

THE TEMPLE ACCOUNT OF CHRONICLES  
BETWEEN KINGS AND JOSEPHUS

JOSHUA E. WILLIAMS\*

**ABSTRACT:** Differences between the accounts of the temple construction in 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles have long raised questions between the accounts. Although one could focus exclusively on the biblical material to attempt to describe the relationship between them, the ancient historian Josephus may provide another set of data to help clarify the relationship, especially since Josephus makes explicit claims about his own historical method. As a result, the present article examines some of the significant differences between Josephus's account and the biblical material. The intention is to determine how Josephus's stated claims inform arguments regarding the shape of the *Vorlage* of Chronicles. In the end, the article argues that despite the complicated textual picture that emerges, arguments for reconstructing the *Vorlage* of Chronicles should take into account not only the presence and sequence of material among the textual witnesses but also historiographical aims reconstructed from the content of each text.

**KEYWORDS:** Solomon's Temple, Josephus, 1 Kings, 2 Chronicles, Text Criticism

## Introduction

Reading parallel accounts of the same event raises several questions of interest to biblical scholars. These questions arise quite often in the reading of Chronicles since about half of its material has a parallel elsewhere in the Old Testament. Among these parallel accounts lies Solomon's temple construction. For Chronicles, the temple itself is a major theme, as demonstrated by the amount of text describing the preparations that David made for building the temple and arranging its worship. Therefore, it appears quite 'striking to observe that, after the extensive, almost belaboured [sic], build-up to this point,' Chronicles preserves a much shorter account of the temple's actual construction and description in comparison to Kings (Williamson 1982: 203). This surprising fact raises the question regarding the relationship between Kings and Chronicles. Beyond examining the texts themselves, as others have done (e.g., Auld 1994, 2017; Koulagna 2007; Van Seters 2011; Trebolle 2020; Person 2010; van Keulen

\* JOSHUA E. WILLIAMS (PhD 2006, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary) is Professor of Old Testament at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Email: jwilliams@swbts.edu.

2005; Carr 2011), this article intends to address the question by introducing another temple account into the conversation: Josephus's *Antiquities* (8:61–98).

Analyzing Josephus's account provides another basis for comparison when trying to reconstruct Chr's *Vorlage* and its historiographical method. Furthermore, Josephus may help in answering the question because elsewhere in his *Antiquities*, he provides some explicit comments about his historiographical work that are lacking in Kings or Chronicles. In the introduction he sets out the purpose of his work in light of those who write history (Josephus 2000: 1.1–10). He states that those who write histories generally have one or more of three motives: 1) to demonstrate their skill in communication, 2) to serve those who will read them, and 3) to preserve their own experience of the facts for the sake of posterity. He continues on that his goal in writing history has only been the latter two motives (Josephus 2000: 1.4). In his introduction to the work, he states, 'I have taken in hand this present task thinking that it will appear to all the Greeks deserving of studious attention. For it is going to encompass our entire ancient history and constitution of the state, translated from the Hebrew writings' (Josephus 2000: 1.5). Furthermore, later he reminds the reader that he has intended to do nothing more than translate the Hebrew writings and explain their facts without adding anything to them or subtracting anything from them (e.g., Josephus 2005: 10.218). One of his aims is to be comprehensive in retelling the history recorded in the Hebrew writings and to preserve it faithfully.

### Overview of Temple Construction Accounts

The comparison will begin at the macro-level. The following chart provides an overview of the relationship of the narrative units for each of the accounts. Significant variations exist between MT 1 Kings 6–7 and 3 Reigns 6–7, so they are treated separately in the table. The chart omits LXX Chronicles (*Paraleipomenon*) because it is substantially identical to MT Chronicles. Asterisks mark passages in which the content is present though either with noticeable variant details or in a different location in the book, that is, outside the temple construction narrative.

Topic	1 Kings 6–7	3 Reigns 6–7	2 Chroni- cles 3–4	<i>Antiquities</i> 8:61–98
Location	-	-	+	-
Time from Egypt	+*	+*	-	+*
Chronology with Solomon's Reign	+	+	+	+
Other Date Information	-	-	-	+
Time of Completion	-*	+	-	-*

Topic	1 Kings 6-7	3 Reigns 6-7	2 Chroni- cles 3-4	<i>Antiquities</i> 8:61-98
Stones for Foundation	-*	+	-	+
Description of Foundation	-	-	-	+
Measurements of Temple	+*	+*	+*	+*
Upper Building	-	-	-*	+
Measurements of Vestibule	+*	+*	+	+
Surrounding Chambers	+*	+*	-	+*
YHWH's Speech to Solo- mon	+	-	-	-
Inside of Walls of Temple	+	+	+*	+*
Comment regarding the Stone	+	+	-	+*
Steps to Temple	-	-	-	+
Measurements of Holiest Place	+	+	+	+
Measurements of Sanctuary	+	+	-	-
Doors of Sanctuary	+	+	-	+
Veil(s) of Holiest Place	-	-*	+*	+*
Cherubim	+	+	+	+
Floor of Temple	+	+	-	+
All with Gold	-	-	-	+
Time of Completion	+*	-*	-	-*
Palace Building	+	-*	-	-*
Craftsman	+	+	-*	+
Two Pillars	+	+	+*	+
Altar of Sanctuary	+	-	-	-
Bronze Sea	+*	+*	+*	+*
Supports for Sea	+	+	+	+
Capacity of Sea	+*	-	+*	+*
Bases for Lavers	+	+	-	+
Ten Basins	+	+	+	+
Measurements of Basins	+	+	-	+
Purpose of Lavers	-	-	+	+

Topic	1 Kings 6-7	3 Reigns 6-7	2 Chroni- cles 3-4	<i>Antiquities</i> 8:61-98
Bronze Altar	-	-	+	+
Recap of Hiram's Work	+	+	+	-
Casting and Weighing of Vessels	+*	+*	+*	-
Lampstands as Prescribed	-	-	+	+
Details of Pouring Vessels	-	-	-	+
Sockets for Doors	+	+	+	-*
Priestly Garments	-	-	-	+
Recap of Building and Dedicating Items	+	+	+	+
Partition Separating Temple	-	-	-	+
Magnificence of Temple	-	-	-	+
Outer Court	+*	-	+*	+*

The table reveals a complex textual situation with numerous pluses, minuses, and reworkings among the various witnesses. When comparing just the textual witness of Kings (even just MT and LXX), one notices several differences even without looking at the specific wording. This picture intensifies as one introduces the material of Chronicles and even more so when introducing the account of Josephus. The purpose of this article is not to simplify the textual situation but to explore what might explain the different types of variation among the witnesses. Ultimately, the question to address is one regarding Chronicles: What material did the Chronicler likely have available to him as he composed the work? A close look at the temple construction account of Josephus may provide some possible explanations.

### Josephus's Treatment of the Temple Construction Account

In light of the textual complexity of the temple construction accounts and Josephus's explicit comments regarding his purpose for writing, a closer look at the accounts is warranted. The discussion will focus on the sections of content within the temple construction accounts rather than the specific wording.

#### *Pluses of Josephus*

In terms of the overall description of the temple building, one will notice that Josephus's account is quite a bit longer than the biblical accounts. He has included the following material which is either not present in the biblical accounts or is only al-

luded to or hinted at: 1) the date of beginning construction in relation to Abraham, the creation of the world, and the reign of King Hiram of Tyre, 2) a description of the temple foundations, 3) a building above the temple, 4) Solomon's steps to the temple, 5) the astonishing view of the golden temple, 6) the number of pouring vessels, 7) descriptions of priestly garments, 8) the court separating the Gentiles, 9) and a final summary of the magnificence of the temple. Furthermore, his account includes passages from both 1 Kings/3 Reigns and Chronicles in order to provide the fullest picture possible. For the most part he has followed 1 Kings/3 Reigns since this account is fuller than the one in Chronicles. There are a couple of sections that are not included, but these will be treated later. From Chronicles, he derives three sections which are not included in 1 Kings/3 Reigns: the veil of the holy place (Josephus 2005: 8.72//2 Chronicles 3:14), the purpose of the lavers (Josephus 2005: 8.87//2 Chronicles 4:6), and the description of the bronze altar (Josephus 2005: 8.88//2 Chronicles 4:1). Besides these notices, there are some specific details that Josephus apparently derived from Chronicles only: the height of the temple at 120 cubits, which Josephus pluses considerably into another building altogether (Josephus 2005: 8.65//2 Chronicles 3:4, 9[?]), the capacity of the bronze sea at 3,000 baths (Josephus 2005: 8.80//2 Chronicles 4:5) not 2,000 baths as Kings recounts, and the description of the lampstands as corresponding to what is prescribed (Josephus 2005: 8.90//2 Chronicles 4:20) although Josephus identifies the source of the prescription more precisely as the Mosaic Law.

This fuller picture of the temple construction coincides with one of Josephus's explicitly stated claims for his work. As stated above, Josephus intends to be comprehensive in retelling the history of the Jews (Josephus 2005: 1.5). Furthermore, the way that Josephus has used Kings and Chronicles to fill out his picture of the temple building is consistent with his treatment of these works elsewhere. Begg has demonstrated that within the material covering the monarchy, Josephus often includes *Sondergut* from both Kings and Chronicles, and when a parallel passage exists in both Kings and Chronicles, he will often follow the fuller description (Begg 2000: 623; Ben Zvi 1988: 76). In other passages, where the accounts of Kings and Chronicles are quite similar, he includes individual details from each of the books in order to create the fullest picture possible (see e.g., Begg 2000: 623; Begg 2008:100–101).

Besides the use of Kings and Chronicles to create the fullest picture possible, Josephus also includes details that are not included in any of the biblical accounts. These pluses are of three types. First, some of these pluses are editorial comments that can be deduced from the biblical accounts. A few relate to the grandeur and beauty of the temple and its furnishings (Josephus 2005: 8.68, 83, 97; see also Pena 2022: 28–29). As an example, after describing Solomon's overlaying the temple with gold, Josephus

goes on to describe how the glimmering of the golden temple would fill the beholder's eyes (Josephus 2005: 8.68).

Second, some details that Josephus includes may be derived (often through typological means) from biblical accounts besides Kings and Chronicles. For instance, he describes the front of the temple as facing east (Josephus 2005: 8.64). This detail is not included in Kings or Chronicles, but it corresponds to both the wilderness tabernacle (Exodus 26:1–30//36:8–38) and to Ezekiel's temple in Ezekiel 47:1 (Josephus 2005: 19). Another detail that may derive from the wilderness tabernacle account is the description of priestly garments (Josephus 2005: 8.93; cf. Exodus 28; 39// Josephus 2005: 3.151–170), whose mention is lacking in Kings and Chronicles (Josephus 2005: 27). Some of these details illustrate Josephus's claims that the Jerusalem Temple was so ancient and famous (Pena 2022: 25).

Third, some details are not derived from any known biblical source. Some of these details appear to correspond to Josephus's experience with the Herodian temple. For instance, Josephus's description of the partition that surrounded the temple and the courtyards beyond them correspond fairly closely with his description of the Herodian temple (Josephus 2005: 28). As Pena argues, these details 'defend the continuity between the Solomonic Temple and the now-destroyed Herodian Temple' (Pena 2022, 28). Josephus includes other information in his account to correlate this historical event within the context of other nations. For instance, he correlates Solomon's starting date for building the temple with the reign of Hiram, king of Tyre, and with the founding of Tyre (Josephus 2005: 8.62). Correlating Solomon's Temple with the founding of Tyre again speaks to Josephus's concern to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jerusalem Temple (Pena 2022: 25).

In summary, looking at Josephus's pluses reveals the following: 1) it is part of his intention to be comprehensive in writing the work, 2) many of his pluses are editorial comments that can be derived from Kings/Chronicles accounts, 3) others are details derived from other biblical material, with which he draws a line of continuity from the tabernacle to the Jerusalem Temple since he mentions the priestly garments and the eastward orientation of the temple. Finally, he includes elements without any recognizable basis in the biblical material but elements that reinforce the antiquity of the Jerusalem Temple and the continuity between the Solomonic Temple and Herodian Temple.

The pluses in Josephus reflect two historiographical aims of his work. First, they reflect his explicit aim to present a comprehensive history. Second, they reflect another aim inferred from the evidence although not explicitly stated by Josephus: a desire to show that the Jerusalem temple was a magnificent, ancient structure, one worthy of respect and even rebuilding (Pena 2022: 39–40).

*Minuses of Josephus*

Despite the general trend to expand the temple building account beyond that of Kings or Chronicles, there is material that is found in Kings, Reigns, or Chronicles that is not included in Josephus's account. Each of these minuses will be treated in more detail below, so they will only be described here. First, Josephus's account does not include the geographical information given in 2 Chronicles 3:1. As the chart shows, Chronicles does not include a chronological notice at all but instead includes a geographical one. Josephus has followed (with some modification) the chronological notice of Kings and added more information to it. Second, his account does not include the notice that Solomon cast all the bronze utensils of the temple in the area around the Jordan and that there were so many that they could not be weighed (1 Kings 7:46//3 Reigns 7:32–33//2 Chronicles 4:17–18). Third, his account does not include YHWH's speech to Solomon recorded in 1 Kings 6:11–14. Only MT Kings records this speech; it is lacking in Reigns and Chronicles. Fourth, his account does not include Solomon's palace construction within the account of the temple construction. Only MT Kings records the palace construction in the middle of the temple construction account. Chronicles does not record it all, and 3 Reigns records it in a different location within the book: it is placed after the description of the temple buildings and all its furnishings but before the dedication of the temple. Josephus records the palace construction as well, but he has completely separated it from the temple construction account, placing it after the dedication of the temple, the celebration of the feasts, and God's (second) appearance to Solomon in a dream (Josephus 2005: 8.125–29). Only then does Josephus include a report of the palace construction.

Among these minuses, a closer look at the palace construction account, along with the information regarding the length of time required to complete the temple and palace provides the most insight into Josephus's treatment of the biblical material. As mentioned, the palace construction account is absent from Chronicles and migrates to different locations in Kings, Reigns, and Josephus. Josephus has treated the palace construction account differently than either Kings or Reigns because he separates it completely from the temple account. This move to push the palace construction further away from the temple construction appears to be part of a strategy to present Solomon as more pious and the central figure of the temple construction account (Feldman 1998a: 602; Koulagna 2007: 208–209). Including the palace construction within the temple construction account whether in the middle of describing the temple construction, like MT, or after it, like LXX, would relativize the importance of Solomon's temple construction and cast Solomon's portrait in a more

negative light (Auld 1994: 123; Koulagna 2007, 208; although see Verheyden 2013: 93–94, who relativizes this distinction because of the quality of the palace itself).

Furthermore, according to both Kings and Reigns, Solomon spends almost twice as much time building his own palace as he does the temple. In order to prevent this fact from tarnishing the portrayal of Solomon at this point (Feldman 1998a: 602; Koulagna 2007: 208), Josephus provides three comments: 1) Solomon did not build his palace with the same enthusiasm as he built the temple (Ant 8.130), 2) since God helped in building the temple, it took only seven years to complete (8.130), a fact that would surprise those who saw the temple (8.99), and 3) the palace was inferior to the temple because the materials were not prepared as long and because it was only a place for kings to dwell and not God (8:131).

Since Josephus moves the palace construction and qualifies it in these ways, does he also intentionally omit material from his biblical sources? Even though Josephus claims that he will be comprehensive in explaining all the historical events of the Jewish people, there are several narratives that he omits from his account (examples found in Feldman 1998a: 37–38; Avioz 2015: 69–70). As an example, one may look at Josephus's account of Moses. Feldman states the following regarding the biblical accounts of Moses:

Josephus was confronted with several very serious problems, namely, his murder of an Egyptian overseer; his marriage to a non-Jewish woman, Zipporah; his lowly occupation as a shepherd; his timidity when selected by G-d to lead the Israelites; the leprousness of his hand; his failure to circumcise his sons; his speech defect; his permission to the Isrealites [sic] to 'borrow' jewelry from the Egyptians; his need to turn to his father-in-law Jethro for advice; his uncontrolled anger in smashing the first set of tablets of the law; his abandonment of his wife Zipporah; his skepticism when G-d promised that He would supply the Israelites with meat; his disobedience toward G-d in striking the rock rather than speaking to it; and his initial inability to answer the complaint of Zelophehad's daughters. Despite the length of Josephus's account of Moses, he resolves these problems in almost all cases by simply omitting the above episodes. (Feldman 1998a: 664)

It may be possible that he did not receive some of these narratives or their details within the Hebrew writings that he possessed; however, it is unlikely that he did not have them all. Furthermore, they generally fall within a pattern of Josephus's own apologetic aims. Josephus was concerned to show that Jews did not hate non-Jews, and so Moses' murder of an Egyptian is omitted. He also wanted to present Jewish heroes as virtuous along the lines of Greek and Roman heroes (Feldman 1998a: 37–38, 660–664; the same holds true for Solomon, see Koulagna 2007: 231–233). There-

fore, he omitted many of the narrative details that cast a doubt on Moses' courage, temperance, justice, wisdom, persuasiveness in speech, or faithfulness to God and family (Feldman 1998a: 37–38, 660–664; although see the qualification regarding Solomon by Verheyden 2013:86–106). The pattern revealed in the picture of Moses is repeated in other passages as well, including Solomon (Feldman 1998a: 660–667; Koulagna 2007: 231–233).

As a result, even though Josephus intended to provide a comprehensive history of the Jews based on the Hebrew writings, he chose to omit some material in light of other aims, even aims that are not explicitly stated in his text.

These omissions create a tension within Josephus's own explicit claims regarding his work. As mentioned above, Josephus claims to do nothing more than transmit and explain the historical events without adding to them or subtracting from them. How does one account for this apparent contradiction? First, even though his statements resemble biblical statements regarding the Mosaic Law (e.g., Deuteronomy 4:2; 12:42 [13:1 LXX]), by the time of Josephus's writing, such a statement about adding or subtracting was also a common trope regarding the accuracy of an account (Sterling 1992, 252–255; Feldman 1998a, 41; Feldman 1998b: 539–543). Second, even though Josephus speaks of transmitting or translating the Hebrew writings into Greek, his task involves more than that (Feldman 1998a: 44–46; Norton 2011, 60; although see Friis 2018: 103–105). As mentioned above, he states to his reader that his purpose is only to translate the Hebrew writings into Greek and to explain them (Josephus 2005: 10.218). Here Josephus differentiates between the transmission of the Hebrew writings, even in Greek, and the explanation of such writings; however, the two should be viewed as components of a single task over against the task of adding or subtracting (Norton 2011, 60). Viewed in this light, any expansions or omissions are simply part of his task to explain the Hebrew writings faithfully according to his understanding of them.

Third, even though Josephus not only claims that he has neither added nor omitted anything for his own writing and claims later in his life that 'no-one has dared to add, to take away, or to alter anything [in the Jewish sacred writings]' (Josephus 2007: 1.42), this statement occurs within a clearly polemical context (Josephus 2007: 1.29–42) in which he contrasts the existence of Jewish historical written records to the absence of Greek historical written records. The absence of such Greek records has led to contradictions among the Greek historians (Friis 2018: 78–85). Fourth, Josephus often attempts to resolve discrepancies or tensions in the Hebrew writings through omission or harmonization (Feldman 1998b: 560–561; Nodet 2006: 143–145; Avioz 2015: 69–70; see also Avioz 2021). Admittedly, when Josephus omits or harmonizes such accounts, he does not explicitly state so. Such a statement would

undermine both his view of the Hebrew writings and his aim in presenting them as accurate portrayals of history of the Jewish people.

Resolving the tension involves recognizing on the one hand that his statements regarding adding or omitting nothing from the accounts fit within the rhetorical setting of ancient writing and his own polemical aims. They are statements concerning the veracity of his account over against others. On the other hand, his statements are not simply empty rhetoric. Even though to a contemporary reader such divergences from the biblical text may appear to be adding to or subtracting from the biblical material, from Josephus's point of view, they are simply part of translating and explaining the Hebrew writings. They serve as programmatic statements intended to show the 'extent of his research and ... the general accuracy of his account' (Friis 2018: 106).

Beyond the palace construction account, there are three other minuses in Josephus's account to address. In each case, there are factors regarding these minuses that raise questions regarding Josephus's access to the material. The first minus is YHWH's speech which concludes the external description of the temple. Neither Chronicles, Reigns, nor Josephus includes this speech as recorded in MT 1 Kings 6:11–14. In fact, Treballe has argued that in many passages, the *setumot* and *petuhot* preserve scribal notations that indicate some type of insertion or rearrangement of the text (Treballe 2016: 165–215). This particular passage serves as one of his many examples (Treballe 2016: 206). Furthermore, the content of the speech appears quite consistent with other elements of Josephus's writing elsewhere and his portrayal of Solomon. Finally, since Josephus intends to be comprehensive, there is no reason to omit this passage.

The second minus concerns a section which Kings, Reigns, and Chronicles include, but Josephus's account does not. Again, for this passage, the content itself does not provide a reason to omit the material. However, it should be noted that 3 Reigns 7:32–33 contains the same material as Kings and Chronicles; however, the content of the verses themselves is reversed: the weight of the bronze is mentioned before their being cast in the area around the Jordan.

Furthermore, returning to Treballe's argument regarding the *setumah* and *petuhah* (Treballe 2016: 165–215), in the case of Chronicles, a *setumah* occurs within 2 Chronicles 4:11, the verse that begins to list all the implements that Hiram/Huram(-abi) constructed. A *petuhah* occurs at the end of 2 Chronicles 4:18 which concludes the section concerning the bronze implements. Again, the fact that Josephus does not include this information in his account would be consistent with viewing this section as unfixed within the temple construction, or at least, unavailable to Josephus.

The third minus is the geographical information regarding the temple site. Chron-

icles makes the connection between the temple site and the site of the near-sacrifice of Isaac recorded in Genesis 22 by mentioning Mt. Moriah. This information is included in Josephus's account of the near-sacrifice of Isaac where he states that Mt. Moriah is the same mountain where David built the temple (Josephus 2000: 1.224–226). As a result, there is no reason to avoid the association of the temple site with Mount Moriah, even though Josephus lists only David as the temple builder here. This lack of reference to the location of the temple site suggests that even though Josephus was familiar with the content of the note, he did not associate it with the context of the temple construction account or even the larger accounts of David and Solomon.

#### *Summary of Josephus's Treatment of Temple Construction Account*

Josephus's account of the temple construction is considerably longer than those represented in Kings, Reigns, or Chronicles. In this case it results from Josephus's attempt to present a comprehensive history of the Jews. His longer account results from four activities: 1) taking over shared and unique elements from Kings and Chronicles, 2) inserting comments that fill in gaps left in each of those accounts, 3) providing additional comments that relate the account to other details found in biblical material, and 4) inserting comments that appear to reflect his wider knowledge or his own experience. Some passages are not present in his account, especially those that are not represented in more than one text form or those that are found in different locations among the text forms. Furthermore, one minus concerns material with which he is familiar, but which he did not include in the context of the temple construction account or even the narratives of David or Solomon. His claim to preserve accurately the history of the Jews without adding or omitting anything reflects the fact that his work fell within the boundaries of his rhetorical context for translating and explaining the temple construction accounts within the Hebrew writings.

### **The *Vorlage* of Chronicles**

Now that Josephus's handling of the temple construction account has been examined, one may address the question of the possible *Vorlage* of Chronicles.

#### *Pluses of Chronicles*

The historiographical method for Josephus's pluses may inform one aspect of addressing Chronicles's *Vorlage*: the inclusion of geographic information only in Chronicles. In 2 Chronicles 3:1, the temple construction account begins with a note that Solomon began building the temple in Jerusalem on Mt. Moriah at the threshing floor of Ornan. The inclusion of Mt. Moriah connects the temple construction with the averted sacrifice of Isaac recounted in Genesis 22 (see Kalimi 1990: 346–350, 357–362). Furthermore, by relating the location to the threshing floor of Ornan, the

text connects the temple construction to David's sacrifice ending the disaster caused from his census (Boda 2010, 246). This type of activity corresponds with Josephus's own method of expansion by including details that draw continuity to other biblical material and probably reflects a way of working with the material that Josephus himself inherited (Feldman 1998b: 541–542). As a result, this evidence would suggest that there is no need for this information to be a part of the Chronicler's *Vorlage*.

### *Minuses of Chronicles*

The rest of the discussion regarding Chronicles's *Vorlage* will follow the lines of the minuses in Josephus's account. Chronicles, Reigns, and Josephus do not include YHWH's speech to Solomon as recorded in 1 Kings 6:11–14. Comparing the MT and LXX does not lead to a clear conclusion regarding the priority of one over the other. As van Keulen states, '[N]o conclusive evidence can be adduced either pro or contra the primacy of 1 Kings 6:11–14 over against the LXX' (van Keulen 2005: 150). Therefore, the customary criteria of textual criticism for Kings provide no real clues concerning which reading more likely occurred in Chronicles's *Vorlage*. From the standpoint of Chronicles, two points are relevant. First, there is no reason that the speech itself would cause a problem for Chronicles, since it communicates well his own principle of retribution. Second, one could argue, as Van Seters does, that Chronicles did not include the speech as a matter 'of economy and abridgment' (Van Seters 2011: 103). This point may apply to Chronicles, but, as stated above, it does not apply to Josephus since he intends to be comprehensive. As a result, it seems likely that neither Chronicles's *Vorlage* nor the material available to Josephus contained this speech.

As stated above, the palace construction account is absent from Chronicles and migrates to different locations in Kings, Reigns, and Josephus. In a previous edition of his textbook, Tov stated, 'Differences in sequence often concern sections, whose position had not yet been fixed in the textual traditions because of their secondary nature' (Tov 2012: 309). If the palace construction account is such a section, then one would still need to determine if it were present in the *Vorlage* of Chronicles. Josephus's treatment of the palace construction sheds light on whether it does. As noted above, Josephus relocates the palace construction account in order to present Solomon as more pious, especially in constructing the temple. Furthermore, Josephus's comments regarding the time taken to build the palace in comparison to the temple also sheds light on whether or not Chr's *Vorlage* likely contained the both the palace construction account and the information regarding the time of completion. Josephus inserts three comments to explain why the palace construction took longer than the temple construction. His comments reveal that the palace construction itself, especially in proximity to the temple construction, poses problems for his

presentation of Solomon as the ‘hero’ of the temple construction account (Koulagna 2017: 208). Although Chronicles does provide a notice that it took Solomon twenty years to build both temple and palace (2 Chronicles 8:1), it does not specify the amount of time required for each; it remains ambiguous. Furthermore, it has long been recognized that Chronicles presents a positive image of Solomon (see review of literature in Jeon 2012: 1–4). The evidence demonstrates that including the palace construction account could be a problem within Chronicles; however, its lack, along with the lack of information regarding the length of time required to build the temple or palace individually, avoids these problems.

Therefore, there is motivation for Chronicles not to include a palace construction account if he found one in his *Vorlage*. However, one may ask whether omitting an account in this way would be acceptable historiographical method for Chronicles. Here again, Josephus proves helpful. Even when Josephus has stated explicitly that he intends his account to be comprehensive, he omits certain details from his recounting. As shown above, whatever the specific, internal guidelines that directed Josephus’s historiography, it is clear that omission, especially of problematic texts, was an acceptable tool in his toolkit for working with the biblical material to create his own work. Therefore, since omission was likely an acceptable historiographical method for handling source material, especially when the material presented certain problems within the historiography, and since the palace construction account would present such problems for Chronicles, it appears likely that if Chronicles did possess an account of Solomon’s palace construction, he either would have reworked it in a manner like Josephus did (inevitably de-emphasizing the temple in the process) or more likely would not have included it at all.

#### *Form of the Vorlage of Chronicles*

The above examination leads to the following results concerning the *Vorlage* of Chr. First, some material of Chronicles’s temple construction account appears to be an expansion beyond Chronicles’s *Vorlage*. For instance, the notes regarding the location of the temple fit well with the historiographical method of Josephus. Second, Chronicles’s *Vorlage* is not identical to MT Kings since no other account contains the passage describing YHWH’s speech (1 Kgs 6:11–14), and there is no discernible reason for omitting the passage in the other accounts. Third, Chronicles’s *Vorlage* is not identical to LXX Reigns since the verses regarding the casting and weighing of the bronze implements occur in a different order. Fourth, regarding the palace construction, the evidence suggests that Chronicles’s *Vorlage* may have included such an account since there are reasons in Chronicles to omit the account.

## Conclusion

Since de Wette the consensus of OT scholarship has considered Samuel-Kings to be the *Vorlage* of Chronicles. His conclusion led to a trend among scholars to approach every deviation of Chronicles from MT Kings as the Chronicler's intentional, motivated alteration of the *Vorlage*. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls required a further clarification of this relationship since it was demonstrated that, at least for Samuel, the *Vorlage* of Chronicles was likely not of the same type as the MT (Lemke 1965:349–363). At that time, the picture of textual complexity began to form a sharper image. As a result, another trend has emerged. This trend views deviations among the textual witnesses, especially Kings and Reigns, as evidence that Chronicles's *Vorlage* did not contain such material (e.g., Auld 1994; 2017; 2023; Trebelle 1982, 2007, 2010; Person 2010). As the analysis above shows, the textual complexity of the accounts invites this trend. As the parallel temple construction accounts show, one cannot simply assume a linear development of texts from Kings (either MT or LXX) to Chronicles to Josephus. There are detours within every account. Furthermore, explorations of scribal work have opened up the discussion regarding parallel accounts preserved in Kings and Chronicles along entirely new lines (Carr 2011a: 73–93, 2011b:73–78, 2015; Person 2016; 2020: 109–122; see also brief summary in Ska 2021: 44–47). Even the notion of a written *Vorlage* is under dispute. At the same time, this trend can give insufficient weight to the historiographical aims of the Chronicler in producing his account with the aid of textual material, what one may term his *Vorlage*, whatever shape it may have. The evidence from Josephus suggests that neither trend captures the full picture. Chronicles's *Vorlage* is not identical to any form of Kings, Hebrew or Greek, even at its macro-level, much less at the level of wording. At the same time, Josephus serves as ancient evidence that historiographical aims, even those only reconstructed from the content of the text, appear to be a legitimate argument to explain why Chronicles may omit material from the accounts available at its production. As a result, this attempt to look at the parallel accounts of the temple construction reinforces an option for interpretation that has been traditional in Old Testament scholarship and, hopefully, has exposed some of the historiographical methods at play within these ancient accounts.

## Bibliography

- Auld AG (2017) *Life in Kings: Reshaping the Royal Story in the Hebrew Bible*. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Auld AG (1994) *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Avioz M (2020) *Legal Exegesis of Scripture in the Works of Josephus*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Avioz M (2015) *Josephus' Interpretation of the Books of Samuel*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Begg C (2008) Solomon's Post Temple-Dedication Initiatives According to Josephus. *Biblische Notizen*, 138: 89–105.
- Begg C (2000) *Josephus' Story of the Later Monarchy (AJ 9,1–10,185)*. Leuven: Leuven University Press/UITgeverij Peeters.
- Ben Zvi E (1988) The Authority of 1–2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, 3: 59–88.
- Boda MJ (2010) *1–2 Chronicles*. Cornerstone Biblical Commentary 5a. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.
- Carr DM (2011) *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carr DM (2011) 'Empirical' Comparison and the Analysis of the Relationship of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. In Dozeman TB, Römer T and Schmid K (eds) *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 73–93.
- Feldman LH (1998) *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill.
- Feldman LH (1998) *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Friis M (2018) *Image and Imitation: Josephus' Antiquities 1–11 and Greco-Roman Historiography*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Jeon YH (2013) *Impeccable Solomon? A Study of Solomon's Faults in Chronicles*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.
- Josephus F (2007) *Against Apion*. In Mason S (ed) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*, vol. 10, Barclay JMG (trans and ed). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Josephus F (2005) *Judean Antiquities*. In Mason S (ed) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*, vol. 5, Begg C and Spilsbury P (trans and eds). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Josephus F (2000) *Judean Antiquities*. In Mason S (ed) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*, vol. 3, Feldman LH (trans and ed). Leiden/Boston: Brill.

- Kalimi I (1990) The Land of Moriah, Mount Moriah, and the Site of Solomon's Temple in Biblical Historiography. *Harvard Theological Review*, 83(4): 345–362.
- Keulen PSF van (2005) *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg 2–11*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Koulagna J (2007) *Lecture et Relectures de la Figure de Salomon de l'Histoire Deutéronomiste à Flavius Josèphe*. PhD thesis, Université Marc Bloch, Strasbourg.
- Lemke W (1965) The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History. *Harvard Theological Review*, 58(4): 349–363.
- Nodet É (2007) Josephus and the Books of Samuel. In Cohen SJD and Schwartz J (eds) *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 141–167.
- Norton JDH (2011) *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus and the Yahad*. London/New York: T&T Clark.
- Pena JX (2022) The Solomonic Temple of Josephus' *Antiquities*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 47(1): 23–42.
- Person RF (2023) *Scribal Memory and Word Selection: Text Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Text-Critical Studies 15. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Person RF (2015) Text Criticism as a Lens for Understanding the Transmission of Ancient Texts in Their Oral Environments. In Schmidt BB (ed.) *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 197–215.
- Person RF (2010) *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World*. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Ska JL (2021) The Book of Chronicles Through the Ages... In Jeon J and Jonker LC (eds) *Chronicles and the Priestly Literature of the Hebrew Bible*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 15–50.
- Sterling GE (1992) *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tov E (2012) *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd edn. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Trebolle Barrera JC (2020) *Textual and Literary Criticism of the Books of Kings: Collected Essays*. Piquer Otero A and Torijano PA (eds). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Trebolle Barrera JC (2016) Division Markers. In Person RF Jr and Rezetko R (eds) *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.
- Trebolle Barrera JC (2010) Authoritative Scripture as Reflected in the Textual Transmission of the Biblical Books: The Case of 1 Kings 3–10 In Popović M (ed.) *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 93–116.
- Van Seters J (2011) The Chronicler's Account of the Temple-Building... In Van Seters

- J (ed.) *Changing Perspectives I: Studies in the History, Literature and Religion of Biblical Israel*. London/Oakville: Equinox, 99–114.
- Verheyden J (2013) Josephus on Solomon. In Amir Y, Pe'er A and Ehrlich CS (eds) *The Figure of Solomon in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Tradition: King, Sage, and Architect*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 85–106.
- Williamson HGM (1982) *1 and 2 Chronicles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.