

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Doctor of Theology Dissertation

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1971

The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, 29 for the Structure and Theology of the Work of the Chronicler

Roddy L. Braun

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_braun@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/thd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Braun, Roddy L., "The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, 29 for the Structure and Theology of the Work of the Chronicler" (1971). *Doctor of Theology Dissertation*. 98.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/thd/98>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Theology Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF 1 CHRONICLES 22, 28, 29
FOR THE STRUCTURE AND THEOLOGY OF
THE WORK OF THE CHRONICLER

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Theology

by
Roddy L. Braun
May 1971

Approved by: Ralph W. Klein
Advisor

Carl Braun Jr.
Reader

Ernest J. Tucker
Reader

ARCH

BV

4070

C69

D6

1971

no. 1

89408

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
	1
	10
SHORT TITLE: THE WORK OF THE CHRONICLER; Braun; Th.D., 1971	10
	12
	14
	14
	20
	68
	76
	86
	99
	107
	108
	113
	115
	120
	122
	129
	130
	143
	149
	159
	164
	166
	197
	200
	225
	232

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. 1 CHRONICLES 22, 28, AND 29	10
The Context	10
1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29: An Overview	12
Detailed Analysis	14
1 Chron. 22:1-19.	14
1 Chron. 23:1-2a; 28:1-21	39
1 Chron. 29:1-9	68
1 Chron. 29:10-19	76
1 Chron. 29:20-30	86
Final Summary	99
III. DAVID AND SOLOMON IN CHRONICLES AND THE DEUTERONOMIC HISTORY	107
David in the Deuteronomic History	108
David in Chronicles	111
Solomon in Chronicles and the Deuteronomic History.	125
Solomon in the Deuteronomic History	125
Solomon in Chronicles	130
Conclusions	139
IV. THE CENTRALITY OF THE TEMPLE IN CHRONICLES.	145
V. THEOLOGICAL MOTIFS IN CHRONICLES.	169
Retribution	169
The Disposition of the Heart.	184
The All Israel Theme.	186
Conclusions	197
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	200
APPENDIX: SPEECH, SERMON, PROPHECY, AND PRAYER IN CHRONICLES.	225
BIBLIOGRAPHY	252

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to examine in detail three chapters of the work of the Chronicler--1 Chronicles 22, 28, 29--and to demonstrate their importance for better understanding the structure, theology, and purpose of the work of the Chronicler. The following background will explain the reason for the choice of these chapters and outline the methodology and contents of the study.

The Old Testament contains two distinct accounts of Israel's history during the monarchical period, the first found in the books of Samuel and Kings and the second in the books of Chronicles. Since it is commonly recognized that the account found in Samuel and Kings predates that of Chronicles by some two centuries, the question of why the latter account should have been written naturally presents itself. Since the two histories generally present the events recorded in the same sequence and are often identical even in their wording, it seems obvious that the Chronicler¹ was aware of the existence of the earlier work.² The necessary conclusion seems to be that the author wished

¹The term "the Chronicler" is used here for the sake of convenience and does not prejudice the issue of the unity of the books involved nor the possibility that the books may be the product of a school rather than of one or more individuals.

²Some, such as W. Rothstein and J. Hänel, Das erste Buch der Chronik, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, edited by Ernst Sellin (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927), XVIII, ii, believe the Chronicler was familiar with an earlier edition.

to present Israel's history from a different point of view than that found in Samuel and Kings, a point of view which he found inadequately expressed there.

In attempting to define what this different point of view was, scholars have carefully compared the text of Chronicles with that of Samuel and Kings, which is generally considered its major, if not only, source. These studies have shown that certain matters dealt with at considerable length in Samuel and Kings are omitted in Chronicles, which conversely includes material not found in Samuel and Kings. But even when the two histories deal with identical material the treatment often differs considerably, with Chronicles sometimes reproducing Samuel and Kings almost verbatim, but at other times characterized by additions, omissions, and alterations of varying degrees.

To be sure, the fact that the Chronicler has composed his work to express a viewpoint different from that of Samuel and Kings, and that the work needs to be evaluated from that viewpoint, has often been forgotten in practice if not in principle. Most commentaries concentrate upon the historical problems raised by a comparison of the books with parallel texts from Samuel and Kings, almost always to the disparagement of the historical accuracy of the Chronicler. While there have been signs of a turn toward a more sympathetic and balanced approach in recent years,³ concerns for historical reliability continue to dominate most authors to the virtual exclusion of all else. That this is

³Cf. Peter Ackroyd, "History and Theology in the Writings of the Chronicler," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXVIII (1967), 501-515.

so may be seen by the minimal amount of space devoted by most commentaries to the important speeches of David in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, 29, the area of immediate concern in this thesis, and, by way of contrast, the continued emphasis upon the role of archaeology in vindicating the historical reliability of Chronicles in the most recent commentary to appear in English.⁴

Perhaps because of this extreme concern for historical reconstruction, studies not only of a historical but also of a theological nature have been directed almost exclusively to those sections which the two histories have in common, the so-called synoptic sections. Whenever Chronicles differed from its supposed Vorlage in Samuel or Kings, an attempt was made to explain the difference in terms of the supposed theological viewpoint of the Chronicler.⁵ That this often resulted in a certain artificiality and forced exegesis is not surprising.

It now appears quite clear that this exclusive concentration upon the synoptic sections was quite arbitrary and resulted in the neglect of a significant part of the Chronicler's work. Recent discoveries have made this approach even more untenable. The study of fragments of ancient Hebrew texts found near the Dead Sea carried out by such men

⁴Jacob Myers, 1 Chronicles, The Anchor Bible, edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965), XIII; 2 Chronicles, The Anchor Bible, XIV.

⁵As examples of this procedure cf. A. M. Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses Sources," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 483-508; LXI (1954), 349-386; C. J. Goslinga, "De parallele teksten in de boeken Samuël en Kronieken," Gereformerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, LXI (1961), 108-116; G. J. Botterweck, "Zur Eigenart der chronistischen Davidgeschichte," Theologische Quartalschrift, CXXXVI (1956), 402-435.

as Frank Cross, Jr., has shown that not every variation should be attributed to the intention of the writer, but that in at least a number of instances the variations are to be explained by the fact that the writer had before him a text of Samuel and Kings which differed from the Massoretic text found in our Hebrew Bibles.⁶ In fact, the text available to the Chronicler appears to have contained readings similar to some previously known to us only in the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint.

In a dissertation written under Cross at Harvard University, Werner Lemke has investigated the relationship of Samuel and Kings to Chronicles in the light of these ancient fragments and the Septuagint and pointed out numerous cases where this new knowledge compels us to revise our theories of the Chronicler's supposed Tendenz.⁷ As a result of his studies Lemke suggests that, in view of the obvious difficulties which the new textual evidence presents for the use of the synoptic texts, future research should reverse the customary methodology and begin rather with the study of the material peculiar to Chronicles, the non-synoptic sections. It is, after all, in these sections that we are most likely to find the distinctive ideas of the Chronicler

⁶Cf. especially "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert," Harvard Theological Review, LVII (1964), 281-299; "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries," Israeli Exploration Journal, XVI (1966), 81-95.

⁷Werner Lemke, "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History" (Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1964); "The Synoptic Problem of the Chronicler's History," Harvard Theological Review, LVIII (1965), 349-363.

expressed, rather than in the material he has adopted from other sources.⁸ Lemke further suggests that following the study of these non-synoptic sections the newly acquired information concerning the Tendenz of the writer be applied to a study of the synoptic sections. It was in agreement with Lemke's basic suggestions that this dissertation was begun, having as its primary objective to ascertain on the basis of non-synoptic sections of Chronicles the theological Tendenz of the writer and to relate this to his purpose in writing the work.⁹

⁸Cf. the remark of Adam Welch, The Work of the Chronicler (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 7, who states that the non-synoptic sections dealing with various prophets in 2 Chronicles are unusually important "for they introduce the student directly to the author's mind and to his thought on such large questions as the function of prophecy and its relation to the kingdom." (Italics mine.)

⁹It should be noted that the methodology suggested by Lemke has not passed without criticism. In particular Peter Ackroyd has labeled Lemke's suggestion to concentrate upon the non-synoptic parts of the history as "somewhat naive," listing three reasons for this dictum: (1) It cannot always be ascertained when the Chronicler is using sources; (2) Lemke's argument, while especially true of small differences, is not as relevant to larger ones; (3) Even when the Chronicler may be borrowing a text from another source which has undergone previous alteration, the Chronicler has at any rate used it in that form, and it now forms a part of the material which we are called upon to interpret (Ackroyd, XXXVIII, 507).

Ackroyd's arguments, while true in part, are also somewhat tendentious. For while it may not always be possible to tell when the Chronicler is composing independently of his sources, it is perfectly clear in many places that he is not independent of his sources. While it will always remain impossible to prove that any given passage was not taken bodily from a previous work, it is reasonable to assume that certain sections of the work, such as the editorial framework and the theological evaluations (e.g., 1 Chron. 10:13-14; 11:10; 12:24; 2 Chron. 12:2,12,14) come from the hand of the author himself. The same is then also true, although admittedly to a lesser degree, of various other portions of the work which reflect the same interests and values as the sections mentioned previously, such as the speeches of David and the prophets (cf. 1 Chron. 22:6-13; 28:2-10; 29:1-5; 2 Chron. 12:5; 13:3-12). The study of such sections in comparison with Samuel and

Initial work on the thesis consisted in a cataloging and preliminary study of all the synoptic and non-synoptic portions of 1 and 2 Chronicles.¹⁰ In order to restrict the material to more manageable proportions, attention was then focused upon the non-synoptic sections dealing with David, the individual commonly recognized to be most important both within the Chronicler's history as well as in Samuel and Kings. Detailed study of these sections led to further restriction of the topic. Two observations led finally to the decision to concentrate upon the three chapters which form the basis of this study. First, the preliminary study had indicated numerous areas where it appeared that 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 were of particular importance for understanding the work of the Chronicler. Secondly, it was becoming increasingly apparent that while earlier sections of the David history, such as 1 Chronicles 10 to 21, had been dealt with quite adequately in earlier works,¹¹ this was not true of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29,

Kings has convinced many, including this writer, that the instances where the Chronicler is dependent upon any source other than Samuel and Kings are rare indeed.

Ackroyd's second and third arguments, which remind us that the synoptic texts too should not be ignored, are valid as far as they go, but do not negate Lemke's conclusion that it is better to begin with the non-synoptic texts. Ackroyd's statement that the argument should not be overstated must apply to both sides of the question. While it appears preferable to begin with the non-synoptic texts, later study will result in the continuous reinterpretation of both synoptic and non-synoptic portions of the literature in the light of the knowledge gained by the study of the other.

¹⁰Especially helpful for such a study, though not without its shortcomings, is the work of Primus Vannutelli, Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti (Romae: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1934).

¹¹Especially valuable in this respect are the commentaries of

probably due to the "a-historical" nature of its contents and the lack of a parallel narrative against which to evaluate it. The detailed examination of these chapters and their significance for the understanding of the total work of the Chronicler thus became the subject of this dissertation.

The structure and methodology of this thesis may be presented as follows. After presenting briefly the context in which these chapters occur, Chapter II is devoted to a detailed analysis of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29. The study of each of the five major units within these chapters is subdivided as follows: (1) Translation with notes on the relevant critical details. Sections of the text adjudged not to be from the hand of the Chronicler are included, but placed within brackets; (2) The structure and literary form of the unit; (3) Traditions and motifs found within the unit and their relationship to the remainder of the Old Testament; (4) Concluding summary. Chapter III pursues further the major question raised by the detailed study of chapters 22, 28, and 29--that of the relationship between the two principal figures, David and Solomon. Chapter IV points to the significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the structure of the books of Chronicles as a whole, and Chapter V similarly points out the significance of

E. Curtis and A. Madsen, The Books of Chronicles, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910), XI; Rothstein and Hänel, and most recently W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Erste Reihe; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), XXI. The works of J. Myers are disappointing in many respects, but especially strong in their citation of the relevant archaeological data.

the theological concepts of these chapters for understanding the work of the Chronicler. Finally, Chapter VI relates the previous studies to the question of the audience and purpose of the Chronicler.

An attempt has been made to pursue this study on the basis of a few clearly stated presuppositions. With the vast majority of Old Testament scholarship,¹² it has been assumed that the greater part of 1 and 2 Chronicles is the product of one author, whom we may call the Chronicler. Extensive additions to his work occur principally in the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1 to 9 and in other lists such as that of 1 Chronicles 23 to 27, which will accordingly be omitted from consideration in this study. While material from Ezra and Nehemiah was originally included in the study as an integral part of the work of the Chronicler, results of several phases of the study appeared to cast doubt upon the common authorship of Chronicles and these books.¹³ The study has therefore been pursued without support of materials from Ezra and Nehemiah, and the results of the study remain valid for possible use in the study of the authorship of those books.

¹²Cf., e.g., Martin Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1943), p. 110, who states: "Es ist jedoch sicher und allgemein anerkannt, dass wir in 1/2 Chr. + Esr./Neh. ein Werk vor uns haben. Es braucht also in diesem Falle nicht erst wie bei Dtr den Nachweis der literarischen Zusammengehörigkeit geführt zu werden," and O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 530.

¹³Cf. infra, pp. 212-222. The question of the authorship of Ezra-Nehemiah has recently been raised again by Sara Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," Vetus Testamentum, XVIII (1968), 330-371; and D. N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIII (1961), 436-442.

It was intended from the outset that this study should have value not only for the scholarly world but for the church at large. This aim may be considered to have been accomplished, first of all, by redirecting our attention to an extensive but often ignored portion of the Holy Scriptures and demonstrating once again the richness and variety of the message of one of its authors. Furthermore, in concentrating upon the figure of David we are dealing with the individual of most significance for the development of Messianism within both the Old Testament and the New, so our study should furnish us with at least one view of the place of David within Israel's hopes at the beginning of the intertestamental period. Finally, in viewing the work of the Chronicler in relationship to the remainder of the Old Testament we shall gain added insight into the manner in which a writer adopted, built upon, and applied to later generations the traditions handed down by those who had earlier served as the interpreters of God's great acts with men.

IV. Post-Solomonic Kings of Judah, 2 Chronicles 10 to 36

A skeleton outline such as this already indicates that David and Solomon occupy a disproportionate amount of space as contrasted with the remaining kings of Judah² and that any interest in the northern tribes is completely lacking except as it may relate to the southern kingdom. Later analysis will indicate that these two sections

¹Items considered later additions to the work of the Chronicler are enclosed within brackets throughout the paper.

²The amount of space dedicated to each king is to an extent dependent upon the presentations in Samuel and Kings.

CHAPTER II

1 CHRONICLES 22, 28, AND 29

The Context

In order to understand better the position which 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 occupy within the books of Chronicles and to gain a preliminary overview of the contents of these chapters, it would be well to rehearse briefly the major divisions of the Chronicler's work and to outline in somewhat more detail the primary units of chapters 22, 28, and 29, with which we shall be concerned.

Chronicles is usually divided into four primary units along the following lines:

- I. Introductory Genealogies, [1 Chronicles 1 to 9]¹
- II. David, 1 Chronicles 10 to 29
- III. Solomon, 2 Chronicles 1 to 9
- IV. Post-Solomonic Kings of Judah, 2 Chronicles 10 to 36

A skeleton outline such as this already indicates that David and Solomon occupy a disproportionate amount of space as contrasted with the remaining kings of Judah² and that any interest in the northern tribes is completely lacking except as it may relate to the southern kingdom. Later analysis will indicate that these two sections

¹Items considered later additions to the work of the Chronicler are enclosed within brackets throughout the paper.

²The amount of space dedicated to each king is to an extent dependent upon the presentations in Samuel and Kings.

concerning David and Solomon do indeed form the center of the Chronicler's message, and that in his presentation of the post-Solomonic kings he has accordingly altered the manner of his presentation.³

The unit which forms the nucleus of our study thus stands at the end of the David history and connects immediately with that portion of the Chronicler's work in which Solomon is the principal personage.

We may subdivide these two important units as follows:

- A. The David History, 1 Chronicles 10 to 21
 - 1. The Rise of David, 1 Chronicles 10 to 12
 - 2. David, the Ark, and the Cult, 1 Chronicles 13 to 17
 - 3. David's Wars, 1 Chronicles 18 to 21
- B. Transitional Unit, 1 Chronicles 22 to [23 to 27] 29
- C. The Solomon History, 2 Chronicles 1 to 9
 - 1. Introduction, 2 Chronicles 1
 - 2. Solomon and the Temple, 2 Chronicles 2 to 8
 - 3. Postscript: Solomon's Prosperity, 2 Chronicles 9

While Section B of the above outline, which we have chosen to designate a transitional unit, has commonly been included with the David history, this may be accounted for in large measure by the fact that David's death is not related until 1 Chron. 29:26-30. Overlooked is the fact that the unit is at least equally concerned with Solomon, who stands in the center of attention and whose anointing is related in 1 Chron. 29:22b-25 prior to the death of David. These chapters then may be considered equally well as a part of either the David or The Solomon history. Since we have reason to believe that the Chronicler has constructed these two portions of his history as a single

³Infra, pp. 167-168.

unit which has its exact center neither in David nor Solomon, but in the temple and its cult,⁴ it seems best to label the unit as transitional.

1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29: An Overview

In its present form 1 Chronicles 22 to 29 forms a single unit of the Chronicler's history spanning the period from David's decision to build the temple (1 Chron. 22:1) to the anointing of Solomon and the death of David (1 Chron. 29:22b-30). Apart from chapters 23 to 27, which we have assumed to be a later addition,⁵ this unit may best be viewed as centering around three speeches and a prayer of David, which are introduced and separated by narrative sections and briefer quotations. We shall again present the unit in tabular form, enclosing secondary material within brackets.

I. David's First Speech, 1 Chron. 22:1-19

A. David's Preparations, 1 Chron. 22:1-5

B. First Speech: Solomon is the legitimate temple builder, 1 Chron. 22:6-13 [14-16]

[C. David exhorts the leaders to help Solomon, 1 Chron. 22:17-19]

II. David's Second Speech, 1 Chron. 28:1-21

A. Second Speech: Solomon is presented to the assembly as temple builder, 1 Chron. 28:1-3 [4-5], 6-7 [8], 9-10

B. The transferral of the temple plans from David to Solomon, 1 Chron. 28:11, 12a [12b-18], 19

⁴Infra, Chapter IV.

⁵Supra, p. 8.

C. Closing exhortation, 1 Chron. 28:20-21

III. David's Third Speech, 1 Chron. 29:1-9

- A. Speech: David exhorts the assembly to contribute for the temple, 1 Chron. 29:1-5
- B. Response: The assembly contributes generously, 1 Chron. 29:6-9

IV. David's Prayer, 1 Chron. 29:10-30

- A. David's prayer of praise, 1 Chron. 29:10-19
- B. The anointing of Solomon, 1 Chron. 29:20-25
- C. The death of David, 1 Chron. 29:26-30

Each of these major units and each of the sub-units with the possible exception of the last two are centered in the construction of the temple. The first two speeches relate to Solomon's role as the legitimate temple builder, around which David's preparations for the temple have been clustered. The third speech speaks at length of David's contributions for the temple and exhorts the people to make similar contributions. David's prayer is a prayer of thanksgiving and praise for the generous contributions, coupled with a petition that Solomon may bring to completion the work of the temple. With the centrality of the temple thus in view we begin our study of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29.

⁶The phrase *na'ar wara* is repeated in 1 Chron. 29:1. The translation here reflects the fact that in 2 Chron. 13:7 Rehoboam appears to be accused for his part in the disruption of the kingdom because he was a *na'ar wara* (1965). Cf. Gen. 20:8; Jer. 1:5.

⁷Reading the *lethib h'ad* against the *gare* and *versio*. Cf. the usage in 28:16, 29:1, and especially at the beginning of direct discourse in 28:20.

Detailed Analysis

1 Chron. 22:2-19

Translation and text

(1) Then David said, "This is the house of Yahweh God, and this is Israel's altar for burnt offering." (2) David then gave command to gather the resident aliens who were in the land of Israel, and he appointed masons who would cut hewn stones for building the house of God. (3) And David made provision for much iron for the nails for the doors of the gates and for the clamps, and so much bronze it could not be weighed, (4) together with cedar wood without limit, for the Sidonians and Tyrians brought much cedar to David.

(5) For David had said, "Solomon my son is young and immature,⁶ and the house which is to be built for Yahweh must be exceedingly great, an object of renown and splendor for all lands. Therefore I will provide for it." So David made elaborate provisions before his death.

(6) Then he summoned Solomon his son and commanded him to build a house for Yahweh, the God of Israel. (7) And David said to Solomon his son,⁷ "So far as I was concerned, I had my heart set on building

⁶The phrase na'ar wārāk is repeated in 1 Chron. 29:1. The translation here reflects the fact that in 2 Chron. 13:7 Rehoboam appears to be excused for his part in the disruption of the kingdom because he was a na'ar w'erak lēbāb. Cf. Deut. 20:8; Jer. 1:5.

⁷Reading the kethib b'enô against the qere and versions. Cf. the usage in 28:6; 29:1, and especially at the beginning of direct discourse in 28:20.

a house for the name of Yahweh my God. (8) But the word of God came to me, 'You have shed very much blood and waged great wars. You shall not build a house for my name, for you have shed much blood on the ground before me. (9) Lo, a son will be born to you. He will be a man of rest, and I will give rest to him from all his enemies on every side. For his name will be Solomon, and I will give Israel peace and quiet in his days. (10) He will build a house for my name, and he will be my son, and I will be his father. I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel for ever.'

(11) "Now, my son, may Yahweh be with you, that you may prosper and build the house of Yahweh your God, as he has spoken concerning you. (12) Only may Yahweh give you intelligence and understanding [. . .]⁸ that you may keep the Torah of Yahweh your God. (13) Then you will prosper, if you observe to do the statutes and the judgments which Yahweh commanded Moses for Israel. Be strong and be courageous; do not be afraid and do not be terrified!" [(14) And behold, by my hard work I have provided for the house of Yahweh one hundred thousand talents of gold, a million talents of silver, bronze and iron beyond weighing (it was so much). Timber and stones also I have provided and you will add to them. (15) And with you in abundance are workmen,

⁸The present text is untranslatable and may well represent either an error that has crept into the text (cf. the Septuagint, which reads katischusai for the Massoretic text's wiṣaww^ekâ) or a later insertion. Cf. J. Rothstein and D. Hänel, Das erste Buch der Chronik, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, edited by Ernst Sellin (Leipzig: A Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927), XVIII, ii, 396. To retain the present text most modern translations consider wiṣaww^ekâ to introduce a temporal clause, "when he sets you over Israel."

hewers and gravers of wood and stone, and every (kind of) skilled workman for every (kind of) work, (16) (as well as) gold, silver, bronze, and iron beyond reckoning. Rise and act, and may Yahweh be with you."]⁹

[(17) And David commanded all the princes of Israel to help Solomon his son: "Is not Yahweh your God with you, and has he not given you rest on every side? For he has given into my hand the inhabitants of the land, so that the land is subdued before Yahweh

⁹The end of chapter 22 consists of two sections, both of which may best be considered expansions of the Chronicler's work. This first unit, vv. 14-16, while accepted by most scholars as an integral part of the speech of vv. 7-13, is rightly excluded by W. Rudolph, who gives the following reasons: (1) The figures listed for the gold and silver are so high and stand in such a poor relationship to the other figures listed by the Chronicler (cf. 29:4,7; 2 Chron. 9:13) that one can with justification assume that we have here a later addition of one who considered it impossible to evaluate the worth of the temple too highly; (2) That David placed numerous workers at Solomon's disposal for every conceivable kind of temple work is a heightening of v. 12; (3) V. 13 presents a clear conclusion beyond which nothing else is expected (W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher, Handbuch zum Alten Testament [Erste Reihe; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1955], XXI, 151*).

The following points would also support Rudolph's conclusion: (1) The looseness of the connection between v. 14 and the preceding w^ehinnēh; (2) The disjointed character of the verses as a whole. In addition to the kî lārōb hāyâ of v. 14, where the author seems to have forgotten that he was quoting David in the present tense, the gold, silver, bronze, and iron mentioned in v. 14 are repeated in v. 16. This is all the more outstanding since the gold and silver which are enumerated in v. 14 are in v. 16 said to be "without reckoning"; (3) In 22:2-4 there was no mention of workmen available to Solomon other than masons, nor of gold and silver. It appears to be typical of the expansions of the Chronicler's text to insert notice of all kinds of preparations, such as workmen, building materials, and lay support, into each portion of the original narrative rather than presenting the narrative as a progressive one in which various new preparations and arrangements are introduced at successive stages. The influence of the narrative of the construction of the tabernacle is often especially strong in these additions; (4) The note of David's prior contributions in 29:3 may well have led to their insertion here, since the later author saw room for a possible discrepancy.

and before his people. (19) Now, give your heart and soul to seek Yahweh your God, and rise and build the Sanctuary of Yahweh God to bring in the ark of the covenant of Yahweh and Yahweh's holy vessels to the house which is to be built for the name of Yahweh."]¹⁰

Structure and form

Dismissing verses 14 to 19 as extraneous to the Chronicler's work, chapter 22 consists of two major units, the first (verses 1 to 5) primarily in narrative form and the second (verses 6 to 13) in the form of a longer speech of David to Solomon. The chapter may be viewed in tabular form as follows:

- A. Narrative. David's arrangements for the temple (verses 1 to 5)
1. David determines the site, verse 1 (wayyō'mer dāwīd)¹¹
 2. David provides material and workmen, verses 2 to 5

¹⁰Vv. 17-19 have been more commonly denied to the Chronicler (cf. Rudolph, XXI, 151-152; M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien [Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1943], p. 112), although the reason given is usually restricted to the fact that the section appears to be a doublet of chapter 28. It should also be noted, however, that there is here no indication of the prior convening of the princes addressed in these verses (cf. v. 17), nor is there any real reason to suppose that they were already present for David's previous address to Solomon. Rudolph correctly notes that chapter 28 does not request the assembly to assist Solomon in the building of the temple apart from the offering to defray its cost. The insertion of an exhortation to the princes here is probably occasioned by the later insertion of chaps. 23 to 27 (infra, p. 39), which gave the appearance of separating David's private address to Solomon from the public address of chapter 28 by a considerable period of time.

¹¹Words significant for the understanding of the structure of the section have been included within parentheses.

- a. The provisions, verses 2 to 4 (wayyō'mer dāwīd)
 - b. Rationale for the provisions, verse 5 (wayyō'mer dāwīd)
- B. Speech. David's first speech to Solomon, verses 6 to 13
- 1. Framework, verse 6
 - 2. Speech: David designates Solomon as temple builder, verses 7 to 13
 - a. David's disqualification, verses 7 to 8 (wayyō'mer dāwīd)
 - b. Solomon's divine choice, verses 9 to 10 (hinnēh)
 - c. Concluding exhortation, verses 11 to 13 ('attā)

The brief quotations of verses 1,5 and the indirect statement of verses 2 to 4 are introduced with the identical phrase wayyō'mer dāwīd, as is also the longer speech of verses 7 to 13. The emphatic 'ānī of verse 7 focuses attention sharply upon David, while the oracle of verses 8 to 10, which is introduced with the oracular formula wayehi'ālay dēbar yhwh lē'mōr includes an explicit disqualification of David as temple builder and through the emphatic hinnēh of verse 9 turns our attention rather to Solomon. David's final exhortation to Solomon is set apart both by the introductory 'attā of verse 11 and the concluding four-fold imperative of verse 13. Further structural and logical divisions within this last unit are indicated by the restrictive 'ak of verse 12 and the particle 'āz of verse 13.

Formally verses 1 to 5 consist of a narrative in which brief quotations of David have been included in verses 1,5. Verses 7 to 13 are a longer speech, including a prophetic oracle in verses 8 to 10 and the components of the form for the induction of a leader into an office in verses 11 to 13.

Since a general discussion of the various speech forms has been included in the appendix,¹² and the function of the speech form in the structure of the Chronicler's work as a whole will be covered later,¹³ we need present here only a summary of David's first speech as it relates to the speech form elsewhere in Chronicles. The brief quotes of verses 1 and 5 may be seen to be excellent examples of the royal edict,¹⁴ which the Chronicler has used with some frequency to lend authority to certain cultic institutions, and of our first smaller group of sayings,¹⁵ in which the Chronicler gives the reason behind an action which he relates. The longer speech of verses 6 to 13 is similar to various other speeches by kings in its use of the vocative, in its use of what amounts to a historical retrospect (verses 7 to 10), and its basic hortatory character is apparent in the jussive and imperatives of verses 11, 12, and 13. Like most of such speeches, it is directly related to the cult. It differs from the remaining speeches, however, in that in it alone the king addresses his son and successor, in the use of the lengthy indirect quotation of verses 8 to 10, in the manner in which this prophetic oracle is used to "prove" Solomon's right to build the temple, and, as we shall see, in the more extensive use which it makes of the form for the induction of a leader into his office (verses 11 to 13).

¹²Infra, pp. 225-251.

¹³Infra, pp. 158-168.

¹⁴Infra, p. 228.

¹⁵Ibid.

These structural elements point clearly to the construction of the temple as the central element with which this chapter is concerned, the backdrop for which was supplied already by chapter 21. Each and every element in the outline converges upon the construction of the temple, and that to a degree which the following analysis will make evident.

The centrality of the temple and Solomon's role in its construction is indicated first of all by the analysis of verses 11 to 13 in terms of what Norbert Lohfink has termed the Amtseinsetzung Gattung. Proceeding on the basis of Joshua 1, Lohfink has isolated three elements which he believes formed a part of the original form for the induction of an individual into an office:

1. The Ermutigungsformel, or formula of encouragement, hāzaq we'ēmaš, Joshua 1:6a.
2. The description of the task to which the individual is inducted, introduced by kî 'attâ, Joshua 1:6b.
3. The Beistandsformel, or formula of accompaniment, of which the central element is 'immekā yhwh, Joshua 1:9b.¹⁶

¹⁶Norbert Lohfink, "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josue," Scholastic, XXXVII (1962), 32-44. Lohfink has arrived at his conclusions on the basis of an analysis of all of the passages which speak of the commissioning of Joshua for his task in connection with the structure of the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua. He concludes that Joshua was actually given two offices, that of the leader of the army which would take the promised land and that of the "apportioner" who would distribute the various inheritances. In Deut. 3:18-28 Yahweh charges Moses to induct Joshua into both offices, a charge which he keeps before the people in Deut. 31:2-8. At this convocation a theophany also occurs, and Yahweh himself also inducts Joshua into his office as commander of the armies (Deut. 31:14-15,23). However, there is here no mention of Joshua as apportioner. Joshua 1:2-9 then presents the final stage, with Yahweh commanding Joshua to begin the exercise of his role as general and now inducting him as well into his second office,

If Lohfink's arguments are accepted, it becomes apparent that 1 Chron. 22:11-13 exhibits the same characteristics and thus portrays Solomon's induction into office by David. The formula of accompaniment is found in verse 11, the formula of encouragement in verse 13, and the description of the task in verse 11. Accordingly it is significant that the major--indeed, the only--task assigned to Solomon in this pericope is the construction of the temple. This concern for the building of the temple is in fact the only thing which these verses have in common with the first part of the speech, verses 5 to 10. This point will be developed further in the tradition and motif studies which follow.

Tradition and motif studies

The Chronicler has been greatly influenced by three blocks of materials in framing his first speech. For the first part of the speech (verses 7 to 10) he has utilized in particular 1 Kings 5:17-19¹⁷ and the related material of 2 Samuel 7 (= 1 Chronicles 17).¹⁸

that of apportioner. Lohfink believes the book of Joshua then exhibits a comparable structure, chaps. 1 to 12 treating the conquest of the land and 13 to 21 the apportionment of West Jordan. The Gattung is also apparent in 2 Sam. 10:12, which demonstrates that it is not just a literary form. Among other occurrences Lohfink mentions Hag. 2:4 and 2 Chron. 19:11b, and in a diluted form 1 Chron. 22:11-16; 28:20 (Lohfink, p. 39). Lohfink admits that already in Joshua 1 we have a clearly extended use of the form, the original kernel of which lies in verses 6,9b, and that the formula of encouragement of the Amtseinsetzung has become mixed with that of the Holy War.

¹⁷The Hebrew versification is followed throughout the thesis.

¹⁸The equals sign (=) is used to indicate a section essentially identical in the Deuteronomic history and Chronicles.

For the second part of the speech he is primarily dependent upon the account of Joshua's induction by Moses in the final chapters of Deuteronomy and especially Joshua 1:2-9.

In view of the tradition that Solomon had built the temple, although David had desired to do so, the Chronicler has used the first part of this speech to explain David's disqualification as temple builder. The reason stated is clear and unequivocal. A direct command had come to David from Yahweh forbidding him to build the temple, since he had "shed very much blood and waged great wars" (verse 8).¹⁹ In drawing this conclusion the Chronicler is clearly dependent upon 1 Kings 5:17-19, which he has otherwise omitted in his rewriting of the relationship between Solomon and Hiram in 2 Chronicles 2:²⁰

You know that David my father could not build a house for the name of the Lord his God because of the warfare with which his enemies surrounded him, until the Lord put them under the soles of his feet. But now the Lord my God has given me rest on every side; there is neither adversary nor misfortune. And so I purpose to build a house for the name of the Lord my God, as the Lord said to David my father, "Your son, whom I will set upon

¹⁹The reference to Yahweh's command no doubt refers to the words of the prophet Nathan, cf. 2 Sam. 7:5, restated more emphatically in 1 Chron. 17:4. While David's disqualification should probably not be interpreted as so critical of David as it was necessary from the Chronicler's viewpoint to legitimize Solomon's role as temple builder, it is nevertheless significant that the Chronicler, whatever his reason, does not avoid a statement which clearly detracts from the idealistic view of David which according to many commentators is his.

²⁰Other examples can be cited where the Chronicler has in his narrative omitted a section of Kings, the thought of which has been of special importance in shaping his own theology. Cf. 1 Kings 8:54-61, which contains many ideas adopted by the Chronicler, but which is not found in 2 Chronicles 7. This is a characteristic of the Chronicler's use of his sources which has not been noted previously.

your throne in your place, shall build the house for my name
(1 Kings 5:17-19, English verses 3 to 5).

Scholars have previously noticed that the Chronicler has reinterpreted this passage in our pericope. In Kings David's failure to build the temple is viewed as the natural result of the fact that he was engaged in warfare and thus did not have sufficient time to accomplish such major building activities as the temple. However, there is no indication that his warfare had in any way occasioned the divine verdict that he was forbidden to build the temple. For the Chronicler, however, David's wars, and especially the bloodshed involved,²¹ have disqualified him as the potential temple builder.

A study of the m^enûhâ concept which is introduced in verse 9 indicates further dependence upon the Kings passage cited. The words of Solomon as reported in Kings had made the distinction that Solomon had enjoyed "rest" in a sense in which David had not, and therefore could build the temple. Chronicles draws this distinction more sharply and maintains that what was forbidden to David because of his bloodshed and wars was permitted to Solomon, the 'îš m^enûhâ, to whom Yahweh will give rest (wah^hni^hô^{tî}) from his enemies round about.²²

²¹J. Myers, 1 Chronicles, The Anchor Bible, edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), XII, 154, can speak of "a strong psychological revulsion against bloodshed" in Chronicles, and Rudolph too comments upon this advanced viewpoint of the writer, which he finds contrary to all Old Testament traditions (Rudolph, XXI, 151).

²²1 Chron. 22:9, and cf. 1 Kings 5:18.

That the Chronicler's conception of rest stems from the Deuteronomistic historian may be considered certain. Only two passages from the Tetrateuch are of possible import,²³ while the Deuteronomistic history contains no less than thirteen occurrences of words from the root nûah. Apart from the occurrences in Deuteronomy itself (3:20; 12:9,10; 25:19), the remaining usages are clustered tightly around three events--the conquest of the land of Canaan by Joshua (Joshua 1:13,15; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1), the dynastic promise to David (2 Sam. 7:1,11), and the erection of the temple by Solomon (1 Kings 5:18; 8:56). It is immediately apparent that each of these events is of considerable importance for the Deuteronomistic historian.

The gift of the promised land is the obvious referent of all of the passages in Joshua, as may be seen most clearly in the passage with which the writer concludes his account of the conquest:

Thus the Lord gave to Israel all the land which he swore to give to their fathers; and having taken possession of it, they settled there. And the Lord gave them rest on every side just as he had sworn to their fathers; not one of all their enemies had withstood them, for the Lord had given all their enemies into their hands. Not one of all the good promises which the Lord had made to the house of Israel had failed; all came to pass (Joshua 21:43-45).

²³Ex. 33:14; Num. 10:33-36. For previous discussion of the m^enûhâ concept, see G. von Rad, "There Remains Still a Rest for the People of God: An Investigation of a Biblical Concept," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, translated by E. W. T. Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), pp. 94-102; and also R. A. Carlson, David, the Chosen King: A Traditio-historical approach to the Second Book of Samuel, translated by Eric Sharpe and Stanley Rudman (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964), pp. 97-106 and passim. The conclusions stated here, while agreeing in many respects with those of Carlson especially, were arrived at independently by the writer except as noted.

But the particular significance of m^enûhâ for the writer of the Deuteronomic history and for our study is especially clear from its use in Deuteronomy 12, which has long been regarded as a touchstone of Deuteronomic theology. There the writer relates that after Israel is settled in the promised land and the central sanctuary has been established

You shall not do according to all that we are doing here this day, every man doing whatever is right in his own eyes; for you have not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord your God gives you. But when you go over the Jordan, and live in the land which the Lord your God gives you to inherit, and when he gives you rest from all your enemies round about so that you live in safety, then to the place which the Lord your God will choose, to make his name dwell there, thither you shall bring all that I command you: your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, your tithes and the offering that you present, and all your votive offerings which you vow to the Lord (Deut. 12:8-11).

For Deuteronomy the concept of rest is therefore integrally bound up with the unification of the cult at one central sanctuary, which in fact meant the Jerusalem temple, desired by David and built by Solomon. In fact, the Deuteronomic historian does not use the m^enûhâ concept again after the settlement of the land under Joshua until the introduction of Nathan's oracle in 2 Sam. 7:1, where it is once again immediately connected with the construction of the temple.²⁴ Strangely enough, the writer seems to be willing on the one hand to ascribe such

²⁴That the root šāqat is regularly used in the book of Judges to denote the periodic rest following the deliverance gained by the various judges is no doubt significant, although it is difficult to see what relationship, if any, exists between this temporary rest and the m^enûhâ of the age of Joshua or, more important, the m^enûhâ of Deuteronomy 12, 2 Samuel 7, or the age of Solomon, which, as will be shown, was the prerequisite for the construction of the temple. Carlson, p. 100, believes šāqat denotes a less permanent form of rest.

rest to the reign of David (1 Sam. 7:1,11), although he did not actually build the temple, and on the other hand to reserve this rest for the reign of Solomon (1 Kings 5:17-19).²⁵ It is clear at any rate that Solomon enjoyed this rest in some sense that his father David did not, from which it was apparent to Solomon, says the author, that the role of temple builder, which in 2 Samuel 7 was to belong to one of the descendants of David, was in fact his alone.

The completeness and finality of the rest attained by Solomon for the Deuteronomic historian is further indicated by a comparison of Solomon's dedicatory prayer and Joshua 21:43-45. Both 1 Kings 8:56 and the Joshua passage point to the events just concluded as the culmination of Yahweh's earlier promises to the fathers: "Not one word has failed of all his good promise, which he uttered by Moses his servant." Although the terminology of rest is not utilized in Solomon's earlier prayer (1 Kings 8:16-21), here too the completion of the temple and the placing of the ark within it are clearly looked upon as the fulfillment of the promises to the fathers, achieved at last by the Davidic dynasty.²⁶

²⁵Perhaps the problem created by these two disparate conceptions can also be blamed for the resultant confusion of tenses in 1 Sam. 7:9. Cf. the statement of 7:1, where the rest is already given to David, with wahānīhōti of 7:11, which, taken as a waw-constructive form, appears to reserve such rest for the future. Hans Hertzberg, I & II Samuel, The Old Testament Library, translated by J. S. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1964), in loc., accordingly rejects the future translation of the Revised Standard Version and most scholars.

²⁶While it has been noted that the Sinaitic covenant may have been superseded by the Davidic covenant in the Deuteronomic history, the possibility that the same writer may in 1 Kings 8 have viewed both

Despite the difficulties involved in the analysis of the various sources in Joshua, the basic connection between rest and the building of the temple is dramatically confirmed by the reading of Joshua 11:23 in connection with Joshua 18:1. Here too the former passage relates that the land had rest (šāqat), and the latter, which follows immediately upon the apportionment of the land which occupies chapters 12 to 17 in the final form of the book, relates that the people then assembled to Shiloh to set up the tent of meeting, since the land lay subdued (nikb^ešâ) before them. While the change of vocabulary is striking and suggests a source other than that found in Joshua 21:43-45; 23:1, it appears likely that the Deuteronomic idea of rest as the prerequisite for the construction of the temple has been read back into the days of the conquest as related to the erection of the tabernacle. The Chronicler's use of šāqat in 1 Chron. 22:9 in parallel with m^enûhâ supports the idea that he found such a passage as this before him also.²⁷

the Sinaitic and Davidic covenants as having attained their goal in the erection of the temple has to my knowledge not been suggested previously. The association of the chosen city, the chosen ruler, the temple, and the ark in this single pericope is most striking. Such a theory might prove helpful in attempting to solve the problem of the absence of a Davidic emphasis in the last part of the Chronicler's work.

²⁷Von Rad, pp. 94-96, makes a distinction between the concept of rest in Deuteronomy, where he believes it depicts the nations salvation here and now in the promised land, and in the Deuteronomic history, where an element of expectation remains in view of Israel's past failures, and "rest" is that which a weary nation finds through the grace of God. However, von Rad has not noticed the connection between the gift of the land and the building of the temple, nor has he seen the pivotal significance of 1 Kings 5:17-19. Carlson, p. 101, believes that David's rest is shown to be of greater ideological

Therefore we may see that the Chronicler has adopted from the Deuteronomic history the idea that a God-given rest in the promised land marked the culmination of Yahweh's promises to Israel and was the necessary prerequisite for the construction of the temple. Moreover, he has on the basis of 1 Kings 5:17-19 correctly noted that even for the Deuteronomic historian Solomon had enjoyed this rest in a unique sense. Therefore by a process of reasoning he has concluded that David did not construct the temple because of his warfare, and accordingly there could have been no rest during David's reign. For the Chronicler such rest took place only during the reign of Solomon, the "man of rest."²⁸

That such ideas were indeed in the Chronicler's thoughts can be seen from his handling of two passages from 2 Samuel 7. The writer of that chapter was willing to say, although admitting that David was not permitted to build the temple, that God had "given rest to him round about" (2 Sam. 7:1). The Chronicler, however, was unwilling to ascribe that rest to David, and has omitted it entirely in his parallel account (1 Chron. 17:1). Furthermore, where 2 Sam. 7:11 read, "and I have/will give(n) rest to you from all your enemies" the Chronicler

importance by the fact that it was he who subjugated Amalek (1 Samuel 30), which Deut. 25:19 marked for extinction when God had given rest to his people. Otherwise, however, he states that it was David's victory over the Philistines which motivates the use of hēnīah in 2 Sam. 7:1.

²⁸The description of David as one who had shed blood (2 Chron. 22:8) is unique to the Chronicler and possibly is meant only to contrast with Solomon, the "man of peace." The Chronicler otherwise does not hesitate to describe Israel's victories enthusiastically, cf. 2 Chron. 13:17; 14:13; 20:22-25; 25:12.

has once again altered the text significantly, reading a similar but less pregnant "I will subdue (w^ehikna[']tî) all your enemies" (1 Chron. 17:10). In the light of the Chronicler's handling of the term elsewhere it appears certain that both alterations are intentional. The Chronicler has completely removed the m^enûhâ which he considered necessary for the construction of the temple from the reign of David and transferred it to the reign of Solomon, thus "proving" Solomon's right to construct the temple.

The Chronicler has reenforced his proof of Solomon's right to build the temple, as well as to reign, by a clever combination of the m^enûhâ theme with the name š^elômôh, and by bringing both into immediate relationship with the dynastic oracle of 2 Samuel 7. Both 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicles 17 speak in unconditional terms of the promise to David's offspring²⁹ who will build a house for the name of the Lord. However, in neither case is it so much as hinted that the chosen seed is to be Solomon. The Chronicler, however, makes the name š^elômôh itself a part of the divinely given oracle (verse 9). The writer himself states that Solomon was given the name out of deference to the peace and quiet which Yahweh would bestow during his reign. With the name Solomon introduced so skillfully in verse 9, one hardly notices the hû' introducing verse 10, which in its original context referred to the unnamed seed who would inherit the promise, but which has now been made to refer directly to Solomon. The

²⁹For the alteration in the Chronicler's text, which does not at any rate name Solomon, see infra, pp. 117-118, note 16.

identity of Solomon with the chosen seed who will build the temple is thus complete.

Turning to the second part of David's speech, 22:11-13, we are immediately confronted with a completely different set of concepts which, together with the introductory attâ, separate this section from the preceding one. The dominant concepts of verses 7 to 9, such as the menûhâ theme, David's warfare and his rejection, the name Solomon, and the references to 2 Samuel 7, are all left behind, and a new type of concern now comes to the fore. Previous discussion has shown that this unit reflects the form for the induction of a leader into his office, such as Lohfink has defined on the basis of his study of Joshua 1.³⁰ Further study indicates that the Chronicler's formulation here is not only dependent upon the form which lies behind Joshua 1, but is in fact immediately dependent upon that pericope.

This dependency is apparent from the following:

1. The formula "May Yahweh be with you/Yahweh is with you" (verse 11, compare Joshua 1:5,9). It is of course true that this formula is common throughout the Old Testament. However, a large number of these usages are clustered around two individuals, Joshua and David,³¹ both of whom may on other grounds be seen to be of special importance for the Deuteronomic historian.³²

³⁰Supra, pp. 20-21.

³¹Joshua, Deut. 31:8,23; Joshua 1:5,9,17; 3:7; David, 1 Sam. 17:37; 18:14; 20:13; 2 Sam. 14:17; 7:3,9 = 1 Chron. 17:2,8.

³²Cf. Noth, pp. 5, 64-65; O. Plöger, "Reden und Gebete im deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk," Festschrift für Günther Dehn, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher (Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1957), pp. 35-49, both of whose analysis of the Deuteronomic history proceeds from speeches such as Joshua 1 and 2 Samuel 7.

2. Especially noteworthy for our study is the fact that the books of Kings posit this presence of God with no leader after the time of David except Hezekiah.³³
3. The introduction of the thought of prosperity points to the influence of Joshua 1:8 upon our pericope. Apart from the incidental references in 1 Kings 22:12,15 and Deut. 28:29, where lack of prosperity is listed as one of the curses resulting from disobedience to the covenant, Joshua 1:8 furnishes the only example of the use of the hiphil of šlh in Deuteronomy or the Deuteronomic history. The remaining uses in the Tetrateuch, all found in Genesis 24 and 39, have an entirely different setting.
4. The concern for the keeping of the law (verses 12 and 13). While this too is a common concern throughout Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic history, it is only in the verses at hand and Joshua 1:7-8 that this obedience is immediately associated with prosperity.
5. The exhortation "Be strong, be courageous; do not be afraid and do not be terrified" (verse 13) likewise consists of four words relatively common throughout the Deuteronomic history. While all four terms are found in this order only here and 2 Chron. 32:7, and with the pairs reversed ('al tîr^e'û we'al tēhattû hizkû we'imšû) in Joshua 10:24, the same sequence is found in both Deut. 31:6 and Joshua 1:9, but with a form of the root 'rš replacing htt. The use of 'rš is quite rare,³⁴ and it seems likely that the Chronicler has for this reason substituted for it the more common htt.

³³The phrase is conditional to Jereboam in 1 Kings 11:38, in which case it is surely not fulfilled, since Jereboam becomes the standing example of an evil king for the writer (cf. 1 Kings 13:33-34). The Chronicler omits the reference to God's presence with Hezekiah (cf. 2 Kings 18:7 with 2 Chronicles 29), although otherwise more favorably disposed toward Hezekiah than to any other post-Solomonic king.

³⁴Deut. 1:29; 20:3; 31:6; Joshua 1:9. A more common arrangement is the occurrence in pairs. For 'al/lô' tîr^e'û see Deut. 1:21; 31:8; Joshua 8:12; 1 Chron. 28:20; 2 Chron. 20:15,17; 32:5. For ḥazaq we'ēmāš see Deut. 31:7,23; Joshua 1:6,7,18. Lohfink, XXXVII, 32-44, believes that ḥazaq we'ēmāš was originally connected with the form for the introduction into office, while 'al tirā' we'al tēhat was originally associated solely with the holy war. Cf. also G. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1951), pp. 9-10.

Only one other passage resembles verses 11 to 13 closely enough to merit consideration:

When David's time to die drew near, he charged Solomon his son saying, "I am about to go the way of all the earth. Be strong, and show yourself a man, and keep the charge of the Lord your God, walking in his ways and keeping his statutes, his commandments, his ordinances, and his testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses, that you may prosper in all that you do and wherever you turn; that the Lord may establish his word which he spoke concerning me, saying, 'If your sons take heed to their way, to walk before me in faithfulness with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail you a man on the throne of Israel' " (1 Kings 2:1-4).

While this immediately becomes an attractive option in that it too records David's last charge to Solomon, any direct literary dependency must be rejected. The total concern of the Kings passage appears to be for the keeping of the law. The two other items in the passage which are reminiscent of 1 Chron. 22:11-13--the encouragement to "be strong" and the reference to prosperity, are present in a quite different way than in either Joshua 1 or 1 Chronicles 22.³⁵ Moreover, while all three elements of the form for induction into an office occur in both Joshua 1 and 1 Chronicles 22, 1 Kings 2 neither mentions any task for which Solomon is inducted nor does it contain the formula of accompaniment. The only real connection with the Gattung lies in the use of the root hzq.

However, it would be unwise to deny all connection between 1 Chronicles 22 and 1 Kings 2. Rather it appears that the Kings

³⁵While the root hzq does occur in v.2, it is not joined with any other words commonly associated with it in Joshua or Chronicles; moreover, the form used in waw-consecutive perfect rather than the imperative. Similarly the root used here of prosperity is skl rather than slh as in 1 Chron. 22:11-13.

passage was modeled very loosely on Joshua 1, and that David's charge to Solomon in 1 Kings 2 then suggested to the Chronicler a similar setting for the material which he wished to convey in 1 Chron. 22:6-13. However, the writer has followed Joshua 1:2-9 much more closely than had the writer of Kings.

We may then consider the literary dependency of 1 Chron. 22:11-13 upon Joshua 1 as assured. We may conclude then that even apart from the question of whether or not a form for induction into office existed, the Chronicler has recognized Joshua 1 as the commissioning of Joshua for a specific task and has used it as a model for entrusting to Solomon the task of building the temple.

But the Chronicler's purpose is made still more evident by the unique way in which he has utilized the Joshua material. This may be seen most clearly from verse 11: "And now, my son, may Yahweh be with you, that you may prosper and build the house of Yahweh" The relationship between God's presence and the prosperity which follows is here a much more direct and causal one than in Joshua.³⁶ But more important, this prosperity for the Chronicler is identical with the construction of the temple, while in the Joshua account success is viewed in more general terms of well-being and only indirectly related to the task for which Joshua has been inducted. The concluding phrase of verse 11, ". . . as he spoke concerning you," relates this pericope

³⁶Notice that in Joshua 1:7,8 the term "success" is applied only in connection with obedience to the law, although the relationship to Yahweh's presence may be implicit in vv. 5 and 9.

once again to the "proof" of Solomon's divine choice as it was stated in the previous section, especially verse 9.³⁷

Turning finally to 1 Chron. 22:1-5 we find that the Chronicler has supplemented the traditions known to him in a more overt way, so far as we can determine from the biblical record. The pronouncement of verse 1 may well reflect popular tradition that Ornan's threshing floor became the site of the temple, but this tradition is not represented elsewhere in the Old Testament. For the Chronicler the significant thing is that this particular place has been divinely validated as a place of prayer and sacrifice by the appearance of fire from heaven (1 Chron. 21:26). There is--again to our knowledge--no tradition to the effect that David made the preparations ascribed to him in verses 2 to 5,³⁸ although this subject is of considerable importance for the Chronicler. In verse 5 the Chronicler has dealt explicitly with the reason for David's preparations, which he states is due to the disparity between Solomon's youth and inexperience and the immensity of the task which lay before him in constructing a temple worthy

³⁷It is impossible to determine the source of the terms śēkel and bīnâ, neither occurring with particular frequency in either the Chronicler's or the Deuteronomist's history. Perhaps as it was stated that David prayed Yahweh would be with Solomon, and it is then related that he was (2 Chron. 1:1); and prayed that he might prosper, and the fulfillment of this prayer is likewise noted (1 Chron. 29:23); so the author, in the light of the well-known tradition concerning Solomon's wisdom, has also inserted such a prayer into David's final words. It is also possible that the root śkl, which occurs in Joshua 1:7-8 and may mean either to be or act wisely or to prosper has been wrongly (?) understood by the Chronicler.

³⁸It is barely conceivable that David's preparations may have been suggested by the remark of 1 Kings 7:51 (= 2 Chron. 5:1).

of Yahweh. With some qualification it would appear most reasonable to accept this explanation as that which lay closest to the heart of the Chronicler. While the designation of Solomon as na'ar wārāk is open to some question,³⁹ there is no question concerning the Chronicler's desire to magnify the temple. He may well have reasoned that preparations for such a magnificent edifice would have required years. The problem presented for the Chronicler may also have been heightened by his tendency to attribute the cultic concerns of the various kings to a very early period in their reigns.⁴⁰ While it is tempting to see parallels between David's role in making various provisions and conveying Solomon's commission to him to build the temple and Moses' work on the tabernacle and in inducting Joshua into his office, or even in Samuel's anointing of David while he was still a youth, these parallels, if present at all, must lie in the rather remote background. David's concluding address to Solomon may well have been suggested to the Chronicler by 1 Kings 2, as we have indicated previously. David's

³⁹While Solomon's age upon his accession is not given, the chronological note of 1 Kings 14:21, together with Solomon's forty-year reign, means that his son Rehoboam was born the year prior to his accession. Admittedly Solomon could still have been quite young at the time David would have begun his preparations. Josephus, Antiquities, VII, vii, 8, as cited by Rothstein and Hanel, XIII, 398, lists the age of Solomon as fourteen at his accession, while the Apostolic Constitutions, II, 1, mentions twelve years (ibid.). It is at any rate apparent that the phrase na'ar wārāk, which is later used to excuse Rehoboam's foolishness in dealing with the northern tribes, is in no way disparaging to Solomon here.

⁴⁰Cf. 1 Chron. 13:1; 2 Chron. 1:2; 24:4, and especially 29:3 and 34:3. Notice that the Chronicler omits 1 Kings 6:1, which has Solomon begin his work in the fourth year of his reign, with 2 Chron. 3:1 giving rather the impression that the temple work was begun almost immediately.

activity in preparing for the temple then is not merely the Chronicler's attempt to magnify David, as many commentators have stated. It is rather to magnify the temple and, as will be demonstrated,⁴¹ to draw a parallel between his accounts of David and Solomon.

While the Chronicler has tended to go his own way in presenting David's role in the preparations for the temple, many of the details of the section appear to be derived from the Solomonic portion of Kings. David's gathering of the aliens (verse 2) is probably patterned upon Solomon's similar act (1 Kings 5:27; 9:15,22).⁴² The mention of cedar, especially in connection with the Tyrians and inhabitants of Sidon, recalls Solomon's arrangements with Hiram of Tyre (1 Kings 5:15-32, especially verses 22 to 24 and verse 32) and the extensive use of it in 1 Kings 6:14-22. While the Kings account makes no mention of provisions for bronze, there is much emphasis upon the bronze articles constructed by the Tyrian craftsman-artist Hiram (1 Kings 7:14-47). There is no mention of iron in Kings, but considerable attention is given to the doors (1 Kings 6:31-34; 7:50; Ezek. 41:21-26); and the gates, also absent in Kings, are mentioned many times in Ezekiel's vision in Ezekiel 40 to 48. The statement of the purpose of the temple as being lešēm ûl'etiperet (verse 5) recalls such passages as Deut. 26:19; Jer. 13:11; 33:9, and Zeph. 3:19-20,

⁴¹Infra, pp. 139-144. Note that David's preparations are not used to detract from Solomon's role and that, moreover, David's rejection as temple builder is very emphatic.

⁴²Cf. the Chronicler's addition in 2 Chron. 2:16, where the parallel between the censuses of David and Solomon is explicitly drawn.

in all of which cases, however, it points to God's elect people as a "name and glory," rather than to the temple as here.

Accordingly we may conclude that the Chronicler has introduced David's preparations for the temple primarily to magnify the temple itself and, secondly, to provide David a place alongside Solomon in the preparations for Israel's major cultic institution. The specific provisions listed are largely derived from the Deuteronomic historian's account of the construction, with some details added from Ezekiel and others from the author's own knowledge.

Concluding summary

We may summarize the major points of this pericope, especially with reference to items of importance for the understanding of the books of Chronicles as a whole, by noting the following:

1. The temple site is approved by Yahweh through his visible acceptance of David's sacrifice. David himself then proclaims the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite as the locale for the future temple.
2. Immediately upon determination of the temple site, David begins preparations for the temple, which appear to have occupied him until the day of his death. At this point in the narrative the preparations consisted of conscripting masons for the stone work and in assembling quantities of the more routine building materials, such as iron, timber, bronze, and stone.
3. The major concern of the pericope is clearly with the erection of the temple and, more specifically, Solomon's role as the temple builder. Even David's preparations, it must be noted, are undertaken with Solomon's task in mind (verse 5). The Chronicler goes to great lengths to present Solomon not only as the temple builder designated by David, but much more as the one chosen by Yahweh. It was this interest, in combination with the traditions of 1 Kings 5:17-19, which prompted the idea of David's disqualification on the basis of his

warfare. David, the man of war (1 Chron. 28:3, compare 22:8), did not build the temple, for the construction of the temple was to mark the fulfillment of God's promise to give rest to his people (1 Kings 8:56). The Chronicler therefore removed every indication that such rest may have existed during the reign of David.

Solomon's divinely-given right to reign and build the temple is therefore proved first of all by the fact that he, unlike David, was an ʾiṣ m^enūḥâ, a man of rest. We have seen that the basis for this tradition lay in 1 Kings 5:17-19, where Solomon, contrasting his situation with David's, moves into the active construction of the temple because God had given him rest. But while this passage from Kings, together with 1 Kings 8:20, concludes that Solomon was the heir to the promises given to the Davidic dynasty because he had overcome all opposition and established himself as king, the Chronicler finds this proof even earlier. It was not conditional upon the results of political maneuverings, but was already contained in the words of Yahweh's oracle to David: "A son will be born to you . . . he will be a man of rest . . . because Solomon will be his name, and I will give peace and prosperity to Israel in his days. He will build a house for my name" (verses 8,9). By virtue of the name Solomon, "Peace," which the Chronicler relates directly to the God-given rest, Solomon has qualified as temple builder and heir to Israel's throne.

In verses 11 to 13 the use of the Amtseinsetzung Gattung has reemphasized Solomon's role as temple builder to the complete exclusion of all else. For Solomon to prosper means for him to be able to complete the temple. While this prosperity appears conditional on the one hand to Yahweh's presence with Solomon, and on the other hand to

obedience to the law which is itself the result of God-given intelligence and understanding (verse 13), the result is in any case completely certain, since it is Yahweh himself who has spoken of Solomon in this way (verse 11, compare verse 8).

That this emphasis upon the role of Solomon in constructing the temple should be so emphatic in David's speech may seem to be the result of reading too much into the Chronicler's words. The introduction to the speech in verse 6, however, completely substantiates our conclusions: "Then he [David] summoned Solomon his son, and he commanded him to build a house for Yahweh, the God of Israel." To return to the point from which we began our study of this unit, each element within the unit is directly related to that goal.

1 Chron. 23:1-2a; 28:1-21

Translation and text

[(23:1) When David was old and full of days, he made Solomon his son king over Israel. (23:2a) And he gathered all the princes of Israel and the priests and the Levites]⁴³ (28:1) And David

⁴³That 23:2a and 28:1 are doublets occasioned by the insertion of 23:2b to 27:34 is commonly acknowledged. But it appears likely that 23:1, commonly accepted as coming from the Chronicler's hand (cf. Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, 406; K. Gallig, *Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra und Nehemiah, Das Alte Testament Deutsch* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954], XII, *in loc.*), is also to be explained on the basis of the same insertion. The contents of both 1 Chron. 29:22, 28 speak against the originality of 23:1. The supposed dependency of 23:1 upon 1 Kings 1:1 and 2:1 often cited is no argument for the integrity of the verse, and it could moreover be argued that if the Chronicler were following his Vorlage carefully the words now contained in

assembled all the princes of Israel, [the princes of the tribes and the princes of the divisions who served the king and the princes of thousands and the princes of hundreds and the princes of all the king's property and cattle, as well as his sons, with the eunuchs and the mighty men, even every warrior, to Jerusalem.]⁴⁴ (2) And David the king rose to his feet and said, "Hear me, my brothers and my people. So far as I was concerned, it was in my heart to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, for the footstool of our God, and I made provisions for building. (3) But God said to me, 'You shall not build a house for my name, for you are a warrior and have shed blood. [(4) Yahweh, the God of Israel, chose me out of all my father's house to become king over Israel forever. For he chose Judah as preeminent, and in the house of Judah (he chose) my father's house,

23:1 should have been placed earlier than here. A similar conclusion may be reached on the basis of a comparison with Old Testament thought, which nowhere else dubs an individual Israelite king as a kingmaker. (Contrast also 2 Chron. 1:11=1 Kings 3:7, where Solomon's kingship is attributed directly to Yahweh!) Rudolph's suggestion that 23:1 be understood as a heading to chapters 28 and 29 appears unlikely, since, apart from the question of whether the verse has the form of a superscript, its presence at this place would separate chapter 22 from 28 and 29, while these three chapters rather have the appearance of a closely knit unit.

It accordingly seems **most** probable that 23:1 was also added to clarify the connection between chapters 22 and 28, originally quite direct but later obscured by the insertion of chapters 23 to 27. The insertion of šēnît in 29:22, whether by the same or a still later hand that 23:1, points at any rate to a realization of the difficulty involved.

⁴⁴This section too reflects expansion on the basis of chapters 23 to 27, as has been pointed out by Adam Welch, The Work of the Chronicler (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 26, and others. For the various princes see 27:1,2-15,16-22,25-31. The mention of the warriors was probably occasioned by 29:24, as was also the case with the mention of the king's sons.

and in my father's house he took pleasure in me, to make me king over all Israel. (5) And out of all my sons--for Yahweh has given me many sons--he has chosen Solomon my son to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh over Israel. (6) And he said to me,']⁴⁵ Solomon your son, he is the one who will build my house and my courts, for I have chosen him as my son, and I will be his father. (7) I will establish his kingdom forever, if he will be strong to do my commandments and my judgments as this day.' [(8) And now, before all Israel, the assembly of Yahweh, and in the ears of our God, keep and follow all the commandments of Yahweh your God, in order that you may possess the good land and that you may cause your sons to inherit it after you

⁴⁵It seems likely, as stated by Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, 495, but denied by Rudolph, XXI, 185, that vv. 4 and 5 are a later expansion of the idea of election found in vv. 6 and 10. This is suggested by the following: (1) The connection between vv. 3 and 6 is interrupted by vv. 4 and 5; (2) The concern elsewhere in this pericope is not with Solomon as king, as it is here, but as temple builder; (3) Several other items, while not contradictory to the concerns of the Chronicler as expressed elsewhere, are unusual. E.g., the omission of "all" before Israel in both vv. 4 and 5 (although "all Israel" does occur one time in v. 5) seems strangely reticent in this connection for the Chronicler, cf. 1 Chron. 29:21-26 and the related discussion infra, p. 94. The reference to an election of Judah is unparalleled elsewhere in Chronicles. The root rāṣā, used here of the election of David, occurs otherwise in Chronicles only in the difficult 29:3, where its meaning is entirely different. The reference to the "throne of the kingdom of Yahweh over Israel," while in general agreement with the Chronicler's thought (cf. 29:23), is unusually extended and verbose as compared with the simpler "the throne of Yahweh" of that verse, as well as the direct malkūtô, "his [Solomon's!] kingdom" of v. 7. On the other hand it should be admitted that if the verses be original with the Chronicler our study is not affected, since the major themes found here are found elsewhere in Chronicles. The introductory phrase of v. 6 becomes unnecessary with the omission of vv. 4 and 5 and should also be dropped.

for ever.]⁴⁶ (9) And now,⁴⁷ Solomon my son, know the God of your fathers⁴⁸ and serve him with a perfect heart and a willing spirit, for Yahweh examines all hearts and understands every thought. If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will reject you for ever. (10) See now that Yahweh has chosen you to construct a temple for the sanctuary. Be strong and act!"

(11) Then David gave Solomon his son the pattern of the temple⁴⁹ and its rooms, its treasuries, its upper chambers, its inner chambers, and the room for the mercy seat, (12) the pattern of all which he had

⁴⁶The use of plural verb forms throughout v. 8 is again indicative of later expansion in a speech which at every other point has Solomon as its object. An additional problem arises in that those who are addressed in plural form in v. 8 are at the same time urged to keep the law "before all Israel," and therefore must be the princes assembled in v. 1, although most commentators ignore this part of the problem. Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, 496-500, connect v. 7b directly with v. 9, as has been done in the translation above. Rudolph, while accepting the arguments of Rothstein, believes that v. 8a is the original introduction to Solomon's admonition, following which some such phrase as "hear my words" has fallen out (Rudolph, XXI, 184).

While it is impossible to decide on the originality of these introductory words, the readings of the Septuagint confirm the conflate character of v. 8. For example, Vaticanus reads "in the face of" instead of "before the eyes of," omits the word "Israel" before qahal yhw, omits "and in the ears of our God," as well as šimrū kol before mišwōt yhw. See also the significant difference of the Septuagint in v. 9 as indicated in the following note.

In addition it may be mentioned that the concluding phrase of v. 8 speaks of Israel's "causing her children to inherit the land" in a manner unparalleled elsewhere in Chronicles.

⁴⁷Reading ʿattâ with the Septuagint instead of ʿattâ. With the addition of v. 8 with its introductory wʿattâ the identical form at the beginning of v. 9 was altered.

⁴⁸Reading the plural ʿabōt with the Septuagint against the Hebrew. Cf. the remarks on 29:10,18 infra, p. 76, note 96.

⁴⁹Reading tou ʿierou with most Septuagint manuscripts.

in mind⁵⁰ [concerning the courts of the house of Yahweh and concerning all of the chambers round about, the treasuries of the house of God and the treasuries for holy things; (13) and concerning the divisions of the priests and the Levites and all the work of the service of Yahweh's house, and concerning all the vessels of the service of Yahweh's house. (14)--for the gold by weight for the gold (things), for every service; (silver) by weight for all the vessels of silver, for every service, (15) the weight of the golden lampstands and their lamps, even of each lampstand and its lamps, according to the usage of its lampstand, (16) and the gold for the tables of showbread, for each table, and silver for the tables of silver, (17) and pure gold for the forks, the basins, and cups; for the golden bowls, the weight of each bowl, for the silver bowls, the weight of each; (18) and for the refined gold by weight for the incense altar; also for the gold for the model of the chariot of the cherubim that spread their wings and

⁵⁰So with the Septuagint and most older commentaries. Since Rothstein it has become common to see here a reference to inspiration, but the grounds for doing so seem insufficient. The commentary of Rothstein and Hánel, XVIII, ii, *in loc.*, mentions only the position of ‘immô, which they believe show ‘immô should be understood as a relative clause modifying rûah, and therefore to be separated from it. Rudolph, XXI, 186, adds that for the Chronicler rûah never means the human spirit, an argument adopted by Myers, XII, 186. But the references to the use of the preposition ‘im in such passages as 1 Kings 11:11 seem to support the translation offered above rather than one which would refer to inspiration. It is moreover to be noted that the Chronicler's portrayal of inspiration elsewhere is considerably more dynamic than here, cf. 1 Chron. 12:9; 2 Chron. 15:1; 20:14; 24:20. Rudolph's lack of equivocation concerning rûah in Chronicles is surprising in view of such passages as 2 Chron. 21:16 and 36:22 (=Ezra 1:1). Both Rothstein and Rudolph have been influenced unduly here by the tabernacle narrative, which pictures Bezalel as inspired by God, and by v. 19, which does attribute inspiration to the plans.

covered the ark of the covenant of Yahweh.]⁵¹ (19) All he (David) made plain to him in a writing from the hand of Yahweh,⁵² including all the details of the pattern.

(20) And David said to Solomon his son, "Be strong, be courageous, and act; do not be afraid and do not be terrified, for Yahweh

⁵¹There is no agreement concerning the authenticity or integrity of 28:12b-18. While numerous modern commentaries view the entire chapter as a unity from the hand of the Chronicler (cf. Myers, XII, 192-193; E. Curtis and A. Madsen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), XI, 298-300), others see in this section the mark of two or more hands. If one can speak of a critical consensus, it would be that of Rothstein and Rudolph, both of whom consider vv. 12b, 13a, and 14 to 18 as secondary. Others also consider v. 19 to be later on the basis that vv. 10 and 20 are doublets, although Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, ii, 496, preserve v. 19 for the Chronicler by considering it originally to have stood after v. 21.

Despite the subjective nature of the argument, it appears that the lengthy description of the temple vessels in vv. 14 to 18 should be excluded. Rudolph's comments on vv. 12b and 13a are equally relevant here: "Wenn sich der. Chr. dort, wo es um den Temple selbst geht, so kurz fasst, ist nicht anzunehmen, dass er so lange beim Zweck der Tempelzellen verweilt" (Rudolph, XXI, 185). Attention must also be given to the grammatical difficulties involved in the translation of vv. 14 to 18. These verses do not in fact constitute any recognizable grammatical construction, and can be translated only by taking liberties with the text. If vv. 14 to 18 are judged an insertion, it is difficult to see why vv. 12a β b, which is largely repetitive of v. 11, and 13b, the emphasis of which upon the temple vessels is lacking elsewhere in chaps. 22, 28, and 29, should not likewise be omitted. Then v. 12a α may be seen to connect quite directly with v. 19.

⁵²The text is awkward and no completely suitable solution has been found. The most extensive discussion is that of Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, ii, 503-506. Most proposed emendations have taken Yahweh as the subject of hiškil, and understood 'ālāyw (to which 'ālay must seemingly be altered in any case) to refer to David, or else have connected 'ālāyw with miyyad yhwh. But on the basis of the Septuagint's 'edōken Daweid Salōmōn, "David gave to Solomon," it is possible to understand David as the subject, "He [David] taught him [Solomon] everything in a writing from the hand of Yahweh," thus requiring only a single textual change.

God, even my God, is with you. He will not abandon you, and he will not forsake you, until all of the work of the service of the house of Yahweh is finished. (21) And here are the divisions of the priests and the Levites for all the service of God's house. And with you for all the work will be every workman skilled for every kind of work,⁵³ and the princes and all the people will be at your command."

Structure and form

Chapter 28, like chapter 22, consists primarily of a speech. In this case the speech is interrupted by the narrative of the transfer of the plans for the temple from David to Solomon and extended by a verse in which David places various people at Solomon's disposal for work on the temple. The chapter may be outlined as follows:

- A. David's second speech, verses 1 to 3,6,7,9 to 12, 19, 20
 - 1. Framework, verses 1 and 2a (wayyāqom dāwîd . . . wayyō 'mer)
 - 2. Speech: David presents Solomon as temple builder, verses 2a,3,6
 - a. The address, verse 2a (šēmā 'ûnî)
 - b. David forbidden to build the temple, verses 2b,3 ('ânî)
 - c. Choice of Solomon, verses 6,7 (š'elômōh binkâ)
 - d. First exhortation, verses 9,10 (w'e'attâ)
- B. Transfer of temple plans, verses 11,12, 19
- C. Concluding exhortation, verses 20 and 21
 - 1. Exhortation, verse 20 (wayyō 'mer dāwîd)
 - 2. People placed at Solomon's disposal, verse 21 (w'e'hinnēh)

⁵³The combination n^edîb lēbāb has been suggested by kol n^edîb libbō of Ex. 35:5 and kol hākām lēb of Ex. 35:10. In this context hākām regularly has to do with skilled craftsmen, thus suggesting the rendering here. Cf. Curtis and Madsen, XI, 301.

The structure of this speech is closely related to David's speech in 1 Chronicles 22. While it is impossible to consider the structure of these chapters apart from their content, the following listing of similarities between the two chapters then indicates their many common elements:

<u>Chapter 28</u>		<u>Chapter 22</u>
28:2	Note of assembly	22:6
28:2	Formula of address	22:7
28:2	David's desire to build the temple	22:7
28:3	David's prior preparations	22:2-5
28:3	David forbidden to build	22:8
28:6	Solomon chosen to build	22:9
28:7	Dynastic promise	22:10
28:9,10,20	Exhortation to Solomon	22:11-13
28:9	Introduction by 'attâ ⁵⁴	22:11
28:9	The vocative b ^{en} î	22:11
28:10,20	Designation of the task	22:11
28:9 (cf. verse 6)	Concern for keeping the law	22:12,13
28:9	Resulting prosperity	22:11b,13a
28:9b,20	Yahweh's presence assured	22:11
28:10,20	Formula of encouragement	22:13

While the similarities throughout the two chapters are striking, they are particularly noticeable between 22:7-9 and 28:2,3,6, which rehearse David's plans to build the temple and the subsequent choice of Solomon to do so; and in comparing 22:11-13, which we have seen to be based on an ancient formula for the induction of an individual into an office, with the exhortations of 28:9,10,20, where, despite differences in vocabulary and conceptions which are quite striking, the underlying form is still apparent.

Despite these many similarities chapter 28 also reflects significant differences in its structure. David's preparations for the

⁵⁴Reading 'attâ with the Septuagint, *supra*, page 42, note 47.

temple, which in 22:2-5 stood as a kind of prelude to his discourse with Solomon, are here introduced into the body of the speech itself, 28:3.⁵⁵ The introduction of the speech in 28:2 is much more formal than in 22:7, as would appear proper before a larger assembly. The two direct quotations of Yahweh in verses 3 and 6 mark the major divisions of the first part of David's discourse. Not only is the exhortation marked at its beginning, verse 9, with the particle ‘attâ, but verse 10 is clearly marked as the first conclusion of the speech not only by the emphatic re'êh ‘attâ with which it is introduced, but also by its restatement of Solomon's task as temple builder (compare verse 6) and by the formula of encouragement, hazaq wa'āseh, which recalls the hazaq we'emās of 22:13. This exhortation is repeated in more extended form in verse 20, which in other ways as well shows its final character. With the loose connective wehinnēh verse 21 broaches for the first time the subject of the active involvement of the people in the work with Solomon.

Like David's earlier speech, this too contains the introductory vocative (verse 2), the historical retrospect (verses 2b-3,6-7), and the hortatory nature (verses 9,10,20). It differs in setting in that the addressee is now the princes of the people rather than

⁵⁵The later insertion vv. 12b to 18 carries this same theme to much greater lengths.

Solomon, and corresponding to this, the introduction appears rather more formal.⁵⁶

The formula for the induction into office is recalled briefly in verse 10, and more extensively in verse 20, although with some alterations.

Tradition studies

In contrast to the speech of 1 Chron. 22:7-13, which is represented as delivered by David to Solomon in private, this second speech has its setting before kol šārê yiśrā'el (verse 1).⁵⁷ That such assemblies belong to Israel's tradition at least from the time of the tribal league and throughout her history appears certain.⁵⁸ That such

⁵⁶The phrase "David rose to his feet" is not meant to indicate, as some commentators have indicated, that the infirm David raised himself from the deathbed to speak, but points to the formal nature of the occasion (cf. 2 Chron. 13:4). For šēmā'ūnī see *infra*, p. 229.

⁵⁷It is difficult to say whom the Chronicler wished to include within this designation, since he uses such terms as šār and nāgīd in many contexts. Cf. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon to the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), p. 978, especially items 5 and 6, for an indication of the range of possibilities. While it is possible that the Chronicler thought only of the tribal and clan leaders of earlier days, it seems more likely that the later expansion of v. 1, which understands šār to include various royal and military officials, has correctly interpreted the significance of the term for the Chronicler's day.

⁵⁸Cf., e.g., the assembly of the tribes against Benjamin (Judg. 20:1-2), Samuel's assembly of the people at Mizpah (1 Sam. 7:5), and the assembly of the elders at Rama (1 Sam. 8:4), as well as the condemnation of the various tribes who refused to report for battle in the ancient song of Deborah (Judg. 5:15-18). All of these passages appear to be free of Deuteronomistic bias.

The great preponderance of such assemblies in Deuteronomy (cf. Deut. 1:1; 29:1; 31:1), the Deuteronomistic history (Joshua 22:12; 24:1;

assemblies would commonly be the setting for the delivery of extensive discourses may have led the Chronicler to assume that they should be present also for his discourses of a more literary nature. The convening of such assemblies provides a favorite means by which the Chronicler expresses the involvement of the people in political and religious activities of which he himself approved.⁵⁹

While the first part of the speech (verses 2,3,6, and 7) corresponds largely with David's private speech to Solomon in chapter 22, the Chronicler has here utilized a further development of the mēnūhâ concept, and an additional tradition is used to express Solomon's unique role as temple builder. Moreover, the exhortation to Solomon (verses 9,10,20) is filled with new concepts which will be seen to play a significant role in expressing the Chronicler's own point of view.

The mēnūhâ theme as it was present in 1 Chron. 22:9 has already been discussed in detail. The description of the temple as a "house of rest for the ark of the covenant of Yahweh and for the footstool of our God" (verse 2) shifts the connotations of that rest perceptibly. While before it had been Yahweh who had promised and given rest to

1 Sam. 12:1; 2 Sam. 5:1; 1 Kings 8:1, etc.), and the priestly code (Ex. 12:3; 35:1; Lev. 8:4; Num. 16:3; 17:7; 20:2, etc.) point to the continuing significance of such assemblies for Israel. That the practice extended also into post-exilic times is clear from Ezra 10:1,5; Neh. 8:1; 9:1, as well as the dramatic account in Joel 2:15. That lesser assemblies, with only the ruler involved, also took place can hardly be doubted, cf. Ezra 10:14 and the repeated emphasis upon the assembly of the elders throughout the Old Testament.

⁵⁹Cf. 1 Chron. 12:24,39; 13:1; 2 Chron. 2:2; 30:23, and 31:1. The examples could be multiplied.

his people, here it is the ark, and Yahweh who may be assumed to be present with it in some sense,⁶⁰ which finds its own resting place in the temple, and accordingly in the midst of Jerusalem and the people.

This same tradition is present in Psalm 132, which should be noted in some detail due to the large number of themes which it shares with Chronicles:

- (1) Remember, O Yahweh, in David's favor,
all the hardship he endured;
- (2) how he swore to Yahweh
and vowed to the Mighty One of Jacob,
- (3) "I will not enter my house,
or get into my bed;
- (4) I will not give sleep to my eyes
or slumber to my eyelids,
- (5) until I find a place (māqōm) for Yahweh,
a dwelling place for the Mighty One of Jacob."
- (6) Lo, we heard of it in Ephrathah,
we found it in the fields of Jaar,
- (7) "Let us go to his dwelling place (lēmiskēnôtāyw);
let us worship at his footstool (lahādōm raglāyw)!"
- (8) Arise, O Lord, and go to your resting place (limnūhātekā),
thou and the ark of thy might.
- (9) Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness,
and let your saints shout for joy.
- (10) For your servant David's sake
do not turn away the face of your anointed one.
- (11) The Lord swore to David a sure oath
from which he will not turn back;
"One of the sons of your body
I will set on your throne."
- (12) If your sons keep my covenant
and my testimonies which I shall teach them,

⁶⁰For discussion of the function of the ark, cf. especially G. H. Davies, "Ark," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by G. A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), A-D, 222-226, who feels there is no doubt but that the ark was viewed as (1) an embodiment of the presence of Yahweh; (2) a war palladium; (3) a container; (4) a portable throne of the invisible Yahweh. See also Carlson, pp. 70-74, H. J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, translated by Geoffrey Buswell (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), pp. 125-128; and R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, translated by John McHugh (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961), pp. 29-30.

- their sons also for ever
shall sit upon your throne."
- (13) For the Lord has chosen (bāhar) Zion;
he has desired it for his habitation:
- (14) "This is my resting place (m^enūhā^{tî}) forever;
here I will dwell, for I have desired it."

In addition to the obvious centrality of David and the temple, this Psalm is notable for its expression of David's desire to build the temple (verses 3 to 5), in describing the transfer of the ark to the temple (verses 6 to 8), and in its concern for David's dynasty in immediate conjunction with these remaining themes (verses 10 to 12). But particularly noteworthy is the reference to the temple as God's resting place (m^enūhā^{tî}, verses 8 and 14), which occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament.⁶¹

Of course, it is not necessary to see these two concepts of rest--the one referring to Israel's rest in the promised land and the other to Yahweh's rest in the temple--as contradictory. Rather they belong to a development which is completely in accord with the theology of the Chronicler. For if such a God-given rest was the prerequisite for the construction of the temple, it follows that after the construction of the temple and with the entrance of the ark into it God would take up his permanent abode with Israel in a sense in which he had previously not done.⁶² In fact, both of these ideas may

⁶¹That Psalm 132 had a special meaning for the Chronicler is also apparent in that he has added Ps. 132:8-9 as the conclusion of the dedicatory prayer of Solomon, 2 Chron. 6:41-42.

⁶²Welch, pp. 25-41, argues that there is evidence of two hands at work in the passages dealing with the function of the ark and the temple in Chronicles. According to Welch, the Chronicler viewed the

be seen to have stemmed easily from such a tradition as that recorded in Num. 10:33-35:

So they set out from the mount of the Lord three days' journey; and the ark of the covenant of the Lord went before them three days' journey, to seek out a resting place for them. And the cloud of the Lord was over them by day, whenever they set out from the camp.

And whenever the ark set out, Moses said, "Arise, O Lord, and let thy enemies be scattered; and let them that hate thee flee before

temple as the surrogate of the tent of meeting, where the ark of the covenant was most prominent (cf. 1 Chron. 22:19; 28:2; 2 Chron. 5:2). A later annotator, however, saw Israel's cult centered around the tabernacle of Moses and the altar of Bezalel (2 Chron. 1:6), with little importance given to the ark. It was this annotator who placed the tabernacle at Gibeon, thus legitimizing Solomon's sacrifice there (2 Chron. 1:3), and who also entered the apology for David's not going to Gibeon (1 Chron. 21:29-30). The resulting confusion is seen most clearly in 2 Chron. 5:2-5, where the annotator has woven into the account of the bringing up of the ark from the city of David (1 Kings 8:1-4) the account of the bringing up of the tabernacle from Gibeon.

While Welch's comments are instructive concerning the multiplicity of traditions present in Chronicles, these traditions do not appear so contradictory as to require the presence of another author. The Chronicler reasoned that the altar was in most cases essential for sacrifice. The legitimacy of David's sacrifice, however, was validated by a special epiphany of fire from heaven, which at the same time indicated this as the site for the future temple. Since he read in 1 Kings 3:4 that Solomon sacrificed in Gibeon, he has either assumed or postulated that the altar, which was not mentioned in connection with David's tent and the ark, must have been present there, together with the tabernacle, which he names the *'ōhel mō'ēd*. Upon construction of the temple it is then quite in order that he has the ark, tent, and holy vessels transferred to the newly approved location.

The reference to the tent of meeting therefore seems quite in place in 2 Chron. 5:5. While an attempt to identify David's tent with the earlier tent of meeting might have been made previous to this in 1 Kings 8:4, this appears unlikely since no other such attempt is apparent in the Deuteronomic history. J. Gray, *I & II Kings, The Old Testament Library* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 191, believes--correctly in my opinion--that they were a later addition to the Kings account of the Chronicles parallel, while M. Noth, *Könige, Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968), IX, i, 174-175, believes the Chronicler found the passage previously expanded in Kings and incorporated it in toto.

thee." And when it rested ($\hat{u}b^e n\hat{u}h\bar{o}h$), he said, "Return, O Lord, to the ten thousand thousands of Israel."

While it has commonly been noted that such a passage clearly points to Yahweh's presence in some manner with the ark, for our purpose we should note that the ark itself was involved in seeking out a $m^e n\hat{u}h\hat{a}$ for the people, and that after having found such rest, both the ark and Yahweh with it resumed its rest in the midst of the people. The Deuteronomic tradition which we have studied previously has developed its concept of rest without reference to the ark, which it viewed as a container for the tablets of the covenant rather than a symbol of the divine presence. Closely related to this, the Deuteronomist considered the temple as a place for the name of Yahweh to dwell rather than a place where Yahweh himself dwells, but where, after Israel has found rest in the promised land, the one legitimate cult with its sacrificial system is found.⁶³ The tradition found in Psalm 132:8 and picked up by the Chronicler in 1 Chron. 28:2 views the ark as much more integrally related to Yahweh's dwelling in the temple, and, in agreement with Num. 10:35, pictures the temple as the place where Yahweh dwells with his ark. Von Rad remarks in connection with his study of Psalm 132:

In this passage the Chronicler found in a remarkable way precisely the authority he needed in order to build upon the notion of

⁶³G. von Rad has made especially perceptive studies of these traditions. Cf. especially "The Tent and the Ark," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, pp. 103-124; and Old Testament Theology (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962), I, 234-241, and the references cited there.

"rest" for the nation the further hope that Yahweh would come to dwell with his people.⁶⁴

That the significance of the temple for Israel was a matter of much debate in both exilic and post-exilic Israel may be amply demonstrated by the varying conceptions of Yahweh's presence which we find in the Old Testament.⁶⁵ In this struggle the Chronicler places himself firmly in the camp of those who maintain the temple is nothing less than Yahweh's dwelling upon earth, a tradition which we might expect to be popular both among the priesthood of the temple and the population of Jerusalem.

The new element introduced in verse 6 to emphasize anew the right of Solomon to build the temple is the use of the root bhr. To appreciate its significance here it is only necessary to contrast its previous usage in the Old Testament. If we confine our study to those cases in which bhr for its subject, we find that no Old Testament writer besides the Chronicler uses the term with reference to any king following David.⁶⁶ The Chronicler, on the other hand, in addition to

⁶⁴Von Rad, "There Remains Still a Rest," p. 98.

⁶⁵In view of Tristo-Isaiah's recognized polemic against the temple, the wording of Is. 66:1 is particularly striking: "Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool. Where, then, is the house which you will build for me, and where, then, is a place for my m'enuhá?" God has no need of a temple, since the whole world is the "stool of his feet." How foolish of men to want to build a house for him!

⁶⁶Bhr is used only three times in the Tetrateuch with Yahweh as subject, all in the Priestly Code and all with the Levites as object (Num. 16:5,7; 17:20). While Deuteronomy uses the verb frequently (cf. S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy, The International Critical Commentary, [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902], V, lxxx, no. 23, for the references), the only objects are Israel, the site which Yahweh will choose for his name (both frequently), the Levites (Deut. 18:5; 21:5), and

speaking of the election of Jerusalem, the temple, the Levites, and David,⁶⁷ applies the term bhr to Solomon at least three times.⁶⁸

This usage is unique with the Chronicler, and gains in significance when we note that otherwise the Chronicler places no more emphasis upon any other object of God's election than do previous traditions.

Von Rad, while not taking note of this particular emphasis, has expressed himself quite critically concerning this use of election:

one time the king "whom the Lord will choose" (Deut. 17:15). Within the Deuteronomic history the divine choice is referred only to the kings Saul (1 Sam. 10:24) and David (2 Sam. 6:21; 1 Kings 8:16; 11:34). While omitted in the account of David's anointing in 1 Samuel 16, it is clearly implied in the mention of his numerous brothers "whom the Lord did not choose" (1 Sam. 16:8,9,10). The only other object of Yahweh's choice in the Deuteronomic history is the city of Jerusalem (1 Kings 8:44,48, etc.). Hence God's choice in the Deuteronomic history is predicated only of Saul, David, and Jerusalem. It never refers to the Levites or to any king after David.

The same usages generally obtain in the latter prophets. With Yahweh as its subject, bhr has as its object Israel (Is. 14:1; Ezek. 20:5; Is. 41:8-9; 43:10; 44:1, etc.), the Davidic and Levitical families (Jer. 33:24), and Jerusalem (Zech. 1:17; 2:16; 3:2). Usage is quite rare in the Psalms, including only Yahweh's people (Ps. 33:12; 65:5), Jacob (78:68; 135:4), Zion (78:68; 132:13), and David (78:70; 132:13). Of particular importance here is Ps. 78:67-70, parallel in many respects to Psalm 132 quoted previously, where God's election of Judah, Mount Zion, and David is linked directly to the building of the sanctuary. For the double election of David and Jerusalem, see most recently H. J. Kraus, Psalmen, Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament (Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1960), XV, i, Psalm 78 in loc. and Excursus VI to Psalm 132; and R. E. Clements, God and Temple (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), pp. 48-55.

⁶⁷Jerusalem, 2 Chron. 6:6; 12:13; 33:7; "this city," 2 Chron. 6:34; "the city which you have chosen," 2 Chron. 6:38 (cf. 6:6); the temple, 2 Chron. 7:12, 16; the Levites, 1 Chron. 15:2; 2 Chron. 29:11); David, 1 Chron. 28:4; 2 Chron. 6:6.

⁶⁸1 Chron. 28:6,10; 29:1. A fourth usage in 1 Chron. 28:5 we have adjudged late.

The Chronicler uses the verb *bhd* [sic] without literary precedent eleven times: but the objects of this divine election are the king, the place for the cult, or the tribe of Levi. The term was never employed in this way in earlier times. [Italics mine.] However to the Chronicler these specific acts of election were more important than the one act of the election of Israel. Is not this too a disjointed election, especially when we bear in mind that the Chronicler says nothing at all about the election of Israel--he does not even know a covenant theology.⁶⁹

Von Rad's criticism is difficult to understand, since it is only Deuteronomy which places a significant emphasis upon the election of Israel as a people. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the Chronicler can justifiably be accused of having envisioned a "disjointed" election. The very objects which von Rad enumerates--king, cult, Levites [and we might add Jerusalem]--are for the Chronicler a closely related group with its center point in the temple.

George Mendenhall has pointed out yet another way in which the Chronicler differs from past traditions in emphasizing the election of Solomon: "In every case except Solomon (in the Chronicler only) the individual obtains his office by means other than regular, socially established conventions."⁷⁰ It could therefore be argued that the Chronicler has taken a term which applied to a certain kind of choice--such as that evidenced by charismatic endowment--and applied it now, at least in Solomon's case, to dynastic succession.

The second part of the speech, verses 9 and 10, introduces other concepts of importance for the Chronicler not met previously in this

⁶⁹Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, 352-353.

⁷⁰Mendenhall, "Election," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, E-J, 79.

study. Solomon is first exhorted to "know (da^c)" the god of his fathers. While there is only a single case in the remainder of the Old Testament where an imperative of yd^c is followed by the deity as its object, the nature of that occurrence is decisive: "No longer shall each man teach his neighbor and each man his brother saying, 'Know the Lord,' for they shall all know me" (Jer. 31:34). Jeremiah's reference indicates that "to know Yahweh" was a common exhortation, the need for which would be abrogated when the new covenant was inaugurated.

Herbert Huffmon has pointed out several cases in Hittite and Accadian treaties where the verb "to know" is used in treaty formulations either to denote the mutual legal recognition of suzerain and vassal or recognition of the treaty stipulations as binding.⁷¹ Biblical passages cited by Huffmon such as Amos 3:2; 2 Sam. 7:20 (= 1 Chron. 17:18); Hos. 13:4-5; Deut. 9:24; Hos. 8:2, and Ps. 14:4 wholly support the contention that we are here dealing with conventional covenant terminology which exhorts Solomon to recognize Yahweh as his covenant lord and to conduct himself in accord with his stipulations. The parallel use of ābad, which has cultic overtones for the Chronicler, suggests that this "knowledge" and "service" finds its best expression in obedience to the divine precepts associated with the cult (2 Chron. 30:8).

⁷¹Huffmon, "The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda^c," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CLXXXI (Feb., 1966), 31-37; and, together with Simon Parker, "A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda^c," ibid., CLXXXIV (Dec., 1966), 36-38.

A second aspect of David's exhortation to Solomon which reveals a clear Tendenz on the writer's part is that to serve Yahweh "with a perfect heart and a willing spirit" (verse 9). This expression is found in Chronicles as frequently as in all of the remainder of the Old Testament,⁷² and with but a single exception it is confined to Chronicles and Kings. The same emphasis is surely found also in the common expression of Deuteronomy, "with all the heart," which is also common in Chronicles.⁷³ Further emphasis upon the necessity for acts flowing from a perfect, undivided heart is found in such phrases as lēb 'eḥad (1 Chron. 12:39; 2 Chron. 30:12), lēb yahad (1 Chron. 12:18), and nepeš ḥāpēsâ, the term used here in parallel with lēb šālēm. The reason given for this whole-hearted devotion, that Yahweh "examines all hearts and understands every thought," together with the concluding thought of verse 9, which will be examined in more detail below, seems to reenforce the idea that within this brief exhortation the Chronicler has gathered together a myriad of quite diverse traditions to which he wholeheartedly subscribed.⁷⁴ In the phrase kol lēbābôt dōrēs ywh he reflects similar conceptions of Yahweh's omniscience

⁷²1 Chron. 12:39; 28:9; 29:9,19; 2 Chron. 15:7; 16:9; 19:9; 25:2; 1 Kings 8:61; 11:4; 15:3,14; 2 Kings 20:3; Is. 38:3.

⁷³In the non-synoptic passages, 2 Chron. 6:14; 15:15; 22:9; 31:21; 32:31; in the synoptic passages 2 Chron. 6:38; 15:12; 34:31 (all with "with all the soul" appended). See Driver, V, lxxxiii, no. 51, for the Deuteronomy references.

⁷⁴Notice once again the eclectic nature of the traditions adopted by the Chronicler. For these various ideas and their significance throughout Chronicles, see Chapter V.

found in such passages as Ps. 7:10; 139:1; 1 Sam. 16:7, and Jer. 11:20, although using one of his favorite vocables, drš,⁷⁵ to express the idea. The parallel phrase wekol yēšer maḥāšābōt mēbîn clearly echoes Gen. 6:5; 8:1. Hence the Chronicler here, as with the knowledge of God, appears to be dealing more with a concept in general use rather than with a single isolated tradition.

The second speech is concluded with a statement which expresses a cardinal tenet of the Chronicler's theology: "If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will reject you forever" (verse 9). The first part of this phrase is closely related to Deut. 4:29 and Jer. 29:13, although it is impossible to determine with certainty whether the Chronicler was directly dependent upon the one or the other.⁷⁶ In any case the manner in which the Chronicler has handled the tradition is exceptional. In both Jeremiah and Deuteronomy the reference is primarily, if not exclusively, to the "forsakenness" of the exile, and the "seeking" refers to the necessity for Israel's repentance, which will result in her being "found," or accepted again, by Yahweh. Such thoughts are totally foreign to the Chronicler. He

⁷⁵Infra, pp. 172-173.

⁷⁶Von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, p. 276, believes it to be based on Jeremiah, apparently because of the use of the niphal of mš' there, which is however lacking in many versions. Other factors, such as the heart/soul picture and the frequent use of Deuteronomy by the Chronicler, would favor the other alternative. In either case there is enough variation in the form of the quotation to suggest that the writer was paraphrasing what had become for him, and possibly for his time, a common theological formula.

has indicated his interpretation of this first phrase by appending to it a second not found in either Deuteronomy or Jeremiah, "but if you reject him, he will reject you forever." The complete statement then states both positively and negatively the doctrine of God's retributive justice which became such a burning issue in post-exilic Judaism.

While the importance of both drš^v and 'zb will be demonstrated in Chapter V, it may be noted that the Chronicler has substituted drš^v-- a term which for him signifies the one basic requirement made of the faithful Yahwist--for the bqš^v which we find elsewhere in this connection. Also, the import of the entire statement is heightened by the addition of l'e'ēd, forever, to the threat of rejection. It may well be significant that among the infrequent occurrences of this word, which is found only nine times in the Old Testament, are included Ps. 132:12,14 quoted previously, where it is used of Yahweh's promise to David and the Lord's m^enūhā in Jerusalem, and Ps. 89:30, where it likewise refers to the eternal promise to David. Therefore the Chronicler has balanced his statement of Solomon's eternal election with at least the possibility of an eternal rejection. In fact, the conditional nature of that election was indicated already in verse 7, where was qualified by the necessity for obedience to the law.⁷⁷

⁷⁷A similar concern for the keeping of the law was expressed in 1 Chron. 22:12-13, although not attached so directly to the dynastic promise. The problem of the nature of the promise to David and his dynasty is one of the most complex issues in the study of the Old Testament. Briefly, Nathan's oracle as framed in both 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicles 17 is expressed in unconditional terms. The formulation in Samuel leaves room for disobedience on the part of the monarch, upon which punishment will follow, but states explicitly, "My steadfast

The two parts of the conclusion to this second speech, verses 10, 21, and 22, reflect again the form of the Amtseinsetzung which we have met in the first speech. All three of the elements which Lohfink has isolated are present here, two of them in both verses 10 and 20. For the formula of encouragement, compare the ḥāzaq wa'āśēh of verse 10 with the more complete formula, also extended by wa'āśēh,⁷⁸ in the

mercies will not depart from him" (2 Sam. 7:15). Chronicles, on the other hand, omits the possibility of such iniquity in Nathan's oracle, although retaining the statement that God's mercy will not depart from him (1 Chron. 17:13).

Other passages, however, such as 1 Kings 2:4; 3:14 ("if your sons take heed"); 8:25, and 9:4 ("If you will walk before me . . . them I will establish your royal throne") add a note of qualification to this promise. In some cases it appears that the promise is unconditional to David, but conditional to his followers (cf. 1 Kings 11:11,13; Ps. 132:11-12). Cf. also 1 Kings 11:31-40, where the conditional and unconditional elements seem to be interwoven.

That such tensions should have developed in attempting to relate the Sinai covenant with its emphasis upon the obedience necessary to the covenant stipulations to the Davidic covenant with its unconditional promise is understandable, and it must be admitted that the tension is quite indissoluble. So far as the Chronicler's use of the traditions available to him is concerned, it appears that he knows both conditional and unconditional forms, both of which he frequently states without attempting a resolution of the difficulties involved.

Among the best recent discussions of the problem are those of R. E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, Studies in Biblical Theology (London: SCM Press, 1965), I, xliii, especially pp. 45-68; and Abraham and David: Genesis 15 and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition, Studies in Biblical Theology (London: SCM Press, 1967), II, v, especially pp. 79-88 (with extensive bibliography). Cf. also ^{David's} Rimbach, "Berit 'Olām" (Unpublished master's thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1967), pp. 20-27.

⁷⁸The use of 'śh, which may be translated either "act" or "build," as a parallel or alternative to the words expected in the formula of encouragement, is quite common in Chronicles. In addition to these two occurrences, cf. 2 Chron. 19:11 and 28:5 and the unusual developments in Ezra 10:4. It could be argued that the Chronicler has preferred 'śh in the passages at hand because of the obvious relevance to Solomon's task of building the temple, although this would not be true of the other passages listed. It is possible that the use of 'śh

following verse 20: hāzaq we'emās wa'āsēh 'al tîrâ' we'al tēhāt."

The mention of the specific task for which Solomon is inducted is also reflected both in verse 10, "See, now, that Yahweh has chosen you to build a house for the sanctuary," and somewhat less directly in verse 20, ". . . until all of the work of the service of the house of Yahweh is finished." The formula of accompaniment occurs only in verse 20. Such detailed repetition of the components of the form, while at the same time introducing variations in order and vocabulary, would support the idea that the Chronicler recognized fully the significance of the form which he was using and was not simply repeating it from Joshua. The variations introduced in the form here may best be included in the discussion of the contents which follows.

Into this conclusion the Chronicler has woven several new elements. The first of these, "He will not abandon you and he will not forsake you" (verse 20) is actually an explanation of the Begleitungsformel, further expanding upon the concept of Yahweh's presence. The identical phrase also occurs in Joshua 1:5, which in view of the Chronicler's strong dependence upon Joshua 1:2-9 is no doubt the source of the quotation here.⁷⁹ In view of the statement concerning retaliation in verse 9, that statement here is quite astonishing, for it seems

points to a growing lack of awareness of the source of the formula, a development extended in the more remote parallels qûm wa'āsēh (1 Chron. 22:16) and qûmû ūbenû (1 Chron. 22:19), both of which appear to be later additions though reflecting the Amtseinsetzung form in some detail. Notice again the imperative thrust of all these forms.

⁷⁹The only other occurrences of lō' yarpēkā we'lō' ya'azbekā are in Deut. 31:6,8, where they likewise form a part of Joshua's induction.

to posit quite the opposite. There it was Solomon's compliance with the law or devotion to Yahweh which was demanded lest he be forsaken by Yahweh; here the divine presence is unconditional. The additional phrase "He will not forsake you until all the work . . . is complete" (verse 20), while at first appearing to qualify the divine presence, is really added to point to the goal of the divine presence, the construction of the temple (compare 1 Chron. 22:11). The juxtaposing of two such contradictory statements is probably to be attributed to the writer's dependence on Joshua 1. The fact that he did not find the two statements contradictory, or at any rate did not or could not resolve them, should be no more surprising that it was in the case of the Deuteronomic historian, who did the same in Joshua 1:5 and 7.

While the preceding phrase and most of the traditions investigated thus far point quite clearly to the Chronicler's dependence upon Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic history, verses 20 and 21 include several items which point just as clearly to the priestly sections of the Pentateuch, and in particular to the tabernacle pericope, Exodus 25 to 31 and 35 to 40. This is true first of all of the terms used to describe the work on the temple, 'ābōdat bēt yhwh (verse 21) and especially 'ābōdat bēt ha'ēlōhîm (verse 20).⁸⁰ The phrase l'ekol nādîb

⁸⁰While m'ele'ket occurs no less than twenty-eight times within the tabernacle pericope, and 'ābōdâh eleven (both terms also being especially frequent in those portions of Chronicles commonly considered late, 1 Chron. 1 to 9 and 23 to 27), it is even more telling that the combination m'eleket 'ābōdâ occurs of work on the sanctuary only in Ex. 35:24; 36:1-3 outside of Chronicles. (The meaning in Leviticus 23 and Num. 28 and 29 is less technical, "laborious work".) W. Rudolph, XXI, 128-129, 137, 149, and passim has shown that the

b^ehokmâ likewise points directly to the tabernacle narrative in that the concepts embodied in ndb and hkm here are unique to that portion of the Old Testament.⁸¹ The Chronicler, like the priestly writer before him, has wished to show the generous participation of Israel in the temple building, and has utilized the example of the tabernacle pericope to express his own Tendenz in this regard. The use of hokmâ too is of a different sort than that found in much of the Old Testament. In the tabernacle pericope hākām and hokmâ are used some sixteen times with reference to the "wise of heart," that is, the skilled workers employed on the tabernacle and its furnishings.⁸² The noun in particular is used in the sense of Yahweh's "putting wisdom" into the craftsmen, resulting in a conception very nearly that of inspiration. It is this usage which the Chronicler has adopted and which he develops still further in relating the details of the construction of the temple.⁸³

Finally, the Chronicler has in verse 21 introduced for the first time the concept of the people as active assistants to Solomon in his

divine names ywh and 'ēlōhîm are not distinguished by the Chronicler, who uses both terms interchangeably.

⁸¹The priestly writer has used the root ndb some five times (Ex. 25:2; 35:5,21,22,29) to point to the generosity of the Israelites in contributing for the construction of the temple. For the Chronicler, who prefers the hithpael, cf. especially 1 Chronicles 29.

⁸²For hākām, see Ex. 28:3; 31:6; 35:10,25; 36:1,2,4,8; for hokmâ, Ex. 28:3; 31:3,6; 35:26,31,35.

⁸³Cf. the treatment of Hiram in 2 Chron. 2:6-13.

work. Especially mentioned here are the divisions of the priests and Levites, together with the skilled workers, the princes, and all the people. While this active participation of the people is a particularly strong emphasis in the tabernacle pericope (compare Ex. 34:4-5), the Chronicler has largely ignored their role apart from their gifts for the building.⁸⁴

The narrative of verses 11,12a,19, which relate the transfer of the plans for the temple and its precincts to Solomon, are also patterned after the tabernacle pericope. This is clearly indicated by the use of the word tabnîṭ (verses 11,12,19), which recalls Ex. 25:9,40, in both of which cases it has reference to a pattern which Yahweh "showed" Moses of the tabernacle and its furnishings. Although the analogy is not developed, the Chronicler seems to assert briefly that as the plans for the tabernacle were delivered to Moses by inspiration, who transferred them to Bezalel, so the plans for the temple were given to David who transmitted them to Solomon. However, the Chronicler, in contrast to Exodus, devotes very little attention to this aspect of the preparations.

We may summarize the writer's dependency upon the priestly tradition of the tabernacle then by stating that, although there are numerous indications that the writer was conversant with that account, he has normally used these traditions in a very flexible manner. The emphasis upon the skilled craftsmen redounds chiefly to the glory of the

⁸⁴With the omission of 1 Chron. 22:17-19, the more active participation of priests and Levites is found only here, suggesting the possibility that 28:21 might also be a later addition.

temple, as had David's preparations earlier. The mention of the participation of all Israel points to a theme of obvious importance for the Chronicler, while that of their generosity, only hinted at here by the use of nēdîb, is expanded greatly in chapter 29. That the writer attributes inspiration to the temple plans is surely striking, and fits in well with his scheme of validating each step of the temple program--the choice of the site, the choice of the builder, and the plans themselves--by divine authority. It too redounds primarily to the glory of the temple, with little or no attention given to either David or Solomon apart from their mention. The brevity of the Chronicler's presentation stands in marked contrast to the length of the tabernacle narrative.

Concluding summary

Having outlined to Solomon his divinely decreed task as temple builder and encouraged him to zeal and faithfulness in carrying out that task (1 Chron. 22:7b-13), David assembles Israel's leaders and informs them of the same details. He repeats his own desire to build the temple as a place of rest for Yahweh, and mentions his provisions for doing so (verse 2), but this desire was thwarted by the divine command not to build, based once again on the fact that David was a man of war (verse 3). Solomon is again explicitly designated as the temple builder, this time expressed through the use of the word bāhar (verses 6 and 7). Since Solomon's future is determined by his obedience to the law (verse 7), David exhorts him to perfect service of Yahweh, supporting that exhortation with two arguments which he has

not previously stated: (1) The omniscience of Yahweh, which examines not only the acts of the hand but the spirit in which those acts are accomplished; (2) The correspondency between Solomon's relationship to Yahweh and Yahweh's relationship to him, which is expressed in terms of retribution (verses 8 and 9).

However, in those portions of the speech influenced by the form of the Amtseinsetzung, verses 10 and 20, the emphasis again falls upon Yahweh's unconditional assistance which will not fail until the temple is completed. In terms borrowed largely from the tabernacle pericope, the plan of the temple is given to David through divine inspiration (verse 11) and conveyed to Solomon by him. David continues his preparations for the construction by placing at Solomon's disposal various other people to assist him: the priests and Levites, who will be necessary for the actual operations of the temple, but also the skilled craftsmen who must execute the plans, the princes who must support the project, and even "all the people" (verse 21), who for the Chronicler must be involved in every significant act involving cult or kingdom.

We may accordingly summarize the crucial points as follows:

1. David's preparations continue to be emphasized. It is he who assembles the leaders, sets Solomon before them as the chosen temple builder, receives the plans for the temple directly from Yahweh, conveys them to Solomon, and places the various people at Solomon's disposal.
2. The main thrust of the pericope remains firmly centered on the temple itself, which is nothing less than a "house of rest" for Yahweh. It was to this end that all of David's preparations were directed and for which Solomon was chosen. With the single exception of verse 9, where the Chronicler appears to have introduced a series of ideas of great importance to him for properly understanding the relationship

between the king and his God, each verse of the pericope stands in immediate relationship to the construction of the temple.

3. Within the framework of the concern for the temple, the Chronicler's primary attention continues to be directed toward the demonstration of Solomon's right to build the temple. David's rejection is again emphasized, this time even stronger than in chapter 22 (compare the designation ^{אֵל}'iš milhāmâ, verse 2), the emphasis upon Solomon as the one chosen by Yahweh forms the central thought of the speech, and Solomon's task given him in connection with the formula of induction is in both cases the erection of the temple (verses 10 and 20).
4. In connection with this public assembly the Chronicler's emphasis upon the participation of all Israel in the work of the temple is brought to the fore. The various workers placed at Solomon's disposal probably form a part of this same concern, though influenced to a degree by the presentation of Exodus 25 to 31 and 35 to 40. On the whole, however, the significance of the tabernacle references, while frequent, should not be overstated. That which the Chronicler has used he has apparently made completely his own and used to express his own thoughts.
5. The significance of the concept of retribution, which is in a sense out of place in verse 9, is very great for the Chronicler, and the same is true to a lesser degree of the other concepts introduced with it. It seems appropriate to state that this introduces the Chronicler's understanding of the covenant relationship, a relationship that is secure when Yahweh's subjects serve him in complete and willing trust and obedience.

1 Chron. 29:1-9

Translation and text

(1) Then David the king commanded all the assembly: "Solomon my son, whom alone⁸⁵ God has chosen, is young and immature, but the work

⁸⁵Rudolph, XXI, 190, is probably right in stating that there is no valid reason to omit the rather difficult ^{אֵל}'ehād, or to alter it to ^{אֵל}'āser. The Septuagint, contrary to the note in Biblia Hebraica, does not favor the omission, but rather supports the text as it stands.

is great, for the palace is not for man but for Yahweh God. (2) With all my power I have made provision for the house of my God--gold for (the objects of) gold, silver for those of silver, bronze for those of bronze, iron for those of iron, and wood for those of wood, stones of onyx, (stones of) setting, stones of antimony, variegated cloth [. . .]⁸⁶ and fine linen in abundance. (3) Moreover, I have a personal treasure, both gold and silver. Because of my delight in the house of my God,⁸⁷ I give to the house of my God above and beyond that which I have (already) provided for the holy house (4) three thousand talents of gold from the gold of Ophir and seven thousand talents of refined silver for plating the walls of the rooms; (5) yea, gold for the things of gold and silver for the things of silver and for all the work by the hand of craftsmen. So who will give generously, consecrating himself freely⁸⁸ today to Yahweh?"

⁸⁶It seems best to accept Curtis' suggestion that kōl 'eben yeqārā was originally a marginal gloss to explain the difficult pūk, later inserted into the text at the wrong place. This occasioned the introduction of 'abnē into the text before šayiš also (Curtis and Madsen, XI, 303). It is possible that these changes were introduced deliberately by the Chronicler, who otherwise states that the precious stones to be used in the tabernacle narrative for the high priest's vestments were to adorn the walls of the temple (2 Chron. 3:6). The translation of riqmā reflects the fact that elsewhere in the Old Testament, with the single exception of Ezek. 17:3, it refers to woven or embroidered material.

⁸⁷The order of the two clauses of v. 3a have been reversed to clarify the meaning. However, it is unnecessary to conclude that the unusual position marks the phrase as late (cf. Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, ii, 508).

That the term "to fill the hand" is a technical one connected with the induction of a priest to his office is well known, cf. R. de Vaux, pp. 346-348. Its precise significance is unknown. De Vaux

(6) Then the princes of [. . .]⁸⁹ Israel gave freely. (7) They gave to the service of the house of God five thousand talents and ten thousand darics of gold, ten thousand talents of silver, eighteen thousand talents of bronze, and one hundred thousand talents of iron. (8) And whoever had (precious) stones gave them to the treasury of Yahweh's house in the care of Jehiel the Gershonite. (9) And the people rejoiced over their generous contributions, for it was with a perfect heart that they had made these generous contributions to Yahweh; David the king also rejoiced with great joy.

Structure and forms

The audience and occasion ostensibly remain the same as with David's second speech. This unit too is composed of a speech of David, verses 1 to 5, to which the response of the people is added in verses 6 to 9, and may be outlined as follows:

believes its original meaning was already lost to Israel. Its extended use may be seen in Ezek. 43:26, where it is used of the inauguration of an altar, as well as in the passage before us, despite the objections of A. S. Herbert, "I and II Chronicles," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by M. Black and H. H. Rowley (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), in loc., who believes it improbable "that a term so closely related to the priestly office would be used by the Chronicler in this vague metaphorical sense." However, Herbert's criticism does not take into account numerous other places where the Chronicler has shifted the meaning of a phrase, cf. note 86 above.

⁸⁹That this verse has been expanded seems probable in view of 28:2, although the original reading is difficult to conjecture. The reading adopted is that of Rothstein and Manel, XVIII, ii, in loc. Rudolph, XXI, 190, assumes "die Oberen die Familien," for which one would however expect expect rā'sē hā'ābôt rather than sārē hā'ābôt.

- A. David's Third Speech, verses 1 to 5
1. Framework, verse 1aα
 2. The Speech, verses 1aβ to 5
 - a. The reason for David's provisions, verse 1aβb
 - b. David's provisions
 - aa. Public contributions, verse 2
 - bb. Private contributions, verses 3 to 5a
 - c. Exhortation to the people to contribute, verse 5b
- B. The Response of the People, verses 6 to 9
1. Their contributions, verses 6 to 8
 2. Concluding note of joy, verse 9

In contrast with the first two speeches, where the logical progression was marked quite regularly with literary features such as 'attâ, hinneh, and the use of direct discourse, the third speech is, with the exception of the introductory wayyô'mer dāwîd, completely lacking in such elements.⁹⁰ In fact, each of the logical divisions within the sermon begins only with the conjunction "and," verses 2,3,5b,6,9.

The first two verses of the chapter illustrate once again how closely this speech is related to those previously analyzed, although at the same time advancing the Chronicler's argument. The details may best be presented in tabular form:

<u>Chapter 29</u>		<u>Chapters 22 and 28</u>
29:1	Solomon's election	28:6,10; compare 22:9
29:1	Solomon a <u>na'ar wārāk</u>	22:5
29:1	Greatness of the task	22:5
29:2	David's provisions	22:2-5; 28:3

⁹⁰Although wē'ôd, v. 3, may be equivalent to wē'attâ.

At the same time, an obvious progression is noticeable. The emphasis upon the divine election of Solomon, which formed the major thrust of the first two speeches, is here assumed and introduced almost parenthetically in verse 1. The reason for David's prior preparations is now moved to the body of the speech, while it had in 22:5 stood in the framework, and the actual account of David's provisions, likewise first introduced outside of the formal speech (22:2-5) and then inserted briefly in 28:3, here becomes the primary point and is expanded to include precious stones and fabrics (29:2).

The remainder of the speech, however, introduces elements not previously encountered in our study. Verses 3 to 5a dwell at great length upon David's contribution to the work from his own private possessions implying that previous statements had reference to public funds. The speech then reaches its climax in verse 5b, where David on the basis of his own example appeals to the assembly to make their own contributions. Verses 7 to 9 report in narrative form the positive response of the people to David's request, detailing their contributions and pointing to the excellent spirit with which they made their contributions.

In comparison with the remainder of the speeches in Chronicles, this one is somewhat different.⁹¹ While verses 1 and 2 might be considered a kind of historical retrospect, it is more related to the situation at hand, and verse 3 moves almost imperceptibly into the present. Finally, while the hortatory note is still present, it is

⁹¹See the appendix.

not introduced until the very end of the prayer (verse 5), and the more common imperatives have given way to the pleading question of the speaker, within which, however, the hortatory tone is implicit.

Tradition and motif studies

In describing David's additional preparations for the temple, the author has continued his dependency upon Exodus 25 to 31 and 35 to 40, a section which we have for the sake of convenience designated the tabernacle pericope. This dependency is apparent from the following:

1. The similarity of the building materials provided and contributed in the two sections.⁹²
2. The use of the term ḥārāš, "engraver" or "artificer," recalls Ex. 28:11; 35:35; 38:23. Compare also 1 Kings 7:14.

⁹²In addition to the gold and silver (vv. 3 to 5), David's prior preparations had included bronze, iron, wood, onyx stones, stones of setting, antimony, variegated cloth, and linen (v. 2); and the things contributed by the people included gold, silver, bronze, iron, and precious stones (vv. 7 and 8). All of these materials except iron are regularly listed among the materials used in the construction of the tabernacle and the vestments of the high priest.

Iron, barzel, is lacking, not only in the tabernacle pericope, where it would be anachronistic, but surprisingly also in the account of the temple in Kings. It is included by the Chronicler but very loosely, cf. 1 Chron. 2:6,13. In addition to frequent mention of individual items, such as gold, silver, and jewels, extensive lists of the materials occur in Ex. 25:3-7; 35:5-9,22-28. Particularly striking is the mention of the otherwise rare onyx (Ex. 25:7; 28:9,20; 35:9,27; 39:13; elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Gen. 2:12; Ezek. 28:13; and Job 28:16) variegated cloth (eight of nine occurrences of the cognate participle rōqēm are found here), stones of setting (Ex. 25:7; 35:9,27; cf. Ex. 28:17,20; 39:13), and linen (thirty-three times in the tabernacle pericope, only five in the remainder of the Old Testament). Pūk is completely absent in the tabernacle narrative, although nōpek, read here by some scholars, occurs as one of the jewels in the high priest's vestments in Ex. 28:18; 39:11.

3. The fourfold use of the verb ndb (verses 5,6,9) returns us to a root the Chronicler has first introduced in 1 Chron. 28:21 in another sense. But the priestly writer has used the root some five times (Ex. 25:2; 35:5,21,22,29) to point to the generosity of the Israelites in making their contributions for the work of the tabernacle. There is little doubt that here too the Chronicler wishes to portray the generosity of the people in supporting the temple.

Perhaps even more convincing, however, is the general parallel which exists between our section as a whole and the tabernacle narrative. Curtis has summarized it well:

Here again the account of the Chronicler is modelled after the history of the tabernacle. . . . As Moses appealed to the people for freewill offerings (Ex. 35:4-9; cf. 25:1-8) and the latter responded to that appeal (Ex. 35:20-29), so David is represented as appealing to the princes of Israel and receiving their gifts.⁹³

While the Chronicler's dependency upon the tabernacle pericope may be considered established, he has used the material available to him there with considerable freedom. He has avoided mention of those items connected most closely with the priests and their vestments, such as the majority of the kinds of cloth, the oil, spices, and precious stones, as well as those items whose use would have been limited to the tabernacle, such as the goat's and ram's skins. In vocabulary too the Chronicler has worked with a certain freedom, preferring, for example, the hithpael of ndb to the qal used in Exodus. Moreover, while in the priestly narrative a concern parallel with that of the generosity of the contributions is that of the actual participation of the people, not just in the offerings but in the building of the tabernacle and its furnishings (Ex. 35:25-26; 36:8-9), that element is completely lacking

⁹³Curtis and Madsen, XI, 301.

in Chronicles, perhaps because of a feeling which we find reflected in 2 Chron. 23:6 that only Levites are permitted in the temple.

In the concluding verse of this unit, verse 9, the Chronicler has woven together with the thought of generosity the two closely related conceptions of the "perfect heart" and joy in making their contributions. The first of these ideas has already appeared in David's exhortation to Solomon, where we saw that it was probably of Deuteronomistic provenance.⁹⁴ The note of joy is also a hallmark of the Chronicler, and this Tendenz too, while surely not absent from the remainder of the Old Testament, is particularly at home with the writers of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history.⁹⁵

Concluding summary

The following items may be enumerated as of particular importance for our study:

1. The emphasis continues to be placed upon the temple, and

⁹⁴Supra, p. 58.

⁹⁵Forms of the root śmh occur some twenty-five times in Chronicles, all but six in the non-synoptic sections. See the fuller description infra, pp. 185-186. In Deuteronomy the note of joy is common in connection with the sacrificial services, cf. Deut. 12 and 16. Forms of śmh occur some seventeen times in Samuel and Kings, and while in most cases there appears to be no particular significance attached to the term, it is found in connection with several events which we can readily recognize as of particular importance for the Chronicler. These include the transfer of the ark to Jerusalem (1 Sam. 18:6 = 1 Chron. 15:25), the women's joyful welcome of David (1 Sam. 18:6), the crowning of Solomon (1 Kings 1:40,45), the splendid tribute to the reign of Solomon (1 Kings 5:1), and the note concluding Solomon's dedication of the temple, where the people returned to their homes with gladness (1 Kings 8:66 = 2 Chron. 7:10).

specifically upon the generous contributions of David and the people for the building of the temple.

2. In this small pericope David is completely in the foreground, both in the generosity of his own contributions and in urging the people to a similar generosity.
3. The participation of all Israel in the work, a note introduced in 1 Chron. 28:21, is again present, although it is noteworthy that here the participation is limited to contributions.
4. Great emphasis is placed upon the spirit with which David and the people made their contributions. This is expressed most frequently through the use of the root *ndb*, which the Chronicler has borrowed from the priestly writer, but also with the emphases upon the perfect heart and joy, both of which stem primarily from the Deuteronomist.
5. In many matters of detail the Chronicler shows himself to be indebted to the tabernacle pericope, although no particular reason for this is apparent. The dependency is probably to be explained on the basis of the similarity of subject matter.

1 Chron. 29:10-19

Translation and notes

(10) Then David blessed Yahweh before all the assembly. David said: "Blessed are you Yahweh our father,⁹⁶ the God of Israel, from eternity even to eternity. (11) To you, Yahweh, is the greatness, the might, the splendor, the eminence, and the majesty--yes, everything

⁹⁶In contrast to Rudolph, XXI, 192; Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, ii, 521-522; Myers, XII, 196, and all modern translations, which translate "the God of our father Israel," that is, Jacob. But such a translation gives too much weight to the admittedly similar phrase "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel" of v. 18, which is clearly a creedal/liturgical statement, and too little to 1 Kings 11:48, upon which our passage is dependent.

in the heavens and on the earth. The sovereignty is yours, Yahweh, who art exalted above everything as head. (12) Riches and wealth come from you, and you rule over everything; in your hand is power and might, and it is in your hand to make everything great and strong.

(13) And now, our God, we give thanks to you and praise your glorious name. (14) But who am I, and who is my people, that we should be able to give generously like this? For everything comes from you, and we have given to you (only what we have received) from your hand. (15) For we are sojourners before you, and pilgrims like all our fathers; our days upon the earth are like a shade; there is no hope.⁹⁷ (16) Yahweh our God, all this abundance which we have provided to build a house for you for your holy name is from your hand; everything belongs to you. (17) And I know, my God, that you examine the heart and delight in righteous deeds. I, in the uprightness of my heart, have freely contributed all these. And now, I have seen your people who are present here⁹⁸ give freely to you with joy. (18) Yahweh, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, preserve forever the

⁹⁷While miqweh is perhaps not to be expected in this context (cf. Rudolph, XXI, 192), it is necessary to remember that the Chronicler's language here is liturgical and highly stylized. Cf. Job 7:6. Otto Plöger sees this "hopelessness" of man apart from God as one of the distinctive themes of the Chronicler, and compares Ezra 9:6-15 (Plöger, pp. 47-48).

⁹⁸For other examples of the article attached, not just to the participle, but to a finite verb(!) as a substitute for the relative pronoun, see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, p. 209a, and Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch, revised by A. E. Cowley (Second English edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), p. 447, section 138i.

frame of the thoughts of the heart⁹⁹ of your people, and establish their heart toward you. (19) And as for Solomon my son, give him a perfect heart, that he may keep your commandments, your testimonies, and your statutes . . . ,¹⁰⁰ and thus build the palace for which I have made provision."

Structure and Form

Apart from the brief introductory framework of verse 10a, this unit consists of a single prayer of David, verses 10b to 19, which may best be divided into three subsections as follows:

- A. Framework, verse 10a
- B. David's Prayer of Thanksgiving, verses 10b to 19
 1. Ascription of praise, verses 10b to 12
 - a. Formula of blessing, verse 10b
 - b. The incomparability of Yahweh, verses 11 and 12
 2. The Thanksgiving, verses 13 to 16
 - a. Statement of thanksgiving, verse 13
 - b. The reason for thanksgiving: Everything comes from Yahweh, verses 14 to 16.

⁹⁹The Hebrew is almost impossibly verbose, no doubt due to the quotation of the phrase from Gen. 6:5, cf. also 1 Chron. 28:9. That one or the other of the words might be a later addition is a distinct possibility, but impossible to prove.

¹⁰⁰la'āsôt hakkōl seems impossible in its present position. Its frequent occurrence in other sections with strong Deuteronomic coloring such as 1 Chron. 22:13 suggests that la'āsôt, with or without hakkōl, may first have been a marginal gloss to lišmōr later inserted in the text at the wrong place. The frequent repetition of 'āśā in parallel with another verb in Chronicles (cf., e.g., the late 1 Chron. 22:16) presents yet another possibility.

3. The Supplication, verses 17 to 19

- a. The basis of the supplication, verse 17
 - aa. God's omniscient righteousness, verse 17 aba
 - bb. Israel's uprightness in contributing, verse 17bβ
- b. The Supplication, verses 18 and 19
 - aa. For Yahweh to keep Israel in such a frame of mind, verse 18
 - bb. That Solomon may be granted a perfect heart, verse 19

David's prayer is introduced with the now familiar wayyō³mer dāwīd that we have met so frequently. Structurally we may note that each of the three major divisions of the prayer seem to begin with a highly stylized liturgical formula: bārūk 'attâ yhwh (verse 10b), môdîm 'ānahû lāk ûmehalêlîm 1ešêm tip'artekā (verse 13), and yhwh 'ēlōhê 'abrāhām yišhāq weyiśrā'el 'ābôtênû (verse 18). The transition from the first unit to the second is furthermore marked by the we³attâ of verse 13, and although the logical progression between the second and third units is very close, it may be that the we³attâ of verse 17b serves a similar function.

Particular attention may also be drawn to the fact that each of the three units of the prayer is supplied by the writer with a basis. The blessing of verse 10b is supported by the description of verses 11 and 12, the thanksgiving of verse 13 finds a similar ground in verses 14 to 16, and the supplications for Israel and Solomon in verses 18 and 19 have their support both in the statement of God's delight in righteousness and in Israel's present righteous state as seen by their generous and joyous contributions.

While the ascription of praise in verses 10b to 12 is couched in completely general terms, the thanksgiving of verses 13 to 16 is directly related to the subject of 29:1-9, the contributions of David and the people. With verse 17 attention is focused upon the attitudes of generosity and joy with which these gifts were offered, thus returning to the most prominent concerns of 29:1-9. While the petitions of verses 18 and 19 break away sharply from the doxological character of the earlier parts of the prayer, they too return us to themes met previously in our study. The concern for the perfect heart recalls 28:9, and the emphasis upon the law has been met repeatedly (compare 22:12,13; 28:9). But most significantly this prayer, like the speeches before it, reaches its final goal only in the construction of the temple (compare 22:11; 28:10,20). As if to complete the cycle, the attention to David's provisions for the temple, which were first introduced by way of a preface in 22:1-5 and then became the major focus of attention in 29:1-5, is attached to the concluding verse almost by way of a postscript, giving way now to a more direct concern for the construction itself.

As noted in the discussion of the prayer form in Chronicles, this prayer must be considered a blending of the hymn, thanksgiving, and petition.¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹Cf. infra, pp. 241-242.

Tradition and motifs

There is little reason to doubt that this fine prayer of David reflects in considerable measure the usage current in the temple or synagogue of the author's day.¹⁰² Accordingly, the author's usage of the various traditions available to him are of a quite different sort here, involving not a direct use of various biblical texts and traditions, but rather an indirect one of these as they have become embedded in the liturgical usage of the congregation and the personal piety of the individual Israelite.

That the piety reflected here is in large part that of the pious Israelite in the author's own day is apparent from a comparison of the vocabulary of this prayer with the Psalms. Almost every item in the opening verses, which is a prolonged ascription of praise, has numerous counterparts in the Psalms. Most decisive in this regard is the introductory phrase "Blessed are you, Yahweh, our father, the God of Israel, from eternity even to eternity." Both the first and last elements in the verse show by their usage in the Psalms their character as liturgical expressions par excellence.¹⁰³

¹⁰²This is also the judgment of A. S. Herbert, p. 364: "The prayer is undoubtedly based on liturgical prayers in use in the Chronicler's day. Many of the phrases appear in prayers still in use in the synagogue."

¹⁰³While the phrase bārûk 'attâ yhwh with the second person pronoun expressed occurs only twice in the Old Testament, the more common phrase bārûk yhwh is found in Ps. 68:36; 66:20, and 135:21, where it obviously serves as a kind of conclusion to the entire Psalm. That this was common liturgical practice becomes still more apparent in that four of the five "Books" of the Psalms end with a termination very

Without entering into detail concerning the remainder of the similarities between David's prayer and the vocabulary of the Psalms,¹⁰⁴

similar to that found here (Ps. 41:13; 72:18-19; 89:52; 106:48 = 1 Chron. 16:36). If the remainder of the occurrences are then examined in this light, it may be seen that the majority of the occurrences of bārûk yhwh introduce the concluding sections of laments where, after describing his previous plight, the individual thanks God for the deliverance promised or bestowed upon him (cf. Ps. 28:6; 31:22; 18:47). Closely related to this is our prayer which, beginning with a thanksgiving, is introduced with bārûk 'attâ yhwh, as is the case also in Ps. 144:1. For further observations concerning this phrase, see Sheldon Blank, "Some Observations Concerning Biblical Prayer," Hebrew Union College Annual, XXXII (1961), 87-90. Blank believes the phrase originated no earlier than the fourth century B. C.

The phrase "from eternity to eternity," which occurs in several differing but very similar forms, is also seen to be a standard liturgical expression apart from the doxologies listed above, cf. Ps. 90:2; 103:17; 106:48; Neh. 9:5.

¹⁰⁴Cf. the following correspondencies: g^edûlâ, "greatness," Ps. 71:21; 145:3,6 (qere), cf. 2 Sam. 7:21,23 = 1 Chron. 17:19,21; g^ebûrâ, "might," is frequent, cf. Ps. 89:14; 90:10; 106:2,8; 145:11-12; 150:2, and others. The vocable tip'eret occurs in Ps. 71:8; 89:18; 96:6; 78:61, and no less than seven times in Isaiah 60 to 66, which has a strong liturgical orientation. The vocable nēšah is common throughout the Psalms, although found only with the meaning "permanence" rather than "eminence." Hôd, "majesty," occurs some eight times in the Psalms, often in combination with hādār, as in Ps. 96:6, which is also quoted in the late (?) 1 Chron. 16:27. Even the phrase "(in) the heaven and (on) earth" seems to be especially favored in liturgical and creedal formulations, cf. Ps. 115:15; 121:2; 123:1; 124:8; 134:3; 135:6, etc, although admittedly most common in creation contexts. Yahweh is viewed as ruling (with the root māšal) in Ps. 22:29; 59:14; 66:7; 89:10. The root ydh is extremely frequent in the Psalms, but for the plural as here cf. especially Ps. 44:9; 79:13. Phraseology such as "your/my/his holy name" is found in Ps. 33:21; 103:1; 105:3; 106:47; 145:21, as well as frequently in Ezekiel and Isaiah 56 to 66. Such a phrase as "you test the heart" recalls not only Jeremiah (cf. 11:20; 12:3; 17:10), but also Ps. 7:10; 11:45; 17:3. The rather rare mēšār, "righteousness," has seven of its nineteen occurrences in the Psalms. Five of the remainder are in Proverbs, which frequently, together with the remaining wisdom literature, shows considerable correspondence with Chronicles in its vocabulary. The phrase beyōšer lēbāb is found in Ps. 119:7. The list could no doubt be extended.

it is striking that at another place too David's prayer shows connections with the laments. The terminology used in verse 15 to describe man's condition apart from God recalls that portion of the laments in which the worshipper recounts his helplessness in the situation at hand. This may be seen most clearly in Ps. 39:13, where the worshiper similarly refers to himself as a "gēr . . . wetôšāb kekol 'ābōtay."¹⁰⁵ The picture of man's days being like a shade is more common, although the precise form of the reference here rather recalls Job 8:9.¹⁰⁶ It appears that the Chronicler found such terminology very relevant in describing the period in which he was writing.

Other references indicate that while the Chronicler has expressed himself chiefly in cultic language, he has continued to deal eclectically with other biblical materials as well. The idea of putting a "blessing" into the mouth of David quite possibly derives from 1 Kings 1:48. The designation of Yahweh as the "God of Israel, our father," is found elsewhere only in Is. 63:16; 64:7. The mention of the God of "Abraham, Isaac, and Israel" (verse 18) is found only in 1 Kings 18:36. The combination 'ōšer w^ekābōd, which occurs some seven times in Chronicles, is probably dependent upon 1 Kings 3:13, while the

¹⁰⁵kî šēl yāmēnū 'ālē 'āreš. The similarity in vocabulary of the Chronicler and the wisdom literature, especially Job and Proverbs, is remarkable in many places. Whether this similarity is due solely to the possible late date of both, or to other considerations, must remain beyond the scope of this paper.

¹⁰⁶The only other passage in which gēr and tôšāb occur together are Lev. 25:35,37, where the usage is literal.

"frame of the thoughts of the heart" (verse 18) is a clear reference from Gen. 6:5 (compare 1 Chron. 28:9).

Concluding summary

While many of the traditions utilized by the Chronicler in earlier parts of our study reappear here, the one significant difference lies in the focusing of attention upon Yahweh and the degree to which he is described, both in his godhead and in his relationship to man. The passage is really one of the most extensive within the Old Testament in doing this in largely abstract terms.

This theme is introduced significantly in verses 11 and 12, which is framed as an ascription of praise to Yahweh. This ascription includes both a majestic view of Yahweh's omnipotence (verse 11) and the significant statement, perhaps relating directly to the contributions in mind, that everything comes from Yahweh's hand (verse 12). The second part of the prayer (verses 13 to 16) expands the conception of God as the source of every gift (verses 14 and 16) and parallels with this the hopeless situation of man apart from God (verse 16). The subject of Israel's contributions are now in the foreground, however, and it is for these, David emphasizes, that neither he nor the people can take any credit. The final section of the prayer continues this extensive description of Yahweh and his attributes, although in terms which we have met previously. Yahweh is omniscient and he delights in righteous deeds (verse 17). Moreover, it is he who is responsible for establishing and preserving the right disposition within his people, both to contribute generously and to keep the law (verses 18 and 19).

Therefore it should not go unnoticed that the Chronicler, for whom the existence of the temple obviously meant so much, has not permitted the temple to replace or obscure the primary responsibility for praise of and obedience to Yahweh, for whom it was to be erected. Rather he has through this fine prayer placed in the mouth of David given exemplary expression to the relationship which exists between Yahweh and his people, a proper appreciation of which can only result in worshippers who come before him with humility, thankfulness, and joy.

While the Chronicler has used a variety of traditions in drafting his prayer, he did not employ these in an inflexible manner but adapted them freely to his own purposes. That his goals remain essentially identical with those in the speeches and narratives studied previously is apparent from the number of traditions and motifs which we find here repeated:

1. Although the pericope is centered in Yahweh and his relationship to his people, David, Solomon, and the temple are not ignored. The prayer itself is placed in the mouth of David, and David's final petition is one for both Solomon and the temple--that Solomon may keep the law and thus complete the construction of the temple for which he has been chosen.
2. The necessity for obedience to the law continues to be maintained as the prerequisite for the construction of the temple (verse 10, compare 1 Chron. 22:12-13; 28:7,9).
3. The concern for the disposition of the heart remains paramount, and it may be deduced that Yahweh, who delights in righteous acts, is displeased with any act not flowing from a proper attitude. The Chronicler emphasizes again the generosity of the people and David in making their contributions, and the people's joy is deserving of special mention (verse 17). David's final request is that Yahweh would preserve this generous, joyous response in the people, and that Solomon too might be given a perfect heart to carry out the divine law.

4. Finally, implicit throughout is the concern for the involvement of the people. It is in large part their contributions which have occasioned David's prayer, and it is for their continued generosity and joy in support of the temple that David likewise prays.

1 Chron. 29:20-30

Translation and text

(20) Then David commanded all the assembly, "Bless Yahweh your God," and all the assembly blessed Yahweh, the God of their fathers, and bowed down and did obeisance to Yahweh and the king (21) and offered sacrifices to Yahweh. On the next day (also) they sacrificed burnt offerings,¹⁰⁷ a thousand oxen and a thousand rams and a thousand sheep, together with their drink offerings, many sacrifices for all Israel. (22) So they ate and drank before Yahweh that day with great gladness, and they made Solomon the son of David king . . . ,¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷This translation, which separates the z^ebāhîm from the 'ōlôt, agrees with the Revised Standard Version of the Bible against the New English Bible and the Jerusalem Bible, as well as most commentators. While the nature of any two-day ceremony is problematic, the unusual position of l^emohōrat hayôm hahû', together with the repetition of l^eyhw, appears to favor the translation given above.

¹⁰⁸The word šēnî, "a second time," appears to be an obvious attempt to reconcile this passage with 23:1, which we have determined above (p. 39) to be a later insertion. Its deletion is further suggested by its omission in the two major Septuagint manuscripts. The unusual translation of the Jerusalem Bible, "Then having made Solomon son of David their second king [emphasis added], they anointed him," appears unjustified. Not only is such a two king theory highly dubious, but the feminine ordinal šēnî also opposes such an understanding.

and anointed him as Yahweh's prince¹⁰⁹ and Zadok as priest.¹¹⁰

(23) So Solomon sat upon the throne of Yahweh as king instead of his father David and prospered, and all Israel was obedient to him.

(24) And all the chiefs and warriors, and even all the sons of King David, vowed their allegiance to Solomon the king. (25) And Yahweh made Solomon very great before all Israel and gave him royal honor such as there had not been upon any king over Israel before him.

(26) David the son of Jesse was king over all Israel. (27) He was king over Israel forty years; in Hebron he was king for seven years and in Jerusalem he was king for thirty-three years. He died in a good old age, filled with days, riches, and honor; and Solomon his son became king in his stead. (29) And the words of David the king, the former and the latter, lo, they are written in the words of Samuel the seer, and in the words of Gad the visionary,¹¹¹ and in the

¹⁰⁹The usage of nāgîd here is probably related to that in 1 Kings 1:35. Whether it should therefore be translated "tribal chieftan" or "crown prince" cannot be determined with certainty. The Chronicler's use of nāgîd elsewhere is very broad, cf. Brown, Driver, and Briggs, pp. 617-618, and 1 Chron. 28:4, which is late.

¹¹⁰Whether the reference to Zadok should be ascribed to the Chronicler or to a later hand is doubtful. But such an anointing was commonplace in post-exilic times, and may be said to be demanded by 1 Kings 1:34,39; 2:35; cf. Ex. 28:41; Lev. 8:12; 21:10 (cf. Rudolph, XXI, 193). Since Zadok had obviously been functioning as a priest for some time prior to this, some understand this anointing to be to the high priesthood.

¹¹¹For extensive discussion of the problem posed by such references, see especially O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, translated by Peter Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 535 and the references cited there, although I would not agree with Eissfeldt's conclusions regarding the nature of the "Midrash." It appears most probable to me that the Chronicler has adopted the idea for

words of Nathan the prophet, (30) together with all his dominion and might and the events which affected him and Israel and all the kingdoms of the nations.

Structure and form

The Chronicler concludes his David history, as he has begun it, with a narrative unit which may be outlined as follows:

- A. Events surrounding Solomon's accession, verses 20 to 22
- B. Preview of Solomon's reign, verses 23 to 25
- C. David's death, verses 26 to 30

The first of these units is directly related to 29:10-19 by its continuance of the blessing theme. David, having completed his own prayer of blessing, continues by exhorting the assembly to do the same (verse 20). While the content of the people's blessing is not recorded, it is related that they "blessed" Yahweh and prostrated themselves before both Yahweh and King Solomon. Other festivities surrounding the accession mentioned are sacrifices (verse 21), apparently offered on two different days, a joyous meal "before Yahweh" (verse 22a), and the anointing itself.

With verses 23 to 25 attention is shifted briefly to paint an anticipatory picture of Solomon's reign. While this insertion breaks somewhat the connection between Solomon's accession and David's death,

such closing summaries from the Deuteronomic historian, frequently, as here, referring to the prophets who were known to be active during the reign of the king in question. Cf. Curtis and Madsen, XI, 307; Rudolph, XXI, 194.

it is easy to see how it was suggested by the statement that Solomon became king (verse 22). The final summation of David's reign (verses 26 to 30) gives the customary information concerning the duration of his reign, with verse 27 taken from 1 Kings 2:11.¹¹² The final unit is rounded out with a customary citation of other sources available to the reader concerning his reign, compare 2 Chron. 33:32; 35:26.

Traditions and motifs

That the account of Solomon's accession should be dependent to some extent upon the last chapters of the Succession Document, 1 Kings 1 and 2, is to be expected. But to evaluate the extent of that dependence and the degree to which the author may have been influenced by other traditions found in the Old Testament or otherwise known to him, it may be helpful to review the remainder of the evidence concerning such accessions.

The material available here is not as abundant as might be expected in view of the prominent place occupied by the king in the Old Testament.¹¹³ In the case of only six kings do we have any information concerning the formal events involved in their coronation.¹¹⁴ Our

¹¹²Although the reference to the seven year reign in Hebron bears no indication that it was over only a part of the kingdom that Solomon reigned there.

¹¹³For this study we must bypass the difficult question of the enthronement of the king as portrayed in the Psalms, where scholarly positions may justifiably said to border on chaos.

¹¹⁴Saul (1 Sam. 10:1), 11:15; David, 1 Sam. 16:3; 2 Sam. 2:4; 5:3; 1 Chron. 11:3; 12:39-41); Solomon, 1 Kings 1:38-48; 1 Chron. 29:20-25;

knowledge is further limited since in several of these instances the anointing took place under extreme circumstances in which ceremonial could have played little part.¹¹⁵ In fact, in the cases of only two kings, Solomon and Joash, is more extensive information available. On the basis of these narratives Roland de Vaux has listed the following as components of the rite of coronation:

1. Investiture with the insignia, which is not mentioned in the case of Solomon.
2. The anointing.
3. The acclamation.
4. The enthronement.
5. The homage of the high officials.

According to de Vaux, the first part of the ceremony took place in the temple, with the king standing upon his dais (compare 2 Chron. 34:31; 6:13) and the actual anointing done by a priest. After the acclamation, all left the sanctuary and entered the palace, where the new king took his seat on the throne, marking his assumption of power.¹¹⁶

Jehu (2 Kings 9:6); Joas (2 Kings 11:12,17 = 2 Chron. 23:11,16); Jehoahaz (2 Kings 23:30). In the last case no details are added other than that the people took him and anointed him king.

¹¹⁵This is true, e.g., of Saul's anointing by Samuel, of Jehu's by the unnamed prophet, and to some degree of David's anointing by Samuel in the presence of his family and guests. David is subsequently anointed by representatives of both Judah and Israel, in the latter of which cases a covenant before the Lord is mentioned.

¹¹⁶De Vaux, pp. 102-105. The expression "to sit on the throne" is therefore synonymous with "to begin to reign." De Vaux does not believe priests were anointed until post-exilic times, when the practice previously reserved for the monarchy was transferred to the priesthood which replaced it in most instances. Traditions extant in the Old

The most extensive study of the parallels between 1 Chronicles 29 and 1 Kings 1 and 2 has been made by Johannes Hänel, who has investigated the area in such detail as to make further study seem superfluous and has concluded that every part of Chronicles' account of the coronation is covered in the Kings narrative.¹¹⁷ While Hänel at times overstates the evidence, and a number of his supposed parallels are no more than possibilities,¹¹⁸ the following correspondencies seem worthy of mention:

1. The prayer of the assembly (verse 20) corresponds to the pious wish of Benaiah in 1 Kings 1:36-37. In particular the prostration before both Yahweh and the king corresponds to the two parts of Benaiah's wish. The posture of the people in "bowing down and worshipping" is also fitting on the basis of statements such as 1 Kings 1:16 and 31.
2. The anointing of (mšḥ) Solomon and the attendant great joy of the people (verse 22) correspond to 1 Kings 1:38-39.
3. The statement of Solomon's accession itself, "So Solomon sat upon the throne . . . of David his father" (verse 23a) recalls 1 Kings 1:40; 2:12a.
4. Solomon's feast and sacrifices recall that of Adonijah (1 Kings 1:9,19,25) and the eating and drinking of 1 Kings 1:41; 4:20.
5. Solomon's prosperous reign (verses 23b-25) has its counterpart in 1 Kings 2:12b. The root gd used in this connection

indicate that this anointing was first transferred only to the high priest, and only later to all priests. De Vaux explicitly excludes 1 Chronicles 29 from consideration in his reconstruction for monarchical practice, stating that "this text tells us how the practice of former times was then pictured" (de Vaux, p. 105).

¹¹⁷Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, ii, 514. After the death of the former, Hänel completed the commentary from 29:10 on (cf. p. 510).

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 514.

this connection is found in 1 Kings 1:37,47; and the mention of 'ōšer w^ekābōd recalls 1 Kings 3:13.

6. The use of nāgīd in the sense of king is found in 1 Kings 1:35, as well as 2 Sam. 5:3; 7:8.
7. The account of David's death (verses 26 to 30) is dependent upon 1 Kings 2:11.
8. The devotion of the people, officers, and heroes (verse 24) is reflected in 1 Kings 1:9,19,25,38-40,49,53.
9. The background of Zadok's ordination to the priesthood is found in 1 Kings 1:38-40; 2:35, since Zadok is there pictured as functioning in the office of high priest.¹¹⁹

There is accordingly little doubt but that the Chronicler has used 1 Kings 1 and 2 in writing his narrative of Solomon's accession. This seems particularly clear in the mention of the anointing itself (verse 22), the statement of his session (verse 23), the chronology of David's reign (verses 26 and 27), and the statement that Solomon reigned in the place of David (verse 28). This dependency also seems likely in that verse 24 is a conscious attempt to counteract the Adonijah episode, which at the same time builds upon the basic loyalty and support of the troops as stated in 1 Kings 1:8,10.

However, it is necessary to balance Hänel's detailed and often ingenious study of these parallels by considering other possible influences upon the Chronicler.¹²⁰ While Hänel has seen the inspiration

¹¹⁹Ibid., pp. 513-514.

¹²⁰Hänel is not unaware of the wider connections which the narrative shows with Samuel and Kings. He mentions, e.g., that the sacrifices recall those made at the removal of the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6:17-18) as well as at the threshing floor of Araunah (2 Sam. 24:25), both of which parallels are reproduced in Chronicles, that 'ōšer w^ekābōd (v. 25) is dependent upon 1 Kings 3:13, that nāgīd is used of

for the "prayer" of the congregation in Benaiah's words recorded in 1 Kings 1:38-39--a parallel which is in any case none too convincing--he has in so doing ignored the fact that the Chronicler specifically categorizes the prayer as a blessing; and this, together with the statement of the response to David's exhortation, reflects more the tradition of the Psalms than it does Benaiah's remarks. Secondly, Hänel has largely disregarded, if not ignored, the fact that perhaps the most prominent element in his schema, that of the sacrifices and festal meal, are quite common throughout the Old Testament, including the Deuteronomic history and Chronicles.¹²¹ It could well be that the Chronicler is indebted to a common tradition concerning the components of such festal services rather than to the abortive ceremony of Adonijah. Numerous other details support the assumption that, while many of the Chronicler's ideas are derived from 1 Kings 1 and 2, he has continued to deal quite freely and eclectically with a much larger body of traditions.¹²²

kings also in 2 Sam. 5:3; 7:8, etc. On the basis of his belief that Chronicles is dependent upon a supposed Vorlage of Samuel and Kings rather than the canonical version, Hänel then reconstructs the supposed Vorlage to show still more correspondencies by including in it such events as the sacrificial meal and sacrifices (Rothstein and Hänel, XVIII, ii, 514-515.

¹²¹For sacrifices, cf. Ex. 29; 40:29; Lev. 9:22-24; 2 Sam. 6:18; 1 Kings 8:62-64; for the "eating and drinking," Ex. 24:11; Deut. 14:26; 2 Sam. 6:19; 1 Kings 4:20; 1 Chron. 12:40, etc.

¹²²While śimhâ gedôlâ occurs in 1 Kings 1:40, the note of joy is common in the description of such festivities in both Deuteronomy and Chronicles, cf. the joy at the moving of the ark (2 Sam. 6:5 = 1 Chron. 13:8), the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8:66 = 2 Chron. 6:10), and at David's coronation (1 Chron. 12:41). Similarly while the root

All in all, however, the dependency of the Chronicler upon various traditions is of less importance than elsewhere. For into this final section of the David history, which may appear at first reading to be a rather annalistic recitation of stereotyped words and phrases borrowed from here and there, the Chronicler has woven together a comprehensive presentation of numerous ideas of importance for understanding his view of the reigns of David and Solomon and the relationship of the monarchy to both Yahweh and the people.

First, the emphasis upon "all Israel" appears to reach a climax in this section, where it occurs no less than four times. In addition to David's address to the entire assembly and the mention of their positive response to his exhortation (verse 20), it is also mentioned that the sacrifices offered were for "all Israel" (verse 21).¹²³ It is explicitly mentioned that "all Israel" was obedient

gdl is found in 1 Kings 1:37,47, the parallel is actually closer with Joshua 3:7; 4:14, which use both the piel of the verb and the phrase "in the eyes of Israel," both of which are missing in Kings. While Hänel has in a few cases pointed out connections with more remote parts of the Deuteronomic history, he has not mentioned the kol yisrā'el so important in this narrative, vv. 21,23,25,26 (!), which is primarily of Deuteronomic origin, nor the significance of slh, likewise of Deuteronomic origin. Less important marks of other traditions which show the Chronicler's eclectic disposition are the mention of drink offerings (v. 21), a P element (cf. the references in Brown, Driver, and Briggs, p. 651a), and the descriptive elements applied to David's death, bēsēbā' tōbā sēbā yāmmim (v. 28), which is applied only to Abraham (Gen. 25:8, P), Isaac (Gen. 35:9, P), and Job (42:27) among all Old Testament saints. (The usage in 1 Kings 1:1, zāqēn bā' bayyāmim, recalls rather Joshua 23:2.)

¹²³There seems to be no basis for the view of Rudolph, XXI, 193, that all Israel should be understood here to refer only to those who were present. Cf. Hezekiah's command in 2 Chron. 29:24. For all Israel throughout Chronicles, see infra, 186-197.

to Solomon upon his accession (verse 23), a picture which stands in sharp contrast to the intrigue pictured in 1 Kings 1 and 2, where Adonijah, Abiathar, and Joab are leaders in a plot opposing Solomon. Of Solomon also it is stated that Yahweh "made him great" before all Israel (verse 25), a statement perhaps to be read in connection with the closing notice concerning David that he was king over all Israel (verse 26). The two poles to which the expression appears to have reference are then: (1) The denotation of the vast extent of the kingdoms of David and Solomon; (2) The unanimity which marked the people's response in participating in Solomon's inauguration and in obedience to his rule.

Secondly, the cultic nature of the ceremony is very evident. As a component of the sacrificial meal accompanying Solomon's accession the note of joy is once again present, recalling the festive note of the še'lāmîm in Deut. 12:7,12; 14:26; 16:15. The Chronicler never permits the solemnity of such events to detract from their joyous nature. The importance of the ceremony for the Chronicler is seen not only by his extending it to cover a period of two days--a device also used in his account of the dedication of the temple (2 Chron. 7:8-9, contrast 1 Kings 8:66)--but also in the large number of animals sacrificed.¹²⁴ Noteworthy also is that there is here no mention of any concomitant

¹²⁴Here again it appears that the Chronicler has included details about such sacrifices in strategic places which he wished to mark as of special importance, cf. 2 Chron. 29:20-24,31-36; 30:1-27; 35.

festival which we may view as having served the actual primary cause of such sacrifices.¹²⁵

Thirdly, David continues to occupy a central place, as is apparent from both his taking the initiative in leading the people in their worship (verse 20) and in the favorable notice concerning his death (verse 27). However, the major emphasis here is rather on Solomon, whose coronation forms the backdrop for the narrative. We have already mentioned the emphasis placed upon the involvement of all Israel in that coronation and the unanimous support given by all, including David's other sons, to Solomon's rule. But the prosperity which was to mark Solomon's reign is also given considerable attention. This is remarkable in view of the fact that Solomon's reign had not yet begun, and this account is actually found within the David history. That it was Solomon, and not the insurgent Adonijah, whom Yahweh made great, is the likely meaning of verse 25 when it is seen in connection with David's prayer in 1 Chron. 29:12b.¹²⁶ That this prosperity predicated of Solomon's reign is a programmatic one rather than merely descriptive of one aspect of his reign is also likely on the basis of 1 Chron. 22:11-12, where this prosperity was on the one hand conditional upon Yahweh's presence with Solomon and his gift to him of wisdom and

¹²⁵Cf. 2 Chron. 29:32-35. Neither de Vaux, p. 102, nor Kraus, *Worship*, pp. 222-224, considers sacrifice a regular part of the coronation proceedings.

¹²⁶Note also the correspondency in vocabular between 1 Kings 1:5, "Now Adonijah exalted himself (mitnaššeh)" and 1 Chron. 29:11, where it is Yahweh alone who exalts, hammitnaššeh l'ekōl l'erō'š.

understanding and, on the other, was to result in obedience to the law and the successful completion of the temple. The significance which the Chronicler is willing to place upon Solomon is furthermore seen by his statement that Yahweh bestowed upon him honor "such as no king over Israel before him had had" (verse 25).¹²⁷

Fourthly, the Chronicler has also used the occasion of the transfer of the rule from David to Solomon to state his view of kingship in Israel. This is seen most clearly in the statement that "Solomon sat upon the throne of Yahweh as king (verse 23)," where the kingship of Yahweh over Israel is stated with absolute clarity and the subservient role of the king to him is implicit. The same is also true of the description of Solomon as a king/prince of Yahweh (verse 22). But that this subservient role of the monarch does not detract from, but rather adds to, his importance and the necessity for absolute obedience to him is also clear from the context into which the Chronicler has inserted it. This is dramatically highlighted in verse 20, where the Chronicler does not avoid positing the identical obeisance of both Yahweh and the king!

Finally, apart from the obvious relationship which existed between David and Solomon, several items in this concluding text appear

¹²⁷ While it would be tempting to interpret this phrase literally and hence point to Solomon's preeminence even to David for the Chronicler, as do Rudolph, XXI, 194, and Curtis and Madsen, XI, 307, it is likely that such an expression reflects customary usage in expressing good wishes for both the old monarch and the new. Cf. 1 Kings 1:37,47, where there is certainly no attempt to detract from David's grandeur.

to forge this link much more strongly. It should be recalled that throughout 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 the focus has been directed toward both David and Solomon. That this is of primary importance becomes clear when we note that nowhere else in the Old Testament has this relationship between a father and a son or a king and his successor been dwelt upon in such a prolonged and detailed manner.¹²⁸ Our unit contains several indications of the application in detail of this major concern which characterizes the section as a whole. Verse 22 states that "they made Solomon, the son of David, king," an expression hardly necessary for readers who have been following the narrative of the last several chapters. In the same way the statement of verse 23 that "Solomon sat upon the throne of Yahweh as king instead of David his father," while apparently equally superfluous and not at first striking in view of similar statements elsewhere,¹²⁹ deserves more attention. Closer scrutiny reveals that the explicit mention of the deceased king's name in the closing part of the formula is indeed exceptional, the more usual form being that occurring in verse 28b: "Solomon his son reigned in his stead." That David's other sons supported the new king, thus recognizing the legitimate authority as passing from David to Solomon, might be still another attempt to join these two reigns closely together. Finally, the statement that "David

¹²⁸The closest parallel is that of Moses' final charge to Joshua, which we have seen to lie at the base of David's speech in 1 Chronicles 22, cf. supra, pp. 30-33.

¹²⁹₂ Chron. 9:31; 12:16

the son of Jesse was king over all Israel" (verse 26) is parallel to the obedience of all Israel tendered Solomon in verse 23.¹³⁰

Concluding summary

We may accordingly summarize the major elements of importance for our study in this final section as follows:

1. The temple, which has been most prominent in all of the preceding units, here recedes into the background. The major emphasis falls upon Solomon, and the transfer of the kingship to him, and to a lesser degree upon David.
2. The unanimous participation and agreement of all Israel with this transfer of the kingship also comes to the forefront of the Chronicler's presentation.
3. The description of Solomon's reign is highly idealized. All Israel is obedient to him, Yahweh gives him unexcelled honor before all Israel, and even before his reign has begun the writer states that he prospered (šlh).
4. The cultic emphasis, with the attendant notes of sacrifice for all Israel and by all Israel and the resounding note of joy, is prominent.
5. Considerable attention is given to the theology of kingship in Israel. The kingdom is Yahweh's, and the king occupying the throne sits upon the throne of Yahweh. Particular attention is also given to placing the reigns of David and Solomon closely together, and thus viewing the kingship as a direct continuum.

Final Summary

We may best summarize the results of our study thus far under four heads, while admitting that the individual areas may overlap at times.

¹³⁰Cf. 2 Chron. 9:30, where Solomon also reigns over all Israel.

These are (1) David; (2) Solomon; (3) the temple, and (4) other theological motifs.

David

Much attention has in the past been given to the role of David in the Chronicler's history, and in particular to his preparations for the construction of the temple. David is the primary actor throughout these chapters, and, in addition, it is into his mouth that the writer has placed three important speeches and a prayer. It is David who determines the site of the new temple (22:1) and immediately afterward begins gathering workmen and materials for its construction (22:2-5; compare 29:2,19). It is David who charges Solomon to build the temple (22:6) and who presents Solomon before Israel's leaders as the chosen temple builder (28:1,5,20). David also received the plan of the temple from Yahweh and conveyed it to Solomon (28:11,19). He placed the priests and people at Solomon's disposal for work on the temple (28:21). Moreover, he both contributed generously to the work of the temple himself and took the initiative in successfully urging the people to do likewise (29:3-5). In response to their generous contributions David offers a suitable prayer (29:10-19) and again urges the congregation to do the same (29:20). The evaluation given him at his death by the Chronicler is adequate, if not extravagant: "He died in a good old age, filled with days, riches, and honor" (29:27).

However, despite the fact that the Chronicler has made David the chief protagonist in these proceedings, and placed into his mouth

words which no doubt reflect his own position, David was not to build the temple. Although this had been his desire (22:7; 28:3), a command of Yahweh had prevented him from accomplishing this desire. The reason the Chronicler gives for David's disqualification as temple builder is that David was a warrior and had "spilled blood" (22:8; 28:3). It is for this reason that attention shifts to Solomon, the man of peace.

Solomon

Solomon comes to the fore in these chapters in a different manner than does David, but is no less prominent. While David is the chief actor and spokesman, the focus of his actions is constantly Solomon and the temple which he is to construct, and the major apology of the speeches is similarly on Solomon's behalf as builder of the temple. David's preparations are undertaken with the construction of the temple in mind (22:5), and his speeches have as their major goal the transmission to Solomon, both privately and then before the people, the task which has been denied to David himself and the asking of the assembly's contributions for that task. After having disqualified David as temple builder, the Chronicler uses no less than three different devices to point to Solomon as the divinely chosen temple builder--the m^enūhā concept, which is applicable to Solomon on the basis of the etymology of the name Solomon; the form for the induction into office, which entrusts Solomon with the task of the building the temple and encourages him with the promise of the divine presence (22:11-13,

28:9,20), and the application to Solomon of the bhr theme otherwise reserved for pre-Solomonic kings. While Solomon remains the silent participant throughout the chapters, apologetic concerns are again apparent in connection with his anointing, where in particular the unanimous support of the people accorded him, the prosperous nature of his reign, and his unique position among kings (29:23-25) is tendential and points to his importance for the Chronicler.

Temple

In discussing the positions and preparations occupied and undertaken by David and Solomon in Chronicles, it must not be forgotten that both are subservient to the major theme of the temple itself. With the single exception of 29:20-30 the temple has lain at the heart of each of the smaller units studied, as the structural outlines clearly show. David's first act introduced in this non-synoptic section was the proclamation of the site of the temple (22:1), and the numerous provisions which follow--workmen, materials, contributions--and even the choice of Solomon the builder, are really developments of this one central theme.

While the centrality of the temple is at times in danger of being obscured by the numerous details with which the Chronicler adorns his narrative, it is instructive to note the numerous instances where this concern is introduced again into a speech or narrative which has drifted somewhat from this goal. While one can point to the explicit mention of the temple in, for example, 22:1,2,5,6,7,8,10,11, the usages in verses 6 and 11 are particularly striking in pointing to the central

thrust of the entire section. In the same way the specific mention of the temple in 28:10,20; 29:19--all of which, it may be noted, conclude units of the larger pericope--are careful to relate the work of David and Solomon directly to this one task. The only pericope not so related is the final one, 29:20-30, which relates Solomon's assumption of the rule and the customary data concerning David's death and rule.

Theological motifs

While the Chronicler's major concern has thus been upon the temple and the role of David and Solomon in relation to it, he has at the same time given expression to numerous theological conceptions which may be seen to play a prominent role throughout his work, especially in his treatment of the post-Solomonic kings, and which also must be considered in discussing the audience and purpose of the Chronicler. We may list these as follows:

1. The All-Israel theme. The Chronicler has sought to present all Israel as in unanimous agreement with and actively involved in the activities most dear to him, in particular, with the construction of the temple and the reign of Solomon. To this end he has introduced not only David's convoking of the larger assembly for his speeches, but also the role of the various workmen and princes (28:21), the generous contributions of the people to the temple (29:6-9), their involvement in the ceremonies accompanying Solomon's accession (29:20-22), and their unanimous obedience to the new king (29:23-24).

2. The doctrine of retributive justice. While a complete formulation of this doctrine, which forms the basic principle according to which the Chronicler narrates the history of the post-Solomonic kings, is given only in 28:9, numerous other details which may best be viewed as a part of or in direct relation to this dogma are more prominent. Chief among these is an emphasis upon the observance of the law, which has become apparent in 22:12-13; 28:7, and 29:19. While this emphasis may be due in part to the Chronicler's literary dependence upon Joshua 1, which has been utilized extensively in framing Solomon's task as temple builder, there can be little doubt that he was one with the Deuteronomist in this emphasis. The omniscience of God as a motive for keeping the law is introduced in 28:9; 29:17, as is God's delight in "righteous acts" (29:17). While the observance of the law does seem to be related to the larger question of the nature of the covenant in 28:9, this question is not pursued further. Similarly, while the ability to observe the law is in some manner dependent upon Yahweh himself (22:11-12; 29:18-19), there is no further discussion of the relationship between God's grace and man's responsibility to observe the law.

3. The disposition of the heart. While closely related in many instances to the preceding concern about the keeping of the law, this concept is deserving of separate mention in a summation of the Chronicler's theology, both because of its frequency and the numerous applications he has given it. For the Chronicler it is not sufficient that Israel observe the letter of the law, contribute their valuables to the temple, and be present for its ceremonies. What is required is obedience with a perfect heart (28:9; 29:9,17), contributions willingly

given (29:1-9,14,17), and participation with joy (29:9,17,22). Anything less than this, we may surely deduce, is unpleasing to the God who searches the heart and examines the mind (28:9; 29:17).

4. The Levites. Since our results are to be related to the purpose of the Chronicler, it should be mentioned that any concern for the Levites, among whom the author of Chronicles is often numbered and whose interests he supposedly champions, is almost completely absent in the text of these chapters as we have reconstructed it, occurring only in 28:21, where they are committed to Solomon's use in the temple work along with the priests, craftsmen, officers, and people, and 29:8, where one Jehiel, a Gershonite, is in charge of the treasury of the temple.

5. The kingship of Yahweh. While introduced only briefly (29:23), such a concept may well lie behind the view of David and Solomon presented previously, and perhaps provides the rationale behind the one unit of our study (29:20-30) not directly related to the temple.

With our findings thus summarized, it may be well at this point to mention some of the more important questions raised, and with which the remainder of this study will deal:

1. Does the temple retain its significance in the remainder of Chronicles? If so, what is the reason for this significance?
2. Is the picture drawn by the author of David and Solomon in these chapters sustained throughout Chronicles? What is the relationship between them?
3. How does the significance of David, Solomon, and the Davidic dynasty relate to that of the temple? Are they to be considered equal, or is the one subservient to the other?

4. Are the theological motifs found in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 unique to this section, or are they representative of the Chronicler's interests throughout his work?
5. Does the inclusion of these chapters at this place in the Chronicler's history have significance for the structure of the work?
6. Why is so little attention given here to the Levites?
7. How do these questions relate to the broader question of the purpose of the writer?¹³¹

¹³¹For final summation of these questions, see infra, pp. 207-213.

CHAPTER III

DAVID AND SOLOMON IN CHRONICLES AND

THE DEUTERONOMIC HISTORY

Our study of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 has shown that in these chapters the Chronicler has repeatedly emphasized the role played by David and Solomon over against the temple. The speeches of David in particular have designated Solomon as the divinely chosen builder of the temple. Moreover, Solomon's reign is introduced in a most auspicious manner in that not only is he offered immediately the enthusiastic and unanimous obedience of all Israel--including his erstwhile opponents, the remaining sons of David--but also by other items which point to the God-pleasing nature of his reign.

In this chapter we will investigate more thoroughly the manner in which the Chronicler has portrayed David and Solomon to determine whether our initial reactions on the basis of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 find further support throughout the work or whether they need to be modified or discarded. Since the Chronicler's treatment of these two kings can only be understood by comparison with the account of the Deuteronomic historian, we shall in each case summarize the treatment of the respective king in the Deuteronomic history and then compare and contrast that treatment with the one accorded him in Chronicles. We shall focus our attention upon several areas of special importance for our study: (1) The manner in which the rise of the king to power is depicted, including the response of the people to his kingship;

(2) His position in the dynastic lineage; (3) His relationship to the cult; (4) The part attributed to him in the division of the kingdom; (5) The general evaluation given him by the respective writer. Lastly, we must include also various other materials which point to the significant role which Solomon occupied for the writer of Chronicles.

David in the Deuteronomic History

In the Deuteronomic history David is anointed king while Saul still occupies the throne, and "the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward" (1 Sam. 16:13). While the writer presents vividly and in great detail the difficulties which David encountered in his rise to power, the support which he receives from the people is presented as an ever-increasing one (1 Sam. 16:6-8,16; 2 Sam. 3:36), and his ultimate success in the achievement of his God-given role seems assured from the time that the prophet Samuel anoints him at the command of Yahweh (1 Sam. 16:12). Not only is Yahweh's presence with David repeatedly affirmed (1 Sam. 18:14,28; 2 Sam. 5:10; 7:3), but even prior to the dynastic oracle of 2 Samuel 7 the conviction is repeatedly voiced by friend and foe alike that it is David alone whom Yahweh has chosen to rule over his kingdom.¹ Although Samuel records numerous incidents which picture David as deceptive, no judgment is pronounced upon these acts, the writer instead emphasizing David's constant loyalty to Saul as Yahweh's anointed (1 Sam. 22:14;

¹Cf. Jonathon (1 Sam. 20:15; 23:17), Saul (1 Sam. 24:20; 26:25), Abigail (1 Sam. 25:28), the dead Samuel (1 Sam. 28:17), and Abner (2 Sam. 3:9-10,18).

24:6,17; 2 Sam. 1:16) and contrasting David's guilelessness with Saul's treachery and deceit (1 Sam. 18:12-16,28,29; 2 Sam. 3:1 and others). Following Saul's death David is first anointed ruler over Judah at Hebron, where he rules seven and one-half years. After an extended period of conflict with Saul's house, Israel too joins in a covenant with him, and David then rules over a united Israel and Judah for thirty-three years from Jerusalem (2 Sam. 5:3-5).

Although David is prevented from building the temple as he had desired, the dynastic oracle of 2 Samuel 7 promises that his seed "who will come forth from his loins" ('āšer yēšē' mimme'ēkā) will both have his kingdom established and build the temple (2 Sam. 7:12-13), and that even if a king commits iniquity Yahweh will not withdraw his ḥesed from him. References to David's position as the founder of the dynasty and the recipient of the promise are frequent throughout Kings.²

Concerning David's relationship to the cult, Samuel reports that David has the ark brought to Jerusalem immediately upon his conquest of the city (2 Samuel 6) and that he pitched a tent for it. No details are given concerning this tent, although one may assume that it was actually quite elaborate,³ and there is no mention at all of the

²Cf. the mention of the "house of David" (1 Kings 12:19,20,26, and frequently), as well as the explicit mention of the oath sworn to David or Yahweh's choice of David (1 Kings 6:12; 8:5,16,24; 9:5; 11:36, 38), and the frequent mention of Yahweh's grace "for the sake of David" (1 Kings 11:13,32; 15:4; 2 Kings 19:34; 20:6).

³Cf. Frank Cross, Jr., "The Priestly Tabernacle," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader, I (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), 201-228, who believes that the later description of the tabernacle in P was in part a retrojection of David's tent to the earlier period.

involvement of cultic personnel either during or after the transfer. Neither is there any indication that David made any provisions for the construction of the temple either before or after being forbidden to build it, although the statement that Solomon later "brought in the things which David his father had dedicated--the silver, the gold, and the vessels--and stored them in the treasuries of the house of the Lord" (1 Kings 7:51), could possibly be so interpreted.

At only two points during David's reign has the Deuteronomic writer recorded God's displeasure with David. Following David's adultery with Bathsheba and the consequent murder of Uriah, the prophet Nathan condemns David. While David's sins are forgiven following his confession, much of the remainder of the Court History pictures in vivid terms the "evil against you from your own house" which Nathan had prophesied (2 Sam. 12:11).⁴ David's action in conducting a census of Israel is similarly condemned and punished, but the acceptance of David's sacrifice again points to his forgiveness (2 Samuel 24). On his deathbed David, at the urging of Bathsheba and Nathan, has Solomon appointed his successor, so that the perpetuation of the dynastic line through him continues to be acknowledged.

⁴R. A. Carlson, David, the Chosen King, translated by Eric J. Sharpe and Stanley Rudman (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964), p. 104 and passim, believes that the Deuteronomic writer has divided the life of David into two distinct periods, the first of which is characterized by blessing and is summarized in 2 Sam. 7:1 and the second of which is characterized by placing David under the curse, 2 Samuel 9 to 20. It should be noted that according to such a division all parts of David's reign except the Court History are favorable to him.

While Kings contains no explicit closing evaluation of David as it does of most kings, it is apparent that the author considers David to be the primary example of the good king, in comparison with whom other kings are to be judged. Numerous kings are evaluated in accordance with whether they "walked in the way of David" or "did right like David."⁵ In one instance David's murder of Uriah is included in such a formula as the sole example of David's misconduct (1 Kings 15:5).

David in Chronicles

Wellhausen's bitter caricature of the Chronicler's treatment of David is well known but deserving of repetition:

See what Chronicles has made out of David! The founder of the kingdom has become the founder of the temple and the public worship, the king and hero at the head of his companions in arms has become the singer and master of ceremonies at the head of a swarm of priests and Levites; his clearly cut figure has become a feeble holy picture, seen through a cloud of incense.⁶

In partial agreement with Wellhausen, we must admit that most of the material of Samuel and Kings which pictures David as the scheming, often ruthless leader of an outlaw band or as a king who could control neither his own passions nor his own family is not contained in Chronicles.⁷ The account of David as found in Chronicles is focused

⁵1 Kings 3:3,14; 9:4; 11:4,6,33,38; 14:8; 15:3,11; 2 Kings 14:3; 16:2; 18:3; 22:2.

⁶Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), p. 182.

⁷However, the reason for the omission is more apt to lie in the fact that the material was of no particular use for the Chronicler's purpose than that he was attempting to cover up David's indiscretions. Cf. the unfavorable account of David in 1 Chronicles 21.

sharply upon two areas of particular concern for the writer: (1) His rise to power, which was both in conformity to God's will and which accordingly received the immediate and unanimous consent of all Israel; (2) His concern for cultic matters. A brief overview of 1 Chronicles 10 to 21 may serve to illustrate the degree to which the Chronicler's presentation of David has been guided by these two concerns.

The subject of David's rise to power has been dealt with by the Chronicler at considerable limits in 1 Chronicles 10 to 12. With the exception of the final two verses, 1 Chronicles 10 parallels 1 Samuel 31 in describing Saul's final disastrous battle with the Philistines. This unusual place to begin his narrative of Israel's history, omitting not only all of Israel's pre-monarchical history but also Saul's rise to power and his struggle with David, together with the interpretative comments of verses 13 and 14, makes it apparent that Saul has been introduced only to prepare for the rise of David. By attributing Saul's death directly to Yahweh and justifying it on the basis of Saul's unfaithfulness,⁸ the Chronicler has accentuated Yahweh's rejection of the house of Saul,⁹ and by Yahweh's turning the kingdom over to David the son of Jesse (verse 14) he has firmly established David's divine right to exercise that kingship.

⁸For the significance of mā'al in the work of the Chronicler, cf. infra, p. 180.

⁹The completeness of this rejection is also indicated by the fact that the Chronicler has in 10:6 recorded the death of all Saul's house, cf. 1 Sam. 31:6

Having established David's right to rule, the Chronicler next moves to demonstrate Israel's unanimous acceptance of him as her king. Bypassing the account of 2 Samuel 1 to 4, which speak of David's efforts to secure the throne amidst considerable opposition and David's establishment of a temporary reign at Hebron over the tribe of Judah only, Chronicles jumps immediately to David's covenant with "all Israel" at Hebron and his subsequent anointing as king "according to the word of the Lord by Samuel" (1 Chron. 11:1-3). After a brief mention of the capture of Jerusalem (13:4-9 = 2 Sam. 5:6-10), which is likewise undertaken with the assistance of all Israel (verse 4), most of the remainder of 1 Chronicles 11 is composed of a list of Davidic warriors which in the Deuteronomic history stood as a kind of appendix in 2 Sam. 23:8-39.¹⁰ The reason for its incorporation at this place in Chronicles is quite obvious, both because of the general character of the preceding sections and by reason of the editorial comment inserted by the Chronicler in 11:10. The list has been utilized by the Chronicler to point out that these heroes, as has "all Israel," previously, have immediately recognized David as the chosen king and supported him in securing that kingship.

Chapter 12 contains the first extensive non-synoptic section of Chronicles, consisting primarily of lists of men who supposedly came to the support of David in his bid for the throne early in his rise to

¹⁰The origin of 1 Chron. 11:41b-46, which is absent in Samuel, is disputed. Cf. M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1943), pp. 117-123.

power. If we agree to consider at least 12:24-41 as from the hand of the Chronicler,¹¹ the primary emphasis of the chapter nevertheless continues to be upon the widespread, seemingly unanimous support for the kingship of David and the recognized correspondency between that kingship and the will and word of Yahweh. This may be seen most clearly in verses 24 and 39. The enthusiasm which the Chronicler is able to muster for this theme is furthermore clear in that the enumeration of the tribes found in verses 25 to 38 is the fullest in the Old Testament, consisting in no less than fourteen names, as well as by the joyous character of the feast described in verses 39 to 41.

¹¹That the materials of this chapter do not form a closely knit unit is obvious, although there is little agreement on details. Noth, pp. 115-116, considers 12:24-41 to be secondary and 12:1-23 later yet, reasoning "denn hätte Chr diese Aufzählung der nach Hebron zur Thronerhebung Davids zusammenströmenden Vertreter aller israelitischen Stämme schon gekannt, dann hätte er sich die Mühe sparen können, in 11:10-47 die zahlreichen Einzelpersonen aufzuführen, die nach seiner Angabe Davids Thronerhebung unterstützten. Nun war 12:24-41 ursprünglich als Ergänzung zu 11:10-47 zugesetzt worden als weiterer Beitrag zu dem gleichen Thema; dann aber sind die dazwischen stehenden Aufzählungen in 12:1-23 vermutlich noch spätere Zutaten, die auch schon deswegen kaum in den Plan von Chr passen" Noth is supported by J. Myers, *I Chronicles, The Anchor Bible*, edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965), XII, 95. Other scholars, however, such as W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher, Handbuch zum Alten Testament* (Erste Reihe; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), XXI, 2, 103-111, consider at least most of vv. 24 to 41 as original with the Chronicler. All are agreed, however, that the lists found in this chapter are not inventions of either the Chronicler or a later hand, but rest upon older traditions.

Whatever the disposition of the various lists, it seems best to retain v. 24, which connects reasonably well with 11:47 (cf. the unusual w'e'ēlleh misperê rā'sê heḥālûš, where the Septuagint reads šemôt for misperê, neither of which is really applicable to the following verses), and vv. 39 to 41, against which no serious argument has been advanced. That 12:24-38 is itself not a unit has not been generally acknowledged, but seems likely in view of the more extended form and the vastly larger numbers following the Benjaminites in v. 30.

Immediately following the lists of 1 Chronicles 12, which are to be considered an adjunct to David's anointing at Hebron, the Chronicler turns in 1 Chronicles 13 to 16 to David's concern for cultic matters, bypassing for the time being the events recorded in 2 Sam. 5:11-25. The result is that David turns his concerns to the ark immediately upon completion of the anointing at Hebron and the capture of Jerusalem. While 1 Chron. 13:5-14 is largely a reproduction of 2 Sam. 6:1-11, the prologue which the Chronicler has provided in 13:1-4 points to the significance which this subject had for the Chronicler.¹² Following the first unsuccessful attempt to bring the ark to Jerusalem (13:5-14), the Chronicler relates in chapter 14 three events from 2 Samuel 5 previously bypassed in proceeding directly to the ark episode.¹³ But verse 17, which the Chronicler has appended as a conclusion, marks clearly another step in the progressive report: "The fame of David went out into all lands, and the Lord brought the fear of him upon all nations" (verse 17).

With David thus glorified in the eyes of the surrounding nations, the Chronicler returns in chapters 15 and 16 to his concern for the ark. Leaving aside 15:4-10, 16-24 as probable expansion from another hand,¹⁴ the introduction relates how David, after having built houses

¹²In addition to the concern for the ark itself, the note of David's concern for all Israel and the enthusiastic agreement which is indicated in v.4 is characteristic of the Chronicler.

¹³It appears that the presence of the material here was governed only by its location in Samuel.

¹⁴Vv. 4 to 10 appear to be an elaboration of v. 11, cf. Noth, p. 116; Rudolph, XXI, 115. Rudolph also considers the references to

for himself and the ark, reaffirmed the role of the Levites as the bearers of the ark (verse 2), interpreted the previous failure to bring the ark safely into Jerusalem as due either to their failure to carry it or to the fact that they carried it in an improper manner (verse 13), and instructed the six Levitical heads to sanctify themselves to bring up the ark (verse 12). These rituals properly accomplished, the Levites bear the ark according to Moses' command and the ark arrives safely in Jerusalem.

David's relationship to the cultic personnel after the arrival of the ark in Jerusalem is also clouded with critical questions. Accepting the position of Rudolph, which considers only 16:1-5a, 39-41 as original with the Chronicler, a view fairly indicative of modern scholarship,¹⁵ this pericope relates David's appointment of certain

the priests in vv. 11 and 14 a later addition, as does A. Welch, The Work of the Chronicler (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 65. Vv. 16 to 24, which enumerate under six heads a total of 862 priests and Levites gathered together in Jerusalem, gives David the initiative for directing the Levites to appoint singers and musicians prior to the moving of the ark, appear to overlap with 16:4-6, which do the same following the arrival of the ark in Jerusalem. It is generally recognized today that there is nothing a priori to be said against the Davidic origin of temple music, however, cf. W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (5th edition; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1969), p. 121.

¹⁵Cf. Rudolph, XXI, in loc., and Noth, p. 116, who considers all of 16:5-38, 41-42 as late, thus leaving only vv. 1-4, 39-40 to the Chronicler. Rudolph's acceptance of v. 5a characteristically permits a limited amount of organization to the Levites, as does also v. 41. Taken together, these two verses account for the deployment of two groups of Levites of two families each to the shrines at Gibeon and Jerusalem. In view of the importance attributed to both shrines in 2 Chron. 1:2-5 it would appear likely that the Chronicler would arrange for Levites in both places. Welch, pp. 72-73 and passim, believes the

Levites as ministers "to give thanks and to praise Yahweh" (verse 4). Asaph is listed as the chief of the singers and musicians and Zechariah as his second (verse 5). Zadok and his brethren, together with the Levites Heman and Jeduthun, are to remain at Gibeon with the tabernacle and altar of burnt offering "to offer the daily offerings according to all that is written in the law of Yahweh." Thus it appears that Mosaic tôrâ is cited as the authority in areas where it would be applicable, such as the Levites' function in carrying the ark (1 Chron. 15:2,13,15), but the function of the Levites as singers and musicians, which may well have been based on the proposition that the Levites were set aside to minister to Yahweh for ever (compare 1 Chron. 15:2), is attributed directly to David.

With chapter 17 the Chronicler returns to his Vorlage, and chapters 17 to 21 relate to 2 Samuel 7, 8, 10, and 24 in essentially identical form. The reason for the inclusion of 1 Chronicles 17 (= 2 Samuel 7) and 1 Chronicles 21 (= 2 Samuel 24) is easily seen. The first of these chapters relates with few differences Nathan's well known oracle promising David an eternal dynasty but denying him the honor of constructing the temple.¹⁶ The latter, which culminates in Yahweh's

traditions concerning the tabernacle, which were connected with Gibeon, and those of the ark with its tent stem from two different hands.

¹⁶Due to the great importance often placed upon the differences between 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicles 17 and the bearing of these differences upon the Chronicler's evaluation of David and Solomon, it would be well here to summarize the most significant divergencies:

(a) The statement of 2 Sam. 7:5, hā'attâ tibneh lî habbayit, reads in 2 Chron. 17:4 lô' attâ tibneh lî habbayit. While the denial of David's request to build the temple is certainly more explicit in

acceptance of David's sacrifice offered on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite through the appearance of fire from heaven, leads to David's pronouncement of 22:1 that this place will be the site for the new temple. While the reason for the inclusion of the material of chapters 18 to 21 is not clear, and is probably due once again only to its presence in the Chronicler's Vorlage, they clearly redound to the glory of David and Israel.¹⁷ Our investigation of 1 Chronicles 22,

Chronicles, the significance of this should not be overstated, since the answer to the rhetorical question in Samuel is also clear. The Chronicler's reading habbayit does focus more clearly on a single, recognized temple which the author had in mind.

(b) Attention is often called to 2 Sam. 7:12, which speaks of Yahweh's promise to David's seed 'āšer yēsē' mimmē'ēkā, as contrasted with 1 Chron. 17:11, which reads 'āšer yihyeh mibbānēkā. It may be doubted whether the alteration here is of any significance. While most commentators understand mibbānēkā to refer more directly to one of David's natural sons, i.e., Solomon, the opposite has also been argued. Cf. G. von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934), p. 124, who uses the same word as an example of the broadening of the promise to later generations.

(c) The omission of 2 Sam. 7:14, which speaks of the possibility of the chosen king's committing iniquity, is often pointed to as occasioned by the writer's high regard for the Davidic line. This explanation is at least suspect in view of such cases as 1 Chron. 22:13; 28:6,9; cf. 2 Chron. 6:17 = 1 Kings 9:4.

(d) The statement of 2 Sam. 7:16, which refers to the establishment of "your [David's] house and your kingdom" is in 1 Chron. 17:14 altered to "I will set him over my house and my kingdom." This alteration is equally applicable to both David and Solomon, but only in so far as it pictures Israel as the kingdom of Yahweh, cf. 1 Chron. 29:23; 2 Chron. 13:8.

¹⁷All attempts to relate these chapters to the intent of the temple narrative appear to have failed. Thus Rudolph, XXI, 139, believes that the chapters illustrate the reason why David himself was forbidden to build the temple, i.e., he had spilled much blood, cf. 1 Chron. 22:8; 28:3. But the generally positive tone, plus the absence of such a passage as 2 Sam. 8:2, makes this seem unlikely. Similarly the suggestion of various commentators, e.g., Myers, XII, 137, that it was through the booty from these wars that the temple was financed appears too ingenious. If another ingenious solution may be offered from the

28, and 29 has then shown how David undertook preparations for both building materials and workmen for the task ahead, entrusted to Solomon the task of erecting the temple, and even provided him with inspired plans to guide the work. David himself makes generous contributions for the construction and solicits and receives the same from the assembled congregation.

In considering Chronicle's view of David we must also extend our study into 2 Chronicles, where references to David occur some thirty-five times without parallel in Kings.¹⁸ Of these non-synoptic passages, by far the most sizeable group, apart from those passages which speak only in general terms of David as the father of Solomon, has to do with David's relationship to cultic matters. A portion of these have to do with building operations per se, and in particular 2 Chron. 3:1 relates carefully how Solomon began to build the temple "in Jerusalem, on

perspective of this paper, it may be that they reflect the lack of m^enúhâ in the reign of David. It should also be noted that the outline of the Deuteronomic writer is stylized here also in that he has placed 2 Samuel 7 with its introductory "when . . . Yahweh had given him [David] rest" prior to these accounts of David's wars.

¹⁸Apart from the phrase "the city of David," the name David occurs some sixty times in 2 Chronicles, thirty-five of which have no parallel in Kings. By way of contrast, forty-one of sixty-four occurrences in Kings--again omitting consideration of the "city of David"--are found in the Solomon section, twenty-eight of these without parallel in Chronicles, while of the twenty-three remaining occurrences in the book fourteen have no parallel in Chronicles. Most of the instances where Chronicles does not include the parallel are due to his habit of omitting entire sections which were of little interest to him or which did not agree with his Tendenz. Cf. 1 Kings 11, which names David fourteen times, but which is omitted by the Chronicler because of its negative view of Solomon.

Mount Moriah,¹⁹ where Yahweh had appeared to David his father, at the place that David had appointed, on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite." Solomon's communication with Hiram of Tyre also refers to David's temple work.²⁰ While it is also possible to see in the references to David's bringing the ark to Jerusalem and preparing a place for it (2 Chron. 1:4) and Solomon's census of the aliens "after the census which David his father had taken of them" (2 Chron. 2:16), all-in-all it appears that Chronicles has given a minimum of attention in these sections to David's role in building the temple. The focus is rather upon Solomon, who conducts a census like David, secures timber and craftsmen like David, and begins construction of the temple at the place sanctioned by divine approval and appointed by David. In drawing this parallel between David and Solomon, however, the Chronicler does not at all disparage the work of Solomon, but rather presents it as part of a unified effort culminating in the completed temple.

In the remaining references having to do more directly with David and the cult, two different but related areas of concern may be noted. The first of these has to do with David's relation to the music of the temple service. This is a completely new emphasis from that of 1 Chronicles, which had spoken only of the personnel in charge of the music. But 2 Chron. 7:6 speaks of the Levites who stood at their post with instruments of music which David himself had made, a reference repeated

¹⁹Note the identification here also of the site of the temple with the site of Abraham's offering of Isaac, cf. Genesis 21.

²⁰Cf. 2 Chron. 2:2,6,13.

in 2 Chron. 29:26,27, where these instruments are contrasted with the trumpets of the priests. In such close proximity it is possible that the reference to Hezekiah's action in stationing the Levites in the temple with certain musical instruments "according to the commandment of David and of Gad the king's seer and of Nathan the prophet" (2 Chron. 29:25) may refer as much to the musical instruments involved as it does to the installation of the Levites, although it is impossible to be certain.²¹

Yet another type of reference occurs in 2 Chron. 29:30, where Hezekiah commands the Levites to sing praises with the words of David and Asaph the seer. Such an association of David with the lyrics used in the temple is otherwise unknown in Chronicles, although the tradition of David's capabilities in this area are well known in other portions of the Old Testament (compare 2 Sam. 1:17-27; 23:1-2, and the Psalm titles). It should also be noted that while in the previous passage David's action was connected with that of Gad and Nathan, he is here associated with Asaph, who is identified as a seer.

Closely related to these passages, and at times intertwined with them, are those referring to David's organization of the priests and Levites. This concern was found repeatedly in 1 Chronicles, although it is difficult to determine which passages are original with the Chronicler.

²¹The reference to David's musical instruments in Amos 6:5 is of unquestioned authenticity, although it is of course derogatory in its tone.

The passages of immediate interest here are 2 Chron. 8:14; 23:18; 29:25-30, and 35:4,15. Unfortunately, there is no agreement on the authenticity of these passages.²² Although dogmatism is impossible here and all conclusions must be tentative, there appears no reason to doubt the statements of 29:25-30 and 30:15 that the Levites connected with the temple music traced their office back through David and his prophets. If any of the other passages are from the hand of the Chronicler, the entire Levitical organization, without respect to individual function, might also be traced back to David, although it is in fact Solomon (2 Chron. 8:14) who brought the plans of David to completion. That such may be assumed to be the case seems most probable in view of 1 Chron. 16:4, without regard to the relationship between these disputed passages and 1 Chronicles 23 to 27, in connection with which their authenticity is often judged. Of special note is the fact that in one case (2 Chron. 30:4) David and Solomon are paralleled with regard to their directives for the Levites.²³

²²R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, translated by John McHugh (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961), p. 390, speaks of the great difficulty involved and chooses to reconstruct the history of the priesthood in this period in broad outline form rather than dealing with any specific passages. Noth, p. 117, questions the integrity of only four passages in 2 Chronicles, but these are all those listed except 29:25-30. While Noth would omit all of 8:14-15, Rudolph, XXI, 221, would omit only the two references to David's command in v. 14. Similarly while Noth omits all reference to the Levites or David from 23:18, Rudolph instead alters "David" in v. 18a to "Solomon"! Rudolph also believes that only the name of Solomon is original in 35:4, to which David is a later addition. As nicely as Rudolph's reconstruction would complement our study, such a wholesale alteration appears hazardous.

²³Cf. also Neh. 12:45, where a similar paralleling occurs.

In Chronicles, as in the Deuteronomic history, David is regarded as the founder of the dynasty. This may be seen most clearly by the retention of the dynastic oracle of 2 Samuel 7 in 1 Chronicles 17. Several of the non-synoptic passages reiterate this position. Abijah's famous speech to Jeroboam reminds him that "Yahweh has given the kingship forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt" (2 Chron. 13:5), and the consequences of this for the north are more fully developed in verse 8: "And now you think to withstand the kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of David." This relationship to the Davidic dynasty is also heightened by the speech of the priest Jehoida upon the occasion of Joash's succession: "Behold, the king's son! Let him reign, as Yahweh spoke concerning David's sons" (2 Chron. 23:3).

It is in keeping with this dynastic emphasis the Chronicler has added as the conclusion of Solomon's dedicatory prayer in 2 Chron. 6:41-42 a quotation from Ps. 132:8-9, which refers not only to the arrival of the ark in the temple but also to Yahweh's hesed for David, and that, in comparison with 2 Kings 8:19, the covenant terminology in 2 Chron. 21:7 is much sharper.²⁴ All-in-all, however, there appears to be little substantial change in the position accorded to the dynasty by the Chronicler.

In Chronicles as in Samuel and Kings David remains the exemplary king in comparison with whom others are judged. However, this happens far less frequently in Chronicles than in Kings. In only four cases has the Chronicler taken over from the Deuteronomic writer a direct

²⁴The same is also true of 2 Chron. 7:18 compared with 1 Kings 9:5.

or implied statement of evaluation which makes mention of David.²⁵ In only one case has he added such an evaluation, noting that at the time of Rehoboam Judah walked for three years "in the way of David and Solomon" (2 Chron. 11:18), a phrase which joins Solomon with David in a manner quite inconceivable in the earlier history.

We may then summarize by noting that the Chronicler has probably idealized David's rise to power to some degree, omitting reference to any substantial opposition to his reign and stressing the unanimous support of the people for his kingship. The great bulk of the Court History, including David's affair with Bathsheba, has also been bypassed, although the reason for this is more open to question. The Chronicler has viewed David as the originator of the musical instruments of the cult, a contributor to the lyrics of some of the chants, and the one responsible for those Levitical groups concerned with music in the temple. It is probable that the Chronicler has also viewed David as responsible for the remaining Levitical divisions, although the precise nature of his activity here is more difficult to evaluate. The Chronicler has also stressed David's preparations for the building of the temple, and has him decree the building site,

²⁵2 Chron. 7:17 = 1 Kings 9:4 (Solomon); 2 Chron. 28:1 = 2 Kings 16:2 (Ahaz); 2 Chron. 29:2 = 2 Kings 18:3 (Hezekiah); 2 Chron. 34:2 = 2 Kings 22:2 (Josiah).

²⁶Many manuscripts contain an additional reference to David in 2 Chron. 17:3, but the use of the adjective *hārī'šōnīm*, "the former," makes no sense when related to the reign of David, while it is easily understood in view of the Chronicler's portrayal of Asa (cf. 2 Chron. 16:7-14). The omission is also supported by the Septuagint manuscripts Vaticanus and Alexandrinus.

arrange for workmen and materials, and commission Solomon for the actual construction. On the other hand, there is no discernible attempt to emphasize David's role as the founder of the dynasty, and the use of David as a standard by which other kings are judged appears to be minimized. The significance of this observation will become more apparent in studying the Chronicler's view of Solomon.

Solomon in Chronicles and the Deuteronomic History

In turning to Solomon, we shall once again concern ourselves with specific areas, which however embrace the great majority of the Solomon materials: the manner in which his rise to power is depicted, his relationship to the cult, his role in the division of the empire, and the general evaluation given him by the respective writer.

Solomon in the Deuteronomic History

While it seems to have been the position of the writer of Samuel and Kings that Solomon was the divinely chosen successor of David, as is evident in his treatment of such passages as 1 Kings 5 and 2 Sam. 11:24, he has not permitted this view to determine the manner in which the Solomon history has been portrayed. This is apparent most of all from the incorporation of the so-called Court History of David, 2 Samuel 9 to 20 and 1 Kings 1 and 2, into his work, which relates in great detail the strife among the sons of David as to who will succeed him. In particular, while statements of 1 Kings 1 and 2 make it apparent that David had promised Bathsheba that Solomon would be the next

king (2 Kings 1:12,30,35), this was apparently either unknown or disregarded by a considerable number of people (compare 1 Kings 2:15). There is no indication that David's choice of Solomon was also to be considered a divine one apart from the cryptic note of 2 Sam. 12:24 and the statement attributed to Adonijah in 2 Kings 2:15, and Adonijah's actions which followed indicated that he did not take such a view too seriously. Rather it was in response to Adonijah's power play that Solomon, supported by Nathan the prophet, Zadok the priest, Benaiah, and not least David's mighty men (2 Kings 1:8), that Solomon emerged as the new king of Israel. Solomon then proceeded to secure his throne by effectively silencing all opposition to his rule, banishing Abiathar from the priesthood and arranging for the death of Joab and Adonijah. With these considerations cared for, the writer remarks pithily: "The kingdom was established in the hands of Solomon" (1 Kings 2:46).

For the Deuteronomic historian the construction of the temple occupied the major part of Solomon's reign. Previous discussion has shown how that writer has in 1 Kings 5:15-19; 8:16-21 applied the dynastic oracle of 2 Samuel 7 together with the concept of rest to demonstrate Solomon's right to build the temple.²⁷ Solomon accordingly arranges for timber with Hiram of Tyre and conscripts a levy of forced labor out of all Israel to work with Hiram's servants (1 Kings 5:20-32). Solomon completes the temple after seven years of labor, arranging

²⁷Supra, pp. 29-30.

to have the bronze work done by another Hiram, son of a widow of Naphtali (1 Kings 7:13).

Solomon's cultic concerns did not conclude with the erection of the temple, however. Instead he assembled the elders of Israel (1 Kings 8:1) and the ark is brought up from the city of David by priests and/or Levites and deposited in the holy of holies (1 Kings 8:4-9).²⁸ The transfer of the ark to the temple is completed with the appearance of the glory of Yahweh in a cloud (2 Chron. 8:11), following which Solomon speaks a long prayer of dedication and holds a dedicatory feast with all Israel which extends for seven days. A great number of sacrifices are offered, and on the eighth day the people are dismissed "joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness the Lord had shown to David his servant and Israel his people" (1 Kings 8:66). An isolated note in 2 Chron. 9:25 mentions that it was Solomon's custom to offer sacrifices three times per year.

The final evaluation of Solomon in Kings however is not based on his temple activities, but on his syncretistic worship practices. While Solomon's frequenting of the high places prior to the erection of the temple seems to be largely condoned by the writer,²⁹ the same cannot be said for the report of 1 Kings 11. There Solomon's marriage with

²⁸The reference to the tent of meeting and its vessels in 1 Kings 8:4 is a later addition on the basis of 2 Chron. 5:5. For the Chronicler the tent of meeting in question was not David's tent, but that at Gibeon (cf. 2 Chron. 1:3).

²⁹This may be seen not only from the remark of 1 Kings 3:2, but also by the fact that Yahweh's favorable epiphany to Solomon takes place at Gibeon.

foreign women is explicitly condemned as a violation of God's command, it is twice stated that his heart was not wholly true to the Lord as was the heart of David his father (verses 4 and 6), and the high places which he built for his foreign wives are clearly considered idolatrous (verse 8). Moreover, there is common agreement that the present wording of Deut. 17:16-17 has particular reference to Solomon, compare 1 Kings 10:23-29, so that Solomon has in fact become the primary examples of the evils of kingship.

As a result, Yahweh becomes angry with Solomon (1 Kings 11:9), and the announcement of the division of the kingdom in verses 11 to 13 is the punishment, though tempered by the twin conditions of a delayed punishment and the retention of one tribe for the Davidic dynasty for the sake of David and for the sake of Jerusalem (1 Kings 11:13). The activities related in the remainder of the chapter now speak of the adversaries whom God "raised up" against Solomon, Hadad the Edomite and Rezon of Syria (verses 14 to 25), whereas earlier portions of the book had mentioned only items reflecting Solomon's prosperity. The rebellion of Jeroboam is given divine sanction by the words of the prophet Ahijah, as seen by such statements as "this was the reason why he lifted up his hand against the king" (1 Kings 11:26), and 11:31, where it is emphasized that it is Yahweh who is tearing the kingdom from the Davidic dynasty.³⁰

³⁰Noteworthy also is the fact that all major versions except the Hebrew reads "because he [Solomon] has forsaken me" in 1 Kings 11:33, where the Hebrew reads the plural "because they have forsaken me." The vocable used here is 'āzab, the common term for complete defection from Yahweh.

The customary notice concerning Solomon's death is given in 1 Kings 11:41-43, and nothing favorable is reported concerning him in the remainder of Kings. Particular attention is given to the fact that Josiah, whose reforming activity is the center of the Deuteronomic history, broke down the high places which Solomon had made, thus abolishing at last the practice instituted by Solomon years before.

In summary then, Solomon's reign is divided by Kings into two quite distinct periods. The first of these, prior to the erection of the high places for his foreign wives, is characterized by total prosperity which included the erection of the temple, material wealth, peace, wisdom, and--perhaps most important of all--recognition of these in the eyes of the peoples of the world. The report of the visit of the Queen of Sheba fittingly climaxes this part of Solomon's reign (compare 1 Kings 10:1-13,14-29).

The second part of Solomon's reign, which pictures Solomon under Yahweh's curse, sees Solomon's kingdom dissipated through the attacks of Edomites and Syrians, as well as internally through Yahweh's judgment expressed through Jeroboam. There is no indication that the historian desired to alter this final view of Solomon, which viewed him as apostate until the day of his death, as the one responsible for the high places to which the writer was so unalterably opposed, and as the sole cause for the disruption of the united kingdom.

Solomon in Chronicles

In contrast with the Chronicler's customary methodology, which seems to have been to accept at face value King's evaluation of various kings and to proceed from that point, the Chronicler has radically altered the picture of Solomon which he presents, so that Solomon appears to stand completely parallel to David. This is apparent in almost every phase of the reigns of the kings which we have been presenting.

First, Solomon's accession to the throne and consequent rise to power is presented by the Chronicler in a completely different light than was the case in Kings. The major points at issue here have been covered in detail in the analysis of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29,³¹ and need only be summarized here. We need only recall, for example, that the divine designation of Solomon as the son of David to whom the promises of 2 Samuel 7 had reference, such as is found above all in 1 Chron. 22:9-10 and 28:6,7,10 stands in vivid contrast to 1 Kings 1 and 2, where Solomon's claim is supported rather by David's personal oath to Bathsheba rather than by divine election. A second aspect of Solomon's accession--the recognition and obedience accorded him by the people--received no less attention from the Chronicler. For while Kings was content to let Solomon rise from the chaos surrounding David's death by his own power and that of his supporters, thus "proving" himself to

³¹See supra, especially pp. 89-93.

be the particular son of David to whom the promises of 2 Samuel 7 were applicable, the Chronicler proceeded differently here also. Solomon's divine choice was indicated already in his name "Solomon" (1 Chron. 22:9), and it was in this light that David presented him to the people as his successor. The acceptance of Solomon as Israel's legitimate king is presented by 1 Chron. 29:22-25 as instantaneous and unanimous. Unlike the palace intrigue of 1 Kings 1 and 2, all Israel was immediately obedient to him--the princes, the warriors, and even the king's sons (1 Chron. 29:23-24). Even before Solomon's reign has begun Chronicles reported "He [Solomon] prospered . . . Yahweh made him great . . . and gave to him royal honor such as no king had had before him" (1 Chron. 29:23,25). A view of Solomon's rise more divergent from that of Kings can hardly be imagined!

Since Solomon's concern for the temple was already foremost in the mind of the writer of Kings, it would have been possible for the Chronicler to adopt the account of Kings in this respect with little or no modification. However, a comparison of the two accounts reveals that Solomon's concern for the temple and other cultic matters is even more pronounced and exclusive in Chronicles than it was in Kings, where it formed the subject of 1 Kings 5 to 8. While the Chronicler's omission of most of the unpleasant details of 1 Kings 1 and 2 is understandable in the light of the idealized view of Solomon's accession which he has presented, his omission of much of 1 Kings 3 and 4 is not so obviously tendential. The Chronicler has however moved almost immediately to his proper subject, the construction of the temple, which is introduced quite formally in 2 Chron. 1:8: "Solomon decided to build a house for

the name of Yahweh and a royal palace for himself." The totality of chapters 2 to 8 are then devoted exclusively to this subject.

But the Chronicler's attention to Solomon's concern for the temple is clear in yet other ways than from the sheer bulk of the material which he has included, to the virtual exclusion of all else. For the Chronicler has shown that his interest in Solomon and the temple was in this section both by the different way in which he has utilized his source material, and by his reasoned and sympathetic treatment of the entire pericope, a lively one.

First, a study of the relationship between the accounts of Chronicles and Kings reveals that Chronicles has here adopted a very different methodology in dealing with his Vorlage. In the David history the Chronicler has largely confined himself to deletion of some materials and the addition of others, with the occasional transfer of larger blocks of material from one position to another, minor alterations, and a few interpretative additions. But the Chronicler's account of Solomon's reign, although in almost every case dependent to some degree upon the account of the Deuteronomic writer, amounts to a virtual rewriting of the history and shows definite signs of extensive planning.

Thus the Chronicler begins his Solomon history with the account of Solomon's sacrifices at Gibeon as does 1 Kings 3:4. But for the Chronicler this mention becomes the occasion for a Solomon-led procession of all Israel to the legitimate tent of meeting of Moses, where the legitimate bronze altar is located. This act of Solomon's faithfulness then

forms the backdrop against which Yahweh's first epiphany to Solomon occurs, culminating in Yahweh's assurance of unequalled wisdom, wealth, and honor for Solomon (2 Chron. 1:7-13). The account of verses 14 to 17, which the Chronicler has transferred from its location in 1 Kings 10:26-29 in preference to the rather disparate notices of 1 Kings 3:16--4:34, pictures fittingly and briefly Solomon's military strength and the wealth which followed.³²

With chapter 2 the Chronicler moves directly to his concern for the temple. After his initial statement of the theme (2 Chron. 1:18), Solomon gathers laborers for the task³³ and arranges with Hiram for the necessary materials (2 Chron. 2:1-15). But the Chronicler has used Solomon's correspondence with Hiram not only to request timber from him for his building operations, but also through the rewriting of Solomon's message (2 Chron. 2:2-9) has included what amounts to both a confession of faith for Solomon and a significant statement of the purpose of the temple as seen by the writer (verses 3 to 5).³⁴ At the same time, Solomon's request for a craftsman to direct the more delicate work,

³²Most of the material included in 1 Chronicles 1, 8, and 9 not directly related to the temple serves one of two basic purposes: (1) to point out Solomon's wisdom and prosperity, indicative of his God-pleasing life, cf. 2 Chron. 1:7-13,14-17; 8:1-10,17-18; 9:1-21,22-28, or (2) to correct an unfavorable impression of the Deuteronomic writer, cf. 2 Chron. 1:2-6; 8:11.

³³Note that this brief statement too has been moved from its original position (2 Chron. 2:1 = 1 Kings 5:27).

³⁴Note that the Chronicler, as is customary (cf. 2 Chron. 7:12), finds Kings' description of the temple as only a place of prayer and the place where Yahweh's name dwells inadequate, and supplements it strongly with references to sacrifice.

which in Kings has stood quite alone (1 Kings 7:13-14), is also made an original part of Solomon's request. The reply of Hiram is similarly altered and concerns itself not only with the formalities of diplomatic correspondence as does Hiram's message in the Deuteronomic narrative but also adds a theological note to Hiram's answer³⁵ and appends as a kind of qualifying phrase to the statement concerning Solomon's wisdom the phrase "who will build a temple for the Lord and a royal palace for himself" (1 Chron. 2:11), as well as outlining the arrangements made for Hiram to serve as craftsman for Solomon.³⁶

While 2 Chronicles 3 to 5 is largely parallel with 1 Kings 6 and 7, where neither Solomon nor the cult could scarcely be more central, the Chronicler has added in 5:11-13 a characteristic note concerning the participation of the Levitical singers in the ceremonies which marked the transfer of the ark of the covenant into the temple.³⁷ Solomon's lengthy dedicatory prayer is likewise repeated almost verbatim (2 Chron. 6:12-40 = 1 Kings 8:22-51), although the Chronicler alters the concluding verses to refer to the resting of the ark in its place and the Davidic covenant rather than to the events of the Exodus as the

³⁵Cf. "who made heaven and earth," v. 11.

³⁶Throughout his narrative the Chronicler shows himself to be less interested in the building proper and more in its furnishings. The outline of Hiram's task here conforms to this same concern. Perhaps the reason for this is that Solomon's temple was no longer standing, while in a sense its services and institutions continued to exist.

³⁷Although Rudolph believes with some justification that this passage (2 Chron. 5:11-14) should be considered late (p. 211).

essential items.³⁸ However, Solomon's prayer is given immediate divine approval by the appearance of fire from heaven, just as had David's sacrifice earlier on the threshing floor of Araunah (2 Chron. 7:1, compare 1 Chron. 21:26). After the completion of the dedicatory feast, which the Chronicler has expanded to fourteen days as compared with Kings,³⁹ and a note concerning the participation of the Levites (1 Chron. 7:6), Yahweh's second appearance to Solomon is recorded (2 Chron. 7:11-22). Once again in this second discourse as framed by the Chronicler there is considerably more emphasis upon the temple than was the case in 1 Kings 9:2-9, where the dynastic emphasis is more central (compare 1 Kings 9:4-5). The insertion of the Chronicler in 7:12b-15 concentrates once again upon the temple as a place of sacrifice (verse 12b) and upon the constant need for repentance and "seeking Yahweh's face."⁴⁰ After inclusion of much of the material of 1 Kings 9:10-28, where the Chronicler's literary sensitivities are again apparent in that he has smoothed out much of the disparate character of the Kings account, the entire temple pericope reaches its conclusion for the Chronicler with Solomon's inauguration of the weekly, monthly, and annual

³⁸It may often be noted that various emphases of the Chronicler are quite in line with the wisdom tradition, where, e.g., the absence of any concern for the Exodus events is well known. Cf. however, 2 Chron. 7:22, where the reference to the Exodus from 1 Kings 9:9 is retained.

³⁹2 Chron. 7:9 = 1 Kings 8:66. The Chronicler's omission of 1 Kings 8:54-61, which contains many themes of primary importance for the Chronicler, adds to our conviction that he has omitted certain sections of most importance in shaping his own theology, supra, p.22.

⁴⁰For the significance of these themes for the Chronicler's theology, see infra, pp. 172-174, 181-182.

sacrifices, together with the appointment of the divisions of the priests, Levitical singers, and gatekeepers as directed by David.⁴¹ Following the climatic statement of 2 Chron. 8:16 and the inclusion of 1 Kings 9:26-28 in 1 Chron. 8:17, the account of Sheba's visit becomes for the Chronicler the final account of Solomon's prosperous career, which he has moreover climaxed with the statement previously omitted from 1 Kings 5:1: "He [Solomon] ruled over all the kings from the Euphrates to the land of the Philistines and to the border of Egypt" (2 Chron. 9:26).

It can therefore be easily seen how completely and how meaningfully the Chronicler has rewritten and reorganized the material of his Vorlage to focus attention directly upon Solomon and his cultic concerns. Explicit statements of the Chronicler's framework assure the conclusion that this structuring has been deliberately and carefully undertaken. That part of the Solomon section which deals exclusively with the temple narrative, chapters 2 to 8, is clearly set apart, both at its beginning ("Now Solomon purposed to build a house for the name of the Lord," 1:18) and at its conclusion ("All the work of Solomon was completed, for the day of the foundation of the house of Yahweh until Solomon had completed the house of Yahweh," 8:16), neither of which is found in Kings. Various stages within the temple narrative are also marked with introductory and concluding formulae, some of which are borrowed from Kings, but others of which are added by the Chronicler. The end of the preparatory work, which has occupied the writer fully

⁴¹On the integrity of this passage cf. supra, p. 122.

since David's designation of the temple site in 1 Chron. 22:1, and the beginning of the actual construction is marked in 2 Chron. 3:1, which significantly refers back to David's decision which began the preparations: "Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord in Jerusalem on Mount Moriah, where the Lord had appeared to David his father, at the place that David had appointed, on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite." The termination of the actual construction is similarly marked: "All the work that Solomon had done with respect to the house of Yahweh was completed" (2 Chron. 5:14). The most significant events associated with the dedication of the new temple, the transfer of the ark to its new home and Solomon's dedicatory prayer, are also set apart by the divine epiphanies which accompanied them (2 Chron. 5:14; 7:1-3). While the statements of 1 Kings 9:1,10, which marks the end of the temple account in Kings, have been included by the Chronicler (2 Chron. 7:11; 8:1), a final conclusion has been necessitated by the fact that the Chronicler has interpreted the three annual festivals mentioned in 1 Kings 9:25 to apply to the institution of the regular temple services: "Thus was accomplished all the work of Solomon from the day the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid until it was finished. So the house of the Lord was completed" (2 Chron. 8:16). The institution of these services marks at last the goal of the entire work of David and Solomon, toward which the writer has been pressing since the first mention of David.

We may accordingly summarize that, as was the case with David, the Chronicler has ignored almost everything except cultic concerns. Solomon too turned his attention immediately toward preparations for the temple.

With the building finished, Solomon himself participated fully in the transfer of the ark and the dedicatory services together with all Israel, an emphasis already found in Kings. Levites and singers also participate in these activities, although their participation is not directly attributed to Solomon. Solomon himself enunciates the function of the temple, as does Yahweh in his second appearance to Solomon. His entire activity reaches its climax in the dual inauguration of the sacrifices commanded by Moses and the levitical and priestly orders commanded by David.

The final evaluation of Solomon given in Chronicles is completely in keeping with the favorable picture previously painted of him. No indication is given that any part of Solomon's reign was characterized by anything other than complete obedience and service to Yahweh. The condescending tone of 1 Kings 3:2-3 is completely lacking in 2 Chron. 1:3-6, which pictures Solomon as the enthusiastic leader of all Israel engaged in proper worship before the legitimate tent and altar at Gibeon. But most significantly the entire thrust of 1 Kings 11, which condemned Solomon for the high places built for his wives and declared that "his heart was not wholly true to the Lord as was the heart of David his father" (1 Kings 11:14) and therefore pronounced the impending disruption of the kingdom and the consequent retention of a single tribe for David's house, has disappeared. The end of Solomon's reign, as was its beginning, is marked with prosperity and world-wide recognition of his wisdom (2 Chronicles 9). Like David, he completes a full reign of forty years (2 Chron. 9:30 = 1 Kings 11:42).

Conclusions

On the basis of our study the necessary conclusion seems to be that the Chronicler has considered David and Solomon as essentially equal in his presentation of them, contrary to the Deuteronomic writer, where above all the emphasis upon the divine choice of Solomon as both king and as temple builder is much less prominent, if not entirely missing, and where Solomon's apostasy in constructing the high places is condemned and cited as the reason for the division of the kingdom and the loss of ten tribes for the Davidic dynasty. In Chronicles both kings occupy the throne by reason of divine choice, and in both cases this rule receives the immediate and unanimous support of its subjects. Both kings immediately turn to express their concern for cultic matters. Both kings end lengthy reigns of forty years, as they had begun them, in complete loyalty and devotion to Yahweh.

This similarity has continually been ignored, obscured, or denied by scholars who have taken great pains to demonstrate the larger role attributed to David in the construction of the temple by the Chronicler without directing sufficient attention to the Chronicler's account of the reign of Solomon.⁴² While it would be equally unwise to ignore the

⁴²Cf., e.g., the justifiably famous study of von Rad, who concludes that the major themes of the book are David and the ark, David and the cult personnel, David and the temple, David and the cult, David and Israel (p. 134). Von Rad's study may be faulted especially in that it has overemphasized both David and the Levites, while largely ignoring Solomon and the temple. While examples could be multiplied, the most recent of the commentaries on Chronicles, that of Robert North, "The Chronicler," The Jerome Bible Commentary, edited by Raymond Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, and Roland Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.), pp. 402-426, seems particularly Wellhausian in

major role played by David, who has made certain arrangements for materials and workmen and perhaps taken care of the organization of priests and Levites as well, it must be stressed that it was Solomon who had been divinely chosen to build Yahweh's house, and his successful efforts in completing that task occupy seven of the nine chapters which the Chronicler has devoted to his reign.

It is necessary too to avoid the view that the work of Solomon is to be considered simply as the natural result of procedures begun by David, so that Solomon becomes merely a chronological extension of David. Chronicles often goes to considerable pains to make the relationship a more balanced and parallel one than that. Solomon, like David, invites all Israel to participate with him in the ceremony surrounding his accession.⁴³ Solomon's prayer for wisdom and knowledge (2 Chron. 1:10) recalls the "wisdom and understanding" which David had prayed for (1 Chron. 22:12), and David's confession that riches and honor come from Yahweh (1 Chron. 29:12) recalls similar terminology in 2 Chron. 2:11-12. The prosperity which was to result from Solomon's wisdom is fittingly recorded in 1 Chron. 29:23, as well as implied by

greeting Solomon not only with neglect but with considerable ridicule as well, which he has continually imported into the text, cf., p. 412: "By a double pun on the name Solomon--šēlōm-š, "his peace," and (Jeru-)šalem--David reduces to mere nominalism the fitness of his son to take responsibility for the building." To my knowledge the only author to give adequate attention to Solomon is A. Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie, XCIX (1966), 110-120, although Rudolph has stressed his importance in organizing the divisions of the priests and Levites.

⁴³2 Chron. 1:2-6; cf. 1 Chron. 11:1-3,4; 13:1; 28:1; 29:1,20-22.

the concluding remark of the temple pericope (2 Chron. 8:16). Like David, Solomon too gathers laborers and arranged for building materials.⁴⁴ Solomon's letter to Hiram recalls other aspects of the David history, compare verse 4, which likens the greatness of God to the magnificence of the temple which must be built for him (compare 1 Chron. 22:5; 29:1); verses 6 and 7, which point to man's humanity in contrast to God (1 Chron. 29:14-15); the interest in skilled craftsmen;⁴⁵ and the more expensive building materials.⁴⁶ Solomon too conducts a census which is explicitly related to the census of David (2 Chron. 2:16-17). This apparently conscious paralleling of the two accounts perhaps finds its strongest expression in 2 Chron. 3:1, where the writer cannot seem to overemphasize the fact that Solomon's temple site is identical with that chosen by David (1 Chron. 22:1), with the result that both of the pericopes of primary importance to this study--1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 and 2 Chronicles 3 to 8--have as their overarching rubric the divine choice of the Jerusalem site of the temple.⁴⁷ David makes preliminary arrangements for the cultic

⁴⁴2 Chron. 2:1-2, cf. 1 Chron. 22:3-4.

⁴⁵2 Chron. 2:6,12; cf. 1 Chron. 29:20.

⁴⁶2 Chron. 2:6,13; cf. 1 Chron. 29:2; 2 Chron. 3:6.

⁴⁷Such passages as these, which emphasize the Jerusalem site of the temple, should not be overlooked in considering the purpose of Chronicles. Cf. also especially the alteration introduced by the Chronicler in 2 Chron. 6:6, where the mention of the choice of Jerusalem was absent in the parallel in 1 Kings 8:16. The Chronicler's alteration makes it plain that he considered the choice of Jerusalem an ancient one.

personnel, while Solomon actualizes these arrangements. Neither David nor Solomon falls from Yahweh's grace but complete their reigns in prosperity.

In three cases the Chronicler has stated explicitly this parallel relationship which he has otherwise drawn tacitly. While 1 Kings 8:66 marked the departure of the worshippers following the dedication of the temple with the phrase that they returned to their homes "joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness that the Lord had shown to David his servant and to Israel his people," the Chronicler has altered the passage to read "for the goodness that the Lord had shown to David and to Solomon and to Israel his people" (2 Chron. 7:10).

This same tendency to parallel David and Solomon is also found in the post-Solomonic portion of Chronicles. The reign of Rehoboam, Solomon's son during whose reign the disruption occurred, is presented by the Chronicler in two parts. The first of these is marked by faithfulness in Judah, and the Chronicler denotes this faithfulness by stating that Judah "walked for three years in the way of David and Solomon." This viewpoint would have been inconceivable for the Deuteronomic writer.

Finally, Solomon's activity is also viewed as parallel with that of David in their relationship to the Levites. Josiah instructs the Levites in connection with his passover to prepare themselves "following the directions of David king of Israel and the directions of Solomon his son" (2 Chron. 35:4).⁴⁸

⁴⁸Neh. 12:45 similarly speaks of the command of David and Solomon concerning the singers.

The Chronicler, then, has presented us with essentially parallel pictures of Israel's two greatest kings, David and Solomon. In neither case does it appear that the exaltation or idealization of the one is exacted at the expense of the other, but rather the lives of both are presented according to the same general framework. If indeed any distinction is to be drawn between these two kings, it lies in the fact that what was denied to David, the 'îš milhāmâ--the building of the temple--was in fact accomplished by Solomon, the 'îš menûhâ, and that the actualization of the completed cult took place under his direction. But while it would appear unwise to overemphasize this, it may nevertheless be permitted to stand as a necessary corrective to an exaggerated view of David that the Chronicler marks the conclusion of Hezekiah's passover, which for him was the climax of the post-Solomonic era, with words of utmost importance: "So there was great joy in Jerusalem, for since the time of Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel, there had been nothing like this in Jerusalem" (2 Chron. 30:26).

Having completed our survey of the Chronicler's view of David and Solomon, and seen the great amount of importance attributed to them in their roles of preparing for and building the temple, together with the organization of the personnel for the temple services, we may return once again to the pericope from which this study originated, 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29. While it might have been assumed beforehand, the fact that the Chronicler has inserted three chapters to join the reigns of David and Solomon has been shown to be of significant importance. The Chronicler has used these chapters to tie the two most significant parts of his history, the reigns of David and Solomon, into a unified

whole centered around the construction of the temple. Nowhere else in the Old Testament, it should be noted, have the final words of a father to a son or a ruler to his successor been recounted in such detail. In our concluding chapter we will return to the possible significance of this for the Chronicler's audience and purpose.

CHAPTER IV

THE CENTRALITY OF THE TEMPLE

Our study of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 has demonstrated the centrality of the Chronicler's concern for David, Solomon, and the temple. In Chapter III further attention has been directed toward David and Solomon and the relationship which the Chronicler envisioned as existing between them. The present chapter will concentrate upon the third item mentioned above, the temple, and investigate its significance throughout the books of Chronicles. The conclusions reached will then be available to explain the relationship between David and Solomon as seen in the previous chapter and to highlight the importance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 within the total structure of the Chronicler's work.

That portion of the books of Chronicles commonly ascribed to the Chronicler is generally divided into three major parts, 1 Chronicles 10 to 29, 2 Chronicles 1 to 9, and 2 Chronicles 10 to 36, as we have noted previously.¹ The first two of these units deal with the reigns of David and Solomon respectively, and their contents have been viewed in the previous chapter in studying the Chronicler's conception of David and Solomon. Concerning 1 Chronicles 10 to 21, we have noted that the Chronicler has concentrated upon two aspects of the David history. The first of these, which is most prominent in chapters 10

¹Supra, pp. 10-11.

to 21, depicts David's rise to power as both in conformity with God's will and as having received the immediate and unanimous consent of the people.² The second, David's concern for cultic matters, is probably introduced already in 1 Chron. 11:4-9, where the capture of Jerusalem, soon to become the home of both the temple and the dynasty, is related as the first act of David and the people after his anointing by all Israel at Hebron. This concern for the temple, together with the ark and the Levites associated with it most closely, dominates chapters 13 to 17, which concentrate upon the removal of the ark to Jerusalem and the activity of the priests and Levites both in the transferral and after the arrival in Jerusalem,³ while 2 Chronicles 17 contains the well-known oracle forbidding David to build the temple, but promising him both an eternal dynasty and that one of his offspring will build the temple. The reason for the inclusion of chapters 18 to 20 in the work are not apparent,⁴ but chapter 21 culminates in the divine approval of the threshing floor of Ornan as the future site for the temple, to which David's proclamation in 22:1 is immediately tied. In both basic structure and content chapters 10 to 21 thus center upon the twin concerns of dynastic recognition (10 to 12) and the temple (13 to 17, 21), with details of the format governed in part by the Chronicler's Vorlage in the Deuteronomic history.

²Supra, pp. 112-114.

³Supra, pp. 115-117.

⁴Supra, pp. 118-119, note 17.

Our survey of 2 Chronicles 1 to 9 has indicated that in the case of Solomon the emphasis lies upon the temple alone, with dynastic concerns lacking except in the speeches of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29. The Chronicler has moved immediately to the subject of the construction of the temple (2 Chron. 1:8) and has dedicated no less than seven chapters of the account of Solomon's reign (2 Chronicles 2 to 8) directly to that subject, revising his Vorlage extensively to concentrate more clearly upon this subject.⁵ Both Solomon's correspondence with Hiram (2 Chron. 2:2-9) and Solomon's dedicatory prayer (2 Chron. 6:12-42) add additional matter concerning the purpose of the temple, and the participation of the Levites is noted in the appropriate places (2 Chron. 5:11-14; 7:6). The structure of the total pericope is marked by various formulae (2 Chron. 1:8,18; 3:1; 5:1); the significant events of the transfer of the ark to the temple and the conclusion of Solomon's dedicatory prayer are both marked out by the divine epiphanies which conclude them; and the entire account is concluded by the remark of 2 Chron. 8:16. The concluding chapter of this Solomon history, which is not directly related to the temple, is no doubt carried over from 1 Kings 10 to point to the prosperity which accompanied such a God-pleasing king.

In the histories of both David and Solomon the major attention is therefore directed toward the temple, with a lesser emphasis upon dynastic considerations, and in particular Israel's unanimous obedience to the Davidic king. This unity of all Israel under David and Solomon

⁵Supra, pp. 132-136.

which was at the same time a unity around the Jerusalem temple was shattered by the north's rebellion under Jeroboam. The significance of this transition for the Chronicler may be seen from the following:

1. The Chronicler has made Jeroboam responsible for the disruption. It seems quite certain that in Kings Jeroboam was not actively involved in the events leading to the break and was only later chosen by the northern tribes as their leader. This is apparent not only from the unevenness of 1 Kings 12:2 and the lack of agreement of verses 2 and 3a with verse 20 of the same chapter, but also by the fact that these verses, together with the mention of Jeroboam in verse 12, are absent in certain manuscripts of the Septuagint. This seems to assure the fact that the mention of Jeroboam's return originally came only in verse 20 of the King's account, but that the Chronicler has transferred the notice of his return to the beginning of his narrative, 2 Chron. 10:2-3, omitting the notice occurring in 1 Kings 12:20 and inserting also the mention of Jeroboam in verse 12. A later hand has then inserted this additional material into Kings, and by leaving verse 20 intact has introduced the present confusion into the text.⁶

2. Rehoboam's lack of wisdom in dealing with the rebellion, which would be the single "human" cause for the disruption, is covered over

⁶Cf. W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Erste Reihe; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), XXI, 227; and contrast M. Noth, Könige, Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsverein Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1968), IX, i, 266-267. The most recent study is that of Ralph Klein, "Jeroboam's Rise to Power," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIX (1970), 217-218.

by the Chronicler. Instead, the first part of his reign is pictured as an age of unmitigated blessing and prosperity.⁷ While the writer does report that Rehoboam and all Israel forsook the law (2 Chron. 12:1), this apostasy follows rather than precedes the disruption, and was necessary in view of the Chronicler's concept of retribution to explain the invasion, which 1 Kings 14:25 had recorded but for which it had given no cause. The Chronicler attributes Rehoboam's failure to deal wisely with the political situation to his youth and immaturity (2 Chron. 13:7), exactly the same qualities which existed in Solomon and hence called for David's help in making preparations for the temple (1 Chron. 22:5; 29:1), although 2 Chron. 12:13-14 (= 1 Kings 14:21-24) states that Rehoboam was forty-one years old at his accession!⁸ Nor should it be forgotten that Rehoboam and his people repented at the warning of the prophet Shemaiah (2 Chron. 12:6-8,12), an act which usually shows qualified approval for the Chronicler.⁹

⁷Rehoboam's construction of fortified cities is certainly to be interpreted in this light, as is probably also his large family and the statement concerning his wisdom.

⁸Rudolph, XXI, 235, has argued persuasively that vv. 13 and 14 are a later addition in Chronicles. A later editor has also omitted the words condemning Judah (cf. 2 Kings 14:22-24), applying them to Rehoboam instead, since they stood in too clear a contradiction to 2 Chron. 12:12. The statement that Rehoboam did evil is strange in the light of Rehoboam's repentance and the fact that Kings contains no such evaluation at this place (but cf. 1 Kings 15:3). At any rate, it is apparent that, given the Chronicler's doctrine of immediate retribution, this could not have been the cause for the earlier disruption. The Chronicler reasoned that since the invasion of Shishak occurred in Rehoboam's fifth year (2 Chron. 12:2 = 1 Kings 14:25), Judah was faithful for three years (2 Chron. 12:17) before apostasy.

⁹For Chronicles' emphasis on prophecy, see infra, pp. 182-183.

3. The Chronicler affirms that the legitimacy of the Jerusalem priesthood, and above all of Jerusalem as the legitimate place of sacrifice (2 Chron. 12:16), was immediately apparent to large segments of Israel--priests, Levites, and laymen--who desert the north and come to Jerusalem to sacrifice to Yahweh, the "God of their fathers."

4. The Chronicler has placed into the mouth of Abijah a lengthy discourse which not only absolves Rehoboam from blame (2 Chron. 12:12), but clearly outlines the basis of his objections to the north's apostasy. In so doing he has altered radically the significance of Abijah, to whom the writer of Kings had given only scant attention.¹⁰ These objections center upon the north's apostasy from the legitimate dynasty and the Jerusalem cult, the same concerns which we have seen to be central in earlier portions of his work. The north is without excuse in failing to recognize that "the Lord God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel for ever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt" (2 Chron. 13:5), so that he can even speak of "the kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of David (verse 8). But the major concern still revolves around the temple. The north has forsaken the true God, which can be seen from their having driven out Yahweh's priests, the Aaronides and Levites, and made themselves priests like the peoples of other lands (verse 9). The extended mention of the priests and

¹⁰Cf. 1 Kings 15:1-8. Gudrun Wilda, Das Königsbild des Chronistischen Geschichtswerk (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1959), p. 63, remarks that Abijah appears in the Chronicler's history "als das strahlende jüdische Gegenbild zu dem abtrünnigen Jerobeam" and feels the reason Abijah was chosen to deliver this programmatic discourse was because of Rehoboam's unhappy role in the division of the kingdom and his visitation by Shishak.

particularly of various aspects of the temple service itself (verses 10 and 11) illustrates the fact that Judah has not overlooked and forsaken Yahweh, but has kept his ceremonies, while Israel has not done so. The result is that Yahweh is "with" Judah, so that she is certain to prosper, that is, her victory is assured, while Israel¹¹ has with her only the golden calves made by Jeroboam.

While it is difficult to say why the Chronicler waited until Abijah to formulate this programmatic speech, it is true that Abijah is one of only two kings whose evaluation as given by the writer of Kings the Chronicler has not only ignored but completely reversed.¹² The Deuteronomic historian reports nothing good of Abijah, stating that he did evil like his father (Rehoboam!) and in fact was permitted to rule only because of God's faithfulness to David's dynasty (1 Kings 15:2-3). The Chronicler gives no negative evaluation of Abijah of any kind, presenting him rather as the perfect example of and spokesman for Judah's faithfulness, which results in her victory over Israel and a large family as well (verse 21).

After the dissolution of the kingdom and Abijah's programmatic discourse, the Chronicler proceeds to narrate somewhat mechanically, at times even with apparent disinterest, the events already recorded in Kings associated with each of the kings of Judah until the fall of Jerusalem. In the main he accepts at face value the evaluation of the

¹¹Notice that the Chronicler does not avoid speaking of the north as "Israel," cf. 2 Chron. 13:12,15,17,18.

¹²The other, of course, is Solomon.

various kings given by the earlier work, modifying the accounts only as necessary to conform to his understanding of retribution.¹³ But in these descriptions too it may be seen that the temple with its cult remains the center of his consideration. This is apparent in that each of the kings with whom the Chronicler is favorably impressed shows himself ambitious for the temple and its environs, while evil kings are shown to be so by their neglect of, and more often hostility to, the Jerusalem cult.

That the relationship to the Jerusalem cult was the standard used by the Deuteronomic historian is true, and may easily lead us to ignore or underestimate the Chronicler's emphasis. The Chronicler was obviously at one with the Deuteronomic writers in seeing Jerusalem as the sole legitimate cultic center for Israel, and it is therefore no accident that he can regularly adopt from that writer the evaluation of a given king on the basis of the king's attitude toward the high places.¹⁴ But as is frequently the case, the Chronicler has carried through the pattern adopted from his source with greater thoroughness and with fewer qualifications. While the writer of Kings gave limited approval to Asa, Jehoshaphat, and Joash, but reserved removal of the high places for Hezekiah and Josiah alone, the Chronicler has attributed cultic

¹³Infra, pp. 169-172.

¹⁴For good kings, cf. Asa (2 Chron. 14:1-5; 1 Kings 15:9-15) and Josiah (2 Chron. 34:8 = 2 Kings 22:3); for evil kings, Ahaz (2 Chron. 28:1-4 = 2 Kings 16:1-4) and Manasseh (2 Chron. 33:1-9 = 2 Kings 21:1-9).

rennovations to all of these kings, including in his narrative some indications of their favorable attitude toward the Jerusalem cult.

In the cases of Asa and Jehoshaphat this concern is expressed somewhat indirectly, and consists largely in their destruction of the high places. However, Asa also concludes a covenant with the people with its setting in the temple, and furthermore "repaired the altar of the Lord that was in front of the vestibule of the house of the Lord" (2 Chron. 15:8). While with Jehoshaphat the Chronicler has underlined primarily his judicial reforms (2 Chron. 19:5-11)¹⁵ and extraordinary faithfulness in battle (2 Chronicles 20), the significant addition in 2 Chron. 19:3 adds that he too destroyed the Asherahs from the land, and the prayer spoken by Jehoshaphat includes a significant reference to the purpose of the temple as a house of prayer and to its erection as the climax of Israel's possession of the land of Canaan (2 Chron. 20:8). Jehoshaphat's relationship to the Levites is also emphasized (2 Chron. 17:8; 19:8,11), as is his zeal in instructing Judah in the tôrâ (2 Chron. 17:7-9).

Although the Chronicler found more precedent in Kings for the temple rennovations and reforms undertaken by Josiah and Joash, he has

¹⁵L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man*, translated by Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 147, has pointed out that the Deuteronomic reform included not only a centralization of the cult, but also a centralization of the judicial system. It is remarkable that the Chronicler has included both concerns, for which he had no precedent in Kings. W. F. Albright, "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat," *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, edited by S. Lieberman (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1950), pp. 61-82, believes the account of the reform in chapters 19 to be essentially correct, while 2 Chron. 17:7-9 may be a misunderstood doublet.

nevertheless expanded the king's concern in cultic matters. Joash's reforms are enclosed within a framework recalling somewhat that of the narrative of Solomon's construction of the temple, being introduced by the statement that "After this Joash decided to restore the house of the Lord" (2 Chron. 24:4) and terminated with the remark that Judah offered burnt offerings "in the house of the Lord" all the days of Jehoiada (2 Chron. 24:14). The beginning of the second part of Joash's reign, characterized by apostasy from Yahweh, is similarly marked by the statement "they forsook the house of the Lord, the God of their fathers, and served the Asherim and the idols" (2 Chron. 24:18). The lengthy addition of the Chronicler to Kings' account of Josiah's Passover begins with a significant if unintelligible statement concerning ark and temple: "Put the holy ark in the house which Solomon the son of David, king of Israel, built" (2 Chron. 35:3).

This concern for the temple and its cult reaches its high point in the Chronicler's account of the reign of Hezekiah, where the Chronicler has greatly expanded the Kings' Vorlage. The Chronicler dedicates three chapters to the cultic concerns of Hezekiah, which must be considered the high point of his narrative of the post-Solomonic kings. Included in these chapters is an important statement concerning the role of the temple in determining Judah's prosperity (2 Chron. 29:3-11), the cleansing of the temple and the ceremony following it (29:12-36), the great passover with the invitation to the north to "come to Yahweh's sanctuary which has sanctified for ever" (30:8) and the reforms arising from it (31:1), and the reordering of the Levites and the contributions of the people in their behalf (31:2-19). The celebration of the

passover is concluded with the significant statement that "since the time of Solomon the son of David king of Israel there had been nothing like this in Israel" (30:26), a statement which obviously points back to the fourteen-day celebration which concluded the dedication of the temple according to the Chronicler's alteration in 2 Chron. 7:9. The conclusion of Hezekiah's reign is likewise marked with a statement significant not only for the many aspects of the Chronicler's thought which it reveals but also for the specific reference to the temple: "Every work that he undertook in the service of the house of God and in accordance with the law and the commandments, seeking his God, he did with all his heart, and prospered" (2 Chron. 31:21).

The relationship to the temple and its cult is frequently mentioned also with those kings whom the Chronicler judged as wicked. To the account of Amaziah's disastrous battle with Joash of Israel the Chronicler adds the notice of Joash's capture of the temple's gold, silver, and vessels (2 Chron. 25:24). Jehoram constructed high places, thus leading the inhabitants of Jerusalem away from the legitimate temple and into unfaithfulness (2 Chron. 21:11). Uzziah's leprosy is attributed to his having entered the temple to burn incense, thus usurping priestly prerogatives (2 Chron. 26:16). The Chronicler spends considerable time in recounting the transgressions of the worst of Judah's kings, Ahaz, and it is surely meant to mark the nadir of Judah's religiosity when it is remarked that he "shut up the doors of the house of the Lord" (2 Chron. 28:24). When the Chronicler wants to find something good to say about the reprobate Manasseh, whose repentance he has probably deduced from his unusually long reign in keeping

with his dogma of retribution, he reports that he too "restored the altar of the Lord" (2 Chron. 33:16), an action for which he had no precedent in Kings.

Concern for the temple also predominates in the final chapter of 2 Chronicles. As the end of the era of the first temple approaches, the Chronicler remarks with regard to each of Nebuchadnezzar's three invasions as to the disposition of the temple vessels, adding a similar remark concerning the vessels at Jehoiakim's exile to the accounts concerning Jehoichin and Zedekiah in Kings.¹⁶ The final verses concerning the destruction of Jerusalem mentions again both the burning of the temple and the destruction of its vessels (2 Chron. 36:19), which is considered the final result of the people's disobedience to the prophetic voice.¹⁷

We may mention very briefly yet other ways in which the Chronicler has indicated his concern for the temple, its personnel, and services. The three essentials of Israel's faith are listed in 2 Chron. 15:3 as the true God, the teaching priest, and tora. The Levites are mentioned as leading in the worship both within the temple (2 Chron. 18:19) and also on the way to Jehoshaphat's battle (2 Chron. 20:21), and their

¹⁶Jehoiakim, 2 Chron. 36:6; Jehoiachin, 2 Chron. 36:10 = 2 Kings 24:13; Zedekiah, 2 Chron. 36:18-19, cf. 2 Kings 25:9,13-17.

¹⁷It is then apparent that Cyrus' edict, which begins the account of the restoration (2 Chron. 36:23 = Ezra 1:2) continues the same kind of concern when it relates "The Lord . . . has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem." Assuming these words to be original in Ezra, it is at least evident that if the same writer was not responsible for them he has here correctly understood the major concern of the Chronicler. The concern for the temple vessels in Ezra 1:8-11 goes beyond that of the Chronicler as met before, however.

role in the reformations of Jehoiada, Hezekiah, and Josiah is emphasized. The Levites are looked upon more favorably than the priests in 2 Chron. 29:34, but despite the generably favorable disposition of the Chronicler toward the Levites, they are taken to task for their sluggishness in 2 Chron. 24:5, as are both priests and Levites in the indictment of 2 Chron. 30:15. That it is the divine worship itself which is at the center of this concern, and not the participation of the priests and Levites per se, seems to be indicated by the absence of their mention at certain places where it may have been taken for granted, such as Asa's covenant ceremony, where both sacrifices and the joyous note is included (2 Chron. 15:10-15), in the return to Jerusalem following Jehoshaphat's victory, where again both the note of joy and the mention of the musical instruments usually found in the hands of the priests and Levites is included (2 Chron. 20:27-30), and in the account of Josiah's covenant ceremony (2 Chron. 34:32-34).

We may conclude then that while the Chronicler's presentation of the post-Abijah era tends to be quite fragmentary, with few if any major turning points, and with the guiding principle the dogma of retribution,¹⁸ the temple with its personnel and its services of praise remains the geographical and ideological center of the Chronicler's work. If 2 Chronicles 10 to 36 has a structural center, it is surely the cultic reforms of Hezekiah, who returned Judah to the status quo which she had enjoyed at the time of Solomon. For the Chronicler the Jerusalem temple was the sole place which Yahweh had chosen for his

¹⁸Infra, pp. 169-172.

habitation, and to him it was axiomatic that one's relationship to Yahweh was normally evident in his relationship to the Jerusalem temple.

We therefore conclude that the temple is the center of concern in each of the three major portions of Chronicles. While in the last case, 2 Chronicles 10 to 36, this concern is more indirect and often present in a role subsidiary to the doctrine of retribution, this is not the case in 1 Chronicles 10 to 21, which ends with the ark in Jerusalem and the temple site chosen, or in 2 Chronicles 1 to 9, which focuses almost exclusively on the construction of the temple by Solomon. It is thus apparent that the interest in the temple shown in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 has been sustained throughout the book. To this theme we shall return in concluding this chapter.¹⁹

The significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 is furthermore shown by the fact that the Chronicler has included within these chapters no less than three sermons and a prayer through which he has expressed his own thoughts on various aspects of the temple and other theological considerations. The significance of such speeches within the historical works of the Old Testament has been the subject of studies by both Martin Noth²⁰ and Otto Plöger,²¹ whose studies we must

¹⁹Infra, pp. 167-168.

²⁰M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1943), especially pp. 5-6.

²¹Otto Plöger, "Reden und Gebete im deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk," Festschrift für Günther Dehn, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher (Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1957), pp. 35-49.

consider in some detail. Noth has examined the Deuteronomic history in great detail and pointed to the extensive use of speeches at decisive points in the narrative which clarify the course of events and draw the practical consequences of man's acts.²² In addition to the extensive use of the speech in Deuteronomy, Noth points to Joshua 1, where Yahweh sets the task of conquest before Joshua, and Joshua 23 and 24, where Joshua addresses the people at the conclusion of the conquest. Other important speeches are delivered by Samuel upon the inauguration of the monarchy (1 Samuel 12), and above all of Solomon at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8). This procedure of introducing lengthy discourses at decisive points has, according to Noth, no exact parallel in the Old Testament, and presents a strong argument for the unity of the Deuteronomic history. Noth further believes that Solomon's reign is divided into two major parts, at the beginning of each of which a divine revelation occurs. The temple is therefore the concluding part of the first part of Solomon's work.²³

Noth admits that in some cases the historian has entered his comments in narrative form in considerable detail, but feels this may be

²²"Dtr an allen wichtigen Punkten des Geschichtsverlaufs die führend handelnden Personen mit einer kürzeren oder längeren Rede auftreten lässt, die rückblickend und vorwärtsschauend den Gang der Dinge zu deuten versucht und die praktischen Konsequenzen für das Handeln der Menschen daraus zieht," Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 5.

²³Ibid., p. 67.

due either to the fact that the situation did not lend itself readily to direct discourse or that suitable speakers were not at hand in the narrative.²⁴

Turning to Chronicles, Noth feels that the Chronicler has used his speeches somewhat differently in that he has not concentrated them at major turning points, but has used this or that event to serve as the occasion for a speech.²⁵ But more often the Chronicler lets various prophets come forth--some known from Kings, but other unknown--to give instruction in the doctrine of retribution.²⁶

Plöger has carried the study of the use of the speech and prayer in Chronicles and the Deuteronomic writings considerably farther than Noth. While in general agreement with Noth, he adds the following considerations concerning the Deuteronomic history. The prayers of both 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Kings 8 were occasioned by the fact that the pre-Deuteronomic version of these were also in prayer form (compare 1 Kings 8:12-15). While Plöger does not consider the narrative statements of either Judges 2 or Joshua 12 to be of particular significance, but

²⁴Ibid., pp. 160-161. Noth lists the summaries of Joshua 12, the program of the book of Judges as expounded in Judg. 2:11-23, and above all the lengthy discussion of the fall of the north in 2 Kings 17 as such important prose accounts.

²⁵Ibid. Noth mentions in particular the three speeches and prayer of David, Abijah's speech (2 Chronicles 13), Jehoshaphat's prayer before battle (2 Chron. 20:5-12), Hezekiah's words to the Levites concerning the coming reforms (2 Chron. 29:6-12), his letter to the north concerning retribution (2 Chron. 30:6-9), the confession of Ezra (Ezra 9:5-15), and his long prayer (Ezra 9:16-37) as the most important examples.

²⁶Ibid., p. 161.

finds them embodied in Joshua 23, the same is not true of 2 Kings 17. Here it must be remembered, says Plöger, that there has not been a single extensive discourse since the dedication of the temple, the words of the prophets which were strewn here and there apparently making such a programmatic statement superfluous. Furthermore, it should be noted that the speeches of Ahijah and Shemaiah are in their content completely Deuteronomic. The words of 2 Kings 17 are then meant in fact to be a summary of the prophetic message.²⁷

Plöger agrees with von Rad that Chronicles is more closely related to the Deuteronomic school than to that of the priestly writer,²⁸ and apparently agrees with Noth that the Chronicler did not use extensive speeches to mark historical periods in the same way as did the Deuteronomic historian. But at the same time he appears to question Noth's view of their usage in the Chronicler.

Plöger agrees also that while a large number of the speeches found in the Deuteronomic history belong to the time prior to David--a period omitted entirely in Chronicles-- the Chronicler has taken over Solomon's lengthy prayer from 1 Kings 8, and "beyond that, in view of the significance which he has attributed to David, has accompanied the events connected with the building of the temple with added speeches from the

²⁷Plöger, p. 38, furthermore believes that some kind of form of prophetic proclamation has furnished the material for the Deuteronomic sermon.

²⁸Although Plöger notes that certain characteristics of the Chronicler, such as the use of the genealogy to bridge a historical span, belong rather to P, and that the use of the speech is not unknown in P either (cf. Genesis 9). Ibid., p. 40.

mouth of David.²⁹ Plöger feels that the prayer of 1 Chron. 29:10-19 concludes the section which began with the prayer of 1 Chron. 17:16-27 (= 2 Samuel 7), with the result that the temple preparations are set off by the two prayers from the remainder of the history. Of further importance in this respect is the fact that David's prayer found in 2 Samuel 22 is removed from the appendix in which it stood and placed in 1 Chron. 16:8-36, where it stands immediately after the narrative of the ark and serves as a kind of Introit to the theme of the temple building.³⁰

Concluding the account of the temple building with Solomon's prayer, the Chronicler also uses in considerably modified form the policy of the Deuteronomic historian in letting the prophets speak in the post-Solomonic period. But he has modified his view of the fall of the north by omitting the speech of 2 Kings 17, highlighting instead the separation of the two kingdoms as a schismatic act by Abijah's sermon in 2 Chronicles 13. In Ezra-Nehemiah there is a notable receding of the speeches, while even those that do occur are of less than programmatic significance.³¹ Plöger feels that this was due to the fact that the brief period under consideration was already sufficiently demarked by significant events.³² Plöger finally concludes:

²⁹Ibid., p. 40.

³⁰Ibid., p. 41.

³¹Cf. Ezra 10:2-4,10-11; Neh. 5:8-11; 13:25-27.

³²Of the three units which Plöger finds in Ezra and Nehemiah, the first is introduced by Cyrus' edict (Ezra 1) and concluded with the rededication of the temple (Ezra 6), the second introduced with Ezra's

Wir beobachten also im Vergleich zur deuteronomistischen Darstellung beim Chronisten eine grösser Auflockerung in der Verwendung ausführlicher Reden. Er bedient sich ihrer, um einen wichtigen Zeitabschnitt in seiner Bedeutung hervorzuheben (David=Salomo=Zeit und Tempelbau) oder um einen weiteren Zeitraum als relativ einheitlich vorzuführen, indem er ihn durch gleichartige Reden abgrenzt (die Zeit der getrennten Reiche); er kann aber auch kleinere Zeitperioden, die durch die geschilderten Ereignisse in sich schon abgeschlossen waren mit einem besonderen Höhepunkt versehen, und zwar in der Form eines ausführlichen Gebetes. Darin allerdings unterscheidet sich der Chronist vom Deuteronomisten, dass er die Gebetsform weitaus häufiger gewählt hat, so dass es nicht unangebracht ist, die chronistischen Gebete als Darstellungsmittel von den Reden stärker abzuheben.³³

In addition to the prayers which the Chronicler has borrowed from the Deuteronomic history and those with which he has outlined both the construction of the temple (1 Chronicles 17, 29) and his entire account (1 Chronicles 16, Nehemiah 9), Plöger addresses himself also to the prayers found in Ezra 9:6-15, Neh. 1:5-11, and 2 Chron. 20:5-12. The second of these prayers Plöger believes to have been a part of the Nehemiah Memoirs, and thus to have served as a pattern for the prayer of Ezra 9:6-15, thus permitting Ezra and Nehemiah to stand parallel with each other in the last part of the Chronicler's work as had David and Solomon in the first part.³⁴ With regard to Jehoshaphat, Plöger notes also that the reference to his faithfulness in 2 Chron. 20:9

commission (Ezra 7) and concluded with the putting away of foreign wives (Ezra 9), the third introduced by the prayer of Neh. 1:5-11 and concluded with the prayer of Nehemiah 9. Plöger, p. 43.

³³Ibid., pp. 43-44.

³⁴Plöger, pp. 40, 46, is to my knowledge the only individual who has previously noted that David and Solomon stand parallel to each other and that their work is to be considered a unit.

points to the fact that the Chronicler considered him a faithful king, whose piety was comparable with that of David and Solomon.³⁵

Plöger then concludes his evaluation of the place of the prayer in the Chronicler's history, with the remarks:

So hat der Chronist in der Verwendung seiner Gebet kein starres Prinzip verfolgt, sondern eine ähnlich freie Handhabung gezeigt, wie wir es auch schon bei seinen Reden und Ansprachen beobachten konnten. Wenn es darum ging, ein besonderes Ereignis, das überdies mit Hilfe ausführlicher Reden bereits markiert war, oder eine dem Chronisten am Herzen liegende Persönlichkeit der Geschichte würdevoll hervorzuheben, griff er zu dem Darstellungsmittel des Gebetes, das seine Absichten eindrucksvoller wiederzugeben vermochten, als es bei den Reden der Fall war.³⁶

The prayers then do not differ in their contents at all from the speeches, but only in that they serve as a better vehicle for the speaker's thoughts. As Plöger adds: "In a sermon-like speech one can confess what one believes, but it can be said more impressively in a prayer, when one asks for a realization of what one believes and confesses."³⁷

Conclusions

While the studies of Noth and Plöger at first seem to diminish the importance of the speech in Chronicles, such a conclusion would have to be based on two premises: (1) The Chronicler has used a greater number of speeches than the Deuteronomic historian, and hence values their

³⁵Ibid., p. 46.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid.

importance less; (2) The speeches of the Chronicler do not have "programmatic" significance, while those of the Deuteronomic writer do.

It is a matter of record that the Chronicler has utilized more speeches than the Deuteronomic writer. We must question, however, whether this difference in frequency points to any difference in significance. The speeches within the Deuteronomic history seem to serve two primary functions. First, they divide the narrative of Israel's history into certain chronological periods beginning with the entrance into Canaan (Deuteronomy, Joshua 1), the conclusion of the conquest (which is at the same time the beginning of the age of the judges, Joshua 23 and 24), the inauguration of the monarchy (1 Samuel 12), and the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8). Secondly, however, the speeches speak the author's message to the age for which he was writing. The contents of the various speeches are in fact only indirectly related to the circumstances into which they have been inserted, which have rather served as the backdrop into which the author has inserted his message. It is then not surprising that the primary theological emphases of these speeches are, on the one hand, the necessity for absolute obedience to Yahweh, involving both the avoidance of the worship of other gods and unconditional obedience to the covenant stipulations; and, on the other, the preeminence of the Jerusalem temple. These are characteristic emphases throughout his history--the same message, as Plöger has noted, delivered by the prophets whom the Deuteronomic writer introduces from time to time into his narrative and summarized so well in 2 Kings 17.

Within the historical period which the two histories have in common, that from David to the fall of Jerusalem, the Deuteronomic writer recognized only one significant break, marked by the construction of the Jerusalem temple. The Chronicler too has emphasized the significance of this event, grouping around his account of it no less than seven major speeches, prayers, and letters, some borrowed from his Vorlage and others supplied by himself. While some of these speeches have an apparent apologetic concern in designating Solomon as the chosen temple builder, others are of a more general nature and point to the author's general interest in the temple, its services, its purpose, and its functionaries.³⁸ The content of the remainder of the speeches, which is often joined together with an emphasis upon the temple, can be viewed under two heads which are part and parcel of the Chronicler's theology: the necessity for absolute trust in Yahweh, especially in the face of battle,³⁹ and the doctrine of retribution,⁴⁰ together with which a special concern for the north is often intertwined.⁴¹

It thus becomes clear that the Chronicler, like the Deuteronomic writer before him, has used the speech and prayer as a vehicle to express his own thoughts for the reader. It should not be charged to the Chronicler's account if he finds need to insert such thoughts into his

³⁸Cf. also 2 Chron. 13:4-12; 24:5-6; 26:18; 29:4-11,18-19,31; 30:6-9; 31:10; 35:3-6.

³⁹2 Chron. 14:10; 16:7-9; 20:5-12,14-17,20; 25:7-9.

⁴⁰2 Chron. 12:5; 15:2-6; 19:23; 24:20. For the significance of these themes throughout Chronicles, see Chapter V.

⁴¹2 Chron. 13:4-12; 28:9-11; 30:6-9.

narrative more frequently. The frequency and extent of these remarks might rather point to the Chronicler's originality in writing his history. Nor are the Chronicler's speeches any less programmatic than those of the Deuteronomic historian. The necessity for obedience, for example, is the central note of both 1 Samuel 11 and 2 Chron. 15:2-6. We may then agree with Noth and Plöger in seeing the speech and prayer as a means for expressing a high point in a narrative and giving importance to certain individuals judged worthy by the author, for example, David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah. But we must remain insistent that the speech is primarily a vehicle to express the author's own thought. Moreover, we must emphasize that the manner in which the Chronicler has clustered his speeches and prayers around the construction of the temple, and the degree to which these and other speeches deal with the subject of the temple, point again to the centrality of the temple throughout the work, and especially within 1 Chronicles 17 to 2 Chronicles 9.

If we look more carefully at these last-named chapters, we recall that the contents of 1 Chronicles 17 to 21 and 2 Chronicles 1 to 9 were already present in the Chronicler's Vorlage, although he felt it necessary at times to revise them drastically. Between these two units, the first dealing primarily with David and the second with Solomon, the author has inserted a large transitional unit, 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29, which joins the two together as one large pericope centered upon the construction of the temple. The two reigns, which stood largely separate in the earlier history, are thus made parts of a larger whole.

The centrality of the unit is therefore manifest in two ways. First, its content is almost exclusively concerned with the temple, a theme which we have demonstrated to be of central significance throughout the work of the Chronicler. Secondly, our study of the Chronicler's use of the speech has indicated not only that he uses such speeches to express his own ideas, thus highlighting once again the importance of the temple for him, but also that he has commonly used such speeches to mark places of importance within his narrative. The addition then of three speeches and a prayer by the Chronicler into this transitional unit shows how intent the Chronicler was in emphasizing the temple accounts, the role of David and Solomon in those accounts, and the relationship existing between them. As monarchs reigning over nothing less than the kingdom of Yahweh on earth, David and Solomon complete the temple, aided by the generosity and obedience of all Israel, the people of Yahweh. It was this unity, centered around the Jerusalem temple, which was broken by Jeroboam's revolt and which served as the basis for the Chronicler's appeal to the north.

particularity found are also related directly to this doctrine.

The centrality of retribution in the work of the Chronicler is evident in that he has in three additional cases repeated the dogma in terms almost identical with 1 Chronicles 28:2.¹ But the full extent to which the Chronicler has made use of this doctrine may best be shown by considering several concrete examples of his historiography. The

¹ 1 Chron. 12:5, 15:2, 24:20.

CHAPTER V

THEOLOGICAL MOTIFS IN CHRONICLES

In addition to the significance which David, Solomon, and the temple have been seen to play in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, 29, and throughout Chronicles, and to the important role played by these chapters in joining the David and Solomon sections together into a structural unity, examination of 2 Chronicles in the light of our study of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 reveals numerous other instances where theological concepts and vocabulary added by the Chronicler in these earlier chapters are indicative of the importance which they had for him.

Retribution

This is true above all of the doctrine of retribution, which was enunciated for the first time in 1 Chronicles 28:9. This is the single most important concept for the Chronicler's presentation of the post-Solomonic kings, and many other concepts of which the Chronicler is particularly fond are also related directly to this doctrine.

The centrality of retribution in the work of the Chronicler is evident in that he has in three additional cases repeated the dogma in terms almost identical with 1 Chronicles 28:9.¹ But the full extent to which the Chronicler has made use of this doctrine may best be shown by considering several concrete examples of his historiography. The

¹2 Chron. 12:5; 15:2; 24:20.

Chronicler's evaluation of Asa as a king who did that which was good and right in Yahweh's eyes is taken with only slight alteration from 1 Kings 15:11, and both accounts relate his reforming zeal in some detail. For the Chronicler such loyalty is rewarded with a ten-year period of rest (2 Chron. 13:23), as well as by other signs of prosperity (2 Chron. 14:5-7). An invasion by Zerah the Ethiopian with no less than a million soldiers is easily repelled during this period by a force of only half that size, since Asa demonstrated the necessary faith in Yahweh (2 Chron. 14:8-14). As if by way of explanation, the Chronicler has the prophet Azariah appear, who reiterates the principles of retribution (2 Chron. 15:1-7), after which still other reforming activities of Asa are listed culminating in a covenant to "seek" Yahweh in the fifteenth year of Asa's reign (2 Chron. 15:8-15).

However, the Deuteronomic history had included an account of Asa's alliance with Ben-Hadad of Syria against Baasha of Israel, although the alliance is undated and reported in a matter of fact way. But the Chronicler never permits such an alliance, which for him exhibits a lack of faith in and reliance upon Yahweh,² to pass without condemnation. The Chronicler has the prophet Hanani appear to condemn Asa's alliance, which he dates in the thirty-sixth year of Asa's reign, predicting continuous wars for Asa as the result of this faithlessness. The account of Asa's diseased feet (2 Chron. 16:12 = 1 Kings 15:23) in his thirty-ninth year follows, with the added statement that even when his disease was severe Asa did not "seek" Yahweh.

²Infra, pp. 173-174.

Three particular aspects of the Chronicler's handling of the Asa material which are exemplary of his general methodology may be pointed out: (1) The Chronicler has accepted the evaluation of the Deuteronomic historian as the basis for his own evaluation,³ as is almost always the case. (2) The Chronicler frequently divides the reign of a given king into two or more completely distinct periods depending upon the details available to him from Kings and his own theological assessment of those details. Thus the doctrine of retribution is made applicable not only to the reign of the king as a whole, but also to each detail within the reign. (3) In cases such as that of Asa, to whom the Chronicler is quite favorably disposed, religious zeal is normally demonstrated very early and for a prolonged period of his reign,⁴ so that the period of the king's apostasy is relegated to the final few years of his reign.

Uzziah also "did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, according to all that Amaziah his father had done (2 Chron. 24:4 = 2 Kings 15:5).⁵ The Chronicler has once again added a section which relates in some detail his initial prosperity and its cause (2 Chron. 26:5-15). But in view of the statement of 2 Kings 15:5 that Uzziah was smitten with leprosy, the Chronicler has added in verses 16 to 21 an account of

³The only exceptions are Solomon and Abijah.

⁴Cf. Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. 17:3; Hezekiah, 2 Chron. 29:3; 32:4; Josiah, 2 Chron. 34:3 and contrast 2 Kings 22:3.

⁵This is so even though the Chronicler has similarly divided the reign of Amaziah into two periods, the latter of which was marked by apostasy (2 Chron. 25:14-28).

Uzziah's attempted usurpation of priestly prerogatives, which is then given as the cause for the disease. Examples could be multiplied from the reign of almost every one of Judah's kings. There can be little doubt that the Chronicler has adopted the dogma of retribution, personal and immediate, as the framework into which the lives of the various kings are fitted, and has added, most probably from his own imagination, whatever details were necessary to make each individual fit into this scheme.⁶

The two basic terms utilized throughout the work for presentation of this dogma are precisely the two introduced in 1 Chron. 28:9, dāraš, to seek, and ʿāzab, to forsake. It is readily apparent that for the Chronicler, who uses the term some forty times, dāraš embodies much more than the "to inquire of" with which it is often translated.⁷ Rather dāraš is usually a more general term, including all that might be involved in "keeping the faith" and thus remaining a true Yahwist.⁸ To

⁶Most strikingly cf. his presentation of Josiah's death at the hands of Necho, 2 Chron. 35:21-23, where it was necessary to furnish a cause for the violent death of such a good king. Similarly Manasseh's repentance (2 Chron. 33:12) is probably meant to explain his long reign and peaceful death despite his known weaknesses.

⁷Although this meaning is not foreign to the Chronicler, cf. 1 Chron. 10:14; 2 Chron. 31:9; 32:31; 34:21,26.

⁸Cf. 2 Chron. 12:14, where the statement adopted by the writer from 1 Kings 14:22 that the king did evil is expanded by the Chronicler through the addition of the words "he did not set his heart to seek Yahweh." Asa's reform is introduced by his command for Judah to "seek" Yahweh (2 Chron. 14:3), and the contents of the resulting covenant are summarized with the words, "They entered into a covenant to seek Yahweh, the God of their fathers" (2 Chron. 15:12). Hezekiah's well-known prayer on behalf of the worshipper who had eaten the Passover without proper preparation is rendered especially for him who "would establish

further define the content of this seeking is more difficult. That it involved a commitment may be seen from its frequent combination in such a phrase as "to set (hēqîm) the heart to seek Yahweh," as well as by its usage in various covenant contexts such as that cited in the last footnote, where the decision of the people for Yahweh would be of primary importance. That such seeking of Yahweh demanded at the same time the avoidance of foreign gods is certain and becomes explicit in such passages as 2 Chron. 17:3; 25:15,20. That it required a positive relationship to the Jerusalem temple may be assumed, and is again in one case explicit (2 Chron. 20:3-4). That this seeking involved an observable conduct of a certain sort is clear once again from the account of Asa's covenant, where those who do not seek Yahweh are to be put to death (2 Chron. 15:12-13), but in only one instance is this seeking explicitly related to the observance of the law (2 Chron. 17:4).

The emphasis upon faith and commitment is strongly accentuated throughout the Chronicler's description of the post-Solomonic kings. Two particular aspects of the Chronicler's presentation stand in bold relief: (1) In numerous cases the need for complete reliance on Yahweh is given extended treatment, both in various prophetic speeches as well as in the editorial framework of the book. The key word often found in such contexts is šā'an, "to rely upon."⁹ A similar point is made in Jehoshaphat's address to his troops prior to their engagement with the

his heart to seek Yahweh" (2 Chron. 30:19), that is, who was coming before Yahweh in true faith.

⁹Cf. 2 Chron. 13:18; 14:10; 16:7-8.

the Moabites, where Jehoshaphat's words "Believe in the Lord your God, and you will be established; believe his prophets, and you will succeed" (2 Chron. 20:20) recalls Isaiah's demand for faith in the face of the Syro-Ephraimitic encounter (Is. 7:9). In this battle, as in numerous others, Israel's victory is assured when she has shown the necessary faith, and the narration of the battle is couched in terms often reminiscent of the holy war, again recalling Isaiah.

The positive import of the doctrine of retribution is that prosperity results when the proper relationship with God exists. The Chronicler has introduced this important element too for the first time in David's first speech to Solomon, 1 Chron. 22:11,13, where we have seen him to be dependent upon the formulation of Joshua 1. The note of prosperity reoccurs in 1 Chron. 29:23, where it is used to describe the reign of Solomon even before it begins. The key word for the Chronicler in this regard is the hiphil of šlh, which he has used eleven times without precedent in the Deuteronomic history.¹⁰ But the full significance of hišliah again becomes apparent only from observing its distribution throughout the Chronicler's work. The Chronicler has reserved the prosperity denoted by this term for precisely that group of kings to whom he is favorably disposed: Solomon (2 Chron. 7:11), Asa (2 Chron. 14:6), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 20:20), Uzziah (2 Chron. 26:5),¹¹

¹⁰šlh is used only five times in the hiphil in the entire Deuteronomic history, Deut. 28:29; Joshua 1:8; Judg. 18:5; 1 Kings 22:12,15.

¹¹It must be admitted that Uzziah does not rank on a par with the other kings listed here in the opinion of the Chronicler.

and Hezekiah (2 Chron. 31:21). In the case of both Uzziah and Hezekiah this prosperity is directly related to the seeking of Yahweh, as it is also somewhat less directly with Asa. The reign of Hezekiah, the post-Solomonic king most in favor with the Chronicler, is aptly concluded with the words, "Hezekiah prospered in all his activity" (2 Chron. 32:30).

In several cases also the breach of this relationship with God is cited as the actual or potential cause for the lack of success. Abijah's important discourse points out that it is impossible for the north to "succeed" in its war with Judah, since God is with the latter, and Israel is accordingly fighting against God (2 Chron. 13:12). Zechariah's words following Judah's apostasy after Jehoiada's death likewise point out the impossibility of Judah's success when she has transgressed Yahweh's commandments and thereby forsaken him (2 Chron. 24:20). The statement which concludes the first part of Uzziah's reign, "in the days when he [Uzziah] sought him, he prospered (2 Chron. 26:5)," clearly foreshadows the second part of Uzziah's life when he was unfaithful in entering the temple to burn incense.

While the Chronicler has in these cases spoken in direct if general terms of the success which resulted from a proper relationship of Judah and her kings to Yahweh, this prosperity is more commonly indicated through concrete examples. The many and varied ways in which the Chronicler portrays the prosperous nature of the reigns of God-pleasing kings is one of the most striking characteristics of his

account and highly reminiscent of the covenant blessings and curses as found, for example, in Deuteronomy 27 and 28.

It is, for example, frequently stated of the godly king that Yahweh was "with him."¹² In other cases echoes of this ancient formulation also occur, although modified by their inclusion in larger literary forms or under the influence of the Chronicler's theology.¹³ Secondly, the concept of mēnûhâ, or rest, which the Chronicler has introduced so significantly in 1 Chron. 22:9, is afterward applied to various other periods in Judah's history to point to the peace which attended a God-pleasing reign.¹⁴ This is most apparent in the Chronicler's description of the first part of Asa's reign, where three usages of nûah are clustered together with one of šāqat (2 Chron. 13:23; 14:4-7). Both hēnîah and šāqat are also used to describe a portion of Jehoshaphat's reign (2 Chron. 20:30). Concerning Hezekiah too it is noteworthy that the concluding verses which the Chronicler has added

¹²Solomon, 2 Chron. 1:1; Judah at the time of Abijah, 2 Chron. 13:12; Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. 17:3; Asa, 2 Chron. 15:9.

¹³That the statement is applied to Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 20:17), Hezekiah (2 Chron. 32:8), and perhaps Pharaoh Necho (2 Chron. 35:21) is influenced by the Holy War. The use of the jussive formulation by David in 1 Chron. 22:11, yehî yhw immāk, as well as Jehoshaphat's remarks to the judges being installed in 2 Chron. 19:6, is probably influenced by the connections with the Amtseinsetzung Gattung. The conditional formulation of 2 Chron. 15:2, "Yahweh is with you while you are with him," is an obvious alteration of the standard phrase under the influence of the Chronicler's view of retribution.

¹⁴G. von Rad, "There Remains Still a Rest for the People of God," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, translated by E.W.T. Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 97, points to the discrepancy with the view that such rest was a once-for-all gift, as in the book of Deuteronomy.

to a narrative generally taken over from Kings adds the phrase "Yahweh gave them rest on every side" (2 Chron. 32:22).¹⁵

In numerous other ways the Chronicler has pointed out the prosperity which was part of the reigns of the God-pleasing kings. In most of these cases it appears that the description of the unprecedented prosperity of Solomon's reign as it was presented in Kings and adopted by the Chronicler has been accepted as a basis. Thus while Solomon's reputation for riches is already present in the Deuteronomic history (1 Kings 3:12-13; 10:22), the Chronicler has both picked up this tradition (2 Chron. 1:12-13; 10:22) and repeated it of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 17:5) and Hezekiah (2 Chron. 32:27). The closely related honor and fame are likewise characteristic of Solomon in both Kings (1 Kings 3:12-13) and Chronicles (2 Chron. 1:12), but the Chronicler has inserted a similar statement into his accounts of David (1 Chron. 14:17), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 17:5), Uzziah (2 Chron. 26:8,15), and Hezekiah (2 Chron. 32:27). Statements that a king was, became, or was made great or strong are common, with the first mention again being that of Solomon (2 Chron. 1:1), and continuing with Rehoboam (2 Chron. 11:17), Abijah (2 Chron. 13:21), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 17:1,5,11), Uzziah (2 Chron. 26:8,15), and Jotham (2 Chron. 27:6). The large armies of various kings are referred to as evident testimony of their prosperity

¹⁵In only one case in the Deuteronomic history is such a statement included, and that rather strangely following the death of the usurper queen Athaliah, 2 Kings 11:20 = 2 Chron. 23:21.

and strength,¹⁶ as are the victories which they achieve in battle.¹⁷ Furthermore, it is related that the "fear of the Lord" fell upon the surrounding nations during the reigns of Asa (2 Chron. 14:14), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 17:10; 20:29), and David (1 Chron. 14:17), where terminology of the Holy War again seems to be apparent.

Great attention also given to the building operations of various kings, all of which, it should be noted, are included in the God-pleasing portions of their reigns. While many of these are directly related to the temple and its environs,¹⁸ an equal number seem to be concerned with all kinds of secular building operations, and in particular with fortifications.¹⁹

It is also emphasized by the Chronicler that the kings of the world brought gifts, not only to Solomon (2 Chron. 9:23 = 1 Kings 10:23), but also to Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 17:11), Uzziah (2 Chron.

¹⁶Abijah, 2 Chron. 13:3; Asa, 2 Chron. 14:8; Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. 17:13-19; Uzziah, 2 Chron. 26:11-15.

¹⁷Abijah, 2 Chron. 13:13-20; Asa, 2 Chron. 14:12-15; Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. 20:1-30; Amaziah, 2 Chron. 25:11-13; Uzziah, 2 Chron. 26:7; Jotham, 2 Chron. 27:5; Hezekiah, 2 Chron. 32:22. Particular notice should be given that Solomon, whom the Chronicler has designated as a man of peace, is absent from this otherwise most complete list of the Chronicler's favorite kings. For David, cf. 1 Chron. 18:1 to 20:8.

¹⁸Solomon's building of the temple is of course the most prominent example, but note also the activities of Asa (2 Chron. 15:8), Joash (2 Chron. 24:4), Jotham (2 Chron. 27:3), Hezekiah (2 Chron. 29:3), Manasseh (2 Chron. 33:17), and Josiah (2 Chron. 34:8-13 = 2 Kings 22:3-6).

¹⁹Solomon, 2 Chron. 8:2-6; Rehoboam, 2 Chron. 11:5-12; Asa, 2 Chron. 14:5; Uzziah, 2 Chron. 26:6-8; Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. 17:12; Jotham, 2 Chron. 27:3; and Hezekiah (2 Chron. 32:8,28-30). Note once again the comprehensive nature of this list!

26:8), and Hezekiah (2 Chron. 32:23) as well! In this last case the gifts brought to Hezekiah are paralleled with those brought to Yahweh.

It is thus apparent that the Chronicler has gone to great lengths to describe the prosperity which resulted from a God-pleasing reign in accord with his dogma of retribution. While in a few cases these elements are already present in the Chronicler's presentation of David, in most it appears that the prosperous conditions under Solomon as they were recorded in Kings served as his model for the description of the post-Solomonic kings.

The negative counterpart of dāraš is ʿāzab, as may be seen from the antithesis in 1 Chron. 28:9. Here the Chronicler's usage provides us with considerable indication of the manner in which he understood the nature of the apostasy being referred to. This forsaking is at times very general in nature, as indicated in instances where Chronicles, after recounting a section from Kings which details the wicked practices of a given king, concludes his account of the resulting punishment with a generalizing phrase such as "because they had forsaken the Lord" (2 Chron. 21:10; 28:6). But at other times this forsaking is more specific and refers to the failure to observe the law (2 Chron. 12:1,5) or to idolatrous worship practices (2 Chron. 24:18; 7:22 = 1 Kings 9:9). Most commonly it involves the relationship of the individual to the Jerusalem temple. This is assured by the account surrounding Jehoiada's death, when Judah "forsook the house of Yahweh and served the Asherim and the idols" (2 Chron. 24:18), as well as by the summary of the apostasy preceding Hezekiah's reform:

For our fathers have been unfaithful and have done what was evil in the sight of the Lord our God; they have forsaken him, and have turned away their faces from the habitation of the Lord, and turned their backs. They also shut the doors of the vestibule and put out the lamps, and have not burned incense or offered burnt offerings in the holy place to the God of Israel.

(2 Chron. 29:6-7)

The relationship of this forsaking to the cult for the Chronicler is furthermore seen in the programmatic speech of Abijah in 2 Chronicles 13, which states the Chronicler's judgment upon the northern tribes. The statement that the north has forsaken Yahweh is preceded by an account which specifically mentions the expulsion of the Aaronides and Levites from their offices by Jeroboam.²⁰ On the other hand the south can affirm that it has not forsaken Yahweh since it has the legitimate priesthood, together with the prescribed temple services which include such minutiae as the daily offering of the showbread and the lighting of the golden lampstands (2 Chron. 13:9-12).

In addition to the root zb, the Chronicler has also used the root m'1, a term familiar in the priestly vocabulary but absent from 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29. Forms of this root occur some sixteen times in the Chronicler's work, and seem to be even more general in their viewpoint than āzab. This is apparent from the summary manner in which it is used in describing the reigns of Ahaz (2 Chron. 28:19, compare 29:6), and Manasseh (2 Chron. 33:19), as well as Judah's condition which ultimately led to the exile (2 Chron. 36:14, compare 1 Chron. 5:25; 9:1).

²⁰While 2 Chron. 13:5,8 points to Yahweh's choice of the Davidic dynasty, the decisive point made in vv. 8 to 13 is that, while Israel has with her only the golden calves, since she has forsaken Yahweh, it is Yahweh himself who is with Judah (v. 12), since she has kept the cultic ordinances.

At times, however, this unfaithfulness too has direct reference to one's relationship to the temple.²¹

As might be expected in view of the detail with which the Chronicler has described the prosperity resulting from "seeking" Yahweh, the results of "forsaking" Yahweh are also presented in great detail. That the details themselves are rather insignificant for the Chronicler can be seen from the fact that quite frequently he is content to describe the situation with the very general phrase that "wrath came" upon the offending party, without further qualification (2 Chron. 21:18; 19:2; 32:26). At other times, however, this unfaithfulness results in war, defeat, disease, and conspiracy.²² In only one case does it appear that the Chronicler has failed to carry through his dogma of retribution to its logical and complete conclusion.²³

Lest the Chronicler's theology be distorted, it must be noted that on occasion he too speaks of a grace of Yahweh which surpasses the strict requirements of retribution, and which is available through

²¹2 Chron. 26:16,18; 36:14. In sharp contrast all five occurrences of the root mā'al in Ezra and Nehemiah deal with the problem of foreign marriages.

²²War, 2 Chron. 16:9; 21:16; defeat, 2 Chron. 24:23-24; 25:17-24; 28:6,19; 30:7; disease, 2 Chron. 16:12; 21:14,18; 26:19; conspiracy, 2 Chron. 24:25; 25:27.

²³King Jehoshaphat, for whom the Chronicler shows great sympathy, is rebuked by the seer Hanani for his alliance with Ahab of Israel, and it is reported that "wrath has gone our from the Lord" as a result (2 Chron. 19:2). However, this rebuke is immediately tempered with the note that "some good" is found in him, since he had destroyed the Asherah from the land (v. 3).

repentance.²⁴ While the Chronicler's language here too is often general and vague, instances such as that in 2 Chron. 12:6-12 are clear in their intent. When Shishak's forces have approached Jerusalem because of the unfaithfulness of Rehoboam and his people, they "humble themselves (wayyikkān^e'û)," and Yahweh announces through his prophet Shemaiah that they would not be destroyed, but that he would grant them "some deliverance (kim'at liplētâ)," so that the wrath would not be poured out on Jerusalem through the hand of Shishak. Verse 12 likewise adds that as the result of this repentance the anger of Yahweh turned away, so as not to make a "complete destruction (lehašhît lekālâ)."
 Examples of past repentance are cited for the people's example (2 Chron. 15:4), and even the rebellious north is assured that the grace and mercy of God will not permit him to ignore those who turn to him (2 Chron. 30:6-9). Hezekiah's repentance prevents God's wrath from coming upon him during his lifetime. While Josiah's exemption from the punishment coming upon Judah is dependent upon the identical statement in 2 Kings 22:18-20 (=2 Chron. 34:26-28), it is surely significant for the Chronicler that even the villainous Manasseh is forgiven when he repents (2 Chron. 33:12-13).

The ultimate affront to Yahweh's mercy, however, is the rejection of the message of the prophets who appear now and then to instruct and

²⁴This theme is not found in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29, but is common in Deuteronomy, cf. Deut. 4:29-31; 30:1-10. One of the regular words for such repentance in Deuteronomy is dāraš, which we have seen the Chronicler to use normally in a much broader sense, although perhaps retaining some ties with repentance.

warn Israel as to the proper action to take. While this voice is in some cases obeyed, thus resulting in prosperity,²⁵ it is more often rejected, with the prophets suffering physical abuse and even death from their audiences. In such cases Chronicles emphasizes strongly the resulting punishment, which it appears impossible to avoid in these circumstances.²⁶ The significance of the rejection of the prophetic message for the Chronicler is fully apparent in his account of the fall of Jerusalem, where Zedekiah is not only condemned for his failure to repent at the words of Jeremiah, but where the Chronicler concludes, much in the style of Jeremiah:

The Lord, the God of their fathers, sent persistently to them by his messengers, because he had compassion on his people and on his dwelling place; but they kept mocking the messengers of God, despising his words, and scoffing at his prophets, till the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no forgiveness. Therefore he brought up against them the king of the Chaldeans²⁷

In summary, then, we may conclude that the doctrine of retribution is by all accounts the governing principle in the Chronicler's presentation of the post-Solomonic kings. This doctrine, together with the necessary criteria, the seeking or forsaking of Yahweh, is first introduced in 1 Chron. 28:9, where it is admittedly of limited relevance, pointing again to 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 as a significant unit of

²⁵Cf. 2 Chron. 12:5-6; 20:15-17; 25:7-13.

²⁶Cf. 2 Chron. 16:10-12; 24:20-27; 25:15; 26:18; 36:15-16.

²⁷2 Chron. 36:15-16. That marpē', usually translated "healing," is to be understood here as forgiveness, seems apparent. Cf. also 2 Chron. 30:18-20, where the root rp' occurs in the answer to Hazekiah's prayer for forgiveness parallel with yekappēr.

the Chronicler's thought. While the ideas of rewards and punishments are necessarily implicit in such a doctrine, the note of prosperity has furthermore been explicit in the case of Solomon (1 Chron. 22:11,13; 29:23), while in dealing with David and Solomon there would be no opportunity to introduce concrete examples of punishment. While a note concerning Yahweh's grace in enabling his people to observe the law properly is discernible in such passages as 1 Chron. 22:11-12; 29:18-19, the emphasis upon Yahweh's mercy which is available through repentance and of the seriousness of the rejection of God's word through his prophetic messengers is introduced only later when the Chronicler weaves them into his presentation of a suitable historical situation.

The Disposition of the Heart

A second major grouping of themes which we have seen to be prominent in our study of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 are those concerned with what we have chosen to call the "disposition of the heart."²⁸ The Chronicler has insisted upon obedience with a perfect heart, together with generosity and joy, as marks of God's people. These attitudes too are noticeable throughout the books of Chronicles.

While it is somewhat surprising that the Chronicler affirms of neither David nor Solomon that they were perfect in Yahweh's service,²⁹

²⁸Supra, pp. 104-105.

²⁹But notice that the remarks of 1 Kings 11:4; 15:3 that Solomon and Abijah did not serve the Lord with a perfect heart are omitted by the Chronicler.

it is striking that this is affirmed of the remainder of the kings with whom the Chronicler was particularly pleased, Asa (2 Chron. 15:17 = 1 Kings 15:14), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 22:9), Hezekiah (2 Chron. 31:21), and Josiah (2 Chron. 34:31 = 2 Kings 23:3). While it is probable that the Chronicler has here once again been influenced by the Deuteronomic historian, the consistency with which he carries out his plan is characteristic.³⁰

Another aspect of the Chronicler's viewpoint which points to the disposition of the people in their service is the joy which attended Israel's celebrations. This motif was especially prominent in 1 Chron. 29:9,22, where it characterized the mood of the people in making their contributions to the temple and at the feast accompanying Solomon's coronation. While such joy too is a motif common in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic history, the Chronicler has again carried this emphasis through more consistently, using the root śmh some fifteen times without parallel in the Deuteronomic history. While some of the usages reflect the mood of the Levites and singers in the temple services,³¹ a greater number concerns the mood of other lay participants in various kinds of cultic activity,³² as well as the anointing of various kings

³⁰The Chronicler uses the phrase "with a perfect heart" or "with all the heart" twenty-one times, of which only three have parallels in the Deuteronomic history.

³¹1 Chron. 15:16; 2 Chron. 23:18; 29:30.

³²2 Chron. 15:15 (Asa's covenant); 29:36; 30:21,23,25 (Hezekiah); 24:10 (Joash's reform); 2 Chron. 7:10 = 1 Kings 8:66 (Solomon's dedication). See also Ezra 3:13; 6:22; Neh. 8:12,17; 12:27.

of Judah.³³ Seldom does the Chronicler fail to note such willing participation of Israel in the ceremonies of which he was so fond.

A closely related emphasis is that of the generosity of the people and their leaders in supporting the cult, introduced at considerable length in 1 Chronicles 29. This theme is especially noticeable with regard to the contributions solicited for the priests and Levites in connection with Hezekiah's reform, 2 Chronicles 31. It is also apparent, however, in the large contributions of sacrificial animals regularly offered by the kings and princes in conjunction with the major feasts and reform movements (2 Chron. 29:20-24,31-35; 30:24-25; 31:4-10; 35:7-9). That such contributions are patterned somewhat after that of Solomon as recorded in 2 Chron. 7:5 (= 1 Kings 8:63) seems likely, supplying yet another case where the Chronicler is ultimately dependent upon the Deuteronomic history.

The All Israel Theme

Our previous studies have demonstrated that the Chronicler has given considerable attention to the concept of all Israel in both the David and Solomon portions of his work.³⁴ In particular he has emphasized the participation of all Israel in the acceptance of David and Solomon as the legitimate occupants of the throne, as well as in cultic events such as the transfer of the ark and the construction of the temple in Jerusalem.

³³1 Chron. 12:41 (David); 29:22 (Solomon); 2 Chron. 23:13,21 = 2 Kings 11:14,21 (Joash).

³⁴Supra, pp. 103, 113, 131.

This same emphasis is carried through with necessary modification also in the Chronicler's description of the post-Solomonic period. Like the Deuteronomic historian, the Chronicler has Rehoboam appear before all Israel at Shechem to be made king (2 Chron. 10:1 = 1 Kings 12:1). After the disruption, however, there is considerable divergency in the use of the term "Israel."³⁵ First of all, the Chronicler uses "Israel" and "all Israel" for the northern tribes (compare 2 Chron. 13:4,5,15,18), in contrast to the southern tribes, which are variously designated as Judah (2 Chron. 14:4,7), Judah and Benjamin (2 Chron. 31:1; 15:2,8,9), and Judah, Benjamin, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (2 Chron. 21:11, 12; 34:9). But the Chronicler can also continue to apply the name Israel to the south, or at least to portions of it (2 Chron. 24:5-6). The use of such a qualifying phrase as "all Israel dwelling in Judah" (2 Chron. 10:17 = 1 Kings 12:17), points to both the narrower meaning of the term as the faithful among the people as well as the Chronicler's dependence once again upon his Deuteronomic Vorlage for yet another significant theological theme. But the Chronicler does not idealize even this limited concept of Israel, freely ascribing to Israel persistent transgressions against its God (2 Chron. 12:1, 28:23, and others). Nor has

³⁵Although the etymological connections of the word Israel are obscure, it appears certain that Israel was the name given to the tribal confederacy united around the common sanctuary upon their exit from Egypt. Cf. J. N. Schofield, "All Israel in the Deuteronomic Writers," Essays and Studies Presented to Stanley Arthur Cook, edited by D. Winton Thomas (London: Foreign Press, 1950), pp. 25-34; Walter Beyerlin, Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1959), passim.

he, in concentrating upon the southern tribes, forgotten that the entire land, including the north, is within the ideal limits of the holy land "from Beersheba to Dan" (2 Chron. 30:5). As we shall see, the Chronicler groups together worshippers from both north and south as components of "all Israel" (2 Chron. 31:1; 35:17-18).

While such a statement may seem unjustified in view of the traditional description of the Chronicler's supposed hostility toward all aspects of the northern kingdom, it is nevertheless amply supported by the materials before us in 2 Chronicles 10 to 36. These chapters exhibit a persistent and recurring concern for the problem posed by the north's apostasy. This concern is portrayed on several different levels. On the lowest level, we find that the Chronicler reports that kings Abijah (2 Chron. 13:19), Asa (2 Chron. 15:8), and Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 17:2) are all listed as having captured various northern cities, and in the last case as having fortified them. While taken alone these references might seem to support rather the idea of the Chronicler's vindictiveness against the north, this would not appear to be the case when the remaining references are considered. Immediately upon the disruption the Chronicler has pointed out that priests, Levites, "and those who had set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel came . . . from all the tribes of Israel to Jerusalem to sacrifice to the Lord" (2 Chron. 11:16), thus strengthening the kingdom of Rehoboam. The significance of the Chronicler's terminology here is immediately apparent, since the phrase "to seek the Lord God" is the Chronicler's

way of describing those involved as faithful Yahwists.³⁶ All of the priests and Levites defect to Rehoboam, led not only by Jeroboam's rejection of them but by their recognition of Rehoboam and the central shrine at Jerusalem as well. The statement that these people came to Jerusalem, and in particular that they came to sacrifice to Yahweh, likewise reflects a characteristic emphasis of the Chronicler.³⁷

This recognition of the legitimate role of the Judean dynasty and temple is again apparent in that description of the reign of Asa as it is found in 2 Chron. 15:8-15. After Asa's reforming activity in both north and south is mentioned (verse 8), the Chronicler goes on to discuss a covenant made at Jerusalem which included also people from "Ephraim, Manasseh, and Simeon"³⁸ who were at this time sojourning (gērîm) in the south. The language used is once again explicit: "for great numbers had deserted to him from Israel when they saw that the Lord his God was with him" (verse 9). The twin themes of seeking Yahweh and sacrificing to him are again present in the description of the covenant (verses 11 and 12).

³⁶Supra, pp. 172-174.

³⁷Cf. 2 Chron. 2:5; 6:6; 7:12.

³⁸The reason for the inclusion of Simeon is difficult to surmise, but probably reflects the Chronicler's desire to encompass "all Israel" exclusive of Judah and Benjamin, including not only the northern tribes but perhaps portions of the south which had been lost to the Edomites as well, cf. W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Erste Reihe; Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr, 1949), XXI, pp. 229, 247.

In addition to the fact that sizeable numbers from the northern tribes recognized the legitimacy of the south's dynasty and cult and defected to the south, where they lived as sojourners, the Chronicler has also related frequently various types of religious activity in the north pursued by Judean kings. As mentioned previously, Asa removes idolatrous images not only from Judah and Benjamin, but also from the "cities which he had taken in the hill country of Ephraim (2 Chron. 15:8). Jehoshaphat's missionary activity in bringing the people back to Yahweh is characterized as extending from Beersheba to the hill country of Ephraim (2 Chron. 19:4). Hezekiah extends an invitation to all Israel "from Beersheba to Dan" (2 Chron. 30:5) to come to Jerusalem to keep his passover, and it is noted that, while his messengers met with some scorn and ridicule in their journeys, which extended all the way to Zebulun, "However, some men³⁹ of Asher, Manasseh, and Zebulun humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem" (2 Chron. 31:11).

³⁹The customary translation "only a few men" is an inaccurate reflection of the Hebrew 'ak 'ānāšim mē-, and no doubt reflects the customary attitude taken by scholars towards the Chronicler's view of the north. While *min* is no doubt partitive, there is no justification for interpreting this as "a few" rather than some. Moreover, while 'ak may be equivalent to the English "only" in some cases, the reading "only a few" reflects an English nuance not found with the Hebrew 'ak, which is commonly restrictive and emphasizes the contrast with the preceding, cf. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), p. 36b. Both the New English Bible and the Jerusalem Bible correct this later error by translating "however" or "though" respectively; although both retain the "few." Both versions show a similar disregard for the Chronicler's theology in the same verse in translating *niknē'ū*, which for the Chronicler signifies repentance, as "submitted" or "were humble enough." Cf. the notes on repentance supra, p. 182, where the verb most commonly used in *niknā'*.

The favorable response to Hezekiah's invitation on the part of some of the north resulted in their participation in Hezekiah's delayed pass-over, which it will be recalled is the high point of the Chronicler's narrative of the post-Solomonic kings. While there is less emphasis upon the involvement of the north in Josiah's passover, where it is the role of the Levites which receives the major emphasis, the statement of 2 Chron. 35:18 referring to "all Judah and Israel who were present and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" clearly includes the northern tribes, and indicates that the "all Israel" of verse 17 should also be understood to embrace the north. This means that in addition to Asa's covenant ceremony of 2 Chronicles 15, a contingent from the north was present for both of the major festivals celebrated by post-Solomonic kings, the passovers of Hezekiah and Josiah.

It is also reported in connection with these three kings that reforming activities took place which included the north. Asa destroyed the idols in both north and south (2 Chron. 15:8). While 2 Kings 18:4 had noted Hezekiah's reforming activity in the south, the Chronicler ascribes to the Israel which was present for his passover, and which we have noted included a delegation from the north, the destruction of high places not only in Judah and Benjamin but also in Ephraim and Manasseh (2 Chron. 31:1). The account of Josiah's reform in 2 Kings 23:15-20, which does include the destruction of high places in the north, is rewritten in a somewhat more general fashion by the Chronicler, but retains its emphasis upon the reforms in both the south and in "the cities of Manasseh, Ephraim, and Simeon, as far as Naphtili (2 Chron. 34:6).

To these we may add a scattering of other briefer references which do not lend themselves readily to the above groupings. These include the double mention of the sacrifices offered for "all Israel" upon the occasion of Hezekiah's rededication of the temple (2 Chron. 29:24), a reference perhaps recalling the similar statement of 1 Chron. 29:21. Within the Josiah account the Chronicler has similarly included two episodes which point again to the sympathetic involvement of the north and the writer's concern for them. While the writer of Kings had the money collected for the necessary temple repairs collected by being deposited in a chest in the temple (2 Kings 22:4), the Chronicler has not only rewritten this narrative to reflect more favorably upon the priests and Levites, but has the Levites collect the offering from "Manasseh and Ephraim and from all the remnant of Israel and from all Judah and Benjamin and from the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (2 Chron. 34:9), a passage which in its comprehensiveness suggests the degree of the writer's concern. The Chronicler has moreover significantly introduced the north as an object of Josiah's inquiry of the prophetess Huldah (2 Chron. 34:21), where the Vorlage of 2 Kings 22:13 asks information only concerning Josiah and the people of the south. In none of these cases, it may be noted, does the writer berate the north or its representatives, but they are apparently accepted as completely equal with the faithful in the south.

Lastly, we must consider in somewhat more detail the three passages in which the writer dealt at greater length with the problem of the relationship of the north to the south, and particularly to the

dynasty and temple. It has been noted that the Chronicler ascribed the primary responsibility for the dissolution of the united monarchy to Jeroboam, largely absolving Rehoboam and Judah from fault,⁴⁰ and that into his account of the reign of Abijah he has inserted a lengthy speech presenting his own views of the north's apostasy.⁴¹ The objections raised there are twofold: (1) The Lord has given the kingship over Israel for ever to David and his sons (2 Chron. 13:5,8); (2) The north has forsaken the Lord in that they have driven out the sons of Aaron and Levites from their land, while the south has retained the legitimate priesthood and cult. It is therefore obvious to the writer that Israel has forsaken Yahweh, and thus Yahweh is not with them. Judah's victory is assured "because they relied upon the Lord (2 Chron. 13:18), while a half-million of the enemy's troops are killed.

The second more extensive account, which is very different in its focus, has been inserted by the Chronicler into his account of the reign of Ahaz (2 Chron. 28:8-15). In keeping with his dogma of retribution, the writer has stated that as a result of the wickedness of Ahaz Judah was given into the hand of the king of Syria, and some one hundred and twenty thousand Judeans also fell at the hand of Pekah of Israel "because they had forsaken the Lord" (2 Chron. 28:5-7). In addition to the men slain, the writer also reports that two hundred thousand women and children were then taken captive by Israel and

⁴⁰Supra, pp. 148-149.

⁴¹2 Chron. 13:4-12, cf. supra, pp. 150-151.

brought as spoil to Samaria. But a prophet of Yahweh was there (!) who urged the north to return their captives. Both his message to the soldiers and the reaction of them and the people is exceptional. The prophet condemns the north because, while Yahweh was angry with Judah and had handed them over to Israel, Israel had overstepped their allotted task, both in the severity of their attack (verse 9) but above all in their plans to subjugate the women and children, who are described as their relatives (mē'āhēkem, verse 11), as their slaves (verse 10). Israel is reminded at the same time of her own sins and of the additional wrath which her present plans will bring upon her (verses 10 and 11).

The response of the Samaritan princes is indeed remarkable. Reiterating their own present guilt and sins, they persuade the armed men to leave the captives with them (verse 14), and the princes themselves take the captives, provide them with food and clothing, and even transportation for the particularly infirm, and return them to Jericho, a city apparently in Israelite hands at this time but from where they could easily enter Judah. Rudolph most aptly remarks concerning the character of these first "Good Samaritans."⁴¹

This passage emphasizes then the existence of prophets of Yahweh in the north, as well as people obedient to their message. Although it is true that in this instance the focus is upon Israel for overextending

⁴¹Rudolph, XXI, p. 291. Is it possible that Luke 10 is dependent upon this passage in a more formal sense?

Yahweh's punishment upon Judah, the sins and guilt of both Israel and Judah are acknowledged. But an equal emphasis lies upon the fine character of the Samaritans, who respond to the prophetic word and show compassion to their relatives from Judah.⁴²

The final passage in which the Chronicler has dealt with the problem posed by the separate existence of the north is 2 Chron. 30:1-27; 31:1, where the participation of all Israel has been included as a major emphasis within the account of Hezekiah's passover. We have previously mentioned Hezekiah's invitation to the northern tribes to come to Jerusalem for the passover and have indicated that verse 11 pictures a more positive response than would be suggested by many translations.⁴³ Here we need call particular attention to the contents of the king's letter of invitation as stated in verses 6 to 9.

While it would be easy to emphasize the guilt which the message attributes to the north, as a result of which Israel has been laid waste by the kings of Assyria, to do so would negate the major thrust of the passage, which is clearly a preaching of repentance. The remnant left from the Assyrian invasion is urged to take heed to the negative example given them by their faithless fathers, to give themselves

⁴²J. Myers, *II Chronicles, The Anchor Bible*, edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1965), XIII, 162, has pointed to the remarkable nature of this passage "because it runs counter to his [the Chronicler's] strong emphasis upon the separation of the two kingdoms," and believes the writer found the essentials of the narrative in his sources. That it is not so contrary to the Chronicler's emphasis has become apparent in our discussion.

⁴³Supra, p. 190, especially note 39.

to Yahweh and return to his sanctuary, "which he has sanctified forever" (verse 8). The remnant is given at least three reasons why they should do this, the first two stated in terms of the results: that Yahweh's anger might turn from them (verse 8) and that their exiled relatives might find mercy in the hands of their captors and return to Israel. But the third reason for Israel's repentance lies in the nature of Yahweh himself: "For Yahweh your God is gracious and merciful, and he will not turn aside his face from you if you return to him" (verse 9). Yahweh's grace therefore is readily available to those of the north who will repent and return to him, although it is apparent that for the Chronicler this "repentance" includes a recognition of and return to the Jerusalem sanctuary.

In the account of the Passover which follows, the note of the involvement of the north is never permitted to wane. While verse 18 seems to state that it was in particular the representatives of various northern tribes who had not been able to prepare themselves properly for eating the Passover as prescribed, Hezekiah's prayer for forgiveness, which proclaims emphatically that "setting the heart to seek Yahweh" is more important than obedience to cultic laws, would also be particularly relevant to the north. The Chronicler is then careful to add the note of Yahweh's approval (verse 20). The inclusion of the north within the "people of Israel that were present at Jerusalem" (verse 21), and with "all the assembly" (kol haqqāhāl) in verses 23 and 25 may be assumed, and the last-named verse mentions specifically both the "whole assembly that came in from Israel" and also sojourners

(gērîm) who had come in from the land of Israel as participants in the fourteen day feast. The emphasis upon the involvement of all segments of Israel in the preceding verses suggests strongly that the paralleling of the event with the days of Solomon which is introduced so dramatically in verse 26 may refer specifically to the participation of segments from both the north and south in both feasts, a note which would be particularly significant under the reign of Hezekiah when the north has just fallen to the Assyrians and ceased to exist as an independent kingdom.

Conclusions

The major theological concerns introduced in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29, which we have summarized under the larger headings of the dogma of retribution, a concern for the disposition of the heart, and the involvement of "all Israel," are of primary importance throughout the books of Chronicles, in particular in the description of the post-Solomonic era. The dogma of retribution, which the Chronicler has introduced for the first time in 1 Chron. 28:9 in a setting which is quite inappropriate, assumes major prominence following the age of David and Solomon, where it lies at the very basis of the Chronicler's historical methodology. Israel's willing and even enthusiastic participation in the observance of the divine law, in the support of the cult with monetary contributions, and in joyous worship and praise is a note which is prominent throughout the work, but which reaches its peak in the Chronicler's description of cultic celebrations centered around

the Jerusalem temple. The concern for the unanimous consent of all Israel to the Davidic dynasty and the Jerusalem temple necessarily take on a new dimension following the apostasy of the north. Immediately following the disruption the writer is at pains to indicate that at least a portion of the northern tribes immediately recognized the legitimacy of these two Judean institutions and defected to the south. The involvement of various southern kings in the north is also repeatedly mentioned, principally in conducting successful military campaigns into those regions, but also in directing cultic reforms there and even in leading the people back to the worship of Yahweh. Various Judean kings also take the initiative in inviting the north to Jerusalem for participation in major cultic feasts, and the northern response is normally described in terms which may rightly be characterized as positive.

The Chronicler never alters his basic conviction that the king of Judah is the legitimate ruler upon the throne of Yahweh and that the Jerusalem temple is Yahweh's legitimate sanctuary, a conviction stated emphatically in Abijah's discourse, and the recognition especially of the latter is the central component of his concept of the meaning of repentance. Nevertheless, with these conditions attached, men from the north appear to be accepted at the Jerusalem temple as brothers. They are urged to repentance on the basis of Yahweh's mercy and thus assured of his forgiveness, and their kindly treatment of the south in releasing women and children captives of war is exemplary. The Chronicler seems to have demanded nothing more of his brothers

from the northern tribes than that they repent of their transgressions, come to the Jerusalem temple to worship Yahweh, and set their hearts to serve him. While their geographical habitat was different, there is no indication that he demanded any less of the members of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. We shall return to these considerations in discussing the purpose of the Chronicler's work.

In preparing for and accomplishing the construction of the temple, the figures of David and Solomon were shown to be central. David's role was emphasized in gathering materials and personnel for the building, as well as in the generous contributions which he made for it.⁴

⁴ See the summary *op. cit.*, pp. 108-101.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The study of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 (Chapter II) has pointed clearly to the temple as the center of the author's concern. The designation of the site for the temple (1 Chron. 22:1), for which the Chronicler has been careful to record previously the divine approval (1 Chron. 21:26), serves as a fitting introduction to a unit which is in almost every detail focused on the temple. It is for the temple that David makes various preparations and contributions, and it is for the construction of the temple that Solomon is above all set before the people and for which the divine presence with him is assured (1 Chron. 28:20). The plans for the temple, like the choice of the site, have their source in Yahweh himself (1 Chron. 28:19). The people are put at Solomon's disposal for the construction of the temple (1 Chron. 28:21), and their contributions are solicited and received for the same purpose (1 Chron. 29:1-9). David's concluding prayer includes the petition that the same generous and joyous attitude toward the temple may persist forever (1 Chron. 29:18).

In preparing for and accomplishing the construction of the temple, the figures of David and Solomon were shown to be central. David's role is emphasized in gathering materials and personnel for the building, as well as in the generous contributions which he made for it.¹

¹See the summary supra, pp. 100-101.

However, the Chronicler's speeches placed in the mouth of David are primarily directed toward Solomon in his role as divinely chosen temple builder. Through the use of the m^enûhâ concept, the formula for the induction of an official into his office, and the application to him of the term bāḥar the Chronicler has repeatedly pointed to Solomon as the man of rest chosen by God to build the temple.² A second apologetic concern is also apparent in connection with Solomon's anointing, where the Chronicler has gone to considerable lengths to point to the enthusiastic support which Solomon received from the people of Israel upon that occasion (1 Chron. 29:22-25).

At the same time that the Chronicler has focused principally upon the temple and the role of David and Solomon in its construction, he has also woven together into his presentation a number of other motifs which are apparently due to his own Tendenz. We have summarized the most prominent of these under three heads: (1) The all Israel concept, where the Chronicler is concerned to portray the involvement and enthusiastic consent of all the people of Israel in the two motifs most important to him, that is, the recognition of the Davidic dynasty and the erection of the temple; (2) The concern for the disposition of the heart, where we have seen the Chronicler's emphasis upon obedience rendered with a "perfect heart" and service and generosity with joy; and (3) The dogma of retribution, where prosperity or the lack of it is seen to be completely dependent upon one's acts toward God. It is

²Supra, pp. 101-102.

then this basic group of ideas--David, Solomon, temple, all Israel, the perfect heart, and generosity--which the remainder of the thesis explored throughout the work of the Chronicler.³

In Chapter III the subject of David and Solomon has been pursued further, and we have noted the author's differing treatment of Solomon as of primary importance. Not only is the beginning of Solomon's reign transformed from the power struggle depicted in 1 Kings 1 and 2 into a scene in which all Israel immediately acknowledges Solomon as the legitimate king (and temple builder), but in striking contrast to 1 Kings 11 the Chronicler views Solomon's entire life as lived in complete and perfect obedience to Yahweh. Solomon therefore is in no way responsible for the division of the kingdom, as he is in Kings. Since David was already the primary example of a god-fearing king for the Deuteronomic historian, the alternative evaluation by the Chronicler has resulted in a virtual paralleling of David and Solomon--a paralleling which is apparent both in passages added by the Chronicler and in alterations introduced into still other passages adopted from Kings. It seems likely that this desire to coordinate the reigns of David and Solomon also governed to a considerable degree the choice of the material included in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29, where, for example, the numerous preparations undertaken by David for the construction of the temple may be due not only to the author's attempt to aggrandize the temple, but also to give David, like Solomon, some immediate part in the building operation. Similarly Israel's immediate and unanimous

³See the summary, supra, pp. 103-105.

recognition of Solomon as king (1 Chron. 29:22-25) is probably due to the author's attempt to present the reigns of David and Solomon as equally legitimate in the eyes of Israel.

In Chapter IV the question of the significance of the temple throughout Chronicles has been pursued. Here we concluded that the temple and its cult formed the center of concern not only in what we have chosen to call the David and Solomon histories, 1 Chronicles 9 to 21 and 2 Chronicles 1 to 9 respectively, where its centrality might be due to obvious chronological considerations, but also in 2 Chronicles 10 to 36, the narrative of the post-Solomonic kings. The north's apostasy is viewed above all as the rejection of the legitimate temple (2 Chronicles 13), and their repentance means for the Chronicler a return to the Jerusalem temple (2 Chron. 30:8). The most extensive additions to the Chronicler's work occur in contexts describing the temple, its services, and its personnel, as is indeed the case already with 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29. The kings with whom the Chronicler is most pleased are regularly portrayed as having taken certain measures on behalf of the temple and the cult, while apostate kings are noted as having done the opposite. The Chronicler marks the depths of degradation for a king of Judah when he reports that Ahaz completely closed the temple (2 Chron. 28:24). In recounting the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, the Chronicler gives even more attention to the fate of the temple and its vessels than the Deuteronomic writer.⁴

⁴The temple is also central in 2 Chron. 36:23, which we must consider secondary to Ezra 1:2. We have not presupposed, however, that Ezra and Nehemiah should be attributed to the Chronicler.

Our evaluation of the significance of the use of the speech and prayer in Chronicles likewise pointed to the significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 and, as a result, to the significance of the temple. For the Chronicler has inserted these speeches first of all into a context dealing with the temple, thus marking the point as a significant one for him. Moreover, the content of the speeches themselves, which we have seen to serve as a reflection of the author's thought, points us repeatedly to the temple.

In Chapter V we have turned to the remaining theological motifs discovered in our study of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 and examined the use made of these motifs in the remainder of Chronicles. Here it was found that the dogma of retribution, which was introduced in David's second speech to Solomon (1 Chron. 28:9), where it appears as somewhat of an intrusion in view of the Chronicler's high evaluation of King Solomon, should be viewed as the dominant concept governing the Chronicler's presentation of the post-Solomonic kings. Not only do prophets repeatedly come forth to expound the dogma in theoretical terms, but whatever is lacking in the narrative of the Deuteronomic historian which might be considered a deficiency in this respect is carefully supplied by the writer. Where the Deuteronomic Vorlage reports both good and evil of the same king, the Chronicler frequently divides the reign of that king into two or more different periods, in each of which this principle of retribution is applied with absolute consistency.

What we have termed the concerns for the disposition of the heart and for the all Israel theme reoccur throughout the books also. In the latter case, however, a distinct change is observable following the age

of Solomon. After the division of the kingdom the author is concerned first of all to point to the fact that at least a portion of the north had always recognized the legitimacy of the major institutions of Judah, the temple and the Davidic dynasty, and come to the south for that reason. The involvement of various kings of Judah in the north is mentioned, and the south's invitation to their northern brethren to join them for various festivities is duly noted. The author apparently believed that worshippers and prophets true to Yahweh continue to exist in the north, and that these are welcome at the Jerusalem temple if they will but recognize its unique position. The view of various Samaritans given in 2 Chron. 28:8-15 presents a particularly sympathetic view of the north, and the repentance offered them in 2 Chron. 30:9 assures them of Yahweh's readiness to forgive. Those who appear for Hezekiah's passover are numbered with "all Israel," and the resulting celebration is marked as unsurpassed since the time of Solomon (2 Chron. 30:26).

We conclude, therefore, that the unit composed of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 is of extreme importance for the Chronicler's work, and that, in fact, it is impossible to find a single comparable passage anywhere in his work.⁵ This importance is clearly indicated both by its location within the total work of 1 and 2 Chronicles as well as by its subject

⁵The only possible alternative would be the reign of Hezekiah, 2 Chronicles 29 to 32. However, these chapters occupy no observable place of importance in the structure of the total work, and in fact seem to present the situation as a return to the status quo of Solomon's time. Note also that Hezekiah is condemned by the Chronicler for his pride.

matter and various motifs which it contains. Structurally these chapters form the connecting link between the two larger units of the Chronicler's work centered most directly in the construction of the temple, the David history (1 Chronicles 10 to 21) and the Solomon history (2 Chronicles 1 to 9). While the inclusion of the chapters at this place points to the significance of the subject into the discussion of which they are inserted, that is, the temple, and their content is likewise centered on the temple, the Chronicler has also woven into these chapters other significant items of both structure and content. First, the great emphasis upon David and Solomon which is presented in these chapters is striking. But we have noted instances where the Chronicler seems to have given particular attention to making this parallel between the only two kings to rule over a united Israel a more detailed and considered one.⁶ Alterations introduced into the Solomon history confirm this observation, and lead us to ask what the Chronicler's rationale may have been in so elevating Solomon to a position equal with that of David and in providing such an elaborate apology for his construction of the temple. Secondly, the occurrence of various other motifs of which the Chronicler is particularly fond--the all Israel theme, the disposition of the heart, and retribution--points to the chapters which contain them as at least a significant repository of the Chronicler's thought. Whether this occurred naturally in the Chronicler's writing or whether they have been introduced here by design is unfortunately impossible to determine with certainty. The inclusion

⁶Supra, pp. 139-142.

of the concern for retribution in David's speech to Solomon, where it has little relevance in view of the Chronicler's obvious tendency to idealize Solomon, might, however, support this last suggestion.

Before turning to the consideration of possible import of our study upon the larger question of the purpose of the Chronicler, we may first return briefly to the questions raised at the termination of our detailed study of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29,⁷ since these will both summarize the major results of the study and serve as background material for the consideration of the larger question.

1. What significance does the temple have in the remainder of the work? What is the reason for this significance?

The studies of Chapter IV have demonstrated how completely the temple and its cult dominates the Chronicler's presentation throughout. Upon any dating the writing of Chronicles must fall some time after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, which is recorded in its final chapter. Unless one wishes to affirm that the Chronicler's interest was merely antiquarian, it is thus necessary to conclude that at some time during the exilic or post-exilic period a situation arose which questioned the role of the Jerusalem temple as the Chronicler understood it. Moreover, the repeated references to the generosity of its adherents in supporting the temple perhaps point to a related concern in which renewed zeal in support of the temple and its cult was called for even on the part of those who supported it.

2. Is the picture of David and Solomon found here continued throughout the books of Chronicles? Are other kings dealt with in a similar fashion?

⁷Supra, pp. 105-106.

We have seen (Chapter III) that the Chronicler has consciously attempted to equate and to parallel David and Solomon both within 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 and throughout his work. This has been done above all in two ways: (1) Solomon, like David before him, is made king by divine choice, and all signs of opposition to his reign on the part of his subjects and any sins or shortcomings on Solomon's part which might have served as the cause for the division of the kingdom are removed from the Chronicler's account. Thus Solomon is made approximately equal to David in these respects. (2) David is assigned a significant role in the preparations for the temple, thus equating him with Solomon in this respect, to whom the Deuteronomic historian had apparently attributed all aspects of the temple construction. Throughout the books primary emphasis in the case of both David and Solomon falls upon their cultic activity, in particular to their ordering of the cultic personnel and, in the case of David, to the music for the temple. Relatively little attention is given to the question of the Davidic dynasty, though to be sure this accent is not completely absent.

When we consider further the reason for this paralleling of the two kings, only one answer seems possible. That it had been Solomon who had built the temple was a well established tradition. The Chronicler has therefore emphasized most strongly that Solomon possessed this charge to build the temple through the explicit choice of Yahweh himself and has presented Solomon as completely perfect in his allegiance to both Yahweh and the temple. It had been David, however, who had

brought the ark to Jerusalem, had conceived the idea of building the temple, and who had been promised both the eternal dynasty and the seed who would construct the temple. Moreover, David had enjoyed the support of all Israel in his activities in a sense which Solomon clearly did not. By extending this unanimous support to the reign of Solomon the Chronicler has presented all Israel as completely united throughout the united monarchy, during which the temple was also erected on Zion as the only sanctuary of an undivided Israel.

3. How do David, Solomon, and the Davidic dynasty relate to the temple? Are they to be considered equal, or is the one subservient to the other?

This problem has been vigorously debated, and the results are mixed. Some scholars affirm the centrality of the Davidic dynasty throughout the work,⁸ while others believe these dynastic concerns to be altogether absent or at least subordinate to the temple.⁹ Our study seems to support strongly this last position, with dynastic emphases subordinate to the temple. While it must be admitted the Chronicler's

⁸Cf. especially G. von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930), p. 131; Martin Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1943), p. 179; A. M. Brunet, "La Théologie du Chroniste. Théocratie et messianisme," Sacra Pagina, I (1959), 384-397; G. J. Botterweck, "Zur Eigenart der chronistischen Davidgeschichte," Theologische Quartalschrift, CXXXVI (1956), 402-435.

⁹Cf. especially W. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Erste Reihe; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955), XXI, xxiii; Otto Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), pp. 37-45; A. Caquot, "Peut-on parler de Messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?," Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, XVI (1966), pp. 110-120; G. Wilda, Das Königsbild des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1959), pp. 109-112, et. al.

work contains some striking statements concerning the Davidic dynasty, such statements are insignificant both in their number and theological development when compared with statements concerning the temple. We have seen, for example, that 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 returns repeatedly to the theme of the temple building, and that it is for this purpose that Solomon is inducted. The account of the destruction of Jerusalem contains no mention of the problem of the monarchy or the disposition of Zedekiah, although considerable attention is given to the temple and its vessels. For the Chronicler the promise to both the Patriarchs and to the Davidic dynasty seems to have reached its completion in the temple (compare 2 Chron. 6:6-11; 1 Kings 8:54).¹⁰

4. Are the theological motifs found in this section unique, or are they representative of the Chronicler's interests throughout his work?

The primary motifs found in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 certainly have wide distribution throughout the books and may be considered characteristic of the Chronicler's interest, as we have seen in Chapter V. Those themes relating to the disposition of heart and retribution may be seen to relate loosely to the temple in that the required single-mindedness, generosity, joy, and so forth is required above all in relation to the temple and its cult. "Seeking" and "forsaking" Yahweh

¹⁰For scholars who would assume 2 Chron. 36:22-23, which are reproduced from Ezra 1:1-3a, to be from the hand of the Chronicler, it may be of the utmost significance that Cyrus is here described in terms reminiscent of Second Isaiah, where he is specifically labeled as Yahweh's anointed. Is it possible that Cyrus, the new temple builder, is the successor of David and Solomon? Cf. Wilda, p. 130.

frequently involves the participation or lack of it in the services of the Jerusalem temple, and both weal and woe are expressed through the individual's relationship to the temple. The theme of "all-Israel" is more important for the purpose of the Chronicler, and will be discussed later.¹¹

5. Is the inclusion of these chapters at this place in the Chronicler's work significant, or might they have been included elsewhere?

The study of the speech in Chapter IV has indicated that the placement of such a complex of speeches and prayer as found in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 should indeed be considered significant in marking an episode of unusual importance for the writer, that is, the construction of the temple. We have shown also that its occurrence in immediate connection with the transferral of the kingdom from David to Solomon is significant in that the two major units of the Chronicler's work dealing with the temple are thereby joined into a single unit.

6. Why is so little attention given to the Levites?

This is impossible to determine with certainty. However, Rudolph is certainly correct in branding von Rad's statement that the position of the Levites in post-exilic Israel is the central concern of the Chronicler as an overstatement.¹² It seems probable that a number of the references to the Levites in 2 Chronicles are later additions, as we have found to be the case also in 1 Chronicles. As correctly noted

¹¹Infra, pp. 212-222.

¹²Von Rad, as quoted by Rudolph, XXI, xiv.

by S. Japhet, the terminology applied to the various temple personnel in Ezra differs significantly from that in Chronicles, thus presenting the student with additional difficulties in properly assessing the role which the Levites played in the economy of the original Chronicler.¹³ Two points however are deserving of mention: (1) The Levites are not mentioned as frequently as might be supposed in a work concerning which they have received a great deal of attention, and among whose members the author of the work has often been placed; (2) While at times the mention of the Levites does have a clear apologetic concern, in numerous other cases such references are found in contexts where the author is rather intent upon impressing upon Israel the duty and privilege of the worship of Yahweh.

7. How do these various questions relate to the broader purpose of the writer?

We may begin our discussion with the all Israel theme, which we have seen to undergo various changes in the course of the work.¹⁴ During the reigns of both David and Solomon the author has pointed repeatedly to the immediate and unanimous assent given by all Israel to the reigns of these kings and to their efforts on behalf of the cult. Following the dissolution of the monarchy we have further noted that the Chronicler does not cease to be concerned with the north, but admonishes them for rejecting the Jerusalem temple, exhorts them to return to it in

¹³S. Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," Vetus Testamentum, XVIII (1968), 351-354.

¹⁴Supra, pp. 186-197.

repentance, and invites them to participate in its ceremonies. We have seen that, with the possible exception of 2 Chronicles 13, where the necessity for the recognition of the Jerusalem temple is expressed in unequivocal terms, the writer is not at all negative in his appraisal of the north and does not hesitate to report the positive response of at least a portion of the northern tribes. It is probably significant that it was in the reign of Hezekiah, the first pious king of Judah after the fall of the north, that the most extensive consideration of the question of the north arises, and that the participation of the north in Hezekiah's Passover as a result of Hezekiah's invitations is noted as marking a return to the situation existing at the time of Solomon, when "all Israel" gathered for the dedication of the temple (2 Chron. 30:26).

Presupposing the common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah, it has by now become almost traditional to find the primary goal of the Chronicler's work in the author's opposition to the Samaritans.¹⁵ Even the omission of the history of the northern kings is commonly traced back to this same distaste for the north, as if the writer were unwilling even to concede its existence. However, if the analysis adopted here of the author's view of the north is substantially

¹⁵Cf., e.g., Wilda, p. 53; Botterweck, CXXVI, p. 434; O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 531; Rudolph, XXI, ix; Noth, pp. 164-166. Numerous other examples could be stated. Recent scholars who have expressed themselves with more caution on this subject are rare, but cf. Peter Ackroyd, "History and Theology in the Writings of the Chronicler," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXVIII (1967), 512.

correct, more attention needs to be directed toward this problem. On the basis of Chronicles alone it is difficult to accept the view that the Chronicler was so unalterably opposed to the northern tribes, and, beyond that, that the same author could have been responsible for two passages so diverse in their viewpoint as 2 Chronicles 30 and Ezra 4:1-5 as it has been commonly understood. Several alternatives then present themselves.

First, assuming the same author to be responsible for Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah, we may assume that the purpose of the presentation in Chronicles is in some way subordinate to or has been replaced by the understanding found in Ezra. G. Wilda concludes, for example, that the Chronicler wrote off the northern kingdom when Hezekiah's invitation did not bring about the expected results.¹⁶ However, it seems clear that such an idea must be read into the text rather than extracted from it, and would not be worth suggesting if it were not for the supposed common authorship of the work. There is no indication whatever that the hope for forgiveness which lies in Yahweh's mercy (2 Chron. 30:9) is limited to a certain period of time after which it becomes invalid. Moreover, the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin in Ezra 4:1-5 can certainly not be pictured as recalcitrant, but their desire to participate in the building of the temple is dismissed immediately and emphatically.

A second possibility, still assuming common authorship, may emerge from a reinterpretation of certain passages within Ezra and Nehemiah,

¹⁶Wilda, p. 110.

and particularly of Ezra 4:1-4. It has become traditional to read Ezra 4:2 in connection with 2 Kings 17:24-41 and to interpret both passages as indicative of a Judaistic separatism which believed it essential to avoid all contact with foreigners, among whom are to be included the remnants of the northern tribes. But it is possible that the author may not have lumped together the native Israelites with the remainder of the peoples surrounding Judah.¹⁷ In discussing the foreign marriage problem, such groups as Canaanites, Hittites, Perizzites, Jebusites, Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians, and Amorites are designated by the Chronicler as "people of the lands" (Ezra 9:1; compare 4:4). While some of these names may be due primarily to the traditional enumeration of Israel's enemies, the Moabites, Ammonites, Arabs, and Ethiopians are mentioned repeatedly in Chronicles also in passages which seem to classify them as traditional enemies of Israel.¹⁸ Apart from Ezra 4:1-5, Judah's opposition in attempting to build the temple and the city walls is repeatedly traced to various officials of the province Beyond the River, such as Sanballat, the governor of Samaria; Tobiah, the governor of Ammon; and Geshem the Arab, whose political authority would be diluted by the intrusion of the small Judean community. The opposition

¹⁷Remarks in this section are dependent upon the lucid presentations of R. J. Coggins, "The Old Testament and Samaritan Origins," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute, VI (1968), 35-48; and T. H. Gaster, "Samaritans," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), R-Z, 190-197. Cf. also H. H. Rowley, "The Samaritan Schism in Legend and History," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, edited by B. W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 208-222.

¹⁸2 Chron. 12:2; 14:9; 20:1,10; 21:16; 26:7-8.

to the Jews on the part of such rulers--and it may be assumed by a number of their subjects as well--was therefore no doubt more political than it was racial or religious,¹⁹ as we may see also in the names formed with a Yahweh element, such as Tobiah, Delaiah, and Shelemiah, the latter two children of Sanballat known from the papyri discovered at Elephantine.²⁰ That Sanballat in particular remained on relatively friendly terms with Judean leaders is also apparent in the fact that one of the grandsons of the high priest Eliashib was married to the daughter of none other than Sanballat himself (Neh. 13:28). It thus seems likely that Ezra 4:1-5 may not in fact apply to native Israelites at all, nor to half-Israelites who had intermarried with the gentiles brought in by Assyrian kings, but, as verse 2 clearly indicates, to foreigners alone. It is noteworthy in this respect that Coggins finds indications in 2 Kings 17 of two differing traditions, neither of which is anti-northern, therefore concluding that the emphasis in 2 Kings 17, as in Ezra, may be rather upon the necessity for a single temple rather than anti-northern.²¹ Such an emphasis would certainly be more in line with the Chronicler's thought as we have seen it expressed in Chronicles.

Finally, the rejection of the foreigners in Ezra 4 may be used as support for the idea that Ezra and Nehemiah are to be ascribed to a

¹⁹Dahlberg, "Sanballat," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, R-Z, 192.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Coggins, p. 38.

different author from Chronicles. While the common authorship of these books has in recent times been largely assumed,²² it has not been without its critics of late and may well be a subject ready for more extensive investigation.²³ Without entering into detailed investigation of other facets of Ezra and Nehemiah or Chronicles, either the second or third alternative listed above would provide a suitable alternative to the currently prevalent view of the author's anti-Samaritan bias, that is, we may either reinterpret the sections commonly quoted in support of this hypothesis or we may deny the Chronicler's authorship of at least these portions of Ezra and Nehemiah. The central issue as seen by the Chronicler is then not the participation of the descendants of the northern tribes in cultic activity in general, but rather the question of the unique position of the Jerusalem temple. Throughout his work the Chronicler has not hesitated to state, even in the face of his generally favorable reaction to the north, that recognition of and return to this Jerusalem temple was essential (2 Chronicles 13; 30:8).

²²Cf. Noth, p. 110.

²³The question of the unity of Ezra and Nehemiah and Chronicles has not been seriously investigated for decades, but has recently been questioned by D. N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIII (1961), 436-442; and Japhet, XVIII, 330-371. Japhet presents evidence to contradict the four principle arguments upon which the supposed common authorship is predicated (pp. 330-332), while Freedman concludes that the original work ended with the account of the construction of the temple under Zerubbabel, although the original ending has now been replaced with an Aramaic record. The Memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah were then added in a somewhat haphazard fashion towards the end of the fifth century B. C. The original document has as its model the Davidic monarchy, while the later additions orient the community in accordance with the pattern prescribed by Moses in the wilderness (Freedman, XXIII, 441).

With such a view of the importance of the Jerusalem temple, the reason for the emphasis upon David and Solomon as the instruments for the erection of the sanctuary becomes apparent. It is these two kings who ruled over the united kingdom of Israel and Judah, and who commanded the allegiance--as the Chronicler has repeatedly reminded us--of both north and the south. Therefore the writer can point to the Jerusalem temple as the common sanctuary of a united Israel, constructed by its anointed kings with the concurrence of all Israel and dedicated and frequented by the same. This connection between Israel's political and religious unity may also explain the emphasis placed upon Hezekiah's invitation to the north to return to the legitimate temple--an invitation following only shortly the end of the north as a political entity--and the elaborate descriptions of the festivities surrounding the rededication of the temple and the participation of all Israel in the passover which followed. Israel was once again a unity as she had been in the days of David and Solomon.

However, it was not sufficient for the Chronicler to demonstrate that the Jerusalem temple had been the original sanctuary of both north and south. For he is at pains also to show that its unique position was the result not merely of political alliances but of the divine decree, and each phase of the temple construction--from the choice of the temple site through the temple builder, the plans, the transfer of the ark, and the final ceremonies of dedication--was marked by the divine choice and/or approval. This emphasis probably provides the major reason for the great emphasis which we have seen on Solomon's election as temple builder. It may be assumed that when friction did arise

between north and south over the claims of the Jerusalem temple, Solomon's participation in the venture would be a major source of embarrassment to those advocating its supremacy. Upon what authority did he build, and how was the Jerusalem location determined? Was it not this same Solomon who had himself built other cult sites, and had not Solomon been rejected by Yahweh himself and been made to bear the brunt of the responsibility for the divisions within Israel? The Chronicler however has effectively removed these objections both by pointing to Solomon's divine choice and by remaining judiciously silent concerning his later apostasy.

Therefore the added emphasis upon Solomon serves both as a means of emphasizing the unity of Israel and as a guard against placing the unique role of the Jerusalem temple in jeopardy. But to say this means that undue emphasis should not be placed on David, Solomon, or the Davidic dynasty apart from their role in the construction of the temple. The emphasis upon the dynasty is minimal throughout the work, and the concluding chapters of Chronicles give us little if any reason to assume that the author looked forward to the reestablishment of that dynasty in any sense. If the original work of the Chronicler ended with 2 Chron. 36:21, there is even less reason to suppose that he expected the restoration of the dynasty than is the case at the end of 2 Kings. If his original account included the account of Zerubbabel's rebuilding of the temple, as assumed by Freedman, it is still remarkable that no emphasis is placed upon Zerubbabel's Davidic lineage.²⁴ If all of

²⁴Cf. 1 Chron. 3:17-19.

Ezra and Nehemiah be from the hand of the same writer as Chronicles the situation becomes still more problematic, since the activities of Ezra and Nehemiah leave little room for a Davidic hope of any kind.²⁵

David, Solomon, and all Israel had built a temple where the name of Yahweh might dwell (1 Chron. 22:7) and to which Israel might pray (2 Chron. 6:20). But beyond that the temple was for the Chronicler a "house of rest for the ark of the covenant of Yahweh" (1 Chron. 28:2; 2 Chron. 6:41) and a house of sacrifice (2 Chron. 2:3; 7:12). But most of all it was the place where the priests, levites, and all Israel performed their joyous ministry to Yahweh (2 Chron. 5:12-13; 7:6; 8:14). By the time of the author of the Davidic dynasty appears to have disappeared from the scene. The other great institution of Israel, however, the temple, remained and in it the work of the Davidic dynasty was embodied. As the Sinaitic covenant needed to be reinterpreted to provide a place for the Davidic covenant, so the Davidic covenant was now to be understood in terms of the temple which it had left as a legacy for all Israel.²⁶ While it is unprofitable to argue whether this should

²⁵A. Noordtzij is able to predicate an eschatological hope in these chapters only by supposing that the Chronicler's work points to the failure of both the dynasty and the theocracy of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and thus must look beyond these to a better day. Such a reading of Ezra and Nehemiah appears impossible to me. A. Noordtzij, "Les Intentiones du Chroniste," Revue Biblique, XXXIX (1940), 161-168.

²⁶"The kingdom, as an institution, had failed; but it did not disappear until it had brought into existence an institution which outlasted itself," Adam Welch, The Work of the Chronicler (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 53.

or should not be considered an eschatological hope, it amounted to a re-interpretation of the David-Jerusalem tradition in theological rather than political terms.²⁷ And the north too was invited to participate in this new Israel which had its center in the Jerusalem temple.

The Chronicler's emphasis upon retribution and the need for joy and generosity in the service of Yahweh provides us with little additional information concerning the precise period in which he wrote, but may illuminate somewhat the audience to which he spoke. The Chronicler shows no hesitation in accepting the general applicability of the doctrine. It would appear that the Chronicler would have denied the allegation that wickedness may befall the righteous, although conversely he may believe that through God's grace the wicked are not always punished to the degree justified. It is impossible to determine, however, whether the concern for theodicy so prominent in the later wisdom writings were written in protest to views such as those expressed by the Chronicler, or whether the Chronicler himself might not be entering into a frontal attack upon some who did not see God's hand working so immediately in history.

Concerning the joy and generosity which the Chronicler seeks from his readers, we are in a somewhat similar case. The constant and recurring emphasis upon the joy accompanying the cultic celebrations and the emphasis upon the generosity which is necessary in support of the cult pictures an age in which religious enthusiasm was a low point. While we

²⁷Ackroyd, XXXVIII, 512. Ackroyd, like the great majority of scholars, gives too little attention to Solomon.

are immediately tempted to think of the situation reflected in such prophets as Haggai and Malachi, our meagre knowledge of the following three centuries suggests that there were probably pitifully few periods when the exhortation would have been less relevant.

We may conclude then on the basis of our study, which has concentrated upon the non-synoptic portions of the books of Chronicles, that the author was interested above all in presenting the Jerusalem temple as the only legitimate temple of Yahweh. While it is impossible to date his message with precision, it may, contrary to current consensus, best be placed prior to the date at which tensions between Judah and her neighbors, especially to the north, became severe and hardened into intransigence.²⁸ Chronicles is concerned to present the temple as the common property of both north and south. At the same time that the north is invited to return to it, the south is urged to commit itself wholeheartedly to participation in its cult, to support of its services, and to experience the joy resulting from it. These exhortations are reinforced with countless examples from Judah's past and supported with the promise of rewards for faithfully seeking Yahweh and the threat of punishment for forsaking him.

²⁸It should be noted that recent studies of the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch have confirmed that the tradition represented here diverged from the Old Hebrew only after the Hasmonean period, so that on this basis too there is reason to believe that the definitive split occurred much later than the time of the Chronicler. Cf. most recently Bruce Waltke, "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament," New Perspectives on the Old Testament, edited by J. Barton Payne (London: Word Books, 1970), pp. 212-239, and the complete listing of earlier bibliographical sources there. The works of Frank M. Cross, Jr., have been of particular importance here.

In concluding, it may be possible to render our own judgment concerning some of the more remote questions concerning the Chronicler's work which have busied students in the past. We have become convinced in the course of this study that the emphasis upon the non-synoptic portions of the work is a correct one, and that many of the distortions of the past are due to an over-emphasis upon small differences within the synoptic portions. On the other hand, while we have not made an extensive study of the textual materials in these synoptic sections, we have become equally convinced that additional studies such as those of Lemke, from which this thesis had its beginnings, will not materially affect our understanding of the Chronicler's work.

Concerning the Chronicler's use of his sources, we have become convinced of the eclectic nature of his interests. It is apparent that he was familiar with and utilized a broad spectrum of the Old Testament, and that he did this with considerable freedom and ingenuity. The Chronicler therefore should not be placed automatically in the camp of either the Priestly writer nor the Deuteronomic historian. From each he has chosen aspects which apparently appealed to him, without ignoring the prophetic, wisdom, or hymnic literature. On the other hand the total arrangement of 1 and 2 Chronicles is determined almost in its entirety by our Deuteronomic edition of Kings, including probably even the relative amount of space dedicated to various kings such as David, Solomon, Joash, Amaziah, and so forth. With the exception of various genealogical information and possibly some documents closely related to fortifications and warfare, we find few reasons to believe

that the Chronicler used other non-biblical sources in composing his work.²⁹ The remainder of the non-synoptic sections included shows clear signs of the Chronicler's overarching interests, and not infrequently of his own vocabulary. The Chronicler was much more than an unthinking editor who rearranged an assortment of documents from the past, and he has presented a largely consistent, interesting, at times even brilliant account of Israel's past as interpreted from the standpoint of the Jerusalem temple. Whether that viewpoint is entirely justified must lie outside of the scope of this paper. Although von Rad finds much to criticize in the Chronicler, it is difficult to disagree with his final appraisal: "With it all we must always ask whether a theology which saw Israel's existence in the eyes of Yahweh as so strongly conditioned by praise could have strayed so very far from the proper road."³⁰

²⁹Noth, pp. 141-143.

³⁰G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962), I, 354.

APPENDIX I

Speech, Sermon, Prophecy and Prayer in Chronicles

Since the literary form of most of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 consists of three speeches and a prayer from the mouth of David, it should be instructive to investigate the usage of these forms elsewhere in Chronicles to properly appraise the significance of their usage and their contents. Since it becomes readily apparent that there is great similarity, especially in content, in all of the forms of direct discourse in Chronicles, including the utterances ascribed to the prophets, we shall include these in our study also.

Old Testament Speech Forms

Scholars commonly divide the literary corpus of the Old Testament into prose and poetic types, often with a third intermediate literary type such as "saying" between the two. The prose materials are further divided into records, narratives, and speeches, and the speeches subdivided into speeches, sermons, and prayers.¹ Deserving special

¹Cf. O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, An Introduction, translated by Peter Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 12-56. A. Weiser, The Old Testament (New York: Association Press, 1961), makes essentially the same division, although the "liturgical speech," as he chooses to call it, is viewed as a development of the narrative, with its root in the oral preaching which was itself an offshoot of the narrative presentation of the salvation history in the cult (p. 67). G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, translated by David Green (New York: Abingdon Press, 1968), pp. 63-102, speaks rather of "Communicating Literary Types," into which he also subsumes conversations and letters.

mention as a type of speech is the political speech, either by the leader upon the occasion of his departure² or by a commander at the opening of a campaign.³ Sermons, or speeches of a religious nature, are considered to have appeared quite late, due to their absence from the earliest prophets and their more frequent occurrence in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic history.

The major characteristic of all sermons, according to Eissfeldt, is the historical retrospect which they contain, which emphasizes in particular Yahweh's grace and Israel's ingratitude and thus shows signs of their connections with the prophetic sayings and poems. Whether it derives from prophetic or priestly/Levitical circles, it is definitely to be considered a separate literary form, although it becomes increasingly interwoven with the forms more original to both prophets and priests, as well as the wisdom sayings.⁴

Prayers are further divided into intercessions, thanksgivings, and confessions. While briefer forms occur earlier, such as Judg. 16:28, most of the lengthy prose prayers belong to a relatively late period. Eissfeldt believes the basic components of the intercessory prayer--the address, petition, affirmation of Yahweh as God, and petition with statement of motive--are very similar in earlier and later prayers,

²Eissfeldt includes here 1 Chron. 28:2-10; 29:1-5, together with 1 Samuel 12, Joshua 24, 1 Kings 2:1-9, and 1 Macc. 2:49-68 (Eissfeldt, p. 13).

³2 Chron. 13:4-12; 20:20; Deut. 20:5-8; 1 Macc. 13:3-6.

⁴Eissfeldt, pp. 16-17.

although more expanded in later ones. In addition, the historical retrospect, which is present already in 1 Kings 3:6-9, is given the dominant position. The prayer of confession is found in 1 Sam. 12:10 and Judg. 10:10, and in more expanded form in Ezra 9:6-15; Dan. 9:4-19; 3 Macc. 2:2-19. A pure example of the prose form of the prayer of thanksgiving has not been preserved in the Old Testament, according to Eissfeldt.⁵

The Speech in Chronicles

Using the term "speech" in its broader sense to include sermons and prayers, we find that all speeches in Chronicles, with the exception of brief quotations of the people in response to larger speeches of kings and prophets, may be divided into three groups on the basis of whether the speaker is a king, a prophet (or one who is described with prophetic terminology), or a priest and/or Levite not described as a prophet.

The king

A number of shorter or longer quotations from various kings have been recorded by the Chronicler. In addition to the speeches under direct consideration in this paper, those found in 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29, these include also briefer statements of David in 1 Chron. 12:18; 13:2-3; 15:2,12,13; 22:1,5; as well as Solomon's message to Hiram

⁵While Gen. 32:10-13 and 2 Sam. 7:19-29 begin with such thanksgivings, the second part of each is rather a petition. Eissfeldt does not discuss 1 Chronicles 29 as an example of this type of prayer, although it would be expected that the concluding petition there also (vv. 18-19) would mark it as an "impure" form. Cf. Eissfeldt, pp. 17-18.

(2 Chron. 2:2-9) and the brief statement of 8:11b, together with 2 Chron, 13:4-12 (Abijah); 14:6 (Asa); 19:6,7,9,11; 20:20 (Jehoshaphat); 24:5-6 (Joash); 25:16 (Amaziah); 29:4-11,31; 30:6-9; 32:6-8 (Hezekiah); 35:3-6 (Josiah).

On the basis of their form and content it appears that the quotations may be divided into three major groupings: (1) In two cases (1 Chron. 22:5; 2 Chron. 8:11), the Chronicler has placed a very brief quotation in the mouth of a king to provide the rationale for a certain action, that is, David's preparations for the temple and the removal of Pharaoh's daughter from the temple precincts; (2) A number of the quotations are given in the form of what we might call a royal edict.⁶ This may be seen most clearly in such cases as 1 Chron. 22:1, where the royal pronouncement stands completely alone, as well as 1 Chron. 15:2, where a brief reason for the edict is given; (3) The remaining speeches, which should perhaps alone be classified as speeches in the narrower sense are more hortatory in their character.⁷

Formally the most noteworthy characteristic of both the second and third groups is the imperative forms or their equivalents which introduce the major concern of the speech. The briefer edicts, such as

⁶1 Chron. 15:2,12,13; 22:1; 2 Chron. 24:5-6; 25:16; 29:31; 35:3-6.

⁷1 Chron. 12:18; 13:2-3; 22:7-13; 28:2-10,20-21; 29:1-5; 2 Chron. 2:2-9; 13:4-9; 14:6; 19:6,7,9-11; 20:20; 29:4-11,31; 30:6-9; 32:6-8. The division between the second and third groups is not always precise, with some of the commands given to the Levites (e.g., 1 Chron. 15:12; 2 Chron. 24:5-6; and especially 2 Chron. 35:3-6) approaching quite closely the speeches of the third group. Their contents, however, seem to place them with the edicts rather than the exhortations.

2 Chron. 24:5, 29:31, commonly consist of only a single clause introduced by such an imperative. In the longer speeches this imperative element is often introduced in ways other than with a simple imperative, such as jussives, cohortatives, imperfects with imperative meaning, or even a question--although the simple imperative remains the most frequent form.⁸ This hortatory element quite commonly follows the historical retrospect (see below), and introduces the major concern of the speech,⁹ but in other cases an introductory imperative is followed by the historical retrospect and then resumed by another group of hortatory phrases.¹⁰

The second formal characteristic of these longer exhortations, which frequently sets them apart from those of the second group, is the historical retrospect which they contain. Most commonly this retrospect, which may relate either to the distant past or to the immediate

⁸Cohortatives, 1 Chron. 13:2; 2 Chron. 14:6; jussives, 1 Chron. 22:11; 30:6, etc.; emphatic imperfect, 2 Chron. 20:9 (and cf. the form of the edict in 1 Chron. 22:1; 15:2); hortatory question, 1 Chron. 29:5. For the more conventional imperatives see 1 Chron. 28:8; 2 Chron. 2:6; 20:20; 29:9; 30:6; 32:7, etc. The formal introductory *s^ema uni*, which occurs four times in Chronicles and nowhere else in the Old Testament, according to S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), p. 537, #2, a work still unexcelled in its analysis of Chronicles' style, perhaps deserves to be placed here on the basis of its form also.

⁹Cf. 1 Chron. 22:11; 28:9; 29:5b; 2 Chron. 2:6, etc.

¹⁰2 Chron. 29:5,11; 30:6,8. Some of these imperative forms are those commonly associated with the formula for the induction into office (see p. 20 above). The usage of similar terminology in connection with warfare shows how inseparable this terminology had become from that of the Holy War for the Chronicler.

situation which forms the basis for the exhortation, begins the discourse,¹¹ while, as noted above, at other times it may follow an introductory exhortation.

Apart from this basic structural similarity, the speeches show few additional similarities. While some are extremely brief, and add little to the basic imperative significance, others add a simple phrase or two, often of dogmatic significance, while others are much more extensive. The lengthier speeches make use of a variety of connecting particles, although no particular pattern is discernible in their use.¹² An introductory call to attention, sēmā 'unī, "Hear me," occurs in four of the speeches,¹³ and a vocative in 1 Chron. 29:4; 2 Chron. 13:12; 30:6. The formula of encouragement is used in Jehoshaphat's exhortation to the judges (2 Chron. 19:7,11), as well as Hezekiah's to the Levites (2 Chron. 32:7), where the formula of accompaniment also occurs.

Directing our attention to the subject of the contents of these discourses, we find that by far the greatest number of them are concerned with cultic places and objects, and in particular the temple, its services, and its functionaries. This is true, for example, of all of David's speeches with the exception of 1 Chron. 12:18, and for

¹¹Cf. 1 Chron. 22:7-10; 28:2-7; 29:1-5a; 2 Chron. 2:3-6; 13:5-7; 29:6-9; 30:7-8 (where it is worked directly into the exhortation).

¹²Cf. hinnēh, 2 Chron. 2:3,9; 13:12; 19:11; 29:9; 'attā, 2 Chron. 2:6,12,14; 13:8; 29:5,10,11; 30:8; 35:3; and especially kī, 2 Chron. 8:11; 13:11,12; 14:6,7; 29:6; 30:9; 32:7, which occurs even in the shortest speeches.

¹³1 Chron. 28:2; 2 Chron. 13:4; 20:20; 29:5, as well as two prophetic speeches, 2 Chron. 15:2; 28:11.

Solomon's message to Hiram which has been introduced in 2 Chronicles 2, as well as many others. A much smaller group is delivered by the kings to their troops in the face of warfare (2 Chron. 13:4-12; 20:20; 32:6-8; 14:7). In fact, only the brief exhortations of Jehoshaphat to his judges (2 Chron. 19:6-7,9-11) fall outside these two categories!

This same interest remains clear in considering the immediate function which the speeches are to serve in the Chronicler's narrative. While those speeches connected with warfare obviously are meant to encourage faithfulness to Yahweh in the face of opposition, and those of Jehoshaphat to encourage the judges' faithfulness in their assigned tasks, the great majority of the passages may be seen quite easily to furnish the theological foundation behind a certain cultic action and to ascribe the initiative for certain cultic regulations and reforms, especially as these relate to the Levites, to various kings. The important speeches of Abijah (2 Chron. 13:4-12) and Hezekiah (2 Chron. 30:5-9) both point to the apostasy of the north from the Jerusalem sanctuary and, at least in the latter case, urge their return to it.¹⁴ In numerous cases, both with respect to warfare and the cult, these speeches often relate the doctrine of retribution to Israel's prosperity or lack thereof.

¹⁴This last speech is also unique in its use of the motif of Yahweh's grace as incentive for repentance, v. 9.

The prophet

Some twelve discourses in Chronicles are spoken by individuals who are explicitly designated as prophets or to whom prophetic terminology is applied.¹⁵ Attention is drawn immediately by the diversity of the names and terms used by Chronicles in referring to these individuals. Only four of the men are referred to by the term nābî' (Shemaiah, 2 Chron. 12:5; Elijah, 2 Chron. 21:12; an anonymous prophet in 2 Chron. 25:15; and Obed, 2 Chron. 28:9). The speaker of 25:7-9 is referred to as ʾish hā'ēlōhîm (verses 7,9). Hanani is designated as a rō'eh (2 Chron. 16:7), and his son Jehu as a hōzeh (2 Chron. 19:2). While no such nouns are applied to the remaining five, it is related of Eliezer that "he prophesied" (wayyitnabbē', 2 Chron. 20:37), and of Azariah and Jahaziel that the Spirit of Yahweh/God came upon them (2 Chron. 15:1; 20:14). Likewise it is said of Zechariah the priest and Amasai the warrior chief that the Spirit of God "clothed them" (2 Chron. 24:20; 1 Chron. 12:19). There is accordingly little doubt that the Chronicler is placing each of these men in the prophetic tradition, although Jahaziel is traced back to the Levites Asaph, Zechariah is said to be the son of Jehoida the priest, and Amasai is said to be one of the

¹⁵ 1 Chron. 12:18; 2 Chron. 12:5; 15:1-7; 16:7-10; 19:2-3; 20:15-17; 20:37; 21:12-15; 24:20; 25:7-9; 25:14-16; 28:9-11. Cf. Claus Westermann, "Excursus: Prophetic Speeches in the Books of Chronicles," Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), p. 163, who however does not include the last-mentioned speech in his listing. Although this speech is admittedly of a different type, and far removed from the pre-exilic judgment speech which is his primary concern, Westermann gives no reason for its omission.

thirty, David's elite crew of warriors. The use of such ancient terms as rō'eh and hōzeh and the appropriation of terminology such as "the Spirit of God came upon him" or "clothed him" point to a conscious attempt to identify the prophets with ecstatic leadership of old, as perhaps does also the use of the hithpael of nb'.

The person addressed is in every case the reigning king, with the single exception of 2 Chron. 24:20, where it is the people. At times the "princes of Judah" (2 Chron. 12:5), "all Judah and Benjamin" (2 Chron. 15:1), and "all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" (2 Chron. 20:15) are mentioned with him. In one case the "army of Samaria" is also included in the address (2 Chron. 28:9).¹⁶

When one examines the prophetic utterances in Chronicles in comparison with that of earlier prophets, the difference becomes immediately apparent. Studies such as those of Westermann have shown, for example, that the most common form of prophetic speech, the judgment speech, consisted essentially of two parts. The first of these, which might be termed the accusation, gives the reason for the condemnation, which usually consists of one concrete transgression and may be stated in either interrogative or declarative form, while the second part

¹⁶Westermann, p. 165, considers the address to kings to be a reflection of the prophetic traditions, in that the judgment speech originated in the divine condemnation of the king against whom the legal suit would otherwise not be possible. While this may be possible, it is difficult to see how, given the Chronicler's method of writing history, the condemnation could have been directed elsewhere.

presents equally briefly the judgment pronounced.¹⁷ In the earliest forms the messenger formula, "Thus says Yahweh," occurs prior to the announcement of the punishment, thus separating the reason, which is considered to be the prophet's word, from the punishment, which is Yahweh's. Due to the simple form of the oracle no connecting words are used between the two parts, and no causal particles are attached to the reason.¹⁸

In the course of time, however, both the statement of the reason and the punishment were often expanded. The messenger formula was transferred to the beginning of the reason, thus giving divine status to both parts of the message. With the resulting expansion causal particles such as ya'an, ya'an 'ăšer, or kî ("because") were also introduced prior to the reason. The climax of this development of formulae is reached with Ezekiel, whose lengthy discourses at times become almost hopelessly entangled in prophetic formulae.¹⁹ Nevertheless, the original elements of the judgment speech remain clearly evident.

However, the prophetic discourses in Chronicles are far removed even from those of Ezekiel. This may be seen both by the difference of the formulae used, as well as by the different purpose for which the discourse is used. The messenger formula kōh 'āmar ywh is used in only five cases, and in each instance it stands prior to the reason rather than the punishment. While a reason for the punishment is often

¹⁷Cf. Is. 3:16-17, where v. 16 presents the reason for the condemnation and v. 17 the punishment corresponding to it.

¹⁸Westermann, pp. 129-136.

¹⁹Cf. Ezek. 34:7-10; 36:1-7.

given, it is introduced by causal particles which point to a continued dissolution of the form and the resultant attempt to express by the use of particles the relationship between the two major parts.²⁰ In other cases it is introduced with a direct question (2 Chron. 19:2; 24:20; 25:15; compare also 35:21), a usage which Westermann believes reflects ancient usage,²¹ as well as by a simple hinnēh (2 Chron. 21:14), by 'attâ (compare 2 Chron. 28:11), and by 'al kēn (2 Chron. 16:7). The extended length of the "oracles" has also led to the use of various transitional particles,²² sometimes to introduce a significant division but frequently only as a loose connecting device. The response to or fulfillment of the prophecy is almost always made clear in the context, and in two cases the response of the king/people is reported verbatim (2 Chron. 12:6; 25:16).

The prophet's message contains brief historical retrospects in 15:2-6, pointing out in considerable detail the theory of retribution as it had shown itself in Israel's past history. It contains also words of encouragement (2 Chron. 15:6; 20:5,17), instructions for battle (2 Chron. 20:16-17; 25:7), and specific instructions for the course

²⁰Cf. tahat 'āšer, 2 Chron. 21:12, otherwise used in the prophets in this sense in Is. 53:12; Jer. 29:10; 50:7; an infinitive with the preposition bêt (2 Chron. 16:7) or kap (2 Chron. 20:37); the preposition bêt on a pronoun (2 Chron. 19:2), and cf. also b^ehamat yhw (2 Chron. 28:9), which, while occurring in a more diffuse construction, reflects in all probability the same usage.

²¹Westermann, pp. 167-168.

²²Cf. w^e'attâ, 2 Chron. 28:10,11; hinnēh, 2 Chron. 28:9, 21:14; and especially kī, 2 Chron. 24:20; 25:7,8.

which the hearer is to take (2 Chron. 28:11), together with many other dogmatic considerations.²³

Despite these numerous differences in form and content, the most striking feature of the prophetic speeches is the purpose for which they are utilized by the Chronicler. While the primary purpose of the judgment speech was to pronounce sentence upon the offender, the majority of the prophetic speeches in Chronicles pronounce no judgment of any kind.²⁴ For the Chronicler the prophetic oracle has rather become the vehicle for the divine word which gives the reason behind or interprets the significance of a historical event, or even supplies the maxim which is to guide the interpretation of all historical events: "The Lord is with you while you are with him. If you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you forsake him, he will forsake you" (2 Chron. 15:2).

While the generalizing and conditional nature of the prophetic voice for the Chronicler is very apparent in this quotation, which is connected only loosely with Asa's preceding battle, several other "prophecies" apply the same dictum more concretely to a historical situation. Shemaiah's prophecy of 2 Chron. 12:5 states in simple terms the prophet's interpretations of the reason for Shishak's invasion of Judah: "You have forsaken me, so I have forsaken you to the hand of

²³Cf. 2 Chron. 18:8; 20:5,16,17; 25:7,9; 28:9-10.

²⁴In only two cases, 2 Chron. 20:37 and 21:12-15, is there a specific penalty, while in two more, 2 Chron. 16:7-10 and 25:14-16, there is a more general punishment given.

Shishak." The specific nature of Israel's transgression is left completely indefinite, and is apparently of no concern to the Chronicler, who states only that Rehoboam "forsook the law of the Lord, and all Israel with him" (2 Chron. 12:1). A similar occurrence is found in Zechariah's speech, where Israel's sin is described only as transgressing the commandments and forsaking the Lord (2 Chron. 24:20), and the words "because you have forsaken the Lord, he has forsaken you" serve as the justification for the ensuing defeat at the hands of the Syrians (2 Chron. 24:23-24).

Similar instances of prophetic interpretation of past events occur in 2 Chron. 16:7-9, although Asa's defeat is there attributed to his alliance with Syria rather than directly to his having forsaken the Lord; and in very general terms in 2 Chron. 19:2-3, where Jehu likewise condemns Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahaz. The "man of God" who addressed Amaziah instructs him not to permit mercenary Israelite troops to accompany him into battle, warning him that if he does God will cause him to stumble, and thus uttering in effect a conditional condemnation (2 Chron. 25:7-9). The need for complete reliance on Yahweh in warfare is also the subject of Jehaziel's prophecy (2 Chron. 20:14-17), which furnishes the prophetic answer to Jehoshaphat's prayer, and which no doubt reflects the Chronicler's viewpoint of the proper disposition of the faithful Judahite in the face of war. Somewhat more conventional judgments occur in 2 Chron. 25:14-16 and Elijah's letter in 2 Chron. 21:12-15, although in these cases too the prophecy

appears to be in complete keeping with the Chronicler's usual portrayal of the doctrine of retribution.²⁵

It thus becomes clear that, while the origin of the form as used by the Chronicler may be quite doubtful, the prophetic discourse has been used here chiefly as a vehicle for expressing his own evaluation of a given situation.²⁶ While it would appear unreasonable to deny

²⁵Completely different concerns seem to predominate in 1 Chron. 12:6, where Amasai's words of confidence in David most likely stem from an ancient source to which the Chronicler wished to give particular authority, and in 2 Chron. 28:9-11, where Obed's words to the north after their capture of Judahite troops is apparently meant to establish that Israel was at least equally guilty.

²⁶Cf. the remarks of Westermann, p. 163: "A few of these speeches have practically nothing to do with the original form of the prophetic judgment speech and are no more than the form used to express the Chronicler's interpretation of history."

Westermann believes, however, that in all of these cases there are traces of the original prophetic speech with its two parts. Westermann has in fact pointed out four places where he believes older traditions have been preserved in these prophetic discourses: (1) The promise of success in holy war in 2 Chron. 20:14-18 preserved in a form very close to the ancient speech forms; (2) The accusing question is one of the two ancient forms of the accusation addressed to the king; (3) The kernel of an older prophecy can still be seen in such cases as 2 Chron. 16:9; 21:13-14, suggesting that the Chronicler has not simply invented his speeches, but has had access to traditions "telling of the appearance of these prophets (p. 166); and (4) The royal opposition to the prophetic message in a book which idealizes the kings is striking, and therefore derives from traditional material (Westermann, pp. 164-168).

Westermann's first point we may grant, although it should be added that many of the sections unique to Chronicles show an interest in and refined knowledge of the details of warfare. Point two is striking in its use of the accusing question, but its specific relationship to the king seems more doubtful. Concerning point three, Westermann himself professes his inability to explain the reason for the omission of the mention of prophetic work in Judah from the Deuteronomistic history. The absence of even the names of the various prophets from the rest of the Old Testament and the inclusion of some of them in Chronicles as Levites and priests cast considerable doubt on the assumption that these names were found by the Chronicler in older prophetic traditions. And

the Chronicler's acquaintance with and use of older prophetic forms, it appears that at least another tradition had influenced the Chronicler in ascribing such speeches to men whom he characterized as prophets, a tradition closely approaching that found in the remaining speeches in Chronicles, and in which interpretation, exhortation, and direction is a vital part.

Other speeches

Several additional speeches or quotations must be mentioned which are ascribed to neither prophet nor king. Regularly this consists of only the briefest of responses to an earlier speech, compare 2 Chron. 12:6; 28:13, or the report of the Levites to Hezekiah informing him they have done as commanded (2 Chron. 29:18).

A desire to explain the logic behind an action, such as may be seen also in 1 Chron. 22:5 and 2 Chron. 8:11, is also found in the remark attributed to the people in 2 Chron. 32:4. This same tendency to explain is found in the theological realm in the speech of Azariah the priest (2 Chron. 31:10), where the prosperity of the people is directly related to the tithing of the people. Another striking instance is provided in 2 Chron. 26:18, where Azariah the priest condemns Uzziah

finally, concerning point four it should be noted that disobedience to the prophetic voice is a common phenomenon of the Chronicler's history, as Westermann notes: it is of the Deuteronomistic history (cf. 2 Chron. 20:20, where obedience to the prophets is paralleled with obedience to Yahweh, and the results of obedience and disobedience in 2 Chron. 12:7; 25:16,20; 35:22). It may moreover be noted that each of these accounts of obedience and disobedience to the prophetic words is integrally related to the Chronicler's dogma of retribution.

for burning incense in the temple, and by Necho's words in 2 Chron. 35:21, which provide the basis upon which Josiah's death may also be understood as the result of retributive justice.

Prayers

In addition to David's prayer of thanksgiving in 1 Chronicles 28, Chronicles contains three additional non-synoptic prayers, 2 Chron. 14:10; 20:5-12, and 30:18-19. The last is more impersonal and indirect than the others and relates Hezekiah's brief petition for those who were eating the passover without proper ritual purification.²⁷ Both Asa's prior prayer of 2 Chron. 14:10 and Jehoshaphat's much more extensive prayer in 2 Chron. 20:5-12 are petitions for deliverance in the face of approaching warfare. Despite the considerable difference in the extent of these prayers, it is none the less remarkable that they have much in common: the introductory vocative yhwh, together with a brief statement pointing to Yahweh's incomparability (2 Chron. 14:11; 20:6), and the petition itself (here couched in quite general terms) that Yahweh show himself superior to the forces opposing Israel (2 Chron. 14:11; 20:12). Nevertheless, the two prayers differ considerably in their tone, the first being more exuberant and positive, the second--as befitting the more serious situation into which the Chronicler has inserted it--more somber and questioning. Hence the statements refer-

²⁷Here too the Chronicler is careful to add the response of Yahweh's approval to the irregular proceedings, stating that Yahweh "heard Hezekiah and forgave [wayyirpā], sic!] the people (v. 20), as he had done earlier with respect to David's sacrifice, 2 Chron. 20:26.

ring to Yahweh's incomparability are in the latter prayer placed in the form of a question,²⁸ as is the extensive historical retrospect of verses 7 to 9, which are here added as a kind of basis for the petition.²⁹ Notice also that verse 10 terminates the historical retrospect with a description of the present plight of the people.

The setting of David's prayer in 1 Chron. 29:10-19 is entirely different from these two prayers, and shows similarities to the three major Psalm types, hymns, thanksgivings, and petitions. Both the introductory bārûk 'attâ yhw³⁰ and the extended description of Yahweh's incomparability (verses 10 to 12) are most closely related to the hymns of praise. The explicit statement of verse 13, however, and the relationship to the prior contributions mentioned in verse 14, point to the thanksgiving aspect of the prayer as well. Finally, the prayer concludes with two petitions (verses 18 and 19) which have no part in hymns or thanksgivings in the narrow sense.³¹

It is then apparent that the distinction between the various types of prayers and psalms were largely ignored by the Chronicler, who

²⁸Note the similarity with the use of the accusing question in the speeches above, p. 235.

²⁹Significantly the two major events in the Chronicler's presentation of the Heilsgeschichte are the gift of the land and the erection of the temple.

³⁰Supra, Chapter II, p. 81.

³¹Barbara Hornig, "Das Prosagebet der nachexilischen Literatur," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXIII (1958), col. 645, states that the post-exilic prayer should be viewed as a living intercourse of the pious with his God, which involved not only petition but praise and thanksgiving as well.

blended praise, thanksgiving, and petition quite closely. In utilizing the prayer form he has, as with the speeches, continued to express thoughts with which he agreed completely--the incomparability of Yahweh, the necessity for complete trust in him, the centrality of the temple, the emphasis upon the generosity of the people, and for wholehearted and complete observance of the law (1 Chron. 29:18-19). The proximity to the speeches therefore lies close at hand.³²

Summary and Conclusions

Following up a suggestion by Ludwig Köhler, Gerhard von Rad has advanced the thesis that various speeches in Chronicles belong to a genre that he has named the Levitical sermon, in which the primary aim of the speaker is to instruct and exhort the people.³³ In making his analysis von Rad examines in some detail ten discourses, which have apparently been chosen on the basis of their hortatory character.³⁴

³²Cf., e.g., the connecting particles 'attâ (1 Chron. 29:13; 2 Chron. 20:10); hinnēh (2 Chron. 20:10,11); kī (1 Chron. 29:14-15; 2 Chron. 14:10; 20:11-12).

³³Ludwig Köhler, Hebrew Man, translated by Peter Ackroyd (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 143-146; G. von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, translated by E. W. T. Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), pp. 267-280.

³⁴Four of these (2 Chron. 35:7; 16:7-9; 15:2-7; 20:15-17) we have regarded above as prophetic, while the remaining six (1 Chron. 28:2-10; 2 Chron. 19:6; 20:20; 29:5-11; 30:6-9; 32:7-8) are from kings. Von Rad assumes these speeches are to be considered sermons, but gives no reason for bypassing the remainder of the quotations, some of which it would clearly be impossible to classify as sermons.

While von Rad himself admits that it is not easy to identify the characteristics of the genre on the basis of the Chronicler's indirect evidence, he refers to several items in the course of his discussion which he obviously considers characteristic. We may list these as follows:

1. The religious instruction which they render, which, says von Rad, corresponds to the Deuteronomic history, but not to the Priestly Code, which "evinces no interest whatever in the instruction of the people."³⁵
2. They are concerned with the application of a doctrine long since established by the prophets, rather than a prophetic pronouncement. "One might go so far as to say he is preaching one a prophetic text."³⁶
3. It makes use of a theological retrospect into Israel's history.³⁷
4. In discussing Azariah's discourse to Asa (2 Chron. 15:2-7), von Rad suggests as a classical outline the following three parts: (a) The conditions under which God is willing to give his help, that is, the doctrine; (b) The application, which in this case shows "that God's nearness is not to be taken for granted, and that there are whole periods of history in which he was far removed"; (c) The exhortation, the call to faith with the promise of a reward.³⁸

While von Rad admits that it is rather unrewarding to discuss this category on the basis of the Chronicler's evidence, he continues:

Stylistically the sermon is, of course, a prose form, although there appears to have been a predilection for high-sounding elevated vocabulary and solemn formal phraseology. When the writer wishes to present such sermons as prophetic pronouncements he will

³⁵Von Rad, p. 268.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 269-270. Von Rad also adds, "We notice once again the peculiar harking back to ancient prophetic pronouncements which gives this speech [2 Chron. 15:2-7] its characteristic flavor," p. 271.

³⁷Ibid., p. 271.

³⁸Ibid.

occasionally employ a style akin to poetic parallelism, although we are always conscious that prose is the essential medium of this form-category. Further, the use of quotations from ancient authoritative texts is a particular characteristic of these sermons. Telling phrases which seem to lend weight to the theme of the homily are quarried wherever they may be found in earlier literature, and incorporated into the sermon. There is no question of preaching to a text in the modern sense, if only because the text usually stands at the end by way of climax, as a kind of final trumpcard with which the speaker takes the decisive trick against his hearers.³⁹

For the situation in life of these sermons, von Rad feels that the sermon may have been at home in such a situation as that pictured in 2 Chron. 30:6-10, where messengers are sent throughout the country to deliver such addresses. He remarks that it would certainly be conceivable that the Levites, deprived of their office through the centralization of the cult, found a new sphere of activity in religious instruction.⁴⁰

For our purposes the question of the role of the Levites in the development of such sermons may be left to the side.⁴¹ However, we should note several points at which von Rad's thesis may be open to question:

³⁹Ibid., p. 278.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 278-279.

⁴¹It is apparent that von Rad's viewpoint is based to some degree upon his high evaluation of the role of the Levites in the Deuteronomic reform. Cf., e.g., G. von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy (London: SCM Press, 1953), pp. 60-69, and of their centrality in the Chronicler's work, G. von Rad, Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930), pp. 90-118. While the Levitical origin of such sermons appears feasible, it is difficult to believe that there were no homilies of any kind prior to the centralization of the cult. Von Rad's assertion that the Priestly code shows no interest in the instruction of the people is surely questionable.

1. Von Rad has discussed some ten speeches of greater and lesser length, spoken by both prophets and kings, and assumed them to be sermons.⁴² However, he gives no reason for ignoring the remainder of the discourses in the work. Von Rad's results, especially in so far as they refer to the use of prophetic texts, would be much less striking if all examples were included.

2. Von Rad states that there is no difference in method between king and prophets. While he qualifies this statement somewhat,⁴³ it must also be pointed out that here are some striking differences. To be noted first of all is the fact that a king is never referred to as a prophet, nor does he have prophetic language applied to him. As mentioned above, neither do the prophets ever discuss cultic matters, while the king frequently does, a striking development in view of von Rad's opinion that all such speeches are intended basically to support the prophetic claims of the Levites as conceived by the Chronicler,⁴⁴ and that in only two cases are such speeches directly connected with the Levites.

3. Von Rad states that while the form of a prophetic oracle is occasionally found in such sermons, these are "secondary features, to be explained on the grounds of the general character of the work as a

⁴²The justification later offered by von Rad for this assumption must be said to have failed, resting as it does on his opinion that the Chronicler himself was obviously incapable of creating anything new and that the author was a Levite.

⁴³Von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon," p. 272.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 277.

whole."⁴⁵ He ignores the fact, however, that in at least some cases these prophetic elements predominate to the virtual exclusion of all else.

4. In his discussion of the one characteristic to which he seems to point as justification for his belief that such sermons followed a pre-existent form, that of the citation from older sources, von Rad often seems to be at odds with himself. In discussing the use of Zech. 4:10b in 2 Chron. 16:7-9, von Rad states that "one might go so far as to say that he is preaching on a prophetic text."⁴⁶ In a previous quotation he also spoke of the use of such texts as climactic trumpcards, and von Rad speaks otherwise also of the fact that the sermon "takes its stand upon ancient scriptural texts of acknowledged authority, and justifies its own demands by reference to them."⁴⁷ However, in his conclusion, von Rad states:

We must not forget that these sermons do not deal with quotations in the strictest sense of the term: the borrowed phrases are not marked out from their context as especially authoritative ones. The speaker makes no suggestion that the phrases in question are of outstanding significance, and there is never any formula to indicate that a phrase is actually a quotation.⁴⁸

5. Related to this is the fact that the quotations cited by von Rad are in themselves very diverse. In some cases they consist of an entire thought, for example, "If you seek him, he will be found by you"

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 269-270.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 272.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 279.

(2 Chron. 15:2); in other cases of stock formulae such as the formula of encouragement,⁴⁹ in yet other cases of single words such as niskalti, "You have acted foolishly" (2 Chron. 16:9b). In one case von Rad speaks of no less than five "allusive expressions" in 2 Chron. 30:6-9, most of which refer to common biblical terminology.⁵⁰

6. In view of the diverse interpretation placed upon such "quotations" by von Rad, it is not surprising that he sees little if any reason for the Chronicler's having chosen the particular quotes which he did. Von Rad states:

It is now easy to see, however, how little the writer is restricted in his choice of quotations by his own particular religious viewpoint and interests The Chronicler belongs to a very definite religious tradition with its own distinctive interests, yet his quotations and borrowing from earlier writers belong to no particular tradition and are wholly eclectic in nature.⁵¹

But in making such an evaluation of the significance of these quotations for the Chronicler, von Rad has inexplicably ignored the interpretation of history found in Chronicles, perhaps because of his over-emphasis upon the Levites. In particular his assertion

We have seen how varied are the fundamental notions underlying the passages cited--Yahweh's omniscience, his grace which is not withheld from those who seek it, his justice, human faith in him, and so on--a fact which makes it difficult to suppose that the Chronicler himself invented this literary form with its interwoven quotations. It is not an accident therefore that the content of

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 274, and supra, p. 20.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 275.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 278.

the sermons is frequently less relevant to its historical setting than one might have wished"⁵²

really reveals an astonishing lack of insight into the Chronicler's work. Somehow von Rad has failed to see that these are precisely the topics which are of fundamental importance to the Chronicler's theology, as it is found expressed both within and without the sermons.⁵³

7. It should also be mentioned that von Rad's original attempt to link these quotations and allusions with prophetic texts has resulted in his overlooking other possible sources for the quotations. Von Rad derives the phrase "If you seek him, he will be found by you" from Jer. 29:14, overlooking the significance of the reference in 1 Chron. 28:9, which points instead to a relation with the account of Deuteronomy and Joshua's installation.⁵⁴ The same procedure also leads him to ascribe the fourfold imperative of the formula of encouragement to Josh. 10:25, ignoring the similar accounts of Josh. 1:7,9.

It is accordingly difficult to avoid the conclusion that von Rad's analysis of the Levitical sermon has been unduly influenced by his rather biased appraisal of the Chronicler's abilities and viewpoint, together with his high opinion of the Levites. Thus von Rad, who speaks of the "admittedly limited literary capacity" of the Chronicler,⁵⁵

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Von Rad's statement that "the statements that God is found by those who seek him, and that the people of God will in due course be rewarded, can, in fact, hardly be reconciled with the Chronicler's own way of showing that Israel's victories are due to Yahweh's help" ("The Levitical Sermon," p. 271) reflects a similar lack of understanding.

⁵⁴Supra, pp. 20-21, 59-60.

⁵⁵Von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon," p. 277.

also adds:

We must therefore ask whether it is likely that the Chronicler himself invented this mode of instruction, expressly for the purpose of putting over his own point of view. But he really is last person to whom we should credit with the creation of anything, let alone a new literary form! We are thus driven back to the position of assuming that he relies upon a model, that is to say, upon forms which were well-known and in common use in that Levitical tradition in which he himself was at home.⁵⁶

Final Conclusions

Despite these many disclaimers, it nevertheless seems most probable that the Chronicler was familiar with a type of religious exhortation and instruction which we may with some hesitancy call the sermon. This is difficult to deny in the light of the numerous examples of speeches, both by kings and prophets, in which the hortatory idea is the central, if not the only, concern of the speech.

Our investigation would suggest, however, that the Chronicler has shown considerably more freedom in his use of the sermon than von Rad would permit him, a freedom which is vividly attested to by the various situations into which he inserts them, the variety of speakers to whom they are assigned, the subjects with which they deal, and not least their great variety in both style and length, which reflects greater and lesser degrees of amplification, summarization, and alteration of the Chronicler's supposed model.

It is also necessary to admit that the writer was obviously familiar with the prophetic judgment oracle and has, although to a limited

⁵⁷Ibid.

degree, distinguished his prophetic forms from the sermon. This is clear first of all from the fact that, despite other similarities, he has not applied prophetic inspiration nor titles to any of his kings, nor do their speeches contain any reminiscences of prophetic formula otherwise so common. While it is true that the Chronicler has diverged quite drastically from the older form of the judgment oracle, it is equally true that signs of an immediate connection remain. That the Chronicler has used these prophetic forms to express his own judgment upon the events to which he refers does not alter this fact, but instead points to its significance for the writer. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the prophetic oracle and the homiletical exhortation are flowing into each other increasingly.

Several questions might be raised concerning other influences upon the Chronicler's forms. Does what we have for lack of a better title called the "royal edict" have an actual background in the court or temple, or was this an invention of the Chronicler? Does such a phrase as "Do not be afraid" indicate a familiarity with the priestly oracle of salvation, or is it merely an adaptation of the formula for installation or the Holy War? These and many other questions must go unanswered on the basis of the information currently available to us.

Concerning the prayer too it should be emphasized that in his use of all of these forms--prophetic oracle, sermon, and prayer--the Chronicler has repeatedly pointed to concerns, emphases, and interpretations which are found in other forms throughout Chronicles as well. His concern for the cult and the Levites are well known and expressed throughout his work, and the astonishing thing is that this concern finds

expression only in the edicts and speeches of the king, and never of the prophet. The doctrine of retribution, which forms the major message of the prophets introduced by the Chronicler, is the primary concern according to which the Chronicler has ordered his entire post-Solomonic history. It appears obvious therefore that the Chronicler, if he used sources for such material, was in complete agreement with these sources. On the other hand, by far the simplest explanation is that the Chronicler himself is completely responsible for the contents of these speeches, edicts, and prayers, and has used them to give prophetic and royal authority to institutions and conceptions which were dear to his own heart.⁵⁸

⁵⁸The work of Dennis McCarthy, "An Installation Genre," Journal of Biblical Literature, XC (1971), 31-41, appeared too late to be considered in this thesis. However, McCarthy's conclusions do not appear to affect the results of our study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abba, R. "Priest and Levites," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible.
K-Q. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press,
1962. Pp. 876-889.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. Exile and Restoration. In The Old Testament Library.
London: SCM Press, 1968.
- . "History and Theology in the Writings of the Chronicler,"
Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXVIII (1967), 501-515.
- . "The Interpretation of Exile and Restoration," The Canadian
Journal of Theology, XIV (1968), 3-12.
- Ahlström, G. W. "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau," Vetus
Testamentum, XI (1961), 113-127.
- . "Solomon the Chosen One," History of Religion, VIII (1968),
93-110.
- Albright, W. F. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. 5th edition.
Anchor Books. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1969.
- . The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra. New York: Harper
Torchbooks, 1963.
- . "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," Journal of
Biblical Literature, XL (1921), 104-124.
- . From the Stone Age to Christianity. New York: Doubleday Anchor
Books, 1957.
- . "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat," Alexander Marx Jubilee
Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday. English section
edited by Saul Lieberman. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of
America, 1950. Pp. 61-82.
- . "New Light on the Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible,"
Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXL (1955),
27-33.
- Amsler, S. David, Roi et Messie. La Tradition davidique dans l'AT.
Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1963.
- Anderson, G. W. A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. London:
Gerald Duckworth, 1959.

- Ap-Thomas, D. R. "Some Notes on Old Testament Attitude to Prayer," Scottish Journal of Theology, IX (1956), 422-429.
- Asmussen, Peter. "Priesterkodex und Chronik in ihren Verhältnis zueinander," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, LXXIX (1906), 165-179.
- Bach, R. "David," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. II. Edited by Kurt Galling. 3rd edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958. Pp. 47-48.
- Baltzer, Klaus. Das Bundesformular. Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1960.
- . "Das Ende des Staates Juda und die Messiasfrage," Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen. Edited by R. Rendtorff and K. Koch. Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1961. Pp. 33-43.
- Barnes, William E. The Books of Chronicles. Vol. XIV in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1899.
- . "The David of the Book of Samuel and the David of the Book of Chronicles," Expositor, XXXVII (1909), 49-59.
- . "The Religious Standpoint of the Chronicler," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, XIII (1896 and 1897), 14-20.
- Bartlett, J. R. "Zadok and His Successors at Jerusalem," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, XIX (1968), 1-18.
- Bea, A. "Neuere Arbeiten zum Problem der biblischen Chronikbücher," Biblica, XXII (1941), 46-58.
- Begrich, Joachim. "Das Priesterliche Heilsorakel," Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964.
- Bennett, William H. The Books of Chronicles. Vol. XII in The Expositor's Bible. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894.
- Bentzen, A. "Sirach, der Chronist und Nehemia," Studia Theologica, III (1950 and 1951), 158-161.
- Benzinger, I. Die Bücher der Chronik. Vol. XX in Kurzer Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901.
- Bertheau, Ernst. "Commentary on the Books of Chronicles," Clark's Theological Library. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1857. Pp. 191-463.
- Beyerlin, Walter. Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1959.

- Bible, Holy. Jerusalem Version.
- Bible, Holy. New English Version.
- Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version.
- Biblia Hebraica. Edited by R. Kittel. 3rd edition. Stuttgart: Württembergischen Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- Bickerman, E. J. "The Historical Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism," From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees. New York: Schocken, 1962.
- Blank, S. H. "Some Observations Concerning Biblical Prayer," Hebrew Union College Annual, XXXII (1961), 75-90.
- Blenkinsopp, J. The Promise to David: Where We Stand. Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1964.
- Bin-Nun, S. R. "Formulas from Royal Records of Israel and Judah," Vetus Testamentum, XVIII (1968), 414-432.
- Boecker, Hans. "Anklagereden und Verteidigungsreden im Alten Testament," Evangelische Theologie, XX (1960), 398-412.
- Botterweck, G. J. "Zur Eigenart der chronistischen Davidgeschichte," Theologische Quartalschrift, CXXXVI (1956), 402-435.
- Bratsiotis, Nikolaus. "Der Monolog im Alten Testament," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXIII (1961), 30-70.
- Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster, n.d.
- "Studia Biblica: I and II Samuel," Interpretation, V (1951), 450-461.
- Brongers, H. A. "Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch des Adverbialen $W^{e'c}attāh$ im Alten Testament," Vetus Testamentum, XV (1965), 289-299.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, editors. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Brueggemann, W. "David and His Theologian," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXX (1968), 191-203.
- "Isaiah 55 and Deuteronomistic Theology," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXX (1968), 191-203.
- "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomistic Historian," Interpretation, XXII (1968), 387-402.

- Brunet, A. M. "Le Chroniste et ses sources," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 481-508; LXI (1954), 349-386.
- . "La Theologie du Chroniste. Théocratie et messianisme," Sacra Pagina, I (1959), 384-397.
- . "Paralipomènes," Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible. VI. Edited by L. Pirot, A. Robert, and Henri Cazelles. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1928-- . Cols. 1220-1261.
- Bückers, Herman. Die Bücher der Chronik; oder, Paralipomenon. Vol. IV/I of Herder's Biblekommentar. Freiburg: Herder, 1952.
- Budde, Karl F. R. Die Bücher Samuel. Vol. VIII in Kurzer Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1902.
- Busche, H. van den. "Le texte de la prophétie de Nathan sur la dynastie davidique (II Samuel VII--I Chronicles XVII)," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, XXIV (1948), 354-394.
- Calderone, P. J. Dynastic Oracle and Royal Covenant. A Study of II Samuel 7 in the Light of the Suzerainty Treaties. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University, 1966.
- Campbell, J. Y. "Rest," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. R-Z. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 37-38.
- Caquot, "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?" Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie, XCIX (1966), 110-120.
- Carlson, R. A. David, the Chosen King. A Traditio-historical approach to the Second Book of Samuel. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe and Stanley Rudman. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964.
- Cazelles, H. Les Livres des Chroniques. 2nd édition revue. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961).
- . "La Mission d'Esdras," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 113-140.
- Clements, R. E. Abraham and David. Genesis 15 and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition. Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, Vol. V. London: SCM Press, 1967.
- . "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," Vetus Testamentum, XV (1965), 300-312.
- . God and Temple. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- . Prophecy and Covenant. Studies in Biblical Theology, First Series, Vol. XLIII. London: SCM Press, 1965.

- Coggins, R. J. "The Old Testament and Samaritan Origins," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute, VI (1968), 35-48.
- Congar, Ives. The Mystery of the Temple. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962.
- Cooke, G. "The Israelite King as Son of God," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXIII (1961), 202-225.
- Cross, Frank M., Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran. 2nd edition. New York: Doubleday, 1961.
- . "The Contribution of the Discoveries at Qumran to the Study of the Biblical Text." Address delivered at the opening of the Shrine of the Book, Jerusalem, April 21, 1965.
- . "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries," Israeli Exploration Journal, XVI (1966), 81-95.
- . "The Earliest Manuscripts from Qumran," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 147-172.
- . "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert," Harvard Theological Review, LVII (1964), 281-299.
- . "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Religion, CXXXII (1953), 15-26.
- . "The Priestly Tabernacle," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader. Vol. I. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.
- Curtis, Edward Louis, and Albert Alonzo Madsen. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. Vol. XI of The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.
- Dahlberg, B. T. "Sanballat," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. R-Z. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. P. 210.
- . "Tobiah," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. R-Z. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 657-658.
- Danielou, J. "David," Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. III. Edited by Theodore Klauser. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1957.

- Davies, G. Henton. "Ark of the Covenant," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. A-D. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 222-226
- . "Tabernacle," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. R-Z. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 498-506.
- De Boer, P. A. H. "2 Samuel 12:25," Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen. Netherlands: H. Veeman, 1966. P. 29.
- Delcor, Mathias. "Hinweise auf das Samaritanische Schism im Alten Testament," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXIV (1962), 281-291.
- Delekat, Lienhard. "Tendenz und Theologie der David-Salomo Erzählung," Festschrift L. Rost. Edited by F. Maass. Berlin: Topelmann, 1967. Pp. 26-36.
- Dentan, Robert C. The First and Second Books of the Kings. The First and Second Books of the Chronicles. Vol. VII of the Layman's Bible Commentary. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964.
- Dion, Paul-Eugene. "The 'Fear Not' Formula and Holy War," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXXII (1970), 565-570.
- . "The Patriarchal Traditions and the Literary Form of the 'Oracle of Salvation,'" Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIX (1967), 198-206.
- Drijvers, Pius. The Psalms: Their Structure and Meaning. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
- Driver, S. R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. Vol. V of The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- . An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- . Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel. 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament. An Introduction. Translated by Peter Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Elliger, K. "Benjamin," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. A-D. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 383-384.

----- . "Die dreissig Helden Davids," Palästinajahrbuch, XXXI (1935), 29-75.

Elmslie, W. A. L. The Books of Chronicles. Vol. XIV of The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. 2nd edition. Cambridge: University Press, 1916.

----- . "Introduction and Exegesis to 1-2 Chronicles," Interpreter's Bible. III. Edited by George Buttrick and others. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954. Pp. 339-548.

----- . "Prophetic Influences in the Sixth Century B. C.," Essays and Studies Presented to Stanley Arthur Cook. Edited by D. Winton Thomas. London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1950. Pp. 15-24.

Emerton, R. "Priests and Levites in Deuteronomy," Vetus Testamentum, XII (1962), 129-138.

Foerster, Werner. From the Exile to Christ. A Historical Introduction to Palestinian Judasim. Translated by Gordon E. Harris. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Fohrer, Georg. Introduction to the Old Testament. Translated by David E. Green. New York: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Fuente, O. Garcia de la. "'Buscar' en el vocabulario de Isaias 1--39," Augustinianum, VII (1967), 486-501.

Galling, Kurt. Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra und Nehemia. Vol. XII in Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954.

----- . "Das Gemeindegesetz in Deuteronomium 23," Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag. Edited by Walter Baumgartner. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950. Pp. 176-191.

----- . "Könige und nichtkönige Stifter beim Tempel von Jerusalem," Beiträge zur Biblischen Landes--und Altertumskunde, LXVIII (1951), 134.

Gaster, T. H. "The Samaritans," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. R-Z. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 190-197.

Gehrke, R. R. 1 and 2 Samuel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968.

Gerleman, G. Studies in the Septuagint II: Chronicles. Lund: Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, 1947.

- , Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament. Lund: Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, 1948.
- Gese, Hartmut. "Zur Geschichte der Kultsänger am zweiten Tempel," Abraham unser Vater. Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel. Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag. Edited by Otto Betz and others. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Goettsberger, Johann. Die Bücher der Chronik; oder, Paralipomenon. Vol. IV, Part 1 of Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1939.
- Gooding, D. W. "The Septuagint's Version of Solomon's Misconduct," Vetus Testamentum, XV (1965), 325-335.
- Gordis, Robert. "Democratic Origins in Ancient Israel--the Biblical 'Ēdāh'," Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday. English section edited by Saul Lieberman. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.
- Goslinga, C. J. "De parallele teksten in de boeken Samuël en Kronieken," Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, LXI (1961), 108-116.
- Gray, John. I & II Kings. In The Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- , "The Kingship of God in the Prophets and Psalms," Vetus Testamentum, XI (1961), 1-29.
- Greenberg, M. "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible," Journal of the American Oriental Society, LXXVI (1956), 161-163.
- Grindel, John M. "Another Characteristic of the Kaige Rescension," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXXI (1969), 499-513.
- Grintz, J. M. "The Life of David in Samuel and Chronicles," Beth Mikra, I (1956), 69-75. (Hebrew)
- Haller, M. Chronik. Vol. II, III of Die Schriften des Alten Testaments. 2nd. edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925. Pp. 330-354.
- Haran, M. "Shiloh and Jerusalem: the Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXI (1962), 14-24.
- Harvey-Jellie, W. R. Chronicles. Vols. VII and VIII of The Century Bible. London: Caxton Publishing Co., n.d.

- Herbert, A. S. "I and II Chronicles," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962. Pp. 357-69.
- Herbert, A. S. Worship in Ancient Israel. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Hertzberg, H. W. I and II Samuel. Translated by J. S. Bowden. The Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- Hillers, Delbert R. Covenant. The History of a Biblical Idea. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- Hodges, Z. C. "Conflicts in the Biblical Accounts of the Ammonite-Syrian War," [2 Sam. 10:6,18 and 1 Chron. 19:6-7,18], Bibliotheca Sacra, CXIX (1962), 238-243.
- Hohenstein, Herbert E. "Psalms 2 and 110: A Comparison of Exegetical Methods." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1967.
- Hornig, Barbara. "Das Prosagebet der nachexilischen Literature," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXIII (1958), 644-646.
- Huffman, H. B. "The Exodus, Sinai, and the Credo," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVII (1965), 101-113.
- "The Treaty Background of Yāda^c," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CLXXXI (1966), 31-37.
- "A Further Note on the Treaty Background of the Hebrew Yāda^c," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CLXXXIV (1966), 36-38.
- Janssen, Enno. Juda in der Exilzeit. Ein Beitrag zur Grage der Entstehung des Judentums. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. "Septuagint Studies in the Current Century," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVIII (1969), 191-199.
- Jones, B. W. "The Prayer in Daniel 9," Vetus Testamentum, XVIII (1968), 488-493.
- Kapelrud, A. S. "Konig David und die Söhne des Saul," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXVII (1955), 198-205.
- Kennedy, A. R. S. Samuel. Vol. VI of The Century Bible, Caxton series. London: Caxton Publishing House, n.d.

- Kennett, R. H. "The Date of Deuteronomy," Journal of Theological Studies, VII (1905-06), 481-500.
- Kittel, Rudolph, and D. C. Siegfried. Die Bücher der Chronik und Esra, Nehemiah, und Esther. Vol. VI, part 1 of Göttingen Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902.
- Klein, Ralph. "Jereoboam's Rise to Power," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIX (1970), 217-218.
- Koch, Klaus. The Growth of the Biblical Tradition. Translated from the second German edition by S. M. Cupitt. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.
- . "Das Verhältnis von Exegese und Verkündigung anhand eines Chroniktextes," Theologische Literaturzeitung, XC (1965), 659-670.
- Köhler, Ludwig. "Justice in the Gate," Hebrew Man. Translated by Peter Ackroyd. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. Pp. 127-150.
- Kraft, R. A. "Barthélemy, les devanciers d'Aquila," Gnomon XXXV (1965), 474-483.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. Psalmen. Vol. XV, part 1 of Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament. Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1960.
- . Worship in Israel. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Kropat, A. Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik. Vol. XVI of Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Giessen: A. Topelmann, 1909.
- Kutsch, E. "Die Dynastie von Gottes Gnaden. Probleme der Nathanweissagung in 2 Samuel 7," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LVIII (1961), 137-153.
- Laurentin, Andre. "We'attah--Kai nun. Formule caracteristique des textes juridiques et liturgiques," Biblica, XLV (1964), 168-197.
- Leach, E. "The Legitimacy of Solomon. Some Structural Aspects of Old Testament Theology," Archives européennes de Sociologie, VII (1966).
- Leeseberg, Martin W. "Ezra and Nehemiah: A Review of the Return and Reform," Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1961.
- . "Ezra and Nehemiah: A Review of the Return and Reform," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXIII (1962), 79-90.

- Leimbach, Karl A. Die Bücher Samuel. Vol. III, part 1 of Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1936.
- Lemke, W. E. "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," Harvard Theological Review, LVIII (1965), 349-363.
- "Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1965.
- Liver, J. "Book of the Acts of Solomon," [1 Kings 11], Biblica, XLVIII (1967), 75-101.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Die deuteronomistische Darstellung des Übergangs der Führung Israels von Moses auf Josue," Scholastik, XXXVII (1962), 32-44.
- McCarthy, D. J. "Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVII (1965), 217-240.
- "An Installation Genre?" Journal of Biblical Literature, XC (1971), 31-41.
- "2 Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomic History," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (1965), 131-138.
- MacDonald, John. The Samaritan Chronicle II. Berlin: Topelmann, 1968.
- The Theology of the Samaritans. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- McKane, William. I and II Samuel. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- MacKenzie, J. A. R. "Valiant against All. From Text to Sermon on I Chron. 11:22,23," Interpretation, XXII (1968), 18-35.
- McKenzie, J. L. "The Dynastic Oracle: II Samuel 7," Theological Studies, VIII (1947), 187-218.
- "Royal Messianism," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XIX (1957), 25-52.
- MacLean, H. B. "Asa," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. A-D. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 243-244.
- "Abijah," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. A-D. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 8-9.
- "Rehoboam," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. R-Z. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 29-31.

- Maisler, B. "Ancient Israelite Historiography," Israeli Exploration Journal, II (1952), 82-88.
- Mandelkern, Salomon. Veteris Testamenti concordantiae hebraicae atque chaldaicae. Lipsiae: Veit, 1896.
- Mangenot, E. "Paralipomenes," Dictionnaire de la Bible. IV. Edited by F. Vigouroux. Paris: Letouzey et Anè, 1908. Cols. 2128-2151.
- Mazar, B. "David's Reign in Hebron and the Conquest of Jerusalem," In the Time of Harvest. Essays in Honor of Abba Hillel Silver on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday. New York: Macmillan, 1963. Pp. 235-244.
- . "The Military Elite of King David," Vetus Testamentum, XIII (1963), 310-320.
- Mendenhall, George E. "Election," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. E-J. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 76-82.
- . "Covenant," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. A-D. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 714-723.
- . Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955.
- Michaeli, Frank. Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie. Vol. XVI in Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1967.
- Miller, Patrick D., Jr. "The Gift of God. The Deuteronomic Theology of the Land," Interpretation, XXIII (1969), 451-465.
- Montgomery, James A. "A Study in Comparison of the Texts of Kings and Chronicles," Journal of Biblical Literature, L (1931), 115-116.
- Montgomery, James A., and Henry Snyder Gehman. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings. Vol. X in The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951.
- Moore, Carey A. Review of Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Nehemie, by Frank Michaeli. Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVII (1968), 210-212.
- Moran, William L. "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXV (1963), 77-87.

- Morgenstern, J. "The Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah," Journal of Semitic Studies, VII (1962), 1-11.
- Moriarity, Frederick L. "The Chronicler's Account of Hezekiah's Reform," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVII (1965), 399-406.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Erwägungen zum chronistischen Geschichtswerk," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXV (1960), 1-8.
- Muilenberg, J. "The Form and Structures of the Covenantal Formulation," Vetus Testamentum, IX (1959), 347-365.
- . "The Intercession of the Covenant Mediator (Exodus 33:1a,12-17)," Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas. Edited by Peter Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: University Press, 1968. Pp. 159-181.
- . "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, I (1953), 97-111.
- Murtonen, A. "The Use and Meaning of the Words lebarek und [sic] berakah in the Old Testament," Vetus Testamentum, IX (1959), 158-177.
- Myers, J. M. "David," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. A-D. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 771-382.
- . 1 Chronicles. Vol. XII of The Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965.
- . 2 Chronicles. Vol. XIII of The Anchor Bible. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965.
- . "The Kerygma of the Chronicler," Interpretation, XX (1966), 259-273.
- Newman, Murray Lee, Jr. The People of the Covenant: A Study of Israel from Moses to the Monarchy. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Noordtzijs, A. "Les Intentions du Chroniste," Revue Biblique, XXXIX (1940), 161-168.
- North, Robert. "The Chronicler: 1--2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah," The Jerome Biblical Commentary. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, and Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1968. Pp. 402-438.

- . Review of I Chronicles. II Chronicles. Ezra--Nehemiah, by Jacob M. Myers. Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVIII (1966), 519-524.
- . "Theology of the Chronicler." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII (1963), 369-381.
- Noth, Martin. "Das Amt des 'Richters Israels'," Festschrift Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag. Edited by Walter Baumgartner and others. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950. Pp. 404-417.
- . "History and Word of God in the Old Testament," The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- . "Jerusalem and the Israelite Tradition," The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- . "Könige. Vol. IX, part 1 of Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsverein Neukirchen-vlunyn, 1968.
- . Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1943.
- Nowack, W. Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis. Vol. IV, part i of the Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902.
- O'Ceallaigh, G. C. "And so David Did to All the Cities of Ammon," [2 Sam. 12:31], Vetus Testamentum, XII (1962), 179-189.
- Orlinsky, H. M. "The Septuagint, Its Use in Textual Criticism," The Biblical Archaeologist, IX (1946), 22-34.
- . "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1965.
- Pavlovsky, V. "Die Chronologie der Tätigkeit Esdras," Biblica, XXXVIII (1957), 275-305, 428-456.
- Payne, D. F. "The Purpose and Methods of the Chronicler," Faith and Thought, XCIII (1963), 64-73.
- Pedersen, Johs. Israel. Its Life and Culture. 4 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1940.

- Pfeiffer, R. H. "I and II Chronicles," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. A-D. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 572-580.
- Phillips, Anthony. "David's Linen Ephod," Vetus Testamentum, XIX (1969) 485-487.
- Plöger, Otto. "Reden und Gebete im deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk," Festschrift für Günther Dehn. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1957. Pp. 35-49.
- . Theocracy and Eschatology. Translated by S. Rudman. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Porten, B. "The Structure and Theme of the Solomon Narrative. [Wisdom, Welfare, Glory]," Hebrew Union College Annual, XXXVIII (1967), 93-128.
- Porter, J. R. "The Interpretation of 2 Samuel 6 and Psalm 132," Journal of Theological Studies, V (1954), 167.
- Purvis, James D. "The Origin of the Samaritan Sect," Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, 1962.
- Rad, Gerhard von. "The Beginnings of Historical Writing in Ancient Israel," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Translated by E. W. T. Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. Pp. 166-204.
- . "The Deuteronomic Theology of History in I and II Kings," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. Pp. 205-221.
- . Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930.
- . Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1951.
- . "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. Pp. 267-280.
- . Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Translated by D. N. G. Stalker. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- . "The Preaching of Deuteronomy and our Preaching," Interpretation, XV (1961), 3-13.

- . Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934.
- . Studies in Deuteronomy. Vol. IX in Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- . "There Remains Still a Rest for the People of God: An Investigation of a Biblical Conception," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. Pp. 94-102.
- . "The Tent and the Ark," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. Pp. 103-124.
- Rawlingson, George. Chronicles, Books I and II. Vol. III of The Speaker's Commentary. N.p., n.d.
- Rehm, Martin. Die Bücher der Chronik. Vol. VIII of Die Heilige Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung. Das Alte Testament. Wüzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1949.
- . Die Bücher Samuel. Vol. VII in Die Heilige Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung. Das Alte Testament. Wüzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1949.
- . Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik. Münster i.W: Aschendorff, 1937.
- Richardson, H. Neil. "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles," Journal of Bible and Religion, XXVI, (1958), 8-12.
- Richter, W. "Die nagid-Formel," Biblische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge, IX, 71-84; X, 44-56.
- Rimbach, James A. "Berith Olam: Studies in the Davidic Covenant Traditions." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1966.
- Ringgren, Helmer. Israelite Religion. Translated by David E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Roberts, Bleddyn J. The Old Testament Text and Versions. The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951.
- Rost, Leonhard. Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926.
- . "Zur Vorgeschichte der Kultusreform des Josias," Vetus Testamentum, XIX (1969), 113-119.

- Rothstein, J. Wilhelm, and D. Johannes Hänel. Das erste Buch der Chronik. Vol. XVIII, part 2 of Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst Sellin. Leipzig: A Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927.
- Rowley, H. H. "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays. Second edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- . "From the Exodus to the Founding of the Temple," Worship in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967. Pp. 37-70.
- . (ed.) The Old Testament and Modern Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- . "The Samaritan Schism in Legend and History," Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Edited by B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- . "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXVIII (1955), 166-198.
- . "The Temple and its Place in Worship," Worship in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967. Pp. 71-110.
- . Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Rudolph, W. "Der Aufbau der Asa-Geschichte" [2 Chron. 14-16], Vetus Testamentum, II (1952), 367-371.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. Chronikbücher. Vol. XXI in Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949.
- . Esra und Nehemia. Vol. XXII in Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949.
- . "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 401-409.
- . "Zur Theologie des Chronisten," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXIX (1954), 286.
- Rylaarsdam, J. C. "Recovery of Relevance," [1 Chron. 29:11] Criterion, V (1966), 13-16.
- Schofield, J. N. "'All Israel' in the Deuteronomic Writers," Essays and Studies Presented to Stanley Arthur Cook. Edited by D. Winton Thomas. London: Foreign Press, 1950. Pp. 25-34.

- Schumacher, J. H. "The Chronicler's Theology of History," The Theologian, XIII (1957), 11-21.
- Shenkel, James Donald. Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings. Harvard Semitic Monographs. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- . "A Comparative Study of the Synoptic Parallels in I Paralipomena and I-II Reigns," Harvard Theological Review, LXII (1969), 63-85.
- Skehan, P. W. "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 147-172.
- Slotki, I. W. Chronicles. Vol. XIV of Soncino Books of the Bible. London: Soncino Press, 1965.
- Smith, Henry Preserved. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.
- Speiser, E. A. "The Biblical Idea of History and Its Common Near Eastern Setting," Israeli Exploration Journal, VII (1957), 201-216.
- Steinespring, W. F. "Eschatology in Chronicles," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXX (1961), 209-219.
- Sutcliffe, E. F. "1 and 2 Paralipomenon," A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. Edited by Dom Bernard Orchard et. al. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1953. Pp. 351-374.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Revised by Richard Ottley. New York: Ktav, 1968.
- Szikszi, S. "Anoint," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. A-D. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 138-139.
- Thackeray, H. St. John. "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," Journal of Theological Studies, VIII (1907), 262-278.
- . The Septuagint and Jewish Worship. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.
- Thomas, D. Winton. "The Sixth Century BC: A Creative Epoch in the History of Israel," Journal of Semitic Studies, VI (1961), 33-46.
- Thornton, T. C. G. "Solomonic Apologetic in Samuel and Kings," Church Quarterly Review, CLXIX (1968), 159-166.

- Toombs, L. E. "War, ideas of," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. R-Z. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 796-801.
- Torrey, C. C. "The Apparatus of the Textual Criticism of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah," Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper. Edited by R. F. Harper and others. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908. Pp. 55-111.
- . The Chronicler's History of Israel: Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah Restored to Its Original Form. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.
- . "The Chronicler's History of the Return under Cyrus," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, XXXVII (1920-21), 81-100.
- . Ezra Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910.
- Tsevat, M. "House of David in Nathan's Prophecy," Biblica, XLVI (1965), 353-356.
- . "Studies in the Book of Samuel III: The Steadfast House: What Was David Promised in 2 Samuel 7:11b-16?" Hebrew Union College Annual, XXXIV (1963), 71-82.
- Vannutelli, Primus. Libri Synopticon Veteris Testamenti seu Librorum Regum et Chronicorum loci paralleli. Two volumes. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1931-34.
- Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1961.
- . Les Livres de Samuel. 2nd edition. La Sainte Bible. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961.
- . Review of Chronikbücher, Ezra und Nehemia, by W. Rudolph. Revue Biblique, LXIV (1957), 278-281.
- Vink, J. G. The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Vriezen, Th. C. The Religion of Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament," New Perspectives on the Old Testament. Edited by J. Barton Payne. London: Word Books, 1970. Pp. 212-239.

- Weinfeld, Moshe. "Deuteronomy--The Present State of Inquiry," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVI (1967), 249-262.
- Weiser, A. "Die Legitimation des Königs David; zur Eigenart und Entstehung der Sogenannten Geschichte von Davids Aufstieg," Vetus Testamentum, XVI (1966), 325-354.
- . The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development. New York: Association Press, 1961.
- . "Die Tempelbaukrise unter David," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXII (1965), 153-168.
- Welch, Adam. The Work of the Chronicler. Its Purpose and Date. London: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- . Post-Exilic Judaism. London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1935. Pp. 185-216.
- Wellhausen, J. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- Westermann, Claus. Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- . "Excursus: Prophetic Speeches in the Books of Chronicles," Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967. Pp. 163-168.
- . Der Segen in der Bibel und im Handeln der Kirche. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968.
- Wevers, J. W. "Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms," [3 Kings 22:1--4Kings 25-30], Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XIV (1952), 40-56.
- Werbeck, W. "Chronikbücher," Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. I. Edited by K. Gallig and others. 3rd edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957. Cols. 1803-1806.
- Whitley, C. F. The Exilic Age. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957.
- Whybray, R. N. The Succession Narrative. A Study of II Sam. 9--20 and I Kings 1 and 2. Studies in Biblical Theology, II, 9. Naperville, Ill: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1968.
- Wifall, Walter R., Jr. "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXXX (1968), 319-337.

- Wilda, Gudrun. Das Königsbild des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes.
Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1959.
- Wolff, H. W. "Herrschaft Jahwes und Messiasgestalt im Alten Testament," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIV (1936), 168-202.
- Wright, G. Ernest. "Cult and History," Interpretation, XVI (1962), 3-20.
- Zimmerman, F. "Chronicles as a Partially Translated Book," Jewish Quarterly Review, XLII (1951-52), 265-282, 387-412.
- Zerafa, P. "Priestly Messianism in the Old Testament," Angelicum, XLII (1965), 318-41.