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The Testament of Darius (DNA/DNb) and Constructions of Kings and Kingship in 1–2 Chronicles

Christine Mitchell (St. Andrew’s College)

Introduction

The Testament of Darius (DNA and DNb), from the early fifth century B.C.E., presents Darius’s views on himself as king and on the ideal properties possessed by kings that might follow him. Even given the paucity of evidence, it is still clear that the text was disseminated widely: DNA was reused by Xerxes at Persepolis (XPh); the first part of DNb was reused by Xerxes (XPl); the last lines of DNb have been found in Upper Egypt on a late fifth-century copy of an Aramaic translation of the Bisitun inscription (TAD C2.1). Therefore, we can expect that the ideology promoted in the Testament of Darius was influential, and we might hypothesize that traces of this ideology of kingship can be found in texts of the Hebrew Bible. The biblical book of Chronicles, written in the fourth century B.C.E., presents a meditation on kings and kingship: both in the Judahite past and in the Achaemenid present. The book was written two centuries after the end of the indigenous Judahite monarchy, and well into the period of Persian domination; it reused earlier textual material that we have access to (including the biblical books of Samuel and Kings) while adding its own new text. As such, its unique understanding of kings and kingship can be analyzed by comparing kingship as depicted in the earlier books to its own depiction of kingship.

In this paper I argue that many aspects of the distinctive vocabulary and themes of 1–2 Chronicles reflect Achaemenid ideology as seen in the Testament of Darius. The doctrine of immediate retribution, the motif of seeking-and-finding, the use of the words *maʿal* and *hithazzeq*, the motif of the deity choosing the king, and other features are discussed. Close readings of the Old Persian of DNa and DNb, the Aramaic of DNb 50–60, and the Hebrew texts attempt to demonstrate the validity of the hypothesis. I conclude with a brief excursus on the role of foreign monarchs in Chronicles and how the portrayals of those figures impinge on ideology of kingship.

**ARAMAIC AND SCRIBAL CULTURE**

The evidence—scanty as it is—demonstrates that a common Aramaic, Chancellery Aramaic, was taught and used throughout the Persian Empire, whether in Upper Egypt, Persepolis, or Bactria. The evidence of the Bisitun copy at Elephantine (TAD C2.1), particularly column XI, which has an interpolation from DNb, also shows that at least some of the Aramaic translations of royal inscriptions were made directly from Old Persian; there are two loan words from Old Persian that correspond exactly to those Old Persian words in DNb in four fragmentary lines of Aramaic text. Some recent investigation has demonstrated that Old Persian narrative had an influence on Aramaic; Old Persian structuring words such as *pasāva*, “afterwards,” were rendered by native Aramaic terms used in innovative ways. For scribes whose native language was not Aramaic, but was a language closely related to Aramaic, such as Hebrew or “Judaean,” their imperial scribal training would have been easily transferrable to their indigenous language. I speak here not of linguistic borrowing, as the

2. Nicholas Sims-Williams, “The Final Paragraph of the Tomb-Inscription of Darius I (DNb, 50–60): The Old Persian Text in the Light of an Aramaic Version,” *BSOAS* 44 (1981): 1–7; Jonas C. Greenfield and Bezalel Porten, *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great, Aramaic Version* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum 1.5; London: Lund Humphries, 1982), argue that the Aramaic version (except the portion corresponding to DNb) was made from the Akkadian translation.


4. Jan Tavernier, “Multilingualism in the Fortification and Treasury Archives,” in *L`archive des Fortifications de Persépolis: État des questions et perspectives de recher-
influence of Aramaic on the Hebrew of texts such as Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah has been well-detailed, but instead of genres, scribal forms, themes, and motifs: the aspects that are more nebulously transmitted from Old Persian through Aramaic to Hebrew. Just as the Neo-Assyrian treaty-form was used as a template probably naturally and unconsciously by the author of Deuteronomy, we should expect to find Achaemenid forms in texts such as Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. Indeed the Hebrew and Aramaic letters in Ezra-Nehemiah, whether actual Achaemenid letters or not, seem to adhere to Achaemenid letter forms as seen in such things as the Aršama correspondence.

The case of Chronicles, however, is slightly different from that of Ezra-Nehemiah. The author of Chronicles had a basic narrative framework and a large body of texts that he worked with. Within these constraints, Chronicles is actually quite an innovative text, as has been extensively demonstrated over the past two decades, but still, there was quite a bit of content that he could not or did not want to alter. The sheer bulk of Chronicles is also unlike anything in the Achaemenid evidence. Nevertheless, I propose that scribal training in texts such as DNa and DNb (in Aramaic) may be reflected in Chronicles. I have chosen DNa and DNb, which I shall call the Testament of Darius, because of the focus on kingship; kingship and the qualities of an ideal ruler are also one of themes of Chronicles.

The Testament of Darius

The text at Naqš-i Rustam on Darius’s tomb is both one text, the Testament of Darius, and two, known as DNa and DNb, sometimes referred to as

ches (ed. P. Briant et al; Persika 12; Paris: de Boccard, 2008), 59–86; Cf. William M. Schniedewind, A Social History of Hebrew: Its Origins through the Rabbinic Period (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2013), 141–45, who argues that in fact the native language of the scribes would have been Aramaic, and Hebrew was a learned literary language.


6. For a very general discussion of how DB might have come to be known in Yehud and had an influence on biblical texts, see Gard Granerød, “‘By the Favour of Ahuramazda I Am King’: On the Promulgation of a Persian Propaganda Text among Babylonians and Judeans,” JSJ 44 (2013): 455–80. He does not provide specific examples of how the Achaemenid ideology may be reflected in biblical texts, although he does discuss Elephantine in some detail.
Darius’s political testament and his moral testament. The entire Testament makes up the tomb inscriptions, but it has two parts, easily seen by the fact that each part was reused separately as a discrete inscription of Xerxes. I will examine the text first as two parts, and then show how the two parts can be read as a whole.

DNa begins with the creation formula: “A great god is Ahuramazda, who established this earth, who established that sky, who established humanity, who established happiness [šiyāti-] for humanity, who made Darius king, one king over many, one commander over many” (ll. 1–8). The dynamics of the creation formula have been well-discussed by Clarisse Herrenschmidt in her classic article, but what is most significant is the verbs used in the formula: dā- for the establishment of earth, sky, humanity and happiness, and kar- for the making of Darius as king: the first four were primordial acts, while the latter was an act within history. The repetition of aiva-, “one” in the description of Darius as “one king over many, one commander over many” emphasizes two things: first, that in Darius there is a step towards restoration of the unity of the primordial state, and second, that a single individual, Darius, is involved in this restoration.

The next part of DNa, its second paragraph, is the royal titulary formula, again, well-discussed by Herrenschmidt. The variations in the formula here are those that emphasize the vastness and diversity of the empire: “I am Darius, Great King, King of Kings, King of lands/peoples [dahayu-] of many kinds [vispazana-], king of this great earth-empire [būmi-] far and wide [durai yapi], son of Hystapes, an Achaemenian, a Persian, son of a Persian, an Iranian of Iranian lineage” (ll. 8–15). The Persian ethnicity of Darius is also highlighted.

The third paragraph begins Darius’s direct speech: “Thus says Darius the King” (ll. 15–16), but even this paragraph is a formulaic text, recording in detail the lands/peoples under Darius’s rule, using the phrase “they bore me tribute” (so also DPe and DSe). It is with the fourth paragraph that a less-formulaic text begins, in which Darius describes in direct speech how

---

he became king. The fifth paragraph continues with Darius speaking in the first person, and has two parts: first Darius claims that he did all that Ahuramazda had made him for (kar-repeated three times); and second, Darius asks for Ahuramazda’s continued blessing for himself, his house, and his land/people.

These five paragraphs of DNa are arranged in a ring structure: creation-titulary-empire-becoming king-maintenance of creation, with strong repetition or catchword links between paragraphs 2, 3, and 4. So the empire in its breadth and diversity of lands/peoples of paragraph 2 is spelled out in more detail in paragraph 3: the lands/peoples in addition to Persia, and in paragraph 4: of what sort are the lands/peoples far [dūraiy] from Persia. Persia is also named in paragraphs 2, 3, and 4, but not in 1 or 5. Between paragraphs 3 and 4 is the repetition of “what was said by me (I said to them); thus they did.” Paragraph 4 also spells out in more detail why Ahuramazda made (kar-) Darius king in paragraph 1: “When he saw this earth-empire in disorder.” The ring structure is marked by the last line of paragraph 5, in which the language of creation (dā-) reappears: “This [protection] may Ahuramazda establish [dadātuv] for me!”

The sixth paragraph of DNa continues with direct speech, but is not introduced by the “Thus says Darius the King” formula. Instead, it begins with the vocative martiyā, “O human,” and continues with an exhortation: “O human, let not the thought of Ahuramazda seem evil to you! Do not leave the right path! Do not rebel!” (ll. 56–60). This paragraph picks up the word gasta-, “evil,” in paragraph 5 as a catchword, but in form and address it is very different, using the vocative and second-person imperatives.10 Yet second-person imperatives were also used in paragraph 4, and although there is no vocative, there is second person address: “If also you should think [maniyyāhay; 2 sing. mid. subjunctive] … look [didiy; 2 sing. aor. imper.] … you will know [xšnāsāhay; 2 sing. act. subjunctive] …. ” Presumably the person addressed in paragraph 4 is also then addressed in the final paragraph. It is a generic person, any person who might see the inscriptions.

The second half of the Testament, DNb, begins with an abbreviated and unusual creation formula: “A great god is Ahuramazda, who has estab-

---

10. Rüdiger Schmitt, The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-i Rustam and Persepolis (Corpus inscriptionum Iranicarum 1.1.2; London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 2000), 32, notes that there is a blank between ll. 55 and 56 that physically marks the break before the final section.
lished [dā-] this wonder [fraša-] that is seen, who has established [dā-] happiness [šiyāti-] for humanity, who understanding [xraθu-] and physical ability [aruvasta-] upon Darius the King has bestowed [nisaya-]” (ll. 1–5). Note again the contrast between the creation language of the “wonder” and happiness, shorthand for earth-sky and humanity-happiness, respectively, and the historic language of the giving of qualities to Darius.

The very long second paragraph is introduced by the phrase “Thus says Darius the king,” and spells out the mental and physical qualities given to Darius. Here the emphasis is on the contrast between right and wrong, and on immediate rewards and punishment for actions. On right and wrong: “I am pleased with right [rāsta-]; I am not pleased with wrong [miθa-]” (ll. 7–8), where wrong is later defined as “the person who lies” (l. 12) in opposition to right in l. 11. On reward and punishment: “The person who cooperates, according to his achievement I reward him; he who does harm, according to his offense I punish him” (ll. 16–19). There is also a strong sense of balance and proportion, which can be seen in statements like: “A person who speaks (ill) of another person—I do not believe it until I know both stories” (ll. 21–24). The entire second paragraph ends with a summary that picks up the language of the first paragraph, especially with the repetition of nisaya-, “bestow”: “These are the abilities that Ahuramazda has bestowed on me, and I am able to bear them. By the grace of Ahuramazda, this is my work, and I did (it) by these abilities which Ahuramazda bestowed on me” (ll. 45–49).

The third paragraph begins at line 50 not with “Thus says Darius the King,” but with marīkā, “young man, ” in the vocative. This third paragraph actually has three sections, each beginning with marīkā, although the second and third sections are highly fragmentary. It also uses a catchword to link with the long second paragraph: hūvnara-, “ability,” in ll. 45, 48, and 51. Another catchword is ayāumainiš, “weak, unskilled,” in l. 59, which contrasts with yāumaniš, “strong, skilled, coordinated,” in l. 40, used by Darius to refer to his physical abilities. A third catchword is skauθiš, “weak, poor,” in l. 56 (reconstructed from Aramaic), which looks back to its double use in ll. 8–10 referring to the weak/poor man. The sense of proportion or balance seen in the second paragraph may also be seen in ll. 52–55: “Let not what is spoken to you in secret (lit. in your ears) seem best; hear also what is spoken openly.” Considering the fragmentary

11. Ibid., 41.
nature of the third paragraph, there are a lot of extant links back to the second paragraph.

Bruce Lincoln has noted that the use of šiyāti- in l. 58 is almost unique in the Old Persian corpus: “do not also become weak [ayāumainiš] with regards to (your) happiness/security [šiyātiyā].” There are only a few non-formulaic uses of the term in the extant corpus, but all are intensely cosmological, referring to the sliver of happiness available in the current state of the cosmos. He suggests that šiyāti- is the theme of the entirety of DNb, pointing to its cosmic appearance in l. 4 in the abbreviated creation formula, and again here near the end of the inscription; the second paragraph is the list of characteristics that Darius possesses and that enable him to be the instrument by which happiness may be regained. I will return to the issue of theme, but for the moment, it is important to note the catchword that indicates a ring structure for DNb: creation-Darius-maintenance of creation.

The Aramaic of the third paragraph is important for enabling the partial reconstruction of the damaged Old Persian text, but it is also significant that in these few lines of fragmentary text there are two Old Persian loan words: פרתר; OP *paratar, “openly,” and אימנש; OP ayāumainiš, “weak, uncoordinated, unskilled (physically?).” This demonstrates that concepts important in Old Persian that the scribes thought did not have an equivalent in Aramaic could be imported directly into the language. We know that Persian administrative vocabulary provided dozens of loan words into Aramaic, but both of these loan words denote more abstract concepts; thus, not only concrete but abstract concepts could be loaned. It is striking, therefore, that the key concept of šiyāti-is translated as טוב, “good, benefit, welfare.” The semantic field of שלם, “peace, wholeness,” would seem to have greater overlap with šiyāti-than the rather common נוחה.

If the theme of DNb is šiyāti-, then it is striking that the text is addressed to marīkā, “O young man,” rather than martiyā, “O human.” The person being addressed is not a generic human being who might read the inscription, but more specifically to a young man. In the ancient Near Eastern wisdom traditions, the “son” or “young man” is the addressee of

---

13. Ibid., 253–57.
texts that seek to impart the wisdom of the sage: a student. More to the point, using “young man” implies that šiyāti-is not available as a pursuit to people in general: there is an aspect of the initiate or member of a special class to the address. Whether the marikā is Darius’s successor(s)—as is usually argued—or the class of Persian nobles, or the scribal elite, or something else, is difficult to determine. It is unfortunate that the Aramaic is not preserved in any of the three places in DNb where marikā is used.

One aspect of the Aramaic version of the third paragraph that has not been fully investigated is how its placement into the Aramaic of DB operates within the context of DB itself. It does not supplement or add something to DB, rather it is substituted for a portion of DB (paragraph 65) that talks about the preservation of the actual inscription and carvings at Bistun. It therefore continues Darius’s description of himself in paragraph 63 and his exhortation in paragraph 64, which is explicitly addressed to “you who may be king hereafter.” In its new context within DB, the marikā of DNb 50–60 would be a future ruler: making explicit what is only implied in DNb itself. The substitution of one text for another in a context like this one is part of the same range of scribal practices that we also see in the biblical book of Chronicles.15

When we place the two parts of the Testament of Darius together, we can read them as a coherent whole with a mirroring structure. Both begin with a creation formula ending with the selection of Darius. Both end with an exhortation addressed directly to an unnamed individual: a citizen of the Empire in DNa and a specific type of elite individual in the case of DNb. Both have a middle section structured with the “Thus says Darius the King” formula. Both have a ring structure in which themes and/or catchwords from the first section are picked up in the last.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DNa</th>
<th>DNb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation (§1)</td>
<td>Creation (§1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titulary (§2)</td>
<td>Darius’s character (§2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire (§3)</td>
<td>Darius’s physical ability (§2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming King (§4)</td>
<td>Summary (§2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation Maintenance (§5–6)</td>
<td>Creation Maintenance (§3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While DNA paragraph 2, the Titulary, is balanced by the reasons for Darius’s choice as king in paragraph 4, with the Empire section in the middle, DNb’s ring structure is less complex: Darius’s character and physical ability, summarized at the end of paragraph 2 is not structured as a ring. However, it is noteworthy that both DNA and DNb begin with creation and end with an exhortation to those charged with the maintenance of creation. What is in the middle of each ring is telling: the Empire and Darius’s character. When the two texts are read as one, the Empire is the means by which the turmoil of the earth is restored to creational design, and Darius’s character is the means by which the Empire is created. If Lincoln is correct that the theme of DNb is the pursuit and maintenance of šiyāti-, then the text as a whole is deeply imbued with creation theology, and obsessed with the maintenance of the restored creation.

**Chronicles**

Perhaps the most obvious thematic connection within the topic of kingship between Chronicles and the Testament of Darius is the theme of immediate retribution. It has long been noted that while many texts of the Hebrew Bible make the connection between actions and reward/punishment, Chronicles takes this connection to an extreme not seen in other texts. There is no delayed punishment, as in 2 Kings, where the fall of Jerusalem is linked to the sin of Manasseh two generations earlier. The story of every king in Chronicles is told in such a way as to demonstrate how his actions led immediately to either reward or punishment. Sara Japhet noted that in every case in his source-text (Samuel-Kings) where: sin was left unanswered, the Chronicler added a punishment; a bad thing happened, the Chronicler added a prior sin; a righteous act was left unanswered, the Chronicler added a reward; a good thing happened, the Chronicler added a prior righteous act; et cetera. While the “doctrine of immediate retribution” is a logical extension of other doctrines of divine justice, and is also a bit utopian (everything has a clear cause and effect), it is also a prominent feature of the Testament of Darius. It may also be rather utopian in the Testament as well! In both texts, justice is clear and logical, and follows directly from an individual’s actions. The individual

---

in the text of Chronicles is always the king or equivalent; the case of Zechariah the prophet in 2 Chr 24:20–21, who was executed despite acting according to the will of God, reminds us that the doctrine of immediate retribution does not apply to everyone in Chronicles.¹⁷

Related to the doctrine of immediate retribution is what Ehud Ben Zvi has called the Chronicler’s “sense of proportion.”¹⁸ In Chronicles, everything is balanced: not only in the matter of reward and punishment, but in such things as the balance between good kings and bad kings; the balance between David as a man of war and Solomon his son as a man of peace (1 Chr 22:7–10); sinners being given a chance to repent, etc. Nothing is out of place. This sense of proportion is seen also in the structure and contents of the Testament of Darius: the balanced ring structure, the sets of pairs, Darius being “in control of [him]self” (DNb 15). This balance is symptomatic of the Achaemenid ideal of a cosmos under control, as also seen in the iconography of Persepolis and in the concept of qrta, “order.”¹⁹ The many good qualities of Cyrus the Great praised by Xenophon in the Cyropaedia may owe much to Xenophon’s own Greek philosophical background and to Herodotus, but they also reflect qualities praised in the Testament of Darius.²⁰ The sense of self-control and moderation seen in the Old Persian texts also characterizes Chronicles. It may account for the reality behind the perception that Chronicles is dull, idealized, and boring. No one can accuse any of the Old Persian inscriptions, even DB, of being exciting.

A strong motif in Chronicles is that of seeking-and-finding. Most often applied to the seeking-and-finding of Yhwh, its classic expression may be found in 1 Chr 28:9: “If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you

¹⁸. Ibid., 160–73.
¹⁹. Margaret Cool Root, The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art (AcIr 9; Leiden: Brill, 1979); Lindsay Allen, “Le Roi Imaginaire: An Audience with the Achaemenid King,” in Imaginary Kings: Royal Images in the Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome (ed. O. Hekster and R. Fowler; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005), 44–45; Lincoln, Happiness for Mankind, 416–23, who notes that “order” is never used as a noun on its own in any of the extant inscriptions.
abandon him, he will reject you forever.” The two verbs for seeking, דְּרָשׁ and בְּקָשׁ, occur forty-one and thirteen times respectively in Chronicles; 25 percent of the occurrences of דְּרָשׁ in the Hebrew Bible are in Chronicles. Almost all of the occurrences of דְּרָשׁ in Chronicles are unique to Chronicles (thirty-seven of forty-one), not paralleled in the source texts. The earliest is in 1 Chr 10, the beginning of the main narrative, and the last is in 2 Chr 34, the account of Josiah, the last real king in the Chronicler’s estimation. The word ties the book together. In five instances, it is paired with מַצַּא, “to find”: 1 Chr 26:31, 28:9, 2 Chr 15:2, 19:3, 34:21 (בְּקָשׁ is also paired with מַצַּא in 2 Chr 15:4, 15). The latter two instances are a play on the motif rather than a strict expression of it. We may consider that the uses of דְּרָשׁ without מַצַּא imply the “finding” as a result of the “seeking,” or the converse: not-seeking leading to not-finding, as in 1 Chr 10:13–14.

It is important to note that Yhwh is also the subject of דְּרָשׁ: he does the seeking and presumably the finding, as in 1 Chr 28:9: “Yhwh is seeking the whole-hearted.” 21 This seeking by Yhwh is similar to the occurrences of vaina-, “to see,” in DNa and DNb: “When Ahuramazda saw [avanai] this earth-empire in disorder, then he gave it to me” (DNa 31–33). The seeing (or seeking) by the deity inevitably leads to the choice of the righteous king. Lincoln has pointed out the importance of seeing in these texts: in DNa, the “wonder” that is the cosmos being seen, and seeing by Ahuramazda; seeing by Darius in DNb. 22 Similarly, looking-and-knowing is an important part of DNa: “Look at the sculptures … then you will know” (ll. 41–42). Most significant, however, is Darius’s insistence on finding out information in DNb: “I do not believe until I hear [äxšnavaiy] both sides” (ll. 21–24) and “Let not what is spoken to you in secret seem best; hear [äxšnudiy] also what is spoken openly” (ll. 52–54). Darius’s entire self-encomium is presented yadbāmaiy taya kārtam vaināhi yadivā äxšnavāhaiy, “so that my work you may see or hear” (DNb 28–30). The ability of a person to find information if they would but seek it is implied throughout the Testament, just as seeking inevitably leads to finding in Chronicles.

Just as Darius was chosen to be king by Ahuramazda, so David was chosen by Yhwh to be king, despite the seeming lack of qualifications for the position: “Yhwh God of Israel chose me from the whole house of my

21. Translations from Hebrew and Aramaic are my own. Hebrew follows the text of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia; Aramaic follows the text of TAD.
father to be king over Israel forever” (1 Chr 28:4), and “Who am I, O Yhwh God, and who is my family, that you should have brought me to this point?” (1 Chr 17:16). While outside the Testament of Darius, Xerxes’s description of his accession in XPf, and Darius’s description of his accession in DB might fruitfully be compared to Solomon’s accession in Chronicles, especially where Xerxes says that Darius made (kar-) him greatest (maθišta) after himself even though he had other sons (XPf 32); David says that out of his many sons, Yhwh had chosen Solomon to be king (1 Chr 28:5).

Up to this point I have examined thematic and motif similarities between Chronicles and the Testament of Darius. I would like to turn to two vocabulary items in Chronicles that I think show Achaemenid influence, although not the influence of the OP language: מַעֲלָה, “unfaithfulness,” and הָתַחֲזֵק, “to strengthen oneself.” The root מַעֲלָה has a ritual or cultic meaning, and is found almost exclusively in a few late texts: primarily Chronicles, Ezekiel, and Leviticus. It is often translated as “unfaithfulness,” but that does not fully express the depth of the wrong against the deity. When used in Chronicles it is always used in the material unique to Chronicles, and it connotes a sin or sacrilege of the highest order. It is beyond sin or wrong of the more usual type, for which other more usual words are used. Like the motif of seeking-and-finding, it runs throughout the book, with its first occurrence in 1 Chr 2:7, its last in 2 Chr 36:14, and its first narrative occurrence in the story of Saul in 1 Chr 10:13–14: “Saul died because of his maʿal, which he maʿal-ed against Yhwh, on account of: the word of Yhwh which he did not keep, and asking of a necromancer in order to seek, and not seeking Yhwh.” I have kept the rather fractured syntax intact, with its repetition of both דַּרְשׁ and מַעֲלָה, because both the repetition and the syntax signal the extreme importance placed upon this statement. It was because of this מַעֲלָה that Yhwh “turned the kingdom over to David, son of Jesse” (v. 14), who then proceeded to put it into order: the next two chapters of Chronicles show David’s organization of his kingdom. In this case, the מַעֲלָה of Saul is very like the yaudanti-, “disorder,” that the earth-empire was in before Ahuramazda handed it over to Darius (DNa 31–32). It is from other texts that we can deduce that the disorder was a result of the entrance of the Lie (drauga-) into the cosmos.23 This highest of wrongs against the deity thus might be analogous to מַעֲלָה in

Chronicles: the good kings vanquish מעלין just as the bad kings commit מעלין, culminating with the priests and the people as a whole continuing and increasing their מעלין in 2 Chr 36:14, leading ultimately to the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple (cf. 1 Chr 9:1). מעלין is not drauga-, but it operates in a manner similar to drauga-: it leads to chaos and destruction.

The second word I wish to examine is התפחיק, the hitpaʿel of the root חזק, “to be strong,” having the sense of “to be established,” or better, “to strengthen oneself.” It is well known that this form of חזק is rare in the Hebrew Bible, with about half of all its occurrences in Chronicles; it occurs fifteen times. Most of the occurrences refer to the king “strengthening himself,” usually at or shortly after his ascending the throne. The first occurrence in this sense is 2 Chr 1:1, Solomon’s accession. It may be significant that the only occurrences previous to Solomon have to do with David’s military; in 1 Chr 11:10, the warriors (זכרים) with David in his kingdom “strengthened themselves,” and in 1 Chr 19:13, Joab exhorts the army of warriors (זכרים) before fighting the Ammonites and Aramaeans: “Let us strengthen ourselves for the sake of our people and the cities of our God.” It is surely significant that none of the irredeemably bad kings are described as having strengthened themselves.24 The last king described as having strengthened himself is Hezekiah in 2 Chr 32:5. In this light, I suggest that the description of Darius in DNb is pertinent. His mental and physical qualities have the effect of making him able to rule, as he says in DNb 45–46: “These are the abilities [hūvnarā-] that Ahuramazda has bestowed on me, and I am able to bear them.” The young man that he addresses in the third paragraph of DNb he exhorts to show “of what sort are your abilities [hūvnarā-]” (l. 51). I suggest that this set of abilities is what is implied by the use of התמחות in Chronicles: the king displays or makes known his abilities for rule, which comprise both mental and physical abilities. This was a key part of the Testament of Darius, and presumably of Achaemenid ideology of kingship.

More tentatively, I have investigated the use of שלום, “peace,” and טוב, “good,” in Chronicles, in the hope of finding a reflex of OP šiyati-. As I noted above, šiyati- was translated into Aramaic as טוב, rather than what I would have expected, שלום. Neither word is particularly common or used particularly characteristically in Chronicles. The closest use of טוב to OP šiyati- is in 2 Chr 6:41, which has a parallel in Ps 132:8–9:

24. With the possible exception of Jehoram in 2 Chr 21:4.
2 Chr 6:41
And now arise, O Yhwh God to your resting-place,
You and the Ark of your strength.
Your priests, O Yhwh God,
Let them be clothed in salvation;
And your loyal ones,
Let them rejoice in the good [טבוב].

Ps 132:8–9
Arise, O Yhwh to your resting place,
You and the Ark of your strength.
Your priests,
Let them be clothed in righteousness;
And your loyal ones,
Let them shout for joy.

In 2 Chr 6:41, טוב is parallel to חסון, “salvation,” which suggests that טוב is understood here as being more specific than “good,” or even “benefit” or “welfare.” It has more cosmic overtones in this enthronement prayer. The kind of “good” that comes from salvation is much more like שלם, “peace, wholeness, completeness,” and thus much like šiyati. The word שלם is almost never used in the non-parallel portions of Chronicles: it is added in 2 Chr 19:1 to show fulfillment of the oracle of 2 Chr 18; it is used to play on Solomon’s name in 1 Chr 22:9. Perhaps the only significant use is in 1 Chr 12:18–19, where it appears four times: “[David] said to them, ‘If in שלם you have come to me … ’ And the spirit enveloped Amasai … ‘We are yours, O David, and we are with you, O son of Jesse. שלם, שלם to you and שלם to your help, for your help is your God.’” David’s straightforward question about intentions for peace or war is answered with a blessing almost cosmic in scope. It is not just peace as opposed to war that is being invoked, but a blessing of wholeness, completeness, or in OP terms, šiyati-. Yet it must be said that these occurrences in Chronicles of טוב and שלם, although suggestive, are not determinative.

26. Ibid., 267.
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FOREIGN MONARCHS IN CHRONICLES

The foreign monarchs in Chronicles have been well studied of late, particularly those who speak or write: Huram, the Queen of Sheba, Sennacherib, Neco, and Cyrus.27 The speeches of these monarchs all “support the theological message of the narrator and of the authorial voice.”28 In other words, they are “Israelitized,”29 and all but Sennacherib are portrayed positively. Ben Zvi suggests that “a bright future is one in which foreigners will recognize YHWH and the role of Israel in the divine economy.”30 The ending of the book, with Cyrus providing for the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple and the repopulation of Judah/Yehud, brings the world of Chronicles into direct contact with the Persian Empire. That Cyrus is portrayed positively is a truism of Chronicles scholarship. But is Cyrus portrayed as a Persian? As an Achaemenid, who were the only Persian kings that most of the Empire had ever really known? Three points are pertinent to the analysis of his speech in 2 Chr 36:23, which reads: “Thus says Cyrus, the King of Persia: All the kingdoms of the earth Yhwh God of Heaven has given to me, and he has appointed me to build him a house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah.” First, the formula introducing his speech is “Thus says Cyrus, the King of Persia,” which mirrors the Old Persian formula. Second he refers to the deity as “Yhwh God of Heaven,” which is the only place in Chronicles that “God of Heaven” is used as an epithet for Yhwh. It is the same appellation used in the Aramaic Elephantine papyri when the Judeans write to Persian authorities: “May the God of Heaven seek the peace/welfare of our lord exceedingly at all times, and favor may he grant you before Darius the King” (TAD A4.7); “saying before Aršama, concerning the house of the altar of the God of Heaven, which is in Yeb the fortress” (TAD A4.9). Third, Cyrus claims he has been given “all the kingdoms of the earth,” which aligns with the creation formula and Darius’s claims of his kingship in DNa. The first part of the edict, therefore, reads exactly as an Aramaic/Hebrew translation of an Achaemenid royal edict (with the pious insertion of Yhwh). Cyrus the Achaemenid indeed!

Notably none of the other royal figures in Chronicles speak in such an Achaemenid way: only Sennacherib in 2 Chr 32:11 begins his letter with

28. Ibid., 279.
29. Ibid., 280.
30. Ibid., 282.
Thus says Sennacherib, the King of Assyria,” and this draws on the parallel text in 2 Kgs 18:38. Only the Persian king looks like a Persian king. Similarly, the features of the ideal Judaean king built up in Chronicles: seeker of Yhwh, builder of temple, successful in war when necessary, father of many sons, dying in peace, do not bear more than a passing resemblance to the ideology of kingship shown in the Testament of Darius. The ideology of a Judaean king remains Judaean at its core, even if the chancellery education of the Chronicler had an impact on its expression. Cyrus the king looks like an ideal Judaean king only when Achaemenid and Judaean ideologies of kingship overlap: subordinate to the deity, recipient of divine favor through holding the kingdom, builder; these are all rather generic traits. Perhaps the most significant difference in the Achaemenid and Judaean ideologies of kingship is the relationship between king and temple-building: in Chronicles, the king’s main purpose is to build the temple, while the Achaemenids seem to not have had temples at all.31

Conclusion

Chronicles is different from most other biblical texts in terms of language, structure, and relationship to other texts (i.e., reuse). It is a product of a scribal culture that had a high degree of textuality. It was produced in Hebrew in a world that was largely Aramaic-speaking, and certainly using Aramaic for administrative purposes under Achaemenid rule. A few generations ago, scholars attempted to find connections between Zoroastrianism and Second Temple Judaism, and these have largely been discounted.32 It is only now that scholars are starting to look at how Achaemenid rule influenced the texts of Second Temple Judaism. Without succumbing to an uncritical parallelomania, I have tried to show how some aspects of Old Persian texts and the underlying Achaemenid ideology can be related to the biblical book of Chronicles.

31. William Riley, King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History (JSOTSup 160; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 163. Discussion at the Leiden conference focused on the lack of attention paid by Achaemenid rulers to their subjects’ temples (with the exception of Darius I). See especially the papers by Damien Agut-Labordere and Olaf Kaper.
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