

## I

### DAVID IN THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES

**T**HE importance of the role which C assigned to David appears from the fact that twenty chapters out of the fifty-six of which his book is composed were devoted to the life of the king. Of these twenty chapters, also, more than half are peculiar to the later record, and have no parallel in the Book of Samuel or that of Kings. We are thus exceptionally well supplied with information on the position which was given to David there. For we are not dependent on conclusions drawn from the passages which C omitted or from the changes he made in those which he included. These might mislead a student, since he must in both cases supply his own reasons for the departure from the original, and, in so doing, might follow his own ideas and go widely astray. But the chapters which have been added represent C's independent point of view, and give his reasons for attaching so much importance to the early reign. A student is thus supplied with a clue which may guide him in his attempt to determine the reason which prompted both the omissions and the alterations which were made in the earlier narrative.

C then began his narrative with the accession of David as King over united Israel. He prefaced the account by the story of Saul's defeat on Mt. Gilboa, I Chr. c. 10, which he based on I Sam. c. 31. But the changes which he introduced and the new setting in which he placed the story gave the whole a different aspect.

The author of Samuel set the defeat at Gilboa in its historical perspective. On the one hand, he made it the final incident in Saul's lifelong struggle with the Philistines. On the other hand, he made it no more than the first stage in the accession of the new king. David must settle with Saul's house in the person of Ishbaal, and only after the collapse of that ill-starred kinglet was he able to transform

his kingdom over Judah at Hebron into one over all Israel at Jerusalem. After Ishbaal's death the elders of Israel transferred their allegiance to the new king. But to the end of his reign David must reckon with the fact that the older line had its supporters in the kingdom. The Rizpah incident and the attitude of Shimei and Meribaal at the time of Absalom's rebellion proved that there was a party in Israel which counted him a usurper.

The attitude of C to the defeat at Gilboa appears in the two verses which he added to the story, vv. 13f. That disaster was no mere incident in the war with the Philistines: in it the divine judgement was pronounced on the early kingdom. Saul died for his trespass against the word of the Lord. Therefore the Lord slew him, and brought his dynasty as well as himself to an end. There could be no successor to the doomed house, for, when Saul died with his three sons, all his house died together, v. 6.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, C omitted all mention of the kingdom of Ishbaal and of David's temporary reign at Hebron. He was equally silent about the incidents in David's reign which proved the existence of a constant and formidable opposition in the interest of Saul's house.<sup>2</sup> Instead of making the elders of Israel wait until Ishbaal was dead before they came to Hebron with the offer of the crown, he made their act immediately follow Gilboa. The men recognized in that débâcle the divine decision, for they did not merely anoint David to be king as in Samuel, they anointed him according to the word of the Lord by the hand of Samuel, 11:3. The new king did not come to the throne, because the leaders of Israel recognized in him the only man who was competent to meet the situation in which their

<sup>1</sup> Incidentally, it may be noted that the inclusion of a genealogy of Saul at I Chr. 8: 33-40, since it contradicts the statement here, is an additional proof that the early nine chapters were no integral part of the work of C.

<sup>2</sup> The only place at which occurs a reference to the Hebron kingdom is I Chr. 29: 27, which is a verbatim copy of the summary of the reign from K. It is not surprising that this casual reference was overlooked.

nation stood. He owed his dignity to the divine choice, in which the entire nation at once and unanimously acquiesced.

Immediately after his accession the king marched against and captured Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> Here C followed the account of his predecessor. He omitted, however, the summary of the reign which prefaced that account: it contained the unwelcome reference to the temporary kingdom at Hebron. Instead, also, of crediting the capture of the new capital to David and his men, as in 5: 6, he ascribed the feat to David and all Israel, 11: 4. The centre for the kingdom, the future centre for the worship of the people, had been won by no privately enlisted troops, but by the united nation with its king at its head. C further made David promise the dignity of Commander-in-Chief of the army to the first man who entered the fortress, and told how Joab won the coveted honour through his courage. Now, according to Samuel, Joab had been Commander-in-Chief during the years at Hebron, and had risked a blood feud in order to prevent an Israelite from supplanting him. The leader of Israel's army must owe his appointment to its king.

As soon as Jerusalem was won, C continued to insist on the unanimity with which the entire nation had accepted its new ruler. The author of Samuel had either written or preserved a list of the names of mighty men in the army with incidents which related how some of these had won distinction. The list, however, appears in an appendix to the reign, II Sam. 23: 8 ff. Because of the place where it appears, it is not possible to pronounce whether it was the work of the historian, or an addition by an editor. Neither is it easy to determine the period or periods in David's life to which the incidents to which it alludes must be referred. C brought the list out of its original place in an appendix, and has referred them all to the years which preceded the accession, 11: 10-47. Even then, before he reached the throne, men of such quality, who derived from more than Judah, had been among his followers. For C prefaced the list with a

<sup>1</sup> I Chr. 11: 4-9, cf. II Sam. 5: 4-10.

statement, which both gave his reason for inserting it where he did, and dwelt on the quality which marked all the men, whatever might be the special distinction of individuals among them. These men 'showed themselves strong with him in his kingdom, together with all Israel, to make him king, according to the word of the Lord concerning Israel', 11:10. The representatives of the nation and its bravest had combined in supporting the king, and, in doing so, acquiesced in a greater purpose than their own.

This list was followed by another series of names and numbers of a similar character in chap. 12. The additional list falls naturally into two sections, vv. 1-22 and vv. 23-40, which differ in one particular. The earlier verses state that contingents from certain tribes joined David during the period which preceded his accession: the later profess to give the numbers of those who came from the several tribes in order to take part in his election to the throne. The source of these passages is quite uncertain; indeed it is an open question whether the Chronicler drew on any original,<sup>1</sup> or gave free rein to his own imagination. It has always appeared to me more probable that much of the material in vv. 1-23 derives from earlier sources. Evidently the period of David's flight before Saul appealed very strongly to the imagination of the early Hebrews, as the number of such folk tales collected by the author of Samuel is enough to prove. Stories about the hunted fugitive who rose to high honour have always exercised a romantic appeal; and, when the hero not only became king but succeeded in restoring the unity and independence of his kingdom, they have a long life. The vividness of the two incidents which are related about the Gadites and about Amasai suggests a very different type of mind from that of C, who had a rather heavy hand when he attempted to restore the past. He may have selected material from an unknown source to complete his picture of David.

<sup>1</sup> Curtis, e.g., in the I.C.C. Commentary has no hesitation in declaring most of the material to be a free creation, which may be dated at the period of the Return.

Then it becomes legitimate to note that the two incidents, which are most unlike his own style, served his purpose. For he thus brought out clearly that the men who came over to David in his early years were of fine quality and character. Again, when the young leader naturally showed some suspicion at the appearance of men from Benjamin, the tribe of Saul, their head claimed to be guided by divine inspiration. The men who supported the future king in his early years were not the broken men whom the author of Samuel described, I Sam. 22: 1-2. Nor were they so few in number as the 400 of I Sam. 22: 2, or the 600 of 27: 2: even before his accession David was at the head of a great host, like the host of God. Already also some of them, and among those men from Benjamin, were able and willing to acknowledge his divinely guided destiny.

The later section, vv. 24 ff., is different in character. It is so confused that it does not seem to be homogeneous; it also bears more evident signs of the style of C. It may, therefore, be a very free reconstruction on his part. But, however this may be, its general aim is unmistakable. The contingents which came to Hebron were drawn from all the tribes of Israel, and they were so numerous as to prove the unanimity of the nation in the nomination of the new king.

Immediately after the capture of Jerusalem, David set on foot the transference of the ark from the house of Obed-Edom. The new capital must become the religious centre of the nation. Here, as Kittel has remarked, C has departed from the order of events in the book of Samuel. In the earlier record the capture of Jerusalem was followed by the building of a palace, by a record of the royal family, and by the account of certain wars with the Philistines. Only then did the king find time to turn his attention to the ark. In C the conquest of the new capital was immediately followed by the effort to bring the sacred emblem into its shrine there. So pious an act could not have been delayed.

The story of the abortive attempt to bring up the ark in chap. 13 is, so far as the later part, vv. 6 ff., is concerned,

parallel to II Sam. 6: 1-11, but it is prefaced by a short introduction which is peculiar to C. The author of Samuel made the king summon 30,000 leading men in Israel, at whose head he went down to the house of Obed-Edom. In C, on the other hand, when David convoked the captains of thousands and the captains of hundreds, he did so in order to lay before them the proposal that all Israel should be brought together that they might take part in the solemn act. In particular, he proposed to send messages to 'all our brethren who are left in all the lands of Israel'. The result was that the entire nation from the brook of Egypt to the entering in of Hamath was assembled. Accordingly, while the author of Samuel said that David went and all the people who were with him, C changed this into David and all Israel. The ark, which was to become the centre for the worship of Israel, must be brought to its shrine in Jerusalem by the united nation. It had been ignored during the reign of the king whom God had rejected: one of the earliest acts of the king whom God had chosen was to give it fitting reverence, and to set it in its place at the national shrine.

In these respects the passage continues the leading motif which dominated C's conception of David and his work. Under him Israel became a united kingdom, and now under him it became one through the possession of a common sanctuary. But the form of the proposal for effecting this which the king is said to have brought before his leading men is very peculiar in its character. It is already singular to find him feeling the need specially to notify Israel proper of the event: it is more singular to recognize the terms in which this was to be done. The men are called our brethren; they are described as those who are left in the lands of Israel; they are said to have among them the priests and levites, where all the LXX MSS. omit the *waw* and read the 'levitical priests'. Now the expression הַנּוֹשְׂאֵרִים, 'those who are left in the *lands* of Israel', is peculiar to the post-exilic literature, and is employed there to describe the men of the

North who survived the divine judgement in the exile under Sargon.<sup>1</sup> The natural explanation for the use of such language in David's time is to suppose that the author lapsed *per incuriam* into the phraseology of his own time. Was it a mere lapse? It remains a remarkable fact that the same author ascribed to Hezekiah and Josiah, the two later reforming kings who restored the conditions which prevailed under David, an equal anxiety that the same men, the remanent Israelites, should take part in the passover celebration at the restored temple. From him we learn of the messages Hezekiah dispatched for this purpose into the North. C was writing in view of the situation which prevailed in his own time. He chose the language which he did and put it into the mouth of David in order to express his conviction. Israel had an equal right with Judah in the worship at the temple. The king who instituted the national shrine at Jerusalem had deliberately included the men of the North in the initial act which made that shrine national. He had put the matter before the leaders of the people, and they had acquiesced in the proposal. For the remanent Israelites were the brethren of the men of Judah, and were treated as such.

This interpretation throws light upon another phrase in the proposal. As the sentence reads in the MT, the remark that the Israelites possessed priests and levites has no very appropriate meaning in itself and has no relation to the matter in hand. There is no obvious connexion between the statement that the Israelites had these two classes of clergy and David's desire to invite them to the ceremony of the transference of the ark. The meaning becomes much clearer, if we follow the unanimous Septuagint reading and understand a reference to the levitical priests. For that is the title applied to the priests of north Israel in Deuteronomy. When C put into David's mouth a reference to the priests of Israel, and when he connected this with an urgent request that the Israelites should take part in the inauguration of the temple,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my *Post-Exilic Judaism*, pp. 59 ff.

he expressed his attitude to one of the burning questions of the time of the Return. The remanent Israelites had the privilege of sharing in the national worship on an equal footing with their Judean 'brethren', and their priests had a similar place in the cult-practice.

After the unsuccessful effort to transfer the ark, David, according to C, made careful arrangements in order to prevent a repetition. He prepared a *מִקְדָּשׁ* or shrine for the reception of the sacred emblem, and set up a tent in which it was to be lodged, 15 : 1. Pronouncing that only the levites were competent to act as its porters, he instructed the heads of fathers' houses of Levi to prepare themselves and to carry out the task, 15 : 2, 12. When these measures proved successful and the ark was safely lodged with due honour in its new position, the king appointed certain levites to minister before it, 16 : 4. This ministration implied more than the chanting of psalms at the new shrine, though a psalm, which was judged suitable for the occasion, has been included. For, at the first stage of its journey from the house of Obed Edom, sacrifices were offered before the emblem, 15 : 25 f.<sup>1</sup> Again, when David gave his final charge to Solomon as to the building of the temple, he commanded him to build the sanctuary of the Lord in order to 'bring the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and the holy vessels of God, into the house that is to be built to the name of the Lord', I Chr. 22 : 19. Now these vessels were more than musical instruments; they were employed for the cult. Accordingly, it is stated that, as soon as Solomon had fulfilled this command, and lodged the ark in its final resting-place, sacrifices were offered before it, II Chr. 5 : 6. The ark was thus the centre of a regular cult, so that, according to C, the first shrine in

<sup>1</sup> The statement there does not *necessarily* imply that these sacrifices were offered by the levites. They were offered in recognition of the divine approval of the undertaking—when the Lord helped the levites who bare the ark of the covenant. But, when the verse continues *וַיִּזְבְּחוּ* or 'then they sacrificed', the verb may be used in the impersonal sense and may imply no more than that sacrifices were offered.



Jerusalem was that of Israel's ancient and revered palladium with the levites acting as its ministers.

The account of David's desire to build the temple with its rejection by Nathan appears in almost identical terms in the two sources.<sup>1</sup> The author of Samuel may have shown a certain dislike on the part of the prophet to the idea of any temple, since he dwelt on the fact that no such building had existed in Israel during the years in the wilderness or during the period of the judges. While C retained the historical references, he softened the refusal by changing the first clause of his predecessor, 'shalt thou build a house for me to dwell in' into 'not thou shalt build'. The earlier narrative took the edge off absolute rejection by inserting the later statement that Solomon was to fulfil the plan of his father; the later went a little further and included this assurance in the actual terms of the rejection. But the leading themes of the pericope were identical in the two historians. On the one hand, the founder of the future temple in purpose, if not in fact, was David. His design was to provide for the ark a more fitting shrine than the one which he had prepared for it at first. He desired to place it in surroundings which were more worthy of its position in the national life and of Him who was worshipped there. The temple was to take the place of the tent which had hitherto housed the ark. On the other hand, no less important was the other theme that, while David was forbidden to build a house for Yahweh, Yahweh purposed to build a house for David. The new king, who had come to the throne through the divine election, was to be the founder of a dynasty which equally owed its being to the divine will. If it realized the purpose to which it thus owed its existence, it would be made secure and enduring.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I Chr. c. 17, and II Sam. c. 7.

<sup>2</sup> The point would be made even more clear, if a slight emendation were made in 17 : 10. In its present form the text is more than awkward, since it implies a confused transition between Yahweh and the prophet as speakers. Rothstein has adopted an older suggestion that the divine name at the end of the verse is due to the error of the copyist, who read

The three following chapters, chaps. 18–20, which contain the account of David's wars, are largely extracted from the much longer record in the book of Samuel. The questions which they raise deal rather with points of detail and are not very relevant to the present study. Some are textual, others are concerned with the extent to which the Chronicler was dependent on other sources than those appearing in Samuel. The leading feature in the narrative of C, however, is the extent to which he has cut down the material which was at his command. As has been already stated, it is possible to suggest reasons for several of his omissions. He ignored David's dealings with Meribaal and his surrender of some of Saul's descendants to the Gibeonites, since all the house of Saul, according to his view, had fallen at Gilboa. He equally ignored the record of Absalom's rebellion, because it did not conform with his picture of the unity of the nation under its first king. His omission of the betrayal and murder of Uriah may have had a double motive. Not only did the story cast an ugly shadow on the fair fame of David, but it offered a singularly unfitting prelude to his representation of Solomon's accession. All the palace intrigues which brought Solomon to the throne disappeared from his account. In its place came a gathering of the leading men in Israel, to whom the old king presented his successor in the character of the one whom God had chosen. David had received the promise that his dynasty was sure of the divine blessing and support. It was not easy to bring this conception of the kingdom of Israel into agreement with the fact that David's successor was born in adultery.

יהוה instead of the ויהיה at the beginning of v. 11. This blunder brought about the change of an original אבנה I will build into יבנה, He, i.e. Yahweh, will build. I suggest that we should further read with the LXX אֲנִי לְיָהוָה in place of אֲנִי לְיָהוָה, and translate the sentence—'I will subdue all thine enemies and will make thee great and I will build thee a house'. The effect of the change will be, not merely to remove the confusion between the speakers, but to make the contrast clearer. As God had given no command to the people in the past about a temple, but had appointed a place for Israel, so will He deal with David.

But all these omissions on the part of the Chronicler, whether it is possible or not to be sure as to the motives which prompted them, make one fact clear. They must be weighed along with the other fact of the additions which he introduced. He included everything from his source which bore upon the king's service to the nation in founding and strengthening the outward institutions of religion in Israel, and everything which he added went to prove that he was the originator of the temple and of the cult which was practised there. But he cut down severely the details of the royal wars and of all the means by which David built up a powerful kingdom.

Accordingly, after his brief mention of the wars in which David was engaged, the historian turned back to his favourite theme. Though the king had been forbidden personally to build the temple, he was to all intents and purposes its originator, for he collected materials for the purpose, arranged as to the workmen, designed the actual building, and determined the functions of the clergy who carried out the cult in it. These matters fill the remaining chapters of the first book of Chronicles. As the last thoughts and energies of the king were devoted to this great purpose of his life, so the last scene, when he was old and full of years, revealed him gathering the notables of the kingdom round him. He announced Solomon as his successor, and, as soon as his son was anointed, solemnly charged the new king and his people to carry out the work which he had begun. The leaders accepted their new ruler and showed their willingness to undertake the responsibility which had been laid upon them by contributing liberally to the preparations for the temple. As David's first task after his accession and conquest of Jerusalem had been to bring the ark into its shrine in the capital, so his dying charge to his successor was to guarantee the completion of the task by building the temple and bringing the ark and its vessels into it.

Most of this material, chaps. 22-9, is peculiar to the Chronicler, and, with slight exceptions, finds no parallel in

Samuel. But C prefaced it by the account of David's numbering of the people with the resultant pestilence, and the building of the altar on the threshing-floor of Araunah. This, his chap. 21, he took from II Sam. c. 24, following very closely his original. Yet he gave it an entirely new meaning through the position in which he set it, and through the slight changes he introduced into its terms.

In Samuel the story has been relegated to an appendix and appears among some other varied material which belonged to David's reign: it is not prominent in that reign, nor is it integrally related to the king's activity. Thus it opens with the statement that again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and He moved David to number the people. Evidently then the story was originally connected with another passage which related a previous outbreak of the divine anger. In my judgement it was so connected with the famine of chap. 21, which led to the deliverance of a number of Saul's descendants to the Gibeonites. When the men whom Saul had wronged had sacrificed those victims before the Lord, the rain which fell on Rizpah during her dreadful watch intimated that the atonement had been sufficient. Again the wrath of the Lord was kindled against Israel, but this time the offender was David himself. To stay the pestilence which resulted from the numbering of the people an altar was built on Mt. Zion and a sacrifice after the use of Israel was offered on it. The effect in both cases was the same: at Gibeon God was entreated for the land, at Mt. Zion the Lord was entreated for the land and the plague was stayed from Israel. It is possible that one reason for setting the two incidents in such close relation was to underline the different methods of atonement which were employed in Gibeon and in Israel, and so to counter the dangerous theological suggestion in the earlier story. It is even possible that this explains the different divine names which appear in the two accounts. God might be entreated by the methods which were followed by the semi-pagan remnant of the Amorites: Yahweh was entreated by

a sacrifice which was after His mind. But, however this may be, the altar on Mt. Zion, according to the author of Samuel, had no permanent place in the national life. It had been erected to serve a special purpose, and, when that purpose was fulfilled, it need never have been used again.

C changed the entire character of the account, when he brought it out of the appendix to which his predecessor had relegated it, and set it in the main stream of his record of the reign. It was thus placed in integral relation to the leading purpose of David's life, instead of being connected with a similar visitation which had befallen the nation. For it followed the divine promise that, though David was forbidden to build the temple, his son was to be granted that privilege, and it preceded the ample preparations which were made to that end. How closely the succession of these events was linked together in his mind C made clear by the new conclusion which he added to his version of the story in 22: 1. After the descent of the divine fire at the threshing-floor, which manifested the divine approval of the offering made on its altar, he put into David's mouth the solemn declaration: this is the house of the Lord God, and this the altar of burnt-offering for Israel. The altar on Mt. Zion was no temporary place of sacrifice, which served its purpose and ceased to have any further place in the national life: it had received a permanent consecration. Before the king made any preparations for the future temple, he received a divine revelation as to the site of the altar before which it must be built. C transformed the story which had told of David's sin in numbering his people, of its chastisement, of the king's repentance, and his atoning sacrifice: he made it into the *εὐρὸς λόγος* of the temple.

The minor changes which appear in the chapter bear the characteristic marks of C's style, and help to bring out his purpose. In v. 1 David numbered Israel, in Samuel, Judah and Israel; the total reported in v. 5a<sup>1</sup> was for all Israel, in

<sup>1</sup> Verse 5b, which is absent from the LXX, is recognized to be a gloss by Rothstein and even by Curtis.

Samuel the totals for Judah and Israel were set down separately. C thought of the nation as a unity when he described the origin of the sanctuary which was to serve it all. The angel commanded Gad to direct the building of the new altar, v. 18; the author of Samuel had been content to ascribe this command to the prophet. The altar which was to be the centre for sacrificial worship must have its site indicated by a direct divine command. When David purchased the threshing-floor, he used about it the technical term **מִקְדָּשׁ** or shrine at v. 25: contrast the language in Samuel, 24: 24. But above all C alone described how God accepted the sacrifice and hallowed the altar by sending down fire from heaven, v. 26b.<sup>1</sup>

As soon as the site of the future temple had been determined, David could press on his preparations, which he did abundantly, 22: 2-5. He then summoned Solomon, who was not yet his successor, and, giving a brief résumé of the reasons why he himself was not permitted to complete the work, he added that the great task had been reserved for his son. He therefore delivered over the preparations which he had made to Solomon and charged him with the responsibility of carrying them to completion, 22: 6-19. While the passage is peculiar to C, it contains certain echoes from the work of Kings. Thus the levy of workmen appears in I Kings 5: 27 f., v. 7 occurs almost verbatim in Solomon's prayer of dedication, I Kings 8: 17, the description of Solomon as a man of peace closely resembles the statement in I Kings 5: 4b, 18. It will be noted that these references are all to events which took place during the later reign. It was natural for C to introduce them here, because he credited David with everything connected with the temple, except the actual building. He made Solomon no more than the executant of the plans of his father.

Otherwise the chapter shows the characteristic attitude of its author. Since he was writing here with greater independence, he introduced, as the reason for David's inability

<sup>1</sup> On v. 29 f., see *infra*, p. 31 f.

to complete the temple, the fact that in his wars he had shed much blood. He returned to the same theme at 28: 3. On the other hand, where he followed his original more closely in the story of the prophet Nathan at chap. 17, he gave no such reason. Here, again, he may be borrowing from and expanding the work of his predecessor. For, in his account of Solomon, K referred to David's wars having interfered with the other sacred task, I Kings 5: 17; but, as Kittel recognized, this implied no more than that the constant wars did not leave the king leisure to undertake the task. As C supplemented K on this point, he also corrected him on another. K made Solomon raise his labour-levy for the work on the temple from all Israel, I Kings 5: 27 ff. According to C, David laid the corvée on the **דַּוָּרָא** or strangers, cf. II Chr. 2: 16. Now these men, according to him, were the descendants of the original inhabitants of Palestine, II Chr. 8: 7 ff.<sup>1</sup>

The final charge, however, which David laid upon his son in connexion with the future temple is most significant as to the attitude of C. As soon as the temple was complete, Solomon must bring into it the ark of the covenant of the Lord and the sacred vessels of God. As to these sacred vessels, even Rothstein, though he referred to I Kings 8: 4, recognized their obvious association with the ark and its sanctuary. The new sanctuary must fulfil David's intention, when he desired a more worthy resting-place for the ark than the curtains of its tent. The temple was a substitute for that tent, and Solomon's first act, when the house of God was complete, must be to lodge in it the ark with the sacred vessels employed in its cult.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The later view of the situation has been introduced into the narrative of K as I Kings 9: 20-2.

<sup>2</sup> David's address to Solomon is followed by five chapters, 23-7. This block of material is the most confused and difficult section to unravel, even in the book of Chronicles. It is also very plainly not homogeneous in character; at least two writers, probably more, can be traced in its composition. The subject with which it chiefly deals is the way in which David determined the functions and the courses of the clergy in the future temple. I propose to deal with that large

The private charge of David to his son was followed by a public assembly, in which the old king resigned his throne and presented Solomon as his successor. He then reminded the notables of Israel that the chief task which lay upon the new king was that of building the Temple. After delivering to Solomon the תבנית or plan which he himself had prepared for the sanctuary and the treasures which he had accumulated, he reminded the leaders that their king would need all the help which they could give him in such a weighty undertaking, and called upon them to show their interest in it by contributing to meet the cost. When they gave a ready response to his appeal, he offered a humble thanksgiving to God and besought the divine blessing on the work which had been denied to him.

The relation between the two speeches has given occasion for a good deal of discussion. Rothstein and Benzinger were of opinion that chap. 28 was originally connected with 23: 1 f., and that the speech was delivered to that assembly of the leaders of Israel. With this judgement I agree, and merely add that the lengthy and pompous introduction in 28: 1 was added after chaps. 23-7 had been brought into their present position. Then the two speeches may both be retained, since one was addressed to Solomon in private before his accession and the other was delivered in public and was followed by the anointing of the new king. Kittel, however, judged it necessary to telescope the two speeches which he then redivided and referred to two separate authors. It is unnecessary to give the details of the division here, and it may be enough to say that by it the more precise description of the Temple, its furniture, and its officials was assigned to one writer, while the hortatory passages were allotted to another. Yet the two subjects are too closely interwoven,

topic at a later stage, and therefore pass over it here. When it comes to be reviewed, it will be necessary to attempt to decide how much of the contents of those chapters may be assigned to the Chronicler. Meantime all that can be assumed about them is that they prove C to have ascribed to David a judgement as to those clergy.



both in the text and in the thought, to admit of this dissection. A writer, who believed that the plan of the temple and its arrangements had been divinely revealed to David, must have counted the king's eagerness to commit this to his successor an evidence of spiritual fervour. Further, whoever this writer may have been, he lived during the time which followed the Return, and so belonged to a generation which judged the maintenance of the temple and its cult to be a matter of life and death for the religion of their nation.

The objection which Kittel and some other students have shown to accepting two speeches of very similar character, as having been put into the mouth of David at the end of his reign by the same writer, fails also to recognize one feature which marks the public address. For the speech to the leaders of Israel served two purposes. So far as it dwelt on the supreme duty of building the temple, it covered much the same ground as the private charge given by the king to his son. But it was also intended to give C's view of the accession of Solomon. We must read the account in its relation to the discreditable version in Kings of the method by which the new king succeeded in reaching the throne. Then, and only then, does it become clear why, in addressing the notables, David began by dwelling on two themes. He spoke of the divine promise as to his dynasty in Israel, and he put forward Solomon as his divinely elected successor. In view of these commanding facts, the new king was at once accepted by the leaders of the nation, and his accession to the throne followed without opposition and as a matter of course. As Israel elected David, because God had already chosen him, so Israel elected his son.

The final charges delivered by David to his successor and to his people contain an epitome of the Chronicler's judgment on the life-work of the first king of Israel. David had united the nation under his authority and maintained that unity throughout his reign. He had also been the founder of the dynasty, which continued so long as the independence of the nation lasted. He was able to accomplish these things

because in them he was the servant of a greater purpose than his own. God had chosen him and had rejected Saul; God had promised to grant him a house; God had chosen from among his many sons the one who was to succeed him. But the dynasty had failed to fulfil the divine purpose which had brought it into being,<sup>1</sup> and had therefore come to an inglorious end. A like failure, however, had not attended the other side of the first king's service to Israel. For he had laid the foundations for the temple, which was to be the centre of worship of Israel, and was to make Mt. Zion a praise to the ends of the earth. He set up the first sanctuary in Jerusalem when he brought up the ark and made it the centre of a cult. He conceived the purpose of building the temple which was to be its fitting shrine instead of its curtains. He planned the lines for its future buildings, and appointed the men who were to conduct its cult. David was, in everything except the actual physical labour, the originator of the temple; and in all he undertook for its future glory he was guided by God who had chosen him to be king. The site for the temple was indicated by a theophany, and the first sacrifice on its altar was consumed by a fire from heaven. The plan for the future buildings and for the officials there was given in writing from the hand of the Lord, 28: 19. Therefore he delivered it to the leaders of the nation, as the pattern for their future work. But he also charged Solomon to bring the ark of the covenant of the Lord and its sacred vessels into the completed temple, 22: 19, and he reminded the leaders of the nation that his design from the beginning had been to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord, 28: 2. Unless that sacred emblem with the vessels which belonged to its cult was housed in the new sanctuary, his purpose would be left incomplete. Because the king was thus the originator of the temple, it is said of the later kings who reformed the religion of the nation that they restored the conditions which had been laid down by David.

From this sketch of the Chronicler's account of David's

<sup>1</sup> On this subject cf. the later chapter on C's attitude to prophecy.

life, it is evident that he was not writing history in the sense in which we conceive that history ought to be written. He was using the records of his nation in order to convey certain theological teaching and to insist on certain ecclesiastical convictions. His work may be compared with that of the man or men who produced the account of Israel's origin, which dealt with the lives of the patriarchs. In certain respects C's work does not bear comparison with that of his predecessor. The two records have nothing in common when they are thought of as literature. The Chronicler had not the same imagination, the power of sketching character, the ability to make the past live. All that in these respects can be set down in his favour is that he probably reproduced with greater accuracy the facts with which he dealt in his narrative. He was not so free in his reproduction of the national past. But the aim of both writers was the same. They were using the material which they borrowed in order to impress certain great convictions on the mind of their contemporaries. Through C's account of David's life we can hear an authentic voice speaking from the period after the Return. What he had it in his heart to say was that David gave Israel two great gifts, the kingdom and the temple, the two institutions which dominated and coloured the national life in Palestine. The one had gone down the wind and could never return. It was conditioned by faithfulness on the part of its kings to the purpose which brought it into being. When the kings failed to obey God's voice through His prophets, the kingdom was doomed. But David's other gift of the temple remained, and in it and its worship was the hope for the future of Israel.

The temple, however, which David had planned, was, as has been pointed out, the substitute for the tent in which the ark had been housed. Even before it was built there had been a sanctuary of the Lord in Jerusalem, and a cult had been practised there which was valid for Israel. That had been the king's first care after the capture of his new capital. His last care had been that Solomon must transfer

that cult to the temple when it was completed. Now in contrast with this leading theme which appears in each successive stage of David's conduct in relation to the national worship, it must be noted that there appears a different attitude in the course of the book. It must also be noted that the evidence of this different attitude emerges at the critical stages of the story. Thus, at the time when David brought the ark to Jerusalem and instituted a cult before it, appears the statement that Zadok the priest and his brethren the priests were before the tabernacle of the Lord in the high place at Gibeon to offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord upon the altar of burnt-offering continually morning and evening, 16: 39 f. The statement is not woven into the passage of which it forms part, but is abruptly interjected, having no connexion with what precedes or with what follows.

It is easy to understand why David honoured the ark, which had played a part in the wilderness journeys and had already been the centre of a cult at Shiloh. It is not easy to explain why the tabernacle, which was a dominant feature in those journeys, disappeared from the life of the nation after they reached Palestine, and why, when it suddenly reappears, it was situated at a high place in the territory of the semi-heathen Gibeonites. As hard is it to explain how ark and tabernacle came to be separated. In the wilderness the ark occupied a very subordinate position, for it appears in a list of the furniture and the vessels which were employed in the cult at the Tabernacle. Yet here it has not only become independent, but has become the centre of a cult of its own. Finally, it is at least remarkable to discover Zadok, whom Solomon made high priest in the Temple, already consecrated and officiating in a sanctuary which existed before the time of his father. To the writer who introduced this note, the cult of the ark at David's shrine in Jerusalem was not the first centre of worship in Judah. There was a sanctuary which owed its origin to the law of the Lord, in which the altar was served by a priesthood which did not owe its consecration to any king.

Again, when David consulted God about his desire to substitute for the curtains round the ark a more worthy resting-place, there appears a curious clumsiness in the prophet's reply in both versions. When he described the conditions in early Israel, the author of Samuel made the prophet state that God had never dwelt in a house, but had hitherto been walking in a tent and in a tabernacle. In I Chr. 17: 5 God is said to have replied to Nathan's inquiry that He had been from a tent to a tent and from a tabernacle.<sup>1</sup> Neither reading can be called satisfactory. Kittel has proposed to improve the hopeless reading in Chronicles by adding 'to a tabernacle' after 'from a tabernacle', but must add a query to his proposal, since his only authority for the addition is the Latin version. Even if the emendation were accepted, it would fail to remove the radical difficulty which is common to both passages. God is represented as having been in both a tent and a tabernacle since the day that He brought the children of Israel out of Egypt. During the wilderness journey and throughout the period of the Judges, therefore, both tent and tabernacle had been in existence, and each of them had been accounted the divine abode. The tabernacle has been introduced into the narrative, perhaps in a marginal note which has been incorporated into the text, by the same reviser who added it in chap. 16. He practically wrote—N.B. by the tent here is meant the tabernacle—for to him the temple took the place of the original tabernacle. As before, however, he failed to say what became of it during the period of the Judges.

Finally, on the occasion of the theophany at the threshing-floor of Araunah, it is stated that, when David received the divine response, he sacrificed there, 21: 28. Obviously this can only refer to the king's further use of the altar on which the fire from heaven had fallen. A site which had received so august an approval could not be deserted: this was indeed the house of the Lord and this the altar of burnt-offering

<sup>1</sup> The above is a literal version of the Hebrew, which the LXX has helped out by reading: but I was in a tent and in a tabernacle.

for Israel, 22: 1. The close connexion of these verses is broken by the statement which separates them: for the tabernacle of the Lord which Moses made in the wilderness and the altar of burnt-offering were at that time in the high place at Gibeon, but David was afraid to employ that altar because of the sword of the angel. The statement about the Araunah threshing-floor being the house of the Lord is thus made to apply to the tabernacle with its altar. But the verses, besides breaking the original connexion, contradict the terms of the theophany, since the command to the king to build the altar came directly from the angel. After his order had been obeyed, and after the divine fire had descended in approval of the sacrifice, the angel put up his sword into its sheath. We have a third addition from the same hand as in the two former cases. Again he intervened with the reminder that before an altar was built in Jerusalem Israel was possessed of a sanctuary and a cult which could claim the authority of Moses himself. Anything which David could provide for worship in the city was either subordinate, as in the case of the ark with its tent, or a mere makeshift, like the altar, due to temporary conditions. The temple took the place of the tabernacle, and its altar was the one which Bezalel made in the wilderness.<sup>1</sup>

When once we have recognized the leading themes of the narrator and the peculiar attitude which dominated the narrator's story of David, it is possible to trace how he dealt with his material, omitting here, supplementing there, and making the changes which he did. The other material has been added to this original narrative, and does not profess to be an independent record. It simply supplements that to which it has been added, by supplying certain caveats in the interest of another view of the course of events.

There is one other reference to the tabernacle in David's lifetime, I Chr. 23:26, but, since the verse occurs in a passage

<sup>1</sup> Kittel has already recognized v. 29 f. to be an addition. Since, however, he did not go farther and seek for the reason which had prompted such an addition, he included v. 28.

which raises other issues, it is passed over here.<sup>1</sup> The sanctuary, however, appears prominently under Solomon in the account of the young king's visit to the high place at Gibeon and of the revelation which he received there. The versions of this incident which appear in our two sources are very divergent. K made the visit the first act of Solomon after his accession, and set it in close relation to the events which followed and preceded. He had described the palace intrigue which had only been defeated by the influence of Bathsheba over the old king, and had dwelt on the strength of the opposition which Solomon needed to face. Because the throne of the new king was by no means secure, he made the visit to Gibeon a personal affair in order to be assured of the divine approval and help. Accordingly, Solomon prayed for wisdom to fulfil his new functions and minister justice to his people, I Kings 3: 4-15. K. found it necessary to explain why on such an occasion Solomon had recourse to a high place, for he added that, so long as the temple was not yet in existence, the people were still using these local sanctuaries, and that the one point in which Solomon failed to keep the statutes of his father was that he also frequented them, vv. 2 f. As the historian thus linked up the revelation at Gibeon with what preceded it, so he related it to that which followed, for he continued with the statement that Solomon, on his return to Jerusalem, acknowledged the grace he had received by a public sacrifice before the ark. Since this sacrifice included **שלמים** or peace-offerings, v. 15, it was different from that at Gibeon which consisted only of burnt-offerings, v. 4: the one was personal in its character, the other was communal. Further, K introduced here the story of the judgement of Solomon. Through that decision of the new king all Israel learned to fear him, for they recognized that the wisdom of God was in him to do judgement, v. 28. The prayer at Gibeon had been answered.

The parallel version to this is found in II Chr. 1: 1-13. So far as the content of the prayer and of the divine message

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 71 ff.

is concerned, there is little difference between the two. The record in Chronicles is somewhat shorter than the other, and has made the message take the form of a direct revelation, instead of an appearance in a dream. It is the setting in which the incident is placed which shows the divergent point of view. The later author made Solomon's visit to Gibeon a public, instead of a private act. To him Solomon had been solemnly put forward by David as his divinely chosen successor and had been accepted by all the leaders of Israel. He, therefore, needed no confirmation of his authority. Nor was the sanctuary at Gibeon an ordinary high place, which was suspect like the similar shrines in Israel, for it contained the tabernacle which Moses the man of God made in the wilderness, and possessed the altar which Bezalel the son of Uri had made. Since it was endowed with such authority, there was no need for any explanation of the king's act in visiting it: K's introductory apology for the royal visit disappeared. In the same way the king paid no personal visit to the shrine: before he went he convened the leaders of Israel, and when he went he was attended by the **לְקָהֵל** or community. The first official act of the new reign was to recognize the supreme authority of the sanctuary, which his father had been prevented from acknowledging in the day when he was afraid because of the sword of the angel of the Lord. Accordingly the king's return to the city was followed by no sacrifice before the ark and no feast to the people: the communal sacrifice had already taken place before the tabernacle. The ark received no notice in the narrative except that it was where David had placed it in its tent: and there the writer avoided the use of the word **מִקּוּם** or shrine, though its omission made bad Hebrew. Equally did the story of the royal judgement disappear: Solomon's authority needed no confirmation, since the nation had already acquiesced in the divine election of its new king.

This version of the incident so clearly contradicts in certain significant points the earlier account that the aim of the



writer must have been to supersede the story in Kings. The only question which can arise is to determine whether it derived from the original in Chronicles, or was the work of the annotator. In my judgement it must be referred to the second hand. What he had previously suggested by a note here and another there, he now stated at length, and placed, before the description of Solomon's work on the temple, his conviction that the temple was no novelty in Israel, but had been an integral part of the national religion, since the time when Moses received the law at Horeb. Whether he substituted his version for a simpler original, or whether the whole was his own work, it is impossible to determine. Yet it ought to be acknowledged that, since the material has nothing with which it can be compared, the above conclusion is more uncertain than in the other cases, where a note can be recognized through its disturbance of the context. Its acceptance must depend on the general conclusion a student draws from the other evidence on the annotations.

When the temple was completed, Solomon summoned the leading men in Israel to bring up the ark of the covenant out of the city of David. In the presence of these men during Israel's holy week the levites, according to Chronicles, the priests, according to Kings, took up the ark. What they brought up to the temple, however, was not merely the ark, but also the tent of meeting and all the holy vessels that were in the tent.<sup>1</sup> The appearance of the tabernacle in this connexion is, to say the least, surprising. The men have been convened in order to bring up the ark, its porters have been appointed and have taken up their burden. The scene is at the sanctuary in David's city. But suddenly we are transported to the other sanctuary at Gibeon, where another set of porters take up the tabernacle and its sacred vessels. Are we to suppose that the assembled representatives of the nation went first to the city of David and then proceeded to Gibeon, or were there two contingents, one of which went down to the lower city and the other to the high place, after

<sup>1</sup> II Chr. 5: 2-5; I Kings 8: 1-4.

which, each carrying its sacred burden, they converged at the temple? To note this awkward situation brings forward another feature in the description. When Solomon convened the people for the purpose of bringing the ark into the temple, he was fulfilling the charge laid upon him by his father at the time of his accession: and, when the levites deposited the ark with the vessels that were in its tent, he and the national leaders exactly carried out the orders issued to them. Naturally they left the tent of the ark behind, since the temple had taken its place. On the other hand, when the porters brought up the tabernacle, they were acknowledging the sacredness of the sanctuary which Solomon had honoured in the first official sacrifice of his reign, but which his father was never reported to have visited.<sup>1</sup> He could not have ignored the sacred emblems, tabernacle and altar, which bore the great name of Moses. Again, if the sudden emergence of the tabernacle raises these difficulties, its entire disappearance remains unaccountable. For the account continues with the deposition of the ark in the temple, after which the glory of the Lord filled the house. David's purpose, when he planned the new house of God, was completed. But what place had the tabernacle in this sequence of events? It was not mentioned, when the king convened the national leaders, and nothing was said as to its ultimate destination. When C described the transference of the ark with the vessels in its tent, he ignored the tent itself, since the temple took its place. When the annotator introduced the transference of the tabernacle, he forgot that, when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part must be done away.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> To notice this connexion between the removal of the tabernacle and the royal visit, in Chronicles, thrusts into more glaring prominence how unsuitable is the mention of the tabernacle in Kings. For that book said nothing of the presence of this sanctuary in Gibeon, made Solomon's visit to the high place unofficial, and even felt it necessary to apologize for it.

<sup>2</sup> It is interesting to compare Bertheau's note, because it shows him

The services on the occasion served a double purpose, the  $\text{הַנִּזְכָּה}$  or dedication of the temple and the celebration of the festival of Booths. The hanukkah came first, I Kings 8: 63, II Chr. 7: 5. As for the festival, there are two interesting points of divergence between the records in I Kings 8: 64-6 and II Chr. 7: 7-10. The earlier writer called the altar, which was found too small for the sacrifices at the festival, simply the altar which was before the Lord: the later called it the altar which Solomon had made, and, when he referred to the hanukkah, named that the dedication of the altar, not of the temple. Again, the writer in Kings made the celebration of the festival last only a week, for in his account the worshippers returned to their homes on the eighth day. He may even have made the two ceremonies run concurrently and together last no more than a week, for the clause at the close of his v. 65, according to which they lasted fourteen days, is absent from the LXX. In Chronicles, on the other hand, an additional day or  $\text{עֶצְרָת}$  was added to the festival, and so the use of Jerusalem at Booths was made to conform from the beginning with the practice prescribed in the later law, Lev. 23: 36; Num. 29: 35.

When, however, we turn to the description of the dedication service in Chronicles, the situation is much more perplexing and involved. Thus there are two series of sacrifices at 5: 6 and at 7: 1. One of these preceded, the other followed Solomon's prayer. Twice also the glory of the Lord is said to have filled the temple, so that the priests were unable to continue their duties in it, 5: 14, 7: 1f. In the latter case it is added that fire descended from heaven and consumed the offerings. Kittel is of opinion that the sacrifice which followed Solomon's prayer was a personal offering

to have had a suspicion of the real situation. There is a minor, but not wholly negligible, difficulty in the phrase, 'the ark and the tent of meeting and the holy vessels that were in the tent'. According to the law in Numbers the ark was one of those holy vessels of the tabernacle. Yet here it has not only escaped from that subordinate position, but is mentioned first.

on the part of the king, which in turn was succeeded by the offerings of king and people in v. 4. This is an impossible interpretation, for the sacrifice which followed the royal prayer was attended both by the descent of the divine fire and the appearance of the divine glory. Now the descent of the fire from heaven was meant to imply that the sacrifice which it consumed was accepted and the altar on which it came down was legitimate. The theophany which filled the temple implied that the dedication was complete. The connexion between the two acts of sacrifice here is that for a time the altar, which had received its consecration, was inaccessible to the priests because of the divine glory. As soon, however, as this had abated, the altar was employed for the celebration of the festival of Booths. The altar which was thus consecrated was the one which Solomon had made, v. 7, and so significant was its consecration that the writer here called the whole ceremony the dedication of the altar, v. 9.

The course of events after Solomon's prayer appears straightforward enough. The real difficulty is to reconcile this with the events which preceded the prayer, for there we read of a similar public and communal sacrifice, which was followed by the descent of the cloud to indicate that the dedication of the temple was complete. The sacrifices in this case were offered before the ark, which is prominent here, but of which nothing is said after the prayer: on the other hand, there is no mention of the descent of the divine fire, nor of an altar Solomon made, on which the fire fell. How prominent a position was given to the ark appears from four features of the earlier account. As soon as it was deposited in the Temple, sacrifices were offered before it. It is added that there it remains to this day, 5:9c.<sup>1</sup> When the

<sup>1</sup> There is no need to alter the MT here, which reads *וְהָיָה*, in order to bring it into agreement with the plural reading in Kings. This change, commonly accepted though it is, fails to explain the peculiar reading in Chronicles, and makes the sentence pointless. What, according to the new text, is said to remain to this day is the protruding staves of the

sacrifices before the ark were consumed, the glory of the Lord filled the Temple and completed the hanukkah. When this was over, and the ceremony had thus come to its end, Solomon rose, not to offer prayer, but to declare what had been done. In his statement he reverted to the charge he had received in the presence of the people on the day of his accession, and declared that he had not failed to fulfil it. I am risen up in the room of David my father, and sit on the throne of Israel, as the Lord promised, and have built the house for the name of the Lord, the God of Israel, and there have I set the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, 6: 10 f.

This reconstructed account of the hanukkah reproduces the features which characterized the work of C. The temple was a surrogate for the tent of the ark.

When, therefore, the temple was complete, the ark was brought into it. On its arrival at its final resting-place sacrifices were offered before it. Thereupon, in token that everything necessary for the dedication of the new sanctuary had been completed, the glory of the Lord filled the house, in which the ark remained to this day: and Solomon was able to declare in the presence of the assembled people that the task his father had committed to him had been fulfilled. It was not necessary that Solomon should build an altar for the sacrifices or for the heavenly fire to declare it acceptable. The altar, on which the sacrifices before the ark were offered, had been erected long before by David on the Araunah threshing-floor. It had then received its consecration by the descent of the fire from heaven, and David, in recognition of the theophany, had declared this to be the house of the Lord God and the altar of burnt-offering for Israel.

The other account, which follows Solomon's prayer, equally bears the sign-manual of the annotator. To him the centre of interest was the tabernacle with its altar.

ark, but one cannot fail to wonder why these should be of such lively interest to any one. The original singular was altered in Kings into a plural, after the preceding verses had been added.

Therefore he made Solomon bring up the tabernacle, for the temple was built to take its place. Because he had made David's altar at the time of the pestilence into a mere makeshift, due to the king's inability to reach Gibeon with its altar, Solomon must construct a new altar, on which, since it required the divine approval, the fire from heaven descended. So essential was this to the efficacy of the sacrifices which were to be offered there that he could call the whole ceremony the dedication of the altar. His account dovetails into his previous notes, as C's account dovetails into his earlier material.

But the annotator was not content to supply a parallel version of the dedication of the temple.<sup>1</sup> He inserted at least two paragraphs into C's narrative, the purpose of which it is possible to recognize. After the levites had brought the ark into the temple and after the sacrifices before it, he made the priests carry it into the holy of holies and deposit it there. In that inner shrine it disappeared from the sight of the worshippers, so that no more sacrifices could be offered before it. After that, he could continue with C's conclusion—and there it remains to this day, since now the sentence meant that the emblem was relegated to the background. There was no need for it to be prominent in connexion with the cult, since it was nothing but a receptacle for the stone tablets which formed the memorial of the divine covenant with Israel.<sup>2</sup> Again, when the priests returned from the inner sanctuary, the ceremony continued. But only the priests were permitted to surround the altar: the levites, who had carried up the ark and who had been its ministers in its tent, were not now allowed to advance beyond the

<sup>1</sup> The same method is followed in the account of Hezekiah's reform. There are two versions of his hanukkah, cf. pp. 105 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For another mention of this employment of the ark, and for the evidence that it implied a quiet degradation of the emblem from its original position, cf. my *Deuteronomy, the Framework to the Code*, p. 64 f. For a similar proof of the desire to dismiss the ark into the background cf. my *Post-Exilic Judaism*, p. 230 f.

east end of the altar. At that careful distance they were entrusted with the musical accompaniment of the rite, though the use of the trumpets was committed to the priests.<sup>1</sup> After the ark had been thus consigned to its fitting resting-place in the hidden shrine, and after the officiating clergy had been arranged with due regard to their ecclesiastical dignity, the glory of the Lord filled the house. The theophany was removed from its dangerously suggestive neighbourhood to the sacrifices before the ark.

In all this the annotator showed his knowledge of the later law and a scrupulous regard for its observance. When the priests carried the ark into the inner sanctuary, they were acting according to the law in Num. 4: 5 ff. When an extra day was added to the week of the festival of Booths, the regulations for the festal occasions in Num. cc. 28 f. were observed. The procedure followed after Solomon's prayer closely resembled that which attended the completion of the tabernacle in Lev. 9: 22-4. There Moses and Aaron came out to the front of the tabernacle and blessed the people. Thereupon the glory of the Lord appeared to the congregation, the fire from heaven consumed the offerings, and the people prostrated themselves. In the temple they prostrated themselves on the **הַפָּזָר** or pavement, an expression which is peculiar to this passage and to Ezek. 42: 3, 40: 17 f.

<sup>1</sup> Kittel pronounced 5: 11b to 13a to be an addition, but he saw in it a desire to assert the dignity of the levites by giving them a due share in the ceremonial through their connexion with the musical service. He failed, however, to recognize the context in which these singers appeared. On the one side was the statement that the levites were not permitted to advance beyond the east side of the altar: on the other, the trumpets were reserved to the priests, so that the levites had not full control even over the musical service. The musical service is here a sign of the lower status of the levitical order and is contrasted with the function of the priests who alone officiated at the altar.