Lars Maskow

Conversational Implicatures in the Book of Chronicles

The Pentateuch as horizon of the Chronicler

„Der Wirklichkeitsbegriff einer Epoche bleibt in ihren Zeugnissen in eigentümlicher Weise stumm, und das nicht zufällig, sondern aufgrund der eigentümlichen Selbstverständlichkeit, mit der eine Epoche sich an das hält, was ihr für wirklich gilt. Von ihrem Wirklichkeitsbegriff macht eine Epoche Gebrauch, aber sie redet nicht von ihm, sie kann von ihm gar nicht reden, und in diesem Sinne ‚hat‘ sie ihren Wirklichkeitsbegriff nicht.“¹

1 Introduction

The literary correlations between the Books of Chronicles and the Pentateuch have always been observed in historical-critical research. Two prominent camps were formed with regard to the directions of reception. Julius Wellhausen, on the one hand, focused strongly on the reception of priestly writings. In doing so, he used striking parallels between P and Chronicles to elaborate his dating of the priestly source. Whereas in the Vorlage (Samuel/Kings) less priestly but rather deuteronomistic use of language could be recognized, priestly influence could prominently be observed in Chronicles:

In the Chronicles the pattern according to which the history of ancient Israel is represented is the Pentateuch, i. e. the Priestly Code. In the source of Chronicles, in the older historical books, the revision does not proceed upon the basis of the Priestly Code, which indeed is completely unknown to them, but on the basis of Deuteronomy.²

1 “The concept of reality of an epoch remains mute in its testimonies in a peculiar way. This is not by chance, but because of the peculiar self-evidence by which an epoch keeps to that which has a real significance for it. An epoch makes use of its concept of reality, but it does not speak of it, it cannot speak of it at all, and in this sense it does not ‘have’ its concept of reality.” (Translation, L. M.) Hans Blumenberg, *Realität und Realismus* (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2020), 11.

2 Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel. With a Preface by William Robertson Smith* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 294.

Lars Maskow, University of Münster

In this sense Gerhard Von Rad has come to a completely different conclusion on the basis of his own observations. For him the reception of Deuteronomy is particularly important. Among other facts, he built his thesis on the term 'Ark of the Covenant.' In his eyes this term was a typical deuteronomistic expression. All in all, Von Rad achieved a balanced result, however, the tendency is clear:

Das eine ist allerdings gewiß geworden, daß sowohl was eigentliche Zitation und Verweisung wie allgemeine theologische Einstellung anlangt, von einer Abhängigkeit der Chronik von P vor anderen Quellen nicht die Rede sein kann. Wir haben im Gegenteil gesehen, daß an ganz ausschlaggebenden Punkten deuteronomische Gedanken in der Chronik Eingang gefunden haben; ja es will fast scheinen als seien sie in ihrer Bedeutung für den Gesamttaufriß des Werkes höher anzuschlagen, als die Abhängigkeit von P in mancherlei kultischen Angelegenheiten.³

With regard to these contradictions, recent research on the Pentateuch has brought decisive progress. In particular, a differentiation of the priestly layers of the Pentateuch, but also the question of the extent to which there have been reciprocal adaptations between the priestly and the deuteronomistic texts, has sharpened our heuristics for the fact that, roughly speaking, there have been approximations in the priestly texts as well as priestly influences on the deuteronomistic texts and *vice versa*.⁴ So it turns out, to give just one example, that the term 'Ark of the Covenant' in Deuteronomy 10:8; 31:9, 25 is not a genuine deuteronomistic term, but rather presupposes the connection of P and D.⁵

³ "However, one fact has definitely turned out to be true. There can be no question of a dependence of Chronicles on P prior to other sources. Both with regard to the actual citation, reference and to the general theological attitude. On the contrary, we have seen that at quite decisive points deuteronomistic ideas have been incorporated into Chronicles. It almost seems as if their importance for the general structure of the work is more important than the dependence on P in many cultic matters" (Translation: L. M.). Gerhard von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), 63.

⁴ Decisive are those approaches that have searched for alternative models in the context of the so-called crisis of Pentateuch Research.

⁵ Achenbach attributes the authorship of the expression ארון ברית יהוה to a Hexateuch-Redactor (HexRed) who combines D and P: "HexRed bildet mit der Bezeichnung der Gotteslade als *ʾārôn berît jhwh* einen aus dtr. und priesterschriftlicher Tradition integrierten Begriff." Cf. Reinhard Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 75 In Achenbach's opinion the process of integration consists of a synthesis of Exod 34:28 and Exod 25:10–22, which combines the tradition of the priestly source with the דברי הברית to *arôn berît adonai*. Cf. Achenbach, 191. It is all the more significant that this term is not taken up in 2Sam 7:1 but in 1Chron 17:1.

A closer look at the reception of Torah in Chronicles reveals a paradox. To be more precise, one can speak of a two-fold reception. In a peculiar way, the texts of the Pentateuch do not appear where תורה is spoken of. Nevertheless, the texts of the Pentateuch are received in different ways in Chronicles, but nearly always without referring to the term תורה. In other words, talking *about* Torah is fundamentally different in Chronicles than talking *out of* Torah. Wherever certain reception formulas appear in Chronicles, they most of the time do not indicate a specific Torah quotation.⁶ I have shown elsewhere that this bivalent reception is like a rhetorical call to order (Back to the Torah!).⁷

In Chronicles there are now numerous references to the Pentateuch, not only on a conceptually explicit but also, and above all, on an implicit level. It is therefore advisable not only to identify intertextual connections on a conceptual level, but above all also to examine where discourses overlap without being

6 This insight has been particularly emphasized by Willi who, with regard to the term כְּתוּב including all subsidiary phrase formations, does not speak of a “Schriftzitationsformel” but of a “Schriftkonformitätsklausel”. Thomas Willi, “‘Wie geschrieben steht’ – Schriftbezug und Schrift. Überlegungen zur frühjüdischen Literaturwerdung im perserzeitlichen Kontext,” in *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden*, ed. Reinhard G. Kratz, 257–277 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002).

7 This call to order is obeyed by the Chronicler himself through significant changes of his Vorlage and implementation of texts of the Pentateuch. This means that we have to differentiate between the rhetorical reception of תורה as an ideal concept and the use of the concrete texts of the Pentateuch. I have tried to give a comprehensive description of these reception processes in a contribution submitted shortly before the beginning of the Lausanne conference, of which the conference volume is now available in print. (Cf. Lars Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik: Studien zur Rezeption des Pentateuchs in den Chronikbüchern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001). It was a stroke of luck for me to be able to discuss the results of my research during the Lausanne conference immediately after publication and I am pleased to be able to present a part of my book here in English. It seems to me that the texts of the Pentateuch are reflected in Chronicles as a kind of *Fortschreibung*, be it affirmative or contradictory. This becomes particularly clear when we compare the influences of the Pentateuch on Chronicles synoptically with Sam/Kgs. All in all, my impression is that the direction of reception can be understood most clearly as a continuation of what Achenbach called *Theocratic Revisions*. (Cf. also his contribution in this volume, page 53.) I was rather cautious about post-chronistic *Fortschreibungen* in the Pentateuch due to the advanced developments and my dating of Chronicles to the Hellenistic era. Nevertheless, some proposals – not least the name Moriah – were brought into discussion. (Cf. Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, *Glaube im Alten Testament: Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Jes 7,1–17; Dtn 1–3; Num 13–14 und Gen 22,1–19*. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 326–331). Jonker has made a striking advance in a recently published article. (Cf. Louis C. Jonker, “Melting pots and rejoinders? The interplay among literature formation processes during the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods,” *VT* 70/1 (2020), 42–54.) It seems to me that particularly at this interface intensive research is required in the future.

made explicit. It seems to me that the texts of the Pentateuch are in a way “selbstverständlich” as Hans Blumenberg speaks of the “Wirklichkeitsbegriff einer Epoche.”⁸ If this holds true, we have to take into account that the texts of the Pentateuch appear somehow latent or as a background; or, to put it in the language of the title of this contribution, as a horizon of the Chronicler. This means that we need other methods than the indication of textual similarities or other incidences of intertextual correlation. At this point the phenomenon of Conversational Implicature which was observed by Grice comes into play.

2 Saying and Meaning: The Gricean Theory of Conversational Implicatures

In the main argument of this essay, the Pentateuch will be made visible as the horizon of the Chronicler. I will show that the Chronicler uses *Conversational Implicatures* that can only be made explicit against the background of an implicit world knowledge. This means that there are cases of reception in Chronicles in which references are made to an implicit knowledge of the torah without making this explicit. I would like to discuss this aspect in the following with regard to 2 Chronicles 26:16–21 unfold. For this purpose, I will first give a short insight into the theory of conversational implicatures, which represent a subfield of linguistic pragmatics.

Pragmatics is – generally speaking – “die Wissenschaft vom Ungesagten,” or, “what is meant without being said.”⁹ Eckard Rolf follows Grice when he calls these approaches “Inferentielle Pragmatik.”¹⁰ Pragmatics is the science of the “Ungesagten-aber-Gemeinten. Als solche versteht sich die inferentielle Pragmatik als Theorie der Sprecher-Bedeutung, als eine Theorie dessen, was vom Sprecher

⁸ Of course, the quotation does not match in every sense of the word because the concept of תורה is not completely “stumm” (engl. mute). But despite this the observation of Blumenberg is helpful to understand the chronistic approach – not with regard to the term תורה but to the texts of the Pentateuch. In almost any case where the Chronicler refers to the Pentateuch this is not made explicit. This means that the Pentateuch at all is somehow a silent or latent presupposition in the book of Chronicles. I will show in this paper what this really means.

⁹ Eckard Rolf, *Inferentielle Pragmatik: Zur Theorie der Sprecher-Bedeutung* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2013), 22. For an introduction to Pragmatics, especially the phenomenon of Conversational Implicature, see also the most influential introduction in English by Stephen Levinson, *Pragmatics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 97–166.

¹⁰ Rolf, *Pragmatik*.

gemeint wurde in Fällén, in denen er etwas zu verstehen geben wollte, was von dem, was er gesagt hat, abweicht.”¹¹ The main purpose of inferential pragmatics is to determine the *meaning* of the speaker’s utterance.

Paul Grice, one of the patriarchs of the so-called *pragmatic turn*, is the one who for the first time systematically applied the distinction between *what is said* and *what is meant*. He laid the foundation for this in his “William James Lectures” held in 1967 which was posthumously published as “Studies in the Way of Words.” In this lectures Grice uttered the idea that language as such represents a maxim-oriented behaviour and designed a way to distinguish between what is said and what is implied with the help of conversation maxims. The core of the theory, which Eckard Rolf¹² calls a kind of “Konversationsethik”, is formulated in the essay “Logic and Conversation.”¹³ It consists of the Cooperative Principle and eleven Conversational Maxims.¹⁴ With the help of this inventory, Grice succeeds in tracking the implied and making it visible. This essay also introduces the term “Conversational Implicature,” which plays a key role in this process. Grice puts the so-called “Cooperative Principle” in front of his eleven maxims: “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.”¹⁵ Grice then introduces the eleven maxims he discovered and divides them “echoing Kant”¹⁶ into four categories:

I Quantity – 1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange). 2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required. II Quality – Supermaxim: ‘Try to make your contribution one that is true’ 1. Do not say what you believe to be false. 2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. III Relation – ‘Be relevant.’ IV Manner – Supermaxim: ‘Be perspicuous’ 1. Avoid obscurity of expression. 2. Avoid ambiguity. 3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity). 4. Be orderly.¹⁷

¹¹ “Unsaid-but-meant. As such, inferential pragmatics is understood as a theory of speaker-meaning, as a theory of what was meant by the speaker in cases where he wanted to give something to understand that differs from what he said” (Translation: L. M.; Rolf, *Pragmatik*, 60).

¹² Eckard Rolf, *Sagen und Meinen: Paul Grices Theorie der Konversationsimplikaturen* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag GmbH, 1994), 9.

¹³ Paul Grice, *Studies in the Way of Words* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989.), 22–40.

¹⁴ Rolf, (*Pragmatik*, 7.26) speaks of “elf, wenn nicht sogar zwölf.” Thus, on the one hand he reacts to the completely inadmissible, albeit widespread, custom of reducing the number of maxims to four. At the same time, he integrates an addition to the maxims of the modality, which was considered by Grice later on. For discussion, see Rolf, *Pragmatik*, 47.

¹⁵ Grice, *Studies*, 26.

¹⁶ Grice, *Studies*, 26.

¹⁷ Grice, *Studies*, 26–27.

Rolf, who wrote a fundamental study of Grice's theory, asserts that the maxims developed by Grice are irreducible and complete. The most important of the eleven or twelve maxims, "die mit dem größten Implikaturerzeugungspotential, lautet (verkürzt wiedergegeben): 'Mach deinen Beitrag so informativ wie nötig!'"¹⁸ Following the introduction of these maxims, Grice lists four ways in which a speaker can violate one or more maxims.

1. He may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead. 2. He may opt out from the operation both of the maxim and of the Cooperative Principle; he may say, indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. He may say, for example, I cannot say more; my lips are sealed. 3. He may be faced by a clash: He may be unable, for example, to fulfill the first maxim of Quantity (Be as informative as is required) without violating the second maxim of Quality (Have adequate evidence for what you say). 4. He may flout a maxim; that is, he may blatantly fail to fulfil it.¹⁹

Grice also speaks of "[E]xploitation,"²⁰ of a maxim. Especially the fourth kind of non-fulfilment of a maxim "gives rise to a conversational implicature."²¹ Grice characterizes the notion of a Conversational Implicature as follows:

A man who, by (in, when) saying (or making as if to say) that p has implicated that q, may be said to have conversationally implicated that q, provided that (1) he is to be presumed to be observing the conversational maxims, or at least the Cooperative Principle; (2) the supposition that he is aware that, or thinks that, q is required in order to make his saying or making as if to say p (or doing so in those terms) consistent with this presumption; and (3) the speaker thinks (and would expect the hearer to think that the speaker thinks) that it is within the competence of the hearer to work out, or grasp intuitively, that the supposition mentioned in (2) is required.²²

In a nutshell, it can be said: By flagrantly violating one of the conversational maxims, the speaker thus makes clear that he intends to say more than he literally says. In other words: By failing to comply with one of the conversation maxims, the speaker makes clear that he does not mean just what he says, but also something beyond it. According to Grice, Conversational Implicatures now have the

18 "The maxim with the greatest potential for generating an Implicature is the following (in brief): 'Make your contribution as informative as necessary!'" (Translation: L. M.; Rolf *Pragmatik*, 26).

19 Grice, *Studies*, 30.

20 Grice, *Studies*, 33.

21 Grice, *Studies*, 30.

22 Grice *Studies*, 30–31.

property of being “cancellable.” Grice speaks of “cancelability.”²³ The Conversational Implicature can therefore be cancelled by adding a remark. Thus, a speaker/writer can, after producing a Conversational Implicature, take the position of not wanting to have said something. He can even take the position of not having said it. After this now almost negligent abbreviation of Grice’s theory, however, the range and functionality of this interpretation can be shown clearly.²⁴

The recourse to the Conversational Implicature will shed light, on the analysis of the following text, which has to be understood as a symptom of a discourse of leadership. In 2 Chronicles 26:16–21 for example this discourse is not conducted directly, but indirectly. The implicit discourse will be made visible in the following analysis and interpreted in terms of the chosen means of expression.

Of course, since it is a maxime-guided inferential procedure, the approach is to a certain extent speculative. But on the other hand, especially because we naturally have to expect Conversational Implicatures in all human utterances and communications, it is at the same time the best method available to us. Consequently, there is the necessity to incorporate as much evidence as possible into the analysis.²⁵

The recourse to the Conversational Implication will now bring to light in the analysis of 2 Chronicles 26:16–21 that it has to be understood as a symptom of a leadership-discourse, which is not directly but indirectly (or implicit) carried out.

²³ Grice *Studies*, 44–46.

²⁴ In the brevity provided for the given purpose, numerous details of Grice’s theory must be left out. In particular, the criticism and metacriticism of Grice’s theory cannot be addressed here. I am only concerned here with the introduction of an *interpretament* for determining the speaker’s meaning, which lies beyond what is literally said. For further details, I refer to Kent Bach “Saying, Meaning, and Implicating”. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*, edited by Keith Allan and Kasia M. Jaszczolt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 47–67; Laurence R. Horn: “Implicature”. In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, edited by Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 3–28; Yan Huang: “Implicature”. In *The Oxford handbook of Pragmatics*, edited by Yan Huang, 155–179 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); Levinson, *Pragmatics*; Rolf, *Sagen*; Rolf, *Pragmatik*.

²⁵ Typically, at this point the question arises whether it would be anachronistic to transfer such an approach to the Ancient Orient. At this point I would like to counter the possible concern with two comments. Firstly, we need to be very aware that the research of linguistic pragmatics prominently speaks of the fact that Grice *uncovered* the Implicatures, and did not *invent* them (Cf. Rolf, *Pragmatik*, 62). Secondly, the design of the theory is related to human language activity in general: “The cooperative principle and its attendant maxims are essentially principles of language use based on the rational nature of human communication, and indeed any shared-goal human activity” (Huang, *Implicature*, 157). I therefore suggest that we may also expect to find Implicatures in texts of the Hebrew Bible and to assume the validity of Grice’s maxims until this assumption is falsified.

The implicit discourse will be made visible in the following analysis and interpreted with regard to the chosen means of expression. The influence of the Torah will play the decisive role in this context.

3 Conversational Implicatures in 2 Chronicles 26:16–21

In 2 Chronicles 26 the hierarchy between two conflict parties is negotiated in form of an “incense scene”.²⁶ After the definition of hierarchy between the different families of Priests (Lev 10) and between priests and Levites (Num 16), the relationship between Priesthood and Kingship is determined in 2 Chronicles 26. Second Chronicles 26:16–21 is part of the Uzziah narrative, which has been greatly expanded compared to its *Vorlage*. It tells the story of king Uzziah, who is called Azariah in 2 Kings 15:2. The Chronicler reports, in accordance with its *Vorlage*, that the king did what was right in the eyes of YHWH (ה'ישר בעיני יהוה).

At a certain point during his reign, however, it is stated that his heart became haughty (לִב גְּבוּהָ) to his own destruction (לְהַשְׁחִיתָ) and he acts disloyally against YHWH (וַיַּמְעַל בַּיהוָה). After the successful and God-fearing years an unprecedented decline begins. The bottom of the decadence is then reached in 2 Chronicles 26:16–22.6 The synopsis of 2 Chronicles 26 and 2 Kings 14–15 shows that the text has been considerably enriched by verses 5–20. The point of the decline seems to me to be in verses 16–21 and to have been formulated in the form of a Conversational Implicature, as I will now demonstrate in a *close reading* of this text.

Zwikel has proposed to stratify the text.²⁷ However, since the reasons given seem unconvincing to me, I maintain the uniformity of the text.²⁸ Japhet consid-

²⁶ In at least two striking texts of the Old Testament, Lev 10 and Num 16, a new formulation of the hegemonial structures is established with the help of the motif of incense: In Lev 10 the two first-born sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, are killed by YHWH because of the offering of foreign fire (זֶרַח אֵשׁ); in Num 16 Datan, Abiram, 250 men as well as Korah and his family are also killed by YHWH after the execution of incense.

²⁷ Wolfgang Zwikel: *Räucher kult und Räuchergeräte: Exegetische und archäologische Studien zum Räucheropfer im Alten Testament* (Freiburg, CH: Universitätsverlag, 1990), 321–22.

²⁸ Cf. for discussion: Georg Steins: *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlußphänomen. Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie von 1 / 2 Chronik* (Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995), 408–414. Steins wants to adhere to the addition of the incense altar in vv. 16b and 19b with Zwikel. However, neither in 16b nor in 19b are syntactic- or content-related reasons to be found that make this assumption necessary. On the contrary, these motifs fit harmoniously into the overall narrative.

ered, with good reason, that the mentioning of 80 priests in v. 17 is a later gloss.²⁹ The actual one-to-one confrontation between Uzziah and Azariah is thus largely defused and has already been decided on the basis of the indicated physical superiority of the priests.³⁰ It is significant that, while otherwise the king commands brave men (cf. e. g. 1 Chron 12; 2 Chron.13:3; 2 Chron 14:7), he is now facing, so to speak, an army of priests. All in all, it should be noticed that this pericope is not just about a confrontation of two characters but of two institutions. Uzziah's sacrilege against the sanctuary, consisting of the intention to burn incense, is stylized exemplarily as a case of precedent. The etymon קטר dominates the narrative and is used seven times. This expands exactly the motif that the Chronicler omitted from his *Vorlage*. While the people offer (מזבחים ומקטרים) in the *Vorlage* (2Kgs 15:4), the Chronicler omits its violation of the prohibition of incense offerings and attributes the sacrilege to the king instead: Uzziah enters the temple (היכל) with the intention of offering incense. In this context, the Chronicler seems to parallel his narrative with 1 Kings 12:33, 57.

According to the genre, the motif of the illegitimate incense offering is connected with texts like Leviticus 10:1; 16:1, 12–13; Numbers 16:7, 17–18, 35; 17:5, 11–12, 58 and also Ezekiel 8:11. Already in 1 Chronicles 6:34 the privilege of the incense offering is explicitly assigned to the Aaronidic priests. In the present pericope the king claims this privilege for himself and thus indirectly also to the hegemony of the priesthood. However, the narration is highly artificial because implicitly it formulates a diametrically opposed proposition: The priestly claim to kingship.

The artificiality of the narrative already exists in the fact that Uzziah – although with the intention of burning incense – goes into the temple, but he does not burn incense at all. Similarly, as in 1 Chronicles 13:9, it seems that already the intention of trespassing in the holy precinct is severely punished. Apart from the similarity of the names Uzzah and Uzziah,³¹ these figures' conduct is thus also paralleled. The intended violation of the *lex sacra* by the king is therefore only the superficial development of a hierocratic discourse on hegemony. In v. 17 the

²⁹ Cf. Sara Japhet: *1 & 2 Chronicles. A Commentary* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 885.

³⁰ The incongruence of numerus in v. 17 (בוא) and v. 20 (פנה) would also support this assumption, although an adjustment was apparently possible in v. 18–19. On the other hand, Japhet's assumption that the report is pre-chronistic is by no means convincing because of the entire artificial constellation. Cf. Japhet, *Chronicles*, 876–77.

³¹ Cf. Louis Jonker: *1 & 2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids, Mi: Baker Books, 2013), 256.

antagonistic priest עזריהו is introduced. His name is frequently mentioned in the post-exile period and the name is often mentioned in priestly genealogies.³²

In v. 18 Azariah the priest confronts Uzziah the king. The appositions, (הכהן v. 17) and (המלך v. 18), show that Uzziah and Azariah represent not only two conflicting persons, but two conflicting institutions. In particular the official title המלך is over-informative and need not be repeated in vv. 1, 3, 11, 13. This over-informativity violates the second maxim of quantity³³ and produces a Conversational Implicature, indicating that there is more at stake than Uzziah's qualification as king: It is about the conflict of leadership between the institutions of kingship and priesthood and about the outcome of the conflict in favour of the second party. The institutional conflict becomes completely apparent when Azariah is described in v. 20 as כהן הראש. Verse 18 introduces the condition known from Exodus 30:7–8 that only an Aaronide priest may sacrifice, since they are sacred for burning incense (קדש, pual): לא לך עזיהו להקטיר ליהוה כי לכהנים בני־אהרן המקדשים: להקטיר.

In the context of that instruction it is also commanded that no unauthorized incense offering may be offered on the altar of incense: לא־תעלו עליו קטרת: זרה (cf. Exod 30:9aa) Even the kings of the Davidic dynasty are thus denied any participation in cultic ceremonies; only the priests are allowed to burn incense.³⁴

³² He is always identified as a high priest. In the priestly genealogy in 1 Chron 5:29–41 Azariah is listed (depending on the evaluation of the doublet) in at least three different positions. What is important here is that it is said of him, and only of him, in 1 Chron 5:36 that he served as priest under Solomon (הוא אשר כהן בבית אשר־בנה שלמה בירושלם). Thus, already the name patron of the descendant has the highest dignity, since Solomon's reign is stylized by the Chronicler as the ideal epoch. At the same time, Azariah is highlighted among the Zadokites in this way, since according to the representation in 1Kgs 1; 2 and 4 Zadok should actually have been named here. However, the rise of Azariah can also be seen in a short note in 1Kgs 4:2. There, a certain עזריהו is introduced, of which it is said that this person was a שר of Solomon. He is listed as a priest כהן־צדוק, too. This is strange in so far as Zadok and Abiathar, the two conflicting parties, are also introduced as priests in v. 4. In addition to this, the apposition הכהן has no counterpart in the LXX and therefore seems to be a post-chronistic addition – depending on 1 Chron 5:36; 9:11 and 2 Chron 26:17, 20 as well as 31:10. Azariah is described in 1 Chron 9:11 and 31:10 as the leader of the house of God (נגיד בית האלהים). The title appears only twice in Chronicles and is apparently on the same level as 1 Chron 27:17, where Aaron is listed next to Levi as a separate tribe and Zadok is designated as its נגיד.

³³ See above page 261 → Second Maxim of Quantity

³⁴ At this point, a tendency becomes apparent in a radicalized way, that Rudnig shows in the sacral layer he worked out in Ez 40–48, especially with regard to Ez 46:1–3, 8–11 he described: the complete laicization of the Davidic dynasty, which henceforth no longer plays a role in cultic practices. Cf. Thilo Rudnig: *Heilig und Profan. Redaktionskritische Studien zu Ez 40–48* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000), 319–322.

Precisely in this context it is stated “You have acted arrogantly” (כי מעלת). On this, Pancratius Beentjes comments that “[a]lléén in 2 Kron. 26:18, en nergens anders in het geschrift, vinden we dit verbum in de directe rede.”³⁵ This comment in the text possibly reflects the *Sitz im Leben* of the Chronicler: it is apparently up to the priest to determine מעל-offenses.

The order to leave the sanctuary (מקדש) (יצא, Imp.) directed to the king by the priesthood, provokes anger in Uzziah (זעף). In this incendiary situation the king is described with an incense pan (מקטרת) in his hand.³⁶ The wrath is announced twice by the Chronicler (v. 19). This overemphasis expresses the idea that Uzziah obviously presumes himself as a legitimate priest to act in this manner. Through this perspective, the narrative suggests to the reader that a trial of power between kingship and priesthood is at stake here.³⁷

The wrath of Uzziah (זעף Inf.+ ב+ePP) is followed by his immediate punishment with leprosy that appears on his forehead (זרה). This symbolically pronounces the conflict in favour of the priesthood. In this way he is treated very similarly to King Asa, whose anger (זעף) also brought about a punitive illness (cf. 2 Chron 16:10, 12–13). It becomes apparent that the Chronicler shapes his narratological intention, on the one hand, with free variation, but on the other hand, the narrative also unmistakably takes up the basic constellations of Leviticus 10, 16 and Numbers 16.³⁸

35 “Only in 2 Chron. 26:18, and nowhere else in the bible, do we find this verb in direct speech” (Translation: L. M.) Cf. Pancratius Beentjes: *2 Kronieken* (Kampen: Uitgeverij Kok 2006), 338.

36 Uzziah holds a מקטרת in his hand (cf. Zwickel *Räucher kult*, 239–244 as well as Rainer Albertz and Rüdiger Schmitt, (eds. *Family and household religion in ancient Israel and the Levant* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 70), while in Lev 10 and Num 16 the term used is מוחתה. The מקטרת is only mentioned in 2 Chron 30:14 and Ezek 8:11.

37 Beentjes *Kronieken*, 338 rightly points out that the anger in connection with the smoking pan “benadrukt [...] dat hij zich gedraagt alsof hij een priester is.”

38 Greenstein, for example, has argued that 2 Chron 26 is a midrash to the Nadab and Abihu episode. (Cf. Edward L. Greenstein: “An Inner-Biblical Midrash of the Nadab and Abihu Episode” (Hebr.). *Assaf* (1994): 71–78.) However, this is questioned by Beentjes due to the sparse linguistic consistency. (Cf. Pancratius C. Beentjes: *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles*. (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 88). However, it is incomprehensible that Beentjes, who is one of the few exegetes to have indicated clear links with the Pentateuch, completely denies a connection to Lev 10 and also Num 16–17. Nevertheless, it is precisely this connection that seems to me to be constituted by the motif of strangeness (זרה). Also, the reference of the priests להקטיר המקדשים בני־אהרן כי לכהנים ליהוה כי להקטיר ליהוה (2 Chron 26:18) seems to presuppose both episodes. For this reason alone, 2 Chron 26 can certainly be read as a *topos* in the horizon of these texts, even if the discourse has developed further and no inner-clerical conflict was carried out here, but rather the relationship between kingship and priesthood is negotiated and decided in favour of the priesthood.

Due to the outbreak of leprosy on the forehead of Uzziah the setting is once again brought into focus. Whereas in v. 16 it was merely indicated that Uzziah went into the temple of YHWH, the scenery is now described in detail. Apparently, the confrontation between Uzziah and the priests happens directly in front of the פרכת at the incense altar.³⁹ Thereby, the priests prevent Uzziah from sacrificing on the altar of incense. One has to imagine that they stood between Uzziah and the altar of incense and obviously turned their backs on the altar while they stood opposite it (לפני). The altar represents the legitimate place of burning incense. This means the מקטרת carried out by Uzziah is currently identified as illegitimate. Because, with the introduction of the incense altar in addition to the requirement for special incense personnel, the offering of incense on the altar excludes the use of an incense pan.⁴⁰

As a consequence, Uzziah is now punished with leprosy. This punishment is documented only three times in the Old Testament, in Numbers 12; 2 Kings 5 and in 2 Chronicles 26. The offences are of varying severity and the penalties therefore of varying duration. While 2 Kings 5 describes a different situation, Numbers 12 is actually the only salient parallel.⁴¹

In Numbers 12, Miriam and Aaron rebel against the Mosaic claim of leadership because of Moses' marriage to a Cushite woman. However, YHWH himself justifies Moses by stating that he speaks face to face (פה אל פה, v. 8) only with him. His anger is inflamed by this conflict and he punishes Miriam with lepro-

39 Cf. on the location of the altar of incense in the temple Exod 30:6. It is particularly striking that after the introduction of the incense altar in Exod 30, which is only mentioned again in Chronicles מזבח הקטרת Exod 30:27; 31:8; 35:15; 37:25; 1 Chron 6:34; 28:18; 2 Chron 26:16, 19.). The popularity of incensing in post-exile times gets also visible on a literary level. Thus, the incense altar in Exod 30:1–10, as Kuenen and Wellhausen have already shown, is a late addition. This can be reconstructed by various observations. First of all, it is conspicuous that the altar of incense is mentioned later than Exod 25–29 (Cf. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 65–6), since it actually belongs to the inner life of the Mishkan. The Samaritan Pentateuch has therefore introduced the altar according to the factual logic of Exod 26:35. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 66 has also pointed out that with the introduction of the smoking altar, the distinction between מזבח העלה and מזבח הקטרת becomes important: “[T]he altar of incense occurs only in certain portions of the Priestly Code, and is absent from others.” Nihan (Christophe Nihan: *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch. A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 32) and Achenbach, *Vollendung*, 95 have confirmed this hypothesis. Analogical observations can also be made for the introduction of the פרכת. Cf. Exod 26:31, 33, 35; 27:21; 30:6; 35:12; 36:35; 38:27; 39:34; 40:3, 21–22*, 26; Lev 4:6, 17; 16:2, 12, 15; 21:23; 24:3; Num 4:5; 18:7; 2 Chron 3:14.

40 Vgl. Erhard S. Gerstenberger: *Das dritte Buch Mose – Leviticus*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 109.

41 Apart from an exact semantic congruence, the topic is also attested in Deut 28:27 and Job 2.

sy.⁴² In 2 Chronicles 26, as we have seen, Uzziah's pride in connection with his intention to bring incense to YHWH on his own, but especially his wrath leads to him being punished with leprosy.⁴³ Both scenes are similar in their representation of the diagnosis of leprosy. The high priest turns to the patient for examination (פנה אל)⁴⁴ and confirms the leprosy.

2 Chron 26:20aα	Num 12:10b
וּפָן אֵלָיו עֲזַרְיָהוּ כֹהֵן הָרֹאשׁ וּכְלִי-הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהִנֵּה-הוּא מִצְרַע בְּמִצְחוֹ	וּפָן אֶהָרֵן אֶל-מֵרִים וְהִנֵּה מִצְרַעַת

The intertextual comparison of the initial diagnosis makes it clear that Miriam's skin disease is diagnosed quite unspecifically, whereas the diagnosis of Uzziah is more specific. In his case the leprosy has broken out on the forehead (במצחו), which is stated twice (v. 19–20). Thus, the leprosy is immediately obvious to the priest. But more than that: the Chronicler apparently points specifically to the forehead of the leper. This deictic motif represents the hermeneutic key of the entire episode, which shifts the antagonism between haughty king Uzziah and high priest Azariah to the level of the institutional conflict between kingship and high priesthood.

The interpretation now is derived from the fact that the redundant description of the leprosy is strikingly over-informative: It does not contribute anything to the progression or dramaturgy of the scene. Nor is it mentioned either in Numbers 12 or in the catalogue of the torah of leprosy of Leviticus 13–14.⁴⁵ The Chronicler thus

⁴² Strangely enough, Aaron is spared from leprosy. Perhaps the punishment of Aaron is blocked at this point by a taboo. Presumably, the high priest remained free of leprosy, since he had to diagnose the disease according to Lev 14:57) himself. With regard to leprosy, neither the ritual of self-diagnosis nor that of self-purification was intended for the priest. See also the analysis of Achenbach, *Vollendung*, 281–301.

⁴³ Dillard has pointed out that for the Chronicler illness as punishment is by no means atypical. In 2 Chron 16:12–13 King Asa gets seriously ill at his feet. However, he does not trust in YHWH, but in healers (רפאים). (Cf. Raymond B. Dillard: *2 Chronicles*. (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987), 211). This emphasis is significant, because Asa could have known better according to the theology of Exod 15:26 (אני יהוה רפאך). In 2 Chron 21:12–19, Jehoram too, gets so seriously ill that his intestines are spilling out, after Elijah's announcement in a letter. Ironically, Elijah's letter criticizes the fact that he had left the ways of Asa (דרכי אסא).

⁴⁴ The confrontation is illustrated quite well by the preposition לפני (v. 19) and the direct inspection (פנה).

⁴⁵ Kurt Galling: *Die Bücher der Chronik Esra Nehemia, übersetzt und erklärt*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1953), 147) already noticed this over-informativity, but did not provide any further interpretation of it.

creates another Conversational Implicature, which indicates that he wants to give more to understand than what he literally says.⁴⁶

What is expressed by the implication, that is, what is meant by the Chronicler, can be explained against the background of the Torah, more precisely of Exodus 28:36–38. This connection is rarely identified; only Johnstone⁴⁷ and Beentjes⁴⁸ indicate this. An analysis from the perspective of inferential pragmatics can assist us here. As part of the instruction for the designing of the high priest's vestment, the order is given to make a flower⁴⁹ of pure gold⁵⁰ (צִיץ זָהָב טָהוֹר). Like a seal (פְּתוּחֵי חֶתֶם)⁵¹ this should bear the engraving קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה. Furthermore, it shall be bound with a cord of blue purple at the front (אֵל מוֹל) of Aaron's headband (עַל הַמִּצְנֶפֶת). Verse 38 specifies this instruction chiasmically:

וְהָיָה עַל־מִצְחַ אַהֲרֹן	A	So it shall be on Aaron's forehead.
וְנָשָׂא אַהֲרֹן אֶת־עוֹן הַקֹּדְשִׁים		Since Aaron bears whatever
אֲשֶׁר יִקְדִּישׁוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	B	guilt the Israelites may incur in
לְכַל־מִתְנַת קֹדְשֵׁיהֶם		consecrating any of their sacred gifts,
וְהָיָה עַל־מִצְחוֹ תָּמִיד	A'	this plate must always be over his forehead, so that they
לִרְצוֹן לָהֶם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה:		may find favor with the LORD.

The motif of the flower frames the guilt (עוֹן) here, which Aaron apparently has to bear (נָשָׂא) on behalf of all those cases in which the Israelites take it upon themselves to offer holy gifts.

⁴⁶ To speak with Grice, that would mean: The Chronicler exploits the second maxim of quantity (see above page 261).

⁴⁷ William Johnstone: *1 and 2 Chronicles. Vol. 2, 2 Chronicles 10–36*. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 169.

⁴⁸ Cf. Beentjes, *2 Kronieken*, 339 as well as Beentjes, *Tradition*, 85.

⁴⁹ The flower motif of the high priest is also attested in Exod 28:36; 39:30; Lev 8:9; Num 17:23.

⁵⁰ The use of “pure gold” as a working material also creates an exclusive connection between the Sinai pericope and Chronicles (Exod 25:11, 17, 24, 29, 31, 36, 38–39; 28:14, 22, 36; 30:3; 37:2, 6, 11, 16–17, 22–24, 26; 39:15, 25, 30; 1 Chron 28:17; 2 Chron 3:4; 9:17). No other book of the Hebrew Bible mentions this material.

⁵¹ The instruction to make and engrave the golden flower, is contrasted with that related to the two gold-encrusted carnelian stones in Exod 28:9–12. The names of the 12 tribes of Israel according to their order of birth are engraved on these stones. While the name Levi is attested there in third position, Aaron – who at this level of literary development – has already been institutionally separated from the Levites, is thus designated by his own engraving as holy to YHWH. In the same way, then, as in Num 17:23 with the staff of Aaron symbolically flourishing from the tribe of Levi, the engraving of the high priest on the precious stones of the high priestly vestments is to be understood as a gesture emphasizing their superiority.

The motif of the golden crown with the inscription “holy to YHWH” is further developed in Exodus 29:5–7, where the term “holy crown” (נֹר הַקֹּדֶשׁ) is used:

ושמת המצנפת על־ראשו ונתת את־נֹר הקדש על־המצנפת	v.6	You shall put the turban on his head, and put the holy crown on the turban.
---	-----	--

The giving of the crown is supported by a royal act of anointing.⁵² This development is then synthesized in Exodus 39:30:

ויעשו את־ציץ נֹר־הקדש זהב טהור ויכתבו עליו מכתב פתוחי חותם קדש ליהוה	Then they made the plate of the holy crown of pure gold, and wrote on it an inscription like the engraving of a signet: holiness to the lord.
---	---

The motif is then executed in the investiture of Aaron by Moses in Leviticus 8:9.⁵³

וישם את־המצנפת על־ראשו וישם על־המצנפת אל־מול פניו את ציץ הזהב נֹר הקדש כאשר צוה יהוה את־משה	And he put the turban on his head. Also, on the turban, on its front, he put the golden plate, the holy crown, as the LORD had commanded Moses.
---	---

Achenbach has shown that the development of the high priestly crown has to be read against the background of a theocratic revision of the Enneateuch. It must of course also be taken into account that this development does not take place as P^s, but, as H^s and took place sometime in the second half of the fourth century BCE: “Mit der Verbindung des Stirnblattes und des altisraelitischen Symbols der Königsweihe des Gewählten durch den *nezer*, das Weihdiadem, wird dem Hohenpriester die königliche Würde Israels i. S. eines ‘Königreichs der Priester’ (Ex 19,6) zugewiesen.”⁵⁴ In any case, the flower (ציץ) on the crown (נֹר) of the priest is in

⁵² The act of anointing is later extended to all priests and has been assigned by Albertz to the last of the priestly revisions for which he especially introduced the signum PB^{Salb} (“Ex 28:41* [nur ‘du sollst sie salben’]; 29:21.36b; 30:26–30; 40:1–16; [vgl. Lev 8:10aβ–11.30]). Cf. Rainer Albertz: *Exodus. Bd. 2: Ex 19–40*. (Zürich: TVZ, 2005), 14.

⁵³ Nihan, *Torah*, 138, is of the opinion that Lev 8:9 does not necessarily presuppose Ex 39:30 MT. However, he also considers Lev 8:9 to be a “conflation of Exod 28:36 (ציץ זהב טהור) with 29:6 (נֹר הקדש).” Nihan is, however, sceptical about using the connection as a reason for literary stratification. However, this is not further relevant for the considerations made here.

⁵⁴ “By combining the front leaf and the ancient Israelite symbol of consecration of the chosen one with the *nezer*, the diadem, the high priest is given the royal dignity of Israel in the sense of a ‘kingdom of priests’ (Exod 19:6).” Cf. Reinhard Achenbach, “König, Priester und Prophet. Zur

some way derived from the Davidic tradition of a royal diadem. This is apparent, for instance, in Psalm 132:18, where, in the conflict situation between an anonymous Davidic king – called the anointed one – and an equally anonymous enemy, the crown of the anointed one literally flourishes (צוץ), whereas, in contrast, the enemy is dressed in shame.⁵⁵ Against this background, the tension of the direct confrontation in 2 Chronicles 26 between king and high priest becomes obvious. In particular, the overwriting of the earlier narrative with the discourse of high priest leadership is expressed in this constellation.⁵⁶ In other words: In the presence of the golden diadem of the high priest – which I consider to be presupposed – the leprosy mark of Uzziah's forehead unfolds its full effect. It shines (זרח) as a diadem of shame. And even more: the breaking of taboo gets apparent not only symbolically; the engraving on the diadem of the high priest also refers back to v. 18: להקטיר המקדשים בני אהרון. All of this remains latent in literary

Transformation der Konzepte der Herrschaftslegitimation in Jesaja 61,” in *Tora in der Hebräischen Bibel. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte und synchronen Logik diachroner Transformationen*, eds. Reinhard Achenbach and Martin Arneth (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 196–244, 239. A particularly important starting point of the theocratic revisions can be seen in Isa 61, where – according to Achenbach – the royal insignia of the king are transferred to the post-exilic high priest.

55 Cf. here the observations of Reinhard Müller “David und die Lade, Zion und der Gesalbte,” in *Psalmen und Chronik*, eds. Friedhelm Hartenstein and Thomas Willi (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 199–222., 216–219.

56 A similar nuance is attested in the revision of 2Kgs 11:4–16 in 2 Chron 23:1–16, where 2 Chron 23 describes how the priest Jehoiada makes Joash king over Judah. However, before the actual enthronement, a number of cultic regulations are introduced which do not come from the *Vorlage* (cf. vv. 4–8). E.g., the gatekeepers are organized (v. 4 f) and access to the sanctuary is reserved exclusively for priests and Levites on service. The specific regulation for entering the sanctuary is not only unknown to the *Vorlage*, but also not in full congruence with Num 4:20. Whereas in 2 Chron 23:6 it is stated *והמה יבאו כִּי־קִדַּשׁ הַמָּה לְלוֹיִם* the Levites in Num 4:20 were forbidden to access the sanctuary; if not obeying, they would even risk punishment of death: *וְלֹא־יָבֹאוּ לִרְאוֹת כְּבֹלַע אֶת־הַקֹּדֶשׁ וּמָתוּ*. In addition, specific Levitical services to the king are established (v. 8). The anointing of the king is carried out in v. 11 where a synoptic comparison brings the chronistic ideology to light:

2 Chron 23:11	2Kgs 11:12
וַיּוֹצִיאוּ אֶת־בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּתְּנוּ עָלָיו אֶת־הַנֹּר וְאֶת־הָעֵדוּת וַיִּמְלִיכוּ אֹתוֹ וַיִּמְשְׁחֻהוּ יְהוֹיָדָע וּבָנָיו וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְחִי הַמֶּלֶךְ	וַיּוֹצֵא אֶת־בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּתֵּן עָלָיו אֶת־הַנֹּר וְאֶת־הָעֵדוּת וַיִּמְלִכוּ אֹתוֹ וַיִּמְשְׁחֻהוּ וַיֹּכִי־כָּף וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְחִי הַמֶּלֶךְ

The Chronicler omits the hand clapping of the *Vorlage*, but instead explicates that Jehoiada and his sons were the executors of the anointing. The insignia of authority, including the initial anointing, thus quite explicitly belong to the sovereignty of the priest. 2 Chron 26 is to be read against this background.

terms. However, it is implied on the one hand by the tight-meshed texture of the intertextual references, and on the other hand by the presumable fact that the high priest's figure in this scene simply could not have been imagined otherwise than with the golden flower diadem on his head.⁵⁷

Certainly Zechariah 6:9–14⁵⁸ is another horizon of this text, where a similar situation is created by the production of two crowns.⁵⁹ While the high priest Yeshua ben Jehozadak, according to 1 Chronicles 5:27–43 a Zadokide, is insigned with a crown (עטרות) there, and it is said of him that he will wear majesty (חור), it is stated in the present text that a second crown is deposited in the temple for a coming Davidide with the “Ehrenbezeichnung צמח.”⁶⁰

James C. Vanderkam also pointed out that the golden leaf of the high priest's forehead was part of the implicit world knowledge of the intended addressees of certain texts. Thus he suspects with regard to Zech 6:12 that with the ruler (צמח)⁶¹ mentioned there a significant paranomastic (with metathesis of Mem and Zade) allusion to the forehead of the priest is given. Vanderkam refers specifically to the connection with Exod 28:36–38.

However, as the literary development appears from the perspective of Chronicles, the direction of dependence seems to be rather the other way around. Zechariah 6:9–14 stands at the beginning of a literary development which – as can be assumed together with Wöhrle – associates Zerubbabel with the honorary title צמח. In contrast to this, the omission of Zerubbabel and the corresponding revaluation of Yeshua by the coronation seems to be the result of a “Jeschua-Redaktion”, which already prepares the idea of a kingdom of priests (Exod 19:6). Reinhard Achenbach describes this development in Zechariah 6 also as theocratic revisions. Other נזר texts also belong to this process of revision (Exod 28:36–38; 29:5–7; 39:30; Lev 8:9). The ideology of these revisions is later reflected in Chronicles in

⁵⁷ It is precisely at this point that the text apparently relates to another text for the historical background, showing that the transitions between the perception of reality and the reception of intertexts become fluid at a certain point.

⁵⁸ On the redactional classification of the text in the Book of Twelve, cf. Jakob Wöhrle, *Die frühen: Sammlungen des Zwölfprophetenbuches Entstehung und Komposition*. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 340–342.

⁵⁹ On the question of whether two crowns were made or only one, cf. Wöhrle, *Sammlungen*, 343–345. Wöhrle, in contrast to more recent trends in research, emphasises that there were originally two crowns. After the failure of Zerubbabel, the passages mentioning him were omitted from the text, which resulted into the conflict in number between עטרות (v. 11) and עטרת (v. 14). Wöhrle assigns this omission to a “Jeschua-Redaktion” (Wöhrle, *Sammlungen*, 345).

⁶⁰ Wöhrle, *Sammlungen*, 344.

⁶¹ James C. Vanderkam: *From Joshua to Caiaphas. High Priests after the Exile*. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 34.

the form of the post-Salomonic decline of the Davidic kingdom. Jeremiah 23:5 and 33:15, of course, also belong to this field of association.

A later reference is attested in Josephus who describes the historically fictitious journey of Alexander to Jerusalem. In his *Antiquities* (X 331) it is told that Alexander inspects Jerusalem from the suburb Sapha. Out of the distance he sees the priests in white robes. The priests' garments are described in detail by Josephus, including the gold-trimmed headband (ἐπὶ τῆς ἔχοντα ἔχοντα τὴν κίδαριν καὶ τὸ χρυσοῦν ἐπ' αὐτῆς κεφαλῆς ὃ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πρῶτος ἐγγράπτο ἔλασμα), and even the engraving of the name of God is mentioned, too.⁶² It is then stated of Alexander that he alone approaches the high priest (προσελθὼν μόνος) and first prostrates himself before the name (προσεκύνησεν τὸ ὄνομα). Only after this does he salute the high priest (καὶ τὸν ἀρχιερέα πρῶτος ἡσπάσατο). Josephus uses the inscription τὸ ὄνομα in his narrative as a metonymy. In portraying Alexander's bowing before the name of God, he therefore leaves the material aspect of the flower unmentioned. From this alone it can be deduced that in later times the golden attribution became not only a sign of recognition of the high priest, but also a symbol for the presence of the deity itself. This leads to the subthesis that the *במצחו* of the Chronicler fulfills a similar (better said: antonymical) function in the same way as Josephus metonymically uses the phrase *προσεκύνησεν τὸ ὄνομα*.

At this point it is now sufficiently obvious that 2 Chronicles 26 is about an implicit discourse on leadership. However, it must not be overlooked that in the present text this is not mentioned explicitly. The discourse on leadership is rather cultivated implicitly by four elements: a) priest vs. king; b) anger; c) punitive leprosy; and d) the overemphasis of the forehead. How inevitable this conclusion is, becomes particularly apparent in the second mentioning of the forehead. During the diagnosis by all the priests, the king gets into a pitiful position: he is the only one who cannot see what literally illuminates the army of 81 priests facing him: YHWH has beaten him (נגע). Accordingly, not only the priests are hurrying (בהל) to expel the king from the sanctuary; instead, at the moment of recognition, the king literally flees (דחף).

As a consequence, the sin of the incense offering is severely punished by two penalties (v. 21):

Firstly, Uzziah is infected by leprosy for the rest of his life (עד יום מותו). But secondly, the concomitant impurity also means that he will be cut off (גזר) from the house of YHWH, that is, from the cult. Accordingly, he had to live in a separate

⁶² The production of the headband is narrated in ant. VIII 93. There, it is told that Solomon made only one headband and that this headband still exists till the present day.

house (בית החפשי).⁶³ Thus, as the progress of the episode shows, he loses his right of residence in the palace and consequently his function as king. There are now two readings:

(1) Against the background of Leviticus 10 it becomes quite clear that Uzziah basically intended a crime worthy of death penalty. The Chronicler, however, could not let Uzziah die, since he was obliged to his *Vorlage* in 2 Kings 15, and at the same time was anxious not to change the sequence of kings and their reigns.⁶⁴ But basically his death began with leprosy, since because of this diagnosis, he was not just cut off from his family while alive, but also buried in the open field and not in the graves of kings. Accordingly, his dignity was still denied even after his death. A closer look at Numbers 12:12 also confirms this impression. After Miriam has been punished with leprosy, Aaron begged Moses: “Do not let her be like the stillborn baby that comes forth from its mother’s womb with its flesh half consumed!” (אל-נא תהי כמת אשר בצאתו מרחם אמו ויאכל חצי בשרו). The death-like condition of leprosy can hardly be described more clearly than by “stillbirth”.

(2) However, a closer look at 2 Kings 15 reveals a completely different reading. The synoptic comparison shows that an incense offering of Uzziah was not even mentioned there. On the contrary, the *people* slaughter (זבח) and burn incense (קטר) on the heights. In contrast to this, the punishment of lifelong leprosy on the king, as mentioned in v. 5, seems extremely draconian. Although Azariah could be buried with his fathers in the city of David without further complications in 2 Kings 15:7, the Chronicler was obviously concerned – supporting Evans⁶⁵ – to invent a crime fitting of the punishment. He apparently used the narrative background of Leviticus 10 and Numbers 16 for this offence and adapted it to the intended narrative purpose. Due to the lifelong leprosy, the Chronicler could not recur to the regulation of the seven-day separation (סגר, hif.) from Leviticus 13, but had to use the stronger motif of “cutting off” irrevocably beyond death.⁶⁶ By

⁶³ Wilhelms Rudolph: *Chronikbücher*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1955), 284 emphasizes the clear mocking euphemism with his translation “Haus der Freiheit”.

⁶⁴ Cf. Ehud Ben Zvi: “About Time: Observations about the Construction of Time in the Book of Chronicles”. In *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles* ed. Ehud Ben Zvi (London/Oakville: Equinox, 2006), 144–157.

⁶⁵ Paul S. Evans, “Let the Crime Fit the Punishment: The Chronicler’s Explication of David’s ‘Sin’ in 1 Chronicles 21,” in *Chronicling the Chronicler. The Book of Chronicles and early Second Temple Historiography*, ed. Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 65–80.

⁶⁶ Beentjes, *Tradition*, 86 even assumes a connection with Lev 16:22 here. However, I cannot see anything but the striking conceptual similarity of sin which is taken away once and for all in both passages.

crossing this border beyond life, the sanction of exclusion and the death penalty were transformed to commensurable forms of retribution. Even worse, whereas Korah and his rotting gang, for example, sink into the ground in Numbers 16, Uzziah faces a much more severe punishment: the visualization of guilt in the form of the leprosy mark.

Against this background the strange fact of the double naming of Uzziah (vv. 17–20) comes into view. Its sense is generated against the background of v. 15b, where Uzziah is portrayed as hero. Verses 17–20 on the one hand emphasizes the extent of Uzziah's dramatic fall from heroism, but on the other hand also uses the name *עזריהו* to mock the king: *ויצא שמו עד-למרחוק כי-הפליא להעזר עד כי חזק*. It is stated that Uzziah's name (*שמו*) spread far and wide (*יצא*), because he was given help in a miraculous way. Through the possessive suffix (3rd sg. masc.) in *שמו* the name announcement refers cataphorically to Uzziah in v. 14 and demonstrates once again to every reader that it is the *name* of Uzziah that is in the foreground here. The anadiplosis from v. 15 to v. 16 in form of the verb *חזק* marks the turning point of the episode and the anathema that begins with the king's pride.⁶⁷ The Chronicler thus offers post-factually an aetiology which transfigures the name *עזריהו* with the infinitive *להעזר* and the revocation. The mockery is made clear by the fact that Azariah, who is now called Uzziah, is no longer receiving divine help after the attempt of the illegitimate incense offering. It is not without irony that Uzziah finds his antagonist in vv. 16–20 in Azariah of all people, the *כהן הראש*. The transfer of the sovereignty of the temple, that is, the claim to power over the post-exilic community, is indicated by the permutation of the names of king and priest and is symbolically sealed by the contrast between the mark of leprosy and the implicated diadem of the priest. The consequences for Uzziah are devastating. Already in his lifetime, Jotham his son, took charge. Significantly, however, he is not referred to as king in this interim solution, but as judge in the king's house: *ויוֹתֵם בְּנוֹ עַל-בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ שׁוֹפֵט אֶת אֶת-עַם הָאָרֶץ*. The motif represents nothing less than a regression into the time of the judges (*בִּימֵי הָהֵם אִין מֶלֶךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל*). Thus, in addition to the development of the chronistic theology of retribution, a narrative trait analogous to the time of the judges is taken up. It appears for a brief moment as if there was no longer a king in Judah. Or, to put it otherwise, as if the royal dignity had – at least for the moment – passed to the priest. From now on every generation, even every generation of kings, has to prove itself anew in its relationship to God. However, in contrast to the fiction of the age of judges, the institutional framework cannot be neglected in this narrative. The story continues in the

⁶⁷ Beentjes, 2 Kronieken, 336 as well as Ibid., *Tradition*, 81 has pointed out that the phrase *וכחזקתו* is inevitably connected with Rehoboam's abandoning of the Torah (2 Chron 12:1).

genealogical paradigm according to the *Vorlage*. Unlike the book of Judges, the evaluation of the epoch is therefore no longer carried out by taking into account the behaviour of the people (see, for example, Jdg 2:12-14: וַיַּחַר אֶף יְהוָה ... וַיַּעֲזֹבוּ אֶת ... יְהוָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּעֲשׂוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה...בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל). Quite the opposite, in Chronicles, the Torah observance of the king alone in the broadest sense, that is, both literal and non-literal, is made the distinctive criterion. From this point of view the overcoming of the disastrous time is understandable: After the death of his father, Jotham becomes king (v. 23) – thus ending the interim of the episode as judge – and immediately does again what is right in the eyes of the Lord (יהוה) בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה [2Chr 27:2]).⁶⁸

Finally, the question arises why the Chronicler has emancipated the priesthood from the Davidic kingship in this indirect way. To be clear: We have seen, that the Chronicler – by overemphasizing the forehead of the king – means what he writes, and he means even more than that. This means that – in terms of Rolf – this is a case of indirectness. The question is: Why did the Chronicler not describe the issue more clearly or directly? Moreover, the question arises why such an important topic is moved to a minor location in Chronicles by its integration into the Uzziah narrative?

From my point of view this is correlated with the importance of King David and his dynasty for the Chronicler. In hardly any other book of the Old Testament does the Davidic dynasty attain greater significance. Only the Psalter ascribes a similarly extensive significance to David, of course in textual interaction with Chronicles.

The unbroken appreciation for this king is shown by the fact that the Chronicler describes David's comprehensive preparations for the temple extensively (1 Chron 22–29), although David himself did not build it himself. Nevertheless, the Chronicler is not only embarrassed to explain David's failure of building the temple, but in the end, he also has to deal in narrative means with the complete decline of the whole Davidic dynasty. Although a pro-Davidic narrative thread – as it is attested in 1Chr 3; 1Chr 17, 2Chr 13:5 and 2Chr 35:4 – is counteracted by an anti-Davidic narrative thread,⁶⁹ the side view on the priesthood remains positively focused throughout. The rule of Judah is always pleasing to God, provided that the royal rule is limited and restricted by the priestly rule.

⁶⁸ Of course, one has to take into account that in the narrative time ("Erzählzeit") no king existed anymore and the priestly option was therefore even closer.

⁶⁹ The first anti-Davidic peak begins already with Rehoboam (cf. 2 Chron 12:14) and then completely culminates in the Jehoram narrative.

A hermeneutic key to the understanding of the Chronicler's indirect manner of expression is the moment of cancelability, which, as has been shown at the beginning,⁷⁰ is a necessary condition of the Conversational Implicature. Rolf states: "Die Annullierbarkeit ist eines der wichtigsten Merkmale der konversationalen Implikaturen. Das, was lediglich impliziert, nicht aber gesagt worden ist, kann, aufgrund seiner materiellen Ungreifbarkeit, leichter wieder aus dem Verkehr gezogen werden, wenn es denn aus dem Verkehr gezogen werden soll."⁷¹

In the present case, the writer of the text, who inscribed the anti-royal sentiment, could at any time cancel his implicature. He could do this by taking the position that he did under no circumstances want to elevate the dispute between king and priest to an institutional level – and thus dispute the king's claims to power – by explicitly mentioning the leprous forehead. The writer could, for example, state that he only wanted to name a visible part of the body and that he had constructed an offence appropriate to the punishment of the *Vorlage*. In view of the explosiveness that is caused in discourses on leadership – all the more by the proposal of a non-Davidic option of leadership – the Conversational Implicature thus represents a caution to any messianic aspirations. To what extent this caution was necessary, is evident, of course, from the fact that Chronicles is a reformulation of the history of the Davidic kingship. After all, the Chronicler also portrays David as a second Moses and somehow as a second Aaron, too.⁷² For example, in 2 Chronicles 13:5 there is an explicit reference to a salt covenant ברית מלח between YHWH and David and his sons.⁷³

The Chronicler cannot hide the conception generated by him in the first place, but must handle it as a narrative burden. At this point the "Putative Kinship"⁷⁴ created between the Judean kingship and the Zadokide high priesthood plays a constitutive role in the justification of the priestly claims to power. At the same time, it should also be noted that 2 Chronicles 13:5 is restricted by v. 8, where the reading of the preceding formulation *כי יהוה אלהי ישראל נתן ממלכה לדוד על-ישראל*

70 Cf. page 263 → Cancelability

71 "Cancellability is one of the most important features of Conversational Implicatures. Something which has only been implied, but has not been said, can be withdrawn from circulation more easily, because of its material non-concreteness, if it should be withdrawn from circulation at all" (Rolf, *Pragmatik*, 27).

72 Note the attribution of David as *איש האלהים* and the fact that he makes his own *מצוה* (2 Chron 8:14).

73 This motif is prefigured in Num 18:19, where the covenant of salt serves to supply Aaron and his sons.

74 On the concept of putative kinship between the tribes of Judah and Levi, see the contribution by Achenbach in this volume and Lars Maskow, *Tora in der Chronik*, 257–259, 293–295.

לעולם (v. 5) is restricted by the phrase *יהוה ביד בני דויד* (v. 8). The Torah restriction of the Davidic kings by the law of the king (Deut. 17:14–20),⁷⁵ which is only enforced in Chronicles, plays the most important role here. In so far, the king is not only subordinated to divine Scripture, but also to the cultic scribes who wrote it. On the whole, the Chronicler creates a dramaturgical caesura after the idyll of Solomon's reign, which responds to the dilemma of the division of the kingdom. Even for the Chronicler, the progressive decline of kingship and the final exile cannot be stopped. Therefore he follows the principle: *Le Dieu règne, mais il ne gouverne pas* from the very beginning.⁷⁶ Whereas the act of government could still be taken over by the kings themselves in the time of David and Solomon – well recognizable in the appointment of the priests by David (1 Chron 24) and the anointing of Zadok parallel to the anointing of Solomon (1 Chron 29:22) – this concept of leadership seems to remain in force in later phases, but the government seems to be successively replaced by the priests. However, with regard to the exile, it is also stated of the priests that they impurify the house of God (טמא), participate in the abominations (תעבות) of the nations, and become unfaithful to YHWH (מעל). Nevertheless, the Chronicler is able to implement a positive exile interpretation by integrating Jeremiah. In doing so he obviously leaves the Davidic option and positions himself ideologically on the side of the observance of the Torah.

The indirect portrayal in 2 Chronicles 26:17–21 indicates that this discourse of leadership could only be conducted in an indirect modality. For it would undoubtedly have provoked harsh opposition from those who longed for hierocratic leadership. In this modality, no matter how clearly the implication appears in 2 Chronicles 26, there was always the opportunity in circumstances of conflict to withdraw to the hierocratic position by claiming that *that* was actually not said.

4 Conclusion

At this point, the result is relatively short compared to the argumentative effort. It can even be summarized in one sentence:

The leprosy erupting on the forehead of King Uzziah in 2 Chron 26 represents, from a pragmatic point of view, a Conversational Implicature that contrastingly

⁷⁵ The reception of the so-called law of the king is of course a neuralgic point of research. See Maskow, *Tora*, 96–100.

⁷⁶ The potential of this concept is nowhere else so obvious than in the addition of the edict of Cyrus to Chronicles.

evokes the golden headband of the Aaronide high priest and thus disavows or rather transmits royal leadership to the high priest. It should be noted at this point that the priestly claim to power *is not expressed directly, but indirectly*. The whole argumentative effort presented here is necessary to determine what the indirect statement – the Conversational Implicature – of the text consists of. At the same time, this provides a methodological approach to the determination of text-text relations, which can determine connections between two texts and the world knowledge constituted by them, beyond literal or terminological similarities. For the Torah reception of the Chronicler it follows at this point that it seems to be a “Wirklichkeit” in the sense of Hans Blumenberg⁷⁷ and that it unfolds highest potential especially at those places where it is not *literally* mentioned. We should bear in mind that this is only one example and that in interpreting the texts we should always be prepared for the appearance of other implicatures, for which a methodology has been offered here for finding and evaluating them.

⁷⁷ Cf. the quotation at the beginning, page 257.