Bakhtin and the Ideal Ruler in
1–2 Chronicles and the *Cyropaedia*

CHRISTINE MITCHELL
St. Andrew's College Saskatoon, Canada

Introduction

When we turn to a study of ancient Hebrew narrative, most readers prefer the engaging and artful narratives of Samuel and Kings to the seemingly plodding and pedantic narrative of Chronicles. Recently, however, Chronicles has enjoyed a minor surge of interest. As plodding and pedantic as Chronicles may be, perhaps as *boring* as Chronicles may be, it is plodding, pedantic, and boring for interesting reasons. It may be instructive to compare the narrative of Chronicles to the narrative of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, also known as 'one of the most tedious books to have survived classical antiquity' (Gera 1993, vii). In this essay, I propose to do exactly that.

However, both Chronicles and the *Cyropaedia* are large, sprawling works, composed of a number of themes and topics. In this essay, therefore, I will limit myself to an examination of the intertextual construction of the figure of the ideal ruler in both books. I will do so, using a theory of intertextuality based on Bakhtin's notion of the dialogic. I will also come to certain conclusions about the genre of both works, an understanding of 'political philosophy' as a genre, also based on Bakhtin's ideas about genre. Furthermore, in order to fully understand the text of Chronicles, especially, I will be using the work of Yuri Lotman on textuality.

Bakhtin, dialogism and genre

In this essay, it is not my intention to provide a roadmap of dialogism or genre in Bakhtin's thought; in any case, there are plenty of others who have taken on that task. Rather, in this essay I intend to use Bakhtinian concepts

in reading both the *Cyropaedia* and 1–2 Chronicles. Therefore, I will briefly sketch some of my understanding of Bakhtinian ideas, and suggest how I intend to use them.

Defining dialogism is perhaps a futile task. There has been such an explosion of literature on Bakhtin's thought in general, and dialogism in particular, that it is now impossible to keep up. I will take as my basic definition of dialogism, Bakhtin's discussion in *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*: the word and idea are by nature dialogic; the word and the idea want 'to be heard, understood and "answered" by other voices from other positions' (1984, 88). Bakhtin's expansion of this discussion in 'The Problem of the Text' is also critical:

> Confidence in another's word, reverential reception …, apprenticeship, the search for and mandatory nature of deep meaning, *agreement*, its infinite gradations and shadings …, the layering of meaning upon meaning, voice upon voice, strengthening through merging, the combination of many voices…that augments understanding, departure beyond the limits of the understood … (1986, 121).

When we consider that Bakhtin's understanding of the dialogic grew out of his study of the novel, we would have legitimate concerns about the relevance of Bakhtin's concepts to our ancient texts. Bakhtin himself considered the *Cyropaedia* an early form of the novel, saying, '*Cyropaedia* is a novel, in the most basic sense of the word' (1981, 29). Thus, James Tatum also looked at the *Cyropaedia* as the precursor to the Greek novel (1994; cf. Bowersock 1994, 124). L. Wills discussed the features of the Jewish novellas of the Hellenistic period in his article (1994). I would suggest that Chronicles could be seen as a precursor to the Jewish novella in the same way that the *Cyropaedia* is seen as the precursor to the Greek novella. However, there is a line of thought that suggests Bakhtin's understanding of the novelistic genre was flawed. R.Bracht Branham argues that the Greek romances/novels are not novelistic according to Bakhtin's own criteria; he suggests that the Greek novel was 'a modernized version of the "absolute past" of epic' (1995, 84). The Greek novel, then, according to this view, is a bridge between the epic and the true novel that developed in Latin literature (the works of Petronius are given as an example). Branham suggests that this refinement or reformulation of Bakhtin 'would require us to historicize his theory of the novel's

origins …' (1995, 87). If we accept Branham's view, then *Chronicles* and the *Cyropaedia* can still be seen as precursors to the novel, but at a much earlier stage in novelistic development, and without all of the features of the true heteroglossic novel. Michael Holquist, however, has pointed out that Bakhtin made a distinction between the novel and novelness: the former has its history in literary history, and the latter has its history in the history of human consciousness (1990, 72–73).

David Shepherd has suggested that Bakhtin had a strong notion of the author's authority over the text (1989, 95); this separates Bakhtin from the theorists (Kristeva, Barthes), who follow his work, but who posit the 'death of the author'. However, Shepherd also argues that in Bakhtin's work there is a strong focus on the historical and social situation of readers, so that 'the dialogic act of reading is disruptive of the seemingly fixed positions of text and reader' (1989, 99). This suggests that although Bakhtin had ideas about authorial authority, the very notion of dialogism breaks down this concept. A similar argument has been made by Holquist (1990, 68–69).

Ken Hirschkop asks if the notion of dialogism is 'for real'. He suggests that we have been eager to embrace the concept of dialogism because the concept of dialogue is very important in a liberal democracy. The point of his essay is to show that there is a difference between dialogue and novel, and thus there is a difference between dialogue and dialogism: they are not the same things (Hirschkop 1998, 183–84). By doing so, Hirschkop would seem to be contradicting those who see the origins of dialogism (and hence intertextuality) in such things as the Socratic dialogues, and those who see dialogism in midrashic exegesis. He points out that in a dialogic novel, all of the speech positions have to be represented by a single author, thus the openness of true dialogue is not present (1998, 189). What dialogism does do is bring in 'everyday' speech-types into the novel, 'endow[ing] so-called popular or everyday language with an historical or social significance it lacks in its everyday context' (1998, 190). He argues that although Bakhtin tried to extend dialogue with the concept of dialogism, in fact he showed the limitations of dialogue by showing all that novels can achieve without being dialogues. Dialogism is not the be-all and end-all, but rather one form of representation in discourse (1998, 192–93, 195). This is an important corrective, I think, to an over-enthusiasm to make all things dialogic, while still showing that dialogism is a meaningful concept.

The issue of genre is complicated, because it is so nebulous a term. The idea of genre is as old as thinking about literature: Aristotle began the *Poetics* by stating that he wanted to consider poetry in general and its forms/genres (47a1). Here, I will be briefly setting out the Bakhtinian understanding of genre that I will be assuming in my analysis. In *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin describes literary genre as containing 'the most stable, "eternal" tendencies in literature's development …', yet a genre is 'reborn and renewed at every new stage in the development of literature and in every individual work of a given genre' (1984, 106). In 'The Problem of Speech Genres', where he discusses the speech genres of utterances (ranging from the sentence to the full-length text), he notes that speech genres are heterogeneous in the extreme, and that their diversity is linked to the diversity of the human experience (1986, 60–61). Thus, genre can be seen as an ever-shifting array of speech types. Bakhtin divides speech genres into primary (simple) and secondary (complex) speech genres; the complex speech genres such as novels absorb primary speech genres such as letters (1986, 61–62). However, most important for our project is Bakhtin's assertion that 'style is inseparably related to the utterance and to typical forms of utterances …' (1986, 63): there is an 'organic, inseparable link between style and genre … each sphere has and applies its own genres that correspond to its own specific conditions' (1986, 64). He also states,

> Where there is style there is genre. The transfer of style from one genre to another not only alters the way a style sounds, under conditions of a genre unnatural to it, but also violates or renews the given genre (1986, 66).

Finally, Bakhtin also suggests that an individual's speech is adapted for a specific genre, it takes the form of the genre; and if speech genres did not exist, communication would be almost impossible (1986, 78–79). We rely on stylistic markers in order to determine genre, which makes communication possible. Genre is thus linked to form, as well as theme. I will be using this point in order to come to conclusions about the genre of the *Cyropaedia* and Chronicles. However, we should keep in mind that genre, for Bakhtin, also means social construction and social context: 'The meaning of a text does not lie in the particular combination of devices but in the ways in which the text is produced and interpreted, transmitted and used' (Cobley 1988, 326).

Social context alone is not enough to form genre; it is the combination of style, content and social context that form a generic meaning (Branham 2002, 163–164). Indeed, as F. Dunn has remarked, for Bakhtin, 'literary genres are neither collections of works nor formal attributes shared by those works but ways of understanding the world' (Dunn 2002, 188). This understanding of genre may help us when we consider that scholars find it difficult to agree on a genre for either the *Cyropaedia* or for Chronicles.

Lotman and (inter)textuality

Yuri Lotman's name has been until recently only known in the West to a few semioticians, as he was the principal writer in the Moscow-Tartu school of semiotics.[1] With the publication of *The Universe of the Mind* in English in 1990, his work became more widely known. Recently, Lotman's concept of the semiosphere has been discussed and debated in some detail; this pertains to the work Lotman did at the end of his career. Both Allan Reid and David Bethea have discussed Lotman's relationship to Bakhtin's work. Reid points out that it appears that in the mid-1970s Lotman discovered and familiarized himself with the work of Bakhtin. At this point Lotman began to move away from a statistical-semiotic approach to texts and to move towards a development of Bakhtin's positions (1990a, 36–37).[2] Bethea suggests that Lotman discovered Bakhtin's work only in the 1980s, and that although Lotman learned from Bakhtin's work and developed his own later work using Bakhtin's arguments, he remained 'very much his own thinker' (1997, 1–2). He suggests that Lotman could be seen as a theorist of poetry while Bakhtin was a theorist of the novel. Lotman was interested in poetic thinking while Bakhtin was interested in prosaics; Lotman came to see '[t]he connection between life and art, text and code … [as] *generative of meaning* — the ultimate semiotic gesture' (Bethea 1997, 2). Bethea discusses how Lotman was able to use the 'openness' of Bakhtinian thought in order to open up his own closed semiotic systems, thus showing how Bakhtin could have used

---

[1] See Voigt (1995) for a summary of Lotman's life and work.

[2] For a discussion of Bakhtin's evaluation of Lotman, see Reid (1990b, 327-328, 331), where he suggests that in his published article Bakhtin evaluates Lotman fairly and approvingly (1986, 2-3). This is in contrast to the private notes where he seems to have fundamentally misunderstood Lotman's work (1986, 135; 1986, 169).

Lotman's understanding of text and code to 'tighten up' his thinking (1997, 4–5).

For our purposes, I will restrict the discussion of Lotman's work to his understanding of text and audience. Lotman presupposes an audience for the text and he argues that the audience and text interact. For him, not only does the text have an idea of its own ideal readership, but also the readership has an idea of its own ideal text. The text and audience must share an interpretive code (1990, 63–64). The relationship between the text and audience is not a passive one (reception of the text by the audience), but rather is dialogic; '[d]ialogic speech is distinguished not only by the common code of two juxtaposed utterances, but also by the presence of a common memory shared by addresser and addressee' (1982, 81). Tradition is often one of the interpretive codes. Lotman defines tradition as a system of texts in the cultural memory; any text is filtered through the code of tradition, that is, through other texts that serve as interpreters (1990, 70–71). However, often an audience will change, and this will force a change in the way the text constructs its ideal readership: text shapes reader shapes text.

The concept of the interrelationship of all texts, often associated with Bakhtin through Julia Kristeva's mediation, is usefully corrected by Michael Riffaterre. Intertextuality is not a free-flowing concept, but rather a "structured network of text-generated constraints on the reader's perceptions" (Riffaterre 1994, 781). Intertextuality, according to Riffaterre, 1) excludes irrelevant data; 2) is generated by textuality; 3) connects existing texts with other texts; 4) decontextualizes the text and focuses on its literariness; and 5) is a closed exchange between the text and intertext (1994, 786). This is a way of looking at intertextuality not as a web, but rather as an infinite line of signification: a chain. Adding this formulation to the work of Bakhtin and Lotman provides a way of usefully structuring the relationship of text to text.

Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia*

It is a critical commonplace that Herodotus' Cyrus is a tragic figure, while Xenophon's is not; James Tatum has referred to Xenophon's Cyrus as a political hero while Herodotus' Cyrus is a mythical one (1989, 101; cf. Cizek 1975, 538). More importantly, in both the *Histories* and the *Cyropaedia*, the fate of Cyrus is foretold by his origins and character: the origins of Cyrus in Herodotus (the foundling, raised by peasants, but his noble birth prevailed)

foretell his rise and tragic death, while the origins of Cyrus in Xenophon (the happy childhood) foretell his rise and happy end (Tatum 1989, 91). For the purposes of this essay, I will discuss the construction of Cyrus in *Cyr*. 1,2–6: his childhood and education.

The relationship between Cyrus and his grandfather Astyages in the *Cyropaedia* is an amiable and happy one. This is in complete contrast to their relationship in Herodotus' *Histories* and in what we know of Ctesias' *Persica*. In Herodotus, Astyages tries to have Cyrus killed as a child, and as an adult, Cyrus conquers him, although we are told that 'Cyrus did no more harm to Astyages, and kept him at his house until he died' (Hdt. 1,130,3). In Ctesias, Cyrus is not related to Astyages, but becomes his son-in-law through marriage (*FGrH* 688 F 9.1). There is also the possibility, based on the evidence from the fragments of Nicolaus of Damascus, that Ctesias' work included a story about Cyrus' rise to power as first the gardener and then the cupbearer of Astyages (*FGrH* 90 F 66.4–8; cf. Gera 1993, 157, 201).[3] The position of Ctesias, that Cyrus rose to power as Astyages' cupbearer, is incorporated and changed by Xenophon in the scene in *Cyr*. 1,3,9, where Cyrus playfully acts as Astyages' cupbearer (Gera 1993, 156–157); here we can see Xenophon fictionalizing the tradition. In the *Cyropaedia*, we have the positions of both Herodotus and Ctesias incorporated and refuted. Cyrus' familial relationship with Astyages is maintained, yet any hint that it is an unhappy relationship is transmuted into a mark of their close relationship: thus, when Astyages is ill, Cyrus weeps lest he die (*Cyr*. 1,4,2); and Astyages' death is in the end peaceful, and not in any way related to Cyrus' actions, as he is succeeded by his son Cyaxares (*Cyr*. 1,5,2; contra Isoc. 9,38).

The incorporation of and dialogue with Herodotus and Ctesias may be seen also with respect to Cyrus' origins. First, about Cyrus' father, Xenophon says that he 'is said to have been Cambyses, king of the Persians' (*Cyr*. 1,2,1). This takes care of Herodotus, for whom Cambyses is the father, but

---

[3] If this fragment can be trusted to have transmitted Ctesias' work, Cyrus' rise in Ctesias is not unlike the rise of David in 1 Samuel. It is generally agreed that Nicolaus of Damascus based his account of Astyages and Cyrus on Ctesias' work. He may even have incorporated Ctesias' work directly into his own. If so, then we may have some of Ctesias' original text. However, there is no way to reconstruct Ctesias' text with any certainty. Therefore, I will use the fragments of Nicolaus only to indicate the general tenor of Ctesias' work, and I will not use these fragments alone to frame my argument in the appropriate places. Cf. Toher 1989, 169-71.

not a king (Hdt. 1,107). It also takes care of Ctesias, for whom Cambyses is
not the father (*FGrH* 90 F 66.3; if we can trust the account of Nicolaus of
Damascus): thus, it is not said by everyone. With regard to his mother,
Xenophon says that 'it is generally agreed' that it was Mandane, daughter of
Astyages (*Cyr.* 1,2,1): this statement thus agrees with Herodotus (Hdt.
1,108) and disputes the position of Ctesias (*FGrH* 688 F 9.1) — thus it is not
generally agreed. Here we have Xenophon ironically using the phrases 'it is
said' and 'it is generally agreed' in order to reverse the positions of Herodo-
tus and Ctesias.

There are three more episodes in Cyrus' childhood in the *Cyropaedia*
that are in a dialogic relationship with Herodotus. The first is Cyrus' descrip-
tion of his lessons in justice in *Cyr.* 1,3,16–17. In Cyrus' telling of this story,
when picked as a judge during his schooling, he erred in applying the princi-
ples of Persian justice when making his judgement. He learned at that time
that the role of the judge is to 'always render his verdict according to the
law' rather than according to what seems right to him; in fact, only what is
lawful is right. In Herodotus' *Histories*, it is Cyrus doing what seems right to
him that leads to his true parentage being discovered; in Cyrus' speech to
Astyages justifying his actions, he says, 'I did these things to him according
to what was right' (Hdt. 1,115,2). In the *Cyropaedia*, the position of Herodo-
tus is absorbed and refined, and at the same time subtly refuted, as Cyrus in
Herodotus is acting as a tyrannical king (Hdt. 1,114), something specifically
banned under the Persian concept of justice in the *Cyropaedia* (1,3,18).
Mandane tells Cyrus that he should be careful not to learn the principles of
tyranny, lest he be flogged to death (*Cyr.* 1,3,18), an ironic reversal of what
the tyrannical Cyrus in Herodotus has done to one of the boys who has re-
fused to obey one of his tyrannical commands — he flogs him (Hdt. 1,114).[4]

The second episode involves the hunt Cyrus is involved in with his uncle
Cyaxares in *Cyr.* 1,4,5–10. Cyrus is eager to hunt in the wild, having ex-
hausted the challenges of his grandfather's wildlife collection, but his grand-
father is afraid of his being harmed. However, Astyages finally allows him to
go with his uncle Cyaxares to hunt, along with attendants whose role it is 'to
safeguard him from dangerous places and from wild beasts' (*Cyr.* 1,4,7).

---

[4] Wood (1964, 61-63) points out that for Xenophon, law was the 'rightful' command of the
leader; Xenophon did not mention law in most of his works. The question of legitimacy
for a ruler never comes up in Xenophon's works; rather political leadership is judged on
performance.

Cyrus of course, succeeds in the hunt, killing not only a deer, but also a boar, which rushed at him. However, his recklessness earns him a reproof from both the attendants and his uncle, who says of Astyages, 'But if he hears that you have been giving chase, he will revile not only you, but me also for allowing you to do so' (*Cyr.* 1,4,9). All of this follows the pattern of the hunt in Herodotus 1,36–45, where Croesus entrusts his son Atys to Adrastus on a hunt (Tatum 1989, 110): Atys begs Croesus to allow him to go on the hunt despite Croesus' fears; Adrastus is his attendant, charged to guard him (there are six occurrences of words from the root *phulak-* in the passage); and it was a wild pig that charged at the hunters. However, the outcome for the young man differs in Herodotus: Atys is killed by Adrastus, the man charged to guard him, and Adrastus kills himself on Atys' tomb. Cyrus, of course, avoids Atys' fate and kills the boar, yet the episode does not bode well for Cyaxares. Cyaxares does not lose his life because of this hunt, but he does lose his throne to Cyrus in *Cyr.* 8,5,19, and is shown to be a coward in *Cyr.* 4,1,13.

The third episode pertains to Cyrus' ability to read auspices. Cambyses tells Cyrus at the beginning of their discussion about ruling in *Cyr.* 1,6 that he has had him taught about divination 'on purpose … in case some soothsayer wants to deceive you about the signs of the gods …' (*Cyr.* 1,6,2). Cyrus' ability to correctly divine the intention of the gods is in direct contrast both to Croesus in Herodotus as well as Astyages in Herodotus: in a sense, he replaces both Croesus and Astyages. Croesus' loss of both his son and his empire are prefaced by an incorrect understanding of oracles: his son is lost because of an incorrect understanding of his own dream (Hdt. 1,34), which leads him to spend a good deal of effort on learning the effectiveness of various professional oracles (Hdt. 1,46–49), but he misinterprets their pronouncements as well, leading to the fall of his empire (Hdt. 1,53–56, 91). Astyages' reliance on professional diviners also leads to the loss of his empire (Hdt. 1,107–8, 120). While it is possible to see Xenophon's emphasis on correct interpretation of omens as having arisen from his own experiences as related in the *Anabasis* (Gera 1993, 55), surely the lesson is more pointed when we consider what happens to the rulers in Herodotus who cannot correctly interpret omens.

David in Chronicles

There is also a contrast between the David depicted in Samuel and Kings and the David depicted in Chronicles. The most memorable episodes of David's story in Samuel (his defeat of Goliath, his flight from Saul, his relationship with Bathsheba, Absalom's revolt) are all absent from Chronicles. The critical commonplace applied to Cyrus can also be applied to David: the David of Samuel has a rise and a fall — perhaps he is a tragic figure; the David of Chronicles has no character change or development, and appears for the first time in the narrative at his accession to the throne.

There is a major difference between the relationship between Xenophon and his predecessors and Chronicles and Samuel-Kings: Xenophon did not quote extensively from his predecessors, while the Chronicler made extensive use of Samuel-Kings. The small changes the Chronicler made to his source can reveal important clues to his views. This is, however, evidence we should treat with caution, as we often do not know if the Chronicler had a text of Samuel-Kings identical to the one we have today.[5] We are probably on safer ground if we look at the Chronicler's own structure and themes, and read David within that pattern, and if we look at the structure and themes of Samuel-Kings rather than at the precise verbal patterns.

Generally speaking, the Chronicler constructed his David through contrast. He contrasted David with the David of Samuel, he contrasted David with Saul in both Chronicles and Samuel, and he contrasted David with Ahab in Kings. First, let us examine the Chronicler's David and the David in Samuel. In 1 Chron. 13, David's first action as king is to attend to the proper worship of Yhwh by bringing the Ark into Jerusalem. In 2 Samuel, David's first concern is not for the proper worship of Yhwh, but rather with fighting a civil war with the last heir of Saul, then with capturing Jerusalem, and finally with fighting against the Philistines. It is many years after the beginning of his kingship when he finally gets around to bringing the Ark into

---

[5] In fact, it is very likely that the Chronicler had a text of Samuel (and perhaps Kings as well) that differed markedly, in some places, from the version that has survived in the rabbinic-massoretic tradition. The version of Samuel known to the Chronicler was probably much closer to the source for the Greek translation in the Septuagint (specifically the Lucianic recension) text – the evidence of the Hebrew manuscripts of Samuel found at Qumran shows a Hebrew version of Samuel that could conceivably have been a source for the Septuagint translation. See Lemke (1965), Ulrich (1978), and McKenzie (1984).

Jerusalem (at least seven years, if we consider 2 Sam. 5,5). So while Samuel says that David is a great military leader first during his reign, Chronicles says that David is a great worshipper of Yhwh first during his reign. For the Chronicler, military accomplishment was important as a facet of the ideal king, but subordinate to the proper worship of God. Here we have an example of a change in David's characterization through the re-ordering of the narrative, from warrior first to worshipper first.

David's attitude towards the Ark is also different in 2 Sam. 6 and 1 Chron. 13. In 2 Sam. 6,12, David decides to bring the Ark into Jerusalem from the house of Obed-edom because he finds out that having the Ark in one's house is a blessing. In Chronicles, David plans from the beginning to bring the Ark into Jerusalem, but he is delayed because he needs to prepare a place for it first, and to demonstrate in other ways that he is the proper king. David is not grasping and acquisitive, rather, he is merely giving himself enough time to prepare himself to receive the Ark. Chronicles elaborates by showing how the meticulous preparations made by David, both in terms of preparing a tent to receive the Ark and in terms of levitical ministers, are evidence of his regard for proper worship above all (cf. Williamson 1982, 119–120; Japhet 1993, 282).

In Samuel, Michal is the wife of David. In the scene of 2 Sam. 6,16–23, she is represented as the daughter of Saul, as representative of Saul's house, but the reader already knows that she is the wife of David. She despises (sexual jealousy is implied) David for the scene he makes in front of the Ark as it is being brought into the city, and she confronts him for it. The Chronicler's reply is that Michal is not the wife of David (she is not described that way in Chronicles), she is merely the representative of Saul's house, and that she despises David for performing proper cultic worship. The irony is that in Samuel, Michal despises David for performing what in her eyes is *improper* cultic worship, while in Chronicles she despises him for performing *proper* cultic worship — a wonderful tension that does not need to be resolved. Michal's characterization is changed from a good but disloyal wife to a bad non-wife. Thus, the episode is kept from Samuel, but its meaning is changed in Chronicles, achieved using irony and a subsequent shift in characterization.

1 Chronicles 18,1–20,8 details the action of the bulk of David's reign, successful military endeavours. A reader who knows Samuel is immediately struck by the omission of the stories of David showing kindness to the de-

scendants of Saul (2 Sam. 9), David and Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11–12), the rape of Tamar (2 Sam. 13), Absalom's revolt (2 Sam. 14–18), and its aftermath (2 Sam. 19–21). When we add in the account of the war between David and Ishbaal in 2 Sam 2–6, all of these stories show division in Israel and division in the house of David. The Chronicler on the other hand suggested that there is no division in Israel, and David's sons do not cause him problems. John Wright points out that in Chronicles, David never loses a battle, never fights against other Israelites, never engages in 'cruel military conduct' (contra Johnstone 1997, 1:221), and altogether does not appear to be so much a tribal chieftain but rather a Hellenistic tyrant (Wright 1997, 164). Perhaps, I might suggest, David is here the model of ideal military behaviour: successful and 'gentlemanly' — the comparison with Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia* might easily be made here (cf. *Cyr*. 1,6,7). David also rules over a united kingdom: there is no dissent.

In Samuel, a completely different picture of David appears: he loses control over himself (as shown by the episode with Uriah and Bathsheba in 2 Sam. 11), he loses control of his sons (one rapes his daughter in 2 Sam. 13, one revolts against him in 2 Sam. 15), and he seems also to be losing control over Israel, or at least he seems to lose perspective on what is important as king. Joab has to come to David and tell him what to do in 2 Sam. 19,5–7. David's kingdom is beset by dissent and trouble after the events of 2 Sam. 12. Samuel-Kings says that David's kingdom is promised to be secure in the long run (cf. 2 Sam. 7), but in his reign there is nothing but trouble once David loses control of himself in 2 Sam. 11. Chronicles replies that not only is David's kingdom secure in the long run (1 Chron. 17), but that during his reign, the boundaries of Israel are made secure and nothing troubles the internal peace of Israel.

Second, David is contrasted with Saul (cf. Mitchell 1999). The importance of David's first act of bringing the Ark into the city is emphasized by his own words in 1 Chron. 13,3, 'So let us bring around the ark of our God to us, for we did not seek it out in the days of Saul'. David is being held up against the negative model of Saul: while Saul had not brought the Ark to the people, David does (cf. Williamson 1982, 113–14; Riley, 1993, 45, 59). The language of this phrase also points out the contrast: just as Yhwh in 1 Chron. 10,14 turns over the kingdom to David because Saul did not seek him, at this point (1 Chron. 13,3) David seeks to turn the Ark back to its proper home (Japhet 1993, 276).

The tribute of Hiram of Tyre and the military actions against the Philistines, and the description of David's children given in 1 Chron. 14 cannot all possibly occur within the three month time frame given in 1 Chron. 13,14 for the Ark's temporary rest at the house of Obed-edom (Japhet 1993, 284; Johnstone 1997, 1:177; Williamson 1982, 117). It may be that the three months simply denotes an interval during which David can perform more deeds to justify bringing the Ark into Jerusalem. At the conclusion of 1 Chron. 13, it seems that the Ark cannot be brought into Jerusalem. The events of 1 Chron. 14 are told in order to justify the arrival of the Ark. Three things happen: tribute, specifically cedar logs, is given to David (14,1); David has many sons (14,3–5); David defeats the Philistines not once but twice (14,8–17). We are specifically told that the tribute allows David to see that he is established as king and that his kingdom is 'highly exalted' (14,2). We are also told that the military victories spread David's fame and that 'Yhwh brought dread of him on all the nations' (14,17). So although David's first act as king is to bring the Ark into Jerusalem, the act cannot be completed until he has 1) received the homage of other kings; 2) has many children; and 3) defeats other peoples who have made incursions into Israel (notably the Philistines) in battle — he makes the borders of Israel secure. This is all in direct contrast to Saul in 1 Chron. 10, who did not receive the homage of other kings, whose sons died, and who was defeated by the Philistines (cf. Williamson 1982, 116–117).

The language of 1 Chron. 14,8–17 has many similarities with the language of Saul's defeat in 1 Chron. 10, mostly giving rise to contrasts. In 10,7, the Israelites are in the valley, and flee because they are defeated; in 14,9 and 14,13, the Philistines are defeated in valleys. In 10,7, the Israelites abandon their towns; in 14,12, the Philistines abandon their gods: note that the gods of the Philistines are defeated, as a contrast to Saul's armour and skull being laid up in the Philistines' temples after his defeat in 10,10. In 14,10 and 14,14, David inquires of God, in order to seek out God's commands: although a nice contrast would have been for the word 'to seek' to be used in order to contrast with Saul's not seeking God in 10,13–14, the use of 'to ask' makes an even more direct contrast, as it is the root ($š^{\flat}l$) from which Saul's name comes. Not only that, but it is the same word which is used to describe Saul's inquiring of a necromancer in 10,13 (Williamson 1982, 117–18). Although the verb 'to seek' is not used in 1 Chron. 14, it is used three times in the rest of the section, in 13,3, 15,13, and 16,11. In 13,3, David

says, 'So let us bring round the ark of our God to us, for we did not seek it out in the days of Saul.' Again, Saul's not seeking is emphasized (Williamson 1982, 115). When the removal of the Ark is resumed in 1 Chron. 15, David says, 'Because you [Levites] were not there the first time, Yhwh our God burst out against us, because we did not seek it out properly' (15,13). David at this point recognizes that seeking out Yhwh properly was very important. Finally, in the hymn at the dedication of the Ark, the people are instructed to '[s]eek Yhwh and his strength' (16,11); seek out Yhwh and no one else for guidance. Both the themes and the specific language of 1 Chron. 13–14, therefore, further emphasize the contrast between David and Saul, pointing up David's proper kingly actions.

Most of 1 Chron. 15 and the non-hymn portion of 1 Chron. 16 are given over to describing how David arranges for the proper guardianship of the Ark: he prepares a place for the Ark (15,1); he commands that only Levites should carry the Ark (15,2) — he attributes the previous disaster with the Ark in 14,10 to the lack of proper levitical attention (15,13); he gathers the Levites and priests (who are properly numbered and accounted for) (15,4–11); he instructs the Levites to appoint musicians, singers and gatekeepers for the Ark (15,16–24); he appoints levitical ministers for the Ark (16,4–6); and he appoints the regular daily ministers and priests for the tabernacle (which is remaining at Gibeon) and the Ark (16,37–42) (cf. de Vries 1988, 637–639). David also ensures that the Ark is properly brought into Jerusalem, that everyone is properly attired, that there is appropriate musical accompaniment to the procession, and that the proper offerings and food distributions are made (15,25–16,3). All of this points to an understanding on David's part of the importance of the ritual and observances that surround the Ark, and shows his concern for proper worship, again all in contrast with Saul. The contrast is especially well pointed out by two small details: in 15,29, Michal the daughter of Saul, upon watching the procession, despises David; and in 16,39 we are told that the most sacred tabernacle and altar remain at Gibeon, the hometown of Saul and his family. A representative of the family of Saul despises David as he performs the proper cultic function for the Ark, as he performs proper worship; and David understands the importance of the tabernacle and altar that are located right in the home of Saul.

This entire passage of 1 Chron. 13–16, then, contrasts David with Saul, and begins to present David as Saul's antithesis, and therefore as the proper king. David's first concern is for proper worship of Yhwh, and so he brings

the Ark of the Covenant into Jerusalem and appoints its attendants. He also seeks the counsel of Yhwh. He has many sons to follow him. He receives tribute from other nations, and subdues other nations militarily. Saul could not or did not do any of these things. David, therefore, is the ideal king for Israel.

Third, an extremely interesting dialogic relationship between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings pertains to David's purchase of the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite for the site of the Temple (1 Chron. 21). However, in this case it is not David being contrasted with Saul, but rather David being contrasted with Ahab, the king of Israel of a later time (cf. Allen 1988, 31, on the contrast between the house of David and Ahab in 2 Chron. 21–23). Ahab is referred to fourteen times in Chronicles (2 Chron. 18,1, 2 (x2), 3, 19; 21,6 (x2), 13; 22,3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8), often in conjunction with his wickedness and the wickedness of his house (e.g. 2 Chron. 21,13; 22,3). However, it is in 1 Kings 16–22 that we see Ahab being set up as the anti-David, the archetypal evil king who leads his people away from Yhwh. What is most interesting about the episode of 1 Chron. 21,18–30 is how it compares with the episode of Naboth's vineyard in 1 Kings 21. In 1 Chron. 21, David, the king of all Israel, approaches Ornan the Jebusite (thus a non-Israelite) and offers to purchase his threshing floor from him as a place to build an altar to Yhwh. In 1 Kings 21, Ahab, the king of the divided kingdom of Israel, approaches Naboth the Jezreelite (thus an Israelite) and offers to purchase his vineyard from him as a place to grow a herb garden. A series of oppositions are thus set up: king over all Israel vs. king of truncated Israel, non-Israelite vs. Israelite owner, and altar to Yhwh vs. herb garden. The opening words of the kings in making their offers are almost identical. David says, 'Give me the site of the threshing-floor, and I will build on it an altar to Yhwh (at its full price in silver give it to me), so that the plague may be stayed from upon the people' (1 Chron. 21,22). Ahab says, 'Give me your vineyard and it will be mine as a herb garden, for it is right beside my house, and I will give you a better vineyard instead of it, or if it seems good to you I will give you silver for its purchase price' (1 Kings 21,2). Although the wording is similar, it is not identical, merely suggesting the other episode rather than quoting it exactly; it is important to note that the changes in 1 Chron. 21,22 from its equivalent in 2 Sam. 24,21 bring it in line with Ahab's request in 1 Kings 21,2. From this point on, almost everything else is in contrast: Naboth the Jezreelite refuses to sell his vineyard since it is his ancestral inheritance;

Ornan the Jebusite immediately offers up his threshing-floor (even though we might assume that it is his ancestral inheritance as well), and offers not only the threshing-floor, but everything in it, including the oxen, sledges and grain. David refuses, emphasizing again that he will pay full price, and that he will not take 'what is yours' (1 Chron. 21,24). In 1 Kings 21, Naboth ends up losing everything, including his life, and Ahab gains not only the vineyard, but also all of Naboth's property, without paying for it. This may be inferred from the manner of Naboth's death, consistent with the legislation of Deut. 13,6–11 and 17,2–7; Ahab's ability to take the vineyard implies that he now has control of all of Naboth's property. In this episode we have an illustration of David's status as ideal ruler through his treatment of Ornan the Jebusite, as opposed to Ahab the wicked ruler: the ideal ruler thinks of the good of the people and of Yhwh, and cares even for the non-Israelites living in his kingdom, while the wicked ruler thinks only of his own good. Here we have an example of role replacement, where Ahab takes on the role of the wicked king normally reserved for Saul in Chronicles. This illustration works if we do not know the story of Naboth's vineyard in 1 Kings 21, but is even more pointed when that story is brought in as well. R. Braun has pointed out even more echoes in 1 Chron. 21: the angel recalls Josh. 5,13–15; the full price paid by David recalls Abraham's purchase of a burial plot in Gen. 23; Yhwh's speech to David in fire recalls 1 Kings. 18,38; and Ornan on his threshing floor recalls Gideon in Judg. 6 (Braun 1986, 218; cf. Williamson 1991, 21). Williamson also has pointed out links between 1 Chron. 21 and Gen. 22–23, seeing the Temple site as a focus of continuity with Israel's early history (1991, 22–24).

The remaining kings of Judah in Chronicles

In the interests of space, I would like to restrict my discussion of the remaining kings in Chronicles to a discussion of Rehoboam. The interpretive key to the reign of Rehoboam is found not in the description of his reign in 2 Chron. 10–12, but rather in the speech of his son Abijah in 2 Chron. 13,4–12. In that speech, Abijah condemns Jeroboam for taking advantage of Rehoboam when he was 'a young man [*na'ar*] and weak of heart' (13,7). The term *rak* 'weak' is used only three times in Chronicles, here and in 1 Chron. 22,5 and 29,1; in the other two cases, the term is used by David to describe Solomon. In all three cases, the term is paired with the term *na'ar*

'young man,' a term which itself is only used five times in Chronicles. This phrase 'a young man and weak of heart' picks up on the description of Rehoboam's friends whom he consults in 2 Chron. 10,8 and 1 Kings 12,8 (these men are described as 'young men'), but makes it more explicit. What we have in Abijah's speech, therefore, is a strong identification of Rehoboam with Solomon as a young man and inexperienced at the time of his accession. However, in 2 Chron. 12,13 Rehoboam is 41 years old when he begins to reign. I do not think that this would be considered young. Sara Japhet deals with this problem differently: she sees the terms as being applied literally to Solomon and figuratively to Rehoboam (1993, 692); I think this overlooks the mention of the 'young men' who were Rehoboam's advisors (cf. Williamson 1982, 253). Rehoboam may also be identified with Solomon in terms of the great quantity of wives and concubines he has (2 Chron. 11,18–21), even though this number does not approach the vastness of Solomon's harem (1 Kings 11,3). He may also be identified with Solomon in his role as builder (2 Chron. 11,5–10; cf. 2 Chron. 8,2–6; 1 Kings 9,15–19). Here we have an example of the dialogism within Chronicles: one voice says that Rehoboam is young and inexperienced and for that reason loses the kingdom, but he also does good work in Judah (cf. Knoppers 1990, 438–439), while the other voice says that Rehoboam is not young but incompetent and for that reason loses the kingdom. The text does not force us to choose (unlike 1 Kings, which does make the choice that Rehoboam is incompetent).

Furthermore, when we compare the role of Jeroboam in 1 Kings and in 2 Chronicles, we see that in 1 Kings, Jeroboam is much more active during the reign of Solomon than he is in the Chronicler's depiction of that reign. His rebellion, therefore, is displaced into the reign of Rehoboam in Chronicles (However, it is possible that the Chronicler knew a version of Kings closer to the Septuagint, which minimizes Jeroboam's role in the rebellion against Rehoboam; Ackroyd 1973, 125; Japhet 1993, 648–650). Jeroboam is set up as a foil for Rehoboam explicitly as an adversary in 2 Chron. 10–12. However, 2 Chron. 10–12 is full of references that pull Jeroboam back into the reign of Solomon: 10,2 describes how Jeroboam fled to Egypt while Solomon was alive; 10,15 makes reference to the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite already alluded to in 9,29; and 12,15 juxtaposes the notice of the records of Iddo (who also records Solomon's reign, cf. 9,29) with the notice of the continual wars between Rehoboam and Jeroboam. When we put this together

with the depiction of the later part of Solomon's reign in 1 Kings 11, we can read Rehoboam's reign in Chronicles as the collection-point for all of the negative stories about Solomon in 1 Kings: rebellion by Jeroboam, loss of the kingdom, cultic aberrations, many wives.

When we read the story of Rehoboam in Chronicles alone, it tells of an incompetent king who makes up for his major losses by some minor organizational tinkering. However, when we read the story of Rehoboam in Chronicles alongside the story in Kings, he emerges not only as an incompetent king and unworthy successor to David and Solomon, but also in effect as the negative face of Solomon. I realize that this is contrary to the way most commentators have read Rehoboam: overwhelmed by the voice of the text which suggests that Rehoboam does indeed do as Yhwh commands, they ignore the voice which says that he does not and never did. In that way, he is both the villain *in* the text for having lost Israel and the Temple wealth, and victim *of* the text's requirement that all explicitly negative features of Solomon be removed (cf. Knoppers 1990). However, because he has been given the negative attributes of Solomon in 1 Kings, he is identified too closely with Solomon in Chronicles to be all bad; thus, he is given positive attributes as well. The dialogic construction of Rehoboam as Solomon explains some of the confusion commentators have while reading this passage. Rehoboam takes on the role of Solomon in 1 Kings, who also had both good and bad characteristics, and who definitely lost the northern tribes (cf. 1 Kings 11,11): the Chronicler kept the traditions but changed the character.

Conclusions

In the *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon constructed his hero Cyrus as an ideal ruler, ideal in two senses: perfect in almost every way, and unique. He is a perfect warrior and a perfect philosopher, always with the perfect battle tactic at hand along with a perfect understanding of himself and the route to true happiness. He rules himself, and thus rules his empire. Xenophon tried to demonstrate how Cyrus came by his abilities, through his origins, nature and education.

Where necessary, Xenophon used material from Herodotus and Ctesias in his construction of Cyrus, without credit — he reworked it in order to create a dialogic relationship between the *Cyropaedia* and those other texts. Xenophon used several techniques in order to create his intertextual Cyrus.

He fictionalized previous traditions, so that a tradition is kept but its meaning is changed (as in the cupbearer tradition). He used phrases such as 'it is generally agreed' ironically. The use of 'it is said' marks those passages where Xenophon was most ardently casting doubt on or opposing the position of Herodotus and Ctesias, most notably in Books 1 and 8; otherwise, his intertextual constructions are subtler. He replaced characters in episodes, such as the episode of the hunt in Book 1. He used role reversal; this is especially marked with respect to Croesus (throughout the work). The result is a change in characterization: Herodotus' tragic king and Ctesias' failed warrior-king become Xenophon's perfect military leader and philosopher-king.

Generally, Xenophon's use of intertextuality emphasizes and reaffirms his position that he had already put forward. He did not *need* to use Herodotus or Ctesias, and in fact often did not, but his integration and refutation of their positions within his own text adds depth to his own work. It also adds irony, or enhances the pleasure of reading the text. At this point, we can begin to see what might be a generic form of (political) philosophy: the disputation between competing voices in the text. This is more easily seen in the Socratic dialogues of both Plato and Xenophon, where the competing voices are clearly marked in the dialogue. Here in the *Cyropaedia* we have the dialogue internalized into the narrative, with Xenophon-as-narrator taking the place of Socrates, and Herodotus and Ctesias taking the place of Socrates' interlocutors.

When we set David in Chronicles and Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia* together with their counterparts in other texts, we can read them in terms of a dialogic relationship as well. In both books, there is a dialogic relationship between the work and other texts, which enhances the pleasure and ironies within the work and serves to make the work's points even more forcefully. Both the *Cyropaedia* and Chronicles actively reply to the position taken about the ruler in other texts, and it is striking that both remove the tragic or flawed elements of the ruler found in the other texts, replacing them instead with elements that tend towards the philosophical. In Chronicles, the contrast between David and Saul is set up even more firmly when read in a dialogic relationship with Samuel; similarly, the contrast between Cyrus and Croesus is made even more pointed when read along with Herodotus' *Histories*. Both texts use the dialogic relationship with their predecessors in order to emphasize their own construction of the ideal ruler.

Both Xenophon and the Chronicler worked in similar ways. As we have seen, both changed the meaning of previous traditions or episodes while still keeping them in the text, both used phrases ironically, both used the replacement of characters while keeping episodes from other traditions. However, while Xenophon used the technique of role reversal, this technique is not found in 1 Chronicles: we do not have David taking the role of someone else from Samuel. The result of these techniques is similar: the change in characterization of the ideal ruler. David is changed from a flawed character to an ideal ruler. The failure by Rehoboam and the other successors to live up to the ideal underscores David's uniqueness, just as Cyrus' successors were unable to live up to Cyrus' ideal in the *Cyropaedia* (8,8).[6]

If we can agree that Cyrus in the *Cyropaedia* is a philosopher-king, then surely it is not much of a stretch to suggest that the *Cyropaedia* is a work of political philosophy. However, taking that approach merely looks at the theme of the work. At the beginning of this essay, I agreed with Bakhtin's premise that every genre has its own generic form. The works of political philosophy from the Greek world that most easily come to mind are the Socratic dialogues of Plato, especially the *Republic*. I have suggested that in the *Cyropaedia*, in the dialogic form of the text, we have a dialogue in narrative form. This dialogue is not between named characters in the text, although there is dialogue of a different kind between named characters in the text, but rather between the voices or texts within the text. Xenophon himself had used the form of the Socratic dialogue for some of his other works (the *Memorabilia*, *Oeconomicus* and *Symposium* featured Socrates, while the *Hiero* did not). The *Cyropaedia* internalizes this form, maintaining it within the genre of philosophy. However, in the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon (or the implied author 'Xenophon') took on the role of 'Socrates', controlling the voices and texts within the text, leading the dialogue in the direction he wanted it go, just as Socrates did. Similarly, Chronicles also internalizes the dialogic form, and also deals with the problem of the ideal ruler. Chronicles' David stands in the same relationship with the David of Samuel-Kings as Xenophon's Cyrus does to the Cyrus of Herodotus and Ctesias.

---

[6] With most modern commentators I see 8,8 as a Xenophontic composition (Delebecque 1957, 405-8); lately, only Hirsch (1985, 91-97) has seen 8,8 as a later addition to the *Cyropaedia*. See Tatum (1989, 220-25) for a good discussion of the ideologies behind seeing 8,8 as a later editorial addition.

Finally, let us turn to social context and location, or the way the text understands the world. Xenophon was writing at a time when there was debate about the form of the *polis* and of government (Dillery 1995, 43–44; Higgins 1977, 128–129), when the Persian empire (although in decline) was able to exert a good deal of control over both the Athenian and Spartan dominions, and at a time when the great Hellenistic empires were not far away. Similarly, the Chronicler was writing at a time when the Persian Empire he was subject to was in a period of decline, and the great Hellenistic empires were not far away (cf. Berquist 1995, 122–123). Similarities in form, theme and social context can be seen between these two works. If the *Cyropaedia* can be seen as a work of political philosophy, can we not see a work of political philosophy in Chronicles as well?[7]

Bibliography

Ackroyd, P.R. 1973. *I & II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*, London: SCM.

Allen, L.C. 1988. 'Kerygmatic Units in 1&2 Chronicles', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 41, 21–36.

Bakhtin, M.M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. V.W. McGee, ed. C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Austin: University of Texas.

— 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, trans. & ed. C. Emerson, intro. W.C. Booth, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

— 1981. 'Epic and Novel', in: M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist, ed. M. Holquist, Austin: University of Texas, 3–40.

Berquist, J. 1995. *Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Bethea, D.M. 1997. 'Bakhtinian Prosaics Versus Lotmanian "Poetic Thinking": The Code and Its Relation to Literary Biography', *Slavic and East European Journal* 41, 1–15.

Bowersock, G.W. 1994. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*, Berkeley: University of California.

Branham, R.Bracht. 2002. 'A Truer Story of the Novel?' in: R.B. Branham (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics*, Evanston: Northwestern UP, 161–186.

— 1995. 'Inventing the Novel', in: A. Mandelker (ed.), *Bakhtin in Contexts: Across the Disciplines*, Evanston: Northwestern UP, 79–87.

Braun, R. 1986. *1 Chronicles*, Waco: Word.

Cizek, A. 1975. 'From the Historical Truth to Literary Convention: The Life of Cyrus the Great Viewed by Herodotus, Ctesias, and Xenophon', *AC* 44, 531–52.

Cobley, E. 1988. 'Mikhail Bakhtin's Place in Genre Theory', *Genre* 21, 321–338.

Delebecque, E. 1957. *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon*, Paris: Klincksieck.

de Vries, S.J. 1988. 'Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles', *JBL* 107, 619–39.

Dillery, J. 1995. *Xenophon and the History of his Times*. London: Routledge.

Dunn, F. 2002. 'Rethinking Time: From Bakhtin to Antiphon', in: R.B. Branham (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics*, Evanston: Northwestern UP, 187–219.

Gera, D.L. 1993. *Xenophon's* Cyropaedia*: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique*, Oxford: Clarendon.

Higgins, W.E. 1977. *Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the* Polis. Albany: SUNY P.

Hirsch, S.W. 1985. *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire*, Hanover: UP of New England.

Hirschkop, K. 1998. 'Is Dialogism for Real?' in: D. Shepherd (ed.), *The Contexts of Bakhtin: Philosophy, Authorship, Aesthetics*, Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 183–95.

Holquist, M. 1990. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*, London: Routledge.

Jacoby, F. 1923–57. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Leiden: Brill.

Japhet, S. 1993. *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary*, Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.

Johnstone, W. 1997. *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 2 vol., Sheffield: Sheffield AP.

Knoppers, G.N. 1990. 'Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim?' *JBL* 109, 423–40.

Lemke, W.E. 1965. 'The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History', *HThR* 58, 349–63.

Lotman, Y. 1990. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*, trans. A. Shukman, Bloomington: Indiana UP.

— 1982. 'The Text and the Structure of Its Audience', trans. A. Shukman, *NLH* 14, 81–87.

McKenzie, S.L. 1984. *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History*, Atlanta: Scholars.

Mitchell, C. 1999. 'The Dialogism of Chronicles', in: M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*, Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 311–26.

Morson, G.S. 1991. 'Bakhtin, Genres, and Temporality', *NLH* 22, 1071–1092.

Reid, A. 1990a. *Literature as Communication in Bakhtin and Lotman*, New York: Garland.

— 1990b. 'Who is Lotman and Why is Bakhtin Saying Those Nasty Things About Him?' *Discours Social/Social Discourse* 3.1–2, 324–338.

Riffaterre, M. 1994. 'Intertextuality vs. Hypertextuality', *NLH* 25, 779–788.

Riley, W. 1993. *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History*, Sheffield: JSOT.

Shepherd, D. 1989. 'Bakhtin and the Reader', in: K. Hirschkop & D. Shepherd (eds.), *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*, Manchester: Manchester UP, 91–108.

Tatum, J. 1994. 'The Education of Cyrus', in: J.R. Morgan & R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London: Routledge, 15–28.

— 1989. *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On* The Education of Cyrus, Princeton: Princeton UP.

Toher, M. 1989. 'On the Use of Nicolaus' Historical Fragments', *ClAnt* 8, 159–72.

Ulrich, E.C., Jr. 1978. *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, Missoula: Scholars.

Voigt, V. 1995. 'In Memoriam of "Lotmanosphere"', *Semiotica* 105, 121–206.

Williamson, H.G.M. 1991. 'The Temple in the Books of Chronicles', in: W. Horbury (ed.), *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Rammel*, Sheffield: JSOT, 15–31.

— 1982. *1 and 2 Chronicles*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wills, L.M. 1994. 'The Jewish Novellas', in: J.R. Morgan & R. Stoneman, *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London: Routledge, 223–38.

Wood, N. 1964. 'Xenophon's Theory of Leadership', *C&M* 25, 33–66.

Wright, J.W. 1997. 'The Fight for Peace: Narrative and History in the Battle Accounts in Chronicles', in: M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund & S.L. McKenzie (eds.), *The Chronicler as Historian*, Sheffield: JSOT, 150–77.