1 Chr 21) as a test case for his hypothesis. He follows Louis C. Jonker’s argument quite closely, and Giffone then extends it to suggest that any narrative set in Jerusalem equally relates to Benjamin and Levi. But this interpretive decision largely hinges on the Chronicler’s addition of Joab excluding Levi and Benjamin. The mention of Benjamin is curious, and, for example, both Knoppers (1 Chronicles, 2 vols., Anchor Yale Bible [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004]) and Steven L. McKenzie (1 and II Chronicles [Nashville: Abingdon, 2004]) demur on why Benjamin is included. Giffone does not raise an alternative interpretation that the tabernacle was located in Gibeon, which is why Joab excluded the tribe from the census (see Ralph W. Klein, 1 Chronicles, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006]).

Giffone’s quest to read the evidence in his favor can become taxing at points. For example, in his discussion of the omission of David’s family troubles (2 Sam 13–21), he notes a number of Benjamites that are portrayed in a poor light (Mephibosheth, Ziba, Shimei, Sheba, Saul’s grandsons). While Giffone rightly notes that the omission of these stories in Chronicles cannot be considered a pro-Benjamin slant, he finds it “notable” that so many Benjamites are excluded. Likewise, is his reading of the inclusion of Saul’s war spoils for the house of YHWH (1 Chr 26:27–28). Giffone sees this as an overtly positive reference to Saul and an example where Chronicles replaces a negative memory about the Benjamite Saul with a positive. He does not raise the suggestion that the mention of the war spoils connects to the more dominant theme in Chronicles of the House of YHWH.

Giffone’s work provides a helpful reflection on Benjamin in a postexilic Persian imperial context. Throughout the monograph, the reader will detect heavy influence from the work of Gary Knoppers and Giffone’s mentor, Louis Jonker. Jonker’s influence is especially pervasive throughout the book, and Giffone frequently draws out suggestions and implications from Jonker’s work on Chronicles. Giffone’s introduction of concepts from political game theory is intriguing, though these theories seem to move into the background after their introduction in ch. two. They are briefly reintroduced and expanded in ch. seven; however, more attention to developing and applying these tools would continue to help support Giffone’s thesis. In sum, Benjamin Giffone provides another welcome voice to the burgeoning study of Benjamin in the biblical period.

Ryan N. Roberts
Cornerstone University


In this slightly revised version of his 2014 doctoral dissertation, Cudworth argues that the Chronicler uses war narratives to illustrate the rewards and consequences of faithfulness or unfaithfulness to the temple cult. Cudworth builds on the widely held view that Chronicles is characterized by retributive
doctrine, but he contends that kings are primarily assessed by proper attention to the temple, rather than by other criteria (e.g., adherence to Mosaic law, or general good or evil-doing). In short, kings who attend faithfully to the temple cult experience military victory and those who do not, suffer defeat.

Cudworth’s thesis depends heavily on the function of certain terms in the Chronicler’s work. The author contends that when the Chronicler speaks of a king “forsaking,” YHWH (עזב), “seeking” YHWH (שׁדר) or “breaking faith” (מעל), he uses these terms paradigmatically to refer to maintenance of the temple (pp. 4–6). Cudworth briefly discusses these and other words in ch. 1 and builds on this discussion throughout the book.

Chapter 2 is an examination of David, the ideal king. Cudworth argues that although the temple was not build in David’s day, the Chronicler depicts David as a “pioneer of temple faithfulness” (p. 7), through two main pursuits. First, David sought to gather “all Israel” together for the proper worship of YHWH (1 Chr 13:2–3). Second, he desired to build, and then made extensive preparations for, the temple. Cudworth argues that as long as David pursued these objectives, Israel experienced success in war and stability in the land.

In ch. 3, Cudworth discusses those kings who consistently exhibited temple faithfulness and, therefore, experienced military victory. His thesis is most compelling with the examples provided in this chapter. He argues that, for the Chronicler, it is Solomon’s temple faithfulness that “enabled him to expand Israel’s borders further, gain hegemony over his neighbors, and establish peace over a broader stretch of land,” (p. 54). Cudworth examines the reign of Abijah, whose attention to the temple (2 Chr 13:10–12) is followed by his victory over Jeroboam, and that of Jotham, whose action to build the upper gate of the house of YHWH (2 Chr 27:3) is followed by his victory over the Ammonites. Finally, he discusses Hezekiah’s extensive temple reforms, which are followed by his ability to withstand the Assyrian army.

Chapter 4 considers kings whom the Chronicler portrays both as wholly unfaithful to the temple and as experiencing military defeat. Cudworth argues that Saul’s defeat and death in battle was the result of cultic transgressions. The author’s contention that the Chronicler uses מעל to indicate unfaithfulness to the temple, even when the temple is not specifically mentioned, is critical to his assessment of Saul. This chapter also examines the military defeats experienced by Jehoram, Ahaziah, Ahaz, Amon, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah and concludes that they ultimately resulted from unfaithfulness to the temple cult.

In the next two chapters, Cudworth investigates kings whose temple faithfulness shifts throughout their reigns. Chapter 5, “Faithful Kings who Falter,” explores the reigns of Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoida, Amaziah, Uzziah and Josiah. Chapter 6 “Unfaithful Kings Who Repent” examines Rehoboam and Manasseh. Chapter 7 succinctly presents conclusions.

War in Chronicles is well-written and the brief conclusions at the end of every chapter helpfully clarify the main arguments. Cudworth’s argument is strongest when he discusses those kings whose faithfulness to the temple cult led to victory in battle and/or Israel’s stability in the land (ch. 2). Cudworth also offers a compelling explanation of David’s sin in respect to the census (pp. 36–42). Additionally, his analysis provides a helpful corrective to the assumption that large military musters are always intended to glorify the king to whom
they are attributed. Rather, Cudworth argues, they can suggest temptation for self-glorification and expansion, at the expense of temple service (pp. 118–19).

However, the reasons the Chronicler gives for the military defeat of several kings seem problematic for Cudworth’s thesis. The Chronicler also connects failure in battle with abandoning the law of YHWH (2 Chr 12:1), making foreign alliances (e.g., 2 Chr 16:7), killing one’s brothers (2 Chr 21:13), and general evil-doing (2 Chr 36:5, 9, 11). In some cases, Cudworth seeks to reconcile these statements with his thesis by appealing to terminology employed by the Chronicler, e.g., that a king had acted unfaithfully ( Melee). It is uncertain to me though that, while Melee can indicate a breach of faith regarding the temple (as in 1 Chr 9:1; 2 Chr 36:14), it always carries that nuance (e.g., in 2 Chr 12:2). A more in-depth discussion of significant terms in ch. 1 and the inclusion of a Hebrew word index would be helpful. Overall, War in Chronicles makes an important contribution to the study of Chronicles and should stimulate further investigation of the various ideologies of war found in different books of the Hebrew Bible.

Denise C. Flanders
Fuller Theological Seminary


This publication of nine papers from the 2015 Örebro School of Theology conference “The Words of the Prophets” has a special focus on intertextuality and the reception of the book of Isaiah. In the first essay, H. G. M. Williamson critically examines Hermann Barth’s theory that Isa 1–39 was subjected to a significant redaction in the reign of Josiah. Williamson finds Barth’s approach unconvincing because: (a) Isa 10:18 seems to be dependent on Isa 35:2, but most date Isa 35 to a period later that Josiah; (b) Isa 8:9–10 seems dependent on vocabulary in Isa 7, so it was later and not preexilic; and (c) Isa 11:1–9 (in the studies by Jacques Vermeylen and Marvin A. Sweeney) found a veiled reference to a Josiah youth, but this ignored the future utopian flavor of the passage. Instead of this approach, Williamson argues for a redaction of Isaiah by Deutero-Isaiah at the end of the exile.

Antti Laato discusses Zion theology outside of the book of Isaiah in order to compare it to Isaiah material in chs. 1–35. He concludes that Isa 1–35 must be interpreted in light of the crisis in 701 BC based on information in Ben Sirah 48:17–25, LXX, and Rabbinic resources. Laato traces Zion theology back to the building of Solomon’s temple, several psalms, and the deliverance of Jerusalem in 701 BC, although he proposes that some texts (e.g., Isa 17:12–14; 28:1–8; 30:27–33) were earlier based on the presence of Yahweh, the Storm God, fighting chaos. Latto ends his discussion with his own interpretive model on how to understand Isaiah’s developing Zion theology in six statements that move from prophecies of salvation, through the miraculous deliverance of Zion, to a utopian future Davidic hope.

Stefan Green proposes that Isa 65–66 (specifically 65:17–25; 66:1–4, 6) were a bridge spanning the differences between prophetic criticism of temple worship (e.g., Jer 7) and later apocalyptic literature, like 1 Enoch’s allegorical summary.