

*JBL* 121/2 (2002) 227–243

## OMITTED AND REMAINING MATTERS: ON THE NAMES GIVEN TO THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES IN ANTIQUITY

GARY N. KNOPPERS and PAUL B. HARVEY JR.

gk7@psu.edu

pbh1@psu.edu

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802-5500

The seventh book [of the Writings] is Dabreiamin, that is “Words of the days,” which we are able to call more specifically a chronicle (χροινικόν) of all divine history; this book is entitled among us *Paralipomenon* One and Two.<sup>1</sup>

—Jerome, from the Preface to his translation of Samuel–Kings.<sup>2</sup>

Like many other works stemming from the ancient Near East, the book known to us as Chronicles was originally untitled and anonymously authored. The purpose of this short study will be to explore the varied nomenclature given to this book by early Jewish and Christian interpreters. The different titles attributed to the text provide fascinating glimpses into how antique translators and commentators construed the nature, genre, and import of this work. That at least some of these titles were retained and perpetuated for much longer periods of time than scholars have previously thought indicates the influence of the early interpreters upon later generations. In brief, the present discussion is a contribution to the hermeneutical history of one biblical book. In what follows, special attention will be devoted to the works of patristic writers, because their comments on the titles of Chronicles are not well known.

<sup>1</sup>Translations ours, unless otherwise indicated. Our thanks for bibliographic and other consultative aid to Gretchen E. Minton, William L. Petersen, and A. Gregg Roeber.

<sup>2</sup>Jerome, *Prologus in libro Regum* (the so-called “prologus galeatus”) in *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. Bonifatius Fischer et al. (3d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1984), 365.

## I. The Name of Chronicles in Rabbinic Literature

In the Hebrew (rabbinic) tradition, cited by Jerome, the work is called “the book of the events (literally: words) of the days” (סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים).<sup>3</sup> It is uncertain when the text acquired this title. The book also carries this title in the earliest witnesses to the Peshitta.<sup>4</sup> In ascribing the name סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים to Chronicles, the early interpreters may have been influenced by biblical tradition itself. The authors of Kings regularly cite lost works entitled “the book of the events of the days of the kings of Israel” (סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; e.g., 1 Kgs 14:19; 15:31; 16:5, 14, 20, 27; 22:39; 2 Kgs 1:18; 10:34; 13:8, 12; 14:15, 28; 15:11, 15, 21, 31) and “the book of the events of the days of the kings of Judah” (סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה; e.g., 1 Kgs 14:29; 15:7, 23; 22:46; 2 Kgs 8:23; 12:20; 14:18; 15:6, 36; 16:19; 20:20; 21:17, 25; 23:28; 24:5). Similar names appear in Esth 10:2, “the book of the events of the days of the kings of Media and Persia” (סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי מְדִי וּפָרְס), and in Esth 6:1, “the book of the records, the events of the days” (סֵפֶר הַיְּבוּרֹת דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים). There is no scholarly agreement about the nature of such lost works. Some think of royal annals, the official records of a given king’s reign.<sup>5</sup> Others think of literary compositions or surveys that may have been based, in part, on official records or annals.<sup>6</sup>

Indebted to the work of the authors of Kings, the authors of Chronicles also refer to written sources dealing with the monarchy. The text sometimes speaks of “the book of the kings of Judah and Israel” (סֵפֶר הַמְּלָכִים לְיְהוּדָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל; 2 Chr 16:11; 25:26; 28:26; 32:32) and of “the book of the kings of Israel and Judah” (סֵפֶר מַלְכֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיְהוּדָה; 1 Chr 9:1; 2 Chr 27:7;

<sup>3</sup> So, e.g., *m. Yoma* 1.6; *b. Meg.* 13a; *b. B. Bat.* 14b–15a; *Midr. Exod* 38:5; *Midr. Lev* 1:3; *Midr. Ruth* 2:1.

<sup>4</sup> W. Bacher, “Der Name der Bücher der Chronik in der Septuaginta,” *ZAW* 15 (1895): 306. On the full title in the Peshitta, see further below.

<sup>5</sup> J. A. Montgomery, “Archival Data in the Book of Kings,” *JBL* 53 (1934): 46–52; J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, *A Critical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1951), 43–44; A. Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (2d ed.; Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1956), 54–60; J. Gray, *I & II Kings* (OTL; 2d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 26–27; T. N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy* (ConBOT 5; Lund: Gleerup, 1971), 38–40.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., C. F. Keil, *The Books of the Kings* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1877; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 12; M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (2d ed.; Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1957), 66–67, 72–75; idem, *Könige* (BKAT 9/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968), 327; O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 48–49; J. Van Seters, *In Search of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 292–302; M. Cogan, “Towards a Definition of סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל/יְהוּדָה” (in Hebrew), in *Frank Moore Cross Volume* (ed. B. A. Levine et al.; *Erlsr* 26; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999), 78–83; M. Haran, “The Books of the Chronicles ‘of the Kings of Judah’ and ‘of the Kings of Israel’: What Sort of Books Were They?” *VT* 49 (1999): 162. Haran provides a useful overview of the issues (pp. 156–57).

35:27; 36:8).<sup>7</sup> In only one case is reference made to “the book of the kings of Israel” (2 Chr 20:34). In no instance is there a reference made to “the book of the kings of Judah.”<sup>8</sup> Interestingly enough, the references in Chronicles to “the book of the kings of Israel and Judah” and to “the book of the kings of Judah and Israel” are all found in discussions of southern kings or of Judah and Benjamin. As such, they are probably formulaic adaptations of the source citations found in Kings.<sup>9</sup> Judging by the context in which the expressions are used, one may assume that readers are being referred to (otherwise lost) written records pertaining to the southern monarchy. Nevertheless, the contrast in phraseology with Kings is important. The book of Chronicles contains no instance of the collocation that later became its name, סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים. Hence, if later interpreters drew the title from earlier biblical tradition, they drew it from works other than Chronicles itself.<sup>10</sup>

Aside from cited works whose titles resemble that given to the book of Chronicles, there are works that refer to its precise name. Both Esth 2:23 and Neh 12:23 mention “the book of the events of the days” (סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים). Whether the citation in Nehemiah refers to the biblical book of Chronicles is disputed. Perhaps some of the rabbis thought so, given the context in

<sup>7</sup> The first reference (1 Chr 9:1) is disputed. The text mentions that “all Israel was genealogically registered (דְּתִיחֲטוּ) and their (records) were written in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah” (מִלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה). Cf. LXX<sup>B</sup> Βασιλέων Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα; Tg. *milky' dbyr' ysrl wmlky' dbyr' yhwth*. Given the plural verb and the following plural pronominal suffix on בְּמַעֲלָם, “their transgression” (later in 9:1), the antecedent should also be plural. But the Hebrew can be taken in another way. Indeed, almost all modern translations read “kings of Israel” and construe “Judah” with the following plural verb (הִגְלוּ), hence “the book of the kings of Israel. And Judah was exiled . . .” to avoid the apparent contradiction of the (northern) Israelites going into a Babylonian exile. In this understanding, the reference to “the book of the kings of Israel” might relate to the northern kingdom (but see 1 Chr 8:1–40, which consists of Benjaminite genealogies), to Judah as representative of Israel, or to the people (north and south) as a whole. We are not inclined to accept these alternate explanations, both because of the grammatical issues and because the collocation “the book of the kings of Israel” is very unusual in Chronicles, occurring elsewhere only in 2 Chr 20:34. It is quite possible that the text of 1 Chr 9:1 has experienced whole word haplography (from מִלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה הִגְלוּ to מִלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה הִגְלוּ). The reference to “the book of the kings of Israel and Judah” is probably formulaic. See further G. N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles* (AB 12; New York: Doubleday, forthcoming).

<sup>8</sup> There is one reference made to a “midrash of the book of Kings” (מִדְּרָשׁ סֵפֶר הַמְּלָכִים) 2 Chr 24:27), and one reference to an “account of the events of the days of King David” (1 Chr 27:24).

<sup>9</sup> Chronicles also makes reference to a variety of (otherwise unknown) prophetic sources. The questions posed by these citations represent a book-length study by themselves. See the recent work of W. M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 197; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995).

<sup>10</sup> Indeed, they may have read references to otherwise lost works such as סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים in Kings (see above) and סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים in Neh 12:23 and assumed that these biblical writings were referring to the Chronicler's work.

Nehemiah. The lists in Neh 12:1–26 refer to lineages of priests and Levites, to companies of singers, and to hymns associated with David. All of these are prominent motifs in the book of Chronicles. But most modern commentators understand “the book of the events of the days” in Neh 12:23 to designate an otherwise lost historical, archival, or chronographic record.<sup>11</sup> In this context, it is relevant that by the Neo-Babylonian period, a variety of third-person prose chronographic writings had been composed or were being composed, such as the *Assyrian Chronicles*, the *Babylonian Chronicles*, the *Dynastic Chronicle*, the *Religious Chronicle*, and the *Weidner Chronicle*.<sup>12</sup> The composition of such diverse documents is attested over a lengthy period of time. The *Babylonian Chronicles* series continued into the Seleucid era.<sup>13</sup> These varied works drew upon a variety of sources, including astronomical diaries, king lists, and memorial inscriptions.<sup>14</sup> In the late Persian or early Hellenistic period, works such as “the book of the records, the events of the days” (Esth 6:1) and “the book of records” (סִפְרֵי־דְכַרְנִיָּא; Ezra 4:15) could well have been understood as historiographic writings.<sup>15</sup> The same could be true of “the book of the events of the days” (סִפְרֵי דְכַרְיִי הַיָּמִים) in Neh 12:23. Whatever the precise referent for the work cited in Neh 12:23, the title סִפְרֵי דְכַרְיִי הַיָּמִים is itself significant, indicating that Chronicles is a book dealing in some fashion with past events.

There is another title associated with Chronicles in the Babylonian Talmud: “the book of the Genealogies” (סִפְרֵי יוֹדְעֵינִי; *b. Pesah.* 62b). This nomenclature may refer, however, to a commentary on Chronicles or a portion thereof.<sup>16</sup> For a time in late antiquity the genealogies in Chronicles and in other biblical books enjoyed some popularity, because the personal, ethnic, and place-names contained within these lineages were thought to be laden with different levels of meaning.<sup>17</sup> Names and patterns of names were inter-

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., C. F. Keil, *The Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1873; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1978), 272–73; W. Rudolph, *Ezra und Nehemia* (HAT 20; Tübingen: Mohr, 1949), 194; H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco: Word, 1985), 361; J. Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), 340. In this respect, F. M. Cross is an exception in thinking that the title does refer to the Chronicler’s work (“A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration,” *JBL* 94 (1975): 8; idem, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998], 165).

<sup>12</sup> A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (TCS 5; Locust Valley, NY: Augustin, 1975; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 8–28.

<sup>14</sup> A. K. Grayson, “Assyria and Babylonia,” *Or* 49 (1980): 171–92; Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 292–94.

<sup>15</sup> Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 294–301.

<sup>16</sup> Reference is made in *b. Pesah.* 62b to this book as having been “hidden,” a surprising assertion to make about the book of Chronicles itself.

<sup>17</sup> Ehud Ben Zvi, “The Authority of 1–2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period,” *JSP*

preted allegorically.<sup>18</sup> Names could be construed as pertaining to different functions and phases in the life of a single person (e.g., *b. Meg.* 13a). It may well be that the popularity of this form of interpretation lies behind the oft-quoted comment about the Sages' many genealogical speculations in *b. Pesah.* 62b. Alluding to the Benjaminite lineages, one of which begins with "And Azel had six sons" (1 Chr 8:38//9:44) and ends with "these were the sons of Azel" (1 Chr 8:38//9:44), Mar Zuṭra declared that "between 'Azel' and 'Azel' they were loaded with four hundred camels of exegetical interpretations."<sup>19</sup> In this context, it is certainly relevant that the Targum to Chronicles begins with the introduction: "this is the book of the genealogies, the events of the days from antiquity" (דִּין סֵפֶר יְחוּסִיָּא פִּתְגָמִיָּא דְּמִן יוֹמֵי עֲלְמָא).<sup>20</sup> The introductory words in the Targum may reflect an attempt to combine two traditional titles, one covering the genealogies and the other covering the rest of the work.<sup>21</sup>

## II. Greek and Latin Sources

Like some of the early Jewish interpreters, Greek and Latin Christian scholars of the third through the early sixth centuries frequently demonstrate exegetical interest in the symbolic value of the genealogies, proper names, and toponyms of the Hebrew Scriptures. Christian symbolic (or typological, analogical, allegorical) interpretation of scriptural names and places could claim a lengthy pedigree. The investigation by secular Stoic antiquarians of etymologies and proper names for metaphorical significance<sup>22</sup> found expression in,

3 (1988): 77, 85; Kai Peltonen, *History Debated: The Historical Reliability of Chronicles in Pre-Critical and Critical Research* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 64; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 1:18–21; I. Kalimi, "History of Interpretation: The Book of Chronicles in Jewish Tradition from Daniel to Spinoza," *RB* 105 (1998): 26–29.

<sup>18</sup> E.g., *Midr.* Ruth 2:1–2; *Midr.* Lev 1:3. See further T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung* (FRLANT 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 14–16; Kalimi, "History of Interpretation," 27–28.

<sup>19</sup> The translation is in dispute. T. Willi prefers to read "he loaded him with four hundred camels of scripture interpretation" (*Chronik* [BKAT 24/1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991], 1).

<sup>20</sup> Le Déaut and J. Robert, *Targum des Chroniques: I, Introduction et Traduction; II, Text et Glossaire* (2 vols.; AnBib 51; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), 1:16, 2:9.

<sup>21</sup> M. Rosenberg and K. Kohler, "Das Targum zur Chronik," *Jüdische Zeitschrift* 8 (1870): 136.

<sup>22</sup> Beginning at least with Ariston of Chios (fl. early third century B.C.E.): *SVF* 1:75–79. For additional discussion of this exegetical tradition, see I. Opelt, "Etymologie," *RAC* 46 (1965): 797–844, esp. 827–30, 839–40; C. B. Tkacz, "Typology," in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (ed. A. D. Fitzgerald; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 855–57.

especially, the Hellenistic Jewish scholarship of Philo, with his frequent emphases on the etymological and allegorical meanings presumably embedded in inspired texts.<sup>23</sup> That interest was extended by the erudite Christian Platonic tradition exemplified by Origen and found scriptural warrant in such Pauline texts as Rom 5:14 and 1 Cor 10:6 (cf. Gal 4:24ff.).<sup>24</sup>

The allegorical tradition of exegesis achieved near-canonical status in the public writings of two prominent late antique Latin Christian scholars. In his treatise *De doctrina Christiana*, on how to study, then apply and communicate effectively what the Bible taught, Augustine remarked of the toponyms and proper names from Genesis, "when these are elucidated and explained, many figurative statements in scripture become clear" (*Doctr. chr.* 2.58).<sup>25</sup> Augustine may well have been thinking of the scholarship of his learned colleague in Bethlehem.<sup>26</sup> For Jerome had made explicit his belief in the exegetical value of symbolic interpretation of genealogies, when advising (in discursive and magisterial fashion) Paulinus of Nola as to the contents and value of each biblical book. As for Chronicles, Jerome judged the significance of that text thus:

The book of *Paralipomenon* is an epitome of the Old Testament and is of such scope and quality that anyone wishing to claim knowledge of the scriptures without it should laugh at himself. For, because of the individual names mentioned and the composition of words, both historical events omitted in the books of Kings are touched on and innumerable questions pertinent to the Gospel are explained. (*Epist.* 53.8)<sup>27</sup>

<sup>23</sup> For example, see Philo's *Migr.* 89–93. In this work, one finds frequent allegorical interpretations of the vocabulary of Gen 12, but with a stern warning that symbolic interpretation is fine as long as enthusiasm for such an approach does not lead to avoidance of the Torah. Samuel Sandmel provides further discussion (*Philo of Alexandria* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979], 14–30).

<sup>24</sup> N. R. M. De Lange, *Origen and the Jews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 90–91, 95–96.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. 2.141; text and translation (ours differs slightly) in R. P. H. Green, ed., *Augustine: De Doctrina Christiana* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 82. See also Manlio Simonetti, *Sant'Agostino: L'istruzione cristiana* (Verona: Mondadori, 1994), 475–76.

<sup>26</sup> This section of *De doctrina Christiana* was completed by 397: see, in brief, Green, *Augustine*, xi–xiii; in detail, Paul B. Harvey Jr., "Approaching the Apocalypse: Augustine, Tyconius, and John's Revelation," *AugStud* 30 (1999): 149–50. Jerome's two lists and his *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* date to the years 389–391: see, in brief, J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), 153.

<sup>27</sup> See J. Labourt, *Saint Jérôme: Lettres* (Paris: Les belles lettres, 1953), 3:21. Throughout this letter of ca. 395 C.E., Jerome propounds a Christian allegorical interpretation of the OT canonical books. His description of Kings, for example, concludes with this assertion: "if you consider the history, the vocabulary is simple; if you consider the meaning residing in the letters, the hard circumstances of the church and wars of heretics against the church are being narrated" (*Epist.* 53.8; Labourt, *Saint Jérôme*, 3:18). Dennis Trout provides further background (*Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999], 90–92).

By the time he wrote to Paulinus, Jerome had already composed an *Onomasticon* (based on third-century lists he thought were the work of Philo and Origen), emphasizing etymologies and symbolic interpretation of biblical names and places (*PL* 23:815–903). Jerome had also corrected, rearranged alphabetically, and enhanced with symbolic interpretations Eusebius's *Onomasticon*, now translated into Latin as *De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraicorum* (*PL* 23:903–76).<sup>28</sup> These research tools were then exploited by Jerome in his *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*,<sup>29</sup> as well as in his massive scriptural commentaries.<sup>30</sup>

In Jerome's (and Augustine's) view, the proper names in Chronicles could be profitably employed to explicate both the book of Kings and the Christian gospel. Explanations in the form of historical exegesis and folk etymologies could contribute to the allegorical interpretations of the Hebrew Bible in accordance with the dictates of NT (especially Pauline) doctrines. In different ways, then, the talmudic tractate *Pesahim*, the Targum, and Jerome all call attention to one of Chronicles' distinctive, and perhaps most infamous, literary features: its first nine chapters, consisting entirely of genealogies, comprise an independent section within the larger work.

The uniform name of Chronicles in the LXX texts, *Paraleipomena* (τὰ Παραλειπόμενα), a participial phrase meaning simply "things omitted/left behind," is both (apparently) a unique title for an ancient literary/historical composition and a reflection of the LXX translators' conception of this work.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> A better text, printed along with Eusebius's *Onomasticon*, may be found in E. Klostermann, ed., *Eusebius Werke* (GCS 3; Berlin: Akademie, 1904). See also Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the "Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim"* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 103–26. On both of Jerome's lists, see Ferdinand Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme: Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum Louvaniense, 1922), 1:144–46; Kelly, *Jerome*, 153–55. The Eusebian *Onomasticon* was more historical and topographical, less allegorical, than Jerome's version (P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990], 41–50; Joan E. Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993], 311).

<sup>29</sup> Two examples from Jerome's *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* suffice: the young woman at the well prefigures the mother of Jesus (24.43); Benjamin prefigures Paul the apostle (49.27) (C. T. R. Hayward, *Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995], 185–87, 243).

<sup>30</sup> For instance, see Jerome, *Comm. Jer.* 4.5–6 (*PL* 24:734). There Judah and Jeremiah prefigure the "pax Christi."

<sup>31</sup> Note the comment of the seventh-century Isidore of Seville (*Origin.* 6.1.7): "The seventh book [of the third order of the Old Testament] is *Dibre haiamim*, which is the Words of the Days, that is, *Paralipomenon*" (Wallace M. Lindsay, ed., *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX* [2 vols.; Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca oxoniensis; Oxford: Clarendon, 1911]).

In this presentation, the LXX is followed by the Ethiopic<sup>32</sup> and the pseudo-Athanasian treatise *Synopsis scripturae sacrae*.<sup>33</sup> According to this line of interpretation, the book was written to record the events left out of earlier biblical history.<sup>34</sup> Chronicles is thus understood to parallel, in some sense, Genesis through Kings. Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus (ca. 455 C.E.) represents this interpretive tradition, when he comments in his *On the First Book of Paraleipomena*:

The beginning of the book of Paraleipomena makes clear the subject. What the royal scribe [the redactor of Samuel and Kings] omitted, the author who took up this specific task set down, using as sources many of the books of prophecy. Much of what was written in those books he harmonized with these events [in 1–2 Chronicles], so that he might demonstrate historical consistency. He starts at the beginning with a genealogy, thus to show concisely how all the groups of mankind arose from one man.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> S. Grébaud, *Les Paralipomenes, Livres I et II: Version éthiopienne éditée et traduite* (Patrologia Orientalis 23/4; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1932).

<sup>33</sup> *Synopsis scripturae sacrae* 19, cf. 78 (PG 28:328–29, 457). This summary account of the Jewish and Christian scriptures was certainly not composed by Athanasius, but reflects the fourth- to fifth-century Christian interest in defining the canon of inspired writings. See, in brief, J. Quasten, *Patrology* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950), 3:39.

<sup>34</sup> The LXX division of Chronicles into two books, 1 and 2 Chronicles, is not original. The marginal (Masora) notation to 1 Chr 27:25 identifies this verse as the midpoint of the book. The end of 2 Chronicles (and not 1 Chronicles) contains the final Masoretic annotations. The distinction between 1 and 2 Chronicles was introduced by the translators of the LXX. The partition they introduced was sensitive to the content and organization of the work. The Alexandrian translators ended the first part of Chronicles with the concluding notices to David's reign (1 Chr 29:26–30) and began the second part with the reign of Solomon, David's son and successor (2 Chr 1). The LXX division between 1 and 2 Chronicles proved influential. Nonetheless, early Christian scholars, while affirming the unity of the "historical" narratives of the OT, recognized that the LXX division was not original. Athanasius, for example, in his *Festal Letter* of 367 C.E. (39.4), asserted: "The first and second books Paraleipomena are reckoned as one book" [following Samuel and Kings, Ezra and Nehemiah each of those Athanasius also counted as a single book]. In Athanasius's canon, 1 and 2 *Paraleipomena* follow Samuel and Kings and precede Ezra and Nehemiah. Athanasius thus follows the LXX order, not that of the MT. Text in L. Théophile Lefort, *Lettres festales et pastorales* (CSCO 150–51; Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1955), 16ff. and 58f.; translation (somewhat different from ours) in David Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 329; cf. 67–68. See also Bruce Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 211–12. Athanasius, then, views the canon of the Hebrew Bible in the LXX order and counts the historical books as individual units, as had Origen (*apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.2). Several generations earlier, Melito of Sardis (ca. 170 C.E.) had included in his canon "four books of Kingdoms" (= 1–2 Samuel; 1–2 Kings) and "two of Paralipomena" (*apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.14). See Jay Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (CBQMS 7; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1978), 35–42. In the fifteenth century, the division of Chronicles into two parts was made also in Hebrew editions of the Bible.

<sup>35</sup> N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, *Theodoretii Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paraleipomena: Editio Critica* (Textos y Estudios "Cardinal Cisneros" 32; Madrid: Instituto "Arias



Theodoret's commentary on Chronicles was followed closely by a later exegete. The brief commentaries by a Byzantine scholar on 1–2 Chronicles attributed to "Procopius of Gaza" demonstrate strong reliance on Theodoret in introductory remarks as well as lemmata.<sup>36</sup> The description provided by the *Apostolic Canons* (85), "four books of Kings, two of Paraleipomena, the book of days," includes the LXX title as well as a translation of the Hebrew title.<sup>37</sup> In this context, it is interesting that in the early third century C.E., the Roman imperial civil servant, chronographer, and Christian apologist Sextus Julius Africanus had cited Chronicles in a Greek paraphrase of the Hebrew title. In an apologetic treatise, the *Letter to Aristides*, in which he discusses the discrepancies in the genealogies given by Matthew and Luke for Jesus' Davidic pedigree, Julius Africanus explicitly refers to the genealogy from "the book of days" (ἐκ τε τῆς βίβλου τῶν ἡμερῶν).<sup>38</sup> In this and other respects, Julius Africanus reflects an early-third-century Christian scholarly interest in the distinctions between the Hebrew and the available Greek texts of the OT.<sup>39</sup>

The more expansive title of Chronicles in Codex Alexandrinus of the LXX,

---

Montano," 1984), 244. On Theodoret's figurative and typological exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures, see Jean-Noel Guinot, "Theodore of Cyrus: Bishop and Exegete," in *The Bible in Greek Christian Antiquity* (ed. and trans. Paul M. Blowers; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 163–93, esp. 173–79.

<sup>36</sup> This commentary may be read, with a stiff Latin translation, in PG 87.1:1201–20; see also H. Gärtner, "Prokopios 2," *KIPauly* 4:1164–65.

<sup>37</sup> The Greek text, with Latin and French translations, may be found in Périclès-Pierre Joannou, *Discipline Générale Antique* (Rome: Tipografia Italo-Orientale "S. Nilo," 1962), 1:2, 51. The *Apostolic Canons* probably date to ca. 380 C.E., within the ambit of scholarly discussion of the Hebrew Scriptures by Athanasius and Jerome (see above); see Berthold Altaner and Alfred Stuiber, *Patrologie* (8th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1978), 256; Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 216, 313. For similar lists of the OT canon, see Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus* 23, in G. Dindorf, ed., *Epiphanius opera* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1863), 4:29 (of ca. 393 C.E.) and a list surviving in an eleventh-century Greek manuscript; see Jean-Paul Audet, "A Hebrew-Aramaic List of Books of the Old Testament in Greek Transcription," *JTS* n.s. 1 (1950): 135–54. Both lists are almost identical with the transliterated (into Greek) Hebrew title followed by the LXX title: (following Psalms) δεβρουαμειμ, ἡ πρώτη τῶν Παραλειπομένων (Epiphanius); δεβριουμιν: Παραλειπομένων α' (MS). Audet has plausibly argued that Epiphanius's canon and that of the manuscript reflect a common early (second century C.E.?) source.

<sup>38</sup> As reported in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.14; cf. *Hist. eccl.* 11.7.1. See also Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 63. J. Quasten remains a reliable guide to Africanus's *Vita et opera* (*Patrology* [Westminster, MD: Newman, 1950; repr. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1983], 2:137–40). In addition, see A. A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1979), 146–50.

<sup>39</sup> For instance, Africanus's epistolary exchange with Origen concerning the Greek puns in the tale of Susanna (Add Dan 13:54, 58): M. Harl and N. De Lange, *Origène: Philocalie 1–20: La lettre à Africanus* (SC 302; Paris: Cerf, 1983), 469–573; Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 6.31 and Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 63. See also J. J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 427–28.

“the things omitted regarding the kings of Judah” (Παραλειπομένων Βασιλέων Ιουδα), delimits the portion of earlier scripture affected by the Chronicler’s coverage. In this respect, Codex Alexandrinus is followed by the Peshitta, which reads the title of the work as “the book of Chronicles, namely, the book remembering the days of the kings of Judah.”<sup>40</sup> The nomenclature adopted by Codex Alexandrinus and the Peshitta thus testifies to another distinctive feature of the Chronicler’s work. In depicting the era of the dual monarchies, the Chronicler’s work, unlike the Deuteronomistic History (Joshua through Kings), maintains a focus on the history of Judah. The book does not relate any of the events occurring in the northern realm, unless those events somehow affect events in the southern realm. In concentrating on the Judahite kingdom, Chronicles portrays many incidents not recorded in Kings. It is interesting that Augustine also understood the title *Paraleipomena* in the LXX similarly, when he speaks of “four books of Kings and two of Chronicles, which are not consecutive to Kings, but relate events parallel to Kings.”<sup>41</sup> By employing these titles, the LXX translators, followed by the authors of the *Apostolic Canons* and Augustine, attempt to explain the existence of two parallel literary works—Genesis through Kings (or simply just Kings) and Chronicles. What the former omits, the latter supplies.

### III. A Chronicle of All Divine History

The stance of the LXX fails to do justice to another prominent aspect of the Chronicler’s work: his rewriting of earlier biblical works.<sup>42</sup> In addition to

<sup>40</sup> W. E. Barnes, *An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version with a Discussion of the Value of Codex Ambrosianus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897), 1.

<sup>41</sup> By the “four books of Kings,” Augustine is referring to 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings (*Doctr. chr.* 2.13.26). See Green, ed., *Augustine: De Doctrina Christiana*, 68; Anne-Marie Bonnardière, “The Canon of Sacred Scripture,” in *Augustine and the Bible* (ed. and trans. Pamela Bright; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 26–41.

<sup>42</sup> This feature of the Chronicler’s compositional technique has become a matter of intense interest among modern interpreters. The recent bibliography is voluminous; see, e.g., Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*; Rudolf Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973); Peter R. Ackroyd, “The Chronicler as Exegete,” *JSOT* 2 (1977): 2–32; I. L. Seeligmann, “Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtsschreibung,” in *Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977* (ed. John A. Emerton; VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 254–84; idem, “The Beginnings of Midrash in the Book of Chronicles” (in Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 49 (1979–80): 14–32; Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ 9; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1989); Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); K. Strübind, *Tradition als Interpretation in der Chronik: König Josaphat als Paradigma chronistischer Hermeneutik und Theologie* (BZAW 201; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991); Marc Z. Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient*

providing information not included in previous biblical books, Chronicles rearranges, reworks, and comments on select portions of these works. This may help to explain why Jerome provides an alternate designation to that of the LXX. Unfortunately, Jerome's comment about "*Paralipomenon* One and Two" as a "chronicle" has not been generally well understood. In speaking of "the things of the days" as a chronicle, Jerome identified the book with a certain genre of historiography known to him in his own historical context—third-person, schematic, selective, and compressed summaries of past history arranged according to a chronological outline.<sup>43</sup> The chronicle genre could claim a long pedigree in ancient Greek historiography, but was a more recent newcomer to the Latin west.<sup>44</sup>

Jerome's classification was undoubtedly informed by his knowledge of a contemporary work, the *Chronicle* (*Chronicon*), written by the church historian Eusebius, a work Jerome himself had earlier embellished and updated.<sup>45</sup> Well aware of the long tradition of Greek chronographic writing, Eusebius designed his *Chronological Canons* (Χρονικὸὶ Κάνονες) to be a synchronistic summary of the ancient Near Eastern, Greco-Roman, and biblical past from the birth of Abraham to approximately 325 C.E., the twentieth year of Constantine's reign.<sup>46</sup> The subtitle of Eusebius's work, "epitome of every sort of history" (ἐπιτομή παντοδαπῆς ἱστορίας), nicely summarized the bishop's intentions. Drawing upon the work of Suetonius and other sources, Jerome extended this historical outline to the latter part of the fourth century (378 C.E.). The title Jerome gave to his own work, *Chronicle of Every Sort of History* (*Chronicon omnimodae historiae*), shows his indebtedness to Eusebius. Later writers, in

---

*Israel* (London: Routledge, 1995); Isaac Kalimi, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten* (BZAW 226; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995); William M. Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David: The Reception History of 2 Samuel 7:1–17* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>43</sup> The genre exhibited great variety. See F. Jacoby, *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1949); Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*; William Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26; Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collections, 1989).

<sup>44</sup> Note especially the *Chronographiai* of Sextus Iulius Africanus (d. ca. 240 C.E.), which appear to have begun, as did Chronicles, with Adam. Africanus's chronicle survives solely in fragments from, notably, Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 6.31) and later chronographers. These fragments are available in PG 10:67–94.

<sup>45</sup> Eusebius's *Chronicon* (Χρονικὸὶ Κάνονες; *Hist. eccl.* 1.1.16) survives only in Jerome's reworked version (R. Helm, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus: Eusebius Werke 7* [GCS; Berlin: Akademie, 1956]). Both Eusebius's *Chronicon* and Jerome's *Chronicon* were popular pedagogical works (G. F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories* [2d ed.; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986], 116–19). The chronicle genre became the most popular form of historical writing in medieval times.

<sup>46</sup> Kelly, *Jerome*, 72–75.

turn, would extend Jerome's *Chronicle* to their own times.<sup>47</sup> Considering that the biblical book of Chronicles begins with Adam and continues to the Babylonian exile (586 B.C.E.), Jerome's choice of terminology seems apt. His description of the book as a "chronicle of all divine history" attempts to do justice to the scope of the book's coverage.

Jerome recognized that "the book of the events of the days" sometimes abbreviates or excerpts earlier biblical texts.<sup>48</sup> The universal genealogy of 1 Chr 1:1–2:2, for example, appearing in both linear and segmented forms, extends from the first person, Adam, to the patriarch Israel and his twelve sons. In composing this piece, the author draws from the main genealogical blocks in Genesis—chs. 5, 10–11; 25; 35–36.<sup>49</sup> The studious, albeit highly selective, reuse of these disparate lines leads one recent commentator to assert that 1 Chr 1:1–2:1 "represents the book of Genesis, from which all of its material is taken."<sup>50</sup> Whatever the case, the book provides a continuous register of people and events, without either a statement of authorial purpose or great ornamental embellishment. Compared with the cycles, peregrinations, and distinct periods depicted in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges, Chronicles contains only lineages and anecdotes. Some of the genealogies are excerpted from earlier biblical sources, but many are not. Chronicles

<sup>47</sup> This was true for both Greek and Latin traditions. One such continuation history was the Gallaecian bishop Hydatius's *Chronicle* (468/469 C.E.); see R. W. Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana: Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993). For the Latin tradition, note especially Prosper of Aquitaine: his chronicle, an edition and extension of that of Jerome, was finished in 445 or 451. See further T. Mommsen, ed., *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi* 9.1 (Hanover/Berlin: Weidmann, 1892), 341–499, with A. Hamman, ed., *Patrologia latina: Supplementum* 3.1 (Paris: Garnier, 1963), 51. For further context, see William Adler, "Eusebius' Chronicle and Its Legacy," in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism* (ed. H. W. Attridge and Gohei Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 467–91.

<sup>48</sup> In this respect, Chronicles may be compared with some of the rewritten biblical texts attested at Qumran. On these, see E. Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 64 (1995): 581–600. The abbreviated texts should also be compared with one of the genres developed in the classical and postclassical worlds—the epitome (ἐπιτομή), a short abridgment or compendium of an older work; see R. A. Kaster, "Epitome," *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3d ed.; ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 549. For a discussion of the Latin tradition of epitomes of historical opera, see W. Den Boer, *Some Minor Latin Historians* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), along with the review of Den Boer's book by C. E. V. Nixon in *Phoenix* 27 (1973): 407–10. Note also H. W. Bird, *Liber de Caesaribus* (Translated Texts for Historians 17; Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1994), xi–xv. In classical antiquity epitomes generally tended to be schematic summaries, rather than stylish short histories (S. Hornblower, "Introduction," in *Greek Historiography* [ed. S. Hornblower; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994], 1–72). An exception is H. W. Bird, *The Breviarium ab urbe condita of Eutropius* (Translated Texts for Historians 14; Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1993), esp. xlix–liii.

<sup>49</sup> E. Pödehard, "Le premier chapitre des Paralipomènes," *RB* 13 (1916): 363–86.

<sup>50</sup> S. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 52.

lacks the graphic tales of David's private life found in Samuel and the many prophetic legends found in Kings. Little interest is taken in the histories of other peoples or in the prehistories of major sites in the land occupied by the Israelites. The narrative portions of the text focus, for the most part, on the public actions of monarchs residing in Jerusalem. Such narratives can include lists (e.g., 1 Chr 11:26–47; 12:1–38; 15:4–11, 16–24; 23:6–24; 24:1–27:34; 2 Chr 11:6–10; 17:14–19; 31:12–18), but these lists usually have little commentary. The condensed nature of the work was recognized by Isidore of Seville (ca. 602–636 C.E.):

What is called *Paralipomenon* in Greek we are able to call [the books] of omitted or remaining matters, since those things which were omitted or not fully reported in the Law or the books of Kings are in this book set out concisely and briefly. (*Origin*. 6.2.12)

But Jerome's description of *Paraleipomena* as a "chronicle (*χροινικόν*) of all divine history" also implicitly acknowledges a distinction between the biblical work and that of Eusebius. Unlike the *chronica* of Eusebius and Jerome, which synchronize sacred and secular history to the respective dates of the two authors, the biblical book of Chronicles summarizes divine history, the story of the relationship between God and God's people.

#### IV. Why *Chronicon* and Not *Annales*?

The title Jerome gave to סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים—*Chronicon*—raises an important question. If the Hebrew title "the book of the events of the days" is elsewhere associated in the Hebrew Bible with royal acts or annalistic records, we may ask, Why did Jerome not identify or mention the appropriate Latin term for a literary work of the scope and format of Chronicles in his *Prologue to Samuel-Kings*?<sup>51</sup> Why did Jerome identify this historical synopsis as *chronicon*, rather than as *annales*?<sup>52</sup> The question becomes all the more intriguing when one realizes that Jerome rendered the similar Hebrew words found in Esth 6:1 (סֵפֶר הַיָּמִים הַזֵּהוּרֹת דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים) as *historias et annales priorum temporum*, "histories and yearly records of early times."<sup>52</sup> We may propose two related answers to this counterfactual query. First, Jerome's adherence to the format, if not in all instances the content, of the LXX was profound—perhaps far more profound than recent scholarship has suggested.<sup>53</sup> We suggest that Jerome found it dis-

<sup>51</sup> See n. 2 above.

<sup>52</sup> Compare Esth 2:23 (סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים): *historias et annalibus*; 10:2 (סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי) (מֵרֵי וּפְרָסִים): *scripta sunt in libris Medorum atque Persarum*.

<sup>53</sup> Jerome's attitude toward the LXX has been a topic discussed frequently; for texts, bibliography, and fair comment, see Kelly, *Jerome*, 159–63; Kamesar, *Jerome*, 49–51.

tasteful and perhaps excessively provocative to label a book in the Hebrew Scriptures with a radically different, thoroughly secular title. The “histories and yearly records of early times” mentioned in Esther were, of course, Persian royal records. Jerome had, in his preface to his critical Latin revision of the LXX *Paraleipomena*, asserted the divine inspiration of the LXX (only later would he decide to translate into Latin directly from the Hebrew).<sup>54</sup> In both that earlier Latin revision of the LXX and his translation of the OT *iuxta Hebraeos* (that is, his “vulgate” translation), Jerome may not have wished readers to confound the divinely inspired *Paraleipomena* with secular “histories and yearly records of early times.” Hence, in both revisions, the title of Chronicles remained (*libri*) *Paraleipomenon*.

Furthermore, *annales* as a literary term evoked a slightly disreputable connotation, especially among those erudite in Latin literature. The early-first-century B.C.E. Roman historian Sempronius Asellio had drawn a sharp distinction between analytical *historia* and simple chronologies (*annales* = “yearly records”):

There is in fact a fundamental difference between those who wished to pass on to posterity annals and those who have attempted to record in writing events . . . books of annals set out solely what occurred in a given year . . . this is the equivalent of composing a diary . . . [to record simply official events and dates] is not to write history, but to tell tales to children. As far as I am concerned, I perceive that it is not enough to state what happened, but that one ought also to set out the intent and rationale of events.<sup>55</sup>

Whether or not Asellio’s own histories were equal to his historiographical assertions was another matter: Cicero, for example, judged Asellio’s prose to be redolent of the dull ignorance of earlier Roman historians (Cicero, *Leg.*

<sup>54</sup> This preface seems not to be known well; see *PL* 29:423–26. Jerome revised in Latin, with critical annotation, several books of the LXX, before he embarked on his translation of (and commentaries on) the Hebraic OT texts, ca. 390. See Kelly, *Jerome*, 159; Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, 1:124, 147; 2:28, 104. Jerome’s Latin revision of the LXX (*libri*) *Paraleipomenon* does not survive; indeed, in 415/416, Jerome could not supply Augustine with a requested text of his earlier LXX Latin versions. Jerome asserted fraud—we may suppose rather an author/translator’s unwillingness to circulate work he now thought unworthy. See Jerome, *Epist.* 134.2 (= Labourt, *Saint Jérôme*, 8:70). An English translation of this letter is available in Carolinne White, *The Correspondence (394–419) between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1990), 227–29.

<sup>55</sup> Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 5.18.7 (H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, vol. 1 [2d ed.; Stuttgart: Teubner, 1967], fragments 1–2 [pp. 179–80]; cf. ccxlii–ccxlv). This distinction has a long history; compare the following judgment on an early English printed chronicle (that of Robert Fabyan): “Chronicles were written when the science of true history had yet no existence; a chronicle then in reality is but a part of history” (Isaac Disraeli, *Amenities of Literature* [2 vols.; London: Edward Moxon, 1841]. This quotation is taken from B. Disraeli, ed., *Amenities of Literature* [new ed.; London, Routledge, 1859], 1:246).

1.2.6).<sup>56</sup> But Asellio's distinction articulated a demonstrable awareness of the difference between a chronicle and a narrative, analytical history. Tacitus thus would entitle his narrative of the events of his own lifetime *Historiae*, while his (arguably far more influential) narrative of earlier events he styled *Annales ab excessu Augusti*. More important for our present discussion, the distinction between annalistic/chronicle records and analytical history was a topic also discussed in Jerome's era by late antique Latin scholars of the stature of Servius (*Ad Virgil Aeneid* 1.373) and Macrobius (*Saturnalia* 3.2.17–3.1).<sup>57</sup> From his own knowledge of the Latin literary tradition and his studies with the great grammarian Aelius Donatus,<sup>58</sup> Jerome would have known of these historiographical traditions and therefore would have appreciated that the term *annales* connoted in Latin little superficial similarity to Eusebius's *Chronicon*, which he himself had translated and extended. Indeed, Jerome had explicitly declared in his letter to Paulinus (cited above: *Epist.* 53.8) his opinion that, regardless of value, *Chronicles* was an "epitome" (and to emphasize that point, Jerome used Greek orthography: "*Paralipomenon liber, id est instrumenti veteris ἐπιτομή . . .*").

Therefore, Jerome did well—for reasons of tradition, literary sensitivity, or both—simply to transliterate the LXX title, while attempting, in his prefatory comments, to ensure that the informed reader understood precisely the connotations of (in Jerome's transliteration) "*Dabreiamin*." The learned would thus appreciate Jerome's comments in his preface to Samuel-Kings and would surely savor the literary and historiographic resonance of the term *χρονικά*; the less scholarly faithful would be content to recognize a familiar title, although the translation might differ from what they may have known.

## V. From "Paralipomenon One and Two" to *Chronicles*

For a millennium after Jerome's translation of the *veritas Hebraica*, biblical editions included "*(libri) Paralipomenon*." How those books in the Hebrew

<sup>56</sup> See also Cicero's distinctions between annals and history in his *De or.* 2.12.52–2.14.60. The commentary of A. S. Wilkins, although bibliographically dated, retains considerable value; see Cicero: *De oratore libri tres* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1892), 250–57.

<sup>57</sup> Servius and Macrobius focused on the tradition of the Roman republican *annales maximi*, Roman religious records presumed to have constituted the skeletal framework of early Roman history. For texts and discussion, see Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, 1:iii–xxix; Bruce Frier, *Libri annales pontificum maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition* (2d ed.; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999).

<sup>58</sup> Robert A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 275–78 (#52), including references to Jerome's studies with this fourth-century Latin scholar. See also Kelly, *Jerome*, 10–17.

Bible came to be commonly cited as “Chronicles” (or “Chronika,” “Chroniques,” “Cronache,” “Crónicas”) provides a fitting conclusion to our discussion. While the word “chronicle(s)” is attested in English to at least 1303 C.E.,<sup>59</sup> “Chronicles” as the title for *סֵפֶר הַדְּבָרִי הַיְקִימִים* seems to have entered English usage because of Martin Luther’s work, as adapted for the English language by Myles Coverdale. The Wycliffe translation (1380–1384) included books entitled “I & II Paralipomenon.”<sup>60</sup> The 1537 English translation of Thomas Matthew contained a translation of the historical books of the Hebrew Scriptures (Joshua through Nehemiah) thought, for good reasons, to be William Tyndale’s translation, retaining the title “Paralipomena.”<sup>61</sup> That version is what Coverdale used and revised for his 1535 English Bible translation. Coverdale, however, now explicitly identified the books “Paraleipomenon” as “Chronicles.”<sup>62</sup> Coverdale’s choice of title was apparently owed to none other than Martin Luther, who, informed by Jerome’s preface to 1–2 Samuel and 1–2 Kings,<sup>63</sup> had rendered “*Paraleipomenon*” as, straightforwardly, “*Die Chronika*” (*Das ander Teil der Chronika*).<sup>64</sup> Soon after the appearance of Coverdale’s Bible,

<sup>59</sup> See the *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. “chronicle.” The word in English and French (*chronique*) evolved from Latin *c(h)ronica -ae*; that singular form derives, of course, from the Greek plural. The diminutive, adjectival suffix *-icle* in English finds correspondence in *chronicalis -e*, employed by Gregory of Tours (*History of the Franks* [ed. O. M. Dalton; Oxford: Clarendon, 1927], 10.31) to describe the content of a *chronica*.

<sup>60</sup> In brief, F. F. Bruce, *History of the Bible in English* (3d ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 13–16.

<sup>61</sup> Bruce, *History*, 64–66; David Daniell, *William Tyndale: A Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 333–34. The standard discussion of Ira Maurice Price (*The Ancestry of Our English Bible* [3d rev. ed. by W. A. Irwin and A. P. Wikgren; New York: Harper & Row, 1956], 252–56) should now be supplemented by the work of Daniell.

<sup>62</sup> J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles* (London: Lutterworth, 1953), 65, 150; see also the succinct discussion by S. L. Greenslade, in *The Cambridge History of the Bible III: The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 149–51. Tyndale’s title for the *Paraleipomena* as such is confirmed by Edward Hall’s *Chronicle* (*sub anno* 1536): Tyndale had rendered into the vernacular “. . . the books of the Kings and the books of the Paralipomenon.” See Mozley, *Coverdale*, 150; Daniell, *William Tyndale*, 333–34; idem, *Tyndale’s Old Testament* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), xviii. Cf. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Reformation of the Bible: The Bible of the Reformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 53–54, 144.

<sup>63</sup> Quoted above (n. 2).

<sup>64</sup> Luther’s version of the historical books (Joshua through Esther) first appeared in 1524; his innovation in using the title “*Die Chronika*” has, of course, been acknowledged: see, e.g., Jacob M. Myers, *I Chronicles* (AB 12; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), xvi; N. J. McEleney, “Chronicles, biblical,” *NCE* 3:667. Luther also used “*Chronica/Chronika*” in his sermons and lectures to refer (without qualification) to these OT books; for example, in his homily on Zechariah (*D. Martin Luther’s Werke* [Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1901], 23:594). The publication history of Luther’s Bible is outlined in Pelikan, *Reformation*, 51–52; see also H. Bornkamm, *Luther and the Old Testament*



John Bale in 1548 would simply refer, for example, to “I Chron. xxviii.”<sup>65</sup> The Geneva Bible of 1560 included a version of the Coverdale-Matthew (Tyndale) rendition of Chronicles entitled “The first (and second) book of the Chronicles or Paralipomenon.” Henceforth in English language and texts, the *libri Paralipomenon* have been commonly known as “Chronicles.” European continental versions would retain the Greek transliteration of “(*libri*) *Paralipomenon*” for a longer period.<sup>66</sup> In contemporary translations the work known in Hebrew tradition as “the book of the events of the days” (סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים) is widely presented as the book of Chronicles. When seen against the backdrop of patristic, medieval, and early modern traditions of interpretation, this is, however, a comparatively recent development.

---

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 219–46. Coverdale’s debt to Luther’s Bible is not widely known (cf. Bruce, *History*, 53–64).

<sup>65</sup> John Bale, *Image of Both Churches* (1548); see the Parker Society edition (ed. Henry Christmas; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849), 1:272.

<sup>66</sup> For example, Dom Augustin Calmet, in the fifth volume of his *Sainte Bible en Latin et en François* (Paris: Boudet, 1767), retains the title “Paralipomena” both in the French translation and in his extensive commentary.