

CHRONICLES AND THE CANON IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

R. LAIRD HARRIS*

The position of Chronicles in the canon of the OT could be easily answered by saying that it is at the end of the Hebrew OT and, in the English Bible, after the historical books of Samuel-Kings as in most LXX and patristic sources. It is often assumed and sometimes argued that, since the Hebrew OT is original, therefore the position of Chronicles was originally at the end. It is our purpose to examine these arguments and assumptions and note some of the consequences of this view.

It is well known that Josephus, near the beginning of our era, classified the books in such a way that Chronicles was not at the end, but his evidence is often downgraded. Not so well known is the fact that a good number of Hebrew MSS and sources do not have Chronicles at the end. The LXX and Christian sources never have Chronicles at the end, having it usually after the books of Samuel-Kings. Nevertheless at the beginning of this century it became common to hold that the present division of our Hebrew Bible into three parts was the original division, and critical scholars proceeded from there to develop a three-stage canonization theory with the Law canonized in its final form about 400 B.C., the Prophets about 200, and the Writings not all canonized until the alleged Council of Jamnia in A.D. 90. This view was espoused by H. E. Ryle in an influential book,¹ by A. S. Geden² and by many others.

The view of Robert Dick Wilson³ following Moses Stuart⁴ is that the division of Josephus was the original one, or at least was prior to the present Hebrew division, and that Daniel, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and so forth were originally among the books of the second division. Wilson's real purpose was to show that the position of Daniel in present Hebrew Bibles is not an argument in favor of its Maccabean date, because originally Daniel was not in the third division supposedly canonized at Jamnia. Jack Lewis has done us a great service in showing that there was no Council of Jamnia and that the discussions that were held there

* Laird Harris is emeritus professor of Old Testament at Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri.

¹ H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament* (London: Macmillan, reprint 1909 [1892]).

² A. S. Geden, *Outlines of Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909).

³ R. D. Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel* (New York: Revell, 1938) 44-45.

⁴ M. Stuart, *Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon* (London: Tegg, 1849), sec. 10.

have been much overrated.⁵ I have followed Wilson and Stuart but in addition have drawn attention to the many early references to a twofold canon.⁶ Roger Beckwith has recently published an exhaustive and very welcome book on the OT canon with much of which we would agree. But he scouts this witness of the LXX, 1QS and twelve NT occurrences as being negated by "the repeated and unanimous evidence of contemporary and earlier Jewish witnesses [Jerome's informants, the *Baraita*, Josephus, Philo, Jesus and the prologue to Ecclesiasticus] that the Jewish canon was from an early period organized in three groups of books."⁷ This is a rather strange statement considering that only one source mentioned is pre-Christian—the prologue to Ecclesiasticus—and this apparently does not antedate the evidence from 1QS.⁸ Jesus once used a threefold reference to the OT (Luke 24:44) but used a twofold reference on other occasions (Matt 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 22:40; Luke 16:16, 29, 31; 24:27). His apostles used only the twofold reference. Furthermore Beckwith uses Jesus, Josephus, Philo and the prologue to Ecclesiasticus to argue for the present threefold division, whereas none of them specify this and one denies it. The early Jewish witness is commonly misused in this fashion.

An outline of Beckwith's positions is in order. First, he agrees that the discussions at Jamnia are not decisive.⁹ They, with other rabbinic discussions, concerned five books, two already well established (Ezekiel and Proverbs) and the others (Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon and Esther) objected to because of their content in much the same way that Luther questioned James. They survived the attacks as did James. Beckwith makes the significant observation that the whole Talmud records no argument that the Apocryphal books should be accepted.¹⁰

Second, he claims that the original number of the books was twenty-four, from which the number twenty-two was artificially derived (in order to fit the alphabet).¹¹ Here he is on more shaky ground. The number twenty-four is, as he says, used in the Talmud, 4 Ezra and Pseudo-Tertullian. The number twenty-two is found in Josephus, Melito (probably—if Samuel, Kings and Chronicles be counted as three books as was usual), Origen, Epiphanius, Athanasius and Jerome. Jerome explains that the Jews have twenty-four books, reckoning Ruth and Lamentations separate from Judges and Jeremiah. In addition Beckwith argues carefully and convincingly that the earliest enumeration we have is the number twenty-two given in the Greek translation of Jubilees done in the

⁵ J. P. Lewis, "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?", *JBR* 32 (1964) 125-132.

⁶ R. L. Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1969) 144-147.

⁷ R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985) 126.

⁸ P. Wernberg-Möller, *The Manual of Discipline Translated and Annotated* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 18-19.

⁹ Beckwith, *Canon* 276-277.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 381.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 256.

first century B.C. After this at about A.D. 100 comes the enumeration of twenty-four in 4 Ezra and, slightly earlier, twenty-two in Josephus. He concludes from all this that the enumerations twenty-two and twenty-four were used by both the Pharisees and the Essenes and that therefore they go back to the time before the division between the two groups. So, he says, "The numeration 24 is due to Judas [Maccabeus, 164 B.C.] and his associates, and that the numeration 22 originated very soon after the other."¹² Apart from the question of the enumerations, his point is very good that the agreement of the Essenes and Pharisees on a complete set of books betokens the early acceptance of the canon.

Third, he holds that Judas Maccabeus also established the threefold division of the Biblical books as found in the Talmud and in our present Hebrew Bibles. He refers to the tradition in 2 Macc 2:13 that Nehemiah founded a "library" including "the books about the kings and prophets and the books of David and letters of kings about sacred gifts." He interprets this as a national archive, not a collection of Scriptures.¹³ He feels that Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, possibly Ecclesiastes and Esther and Daniel (depending on one's views on that book) were not yet written, but that between Nehemiah and Judas there was time enough for the "final books to be written or finished, and to be recognized as canonical and for the realization to grow that the gift of inspiration had ceased and the canon was complete." He adds: "What is more likely than that, in gathering together the scattered Scriptures, he and his companions the Hasidim classified the now complete collection . . . dividing the miscellaneous non-Mosaic writings into the Prophets and the other Books?"¹⁴

There is a good bit of speculation here. That Ezra and Nehemiah were active in regathering Scriptures as they were active in rebuilding the city seems likely from the Biblical evidence. They emphasized the law of Moses and also the liturgy of David (Neh 8:1; 12:24-25). It is possible that the canon was recognized as complete at that time. The date accepted for Chronicles among critics has recently been moved back from about 250 to nearly 400 B.C.¹⁵—and if nearly 400, then the time of Nehemiah is possible. Ecclesiastes, because of its Qumran copy, is put before 250 B.C.—how much before, who can say? The date of Esther is hotly debated, but there is no positive evidence for its lateness. Daniel is held by orthodox scholars (and Beckwith favors this)¹⁶ to be of Persian date. Critics declare, rather, that its prophecies are a *vaticinium ex eventu* and it must be dated at 165 B.C. So on orthodox principles there is no reason why Nehemiah or Ezra may not have finished the canon with Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.

¹² Ibid. 262.

¹³ Ibid. 150.

¹⁴ Ibid. 152.

¹⁵ F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (rev. ed.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1961) 189.

¹⁶ Beckwith, *Canon* 417 n. 76.

On the other hand the witness of 2 Maccabees, cited above, is not final on the closing of the canon or its division into categories by Judas Maccabeus. Beckwith does not enter the field of dogmatics, but if the OT is thought to be a collection of inspired books rather than a collection of books to which inspiration is later attributed, then it was finished when the last inspired author wrote. In this view no one would have closed the canon. The Law of Moses would have been recognized as finished when Moses died. The rest of the canon would have grown as long as there were inspired authors. Nehemiah would have merely gathered the Law of Moses and the rest of the inspired books. He did not know whether other inspired men would be raised up by God. Actually Christians believe that the canon was not closed but was continued by the inspired apostles. In the intertestamental times from Ecclesiasticus to Maccabees to Josephus and the Talmud, however, there was the belief that prophecy had departed from Israel about the time of Artaxerxes—that is, the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. Beckwith, on the contrary, insists that “to crowd all this [writing and recognizing of late books] into the lifetime of Ezra and Nehemiah is not to be followed.”¹⁷ Exactly why not it does not appear. Beckwith apparently cannot shake the idea that it must take many years for a book to be recognized as canonical. But to those who acknowledge a person’s divine inspiration, his writing if genuine would be equally accepted and treasured at once as a word from God. Examples of the immediate reception of a contemporary’s work are Jeremiah, recognized by Daniel (Dan 9:2), and Paul, recognized by Peter (2 Pet 3:15–16). Of course these examples are not persuasive to those who deny the authorship of Daniel and Peter, but the Rylands papyrus of John, copied in Egypt within about thirty years of the death of the apostle, is another rather persuasive example.

Questionable indeed is Beckwith’s assurance that the threefold division as found in the Talmud was set up in the days of Judas Maccabeus. He has no positive evidence for the division into twenty-four books earlier than 4 Ezra (about A.D. 100). He has no sure evidence for the Talmud’s arrangement of the books into five books of Law, eight books of Prophets and eleven books of Writings before the tractate *Baba Batra* (about A.D. 500—which, however, as a *Baraita* may represent material of A.D. 200) or Jerome (A.D. 400). But he claims that the position of Chronicles implied in Matt 23:35 supports the idea that the Talmud division was current in NT times. This we must now consider.

The argument is that Jesus threatened the Pharisees with all the blood of the martyrs from “the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah the son of Berekiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar” (Matt 23:35). The parallel in Luke 11:50–51 speaks of the “blood of all the prophets that has been shed since the beginning of the world, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah.” The claim of Beckwith and

¹⁷ Ibid. 178 n. 107.

of the majority from John Lightfoot to F. F. Bruce¹⁸ is that the reference is to 2 Chr 24:21 and that the statement amounts to saying "from Genesis to Chronicles." So, Beckwith says, Jesus witnesses to the Talmud division some years before Josephus' variant division. Josephus' particular three-fold division is called anomalous—though it is the first detailed one we have.

It should be noted that Jesus did not actually say "from Genesis to Chronicles." Indeed in Luke the expression is temporal: "since the beginning of the world, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah." It is an assumption and not a necessary one that this terminology implies "from the first book to the last book."

And the old crux is this: Who was Zechariah the son of Berekiah? The figure in Chronicles is Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. His murder was the more heinous because Jehoiada his father had preserved Joash the murderer and had set him up as king. For this reason some commentators who hold this view claim that Jesus erred in naming the father. Happily, Beckwith does not go this far. But he makes the identification. He argues for ten pages that the Jewish homiletics would identify the two different men of similar fame or work. Thus, he thinks, the name of Zechariah the son of Berekiah the son of Iddo (Zech 1:1) was used by Jesus for Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. Whether the rabbis at some period did this for homiletical and illustrative purposes or not, there seems to be no reason to employ such homiletics or illustration here. It would appear to be quite wrong to claim that Jesus mixed up these two men from different eras and situations. And it is not necessary to do so except to uphold the Talmud order theory. There were several other Zechariahs. Berekiah also is a common name. There was a Zechariah son of Jeberekiah mentioned in Isa 8:2 but, like the author of the book of Zechariah, he was not murdered. Beckwith insists that a prophet Zechariah must be meant because of the wording in Luke: "the blood of all the prophets." But since Abel is not called a prophet, why must Zechariah have been? The wording is general and includes all martyrs. Actually, although Chronicles says that the Spirit of God came upon Zechariah the son of Jehoiada—and therefore he was a prophet—the text does not call him a prophet but emphasizes that he was "the son of Jehoiada the priest" (2 Chr 24:20, 25). It may well be that Jesus was referring rather to another Zechariah foully murdered at the temple in intertestamental times just as he referred elsewhere to unknown Galileans slaughtered by Pilate (Luke 13:1). He would be saying that "from earliest times to recent events" the martyrs will be avenged. In view of the internecine strife and the murders of righteous people by the Hasmonians it would be strange if Jesus' threat would cover murders only up to 800 B.C. After all, Luke makes clear that the reference is temporal rather than literary.

¹⁸ Ibid. 212–222. J. Lightfoot's comments are found in *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* (Grand Rapids: Baker, reprint 1970 [1859]), 2. 302–308. For F. F. Bruce cf. *The Books and the Parchments* (3d ed.; Westwood: Revell, 1963) 97.

Further it is easy for us who use bound volumes to visualize a span from the first book of the OT to the last, but Jesus' remark came at a time when the OT existed in multiple scrolls that probably had one or more orders but that were not so much a part of the mental furniture as to make a statement from scroll one to scroll twenty-two so likely.

On the contrary side, there is evidence against Chronicles' position being at the end of the list of scrolls. Beckwith has very exhaustively and helpfully given a table of the evidence from the Jewish tradition.¹⁹ The great Aleppo codex and the Leningrad MS used for *BHK* and *BHS* have Chronicles first in the Writings. Beckwith holds that this Tiberian witness was not long before A.D. 1000,²⁰ but how much older their tradition might go it is impossible to say. In any event the table shows that Jerome, who cites Jewish information for this listing, has Chronicles immediately before Ezra-Nehemiah.

More significantly the end of Chronicles clearly shows that its original position was not at the end of the OT books but was just before Ezra-Nehemiah as it is in our English Bibles, whose order is derived from the general LXX tradition. Jerome reflects this order as do Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Athanasius, Origen and others.²¹ The end of Chronicles and the beginning of Ezra-Nehemiah exhibit the use of a catchline, a device used in ancient writing to direct a reader from one tablet or scroll to the next in order. It seems clear that the books of Chronicles ended originally at 2 Chr 36:21. The next two verses are identical with Ezra 1:1-3. But whereas 2 Chr 36:23 ends with the words "Let him go up," Ezra 1:3 continues: "Let him go up to Jerusalem in Judah, . . ." In short, Chronicles ends in the middle of a sentence because it is directing the reader to proceed to the book of Ezra. A similar phenomenon can probably be seen in the end of Joshua and the beginning of Judges. Josh 24:29-31 is the same as verses found in Judg 2:7-9. These verses form an ending (with further mention of Joseph's and Eleazar's burial) that connects to Josh 1:1 ("After the death of Joshua"). There are other similar connections of OT books to which the writer has drawn attention elsewhere,²² and the phenomenon is as old as the Babylonian tablets of creation. Menahem Haran has also drawn attention to the phenomenon,²³ and it is recognized also by Beckwith.²⁴ His scenario is that originally the books were just the Mosaic books, then there grew "a single collection of non-Mosaic scriptures, which in the second century BC was divided into the Prophets and the other Books (i.e. the Hagiographa)."²⁵ In this section of

¹⁹ Beckwith, *Canon* 452-464.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 202-203.

²¹ The data are given in the extensive listings of the order of Christian sources in H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1902) 201-203. The material is ably discussed in Beckwith, *Canon* 183-195.

²² R. L. Harris, "Continuity in the OT Historical Literature," *JETS* 14 (1971) 173-178.

²³ M. Haran, "Catch Lines in Ancient Paleography and in the Biblical Canon," *Erlsr* 18 (1985) 124-129 (Hebrew), abstracted in *Religious and Theological Abstracts* 31 (1988) no. 982.

²⁴ Beckwith, *Canon* 159, 179 n. 121.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 142.

his work Beckwith beautifully answers the old contentions of Ryle and others who hold that the canon was formed in three stages at different periods as each group attained canonical status. It is a question, however, if the division was originally as neat as Beckwith envisages and all done by Judas Maccabeus. As we saw above, he holds that Judas arranged the divisions and order of the canon substantially like that in the Talmud of about A.D. 500. To this we have objected because of the lack of evidence for this arrangement before the Talmud, because of the contradictory evidence of Josephus, and because of the evidence that Chronicles was not where the Talmud places it.

As we stated earlier, Josephus from about A.D. 90 is clearly against the Talmud's and Jerome's division, although he does use three divisions. In a much-quoted statement Josephus says that the sacred books of the Jews are not numerous and inconsistent and contradictory as are those of the Greeks, but that "our books . . . are only twenty-two. . . Of these, five are the books of Moses . . . the prophets after Moses wrote the events of their own times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life."²⁶ Obviously, Josephus' third division does not contain Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, or Daniel, and the enumeration twenty-two probably means that Ruth and Lamentations were attached to Judges and Jeremiah respectively. Beckwith holds that Josephus' principles cause him to divide the canon according to historical principles with the first two divisions consisting of history and the third of nonhistorical material. So, he argues, "the distribution is therefore, in all probability, the historian's own."²⁷ It could be argued whether Josephus' division is so clearly based on the historical principle and further whether the historical principle is necessarily later. But in any case we should like to point out that Josephus' near-contemporary Philo has a division that looks suspiciously like that of Josephus. He is writing of the Therapeutae (whom Beckwith and many others identify or associate with the Essenes) and says of them that each "takes with him into his oratory . . . none of the common things of life, but '(the) Laws, and (the) Oracles given by inspiration through (the) Prophets, and (the) Psalms and the other books whereby knowledge and piety are increased and completed.'"²⁸ The wording is obviously the same as that of Josephus as far as the first two divisions of Law and Prophets are concerned. The third division is referred to by Josephus as comprising "hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life." According to Philo it contains "Psalms and the other books whereby knowledge and piety are increased and completed." Philo's designation of the third division really

²⁶ Beckwith gives the quotation with the significant Greek original in *Canon* 118-119, discussed on p. 125.

²⁷ *Ibid.* 125.

²⁸ Quoted with the original Greek in Beckwith, *Canon* 117. The first word describing the third division of Philo is the plural of Greek *hymnos* and is usually translated "Psalms," but it is the same word in Josephus usually translated "hymns" because it is in the phrase "hymns to God."

agrees very well with that of Josephus. And Philo's wording does not very well fit Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah or Daniel or several other books in the third division of the Talmud. In short, the Talmud division cannot be shown to be earlier than about A.D. 200. Josephus is against it. Bishop Melito is against it (A.D. 170), Philo is probably against it and, as argued above, the references in Matthew and Luke to Zechariah the son of Berekiah do not sustain it. Furthermore the very common twofold division, amply attested in the NT, in QL and in the whole LXX tradition, argues against an early accepted and unchangeable subdivision of the non-Mosaic books. It is much better to hold that the non-Mosaic books could be classified sometimes one way, sometimes another. Certainly Ruth and Lamentations slid easily from being attached to historical and prophetic books to independent existence. This variable placement is witnessed as late as Jerome who mentions both the twenty-two-book arrangement and the twenty-four-book pattern.

Why then was the Talmudic and later Jewish division adopted and kept so nearly intact? The situation can be easily explained if we make one natural assumption: The Talmud arrangement was developed in response to developing liturgical use.

The Talmud, like our present Hebrew Bibles, put the histories (the so-called Former Prophets) and the oracular prophets (the so-called Latter Prophets) together and used them in the weekly synagogue reading. The service today includes a reading from the Pentateuch (all the Pentateuch is used) and a reading from the second section, called the Prophets (but only scattered portions are used). How old this practice is we do not know. The NT refers to the synagogue reading of the Law and the Prophets (Acts 13:15) but this does not thereby prove that the medieval Haphtaroth readings were already established. Indeed in the one place where a particular reading is specified (Luke 4:17-20) a reading from Isaiah (61:1-2) is mentioned, but this reading is not among the current prescribed readings.

Why were the other books not used in the Talmud liturgy? Why was not the whole text of the Prophets used? We do not know. Probably the early practice was somewhat flexible. Perhaps more parts of the Prophets were used originally. But there probably were practical limitations. We can speculate why, for one reason or another, the eleven books of the present Writings were not suitable. The Psalms were used, but in other ways. The disjointed verses of the Proverbs are more for study than for public reading. Ecclesiastes is misleading if it is not read as a whole. The Song of Solomon was not to be read, according to some of the rabbis, by those under thirty. Job, like Ecclesiastes, is not helpful if read piecemeal. Ezra and Daniel had portions in Aramaic, possibly not understood by some laity of the dispersion. Esther was already read at the Feast of Purim. Chronicles is much like Samuel-Kings in material, and we would have expected it to be in the same division. But we may note that Chronicles in addition to being paralleled in Samuel-Kings includes extensive genealogies, which make poor public reading. Actually, of the

Haphtaroth readings used today that are taken from the books of Samuel-Kings about half have a parallel in Chronicles. It would be logical, therefore, not to have Chronicles in the section used for the weekly liturgy, for it was already in a sense covered. As for Ruth and Lamentations, it has already been mentioned that in the early times they were often attached to Judges and Jeremiah, and in later days they were read at annual feasts. The argument makes sense that the present division of books owes something to the formation of the present liturgical system.

We do not know how far back this synagogue liturgy went. Of course it went back to Talmudic times. The NT, as noted above, does not support it but does not give positive evidence to dispute it either. There was a reading from the Law and the Prophets in NT times (Acts 13:15), but we just do not know what these readings consisted of. The phrase "the Law and the Prophets" is often used in the NT for the whole OT,²⁹ and this might suggest that readings were also sometimes made from any of the non-Mosaic books, including those now in the Writings, such as Daniel, Job or Chronicles. There was a great convulsion in Jewish worship after A.D. 70. Josephus, who sided with the Romans in the Roman war, would have naturally reflected the earlier opinions. Certainly his three divisions do not fit the later liturgy.

The LXX became the Christian OT text and was more rejected by the Jews. So it would also probably reflect an earlier usage, although our present codices come, at the earliest, from around A.D. 250 (Chester Beatty).

CONCLUSION

1. *The original position of Chronicles was immediately before Ezra-Nehemiah and in combination with it.* This datum is rather firm.

2. *The OT books were canonical as written.* They may have been collected under the influence of Ezra and Nehemiah, but no man or council closed the canon. It stopped when prophecy ceased and started again when Jesus ordained the apostles. This conclusion is a theological one based on the claims of the prophets and the teaching also of the NT on inspiration. But it has force not only for believers today. It had force also for ancient writers such as Josephus and also for the early Church. Hebrews 1:1 sums it up: "God spoke to our forefathers through the prophets."

3. *The twofold division of Moses and the other books was early and natural.* It was found in the second century B.C. at Qumran and persisted through the NT and LXX into Christian circles.

²⁹ Matt 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 22:40; Luke 16:16; Acts 13:15; 24:14; Rom 3:21. The equivalent "Moses and the Prophets" or a variation is found in Luke 16:29; 24:27; John 1:45; Acts 26:22; 28:23.

4. *A separation of a third category out of the old second section proceeded, probably before the prologue to Ecclesiasticus.* We need not deny Beckwith's point that Judas Maccabeus may have had something to do with it. Many have noticed that in the three references to this third section in the prologue the wording varies slightly. Most critics have concluded from this that the books of the third division were not firmly canonized at that time. It is just as possible that the second and third divisions were not clearly demarcated. Josephus and probably Philo witness to a threefold division differing from the present one. The single NT reference (Luke 24:44) is not decisive, but the original position of Chronicles is clear and the NT does not invalidate that point.

5. *The particular threefold division of the Talmud begins a new chapter, probably under the influence of liturgical use and apparently after the fall of Jerusalem.* It unites the historical prophets and oracular prophets into one category, calling them the Former and Latter Prophets (perhaps from a misunderstanding of Zech 1:4; 7:7, 12). The other books not used in the sabbatical lessons were separated out in orders that vary greatly among the MSS. The great ben Asher manuscripts of the tenth century put the large books of Chronicles, Psalms, Job and Proverbs at the head, the five small Megilloth next and the later part-Aramaic books—Daniel and Ezra-Nehemiah—at the end.

Only the LXX and Christian authors preserved the original situation of Chronicles being joined to its successor, Ezra-Nehemiah.