS, 421/ESHM, 6; London/New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 41–53.

¹² Exceptions are: J. Myers, *II Chronicles* (AB, 13; New York: Doubleday, 1965), 220; R. B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles* (WBC, 15; Dallas: Word, 1987), 300. Both mention the Babylonian chronicle briefly but do not develop this point.

Galil thinks that there is no correspondence between the date Adar 2 appearing in the Babylonian chronicle and the Judean calendar where it was already Nisan. See G. Galil, *The Chronology of the Kings of Israel and Judah* (SHCANE, 9; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 113–14.

¹³ Chronicle BM 21946. See A. Millard, “The Babylonian Chronicle (1.137),” in W. W. Hallo (ed.), *COS 1. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 467.

The month of Adar mentioned in this chronicle corresponds to the Hebrew phrase “in the spring of the year” (ולתשובת השנה) because if the year started in Nisan, then Adar is the last month of the preceding year.

If this is the case, then the Babylonian Chronicle confirms the testimony of the Chronicler, and we may add this case to those in which the Chronicler is historically trustworthy.¹⁴ We may further deduce that the Chronicler had access to sources that were not available to the authors of Kings, who did not know exactly when Jehoiachin was sent into exile. Although we do not know whether the Chronicler had access to the Babylonian Chronicle itself, it would not be sound to merely postulate intuition or luck; the Chronicler may have based his assertions on some other oral or written source.¹⁵

This incident is not the only one where the Chronicler appears to have had additional information about Jehoiachin. The list of Jehoiachin’s heirs in 1 Chr 3:17–24 is another instance in which the Babylonian records support the Chronicler’s additions.¹⁶

A DIFFERENT VORLAGE?

Another possibility to explain the deviations of the Chronicler from his sources is that the Chronicler had a different Vorlage for the books of Samuel-Kings.¹⁷ This means that the Chronicler did not alter the text of Samuel-Kings tendentiously, but rather used a divergent copy of Samuel-Kings. Lemke thus concludes, “The text

¹⁴ Other known examples are Hezekiah’s tunnel (2 Chr 32:30), Manasseh’s deportation by the Assyrians (2 Chr 33:11), and Manasseh’s wall (2 Chr 33:14). See N. S. Fox, *In the Service of the King: Officialdom in Ancient Israel and Judah* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2000), 18–23; A. F. Rainey, “The Chronicler and His Sources—Historical and Geographical,” in M. P. Graham et al. (eds.), *The Chronicler as Historian* (JSOTSup, 238; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 30–72 (52–53); G. N. Knoppers, “Historiography and History: The Royal Reforms,” in *The Chronicler as Historian*, 178–203; B.E. Kelly, “Manasseh in the Books of Kings and Chronicles (2 Kings 21:1–18; 2 Chron 33:1–20),” in V. P. Long et al. (eds.), *Windows into Old Testament History: Evidence, Argument, and the Crisis of “Biblical Israel”* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 131–46.

¹⁵ For the view that the Chronicler had extra-biblical sources, see Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 18, 23 and passim.

¹⁶ See Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 100.

¹⁷ W.E. Lemke, “The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler’s History,” *HTR* 58 (1965), 349–63. Cf. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 28–29; R.W. Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 28–30; Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 69–71; H.G.M. Williamson “The Death of Josiah and the Continuing Development of the Deuteronomistic History,” *VT* 32 (1982), 242–48. Five years later, Begg has written a response to Williamson’s paper, to which Williamson replied: see C. T. Begg, “The Death of Josiah in Chronicles: Another View,” *VT* 37 (1987), 1–8; Williamson, “Reliving the Death of Josiah: A Reply to C. T. Begg,” *VT* 37, 9–15. See also Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 408–9.

which he utilized was an Old Palestinian text type from which also the Greek translation of Samuel was made.”¹⁸

Although I do believe that such a possibility should be considered in certain cases, I do not think that 2 Chr 36:10 is among them. One cannot account for all the differences between the Chronicler’s work and his sources on the basis of that line of explanation,¹⁹ especially in the case of parallel passages in Chronicles and Kings. Although in the case of Samuel, the Vorlage of Chronicles appears to have represented a type of text which was not identical with the MT and was closer to the Hebrew Vorlage of Samuel LXX (see also 4QSam^a), in the case of Kings it is generally admitted that Chronicler’s Vorlage was close to Kings MT, as demonstrated by McKenzie and others.²⁰

A CASE OF INTERPRETATION?

Several scholars hold that the Chronicler should be defined as an interpreter,²¹ but this view is criticized by other scholars. Among the main counter-arguments are: (a) if we define the book of Chronicles as an interpretation or exegesis, why would the Chronicler add unparalleled material? (b) where there are differences between Chronicles and its sources, many of the changes do not appear to be exegetical ones.²²

To be sure, one cannot deny that there are cases in Chronicles in which there is evidence for an interpretive process. However, we

¹⁸ Lemke, “Synoptic Problem,” 362.

¹⁹ Cf. B. E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (JSOTSup, 211; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 217; M. Avioz, “Nathan’s Prophecy in II Samuel 7 and 1 Chr 17: Text, Context, and Meaning,” *ZAW* 116 (2004), 542–54.

²⁰ See McKenzie, *Chronicler’s Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, 55; Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 70. It is true that in the case of 2 Kgs 24–25, McKenzie argued that Chr’s Vorlage of 2 Kgs 24–25 was truncated. However, McKenzie has usually not been followed on this point.

²¹ T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels* (FRLANT, 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972); W. M. Schniedewind, “The Chronicler As An Interpreter of Scripture,” in M. P. Graham and S. L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 158–80 and the literature cited therein.

²² For a critique of Willi and his followers, see P. R. Ackroyd, “The Chronicler as Exegete,” *JSOT* 2 (1977), 2–32 (= *The Chronicler in His Age* [JSOTSup, 101; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991], 311–43); P. C. Beentjes, *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles* (SSN, 52; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 5; I. Kalimi, “The Characterization of the Chronicler and His Writing,” in idem, *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place and Writing* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2005), 19–39. Kalimi raises seven criticisms of Willi, but I do not share all of them. For a definition of exegesis, see S. B. Porter and K. D. Clarke, “What is Exegesis? An Analysis of Various Definitions,” in S. B. Porter (ed.), *Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 3–21.

need not deduce from such cases that the *genre* of Chronicles is interpretation, and that every single difference should be explained as exegetical.²³

THE MEANING OF לַתְּשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה

Scholars have disputed the exact meaning of לַתְּשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה. Morgenstern²⁴ suggests that it is an astronomical term designating the equinox that occurs twice a year, in spring and autumn. The Babylonian calendar begins the year with the spring equinox, i.e. the month of Nisan.

According to Anderson, לַתְּשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה indicates the period between the heavy winter rains and the harvest, i.e. the spring, an appropriate time for military exploits.²⁵ Garsiel, however, rejects this view, reasoning that “it is improbable that all the local kings made a practice of fighting then... we cannot say that there was a fixed time when kings went out to war.”²⁶ Alternatively, Thiele and Finegan²⁷ maintain that the term means a time at or after Nisan 1, since that is the date of the Babylonian New Year and thus, most naturally, the beginning of the spring of the year. These authors connect our verse with Ezek 40:1 (“at the beginning of the year, on the tenth day of the month”) and conclude that Nisan 10 (Apr 22, 597) is the probable date of the actual deportation of Jehoiachin.

Two separate questions should be asked: (a) In what time of the year did armies prefer to wage war? and (b) What is the meaning of לַתְּשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה? The answer to the first question is that armies throughout the ages initiated wars in the spring,²⁸ and we have no

²³ For a similar assessment, see Knoppers, “Historiography and History,” 183–4. The problem of defining interrelations between biblical texts and labeling them with various sorts of misleading terms is beyond the scope of this paper. See, most recently, J. D. Smoak, “Building Houses and Planting Vineyards: The Early Inner-Biblical Discourse on an Ancient Israelite Wartime Curse,” *JBL* 127 (2008), 19–35.

²⁴ J. Morgenstern, “Additional Notes on ‘The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel,’” *HUCA* 3 (1926), 77–107 (78).

²⁵ A. A. Anderson, *2 Samuel* (WBC, 11; Dallas: Word, 1989), 152. Cf. R. P. Gordon, *1 & 2 Samuel: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 252; D. J. A. Clines, *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays 1967–1998*, vol. 1 (JSOTSup, 292; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 371–82; J. A. Wagenaar, “Post-exilic Calendar Innovations: The First Month of the Year and the Date of Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread,” *ZAW* 115 (2003), 3–24.

²⁶ M. Garsiel, “The Story of David and Bathsheba: A Different Approach,” *CBQ* 55 (1993), 251. Cf. P. K. McCarter Jr., *II Samuel* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 285.

²⁷ E. R. Thiele, “The Chronology of the Kings of Judah and Israel,” *JNES* 3 (1944), 137–86 (182); J. Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the Ancient World and Problems of Chronology in the Bible* (2d ed., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1998), 257.

²⁸ A. K. Grayson, “Assyrian Civilization,” in J. Boardman et al. (eds.),

reason to presume that the season of warfare was any different than is described in the Hebrew Bible. This question is not necessarily connected to the meaning of the term “לתשובת השנה,” however, which may refer to the beginning,²⁹ the middle,³⁰ or the end of the year.

While the first question may be answered by referring to statistics, the second question involves philology.³¹ Apparently, whenever biblical records are involved, the term “לתשובת השנה” is connected to military expeditions. In 2 Sam 11:1, it is equated with **לעת צאת המלאכים**;³² 1 Kgs 20: 22, 26 tells about the war between Aram and Israel; and finally in 2 Chr 36:10, Jehoiachin is taken into exile during that season of the year.³³

WHY DID THE CHRONICLER NOT USE THE MONTH NAME ADAR?

We might have expected the Chronicler to use the month name Adar to designate the month, as cited in the Babylonian Chronicle, thereby avoiding any ambiguity concerning the month in which Jehoiachin was deported. Why did he not do so? In the pre-exilic books, dates are designated according to an ordinal system, or numbered months.³⁴ This system is replaced in the post-exilic

The Cambridge Ancient History III/2: The Assyrian and Babylonian Empires and other States of the Near East, from the Eighth to the Sixth Centuries B.C. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 194–228 (219); S. E. Phang, *Roman Military Service: Ideologies of Discipline in the Late Republic and Early Principate* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 89.

²⁹ H. Tadmor, “Chronology,” *Encyclopaedia Biblica* 4 (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1962), 245–310 (276); A. Malamat, *History of Biblical Israel: Major Problems and Minor Issues* (CHANE, 7; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 310.

³⁰ See J. Begrich, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda und die Quellen des Rahmens der Königsbücher* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1929), 88; C. Körting, *Der Schall des Schofar. Israels Feste im Herbst* (BZAW, 285; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 61.

³¹ Galil points out that it is unclear whether the Chronicler meant the day on which Jehoiachin surrendered, a day after the New Year, or the day on which Jehoiachin was deported. See G. Galil, “A New Look at the Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah,” *Zion* 56 (1991), 15 n. 44 (Hebrew).

³² On this term, see McCarter, *II Samuel*, 279.

³³ Cf. Clines, *On the Way*. The term is also found in Greek in the supplement to LXX in 3 Reigns 12:24x. See, most recently, the discussion relating to the originality of this text in E. Tov, “3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions,” in A. Hilhorst et al. (eds.), *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 345–66.

³⁴ See J. C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 6. VanderKam omits the book of Chronicles from his list. Sacha Stern suggests that, “The exclusive use of Biblical, numbered months in some earlier post-exilic Biblical works [...] can be dismissed as literary archaism.” See his *Calendar and Community*:

period by the Babylonian month names, as we see in the books of Zechariah, Ezra-Nehemiah and Esther. However, the book of Chronicles uses the older system of the ordinal designation: the first month (1 Chr 12:16; 27:2), the second month (1 Chr 3:2); and the seventh month (2 Chr 5:3). Talmon³⁵ notes that the dates in post-exilic books are not recorded consistently. There are places where months are identified by numerals only (Hag 1:1), others where the Babylonian system is used exclusively (Esth 9:15, 17, 19, 21; Neh 1:1; 2:1), and still others in which a double date appears (Zech 1:7). Even in the Pseudepigrapha, the numeral system still prevails.³⁶

Because of the considerable ambiguity regarding the period when the system for numbering the months in Israel was changed,³⁷ it remains difficult to establish with certainty the reason for which the Chronicler abstained from using the Babylonian calendar.

CONCLUSION

The divergence between 2 Chr 36:10 and 2 Kgs 24:10 can be explained as having resulted from new information that was available to the Chronicler, but apparently not to the author of Kings,³⁸ a situation that is not unique within the biblical literature. However, my analysis of this one passage of Chronicles does not support unquestioning acceptance of either the book's historical validity, nor of the assumption that its unparalleled material was con-

A History of the Jewish Calendar, 2nd cent. BCE–10th cent. CE. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 29, n. 130. However, it is unlikely that such a discrepancy can be explained in this way. D. Miano (*Shadow on the Steps: Time Measurement in Ancient Israel* [Atlanta: SBL, 2010], 7–48) ignores the testimony of the post-exilic books with regard to the month names.

³⁵ S. Talmon, J. Ben-Dov and U. Glessmer, *Calendrical Texts. Qumran Cave 4 XVI* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, XXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 136 n. 5. See also A. D. Friedberg, "A New Clue in the Dating of the Composition of the Book of Esther," *VT* 50 (2000), 561–65. However, Friedberg does not mention the Book of Chronicles, a point for which he was criticized by Larsson. See G. Larsson, "Is the Book of Esther Older Than Has Been Believed?," *VT* 52 (2002), 130–31. Larsson notes that "The Book of Chronicles, which is also certainly later than 400 BCE, does only use ordinals and demonstrates no influence from the Babylonian calendar" (p. 130).

³⁶ J. C. VanderKam, "Calendars, Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish," *ABD* 1:814–20.

³⁷ De Vaux states that the change in the use of dates occurred long after the exile. See R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions* (trans. J. McHugh; London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1961), 185.

³⁸ In this I differ from Rainey ("The Chronicler and His Sources"), who supposed that both the Dtr and Chr had access to an extended version of the Samuel-Kings texts, but that each author had reasons to use or not to use this material.

sistently taken from extra-biblical sources. Rather, it corroborates the basic rule that Hugh Williamson laid out some thirty years ago in his commentary on Chronicles: “Sound method demands that each passage be examined in its own right first of all.”³⁹

³⁹ Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 19. Cf. also Galil, “The Historical Reliability.” For a positive stance towards the possibility that the Chronicler did have access to extra-biblical sources, see Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 30–44. I wish to express my gratitude to the anonymous referees of a first draft of this paper for their valuable suggestions which significantly improved the present article.