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The aim of this thesis is to evaluate the relationship between Samuel and Chronicles in a single synoptic story: David's transfer of Israel's sacred ark to Jerusalem in 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. **Chapter one** surveys areas of research related to Samuel and Chronicles. First, the writer summarises research and perspectives on these books and their stories of David's ark transfer. The review highlights competing approaches to Samuel which centre on either sources or composition and on either a diachronic or synchronic methodology. The literary history of Samuel is inadequate in conventional perspective, and must be freshly unfolded, and consequently the relationship of Samuel and Chronicles must also be re-evaluated. Second, the writer reviews the textual evidence for both books, focusing on the received versions, the Greek translations, and in the case of Samuel, on the Dead Sea Scrolls. The witnesses to Chronicles are relatively uniform, and it is suggested that the pluriformity among witnesses to Samuel, and the character of the MT of this book, are related to Samuel's editorial history. In particular, revisers reshaped the story of David's ark transfer in Chronicles and Samuel. **Chapter two** surveys issues related to synchronic and diachronic approaches to Samuel and Chronicles. The writer suggests that the impasse between these competing approaches may be resolved by the textual-exegetical approach, that is, by using text-critical controls on redactional arguments. The versional evidence substantiates the validity of the diachronic approach—there are earlier and later forms of biblical texts and editions of biblical stories—and scholars can use this evidence to discern literary origins and developments—developments in the versions whose special features, and the reasons for them, may be perceived and appreciated through holistic or final-form readings. Related to this, the writer points out that the issues of text, language (grammar, vocabulary, style) and story are interconnected. Textual variation and grammatical and stylistic incongruities and lexical discrepancies frequently signal editorial developments in biblical compositions. Three helpful models for understanding this developmental process are considered: McKane's rolling corpus, Tov's and Ulrich's literary layers, and Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis. Finally, it is stated that the principal text-critical aim in this thesis is the detection of earlier and later forms of biblical texts or stories, or to state it differently, the discovery of earlier and later stages in their editorial histories. Using the aforementioned insights and methodologies, **chapters three through six** closely examine 2 Samuel 6 and the synoptic portions of 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. The latter has one short and two lengthy pluses (13.1-4; 15.1-24; 16.4-42) but the text and story in its synoptic material are more primitive than in synoptic MT Samuel. 2 Samuel 6 has one short plus (vv. 20b-23) but the text and story in its synoptic material have developed in MT Samuel beyond LXX Samuel and beyond synoptic Chronicles. In other words, 2 Samuel 6 is a shorter version on the whole, yet in many particulars the MT is a later version of the story of David's ark transfer. The text's 'poor condition' is evidence of its editorial history. Overall, 2 Samuel 6 shows greater textual variation and fluidity, more doublets, and more interpretative difficulties than does 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. Specifically, the MT reflects much literary creativity and ideological bias. The readings special to this text relate to an apology of Davidic kingship, an apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character, and cultic practice. In addition, many textual manipulations in MT 2 Samuel 6 connect to the language of stories in 1 Samuel, especially chapters 2, 10-15, 17 and 25. All these interconnected adjustments point to successive editorial interventions over a substantial period of time and their cumulative appearance and objective may be labelled a literary layer. The thesis concludes with observations regarding the implications of the present investigation for the theories of A. G. Auld.
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INTRODUCTION

Chapters one and two discuss the investigative context and methodological approach of this thesis. Therefore, the brief introductory remarks to follow deal only with the genesis and objective of this study.

My interest in the literary artistry of biblical stories originally surfaced while investigating the reconstruction of Israelite history in the Late Bronze and Iron ages by employing both written and artifactual evidence. W. G. Dever's insistence on correlating 'text and tell' initially influenced me to approach Israelite history this way. Paradoxically, in my first related writing project, I argued that historians and archaeologists regularly misuse biblical literature in their discussions of the emergence of Israel in Canaan. My criticisms addressed their markedly straight-forward readings in which they stop short of grasping the literary artistry in biblical historiography. I argued, under the influence of M. Z. Brettler and K. L. Younger, that the proper use of biblical stories in the exploration of Israelite history should involve a new-literary- or narrative-critical investigation of biblical stories and a comparative-literary contextualization of those stories in their ancient context. I have further explored this methodology in writing projects on Canaanite (Amarna), Ugaritic and Hittite history. The present writing project takes an additional step backwards in the investigative process as I originally envisioned it: the unfolding of Israelite history based on the twin-foundation of 'text and tell' can occur only after appraising the literary artistry of biblical stories, and that appraisal should incorporate a critical examination of the biblical texts which convey those stories. The heart of this thesis is textual and literary criticism, and my approach is indebted to the supervision of A. G. Auld, and to his writings as well as those of J. C. Trebolle Barrera.
This thesis investigates the synoptic presentations of David's relocation of Israel's sacred ark to Jerusalem in 2 Samuel 6 and in 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. For more than two centuries scholars have supposed that the Chronicler rewrote the story in the Former Prophets, and consequently the differences between the accounts in language and content are assumed to be the Chronicler's. In addition, since scholars consider Chronicles to be secondary to Samuel on a literary basis, they also consider the later book to be generally inferior to the earlier one in historical particulars. Since the discovery slightly more than a half-century ago of 4QSam⁹, scholars have gradually recognised that not every difference between the synoptic presentations is due to the Chronicler's initiative or Tendenz. Additionally, scholars' confidence in the Chronicler's historical reliability has increased somewhat while at the same time their confidence in the Deuteronomist's dependability has gradually waned.¹ This thesis seeks to advance still further this appraisal of Samuel–Kings vis-à-vis Chronicles by arguing that MT Samuel's portrayal of David's transfer of the ark shows much late literary creativity and ideological bias.

CHAPTER ONE

Contexts: Books, Stories, Versions

1.0 Introduction

This chapter surveys three areas of research related to Samuel and Chronicles: (1) the history of research and current views on the composition of these books; (2) the history of research on the story of David's transfer of the ark in Samuel and Chronicles, and the meaning of each narrative in its context; and (3) the history of research on the textual witnesses to Samuel and Chronicles, focusing on the received versions, the Greek translations, and in the case of Samuel, on the Dead Sea Scrolls. This survey establishes the context for the investigation as a whole.

1.1 Samuel and Chronicles

The relationship between Samuel–Kings and Chronicles is extraordinarily complex. Synoptic material makes up forty percent of Chronicles2 but only five percent of Samuel and fifteen percent of Kings.3 Notable large-scale differences between these books are David’s preparations for the temple in 1 Chronicles 15–16, 22–29, the absence in Chronicles of Samuel's histories of Saul and personal life of David, and the absence in Chronicles of Kings' history of northern monarchs. In addition to these and other large

---

2 This percentage is true for portions of Chronicles which are parallel to Samuel–Kings and for portions of Chronicles as a whole which are parallel to these books as well as Genesis–Exodus, Numbers, Joshua–Judges, Isaiah–Jeremiah, Psalms, Ruth, Ezra–Nehemiah.

and small pluses and minuses, the wording and placement of the synoptic material often vary.4

Chronicles summarises the period from Adam to David (1 Chronicles 1-9), and deals with David's reign (1 Chronicles 10-29), Solomon's reign (2 Chronicles 1-9), and the kings of Judah, ending with Cyrus, king of Persia (2 Chronicles 10-36).5 Many agree that the book's presentation of Israel's history appeals to the post-exilic community6 to submit to theocratic rule through a Davidic king over a unified Israel. This standpoint accounts for many recurrent themes such as (1) the temple and its personnel (Levites, priests, singers), the law, and the prophets; (2) the Davidic covenant and dynasty; (3) the focus on Judah and the supremacy of Jerusalem, and the corresponding antipathy for the northern kingdom; and (4) the disposition of the heart, personal piety, repentance, and divine favour and retribution.

Since de Wette's Historisch-Kritische Untersuchung über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher der Chronik (1806), research on Chronicles has focused on the credibility of the writer7 and his historical reliability.8 These issues are linked in turn to endeavours to delineate (1) the writer's sources and (2) the manner in which he used them.9

4 See the commentaries and layouts in synopses: Hebrew: Bendavid 1972; Kegler and Augustin 1991; Vannutelli 1931; English: Endres, Millar and Burns 1998; Newsome 1986; also Crockett 1897; Mosiman 1907; Wood 1896. Klein 2001 summarises 'additions', 'omissions' and 'changes' in Chronicles.

5 It is unnecessary to discuss further the contents and structure of the book, and other issues such as: the book's name and place in the Hebrew canon; the book's extent and unity; the book's author(s), setting, audience and date; and the book's language, style and genres (especially lists and speeches). See, e.g., Japhet 1999; Jones 1993; Klein 1992; Kleinig 1994.

6 Most think this community is situated in Jerusalem in the fourth century BCE. But see appendix 3.

7 The word 'writer', rather than another term or 'writers' in the plural, is used loosely. Many now hold that the book was written by a single individual, i.e., Chronicles is a unified composition. 1 Chronicles 1-9, 15-16, 23-27 are disputed.


First, what sources did the Chronicler use? The consensus regarding the writer's main sources is that they were the books of Genesis–Exodus, Numbers, Joshua–Kings, Psalms, Ruth, and Ezra–Nehemiah. Furthermore, he had these books in very similar though not identical (see 1.3.3) forms to the ones in our Hebrew Bible. In addition to these primary sources, he probably also had an unknown number of cited and non-cited extra-biblical sources. This thesis does not directly argue for or against the view that Chronicles is based mainly on Samuel–Kings, although the results of the analysis converge with the view that Chronicles and Samuel–Kings depend on a common or shared source. Rather, this thesis shows that the story of David's transfer of the ark in Chronicles is based on a more primitive textform than the one reflected in MT Samuel. In turn, this fact suggests that scholars may not yet have fully appreciated the literary history of Chronicles.

Second, how did the Chronicler use his sources? Scholars label the Chronicler an author, historian or historiographer, theologian, commentator or expositor, interpreter or exegete, and targumist and midrashist. The consensus is that the writer did not desire to...

---

10 This was the standard view prior to de Wette who argued, against Eichhorn 1780 and others, that Chronicles' Vorlage was Samuel–Kings. Many subsequently abandoned the notion of a common source, with rare exceptions such as Hävernick 1836; S. Davidson 1856; Zöckler 1874 = Zöckler 1876; Rupprecht 1898; and especially Keil 1833, 1859 and Keil and Delitzsch 1866, 1872. More recently, some argue, or are sympathetic toward the view, that the writers of Samuel and Kings and the writer of Chronicles relied partly or wholly on a common source: Rothstein and Hânel 1927; Goettsberger 1939; van den Bussche 1948; Rehm 1943; E. J. Young 1949; Mayer 1965; Zawiszewski 1968; Harrison 1969; Macy 1975; Halpern 1981; Friedman 1987; Payne 1988; Rainey 1997; Edelman 2000. The view is argued in Ho 1994, 1995, and by Auld, whose view surfaced in Auld 1983. Prior to Auld 1994, his arguments appeared in Auld 1992, 1993. He has advanced his thesis in many essays now collected in Auld 2004a and in a short commentary on Samuel (Auld 2003). His thesis has garnered some support, but many criticize Auld on methodological, socio-historical, linguistic and literary bases. Regarding the latter, many disagree over (1) the suitability of a shared story beginning with the death of Saul (1 Samuel 31 // 1 Chronicles 10); (2) the motivation for the exilic or post-exilic writer of Kings to include so much material about the northern kingdom; and (3) the writer's supposed awareness of non-synoptic material in Samuel–Kings. The third issue is weighty, and an investigation of all (supposed) cross-references in Chronicles to material in Samuel–Kings is a desideratum. One instance of this phenomenon, Michal in 1 Chron. 15.29, is addressed in this thesis.

correct or repress or supplant the history in his sources, and neither did he seek to write an authoritative commentary to accompany them. Rather, his aim was to re-present or re-paint or re-cast Israel's history in a way that would advance his community's needs. He was a 'theological historiographer'. Furthermore, he exhibited much control over his sources and was careful and deliberate in his methodology.¹²

Turning to Samuel¹³, the book narrates overlapping histories of the priest/prophet/judge Samuel (1 Samuel 1–25), King Saul (1 Samuel 9–2 Samuel 1) and King David (1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 24). David is the main plot in the book. Samuel and Saul and their families, as well as the priestly family of Eli and the ark, are subplots which support and enhance the story of David. Nonetheless, the story of David is complex, and far from being an idealised hero, Israel's second and greatest monarch spends more (narrative) time clashing with and fleeing from Saul (1 Samuel 18–29) and Absalom (2 Samuel 13–19) than he does seated on the throne. Without the royal house of David, Israel would not have survived, although Samuel makes this house and its subjects answerable to firm standards of prophetic justice. In the end, Samuel's portrait of David is a holographic representation of Israel's experience from conquest to exile. The book is a work of national self-criticism. David, like Israel, is chosen, and David, like Israel, receives blessing for obedience and punishment for sin. Neither, however, is abandoned by Yahweh. The house of David and the nation of Israel will be punished and preserved. Samuel offers hope to those doubting Yahweh's covenant promises.¹⁴

Since Rost's Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids (1926) and Noth's Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (1943), the history of research on Samuel's literary
history focuses on the discernment of diverse traditions within the book which one or more Deuteronomistic editors united into a single composition as part of a larger history of Israel from conquest to exile (Joshua–Kings; prefaced by Deuteronomy). Scholars discern the following blocks of material in Samuel:

| 1 Sam. 1.1-4.1a | Traditions centred at Shiloh regarding the priestly family of Eli and the priest/prophet/judge Samuel |
| 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2, perhaps 2 Sam. 6.1-23 | The Ark Narrative (AN) |
| 1 Sam. 7.3-15.35 | Traditions concerning Saul and the advent of kingship |
| 1 Sam. 16.1–2 Sam. 5.12 | The History of David's Rise (HDR) |
| 2 Sam. 9.1-20.26 | The Succession Narrative or Court History of David (SN or CH) |
| 2 Sam. 21.1-24.25, diverse material in 5.13-25; 7.1-29; 8.1-18 | Traditions (as an appendix) concerning David |

Some assume a prophetic stratum containing part or all of Samuel between the earlier sources and the later Deuteronomistic editors. The methodology for discerning these originally independent blocks of material involves the affirmation of (1) particular yet distinct themes in each block, especially in the AN, HDR, and SN/CH, and (2) conflicts or duplications between the blocks. See 2.2. By consensus, the Deuteronomistic editors of Samuel compiled the earlier sources into a chronological and coherent story, but unlike Judges and Kings, they rarely intervened in these sources. Many think this hands-off procedure accounts for (1) the loose connections between the blocks of material and (2) the relative absence of Deuteronomistic vocabulary and subject matter. In the original formulation of his Deuteronomistic History (DH), Noth attributed the following portions of Samuel to the Deuteronomistic editor: 15

---

15 Noth 1991: 76-91; cf. Campbell 1994: 59-60. According to Noth, 9.1-10.16 and 10.27b-11.15 in 1 Sam. 7.2-15.35 are source material, and 2 Samuel 21–24 is post-Deuteronomistic, following the separation of the book from the surrounding books.
Many since Noth identify additional Deuteronomistic contributions to the book, but these are limited in number in comparison with other books.\textsuperscript{16}

It is remarkable that sixty years after Noth's epic publication scholars agree over the concept of a DH but disagree over many foundational issues\textsuperscript{17}, for example: (1) What are the scope and character of the (pre-Deuteronomistic) sources and of the (Deuteronomistic and post-Deuteronomistic) supplements to the original composition of the History? For instance, the extent and intention of the SN/CH (2 Samuel 9–20; 1 Kings 1–2) are hotly debated.\textsuperscript{18} Furthermore, many on one hand give a pre-exilic date to this pre-Deuteronomistic source (Blum, Brueggemann, Dietrich, Eissfeldt, Gunn, Kaiser, Keys, Naumann, Noth, Rost, Seiler, Von Rad, Whybray), although they disagree considerably over the century to which it belongs; but on the other hand, Auld, McKenzie and Van Seters give an exilic or post-exilic date to this composition. (2) Was the History composed in the pre-exilic period and then updated in the exilic/post-exilic period (Boling, Clements, Cross, Friedman, Knoppers, Levenson, Mayes, Nelson, O'Brien, Provan, Weippert—especially the 'Harvard school' [Dtr\textsuperscript{1}, Dtr\textsuperscript{2}]), or was it composed in the exilic/post-exilic period (Noth, Hoffmann, V. P. Long, McConville, Peckham, Polzin), or was it composed and then updated in the exilic/post-exilic period (Dietrich, Klein, McKenzie, Person, Smend, Van Seters, Veijola, Würthwein—especially the 'Göttingen school' [DtrG, DtrP, DtrN])? Was the History the product of a 'Deuteronomistic school' active over much time (Lohfink, Nicholson, Person, Weinfeld, etc.)?


\textsuperscript{18} De Pury and Römer 2000; cf. Frolov 2002.
The following matters raise doubts about the conventional perspective on the literary history of Samuel. First, scholars disagree on the scope (start and end), purpose and date of the supposed sources of the book, and the same can be said for the editorial layers within these. The characterisation of the hypothetical sources varies with each scholar. Second, there is relatively greater agreement concerning the limits and nature of the AN, the HDR and the SN/CH than on the other supposed sources. It is not by coincidence that these have names. Yet a review of recent literature shows that scholars still disagree concerning many facets of these supposed sources. In particular, were 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 and 2 Sam. 6.1-23 originally a single document or is one story written as a prologue or epilogue to the another? See 1.2.2. And what exactly are 1 Sam. 1.1-4.1a and 7.3-15.35 and 2 Sam. 5.13-25; 7.1-29; 8.1-18; and 21.1-24.25? Scholars often speak about 'traditions' in each of these sections of Samuel, and the last is frequently designated an 'appendix' or 'epilogue' to the book. 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18 suffers the greatest neglect in this regard. Outlines respecting the supposed sources frequently chart the sections within 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18 independently rather than under a common heading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Sam. 16.1–2 Sam. 5.12</th>
<th>= HDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 5.13-25</td>
<td>= ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.1-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 7.1-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 8.1-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 9.1-20.26</td>
<td>= SN/CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is this material and how should one call it? Childs suggests that 'the difficulty of determining the structure of the book seems to arise from the long history of transmission. At various stages in the development the material functioned in different ways and vestiges of several organisational schemes are still evident'. Conversely, it is unclear how 'the material' in Samuel functioned independently or in any other 'organisational scheme'. Third, since the late 1960s/early 1970s practitioners of 'new literary criticism' or

---

19 Childs 1979: 267.
'narrative criticism' have written many synchronic or holistic or final-form readings of the book which suggest that its contents and contours are not susceptible to the sharp distinctions made by source and redaction critics. For example: Alter, Bar-Efrat, Brueggemann, Fokkelman, Garsiel, Polzin, and to give more: Alonso Schökel, B. T. Arnold, Auld, Bergen, Berlin, Clines, Conroy, Eslinger, Exum, Flanagan, R. P. Gordon, Gros Louis, Gunn, Humphreys, Jobling, V. P. Long, Miscall, Rosenberg. These and others have identified thematic and/or structural and/or linguistic links between 2 Samuel 5–8 and 21–24, 2 Samuel 2–4 and 9–20, 1 Samuel 4–7 and 2 Samuel 6, 1 Samuel 1–3 and 4–7, 1 Samuel 1–2 and 2 Samuel 22–23, to give some, and there are many links between the stories of David and Saul (1 Samuel 16–31) and David and Absalom (2 Samuel 13–20).\textsuperscript{20} This thesis will elaborate on connections between the story of David's transfer of the ark in 2 Samuel 6 and other passages in Samuel. The cumulative evidence suggests that the literary history of Samuel is inadequate in conventional perspective, and must be freshly unfolded.

1.2 David’s Transfer of the Ark

1.2.1 Introduction

The noun יִתְנָא appears 202 times.\textsuperscript{21} Cognate terms are widespread in Semitic languages but the etymology is uncertain. In the Bible the term may refer to a secular or religious chest. The secular usage is rare, occurring once in Gen. 50.26 for Joseph's coffin\textsuperscript{22} and six times in Kings and Chronicles for a coffer or money-chest (2 Kgs. 12.10,

\footnote{20 See 2.1 and appendix 5.}


\footnote{22 Some connect Joseph's coffin and the canonically later sacred box, e.g., Görg 2000.}
Ninety percent of these occurrences are in Samuel (61 times), Chronicles (48 times), Joshua (30 times), Exodus (26 times) and Kings (12 times). Only 51 references to the ark occur without any qualification, and very few of these occur without an antecedent with a fuller name for the ark. In total there are 29 different designations for the ark, 60 (118 times) percent with an appellation related to the deity—usually either אלהים הרה or אלהים—he and 40 percent (77 times) without one—usually ארון alone or with בהת or שתו. The designations (and distribution) of ארון indicate the complex significance of ancient Israel's sacred box.

The ark has aroused more curiosity and conjecture than any other Israelite cult object. On one hand, referring to David's transfer of the ark to Jerusalem in 2 Samuel 6, Noth said 'In fact the position in world history which Jerusalem has occupied ever since is due to this very act', but on the other, and less than ten years following Noth's statement, G. H. Davies said 'the accounts of the ark in the Old Testament are beset with the most difficult and tantalising problems'. He lists eighteen difficulties regarding many facets of the ark (or arks?), and he discusses three of these in greater detail: the origin, the mobility, and the significance and function of the ark. These remain unresolved.

The history of the ark. Was there one or several arks in ancient Israel? Did it originate within Israel, during Israel's nomadic period in the wilderness, or was it taken

---

23 There are also allusions to Israel's sacred box; cf. G. H. Davies 1962a: 225-226; Seow 1992: 387-388.
24 ארון occurs in 1 Samuel 3–7 and 2 Samuel 6–7 and elsewhere only in 1 Sam. 14.18 and 2 Sam. 11.11; 15.24-25, 29.
25 ארון occurs in 1 Chronicles 13–17 and elsewhere in 1 Chron 6.16; 22.19; 28.2, 18; 2 Chron. 1.4; 5.2, 4-10; 6.11; 8.11; 35.3.
26 The religious use of ארון appears 195 times in 189 verses in 50 chapters. It occurs 41 times in the Pentateuch, 104 times in the Former Prophets, once in the Latter Prophets, and 49 times in the Writings.
27 See appendix 2. This complexity is augmented by the difficulty in reading 'ark' or 'ephod' in a number of passages in Samuel. See the discussion of MT 1 Sam. 14.18 in 3.1.2.3 and the comments on 'ephod' in 5.1.3.7.
over from the Canaanites, after Israel entered Canaan? Critical examinations have shown that these and other questions cannot be effortlessly or precisely answered. The use of הַיְלָדִים in Samuel is especially suspect, and many doubt the historicity of the stories in 1 Samuel 4–7 and 2 Samuel 6. Why are these passages replete with textual and interpretative difficulties? Does the ark really disappear from 1 Sam. 7.2 to 2 Sam. 6.2 or does MT 1 Sam. 14.18 indicate the presence and use of the ark during Saul’s monarchy? Why, after David places the ark in Jerusalem, is it virtually absent and unused in the remainder of Samuel (only in 2 Sam. 11.11; 15.24, 25, 29; cf. 7.2). Finally, what was the ultimate fate of the ark?

**The meaning of the ark.** There is greater agreement on the significance and function of the ark. Most think its meaning should be considered in relation to other ancient parallels that bear a resemblance, but there is no indisputable correlation to Israel’s ark. Was the ark a war palladium (a sacred safeguard), or a tent shrine or miniature temple in which the deity was thought to be present, or a throne-seat or footstool for the deity who was invisibly seated there, or a container symbolising divine leadership or presence? The common denominator is that the biblical ark is the representation of the deity’s immanence or presence. What was the conceptual and historical relationship of the ark to the tent/tabernacle, mercy-seat and cherubim? What was inside the ark and why: tablets of the law, jar of manna, Aaron’s rod? Do various literary strata (e.g., ‘P’, Deuteronomy, ‘the AN’, Chronicles) attest a continuous history and meaning for the ark?
1.2.2 David's Transfer of the Ark in Samuel

The history of research on the ark has focused on the book of Samuel.\(^{30}\) Wellhausen argued that the priestly description of the ark in the Pentateuch is younger than the portrait drawn in Samuel, and Rost solidified the case by arguing that the AN was a tenth century BCE document which functioned as the ἱερὸς λόγος of the Jerusalem sanctuary.\(^{31}\) Rost's hypothesis is addressed below, but the extremely varied perspectives on the history and meaning of the ark in Samuel cannot be addressed here. The following general remarks pertain to various aspects of 2 Samuel 6, the zenith of biblical ark stories.

(1) **Structure of 2 Samuel 6:** Many consider 2 Sam. 6.1-20a an integral whole with a concentric structure that circles from Jerusalem to Jerusalem (place to place, exit and return, beginning and ending). In addition, many like Rost distinguish between two unconnected traditions in 2 Samuel 6, believing that the Michal material in vv. 16, 20b-23 is secondary. See 5.0 and 6.1.2.2. In this thesis, 2 Sam. 6.1-20a is characterised as follows: the exposition of the main plot (2 Sam. 6.1-5); the inciting incident, initiating the conflict or complication (2 Sam. 6.6-7); the rising action (2 Sam. 6.8-15 [16]); the climax or turning point (2 Sam. 6.17a); and the resolution or denouement or falling action (2 Sam. 6.17b-20a).

(2) **Uzzah and Michal in 2 Samuel 6:** Many think the parallel Uzzah (vv. 6-8) and Michal (vv. 16, 20b-23) incidents are interruptions, and also reprimands of David's enterprise. Both stories, however, enhance rather than disparage David's character.

---


\(^{31}\) Rost 1982: 6-34 says the AN comprises 1 Sam. 4.1b-18a, 18-21; 5.1-11b, 12; 6.1-3b, 4, 10-14, 16; 6.19-7.1; 2 Sam. 6.1-15, 17-20a.
(3) 2 Samuel 6 and 'P': Scholars assign cultic relevance to many facets of the ark story: the ark and its epithet; the status of Abinadab, his sons Uzzah and Ahio, and Obededom, and the nature of their בכר; the status of the nameless transporters in the second attempt; the mood (rejoicing), sounds (voices, instruments) and movements (dance) in each attempt; the threshing floor; Michal at the window; the sacrifices; the tent; David's 'self-revelation', clothing (ephod), blessing and distribution of food-stuff; and the significance of the new cart pulled by oxen and Uzzah's extending his hand, each of which has been interpreted as an instance of cultic error. Many believe David and Uzzah erred in the first attempt to transfer the ark (2 Sam. 6.1-10) by failing to observe priestly regulations regarding the transport of the ark. In his second attempt (2 Sam. 6.11-20a) David supposedly rectified this cultic error. Conversely, and somewhat inconsistently, many scholars use David's priestly activity in 2 Sam. 6.13-20a as both a source and illustration of the theme 'royal priesthood' or 'sacral kingship', to show that David was a king-priest similar to other ANE kings who were also priests of their deities.

32 The Pentateuchal legislation (Exodus 25-26, 30, 35, 37, 39-40; Leviticus 16; Numbers 3-4, 7, 10; Deuteronomy 10, 31) addresses these matters: (1) the ark is made according to exact specifications; (2) the ark contains the covenant between Yahweh and Israel; (3) the meeting place between Yahweh and Moses is before the ark; (4) the ark is separated from the people in the sanctuary and/or behind/under a curtain or screen; (5) the Levites are responsible for the proper care and transport of the ark, including its transportation on their shoulders using poles placed through rings in the ark; (6) the ark travels ahead of Israel on her journeys by a period/distance of three days. The last point is declarative rather than legislative. Levitical portage ( kaldı) of the ark also appears in Joshua 3-4, 6, 8; 1 Samuel 4; 2 Samuel 15; 1 Kings 2, 8; 1 Chronicles 15; 2 Chronicles 5.

33 This view is argued at length in Kleven 1991, 1992. He emphasises the centrality of vv. 13-14 in the story since they (supposedly) describe three changes David made after the failed attempt to transfer the ark (transport on foot, sacrifices, priestly garment). Consequently, David overlooked the law, but in the end he learned and changed. Wright 2002 argues that the second attempt to move the ark is marked by reformation in ritual and intensification of devotion and piety. There are significant problems with Wright's approach: (1) assumptions concerning the story's historical setting and date; (2) ad hoc use of the versions alongside the facile emendation of the MT; (3) heavy reliance on the 'late' Michal material to construe the interpretation of David's dance; (4) recourse to 'late' and 'priestly' material to explain terminology and concepts in MT Samuel; (5) assertion that cultic error/flaw is the basis for David's reforms; and (6) misreading the circumstantial clauses as finite (see 5.0), thus failing to recognise that the story does not describe the movement of the ark in the interval from start to finish.

34 For other passages and some discussion see Cazelles 1992.
(4) 2 Samuel 6 and Psalm 132: One segment of scholarship on 2 Samuel 6 takes its point of departure from Mowinckel.\textsuperscript{35} He associated the ark procession in 2 Samuel 6 with an annual enthronement festival of Yahweh, and more particularly with Psalm 132.\textsuperscript{36} However, most are doubtful about the concept of an annual enthronement festival of Yahweh, and most believe 2 Samuel 6 is the source, rather than the reflex, of Psalm 132. Furthermore, most seem to think that the (seed of the) story of David's transfer of the ark is history rather than fiction or myth.

(5) 2 Samuel 6 and 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18: This material seeks to demonstrate Yahweh's choice of David and Jerusalem. A chiastic structure is identified and developed by Flanagan.\textsuperscript{37} Many recognise the verbal, thematic and structural links, and the central role of 2 Samuel 6, within this material.\textsuperscript{38} Finally, the placement of the ark transfer within the chronology of the life of David is disputed. Most place it near the beginning of his career, as related in Samuel and Chronicles, but many recognise that the presentation of events in Samuel is dischronologised in favour of a thematic arrangement.\textsuperscript{39} Accordingly, Merrill argues that David took the ark to Jerusalem late in his reign.\textsuperscript{40}

(6) 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2: The history of the ark in this material seems straightforward. The ark is taken from Shiloh into battle against the Philistines, but the

\textsuperscript{35} Mowinckel 1922. Seow 1989: 2-4 (cf. 145-203) summarises the views of Mowinckel, Engnell, Bentzen and Kraus.

\textsuperscript{36} Compare 2 Samuel 6 // Ps. 132.1-9 and 2 Samuel 7 // Ps. 132.10-18. Other Psalms are mentioned in this regard, but their setting is far from clear, and numerous hypotheses have been proposed to explain their relationship to 2 Samuel 6.

\textsuperscript{37} Flanagan 1983.

\textsuperscript{38} Earlier scholars recognised some of these, e.g., Carlson 1964: 58 on \textit{verba associandi}. On the themes in this material see Brueggemann 1992: 970; Smelik 1989: 139-140 = 1992: 51-53.


\textsuperscript{40} Merrill 1989; cf. 1987: 238-248.
Israelites are defeated and the ark is lost (1 Sam. 4.1b-22). After a seven month sojourn in the land of the Philistines (1 Samuel 5), the Philistines under divine duress return the ark to the Israelites, and in turn they convey it to Beth-shemesh and then abandon it in Kiriath-jearim (1 Sam. 6.1-7.2). The ark remains in Kiriath-jearim (or does it? [MT 1 Sam. 14.18]) for a number of decades until David brings it to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 6). There are many thematic, structural and terminological links between the two ark stories, and also notable differences, such as the place and personal names and the Levites’ absence from 2 Samuel 6.\(^{41}\) As stated previously, much scholarship on 2 Samuel 6 takes its point of departure from Rost's hypothesis of an AN, but many now think the stories are a literary layer rather than an independent source.\(^{42}\) Most assume that 2 Samuel 6 was composed in response to 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2, but some explore the possibility that the canonically earlier story presupposes, foreshadows or reinterprets the later one.\(^{43}\) Also, some explore the significance of the ark stories in an exilic or post-exilic context: just as Yahweh overcame the Philistine oppressors and journeyed to Jerusalem in triumph, so too the people of the exile would be freed from their Babylonian captors and journey back to Jerusalem.\(^{44}\) However, this writer thinks the relationship between these chapters can be framed more precisely. Scholars recognise that the principal topic is Yahweh rather than

---


\(^{43}\) Schicklberger 1973: 144-148; also Auld 2003: 233. Albertz 1994: I, 300 n. 31 and Polzin 1989: 68 seem to affirm this view. P. R. Davies 1976: 16-17 thinks 1 Sam. 5.1-7.2 developed from 2 Samuel 6. Linguistic, literary and ideological issues are thought to favour this view. For this writer, the significant language items are מֲשָׁא (1 Sam. 6.3-4, 8, 17), מַיִם חָלָה (1 Sam. 6.15), מַעֲרַת (1 Sam. 6.21-7.2), and perhaps אֲרֵרָת הָרָה (1 Sam. 4.3, 4, 5). In particular, this writer believes the totality of the evidence indicates that the ark was originally associated with Baal(ah) Judah (2 Sam. 6.2; 1 Chron. 13.6), then with Kiriath-jearim (1 Sam. 6.21-7.2; 1 Chron. 13.5-6), and finally with Gibeah (2 Sam. 5.25; 6.3-4).

the ark itself (theodicy) and that there is a progression from an old to a new epoch (transition) in these stories. Many comment on the deity's autonomy in both sets of passages. In 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2, he refuses to fight, he allows himself to be captured, he consents to be moved back and forth, he pours out wrath on both the Philistines and the people of Beth-shemesh, and he miraculously guides the milch cows upon his return. In 2 Samuel 6, he maliciously slaughters Uzzah and then strangely blesses Obed-edom. Polzin rightly says '1 Samuel 4–6 looks to the triumphant David of 2 Samuel 6'.

Consequently, David's victory may be construed as his situating the deity in a permanent abode, whereby the deity becomes predictable and manageable. See below. Furthermore, whereas the loss of the ark signals the end of the house of Eli (1 Sam. 4.12-18), the recovery of the ark under Davidic patronage occasions the end of Saul's house (2 Sam. 6.20b-23). The house which remains is David's. In an exilic context, hope for the reinstatement of Davidic kingship symbolises the reinstatement of Yahweh's presence among his people.

(7) Purpose of 2 Samuel 6: Birch provides a good list and discussion of interpretations of 2 Samuel 6. The narrative of David's transfer of the ark to Jerusalem is interpreted as an ideological vehicle which blends continuity and contrast (e.g., ancient and 'modern', northern and southern) in order to substantiate political, religious and social change in ancient Israel. This change revolves around three groups of people and places in Samuel:

Eli and Samuel, Shiloh, Ephraim, 1 Sam. 1.1-8.22.
Saul, Gibeah, Benjamin, 1 Sam. 9.1–2 Sam. 5.12.
David, Jerusalem, Judah, 2 Sam. 5.13-24.25.

Consequently, the common denominator in treatments of 2 Samuel 6 is the legitimisation of Davidic rule and its locus in Jerusalem. This explanation of 2 Samuel 6 is compelling,

---

yet inadequate, for this reason: The ark's importance in 2 Samuel 6 is assumed—never asserted or explained—and consequently one must presume that the events in the earlier ark story and the events in the narrative lapse between that story and the present one seek to construe the manner in which David's ark transfer should be interpreted. Consequently, this writer prefers to construe David's act in 2 Samuel 6 as a triumph for him in relation to both the deity and the former monarch: 2 Samuel 6 narrates a dialectic between the enigmatic character and doings of Yahweh, who mysteriously kills and blesses, and between the firm intentions of King David, who succeeds in settling the potent deity in a fixed abode and in displacing the regime of the Saulide dynasty. David's triumphs over deity and king re-orient in his favour the religious and political spheres of Israel. In essence, David successfully elicits Yahweh's blessing of his/His (sacred and royal) houses.48 The last statement is confirmed by Yahweh himself in 2 Sam. 7.11b-16, and several other investigations explicitly affirm this interpretation of 2 Samuel 6.49

(8) Editorial activity in 2 Samuel 6: Excluding the insertion of vv. 16, 20b-23, most limit editorial activity to vv. 5, 15, and perhaps vv. 13-14. In addition, some consider the relative clause in v. 21 a gloss.

(9) Text and sense in 2 Samuel 6: Many recognise that 2 Samuel 6 is rife with textual difficulties. Furthermore, it is not uncommon to read the following words for the

48 Murray 1998 construes David's removal of the ark as an exceedingly negative act of ambition and intended divine manipulation. There is a drastic difference between David's overt actions and his covert intentions. A harmonious relationship between David and Yahweh appears on the surface, but undercurrents within this relationship gradually rise and become the governing drift in the tide of events in 2 Sam. 5.17-7.29. When at war in 2 Sam. 5.17-25 David seems most at home with Yahweh, but his return home in 2 Samuel 6–7 is to a kind of war with Yahweh. In short, 'David's difference with Yahweh' is rooted in his royal pretension versus Yahweh's robust assertion of divine prerogative. Murray 1998: 307-311 summarises his argument. Murray supports his thesis by a persistent focus on allegedly negative features of the text, including not least Yahweh's bursting forth against Uzzah. However, his approach is extremely subjective, and beset with methodological difficulties, including dependence on underlying textual meanings and references to David's 'interior monologue' and 'covert intentions'. Contrary to Murray, this writer argues that David does not suffer defeats and setbacks in the Uzzah and Michal episodes, but rather, he overcomes both Yahweh and Saul in achieving his religious and political agendas.

language and portrayals in 2 Samuel 6: abrupt, terse, laconic, cryptic, enigmatic, puzzling, ambiguous, unclear, etc. However, few connect the two phenomena, still fewer connect these to the editorial history of the passage, and still fewer investigate the implications of these issues for understanding the history of the text and story in 1 Chronicles 13, [14]. 15–16.

1.2.3 David's Transfer of the Ark in Chronicles

Research on David's ark transfer focuses on Samuel. In turn, research on the synoptic material in Chronicles concerns itself with explaining the 'reworking' of the original story. First, what are the reasons for the changes—additions, subtractions and modifications—in Chronicles vis-à-vis Samuel? Scholars increasingly recognise that some of these differences were already in the Vorlage of the book of Chronicles. The synoptic material in 13.5-14, 15.25-16.3, and 16.43 is investigated in detail in chapters 3–6. Second, what are the reasons for the location of the material in 14.1-17 and for the insertion of 13.1-4, 15.1-24 and 16.4-42? Third, what literary strata are evident in 15.1-24 and 16.4-42? What in these chapters is Chronistic and what is post-Chronistic? Fourth, what is the origin and significance of the songs in 16.7-36? Are they primary or secondary to the synoptic material in Psalms? Fifth, what interests and themes moulded the story of David's ark transfer in Chronicles? What influence did 'P' exert on the Chronicler's history? Finally, it should be pointed out that de Wette used Chronicles' ark story for showing the unreliability of the book50, and Fishbane, and in more detail Brettler, use Chronicles' ark story to elucidate the editorial procedures of biblical

50 De Wette 1806: 85-91.
The following remarks deal with several important aspects of 1 Chronicles 13–16.

(1) Structure of 1 Chronicles 13–16: This material may be outlined as follows:

| 13.1-14 | David attempts to transport the ark to Jerusalem |
| 14.1-17 | David consolidates his kingdom under Yahweh's blessing |
| 15.1-24 | David prepares to transport the ark to Jerusalem (tent, assembly, transporters, musicians) |
| 15.25-16.3 | David transports the ark to Jerusalem |
| 16.4-43 | David prepares for Yahweh's cultic service (musicians, songs, servants) |

A synoptic comparison of 2 Samuel 5–6, 23 and 1 Chronicles 11–16 reveals several differences between the two presentations.

| David is made king over Israel at Hebron |
| 2 Sam. 5.1-5 // 1 Chron. 11.1-3 |
| David captures Jebus/Jerusalem |
| 2 Sam. 5.6-10 // 1 Chron. 11.4-9 |
| David consolidates his kingdom |
| 2 Sam. 5.11-25 // 1 Chron. 14.1-17 |
| The role of David's mighty warriors |
| 1 Chron. 11.10-12.41 // 2 Sam. 23.8-39 |
| David proposes to bring the ark to Jerusalem |
| 1 Chron. 13.1-4 |
| David goes to fetch the ark and Uzzah is slaughtered |
| 2 Sam. 6.1-11 // 1 Chron. 13.5-14 |
| David consolidates his kingdom |
| 1 Chron. 14.1-17 // 2 Sam. 5.11-25 |
| David prepares to bring the ark to Jerusalem |
| 1 Chron. 15.1-24 |
| David brings the ark to Jerusalem and blesses the people |
| 2 Sam. 6.12-19a // 1 Chron. 15.25-16.3 |
| David prepares for Yahweh's cultic service |
| 1 Chron. 16.4-42 |
| The people return home and David returns to bless his house |
| 2 Sam. 6.19b-20a // 1 Chron. 16.43 |
| Michal the daughter of Saul chides David |
| 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 |
| The role of David's mighty warriors |
| 2 Sam. 23.8-39 // 1 Chron. 11.10-12.41 |

Chronicles diverges from Samuel in (a) the alternate placement of the material in 11.10-12.41 and 14.1-17; (b) the pluses in 13.1-4, 15.1-24 and 16.4-42; and (c) the minus of 2 Sam. 6.20b-23.

---

(2) 13.1-4 plus: The following matters are spotlighted. (a) **Consultation**. David's decision is made in consultation and agreement with the entire gamut of Israel's leaders. (b) **Democratisation**. The people are not limited to playing the role of accompanying crowd or audience. The focus of the nation's worship, later identified with the temple, is thus understood as the inheritance of all the people, not just one section within it. (c) 'All Israel'. The feature of assembling all the people for major occasions is a recurrent theme in Chronicles (e.g., 1 Chron. 23.1; 28.1; 2 Chron. 1.2; 5.2; 30.1-5). Regarding the relationship between David and the people, there is a constant process of broadening: David, the commanders, the present assembly, the people who remain in all the land of Israel, (the priests and Levites, the whole assembly, all the people,) all Israel from the Shihor of Egypt to the entrance of Hamath.52 (d) **Priests and Levites**. These are introduced since 'everything must be done according to P'.53 The priests appear in 13.2; 15.11, 14, 24; 16.6, 39 and the Levites in 13.2; 15.2, 4, 11-12, 14-17, 22, 26 (// 2 Sam. 6.13), 27 (// 2 Sam. 6.14); 16.4. (e) **Motif of 'seeking'**. Seeking God and by proper means is key to 1 Chronicles 10–16. Observe הַנִּסָּה in 10.13, 14; 13.3; 15.13; 16.11.54 (f) **Saul as foil**. This theme is related to the previous one. Faithful kings seek God.55

(3) **14.1-17 placement**: David consolidates his kingdom in the three month period between his initial effort (13.5-14) and final success (15.25-16.3) in transporting the ark. He receives gifts from Hiram, his family grows, and he achieves a double victory over the Philistines. This arrangement is considered part of a wider pattern in Chronicles in which a king's military victories and his sovereignty over other peoples are understood as consequences that result from seeking Yahweh.56 However: (a) The Chronicler probably

---

52 Japhet 1993: 274.
53 Curtis and Madsen 1910: 204.
54 Another key term in this material is יִהְצָה, in 13.2, 11; 14.11; 15.13.
56 Selman 1994: 149.
did not make the same distinction between sacred and secular which we moderns make. (b) Some question whether the arrangement of the stories in Chronicles is secondary.\textsuperscript{57} (c) The Chronicler's technique of dischronologisation\textsuperscript{58} is also evident in 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18 (see above). \textit{Both stories are equally tendentious in this regard.}

(4) 15.1-24 plus: David makes several other arrangements in the same three month period following his initial effort (13.5-14) and final success (15.25-16.3) in transporting the ark. He arranges a tent for the ark, gathers the people, and prepares levitical transporters and levitical musicians for the ark's removal to Jerusalem. These arrangements were in keeping with 'P' and the festivity of the occasion. The Chronicler's resolution of the failure of the first attempt to move the ark to Jerusalem is achieved by recourse to Torah. This theme, in turn, is related to the Chronicler's interest in retribution.\textsuperscript{59}

(5) 16.4-42 plus: Following the successful transport of the ark to Jerusalem (15.25-16.3), but prior to the story's end (16.43), David prepares levitical musicians and servants for Yahweh's cultic service, and he also designates songs to be sung by the levitical choirs.\textsuperscript{60} The greater narrative space given in Chronicles to the transfer of the ark, and the sustained interest throughout in the Levites, suggest that the telling of David's religious and political act is a vehicle for (anachronistically) legitimating the cultic role of the Levites in (post-exilic) Israelite religion.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{57} Auld 2000b: 141-142.
\textsuperscript{58} Glatt 1993: 57-60. Kalimi 1993 discusses the phenomenon of 'literary-chronological proximity' in Chronicles.
\textsuperscript{59} Kelly 1996: 72-79.
\textsuperscript{60} Kleinig 1993: 133-148.
1.3 Versions of Samuel and Chronicles

1.3.1 Introduction

The textual witnesses to the books of Samuel and Chronicles stand at the centre of this thesis (see chapter 2). The study of the versions is complicated since each one has a lengthy and unique textual and exegetical history in the hands of successive generations of editors and copyists.62

The received or rabbinic Hebrew version, 'the Masoretic Text' (MT), comes to us in toto following a lengthy period of Masoretic activity (ca. 500-1000 CE) in relatively late manuscripts. The earliest and most important are the Aleppo (925 CE) and Leningrad (1009 CE) codices. In actual fact, 'the MT' is misleading since there is not just one text but a variety of manuscripts which represent the 'Masoretic Family' or 'Masoretic Group' of texts. Nonetheless, there is relative uniformity among these since sometime near the end of the first or early in the second century CE the rabbis selected one text ('the proto-MT') from among several alternative texts of each book of the Bible, and established it as the normative or authoritative text of that book ('the textus receptus'), thus eliminating variant lines of tradition in normative Judaism. See 2.3.2.1.

For several centuries biblical scholars have recognised the value of ancient translations for grasping the earlier history of the texts which became the basis of the Masoretic family of texts. The earliest and most important of these is the translation of the Bible into Greek, which was accomplished in Alexandria in Egypt by men of Palestinian origin in the third and second centuries BCE. The original translation comprised only the Torah, and only it was known as the Septuagint (LXX). However, since the first centuries CE the term 'Septuagint' has come to signify the Greek Scriptures in their entirety, including other ancient Greek translations and revisions as well as books which are not

part of Hebrew Bible canon. Consequently, it is customary to refer to the first or original translation of each book contained in the Septuagint as the 'Old Greek' (OG) translation. The important manuscripts, containing all or almost all books of the Septuagint, are Vaticanus (B; 4th century CE), Sinaiticus (S; 4th century CE) and Alexandrinus (A; 5th century CE).

It is impossible to speak about the Septuagint's character as a whole since each book within it reflects its translator's unique philosophy and capability. Nevertheless, overall the translators sought accuracy. In turn, this concern eventually encouraged a number of revisions of the Septuagint. These were undertaken in the second century CE by three Jews, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and in the third century CE by Origen and in the fourth century CE by Lucian and perhaps Hesychius, all Christians. These revisers sought to (1) correct mistakes, (2) improve and update language and style, (3) adapt the Greek texts to the current Hebrew texts of the Bible, and (4) explain difficulties and make the text more appropriate for public usage. The fact that these revisions were based directly or indirectly on Hebrew texts meant that they increasingly differed from the Hebrew texts which underlay the original translations into Greek.63

The discovery beginning in 1947 of biblical scrolls in the region of the Dead Sea has enormously increased our knowledge of the biblical text. Thus far, scholars have reconstructed more than two hundred biblical manuscripts from many thousands of fragments which range in date from the end of the third century BCE into the first century CE. These manuscripts attest all books in the Hebrew canon of Scripture with the exception of Esther (and Nehemiah) although there are many more copies of books of the Torah, Isaiah and Psalms than the other seventeen books combined. Perhaps the greatest surprise of the manuscript discoveries, and certainly the most significant for the present

---

63 (1) Ur- or proto-Lucian and Lucian and (2) Ur-, proto- or καίγε-Theodotion and Theodotion, cannot be discussed here.
investigation, are the pluriform texts of the manuscripts. Whereas, for example, 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} and 4QJer\textsuperscript{a} show remarkable agreement with the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah in the MT, 4QSama\textsuperscript{a} and 4QJer\textsuperscript{b} agree significantly with the Greek translations of these books. The discovery and publication of the biblical scrolls from the Dead Sea is the watershed event for Septuagintal studies, indeed, for the study of the text of the Bible in general, and especially for Samuel.

This thesis centres on the Hebrew and Greek witnesses to Samuel and Chronicles. However, as for the Greek witnesses, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Josephus are mentioned occasionally, but as corroborative rather than primary evidence. In addition, occasional reference is made to the Aramaic, Syriac (Peshitta, Jacob of Edessa), and Latin (Old Latin [OL], Vulgate) evidence, but once again, these witnesses are corroborative rather than primary. The citations from ancient biblical texts and versions are from the following editions and studies:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Masoretic Text</th>
<th>BHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QSAm²</td>
<td>Herbert 1997b</td>
<td>Fincke 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ulrich 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McKenzie 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McCarter 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
<td>Brooke, McLean and Thackeray 1906-1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holmes and Parsons 1798, 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rahlfs 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquila</td>
<td>Field 1875</td>
<td>Reider and Turner 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmachus</td>
<td></td>
<td>The above Septuagint editions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Cyrrhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thackeray and Marcus 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Niese 1885-1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aramaic</td>
<td>Targum</td>
<td>Sperber 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le Déaut and Roberts 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac</td>
<td>Peshitta</td>
<td>de Boer 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Edessa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Old Latin</td>
<td>Sabatier and de La Rue 1743-1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vercellone 1860-1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morano Rodríguez 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brepols Vetus Latina Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weber 1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2 Versions of Samuel

The state of the **Masoretic Text** of Samuel is routinely the object of highly negative evaluations. It is 'difficult' or 'senseless' or 'faulty' or 'incomplete' or 'corrupt' or 'slightly corrupt' or 'highly corrupt'. Few disagree that MT Samuel is one of the most corrupt and worst preserved biblical books. Most consider MT Samuel defective and haplographic, the latter due to innumerable instances of homoioteleuton. Many cite McCarter's statement:

The received Hebrew text of Samuel in its Masoretic dress (MT) is in poor repair. It is a short text, but its shortness is not the wholesome shortness of a text free of
expansion and interpolation; rather it is the result of countless copying errors and
omissions, some of them extensive, scattered throughout the book.64

Textual scholars are accustomed to the fact that a *textus receptus* is usually a conflate
text, but the reverse is true of MT Samuel. Consequently, for the purpose of emendation
scholars for nearly two centuries have relied on the LXX, which was based on a 'better' or
'purer' text of Samuel.

The *Old Greek* translators rendered their Hebrew *Vorlage* 'literally' but not
'woodenly'. They were 'faithful' to their base text. They did not paraphrase. The language
of the translation is 'indifferent' or 'non-idiomatic' Greek. It is not literary *κοινή*.65 LXX
Samuel is generally longer and often smoother than the MT. Furthermore, 'the Hebrew
underlying the Septuagint is a full text, sometimes conflate, frequently original', such that
the Septuagint translation and the MT 'stand at opposite poles in their textual
development'.66 The most significant Greek manuscripts for the text-critical evaluation of
Samuel are Vaticanus (B; LXXB) and Alexandrinus (A; LXXA). In Samuel, LXXB
provides a direct link to the OG translation. LXXA shows systematic revision toward the
developing MT.

The previous characterisation must be refined and extended. First, Thackeray,
followed by Barthélemy, demonstrated that the Greek books of Kingdoms (Samuel–
Kings) in LXXB were revised by the 'καϊγε-recensionist' from 2 Sam. 11.1 onward.67
Subsequently, Shenkel set the initial limit at 10.1.68 Herbert demonstrated that based on
current evidence it can only be said that the reviser took up his task somewhere between
9.6 and 10.6.69 In any case, this issue does not directly affect the present investigation

---

64 McCarter 1980a: 5.
66 Cross 1995: 133 n. 2.
67 Barthélemy 1963; Thackeray 1907
68 Shenkel 1968.
69 Herbert 2002.
since 2 Samuel 6 is outside the parameters of the reviser's efforts. Second, scholars have recognised the value of the Lucianic manuscripts for the text-critical evaluation of MT Samuel.\(^7^0\) The manuscripts having the Lucianic recension (LXX\(^L\)) in Samuel are 19 (\(b'\)), 82 (\(a\)), 93 (\(e_2\)), 108 (\(b\)) and 127 (\(c_2\)), frequently referenced as boce\(_2\)e\(_2\). On one hand, scholars show that in the \(\kappa\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon\) section these cursives provide superior access to the OG. On the other hand, these manuscripts have a remarkably full appearance, and they not infrequently have conflate readings; that is, they have two readings side by side which otherwise are attested individually in the MT and LXX\(^B\). In other words, Lucian revised the Greek version via the Hexapla toward the developing MT tradition, but he frequently did so not by deleting the original reading and inserting the revised one in its place (cf. LXX\(^A\)) but rather by inserting the revised reading *alongside* the original one. This is a complex issue. The important point is this: late and conflate LXX\(^L\) is often valuable for confirming an OG reading vis-à-vis a more recent or developed reading which is found in the MT or other Greek manuscripts.

The discovery and publication of four Dead Sea scrolls of Samuel is most significant for the study of the text of this book. These manuscripts are 1QSam/1Q7, 4QSama/4Q51, 4QSamb/4Q52 and 4QSamc/4Q53. Since three of these preserve relatively little of Samuel, and in fact do not contain any of 2 Samuel 6, the present discussion focuses on 4QSama, but this should not diminish the value of the other three manuscripts.\(^7^1\) 4QSama was written between 50 and 25 BCE. The extant fragments represent portions of 33 of 55 chapters or approximately 30% of all verses of Samuel. Altogether, less than 10% of the original manuscript has survived. Nevertheless, the significance of the manuscript outdoes this shortfall.

---

\(^7^0\) Busto Saiz 1990; Fernández Marcos 1998; 2000: 223-238; cf. the introductory material in Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1989, 1996.

The official editors, Cross and Parry, have published extensively on the scroll\(^{72}\), as have a number of other scholars, most notably Tov, Ulrich, Pisano, Polak, Rofé, Trebolle Barrera, Catastini, Herbert and Fincke. The key issue is the character of the manuscript in terms of its affinity with other texts of Samuel, mainly the MT and the Septuagint translation(s), but also with Chronicles and other ancient witnesses to Samuel, especially the OL and Josephus. This is a complicated matter.\(^{73}\) Nevertheless, several generalisations are valid.

- 4QSama is 'non-aligned', neither proto-Masoretic nor 'Septuagintal'.\(^{74}\)
- 4QSama has independent features which are often overlooked.\(^{75}\)
- 4QSama is closely related to the Vorlage of the OG. Consequently, the manuscript vindicates critics such as Thenius, Wellhausen, Driver and H. P. Smith who previously valued highly the Greek translation in their text-critical evaluations of MT Samuel.\(^{76}\)
- 4QSama is not related in a large-scale way to LXX\(^L\).\(^{77}\)
- 4QSama is closely related to the presumed Samuel Vorlage of the book of Chronicles in synoptic material.\(^{78}\)

To sum up, Polak says:

Samuel\(^a\) contains some readings that can only be described as variant developments of the reading reflected by the Septuagint; some important variants in the Qumran scroll are not represented in the Masoretic Text or the Septuagint but are reflected in the Greek paraphrase of Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* (as well as many other variants that also are reflected by the Septuagint ...). The text of the Old Greek used by Josephus was probably even closer to the Qumran scroll than to the Septuagint in its present state. Attempts to minimize the text-critical relevance of the scroll as exegetical and thus secondary vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text seem less plausible. ... But statistical analysis of the available data\(^{79}\) ... indicates an undeniable affinity between the Septuagint and Samuel\(^a\): out of more than 180 simple variants (disregarding complex redactional phenomena, long

\(^{72}\) Cross 1953 was the first publication.

\(^{73}\) See the caution in Ulrich 1998a: 90.


\(^{75}\) Parry 2002.


\(^{77}\) Herbert 1997a: 37.

\(^{78}\) See the above references and the next section of this thesis.

\(^{79}\) Polak 1992.
stretches, and so forth), more than 120 are common to the Septuagint and the scroll. Accordingly, both witnesses seem to belong to one branch of the tradition, but the Septuagint reflects an older state of this text, whereas Samuel\(^a\) represents a further development of it. Since the variants characteristic of this branch include many explanatory readings, it appears to embody a recension of an ancient Hebrew text, which makes itself felt in Chronicles and not in the Masoretic Text of Samuel ... But the Samuel\(^a\) and Septuagint variants also include many primary readings that have not been preserved in the Masoretic Text. ... Many of the independent readings of Samuel\(^a\) are to be considered secondary, but some are better viewed as primary. ...  

There are several dissenting views regarding the agreements of (1) Greek Samuel and 4QSam\(^a\) against MT Samuel and (2) 4QSam\(^a\) and Chronicles against MT Samuel. Regarding the first issue, both prior to and since the discovery of 4QSam\(^a\), some scholars have favoured the MT over other text traditions: Barthélemy, de Boer, Erdmann, Frankel, Gooding, Keil, van der Kooij, Löhr (the reviser of Thenius' commentary), Nöldeke, Nyberg, Rofé and Stoebe.\(^81\) Pisano challenges the agreements given above. He concludes after an analysis of 69 passages where LXX or 4QSam\(^a\) differ from the MT by way of a major plus or minus 'that in the vast majority of cases a large plus or minus occurring in the LXX or 4QSam\(^a\) vis-à-vis MT indicates a further literary activity by LXX or 4QSam\(^a\)'.\(^82\) In general, Pisano's arguments are unconvincing.\(^83\) The present investigation argues that in fact MT Samuel shows a high degree of literary initiative. Regarding the second issue, some suggest or at least raise the possibility that some non-MT Samuel readings in 4QSam\(^a\) are the result of Chronicles' influence.\(^84\) This is unlikely.\(^85\) Finally,
Fincke wishes to convince us that the manuscript 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} was the Vorlage of the Greek translation of Samuel.\textsuperscript{86}

In addition to Pisano, two other major contributions evaluate 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and other versions as textual witnesses to Samuel. Ulrich describes the textual nature of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} by charting the scroll's relationship to the MT, to the various forms of the Greek version, and to the narrative of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. He concludes that the group comprised of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, the OG, LXX\textsuperscript{c}, the OL, Chronicles and Josephus 'often, especially where the Massoretic text is troubled, provides or points toward an ancient, preferanda form of the text of Samuel'.\textsuperscript{87} Several conclusions related to Chronicles are\textsuperscript{88}:

- During the first century before the first century of the Christian era, texts of Samuel were extant which at points were much closer to our present Chronicles than to our present MT Samuel.

- 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} is a Samuel text of a tradition different from MT Samuel, and LXX and proto-LXX\textsuperscript{L} Samuel are significantly closer to the 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} tradition than to MT Samuel.

- MT Chronicles never agrees with MT Samuel against 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, except for the addition of one preposition (א in 2 Sam. 10.5). On the other hand, MT Chronicles agrees with 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} against MT Samuel in 42 readings.

- Furthermore, none of the 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and MT Chronicles agreements betrays characteristics commonly associated with Chronicles' specific interests. 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} is not a late conflation of an old Samuel text corrupted and supplemented by Chronicles' readings. It cannot be proved either that 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} is a conflation of MT Samuel and MT Chronicles or that MT Chronicles is dependent on 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}.

- Josephus is solidly and significantly affiliated with the 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} tradition. Josephus used a text of Samuel strikingly close to 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, but that text was in the Greek language, closely connected with LXX and proto-LXX\textsuperscript{L}. Samuel and clearly distinct from both MT Samuel and the καὶ γε and hexaplaric recensions. Furthermore, although Josephus supplemented his narrative with details from Chronicles on rare occasions, these insertions stem from a source in Greek.


\textsuperscript{87} Ulrich 1978: 259.

\textsuperscript{88} Ulrich 1978: 154, 163-164, 190-191.
Nysse's unpublished doctoral thesis focuses on the relationship between the Greek and Hebrew witnesses in 2 Samuel 1–9. He summarises:

The central contention of this study is that, in 2 Sam 1-9, MSS B, y and a2 [= G:B+] witness to a distinct Vorlage more clearly than other Greek manuscript groups, specifically b, b', o, c2 and e2 (G:L) and MSS A, c and x (G:Acx). That Vorlage is distinct from the Massoretic text (MT) and from the tradition shared by 4QSam and Chronicles (Pal). G:B+ is, thus, the best witness to the Old Greek (OG). The witness of G:L to the OG is obscured by proto-Lucianic, hexaplaric and other revisions. G:Acx has undergone extensive hexaplaric revision. Overall, G:B+ cannot be characterized as having undergone revision toward the MT. The OG Vorlage is distinct from the MT and, to a lesser extent, from Pal. These conclusions are reached through a study of the pluses and minuses that arise when G:B+ is compared to G:L (and G:Acx) and when both are in turn compared to the MT. The affiliation of Pal and the Old Latin (OL) is noted when available. Apart from the Lament of David at the end of chapter one, G:B+ strongly attests the OG. It lacks all of the marked hexaplaric readings, differs from 'true' Theodotionic readings, has not been infiltrated by KOLYE, and contains a substantial number of readings that point to a Vorlage that disagrees with the MT. When G:B+ does agree with the MT over against G:L, the readings are more suggestive of revision in G:L than they are of G:B+ revision toward the MT. G:B+ has a relationship to Pal by virtue of its attestation of the OG, but it has no special, post-OG relationship to Pal. G:L does demonstrate some post-OG revision that correlates with the text of Pal, but also goes beyond it. The OL corroborates these G:L readings. G:Acx is not an independent witness to the OG. The OG Vorlage differs from both the MT and Pal. The latter two also disagree with each other and, thus, there is evidence of three text types. The OG, however, also shares a significant number of readings with Pal. The OG, thus, has a relationship with Pal that extends beyond the mutual contact with the original text that is still present in all three text types despite their many independent departures from it.89

Ulrich and Nysse have shown, unquestionably, the convergence of other ancient witnesses against MT Samuel. They, as Cross their Doctor Father, underestimated the independent readings of 4QSam, and they overestimated the affinity between 4QSam and the Greek translation (see above), but overall their conclusions are sound.

1.3.3 Versions of Chronicles

Compared to Samuel, the textual traditions of Chronicles are homogeneous. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is offered in 2.3.2.1. The Masoretic Text of

Chronicles is 'fairly well preserved', with the frequently discussed exceptions of numbers and proper names.\(^90\) Only one small fragment of Chronicles was discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls, 4QChr/4Q118, containing portions of 2 Chron. 28.27-29.3 with slight variations from the MT.\(^91\) It is unclear whether the virtual absence of the book of Chronicles among the Dead Sea Scrolls is by accident or design, perhaps related to the book's deficient authoritativeness or its focus on Jerusalem and the Temple.\(^92\) The Greek translation of Chronicles (Paraleipomena) is 'literal' and 'non-expansionistic' compared with MT Chronicles.\(^93\) It often has readings which are considered preferable to those of the MT, and which agree with MT and/or LXX Samuel–Kings against MT Chronicles. According to Gerleman, the genealogies and lists of names in LXX 1 Chronicles 1–9 show greater resemblance to the Samaritan Pentateuch than to the MT.\(^94\) Allen undertook a thorough study in which he showed that the OG is best preserved in his group 4 (G) which includes B, c\(_2\) and S, but the latter is extent only for 1 Chron. 9.27-19.17.\(^95\) His other three manuscript groups, group 1 (L or Lucianic; principally be\(_2\))\(^96\), group 2 (R; principally dpqtz) and group 3 (O or Hexaplaric; principally ANaceghn), are revisions toward the MT. Allen thinks Greek Chronicles has absorbed varying amounts of contamination from parallel texts in Samuel–Kings.\(^97\) Furthermore, he believes MT

---

\(^90\) On the basis of these S. Davidson 1862: II, 108 says 'We believe that the text is more corrupt that that of any other sacred book' (cf. 108-115). Payne 1978, 1979 give some attention to this issue, and more recently, Klein 1997 gives a short review of numbers over 1,000 in Chronicles for the purpose of determining the meaning of \(\text{n.}\). The present writer has investigated all numbers with \(\text{n.}\) and/or \(\text{l.}\) in MT 1 Samuel 31–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings, and 1 Chronicles 10–2 Chronicles 36. The results of this analysis must be given elsewhere. In any case, S. Davidson overstates the facts.


\(^92\) D. D. Swanson 1995 shows that the Temple Scroll used Chronicles as a source. However, since the Scroll is probably not a Qumran sectarian document, but rather, predates the community, it cannot be used as proof that Chronicles was in fact more favoured in the community.


\(^94\) Gerleman 1948.

\(^95\) Allen 1974.

\(^96\) That is, 19 (b'), 93 (e\(_2\)), 108 (\(\hat{b}\)). Similarly, Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1996.

Chronicles has undergone assimilation to Samuel–Kings in *several* instances: 1 Chron. 6.46 (LXX 6.61); 16.35; 2 Chron. 6.27; 27.8.98

The perennial issue regarding Chronicles is the *Vorlage* of the book. As stated already, the present writer is not certain that Chronicles' principal *Vorlage* was Samuel–Kings, but given that this is the consensus, it is necessary to reiterate that the textform of the book's *Vorlage* was certainly not proto-MT Samuel–Kings. Earlier scholars, and still some, assumed that the Chronicler used a text much like that reflected in MT Samuel–Kings, and attributed the differences between the two to the composer's rewriting. A dramatic change in thought has come about in the past half century. Recent commentaries and many other publications on Chronicles acknowledge that the textform of Chronicles' *Vorlage* was not identical to the text found in MT Samuel–Kings.99 This view was forcefully championed by Cross from the early 1950s on the heels of the Qumran discoveries, and two subsequent Harvard theses on Samuel100 and three on Chronicles101 have sustained his thesis. Many others give corroborative evidence, and the cumulative result of these studies is that it is unacceptable to 'discredit' the Chronicler with many (supposedly tendentious) deviations from his *Vorlage*.

### 1.4 Summary of Chapter one

This chapter surveys three areas of research related to Samuel and Chronicles: (1) the history of research and current views on the composition of these books; (2) the history of research on the story of David's ark transfer in Samuel and Chronicles, and the

---

98 Allen 1974: I, 217-218; cf. this writer's discussions in 3.1.2.3, 3.1.5.2, 3.1.6.2, 4.1.2.1, 5.1.1.1, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.7.

99 This view is so pervasive that it hardly requires validation, but nonetheless: Japhet 1993: 28-29; Williamson 1982: 2-3.

100 Nysse 1984; Ulrich 1978.

101 Klein 1966; Lemke 1963; McKenzie 1984. McKenzie goes further, arguing that the original version of Chronicles was based on Dtr† (his first or pre-exilic or Josianic edition of the DH), but his thesis is questionable (Williamson 1987).
meaning of each narrative in its own context; and (3) the history of research on the textual witnesses to Samuel and Chronicles, with particular emphasis on the Greek translations, and in the case of Samuel, on the Dead Sea Scrolls. This survey establishes the context for the investigation as a whole. The following conclusions are significant.

First, scholarship increasingly attributes more of Samuel to Deuteronomistic editors and less of the book to pre-existing material which was later incorporated into the book. Historically, however, scholars have discerned relatively little Deuteronomistic intervention in Samuel. The current trend is to move from sources to composition. Many practitioners of narrative criticism treat the book as a unified whole. Consequently, it is appropriate to ponder once again the literary history of the book of Samuel, and to reconsider the matter in light of fresh evidence—or at least with a fresh view on relatively new evidence.

Second, MT Samuel frequently diverges from other witnesses to the book, especially the Greek translation and the fragments preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is impossible to defend the view that Chronicles was based on proto-MT Samuel, if in fact Chronicles was even based on Samuel–Kings in the so-called DH. Furthermore, this thesis corroborates the results of Ulrich and Nysse, who identify many belated readings in MT Samuel. Consequently, it is problematic and wrong to use LXX Samuel, or 4QSam⁴, or Chronicles, solely to emend MT Samuel. MT Samuel is not simply the result of scribal carelessness.

Third, many recognise that 2 Samuel 6 is sated with textual and linguistic problems. It is remarkable, however, that scholarship has failed to find any significant connection between MT's condition and the nature of the language and portrayals in 2 Samuel 6. Furthermore, the divergence between the witnesses in this chapter and elsewhere has not been factored into this equation. Ulrich and Nysse, for example,
demonstrate the secondary nature of many readings in MT 2 Samuel 6, but neither they nor others seek to connect the diverse phenomena just described. Why is the total situation such as it is? This thesis argues an answer to this question. The text and sense of 2 Samuel 6 are the result of successive interventions by editors as they sought to relate the story of David's transfer of the ark to their needs or the needs of their communities. 2 Samuel 6 speaks about David, and his relationship to both the deity and the former monarch. These are not 'light' topics; thus the state and significance of MT 2 Samuel 6 are not uncomplicated. By focusing on the Chronicler as the reshaper of the story, scholars fail to perceive revisers' heavy hands in Samuel.
CHAPTER TWO
Approaches: Synchronic, Diachronic, Textual-Exegetical

2.0 Introduction

This chapter surveys issues related to synchronic and diachronic approaches to the books of Samuel and Chronicles and suggests that the impasse between these competing approaches to the interpretation of these books, especially Samuel, may be resolved by the textual-exegetical approach. By combining textual and literary criticism in the analysis of the stories about David and Saul, and especially 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16, the interpreter is enabled to roll back the process of formation of the texts and stories.

2.1 Synchronic Approach: Reading the Stories about David and Saul in a Biblical Context

Outside Samuel and Chronicles, the Bible refers by name to Israel's first monarch, Saul, only in Isa. 10.29 and in the headings to five Psalms (18, 52, 54, 57, 59). He is a character in Samuel and Chronicles in the following passages and blocks of material:
Focus falls on Saul and his family throughout:
1 Samuel 9–2 Samuel 4
2 Sam. 5.2

Saul's lineage and death are reported in:
1 Chron. 8.33; 9.39; 10.2-8, 11-12
1 Chron. 11.2
1 Chron. 12.1-2, 20, 24, 30
1 Chron. 13.3; 15.29
1 Chron. 16.5, 8; 19.18, 25; 21.1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-14; 22.1
1 Chron. 26.28

By and large Samuel and Chronicles sketch a positive portrait of David in comparison with Saul.102 Both books offer a highly negative appraisal of the latter—of both his character and his deeds—and explicitly and implicitly in the books' structures, themes and language. See 1.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3. Chronicles. The only non-negative reference to Saul is 1 Chron. 26.28, and many rightly question the literary integrity of this verse. Elsewhere, Saul, 'the non-cultic king', is simply a foil for David.103 Samuel. 'The legitimacy of David, an outsider/insider, over against Saul's house is a fundamental theme in the Samuel narrative'.104 The narrative in 1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 5 is often described as an apology for David against the external threat to his kingship posed by Saul's house. For example, the narrative develops three themes for the purpose of showing that David did not usurp the throne of Saul: (1) Saul's animosity, (2) David's

---

102 This does not mean that either book presents David as an idealised hero. This is sometimes overstated for Chronicles, but see Japhet 1997: 473-478; 1993: 48; Williamson 1982: 118. The presentation of David in Samuel is complex (Steussy 1999: 40-91). Not everybody, of course, takes such a positive view, e.g., Polzin 1989, 1993. As observed in 1.1, David spends more time clashing with and fleeing from Saul (1 Samuel 18-29) and Absalom (2 Samuel 13-19) than he does seated on the throne. In addition to some interpretations of 2 Samuel 6 and 24 (1 Chronicles 13, 15-16 and 21), the obvious exception to David's positive portrait in Samuel is the story about David, Bathsheba and Uriah in 2 Samuel 10-12. This material, however, may have been inserted secondarily in Samuel and in this particular narrative location, precisely in order to challenge a mostly positive portrayal of David in Samuel. See the note regarding 2 Samuel 10-12 in 1.2.2 (in the discussion of 2 Samuel 6 and 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18). In this writer's opinion, the tension between a mostly positive and slightly negative appraisal of David's character and kingship is due more to recurrent re-interpretations, adjustments and supplements rather than to a one-time wholly conceived history of David.


non-aggression, and (3) David's innocence.105 An important theme in Samuel is the characterisation of Saul and David vis-à-vis their military aptness against the Philistines, and others such as the Amalekites, Ammonites, Arameans, Edomites and Moabites. For example: Yahweh chooses Saul that he might deliver Israel from the Philistines (1 Sam. 9.16), yet Saul is incapable against them, unlike Jonathan and unlike David, and his end finally comes by their hands (1 Samuel 31). David is explicitly recognised for his victories over the Philistines during Saul's reign (1 Sam. 18.6, 30; 19.5; 21.12; 29.5), and upon assuming the kingship, he effectively eliminates the Philistine threat (2 Sam. 5.17-25; cf. 19.9), the purpose for which Yahweh chooses him too (2 Sam. 3.18). In spite of similar evaluations in 1 Sam. 14.47-48 and 2 Sam. 8.10b-12, the book makes clear that David rather than Saul removed the Philistine reproach from Israel (cf. MT 1 Sam. 17.26).

Research has shown that the pro-David/anti-Saul polemic in 1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 5 extends outside this corpus of material, even into 'earlier' and 'later' books, and far beyond a hypothetical tenth century BCE setting. The fact that David's kingship did not immediately eclipse the influence and memory of the Saulide dynasty is at least suggested by 2 Sam. 3.1.

(1) Saul and Samuel, in 1 Samuel 1–15. Samuel is somewhat concerned to show the failures of Saul independent from and antedating his relationship with David (1 Samuel 9–15). David did not cause Saul's failure; rather, Saul disqualified himself before David came on the scene. It has been argued that the link between the traditions concerning Saul and the HDR, namely 1 Samuel 15, is a secondary insertion by an editor with a strong pro-Davidic bias, the effect of whose intervention was to hasten the fall of Saul in order to make way for the kingship of David.106 Some argue that an original

106 Foresti 1984.
history of Saul in 1 Samuel 9–15 was rewritten as an anti-Saul story, and some argue that the birth narrative in 1 Samuel 1 originally spoke of Saul, but that it too was subjected to pro-Davidic editing.

(2) Saul and Absalom, in 1 Samuel 16–31 and 2 Samuel 13–20. Few remark on the literary links between the stories of David and Saul and the stories of David and Absalom. The links between 2 Samuel 2–4 and 2 Samuel 9–20 are developed by Gunn, McKenzie and Van Seters, among others. However, the connections which these observe at the peripheries of the HDR and SN/CH actually lie closer to their centres. Ho develops many affinities, and this writer summarises additional ones in appendix 5. In summary, it is suggested that Saul, Nabal and Absalom are types of one another, each opposed to David. Absalom is a second Saul. Thus both are pitted against David, as external and internal threats to his throne. They are 'negatives' of David.

(3) Saul and Samson, in 1 Samuel 16–31 and Judges 13–16. To begin, observe that MT and LXX 1 Sam. 12.11 speak of Jerubaal, Bedan (MT)/Barak (LXX), Jephthah and Samuel. In spite of 'Samson' rather than 'Samuel' in the NRSV, Samson is never mentioned outside the book of Judges. Brooks argues that these stories are intimately related. In particular, Saul's birth story is incorporated into that of Samuel (see above). When the image of Samuel is put to one side, it becomes clear that Saul's image closely parallels that of Samson in that they share not only a similar Nazirite birth, but also their heroic characters. In Brooks' opinion, the pro-Saul author could not openly write the true story of Saul; instead he camouflaged it behind the heroic image of Samson. The writer expands on Brooks' thesis in appendix 5. In short, a number of conceptual and linguistic

---

111 This translation is presumably based on the reading in the Greek cursive 19 (b'), 29 (b2) and 376 (c).
112 Brooks 1996.
elements suggest that Brooks' association of Saul with Samson merits further consideration. It is possible and perhaps better, however, to read the Samson story as anti-rather than pro-Saul.

(4) Saul and Gibeah, in 1 Samuel 16–31, and in Judges 19–20. David has his origin in Bethlehem in Judah (1 Samuel 16–17) and is associated with Hebron in Judah during his early kingship (2 Samuel 2–5). Saul is a Benjaminite closely attached to Gibeah (1 Sam. 10.5, 10, 26; 11.4; 13.2, 15; 14.2, 16; 15.34; 22.6; 23.19; 26.1, 3; MT 2 Sam. 21.6) and in a few cases to Geba (1 Sam. 13.3, 16; 14.5). Isa. 10.29 associates Saul with both these places. Conversely, Greek Samuel associates Saul with Gibeon in 2 Sam. 21.6, as do the genealogies in MT/LXX 1 Chron. 8.29–40 (esp. 29, 33) and 9.35–44 (esp. 35, 39). In addition, Gibeon is a significant locale related to Saul's affiliates or deeds in 2 Sam. 2.12-13, 16, 24; 3.30; 20.8; 21.1-4, 9, and it is also the site of a significant מזרע related to Solomon in 1 Kgs. 3.4-5; 9.2 // 2 Chron. 1.3, 13 (cf. 1 Chron. 16.39; 21.29). Based on these passages, and following Wellhausen, some argue that Saul's home was really Gibeon rather than Gibeah. However, P. M. Arnold argues against a historical association of Saul with Gibeon, and Walters points out that Saul is the only person in the Chronicler's genealogies unlinked to one of Jacob's twelve sons. He is connected instead with Gibeon, a city which typifies Canaanite religious and political traditions. He is therefore unsuitable to be king, and the future belongs to David and a revived Davidic

113 Milgrom 1989: 392, citing Levenson 1978, suggests that the magnification of Caleb in the early tradition (Numbers, Joshua–Judges) reflects and legitimates David's coronation in Hebron (the home of the Calebites) as king of Judah.
114 Gibeah occurs elsewhere in 2 Sam. 2.24-25; 6.3-4; 23.29. See 3.1.2.3.
115 Geba occurs elsewhere in 2 Sam. 5.25. See 3.1.2.3.
116 Wellhausen 1871: 209.
118 P. M. Arnold 1990.
Consequently, the association of Saul with Gibeon in Chronicles is merely a literary construct.\textsuperscript{120} Whatever the case may be, it is sufficient to observe that MT Samuel repeatedly links Saul to גְּבַע and occasionally to גֶּבֶת but never to גֶּבַע. As for the association of Saul with Gibeah and Geba, both locations were essentially synonymous geographically, and the similar orthography has resulted in confusion in the literature as illustrated in Judges 20 and 1 Samuel 13–14.\textsuperscript{121} Is there further significance in the link between Saul and Gibeah? Some argue that Samuel’s story about Saul should be read in light of the story of the Levite and his concubine in Judges 19–20 (and then in light of Genesis 19) which entails a hidden anti-Saul polemic.\textsuperscript{122}

(5) Saul in the Writings (outside Chronicles). Amit and Brettler suggest that the introduction of Mordecai as the ‘son of Jair son of Shimei son of Kish, a Benjaminite’ in Esth. 2.5 reflects positively on Saul, whose descendant is the hero of the story.\textsuperscript{123} Ackroyd, Brettler and Flanagan think the preservation of the genealogy of Saul in 1 Chron. 8.29-40 and 9.35-44 makes a similar point.\textsuperscript{124} Finally, Brettler suggests that Isa. 55.3 and indeed Deutero-Isaiah as a whole should remind us that not everyone in exilic and post-exilic Israel had messianic expectations of the house of David.\textsuperscript{125}

(6) Saul in post-biblical literature. Brettler traces the pro-Saul ideology described above into post-biblical literature.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{119} Gibeon is significant elsewhere only in Joshua 9–10, where the Gibeonites are disparaged.

\textsuperscript{120} Walters 1991.


\textsuperscript{123} Amit 2000: 185; Brettler 1995: 110. This view is also argued in Abramsky 1983, 1984.


\textsuperscript{125} Brettler 1995: 110, who cites Eissfeldt 1962.

\textsuperscript{126} Brettler 1995: 110-111.
This survey shows that a pro-David/anti-Saul polemic lies behind all of Samuel, figures in Judges, which serves as a preface to Samuel, moves beyond these compositions into the Writings, and continues in post-biblical literature. Furthermore, Brettler and others show that an anti-David/pro-Saul polemic is recognisable in more restricted portions of biblical and post-biblical literature. It is reasonable to conclude that 'house of David versus house of Saul' and/or 'Judah versus Benjamin' were important motifs in the exilic, post-exilic and post-biblical chapters of Israelite literature and history, long after a hypothetical tenth century BCE setting for the historical figures. The existence of this ideological battle in ancient Israel is undeniable, although its full range and dynamics are not entirely clear. A major goal of this thesis is to demonstrate that many details in the story of the ark in MT 2 Samuel 6 are related to the aforementioned pro-David/anti-Saul polemic. Most believe this polemic is elevated in Chronicles vis-à-vis 2 Samuel 6, with the exception of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23, by the insertion of 1 Chron. 13.3 and the retention of 15.29. However, it has gone unnoticed that many details outside the Michal material in MT 2 Samuel 6 are secondary and aimed at advancing the contrast between King David and Saul.

---

127 It is likely that a systematic study of this topic will locate additional examples of the vitality of 'house of David versus house of Saul' and/or 'Judah versus Benjamin' in biblical and post-biblical literature, such as the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, Josephus, Targumim, Mishnah, Tosefta, Talmud and Midrashim.

128 Scholarship is gradually revealing the importance of the region of Benjamin in the Babylonian and Persian periods, which may provide an historical basis for the composition and/or revision of many biblical texts. On the archaeology and history of Benjamin in these periods see Lipschits 1999; Stern 2001: 321-323, 431-434; Zorn 1997. On biblical literature see Amit 2000: 184-188; 2003; Edelman 2001, 2003. Also see the helpful discussion in Langston 1998. He examines Benjaminite cult sites, designated by קָדוֹשׁ, קָדוֹש֔וֹת or נְזִיּוֹת, and concludes with a helpful discussion of cultic and political implications of Benjamin's cultic prominence (180-200). His comments on David's transfer of the ark in 2 Samuel 6 are pertinent. In his view, '[t]he account serves to symbolize the divine rejection of Benjaminite cultic leadership in favor of Levitical control', and the figure of Michal functions as a symbol of Benjamin (192-194). He concludes his book saying: 'Perhaps during the time of the exile and the early days of the restoration, rumblings of support for the Benjaminites had resumed, thereby necessitating a re-affirmation of the Levites and David. If so, the conflict between Levi and Benjamin had re-surfaced'.
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2.2 Diachronic Approach: Discerning Literary Layers in Stories about David and Saul

Scholars use the following criteria for discerning sources and editorial layers in Samuel and the DH.

- **Oppositions**: contradictions, inconsistencies or incongruities, tensions in a passage or between passages.

- **Variations**: in style, grammar, vocabulary (e.g., divine appellation), perspective or viewpoint, that is, ideology or religious outlook (e.g., prophetic, legal, cultic).

- **Repetitions**: conflations or duplications of words, phrases or passages; includes terminology such as doublet, duplicate, double reading, double narrative, lectio duplex, conflate reading, alternative reading, synonymous reading, recapitulation, resumptive repetition, repetición de engarce, reprise, Wiederaufnahme, etc.

- **Insertions**: abrupt interruptions and explanations (e.g., explanatory glosses) which disrupt the logic, flow, and continuity of a narrative.

- **Comparisons**: noticeable differences in the compilation and redaction of parallel accounts (e.g., Samuel–Kings // Chronicles).

The ensuing remarks are not comprehensive.

**First**, it is well known that the application of these criteria has resulted in diverse and perhaps irreconcilable views concerning the literary makeup of Samuel\(^{129}\) and the compositional layers of the DH.\(^{130}\) This is illustrated by a comparison of the views held by adherents to the 'Göttingen School' with the views held by advocates of the 'Harvard School'.

**Second**, the aforementioned situation results from scholars' dependence on subjective criteria for the demarcation of literary layers, namely, the discernment of different themes, interests or perspectives, both positive and negative. For example, the division between positive and negative, pro- and anti-, prophetic and nomistic, judgment and blessing, and so on, depends heavily on the conceptualisation of the interpreter; also,


\(^{130}\) McKenzie 1992.
the contrasted ideas are not necessarily mutually exclusive in a single literary stratum.
'The philologist ought not to maximize for his text an expectation of consistency and unflawed esthetics'.

Third, practitioners of 'new literary criticism' or 'narrative criticism' have produced many synchronic or holistic or final-form readings of biblical texts. These scholars, due to dogmatic or pragmatic reasons, reject the diachronic approach and the above criteria for discerning sources and editorial layers. The outcome is the 'disappearing redactor' phenomenon.

Fourth, the gap between adherents to the diachronic and synchronic approaches and methodologies continues to increase. Some respond to this impasse by reassessing, reaffirming and sometimes modifying source- and redaction-critical methodologies. This is illustrated in investigations which find analogies or models in non-biblical literature for diachrony in biblical texts. Others focus on the usefulness of unifying the diachronic and synchronic approaches. For example, Auld and Conroy affirm the diachronic and synchronic approaches and argue that textual criticism can serve as a pivot-point between them. This tactic is promising. The versional evidence substantiates the validity of the diachronic approach—there are earlier and later forms of biblical texts and editions of biblical stories—and scholars can use this evidence to discern literary origins and developments—developments in the versions whose special features, and the reasons for them, may be perceived and appreciated through holistic or final-form readings.

132 J. Barton 1984: 57; cf. 56-58.
2.3 Textual-Exegetical Approach: Combining Textual and Literary Criticism in an Analysis of the Stories about David and Saul

2.3.1 Rise, Decline, Rebirth

Goshen-Gottstein's classic essay 'The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: Rise, Decline, Rebirth' (1983) chronicles the place of textual criticism in biblical studies over a period of five centuries. His survey begins in the sixteenth century, when textual criticism formed the background of the critical-exegetical endeavour. However, he then shows that beginning in the late eighteenth century the undertaking of large research and publication projects, such as Kennicott's collations, led to sub-specialisation, with the result that textual criticism became slowly divorced from other fields of critical inquiry. There were occasional exceptions during this period, such as Cornill's *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (1886), de Lagarde's *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbiem* (1863), and Wellhausen's *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht* (1871). Nevertheless, the time around 1950 signifies for Goshen-Gottstein the beginning of what may be looked upon as a new stage in the history of textual criticism. Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, a handful of scholars has returned to text-critical exegesis or the textual-exegetical endeavour.

Trebolle Barrera is a key figure among those taking this approach to biblical literature. Auld is another. In a much briefer and more focused historical sketch than Goshen-Gottstein's, Trebolle Barrera describes the role of textual criticism in

---

137 Also Cross 1995: 183.
139 Other significant names in this regard are Barthélémy, Bogaert, Cross, Fernández Marcos, Floss, Gooding, Knoppers, van der Kooij, Lust, McKenzie, Person, Pisano, Rofé, Rösel, Schenker, Stipp, Talmon, Z. Talshir, Tov and Ulrich.
investigations of the DH since Noth's Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (1943) and he describes an alternative approach to the evidence.

Research on the books of Kings has been dominated in these last decades by the work of M. Noth on the Deuteronomistic redaction. His masterpiece opened up new paths and proposed new models of research. After every masterpiece, however, research sooner or later becomes 'scholasticized' and confines itself tamely to the lines traced by the master. Furthermore, the impact of a masterpiece tends either to marginalize earlier paths of research or to close them off entirely. Thus in the work of Noth and his disciples very little importance has been given to the contributions to be drawn from the versions (esp. the LXX and the VL) for recension history and text history of the books of the Bible. In the books of Kings these versions offer many important variant readings with respect to the MT. Noth's work in 1943 coincided with a generalized 'return to the MT' movement. At that time the Greek version came to be considered mostly as a targum or as a midrashic paraphrase of the Hebrew. J. W. Wevers at mid-century and more recently D. W. Gooding and R. P. Gordon developed this line of research by studying the 'principles of exegesis' underlying the Greek version of Kings and the midrashic elements it contains.

If the early decades of this century were characterized by both the use and abuse of conjecturally restoring the 'primitive text' (Urtext) by choosing among the many variants found in the versions, these last decades have seen the analogous abuse of conjecturing, on literary grounds, what was the 'primitive form' (Urform), and this on the basis of the Massoretic text alone. Consequently, if the on the one hand the history of the tradition and redaction of Kings (10th-5th century BC) now appears excessively complicated, on the other hand we are content with a very simple history of the transmission of the text. In the long span stretching from the 5th century BC up to the medieval Massoretes, it is currently assumed that there existed but a simple and direct line of textual transmission in the Hebrew (Noth); the variants of the versions are considered to be merely tendentious deviations from a uniform Hebrew text.

The study of the biblical MSS of Qumran, in particular of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a,b,c}, has facilitated a new understanding of the parallel history and parallel evolution of the Hebrew and Greek texts of Samuel-Kings. This new knowledge creates the need for an interdisciplinary dialogue between the practitioners of redaction history (Noth and his school) and those of the study of the transmission and recension of the text (e.g., W. F. Albright, F. M. Cross, D. Barthélemy, etc.).

In such a dialogue it will be accepted that many of the variants in the versions do not represent isolated phenomena or occasional acts of negligence on the part of the translators and/or copyists. Rather, they represent complete patterns all their own which correspond to different types of text that once existed in the Hebrew tradition. It will also be accepted that the plurality of textual types can even reflect different stages in the earlier process of the redaction and editing of the text.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{140} Trebolle Barrera 1982: 12-13.
The keystone of his methodology is the use of text-critical controls on redactional arguments in the DH, for the reason that

methodologically speaking ... an argument based on the formal aspects of a given text should take precedence over an argument based on its possible 'tendencies'. It also comes first in order as one applies the several critical methods. Tendenzkritik is very much exposed to the fantasies and the biases of each exegete.  

Auld and Person make similar claims. Formal or external evidence/criteria are objectively superior to non-formal or internal evidence/criteria for discerning diachronic developments in biblical texts. The analysis of biblical texts should not end here, but this is the best departure point. The following sections elaborate on the underpinnings and tactics of the textual-exegetical endeavour.

2.3.2 Concepts and Methodology

2.3.2.1 From Pluriformity to Uniformity

The text of the Bible did not change substantially during the Talmudic and Masoretic periods of activity: authoritative readings were chosen and annotated in cases of variants; attempts were made to implement a unitary orthography; and signs for vocalisation and accentuation were added. However, textual fluidity and pluriformity characterised the Bible prior to the end of the first or early in the second century CE. These phenomena have analogies in other ancient literature, and they are corroborated by:

- Repetitions of words, phrases, passages and books (Samuel–Kings // Chronicles) in the received text and other versions of the Bible, which may also point toward conflicting literary and historical traditions. See 2.2.

- Small and large scale variations from the received text in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the versions of the Septuagint, and elsewhere. Discussions of double and successive literary editions will follow.

---

141 Trebolle Barrera 1982: 25.
• Variations from the received text in extra-biblical citations, in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, New Testament, and rabbinic and patristic literature.

• Origen’s description and treatment of disagreements between biblical texts and attempts by him and others to bring the Septuagint in line with the received text.

• Rabbinic traditions about textual disorder and the activities of the sopherim ('the authorised revisers of the text') and the Masoretes.

The concepts of textual fluidity and pluriformity are self-evident and now widely embraced. Among others, Barthélemy, Childs, Cross, Goshen-Gottstein, Sanders, Skehan, Talmon, Tov, Trebolle Barrera, and Ulrich, have published widely on these topics. For example, Ulrich says 'The Scriptures were pluriform (as were Judaism and Christianity) until at least 70 C.E., probably until 100, and quite possibly as late as 135 or beyond'. It was not until then that the rabbis selected one text ('the proto-MT') from among several alternative texts of each book of the Bible, and established it as the normative or authoritative text of that book ('the textus receptus'), thus eliminating variant lines of tradition in normative Judaism. The Bible was pluriform by process; it was made uniform by selection.

The four hundred year 'pre-stabilisation phase' (ca. 300 BCE–100 CE) was a period of productive (not just reproductive) work by scribes and editors, during which many intentional (not just unintentional) changes were made. The biblical texts and

144 Ginsburg 1897: 307.

145 First, Sanders 1992: 848 points out that there is a pervasive tendency to deny these phenomena within Jewish and Christian religious communities and confessional groups. This trend is related to beliefs about the inerrancy and infallibility of the sacred text and, in this writer’s opinion, is deeply embedded in the psychological preference for the ‘comfort and simplicity’ of the received text over the ‘discomfort and complexity’ of varied and competing texts. Broznick 1994: 17-24 is an illustration. Second, Knoppers 2000: 126 makes the point that ‘The differences between these various textual witnesses suggest a certain instability and history of development within the text before the Common Era. In short, ignoring or defying evidence for diachronic development in the Deuteronomistic History can lead to superficial or forced arguments for synchronic unity’.

146 The sole attempt to refute this position is van der Woude 1992 (cf. 1995), and van der Kooij 2002 adds his support. Their arguments are significant, but insufficient to rebut the consensus view (Ulrich 2002; cf. Lim 2001).

stories were fluid and pluriform, changing and growing continually, dynamically and organically.\textsuperscript{148} The 'transformation' of biblical texts and stories is discussed below.

Prior to the twentieth century mid-point scholars affirmed, to some extent, the fluidity and pluriformity of 'the biblical text'. In addition, they recognised the likelihood of variant editions \textit{in Hebrew} of some biblical books. The discovery of biblical scrolls beginning in 1947 in the region of the Dead Sea transformed scholarly opinion on both issues. In its 'pre-stabilisation phase' the biblical text(s) was far more fluid and pluriform then previously imagined, and the possibility of variant editions of biblical books in Hebrew was made reality. Scholars must now contend with 'an array of variant literary editions of virtually all the books of the scriptures'.\textsuperscript{149} These facts call for the complete rewriting of the history of development of the biblical 'text'.

This is not the place to present and critique the principal views on the history of development of the biblical 'text'. In short, Cross argues for a theory of local texts, Talmon argues for a theory of multiple pristine editions, Tov argues for a theory of textual variety, and Ulrich argues for a theory of successive literary editions.\textsuperscript{150} Most scholars find Cross' local texts theory unsatisfactory since the extant textforms and textual phenomena cannot be exclusively situated in a Palestinian, Egyptian or Babylonian setting. In this writer's view, Ulrich's theory of successive literary editions provides an accommodating framework for investigating textual and literary developments within particular books of the Bible.\textsuperscript{151} He describes the theory this way:

The heart of the theory is that the main lines in the picture of the history of the biblical text are formed by the deliberate activity of a series of creative scribes who, one after another in different eras for different reasons, produced the new literary editions of the books (or passages) of the Bible. ... The fundamental principle guiding this proposal is that the Scriptures, from shadowy beginnings to

\textsuperscript{149} Ulrich 2000: 128.
\textsuperscript{150} VanderKam and Flint 2002: 140-147 is a recent 'non-partisan' survey.
\textsuperscript{151} Ulrich 1999 collects many relevant essays.
the final, perhaps abrupt, freezing point of the Masoretic tradition, arose and evolved through a process of organic development. The major lines of that development are characterized by the intentional, creative work of authors or tradents who produced new, revised editions of the traditional form of a book or passage. New Zeitenstren or events, new problems or possibilities, were probably the catalysts for new such editions. This happened repeatedly for all books of the Bible, from the earliest formulations of their sources, until the threats to the continued life of Judaism itself—the Roman destruction and the Christian crisis in the late first or early second century CE—probably brought the process of development to an abrupt cutoff.152

Ulrich also describes three steps for studying these variant literary editions.153

The new theories regarding the developmental history of the biblical 'text' force the reconsideration of the concept of 'the original text' and of the goal of textual criticism. First, was there a single exemplar or archetype or prototype or Ur-text of each book of the Bible? It is not an overstatement to say that most follow de Lagarde's belief in the existence of 'the original text' of each biblical book. Scholars such as Greenberg and Talmon, who think in terms of parallel or divergent or irreducible pristine texts, are few in number. Nevertheless, the search for 'the original text' depends in large part on how one defines the phrase. Ulrich gives eight possible meanings, ranging from "the original text" of the source incorporated by an early author or tradent', to "the original text" as the original or superior form of the MT ...', to "the original text" as fully attested in extant manuscript witnesses'.154 What stage in the development of a given biblical book should be called 'the original text'? This writer doubts that a single exemplar or archetype or prototype or Ur-text of any biblical book is recoverable. The evidence suggests that the biblical texts and stories were fluid and pluriform, changing and growing continually, dynamically and organically, and this diachronic complexity makes the question of 'the original text' unanswerable. Second, what then is the aim of textual criticism? This issue is discussed in all handbooks on textual criticism. For example, Tov believes the text-

154 Ulrich 1999: 12-16.
critic seeks the 'completed literary composition which had already passed through several written stages and which stood at the beginning of the process of textual transmission'. However, if Ulrich is correct, the 'end of the process of the composition of a biblical book' was nothing more than the 'abrupt interruption of the composition process for external, hostile reasons (the Roman threat or the Rabbinic-Christian debates)'. In view of these dilemmas, the principal text-critical aim in this thesis is the detection of earlier and later forms of biblical texts or stories, or to state it differently, the discovery of earlier and later stages in their editorial histories.

Finally, the explanation promised in 1.3.3 for the relative homogeneity of the textual traditions of Chronicles in comparison with Samuel (and Kings) follows. The book of Chronicles has held an inferior position in the annals of Jewish and Christian scholarly activity from the earliest times to the present day. This marginalised doublet was/is considered a contradictory repetition and/or supplement marked by less importance, reliability and authority, and worthy of less attention and use, than its counterparts in the Former Prophets. The evidence indicates that the book was studied, revised, transmitted, and copied differently and less frequently than the books of Samuel and Kings. Consequently, the textual fluidity and pluriformity evident in the early versions of Samuel and Kings are uncharacteristic of the early versions of Chronicles. In short, the disarray in Samuel's textual traditions is the consequence of systematic revision, whereas the state of Chronicles' textual traditions is the result of regular disinterest and neglect.

\[156\] Compare Rofé 1997: 402.
\[158\] Ackroyd 1973: 42; Curtis and Madsen 1910: 36; Würthwein 1979: 18.
2.3.2.2 Concept of a Rolling Corpus

The fluid and pluriform appearance of biblical texts and stories in the period of the Second Temple suggests that they developed gradually over a substantial period of time under the guidance of successive individuals or groups. Three helpful models for understanding this process are McKane's rolling corpus, Tov's and Ulrich's literary layers, and Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis. The idea of a rolling corpus, or revision by supplementation, is not new to biblical studies and it is not unique to McKane. However, McKane develops and illustrates the concept at length in his analysis of Jeremiah. His point of departure is the radically different versions of Jeremiah preserved in the longer MT and 4QJer\textsuperscript{a} over against the shorter LXX and 4QJer\textsuperscript{b}.

Is Sept. a witness to a different and shorter text than MT, or is there only one Hebrew text to be recovered (MT) from which Sept. is derived by processes of abridgement and modification? I have concluded that Sept. gives us access to a Hebrew text which is shorter than MT, and so enables us to identify expansions of the Hebrew text in the period which lies between the Hebrew Vorlage of Sept. and MT. This is a conclusion which is not free from assumptions, but, even so, there is no firmer method than this and none which is so disciplined by objective control, and it is the right point of departure for the examination of the concept of a rolling corpus. There is a proximity to the facts which no other method possesses: the examination of extant texts and the observing of differences between them. The intention is not to assert that a higher criticism should never override these indications, or be pursued when it contradicts them, but its procedures are necessarily more speculative and are not controlled by such hard evidence. One should require a particularly sharp argument before assenting to a speculative kind of criticism which contradicts the indications of a more solid, textual evidence.\textsuperscript{159}

From here McKane adopts the concepts of 'kernel idea' and 'reservoir idea' from Holladay, Hyatt, and Thiel, and argues that a substantial portion (much of it prose) of MT Jeremiah was triggered or generated from the pre-existing text or part of it (much of it poetry). The book was handled, transmitted, and repeatedly recast through a process of interpretation and supplementation. 'In general, the theory is bound up with the persuasion

\textsuperscript{159} McKane 1986: I, l-li; cf. l-lxxxiii; cf. 1999.
that the rolling corpus "rolled" over a long period of time and was still rolling in the post-exilic period.\textsuperscript{160}

McKane's rolling corpus is a helpful model which has been insufficiently explored in relation to the Former Prophets. This is largely due to the history of research on Joshua–Kings. However, with reference to Samuel the current research trend is to move from sources to composition, and therefore it may be suggested that the rolling corpus is a good model for the developmental process. Auld explores 'the revision by supplementation of a common inherited text' in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles\textsuperscript{161}, and elsewhere he argues that the earlier royal stories in these books were the classics on which later biblical authors of Genesis–Judges drew for their language, expressions, themes, situations, histories and stories.\textsuperscript{162} In more focused contributions, Auld and Ho argue that the longer story in MT 1 Samuel 17–18 was revised by means of supplementation from a shorter one similar to LXX\textsuperscript{18} 1 Samuel 17–18. Their conclusion is that

All the major MT pluses can be explained when they are read side by side with the characterization of Saul in 1 Samuel 9–10. ... Our hypothesis is that all these points about David (i.e. most of the MT pluses) are supplements, modelled by a redactor upon the story of Saul with the purpose of contrasting David and Saul.\textsuperscript{163}

This thesis argues that the process and intent of the revision in MT 1 Samuel 17–18 are observable in MT 2 Samuel 6.

2.3.2.3 Concept of Literary Layers

Ulrich's third step for studying variant literary editions is: 'the individual textual variants should be studied as a group, to see whether a significant number of them might

\textsuperscript{160} McKane 1986: I, lxxiii.
\textsuperscript{161} Auld 1994.
\textsuperscript{162} Auld 1998.
\textsuperscript{163} Auld and Ho 1992: 38; cf. Auld 2004b.
display an intentional, systematic pattern'. Tov makes similar comments on interpolations.\textsuperscript{164} With respect to Samuel, Tov says:

More importantly, if limited recensonal differences are recognized within a certain book, such as in 1 Samuel 16–18, the complete book, in this case Samuel, is likely to reflect such features elsewhere, including in small details ...\textsuperscript{165}

Tov makes a similar claim for 1 Samuel 1–2:

If different editions of the Song of Hannah are assumed, evidence for them should also be visible in other chapters in the book of Samuel.\textsuperscript{166}

This writer, like Tov, recognises the difficulty in deciding whether or not a difference in a small detail is part of 'a more extensive stratum of changes' or 'an overall recensonal layer'. Nevertheless, this thesis argues that many of the textual manipulations in the received text which are suggested by the totality of the versional evidence are intentional \textit{and connected}, and represent a literary layer in the compositional process. More specifically, many adjustments in MT 2 Samuel 6 are connected to the language of stories in 1 Samuel sharing the theme 'Davidic displacement of the Saulide dynasty'. Having said this, however, it is not clear whether these adjustments were carried out at one time by a single individual, or group, or whether they represent the cumulative efforts of numerous individuals or groups over a substantial period of time. The latter seems more probable. This is reasonable since, as stated above, '(house of) David versus (house of) Saul' and/or 'Judah versus Benjamin' were important motifs in the exilic, post-exilic and post-biblical chapters of Israelite literature and history, long after a hypothetical tenth century BCE setting for the historical figures.


\textsuperscript{165} Tov 1997a: 242.

\textsuperscript{166} Tov 1999: 434.
2.3.2.4 Concept of Inner-Biblical Exegesis

Scholars have long recognised that there are a variety of relationships between passages and books in the Bible, and they have sought to explain the origin and nature of the developments which led to these resemblances. The label 'midrash' in particular has been applied by many not only to the relationship of Chronicles to Samuel-Kings or of Deuteronomy to Exodus but also to other textual associations and interactions in the Bible. The label itself may be appropriate insofar as similar patterns of activity are observable in biblical and post-biblical literature; and indeed many think the origin of midrash proper is already visible in the Hebrew Bible.\(^{167}\) Lim takes up these issues, discussing the origins and emergence of midrash in relation to Hebrew Bible.\(^{168}\) 'Midrash' or 'midrashic', however, is only one pair of terms among many which scholars use for the variety of relationships between biblical passages and books and for editorial or scribal activities within these. For example, on one hand, biblical or textual, or inner-, inter- or intra-biblical or textual, and on the other hand, terms such as exegesis, commentary, interpretation, editing, revision, redaction or dialogue, are frequently joined to form such phrases as 'biblical exegesis' or 'inner-biblical interpretation' or 'inter-textual dialogue' and so on. There are a variety of perspectives on these phenomena, and scholars do not agree on a single label for all of them. This is due to the complexity of the relationships between the passages and books and to the diversity of scribal and editorial activities within them.

In recent years a number of scholars have written extensively on 'midrash' within Bible. From the United States, the obvious examples are Childs and Sanders, and a group of closely associated scholars, Sarna (who coined 'inner-biblical exegesis'), Fishbane, Brettler, Levinson and Sommers. Several Israelis have written extensively on this topic,

\(^{167}\) For general discussion see Neusner 1987; Porton 1992.
\(^{168}\) Lim 2004.
such as Seeligmann, Rofé and Zakovitch. A lesser known example, but no less prolific, who routinely talks in terms of 'Vorlage versus Targum' and 'Historia o Midrás', and with reference to Samuel–Kings too, is Trebolle Barrera. Fishbane gave us the classic treatment.¹⁶⁹ In his compendium of exegetical insights he analyses hundreds of cases in which earlier biblical texts or traditions are taken up in later texts for authoritative reference, clarification, reinterpretation, and the like. Individual cases can be disputed, and the direction of movement is not always obvious, but Fishbane certainly demonstrates the growing and self-referential character of biblical literature.

The concepts of pluriformity, a rolling corpus, literary layers, and inner-biblical exegesis, combine to result in a serious difficulty: How can one distinguish between authors, editors and scribes? Who did what and how can we know? Who is the author, composer or writer? Who is the editor, redactor or reviser? Is an editor who gathers material a compiler, one who expands an augmenter or supplemener, and one who explains a glossator or interpreter? At what point does the role of author and editor cease and the role of scribe, copier, copyist or transmitter begin? The current evidence from the period of the Second Temple renders the distinction between these 'occupations' and 'practices' virtually impossible.¹⁷⁰

Ancient authors, editors and scribes used a variety of editorial or exegetical procedures. Peckham summarises these techniques, or marks or signs, under the headings 'repetition' and 'reversion'.¹⁷¹ Repetition may be resumptive or proleptic. Lexical repetition involves a catchword (a key word or phrase, 'Buber's leading word'), allusion or citation, a formula, or an adjacent term or phrase (Wiederaufnahme, synonymous/parallel word pair). Grammatical repetition involves a deictic marker, typically יָשָׁר, וַתְּנַשֶּׁר, וֹשָׁר.
('namely'), 'this [means]', אִם or אִם ('it is'), or בֵּין נוֹסֵה וַחֲיָיו (between him and his life). Structural repetition involves an inclusio or chiasm, such as 'Seidel's law' (abcdXdc'b'a', where X is the contextually disruptive element). Reversion 'consists in a literarily unmotivated or grammatically irregular change of person, number, or gender combined with some repetition that, besides modifying the adjacent text, signals a connection between it and a prior or later non-contiguous context'. Unmarked editing is uncommon since as a rule 'writers and editors' wish to deliberately and clearly mark off their additions from the original. At the very least, their activity is marked by simple repetition or redundancy, which seems to be more than the product of accident or formal style.\textsuperscript{172}

Lexical repetition is an editorial technique encountered in a number of cases in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. Alter discusses this phenomenon in a chapter on techniques of repetition and then again in the conclusion to the book.\textsuperscript{173} Simply stated, 'A Leitwort is a word or a word-root that recurs significantly in a text, in a continuum of texts, or in a configuration of texts ...'.\textsuperscript{174} An article by Amit is entirely dedicated to the phenomenon of 'Buber's leading word':

In sum, the leading word is a linguistic expression repeated in identical or similar fashion in a text or a number of texts in a way that calls attention to the needs of strengthening messages in a text or to the relations among texts. Recognition of the fact that the biblical text has been transmitted over generations, and that, in any case, change and additions, deletions and adaptations, were made in it, raises the possibility that whoever was responsible for the appearance of the leading word is not necessarily the original author of the text. An assumption of this kind leaves room for the intervention of an editor or a highly resourceful adapter, who took the trouble of weaving into the text adaptations that suited his purposes.\textsuperscript{175}

It is shown in the analysis of 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 that particular words in MT 2 Samuel 6 seek to link acts of David in this passage to those of other characters in other passages ('word linkage').

\textsuperscript{172} This remains true in spite of occasional criticisms, e.g., B. O. Long 1987; Quick 1993.
\textsuperscript{174} Alter 1981: 93.
\textsuperscript{175} Amit 1989: 109-110.
The last issue in this discussion of inner-biblical exegesis is that of methodical versus arbitrary adjustments in biblical texts. Ulrich and Tov suggest that individual variants which initially appear random may actually display a systematic pattern which can be recognised as a literary layer (2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.3). It is clear that ancient 'participants' in the composition and transmission of biblical texts were partisan in their tactics and objectives. This writer affirms that 'the study of any text must include a clear sense of its revisionary target'. Conversely, major and minor alterations in biblical texts accumulated over substantial periods of time, and it is entirely uncertain how many individuals or groups of individuals intervened in any particular passage or book. This may have caused numerous disconnected adjustments. Person makes a case for the complex interplay between oral and written processes in the transmission of biblical literature. Rather than slavishly copying their texts word for word, scribes preserved the traditions with an oral mind set, thus generating variety and fluidity in their productions. In contrast to mere copyists, they were performers, allowing for variations as they did their work. What we perceive to be textual variants are rather the products of scribes who were faithful in their work of copying for communities of an oral culture. The present thesis shows that many specific readings in MT 2 Samuel 6 are united in their affirmation of several related revisionary targets, namely, apology of Davidic kingship and apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character. Another significant theme in this material is cultic practice. Nevertheless, it is impossible to know precisely who or what groups are responsible for these adjustments and at what points in time they were made.

176 Levinson 1997: 156.
2.3.2.5 Principles of Textual Criticism

The writer accepts the standard text-critical procedures. Preference is given to mechanical or unintentional error rather than intentional alteration (when the former is justifiably probable)\textsuperscript{178} and to internal rather than external criteria.\textsuperscript{179} No \textit{a priori} preference is given to any version of the story of David's ark transfer. All versions must be considered equally. None has a monopoly on 'earlier' readings. \textit{The evidence does not permit the assumption that Hebrew witnesses should be valued more highly than Greek witnesses to a Hebrew original.} The uncritical acceptance of the MT in any particular instance may be tantamount to the emendation of an 'earlier' reading found elsewhere to a 'later' one found in the MT. With reference to the Septuagint, each manuscript, book and tradition must be individually examined in order to ascertain translation techniques and scribal tendencies. The personalities of the witnesses and the patterns of relationships must be kept in mind.\textsuperscript{180} These standards are followed insofar as it is possible and necessary within the parameters of this thesis. Driver, following de Lagarde, makes these points in his discussion of 'the original text of the LXX':

If a verse or part of a verse appears in both a free and a slavishly literal translation, the former is to be counted the genuine rendering.

If two readings co-exist, of which one expresses the Massoretic text, while the other can only be explained from a text deviating from it, the latter is to be regarded as the original.

[These] canons formulate the principle for estimating double renderings in the same MS., or alternative renderings in different MSS., and derive their justification from the fact that the general method followed by later revisers and correctors was that of assimilating the renderings of the LXX to the Hebrew text (the 'Hebraica veritas') current in their day.\textsuperscript{181}

\textsuperscript{178} On unintentional errors and intentional alterations see Tov 2001: 236-285.

\textsuperscript{179} On internal and external text-critical criteria see Tov 2001: 298-310. These criteria are limited in value in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.

\textsuperscript{180} Greenspoon 1997: 156.

\textsuperscript{181} Driver 1890: xlv-xliv.
These judgments are followed judiciously rather than slavishly. The following comments are in order: 

First, Tov categorises 'doublet (conflate reading)' under 'unintentional variants' and refers to it as a 'mistaken juxtaposition'. Elsewhere, Tov distinguishes between 'doublets' and 'synonymous readings', listing the former under 'readings created in the course of the textual transmission' and the latter under 'readings intentionally created by scribes'. He qualifies 'doublets' by saying: 'These doublets sometimes resulted from an erroneous juxtaposition of elements, but in other cases they grew out of a conscious desire to preserve alternative readings'. Tov may be correct that some doublets were created through the accidental insertion of interlinear or marginal elements, but this is the exception rather than the rule. Talmon and Trebolle Barrera have repeatedly demonstrated that doublets in the Hebrew and Greek versions are typically conscious and deliberate. Furthermore, scholars frequently malign the Greek versions, especially LXX, for its double readings; but this perspective neglects to appreciate the motivation and significance of these double readings. For the ancient it was more correct to retain (with reasonable modification for the sake of sense) the extant traditions, rather than allow one of them to fall into obscurity. 'Doublets thus illustrate the scribes' reverence for transmitted alternative readings which were invested with a measure of sacred authority'. They prove that copyists had great respect for every existing variant reading transmitted in the mss. Second, as Driver points out, in cases of double or alternative readings, the reading dissimilar to the one found in the MT is probably the earlier reading. The disharmonious reading is best. This is particularly true when the MT reading is the one which harmonises or coheres best with the diction, style, or Tendenz (broadly

---

understood) of the particular MT passage or book in which it is located. This may seem counter-intuitive, and in practice commentators routinely argue for the originality of an MT reading on these very grounds (i.e., it harmonises best with the diction, style, or Tendenz of the author). However, the suggested approach coincides with the general tendency of editors and scribes (and authors too) to harmonise readings and stories. A reading which is less harmonised and more disparate from the reading of the MT is generally the earlier reading in the history of textual growth.

It is stated in 2.3.2.1 that 'the original text' is unattainable, and consequently, the textual-exegetical task is to roll the process of textual formation back as far as the extant evidence permits. It is characteristic of recent generations of biblical scholars to use the versional data to discover the 'best reading' or correct a perceived 'error' in the received text's wording. This writer's conviction is that these academics have been so concerned with delineating the putative original that they have undervalued, and in many cases, neglected entirely, the significance of textual variation as evidence for the compositional process of biblical books. Textual variants, and grammatical and stylistic incongruities, frequently underscore important points in the literary development of a composition. Consequently, textual criticism must not be separated from other forms of criticism (source, redaction, narrative, etc.). Furthermore, for each variant reading, in each version, one must ask what function that particular reading has in its own context. Childs' discussion of the text-critical task in a canonical context is germane.

Scholars too often correct a perceived 'error' in the MT, the received text, thus failing to ascribe integrity to that tradition and its unique developmental process and

187 'Las variantes textuales más significativas se verifican en los puntos débiles por tratarse muchas veces de hilos o de casos sueltos, a los que se ha cosido una pieza de un paño diferente, con un mal remiendo a veces. En el proceso posterior de transmisión del texto el tejido de la composición tiende a romperse y a corromperse precisamente por aquellos puntos de sutura' (Trebolle Barrera; source unidentified).

188 Childs 1979: 84-106; esp. 103-105.
meaning. Related to this point, it is unnecessary to emend the MT once one realises that biblical authors, scribes and editors elevate polemic above literary coherence and historical veracity.\textsuperscript{189} Thus, for example, many MT passages which scholars routinely emend are in fact intelligible. The interpretative task is to comprehend the meaning of these passages in their own right.

This is but one of several problems in [2 Sam. 21.1-14] which have long caused translators and commentators difficulty. It is common to solve them by amending the Masoretic Text with the help of the Septuagint. In some of these cases, the LXX's smooth and intelligible readings are seductively attractive, and it is correct that they should be considered. But it is the assumption of this paper that MT's angularities are probably not mistakes, but evidences of the text's use. They do not signal the text's corruptness, but its usefulness to the earliest communities which esteemed and transmitted it. MT is a used text, coming with marks of its own past service written into it.\textsuperscript{190}

2.3.2.6 Issue of Dating

This writer holds firm to no particular view about the dating of the (possible) sources or composition of the books of Samuel and Chronicles. Furthermore, in his view, scholars have not successfully dated these books or their contents to any particular period in Israel's pre-exilic or exilic or post-exilic history. At many points throughout this thesis, and in appendix 3, it is demonstrated that frequent assertions regarding earlier and later forms or uses or diachronic developments in biblical Hebrew are patently untenable.\textsuperscript{191}

2.3.2.7 Tools for Grammatical and Lexical Analysis

The grammatical and lexical investigations in this thesis are dependent upon the standard Hebrew grammars\textsuperscript{192}, lexica\textsuperscript{193} and concordances\textsuperscript{194} as well as computer

\textsuperscript{189} The comment in W. R. Arnold 1917: 14 n. 2 on MT 2 Sam. 6.21 is pertinent.
\textsuperscript{191} See Rezetko 2003.
\textsuperscript{192} GKC; JM; WO; Bergsträsser 1918; A. B. Davidson 1901; Ewald 1855, 1881; Kropat 1909; van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroce 1999; Meyer 1992; Williams 1976.
software based on the machine-readable database 'Groves-Wheeler Westminster Hebrew Morphology'\textsuperscript{195} which is incorporated into many Bible software products.\textsuperscript{196}

2.4 Summary of Chapter Two

In 2.1 (synchronic approach) the writer shows that a pro-David/anti-Saul polemic lies behind all of Samuel, figures in Judges, which serves as a preface to Samuel, moves beyond these compositions into the Writings, and continues in post-biblical literature. In 2.2 (diachronic approach) the writer presents the traditional criteria for discerning sources and editorial layers, and he suggests that the impasse between the synchronic and diachronic approaches to biblical literature may be resolved by means of the textual-exegetical approach, i.e., by the use of text-critical controls on redactional arguments. The versional evidence substantiates the validity of the diachronic approach—there are earlier and later forms of biblical texts and editions of biblical stories—and scholars can use this evidence to discern literary origins and developments—developments in the versions whose special features, and the reasons for them, may be perceived and appreciated through holistic or final-form readings. In 2.3 (textual-exegetical approach) the writer surveys the rebirth in the mid-twentieth century of the textual-exegetical approach. This resurgence was brought about by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the confirmation of the textual pluriformity of the Bible in the Second Temple period. Three helpful models for understanding the developmental process of the biblical text are reviewed: McKane's rolling corpus, Tov's and Ulrich's literary layers, and Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis. It is stated that the principal text-critical aim in this thesis is the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{193} BDB; DBHE; DCH; HALOT; NIDOTTE = VanGemeren 1997; TDOT; TLOT = Jenni and Westermann 1997; TWOT = Harris, Archer and Waltke 1980.
\item \textsuperscript{194} Even-Shoshan 1990; Mandelkern 1977.
\item \textsuperscript{195} See http://www.wts.edu/hebrew.
\item \textsuperscript{196} This writer uses, in order of preference, GRAMCORD for Windows 2.4, Bible Windows 7.0 and BibleWorks for Windows 5.0.
\end{itemize}
detection of earlier and later forms of biblical texts or stories, or to state it differently, the
discovery of earlier and later stages in their editorial histories. More specifically, a major
goal of this thesis is to demonstrate that many details in the story of the ark in MT 2
Samuel 6 are related to a pro-David/anti-Saul polemic. It has gone unnoticed that many
details outside the Michal material in MT 2 Samuel 6 are secondary and aimed at
advancing the contrast between King David and Saul. Many adjustments in MT 2 Samuel
6 are connected to the language of stories in 1 Samuel sharing the theme 'Davidic
displacement of the Saulide dynasty'.
CHAPTER THREE

Analysis of 2 Samuel 6.1-5 and 1 Chronicles 13.5-8

3.0 Introduction

The material in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8, as well as the supplement in 1 Chron. 13.1-4\textsuperscript{197}, reports David's initial attempt to bring the ark to Jerusalem. The synoptic verses relate that David assembles a group of Israelites, and they go to bring the ark to Jerusalem, which is mounted on a cart guided by attendants, while they all celebrate with dance and music on the way back. This initial portion of the plot, which may be called the exposition, presents information essential to the story. It is clear that David is the main character (\textit{who?}; the protagonist) and his mission is to get the ark (\textit{what?}; the situation). The reason for David's mission (\textit{why?}), however, is not related in 2 Samuel 6, although a limited explanation is given in 1 Chron. 13.3: '... for we did not turn to it in the days of Saul'. Nevertheless, neither narrative explains the intrinsic significance of the ark which ultimately provokes David's undertaking. The exposition's depiction of the setting is also unclear with respect to both time (\textit{when?}) and place (\textit{where?}), and Samuel and Chronicles differ on several points. Regarding the occasion, and in addition to the enigmatic \textit{לְשׁוֹן} in 2 Sam. 6.1, David's enterprise is placed \textit{after} his defeat of the Philistines in Samuel (2 Sam. 5.17-25) but \textit{before} it in Chronicles (1 Chron. 14.8-17). See 1.2. The geographic information in the versions of 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8 is particularly difficult to construe. Does the march set out from Jerusalem or from some other location in Israel? To where does the procession arrive, or in other words, where is the ark located prior to its relocation to Jerusalem? The exposition also refers to other

\textsuperscript{197} See 1.2.3. For comments on the individualistic focus in Samuel versus the presentation in Chronicles see Japhet 1993: 273-277; Williamson 1982: 113-115.
background information such as additional participants and their conduct, the manner in which the ark is transported (*how?*), and the ark's epithet, but these issues are not free of problems. First, what are the identity and number of the Israelites who accompany David? The relative agreement among the versions of 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 on the conduct of the participants stands out against the difficulties evident in the second half of the story. Second, the ark is conveyed on an animal-drawn cart guided by attendants, but who are these persons and what is their physical position with respect to the ark during the procession? Third, what should be made of the different epithets given to the ark, especially in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6? Significant problems and discrepancies are evident in the versions of 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8. A thorough commentary on 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 would enlarge this thesis at least four-fold; consequently, the analysis provided here concentrates on textual variation and on grammatical and stylistic incongruities and lexical discrepancies, which point to editorial adjustments in the compositions.

3.1 Analysis

3.1.1 The Story's Context and Occasion

3.1.1.1 The Literary Context

The storyline in 1 Chronicles 11–16 vis-à-vis 2 Samuel 5–6, 23 clearly portrays David's first act after his coronation as a religious one. This is indicated by the location of the material on David's consolidation of his kingdom in 2 Sam. 5.11-25 // 1 Chron. 14.1-16 as well as by the topics of Chronicles' non-synoptic material in 1 Chron. 13.1-4; 15.1-24; 16.4-42. See 1.2.3. It is a separate matter, however, whether Chronicles' variations in vocabulary in the parallel portions of the ark story are adjustments which coincide with
the story's religious framework. These will be addressed in the analysis of the details of the story.

The review of research in 1.2 refers to the kinds of readings given for David's ark story. The alleged inconsistency between the story as a religious episode and the military language of 2 Sam. 6.1, namely שלשלת האלהי ברווח ראשון, as well as the presence of וישי יהור דוד ופלוחות אשה אזו (ויקס יהור דוד ופלוחות אשה אזו), have suggested to many that the verse is either displaced or interpolated. However, the facts do not facilitate a decision regarding the authenticity of the verse as a whole. The analysis of the details, nevertheless, will contend that particular features within this verse of Samuel were adjusted to underscore a pro-David/anti-Saul polemic. See 1.2.

3.1.1.2 2 Sam. 6.1
1 Chron. 13.5

This is vocalised as an H wayyiqtol 3ms form of הָיַן, but the absence of a complementary verb (either an infinitive or a wayyiqtol form) explaining what David 'did again' suggests that הָיַן must be related to the verb הָיַן. This is also supported by συνάγηκαν in Greek Samuel and by an equivalent verb in the versions of Chronicles. The form הָיַן may have originated as a defective spelling of הָיַן due to aleph quiescence (cf. Ps. 104.29 and Mic. 4.6), although the G wayyiqtol 3ms form of הָיַן elsewhere appears as הָיָה (as in 2 Sam. 10.17; 12.29; cf. 1 Sam. 14.52; 2 Sam. 11.27, with a suffixed pronoun).

in Samuel is always followed by a complementary infinitive (1 Sam. 3.6 [the infinitive intervenes]; 7.13; 23.4; 27.4; 2 Sam. 2.22, 28; 5.22; 7.20; 14.10), except for one instance where a complementary wayyiqtol follows (2 Sam. 18.22). The construction התוּ הָיַן (from הָיַן) followed only by a direct object cannot be construed with any sense.
The verb לָשְׁפִּית in 1 Chron. 13.5 was not substituted for רָפָא on the basis of linguistic chronology, but it may have arisen under the influence of the noun לָשְׁפִּית in non-synoptic 13.2, 4, and it is perhaps also related to Chronicles' portrayal of Israel as a liturgical לָשְׁפִּית. However, noteworthy points are: (1) The verbs רָפָא and לָשְׁפִּית are used similarly to לָשְׁפִּית in Chronicles, as in 1 Chron. 11.1; 19.17, where 'all Israel' is the object (cf. 23.2). (2) לָשְׁפִּית is not substituted elsewhere in Chronicles for רָפָא in the Vorlage although this could have been expected in some passages (e.g., 1 Chron. 19.17). (3) Chronicles uses the verbs לָשְׁפִּית and רָפָא side-by-side in 1 Chron. 15.3-4 in a religious context, but the referents are Israel, and priests and Levites, respectively. (4) The verb לָשְׁפִּית does not occur in non-synoptic 2 Chronicles 29–30 which deals with Hezekiah's cleansing of the temple and the celebration of the Passover, although the verb רָפָא occurs on five occasions, and the noun לָשְׁפִּית on thirteen, and these occur together in context in 2 Chron. 30.2-4, 13.

Most believe the adverb דָּעֲשׂ was inserted by catch-word influence in the text once רָפָא had 'become' לָשְׁפִּית, but דָּעֲשׂ is unnecessary following לָשְׁפִּית (e.g., 1 Sam. 3.6, 8) and only about one-quarter of the occurrences of לָשְׁפִּית and only about one-third in Samuel are with לָשְׁפִּית. Rather, דָּעֲשׂ was probably inserted deliberately, but why? The full answer to this question will be given after the discussion of the participants' identity and number (3.1.3.1). Prior to 2 Sam. 6.1 it is never explicitly stated that David assembled a group of Israelites for battle, but 1 Sam. 18.5, 13 and 2 Sam. 5.2 do report that David under Saul was a military commander with an army at his disposal. Prior to his exile (1 Sam. 19.12) one supposes that he assembled his troops on a regular basis for the encounters with the Philistines (1 Sam. 18.27, 30; 19.8), and one also supposes that he did the same for the battles against the Jebusites in 2 Sam. 5.6-9 and twice against the Philistines in 2 Sam.

199 See appendix 3.

5.17-21, 22-25. Does it imply one or more of these occasions or does the text mean to say that David assembles a group of Israelites which had been \textit{explicitly} assembled until that time by another?

In view of 1 Chron. 11.1, 4 the retention of \( \text{רָע} \) following \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) would have made good sense in 1 Chron. 13.5 if it had been in the \textit{Vorlage}. For this reason, and because \( \text{רָע} \) usually does occur in Chronicles in other synoptic passages\footnote{\( \text{רָע} \) occurs in both versions in thirteen synoptic passages. It does not occur in Chronicles in five synoptic passages (2 Sam. 6.1 // 1 Chron. 13.5; 2 Sam. 7.19 // 1 Chron. 17.17; 2 Sam. 21.18 // 1 Chron. 20.4; 1 Kgs. 10.10 // 2 Chron. 9.9; 1 Kgs. 12.2 // 2 Chron. 10.2). It occurs in Chronicles alone in two synoptic passages (2 Sam. 5.23 // 1 Chron. 14.14; 2 Kgs. 22.9 // 2 Chron. 34.16).}, the plus in Samuel is probably an insertion. Was \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) altered to \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) in Chronicles? This is possible for the reasons cited above. Could \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) have been altered to \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) in Samuel? In Samuel the noun \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) occurs in 1 Sam. 17.47 and the verb \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) is the \textit{Qere} reading in 2 Sam. 20.14. The ensuing discussion of the participants' identity and number will show that it is equally possible that Samuel contains the adjusted verb lexeme. However, in the end, it is uncertain whether \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) or \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) is the earlier reading.

\begin{tabular}{l}
3.1.1.3 & 2 Sam. 6.2  \\
 & 1 Chron. 13.6  \\
 & 1 Chron. 13.5
\end{tabular}

Dhorme and Hertzberg notice the anomalous accentuation in MT Samuel's \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) and suggest the insertion of additional words\footnote{Dhorme 1910: 318; Hertzberg 1964: 275.}, whereas W. R. Arnold and McCarter consider \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) inauthentic.\footnote{W. R. Arnold 1917: 41; McCarter 1984: 161 (cf. translation).} In narrative the verb \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) often 'functions idiomatically as "begin to do something"'\footnote{Martens 1997: 903.} or 'refers to preparatory activity, especially (although not exclusively) pursuant to traveling.'\footnote{Coppes 1980a: 793.} It has gone unnoticed, however, that \( \text{ךְּפַלֶּה} \) followed by...
a verb of movement with the same subject occurs most frequently in Samuel (nearly 40 times—all but six in 1 Samuel 16-31 and 2 Samuel 11-19) and never in Chronicles. In addition, the construction occurs only twice in synoptic passages, in this verse and in 1 Sam. 31.12 // 1 Chron. 10.12. In the latter passage Samuel but not Chronicles has ישלח, which is an expansion intended to criticise the 'heroic' acts of the men of Jabesh-gilead. The evidence suggests that in both cases Samuel's construction is a stylistic, and perhaps thematic, modification. Chronicles' סرى is not clearly the result of orthographic confusion, 'linguistic tendency', or a different perception of the story's geography (see below). It is impossible to know for certain whether ישלח or ישלח is the earlier verb. If it were the latter, then upon the addition of the סך clause, the resultant ישלח, which occurs only in 1 Sam. 13.15 in Samuel, would easily give way to ישלח, which makes up about half of the nearly forty cases of the construction in Samuel.

---

206 The occurrence subsequent to ישלח of each of the following 33 verbs of movement was located and examined: הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש, הנש.


208 The generalisation in Japhet 1987: 35 n. 92 demands a full-length study.

209 The reading קָלָּא יֵכִלנָּה את ה in LXXAB 1 Chron. 13.6 could reflect יֵכִילנָה in the Vorlage, but more than likely reflects the translator's interpretation of יֵכִילנָה as an H rather than a G form, in which case it became necessary to insert a direct object.

210 Observe that Chronicles says 'David went up (ישלח) ... to bring up (ишלח)' which could be considered the lectio difficilior due to lexical redundancy. It is unclear whether the verb ישלח is used in 2 Sam. 6.2 (once) and 1 Chron. 13.6 (twice) because of the stories' conception of the topography or because sacred places are usually situated in prominent locations, often elevated on a mound or mountain. Apart from stylistic variation, there is no apparent reason for Chronicles' use of לְבָּשַׁת in 13.5 instead of לְבָּשָׁת as in v. 6.
3.1.2 The Story's Geography

3.1.2.1 The Procession's Origin

Where were David and the Israelites prior to going for the ark? In their present arrangements Samuel and Chronicles apparently situate them in different places, the former in the Shephelah (cf. 2 Sam. 5.25) and the latter in Jerusalem (cf. 1 Chron. 11.4-8). However, these are literary depictions. It is impossible to know what span of time elapsed between the events related in 2 Samuel 5 and 6 and whether David and the Israelites returned to Jerusalem during that period. Furthermore, many believe the historical sequence of events related in 2 Samuel 5 is first the removal of the Philistine threat and then the conquest of Jerusalem; that is, the battles in 5.17-25 originally stood between the coronation in 5.1-3 and the conquest in 5.6-9. Consequently, the position of the geographic description מַעֲבֶדָתָם מִרְיָם in 5.25 immediately prior to the geographic descriptions in 6.2-4 is significant from a literary perspective.

3.1.2.2 2 Sam. 6.2
1 Chron. 13.6
1 Chron. 13.5

Most commentators on Samuel and Chronicles think the original story had a geographic reference to Baal(ah) Judah, reconstructed as מַעֲבֶדָתָם אַל כֵּלֵי יְהוֹה אֱשֶר לַחוֹדָה which was subsequently glossed with Kiriath-jearim in one textual tradition (Chronicles and 4QSamaa—as in Josh. 15.9, 60; 18.14) but distorted into a gentilic phrase in another (Samuel). Scholars agree that Baal(ah) Judah and

211 McCarter 1984: 157-160. See the discussion in 1.2.2 of 2 Samuel 6 and 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18.
212 Modern English translations have 'to' (NAB, NASB, NIV) or 'from' (ASV, ESV, JPS, KJV, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, RSV) 'Baale-judah' or 'Baalah(ah)' of Judah.
213 The belated association of the ark with Kiriath-jearim is one point in favour of the literary priority of 2 Samuel 6 over 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2. Compare 2 Sam. 6.2 and 1 Sam. 6.21; 7.1-2.
214 The related biblical references are Josh. 3.16; 9.17; 15.9-11, 60; 18.14-15, 28; Judg. 18.12; 1 Sam. 6.21; 7.1-2; 2 Sam. 6.2; Jer. 26.20; Ps. 132.6; Ezra 2.25; Neh. 7.29; 1 Chron. 2.50, 52-53; 13.5-6; 2 Chron.
Kiriath-jearim were located in the hill country northwest of Jerusalem, but other questions remain unsettled: Do Baal(ah) Judah and Kiriath-jearim refer to one place only or to two different places? What is/are the exact location(s) of Baal(ah) Judah and Kiriath-jearim? Was/were Baal(ah) Judah and Kiriath-jearim originally allotted to Benjamin or Judah? Why are references to this/these place(s) so divergent in the Hebrew and Greek Bibles, especially in Joshua? How did the ark become associated with Baal(ah) Judah and/or Kiriath-jearim instead of a more prominent Israelite sanctuary? This chapter cannot address such questions, and it will not dispute the consensus described above, except for one point: MT Samuel's gentilic phrase מַעְטִל יְוֵהָ is a revision rather than a corruption.215

What does מַעְטִל יְוֵהָ mean and why did it become the undisputed reading in the Masoretic and Greek versions of Samuel? The phrase refers undoubtedly to a group of people rather than a place, and in addition to the Greek versions it is interpreted this way by Aquila and Symmachus (ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκόντων Ἰουδα), the Vulgate (de viris Iuda), the Peshitta (מַקְרֵי יוֹדָה), and Targum Jonathan (פָּרָשָׁה). The phrase does

1.4. For in-depth discussion see dictionary and encyclopaedia entries, volumes on geography and historical geography, and commentaries on Joshua and Samuel. The following deserve special mention: Blenkinsopp 1969 passim; commentaries: Boling 1982 and Nelson 1997 on Joshua 9, 15, 18; W. R. Arnold 1917: 52-59; McCarter 1984: 162-163; Stoebbe 1994: 188; text-critical discussions: Herbert 1997b: 122; McKenzie 1984: 47-48; Pisano 1984: 101-104; Ulrich 1978: 198-199. It is impossible to discuss here all the facets of this textual problem. The following points sum up the significant issues which are not summarised in the consensus expressed above: (1) The preposition ἐν in Samuel's ματουλον is unoriginal. Movement in the original version and in the present versions is toward rather than from (ἐν) a place, although the meaning of the text is construed feasibly by scholars who emend it to 'from (ἐν) Baal(ah) Judah'. (2) The phrase εἰς πόλιν Δαούδ in Greek Chronicles is an intra-Septuagintal reading derived by initially reading ἐν for ἐπί, or encouraged by the translator's conception of the direction of movement, or motivated by the desire to avoid the inappropriate resonance of Baal(ah). (3) The phrase τοῦ βουνου in LXX1 Samuel is an addition intended to smooth the meaningless ἐν αὐτάκειαν standing alone, and is derived contextually from 2 Sam. 6.3-4. (4) The phrases ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκόντων Ἰουδα and ἐν αὐτάκειαν in Greek Samuel are a double reading reflecting the Hebrew מַעְטִל יְוֵהָ and מַעְטִל יְוֵהָ, respectively. The original Greek reading is ἐν αὐτάκειαν Ἰουδα to which the revised reading ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκόντων is prefixed in order to reflect more closely the received version. See Herbert 1997b: 122; McKenzie 1984: 47-48; Ulrich 1978: 198-199.

215 The following scholars believe the gentilic phrase makes good sense but they take it as the original reading: W. R. Arnold 1917: 58-59; Blenkinsopp 1969: 146, 152; 1972: 10, 80-81; Caird 1953: 1077; Campbell 1975: 171.
not mean 'lords' or 'rulers' of Judah as many surmise but rather 'citizens' or 'inhabitants' or 'landowners' of Judah. The commoner rather than the elite is in view. Early editors of Samuel may have altered the text in order to avoid the inappropriate resonance of Baal(ah), or because only Judean soldiers would be returning with David to Jerusalem after battle, or because the transfer of the ark to Jerusalem was a noteworthy event for Judeans more than others. Most significantly, shortly it is demonstrated that later editors of Samuel consigned the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6.3-4) rather than to Baal(ah) Judah.

3.1.2.3 2 Sam. 6.3
2 Sam. 6.3, 4
1 Chron. 13.7

The grammar of the הַרְכֶּב אל ('mount upon') and נָשַׁא ('bring/carry/take away/from/off/out') clauses in 2 Sam. 6.3 is disrupted only by the unoriginal יָא in the former whereas the absence of the verb נָשַׁא in Chronicles makes הַרְכֶּב govern a prepositional phrase introduced by 'לע' and another one introduced by 'מ'. Chronicles' הַרְכֶּב construction is artificial and suggests that either the verb נָשַׁא was deleted or the prepositional phrase מ was added. Allen, following Fishbane, suggests that

---

216 This notion is expressed by אָבֶרַה הָרָדַּע in Samuel (1 Sam. 30.26; 2 Sam. 19.12; cf. 2 Kgs. 23.1 // 2 Chron. 34.29; Ezek. 8.1). There is a large number of words in biblical Hebrew for leaders and rulers.

217 BDB 127; HALOT 1, 143. See Num. 21.28; Josh. 24.11; Judg. 9.2-47 (15 times); 20.5; 1 Sam. 23.11-12 (two times); 2 Sam. 21.12. W. R. Arnold and Caird (see above) read 'fighting men of Judah' but this misrepresents the vocabulary.

218 See Ginsburg 1897: 399-404.


220 Campbell 1975: 171.

221 See Herbert 1997b: 121, 123; McCarter 1984: 163. See 4.1.3.5 and appendix 3 on the interchange between יָא and לָע.

222 The only other occurrence of הַרְכֶּב מ is 2 Kgs. 23.30 (// 2 Chron. 35.24) in which it is probably an interpolation. 'The Hebrew statement is certainly terse beyond comparison' (Montgomery and Gehman 1951: 537-538). The frequent translation 'carry, drive, transport' for הַרְכֶּב in 2 Kgs. 23.30 and 1 Chron. 13.7 is awkward since the verb generally refers to position rather than movement. Space does not permit the development of this point.
was omitted due to its religious connotation in 1 Chron. 15.2, 15, 26-27\textsuperscript{223}, but 1
Chron. 13.6 explicitly seats the ark on a cart, and this does away with any supposed

tension. Conversely, the only other case of שֶׁמֶשׁ with spatial significance in Samuel is 1
Sam. 4.4 where the people of Shiloh bring out the ark in preparation for battle against the

Philistines. In addition, שֶׁמֶשׁ is significant elsewhere in Samuel for relating the movements

of the ark (1 Sam. 4.4; 2 Sam. 6.13; 15.24). Finally, Murray demonstrates that in
6.3-4 'reinforces the sense of victory celebration through a link' with שֶׁמֶשׁ in 5.21 (cf. 1
Chron. 14.12).\textsuperscript{224} To conclude, it is suggested that the interesting detail that the ark is

housed in the רבים, which is probably a reference to a temple or a complex

containing a temple, is interpolated in Chronicles from Samuel, and the phrase may also

be inauthentic in 1 Sam. 7.1 and 2 Sam. 6.3-4.

The supplementary comment in 2 Sam. 6.3-4 (also in 1 Sam. 7.1) that the זֶמֶשׁ

is customarily interpreted as a topographical feature and rendered as 'the

house of Abinadab that/which is/was in/on the hill'. This understanding suffers the

following limitations: (1) The rendering 'in/on the hill' for זֶמֶשׁ is ambiguous in context

and in Samuel. (2) זֶמֶשׁ cannot be construed convincingly as a known district of Baal(ah)

Judah or Kiriath-jearim on the basis of Josh. 18.28.\textsuperscript{225} (3) The position of a locale on a

familiar hill is expressed more appropriately by זֶמֶשׁ rather than זֶמֶשׁ.

(4) The noun זֶמֶשׁ would be the suitable term in Samuel for a well-known shrine if this meaning were

intended (cf. 1 Sam. 9.12-14, 19, 25; 10.5, 13). (5) Alternatively, the noun זֶמֶשׁ could have

been used, as in 1 Sam. 22.6: '... Saul was sitting at Gibeah (ゼムッシュ) under the tamarisk tree

on the height (זֶמֶשׂ)...'. Interestingly, זֶמֶשׁ and זֶמֶשׂ are used similarly. The noun זֶמֶשׂ is

always used with the article (זֶמֶשׂ), except in Josh. 13.26 (זֶמֶשׂ), Josh. 19.8 (זֶמֶשׂ)

\begin{itemize}
  \item Allen 1999: 385; Fishbane 1985: 392-394.
  \item Murray 1998: 32-33, 96-98, 104, 122.
\end{itemize}
and always refers to Ramah, except in 1 Sam. 22.6. The bottom line is this: רמְח (the hill) is Gibeah in the absence of additional clarification. However, few contemplate and even fewer embrace this rendering in 2 Sam. 6.3-4 since it contradicts their corrected Baal(ah) Judah in 2 Sam. 6.2. 'Gibeah' is considered a possibility ('perhaps') by BDB and Propp. Jerome's Vulgate, the King James Version, and Sime and Murray support this view. In addition, Fox renders the text 'in Giv'a and Brettler says 'The main theme of 2 Samuel 6 ... is the conveyance of the ark from Gibeah to Jerusalem ...'. Finally, Blenkinsopp also argues this view, but as discussed in 2.1 he takes 'Gibeah' as a covert reference to Gibeon. It must be stressed that nothing in the present text of MT 2 Sam. 6.2-4 disallows 'Gibeah' and the only evidence against it is the emendation of מִבְּסֵי in 2 Sam. 6.2 and the remote linkage of the ark with Kiriath-jearim in 1 Sam. 6.21-7.2 and 1 Chron. 13.5-6. As a matter of fact the following points argue in favour of the reading 'Gibeah': (1) The juxtaposition of an in vman in 5.25 and הבשעה in 6.3-4 creates a historical-geographic link which makes a rhetorically forceful... 

---

226 For other examples of the noun + article combination elevated to such a position of uniqueness that they have become the equivalents of proper names see JM §137b, p. 505; WO §13.6a, p. 249.
227 BDB 149.
229 The Vulgate has 'Gabaa', and Bressan 1960: 523 aptly remark 'al contrario delle altre volte, qui S. Gir. ha preso per nome proprio el nome comune «in colle»'.
230 Sime 1902: 113.
231 Murray 1998: 53, 56, 102, 113, 118-119. However, he erroneously locates 'a Gibeah' at Baal(ah) Judah, which he also equates with Kiriath-jearim, thus conflating the extant literary traditions.
232 Unfortunately, Greek Samuel is unhelpful here since the book routinely represents גיבא (= 'Gibeah') by ὁ Βουνώς (1 Sam. 10.10; 14.2; 22.6; 23.19; 26.1). Greek Samuel expresses 'Gibeah' of 'Benjamin' or 'Saul' with transliteration (1 Sam. 11.4; 13.2; 13.15; 14.16; 15.34; 2 Sam. 21.6; 23.29) but with ὁ Βουνώς when 'Gibeah' is further defined by another proper noun (1 Sam. 10.5; 23.19; 26.1, 3; 2 Sam. 2.24).
236 The statement that the ark was at Kiriath-jearim for 20 years (1 Sam. 7.2) is no less suspicious than the figures given for the judgeship of Samuel (1 Sam. 4.18; 40 years), the reign of Saul (1 Sam. 13.1; x years), and the reign of David (2 Sam. 5.4-5; 40 years).
point regarding David's success against the Philistines.\textsuperscript{237} (2) Scholars frequently assert the ark's absence in Samuel from 1 Sam. 7.2 to 2 Sam. 6.2 but this is false for MT Samuel which relates that Saul in Gibeah (1 Sam. 14.2, 5 ['Geba'], 16) requested the 'ark of God' (1 Sam. 14.18) in his battle against the Philistines. Saul's request for the ark in the vicinity of Gibeah and David's transfer of the ark from the ark in Gibeah to Jerusalem is hardly a chance association.\textsuperscript{238} (3) MT's statements in 1 Sam. 14.18, 2 Sam. 5.25, and 2 Sam. 6.2-4 constitute an anti-Saul polemic which announces David's control over Saul's Gibeah and Saul's ark.\textsuperscript{239} David finishes the military task which Saul is unable to adequately and fully complete and David recovers the religious symbol which Saul is

\textsuperscript{237} In addition to the remarks of Blenkinsopp and Murray, cited above, see Hertzberg 1964: 278; McCarter 1984: 157, 159-160. See the discussion of Geba and Gibeah in 2.1. The former antecedent of בָּאִם in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6 is Baal(ah) Judah. In Samuel the present antecedent is the expression ' הבמה תור 'בָּאִם in 5.25 and in Chronicles it is the glossed statement בָּאִם אֲשֶׁר בַּת יָהֹוָה in 13.6.

\textsuperscript{238} Most scholars emend MT 1 Sam. 14.18's דָּאָם לָא יֵאֶת on the basis of the Greek and OL evidence, whereas another significant group of scholars retains the MT reading as the lectio difficilior, but for the most part these fail to explain the significance of the MT reading. It is impossible here to review the literature on 1 Sam. 14.18 and the theories that there were multiple arks in ancient Israel or that דָּאָם, wherever in the Bible it (apparently) stands for a solid object, has been deliberately and systematically substituted for בָּאִים, with the single and accidental exception of 1 Sam. 14.18. The MT version of this verse is meaningless, 'And Saul said to Ahijah, "Bring the ark of God", for the ark of God was/existed in that day, and the sons of Israel', and this nonsense is a certain mark of editorial activity in the verse. There are a number of reasons for accepting דָּאָם as the earlier reading, such as (1) the concurrence of priest and ephod in the stories of Saul and David in 1 Samuel; (2) the reason for the request, i.e., oracular consultation, which fits best with the appearances of the so-called divinatory ephod in 1 Samuel; and (3) the language of the passage, such as the statement 'withdraw your hand' in v. 19, the reference to urim and thummim in v. 41, and the singular number of the verbs בָּאָם (v. 3) and בָּאָם (v. 18), which is especially significant since elsewhere a plurality of persons is responsible for the transport of the ark. The presumed originality of דָּאָם, however, does not erase the requirement to explain the significance of the later and canonical form of the biblical text having בָּאִים. It is unnecessary to emend the MT when one can accept that biblical authors, scribes and editors elevate polemic above literary coherence and historical veracity. Related discussion is given in 5.1.3.7.

\textsuperscript{239} Edelman 1992: 22-23 locates the בָּאִים בֵּית בָּאִים בֵּית מֹכֵּה southwest of Gibeon, but on the whole her historical reconstruction supports the view argued here: The ark almost certainly played a central role within Saul's national cult, a fact that led David to move it to his new capital at Jerusalem. As the site of the ark prior to David's reign, it is plausible that "Abinadab's hill" is an oblique reference to the religious capital of Saul's state. Textual tradition (esp. 1 Kings 3-9 and 2 Chronicles 1-2) tends to indicate that the great בָּאִים sanctuary of Gibeon served as Saul's religious capital... This may be so, but Saul is linked overtly to מֹכֵּה in 1 Samuel, and never appears in the book. See 2.1.
incapable of properly employing. Saul is neither military nor religious leader. 
David is both. Chronicles has not omitted 'superfluous details', a point also sustained by an 
examination of similar references to geographic phenomena in synoptic material in 
Samuel, Kings and Chronicles; rather, the early association of the ark with Baal(ah) 
Judah is transformed into a link between the ark and Gibeah in 1 Sam. 14.18 and 2 Sam. 
6.3-4, and into a link between the ark and Kiriath-jearim in 1 Sam. 6.21-7.2 and 1 Chron. 
13.5-6 (and also in Ps. 132.6). These tardy and rival traditions accentuate Saul's 
incapacity and indifference, respectively.

3.1.3 The Participants' Identity and Number

David's entourage is elaborated greatly in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 in contrast to the focus on 
David in 6.12-20a, where the participants are mentioned briefly in v. 15 and then are 
presented in vv. 18-19 more as recipients of David's benevolence than as participants in 
his transfer of the ark. At the outset it is noteworthy that three times Chronicles has 
תרשימים in 1 Chron. 13.5-6, 8 in contrast to a fuller phrase in each parallel case in 2 Sam. 
6.1-2, 5 (and the same is also true in 2 Sam. 6.15 // 1 Chron. 15.28).

---

241 The construction noun + relative + preposition + noun is common in biblical Hebrew for supplying 
geographic information. The preposition is frequently either ָ or ָ. 76 legitimate examples of the 
construction were located in parallel chapters and 13 of these constitute actual verbal parallels. The only 
minus in Chronicles is in the present passage.
242 It is observed in the discussion in 1.2.2 of 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 that some explore the 
possibility that the canonically earlier story presupposes, foreshadows or reinterprets the later one. This 
writer agrees with this hypothesis. It seems likely that the story in 1 Samuel was composed as a preface 
once the story in 2 Samuel was already written. The evidence suggests to this writer that the ark was first 
associated with Baal(ah) Judah, later with Kiriath-jearim, and finally with Gibeah.
243 See appendix 1.
Most scholars think וּרְבָּה was omitted in Chronicles thus producing an emphasis not found in the book's source. It is more probable, however, that לָכַּזְשֵׁא has undergone expansion in Samuel. This is suggested in part by the Hebrew variant ב which results in grammatical incongruity in the geographic phrase following רֶפֶת. The assembly of persons 'in', 'of', 'to' or 'from' geographic regions using the verbs כּנָא, כּנָא, כּנָא and בְּהֵמָּה is not articulated in biblical Hebrew by means of the preposition ב. Murray rightly divines the significance of Samuel's וּרְבָּה in relationship to רֶפֶת and also בְּהֵמָּה, and he also supplies an explanation for the enigmatic וּרְבָּה following רֶפֶת (see 3.1.1.2):

'David again (וּרְבָּה) gathered together all the élite troops...'. To what does the temporal adverb refer back? The most obvious implicature is to a previous occasion when David had assembled such troops. But 5.17-25 has neither explicitly narrated nor implied David's gathering such a military force, nor has there been any previous reference to David's doing so in the David story in Samuel. The answer to the puzzle may lie in the resonant conjunction of the expressions 'picked Israelite troops' (6.1) and 'to search out David' (5.17) further back in two episodes from David's flight from Saul. In 1 Sam. 24:3[2]; 26.2 Saul deployed three thousand picked troops from the fight against the Philistines 'to search out David' (לֹּא בֵּיהוֹוָה) in the Judaean wilderness. Yet as things turned out on each occasion it was Saul's life that, put in jeopardy to David and his small personal band of fighters, was spared by David. Now in our present text the Philistines twice send a force 'to search out David' (לֹּא בֵּיהוֹוָה) but it was they who were routed, by David and his personal band. Only following this defeat of the Philistines does 'David gather again all the elite troops in Israel', ten times Saul's 3000 (6.1). Thus the puzzling וּרְבָּה, 'again', in 6.1 evidently has rather distant textual anaphora, back to 1 Sam. 24.3[2] and 26.2, as being the first subsequent gathering of picked troops noted in the narrative. But this reference so far back in the story would by itself be too distant and allusive to be effective. It is made effective, however, through the further connection strikingly forged by the phrase 'to search out David' (לֹּא בֵּיהוֹוָה), a phrase which also links our passage to the same two earlier texts, and to nothing in between. This link creates narrative irony. For David has emerged unscathed from the Philistines come 'to seek his life', just as he had earlier from Saul. But more, with his small personal band David has now won the victory over the Philistines that Saul had failed to secure with Israel's élite troops.246

244 See appendix 1.
245 The root רְבָּה is discussed further in 6.1.1.3.3.
246 Murray 1998: 114-116. An investigation of the verb בּכּ in Samuel reveals an interesting tale of 'seeker' and 'sought'. Saul and David are neither subject nor object in only two of 37 cases. There are eight
3.1.3.2 2 Sam. 6.1  
1 Chron. 13.5

Chronicles' plus in 13.5 continues the broadness of the consultation in 13.1-4 and corresponds to the most extensive biblical depiction of the land. The land promised to Abraham (Gen. 15.18) and left unconquered by Joshua (Josh. 13.3) is now described according to the frontiers of Solomon's kingdom (1 Kgs. 8.65 // 2 Chron. 7.8). David and Israel turned Joshua's hope into reality—not after David's military crusades and at the end of his rule, but at the very start of his reign!

The 30,000 person army of MT 2 Sam. 6.1 pales into insignificance in light of the quantity of tribal troops in 1 Chronicles 12 and the military divisions in 1 Chronicles 27 and 2 Chronicles 17, and in the face of the enumeration of David's (1 Chron. 21.5), Rehoboam's (2 Chron. 11.1), Jeroboam's (2 Chron. 13.3), Asa's (2 Chron. 14.8), Amaziah's (2 Chron. 25.5), and Uzziah's (2 Chron. 26.13) armies. Therefore Samuel's figure would be inappropriate in 1 Chron. 13.5. The significance of Samuel's and Chronicles' figures should be construed in the context of Samuel, and Chronicles' descriptions in the context of Chronicles. Literally, both descriptions fit their narrative contexts and thrusts appropriately.

Samuel's numerical figure is as tendentious as Chronicles' geographic description and must be considered either figurative or rhetorical. The number in 2

'seekers' in Samuel, and Saul is the subject in 23 of 37 cases, and there are ten 'sought' in Samuel, and David is the object in 23 of 37 cases. There are five purposes for seeking in Samuel, and destruction or killing is the topic in 27 of 37 cases. Saul seeks to destroy David (16 times), and find donkeys (three times) and enlist David (once) and consult a medium (once) and destroy Abiathar (once) and the Gibeonites (once). David seeks Yahweh's mercy (twice), and to destroy Saul's assassin (once) but not Saul himself (once).

247 See the note in 1.3.3. The view that early Israel numbered two to three million people (based on Exod. 12.37; 38.26; Num. 1.46; 2.32; 11.21; 26.51) and that Palestine was the home of fifteen to twenty million people (based on Deut. 7.1) is fictional. See Grabbe 2000. Current demographic estimates for the population of Palestine are 150,000 for the Middle Bronze Age, 60,000-70,000 for the Late Bronze Age, and 50,000-150,000 at the start and 400,000-600,000 at the peak of the Iron Age (Broshi and Gophna 1986: 73-90; Finkelstein 1988: 334, 341, 355; Gonen 1984: 61-73; Gophna and Portugali 1988: 11-28).
Sam. 6.1 may intend to evoke Numbers' and Joshua's cultic armies, or accentuate the ark's religious significance, or glorify David's rise to power from an original base of just 600 men (1 Sam. 23.13; 27.2; 30.9). However, the compositional significance of the numbers three, 30, 300, 3000, 30,000 and 300,000 may be appreciated more fully. The numbers three, 30, 300, 3000, 30,000 and 300,000 are above all associated with military forces, and especially warfare between the Israelites and Philistines.249 There are three battle companies (1 Sam. 11.1; 13.17), three fighting sons (1 Sam. 17.13-14; 31.6, 8; 2 Sam. 2.18), and 'the Three' and 'the Thirty' warriors (2 Sam. 23.9, 13, 16-19, 22-24), and there are also the following:

1 Sam. 4.10 The Philistines fell 30,000 Israelites in battle.
1 Sam. 11.8 Saul musters 300,000 (MT) / 600,000 (4QSama, OG, OL) / 700,000 (Josephus) from Israel and 30,000 (MT) / 70,000 (4QSama, OG, OL, Josephus) from Judah to fight the Ammonites.
1 Sam. 13.2 Saul chooses 3000 to fight the Philistines.
1 Sam. 13.5 The Philistines muster 30,000 (MT, LXXB) / 3000 (LXXL, Peshitta) chariots and 6000 horsemen to fight Israel.
1 Sam. 24.3 Saul assembles 3000 to pursue David.
1 Sam. 26.2 Saul assembles 3000 to pursue David.
2 Sam. 6.1 David assembles 30,000 (MT) / 70,000 (OG, OL) following his defeat of the Philistines.250

The versional evidence suggests that 70,000 was revised to 30,000 in MT 2 Sam. 6.1. The assimilation or harmonisation to 30,000 also has figurative or rhetorical significance in the book of Samuel. David's 30,000 is the number of Israelites killed when the Philistines

248 The historical reliability of this and many other large numbers must be rejected, as well as attempts to explain them by means of mathematical formulae or by interpreting פָּלָק as 'troop' or 'unit' rather than 'thousand'. The occurrence and role of large numbers in the Bible is paralleled in Sumerian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Hittite and Egyptian royal inscriptions and military annals. See Fouts 1992, 1994, 1997.
249 See, e.g., Josh. 7.3-4; 8.3; Judg. 7.6-8, 16, 22; 8.4; 15.11; 16.27; 1 Chron. 11.11, 20; 2 Chron. 14.8; 17.14; 25.5. Only verses with the numbers 3000, 30,000 and 300,000 are given here.
250 On Josephus' reading see Begg 1997: 14. A comprehensive review of all numbers containing פָּלָק / πρακόντα κυλιάδος and פָּלָק פָּלָק / ἐβδομίκοντα χιλιάδος in the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Bible shows that the Greek version is not inclined to exaggerate numbers in the Vorlage and neither does it have a special interest in the particular number 'seven' or multiples thereof. Similarly, a thorough assessment of all instances of פָּלָק and פָּלָק פָּלָק in synoptic passages in Samuel, Kings and Chronicles with attention to the versions shows that these books are equally prone to contain difficulties and disparities in numerical expression. The data supporting these conclusions, which the writer brings together in an unpublished essay entitled 'Large Numbers in Samuel, Kings and Chronicles', cannot be duplicated here.
capture the ark (1 Sam. 4.10) and the number of Judeans which Saul musters for battle against the Ammonites (1 Sam. 11.8). David's 30,000 also represents a ten-fold increase over the 3000 which Saul musters to fight the Philistines (1 Sam. 13.2) and pursue David (24.3; 26.2). MT Samuel's number serves to impart a pro-David/anti-Saul thrust to the story.

This statement must be viewed in the light of the 'polar' description of the figures of Saul and David in what has gone before; we have previously noted the role played by the passage 5:17-25 in this connexion. Saul had no more than 3000 bahurim at his disposal for his wars with the Philistines and his hunt for David, 1 Sam. 13:2, 24:3, 26:2. By contrast, David, the object of berakah, is able in 2 Sam. 6 to muster 30,000 men in order to bring home the Ark, which according to the D-group Saul never recaptured, and according to the Chronicler never even inquired after. This association by contrast corresponds numerically to the song of acclamation in 1 Sam. 18:7, 'Saul slays his thousands, but David his ten thousands', which recurs in 29:5 to provide extra resonance for 2 Sam. 6:1. This expressive numerical symbolism must also be set over against 1 Sam. 11:8, where Saul gathers 300,000 + 30,000 men for the relief of Jabez, and 2 Sam. 24:9, where the number of men mustered in David's kingdom is said to be 1,300,000. The number 30,000 in 2 Sam. 6:1 is thus a highly significant component in this connexion.\(^{251}\)

3.1.3.3 2 Sam. 6.2

Is Chronicles' הָלְלַדוּתָם אֶתְרָא הָאָדָם the result of the book's pan-Israel interest?\(^{252}\)

Accompaniment by implied copula is frequently expressed in biblical literature by means of the formula \(X + יָאְשָר + עַבְדָּה + X\) ('the warriors which [are/were] with him/David'), but Samuel uses this construction far more than any other book. The construction regularly functions to express accompaniment in battle situations, especially in Judges and Samuel. The noun עַבְדָּה most often appears in an identical construction and context in synoptic material, but the phrase הָלְלַדוּתָם אֶתְרָא occurs three times more frequently in Samuel than in either Kings or Chronicles. The use of the noun עַבְדָּה in the formula יָאְשָר + עַבְדָּה + X is


\(^{252}\) See 5.1.3.8 and appendix 1.
most common in Judges and Samuel, and once again, the construction usually expresses accompaniment in battle situations. The similarity between 1 Sam. 14.20 and 2 Sam. 6.2 is remarkable, especially in light of Saul's request for the ark in MT 1 Sam. 14.18:

1 Sam. 14.20
2 Sam. 6.2

Finally, the phrase כִּלְמַדְמָם in 2 Sam. 6.2's plus occurs at the beginning of a concentric structure which ends with David's blessing 'the people' (םִדוֹת; 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2), David's gift of food to 'all the people' (כִּלְמַדְמָם; 2 Sam. 6.19a; cf. 1 Chron. 16.3), and the return of 'all the people' (כִּלְמַדְמָם; 2 Sam. 6.19b // 1 Chron. 16.43a) to their homes.253

Again, is Chronicles' כִּלְמַדְמָם really the result of the book's pan-Israel interest?

3.1.3.4 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8

According to Williamson 'This change is in line with the Chronicler's practice of avoiding terminology which might be confused with that used elsewhere in the Bible for the later political division'.254 This generalised statement must be doubted for both textual and literary reasons.255 First, the shortness of 'all Israel' (Chronicles) vis-à-vis 'all the house of Israel' (MT and Peshitta Samuel), 'the sons of Israel' (LXXAB Samuel and the Syro-Hexaplar), and 'all the sons of Israel' (4QSama, LXXL Samuel and Jacob of Edessa), suggests that the reading in Chronicles is pristine and that the other witnesses contain independent expansions.256 Second, some scholars emend MT 2 Sam. 6.5 to 'all the sons of Israel' whereas others deem the entire verse a late addition to the story based in part on 'all the house of Israel' which they consider anachronistic. It is interesting that

---

253 Murray 1998: 146 thinks והדו כִּלְמַדְמָם and the assembly and dispersal of the participants form an inclusio between vv. 1-2 and 18-20.
255 See appendix 1 and 5.1.2.2.
occurs 125 times in the Latter Prophets (81 times in Ezekiel; 20 times in Jeremiah; 24 times elsewhere), eight times in the Pentateuch (five times in Leviticus; twice in Exodus; once in Numbers) and four times in the Writings (three times in Psalms; once in Ruth). In the Former Prophets the phrase occurs in Josh. 21.25 and 1 Kgs. 12.21; 20.31 and seven times in Samuel, where the textual evidence for the occurrences is striking. appears four times in the stories about the ark (1 Sam. 7.2-3; 2 Sam. 6.5, 15) and occurs three times in the context of the dynasty of Saul (2 Sam. 1.12; 12.8; 16.3). Furthermore, in both 2 Sam. 12.8 and 16.3 MT's is probably secondary to and respectively. Gelander aptly comments:

A key phrase for both episodes [Uzzah and Michal] is (to bless), vss. 11, 12, 18, 20 generally appearing alongside (house), in vss. 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21. There may also be a connection between the motif (bless the house) and the unusual phrase (house of Israel) which appears here twice, in vss. 5 and 15. This may be intended to stress the blessing brought by David, particularly in contrast to the house of Saul, hinted at in the phrase 'above your father and above all his house' (2 Sam. 6:21).

3.1.4 The Participants' Performance

The agreement among the versions regarding in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 stands out against the textual uncertainties in the second half of the story (2 Sam. 6.14, 16 // 1 Chron. 15.27, 29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-22) where David's precise activities are unclear. Other details in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 are not so straightforward.

257 McCarter 1984: 295, 368 argues that, e.g., the Peshitta's and, reflect the original Hebrew.
258 Gelander 1991: 47. 'The contrast between and is prominent in 2 Samuel 3, and 'house of Saul' occurs elsewhere only in 2 Sam. 9.1-3; 16.5, 8; 19.18. Not only Caird 1953: 1078 considers Samuel's 'an editorial exaggeration'.
The prepositional phrase לְפָנָיו (לְפָנַי or לְפָנֶיךָ) followed by יְוהֵי appears 251 times, including 24 times in Samuel, 14 times in Kings, and 19 times in Chronicles. The phrase followed by יָדוֹ (יד) occurs 24 times, including five times in Chronicles, but never in Samuel and Kings. It is remarkable that Chronicles does not dislike 'before Yahweh' which it uses twelve times in non-synoptic material, has as a plus in one synoptic verse, and shares five times in synoptic material. This evidence and additional evidence in appendix 2 suggest that Chronicles' two minuses and two variant readings 'before God'in the story of David's transfer of the ark are not tendentious adjustments.

In 1 Samuel 'King' Saul never acts לְפָנָיו, but others do: the Israelites, Samuel's parents Hannah and Elkanah, the prophet Samuel, the priest Ahimelech, Saul's servant Doeg the Edomite, Saul's son Jonathan, and David. The evidence from 2 Samuel and from synoptic material in 1 Chronicles is summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Sam. 5.3 // 1 Chron. 11.3</th>
<th>S and C have לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8</td>
<td>S has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי; C has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.7 // 1 Chron. 13.10</td>
<td>S has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי; C has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27</td>
<td>S has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי in a plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29</td>
<td>S has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי in a plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1</td>
<td>S has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי; C has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ps. 96.13 // 1 Chron. 16.33]</td>
<td>C [and Psalms] has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.21</td>
<td>S has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 7.18 // 1 Chron. 17.16</td>
<td>S and C have לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 21.9</td>
<td>S has לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

259 1 Chron. 16.33; 22.18; 23.13, 31; 29.22; 2 Chron. 1.6; 14.12; 19.2; 20.13, 18; 27.6; 31.20.
260 2 Kgs. 21.22 // 2 Chron. 33.23.
261 2 Sam. 5.3 // 1 Chron. 11.3; 2 Sam. 7.18 // 1 Chron. 17.16; 1 Kgs. 8.62 // 2 Chron. 7.4; 1 Kgs. 22.21 // 2 Chron. 18.20; 2 Kgs. 23.3 // 2 Chron. 34.31.
262 See appendix 2. לְפָנָיו יְוהֵי appears in 1 Sam. 1.12, 15, 19; 6.20; 7.6; 10.19, 25; 11.15 (twice); 12.7; 15.33; 21.7 (מְלֹאָה); 8; 23.18; 26.19.
263 Greek Samuel has a doublet, the first member in semi-agreement with MT Samuel and the second member in agreement with Chronicles. See appendix 2.
In 2 Samuel David conducts himself (2 Sam. 5.3; 6.5, 14, 16, 17, 21; 7.18) at the expense of Saul and his sons (2 Sam. 6.21; 21.9). On one hand, Chronicles does not have an aversion to, and on the other, Samuel wishes to emphasise David’s conduct. The distribution of the theological adverbial in Samuel, including its appearance in adjustments and supplements, the concentration of the phrase in 2 Samuel 6, and its repetition at the boundaries of 2 Sam. 6.21, are not chance occurrences.

3.1.4.2 2 Sam. 6.5 1 Chron. 13.8

MT Samuel’s text can be translated by ‘with all (sorts of) conifer wood(-instrument)s’ and Chronicles’ and 4QSam’s by ‘with great exuberance and with songs’. Nevertheless, the consensus among scholars is that (1) MT Samuel is unintelligibly corrupt, and that (2) MT Chronicles retains the most pristine form of the original text, and that (3) MT Chronicles should perhaps be emended to, ‘with sonorous instruments and songs’, by the simple addition of a, and that (4) is the original reading in Samuel and in the Vorlage of Chronicles. Chronicles’ present text may show the accidental omission of, but MT Samuel’s text is not the result of scribal errors alone: the omission of, the orthographic confusion of, and, the orthographic confusion of, and as well as the placement of the mistaken reading, the metathesis of and, and the orthographic confusion of, and. MT Samuel’s text must reflect at least some intentional modification.

264 Wright 2002: 204. The exact family, genus and species of שיח is unknown, so ‘conifer’ is appropriate. Other translations are ‘cypress’, ‘juniper’, ‘fir’ and ‘pine’. Modern English translations, except for the ASV, JPS, KJV, NASB and NKJV, emend MT Samuel.

265 Wright 2002: 204.

266 McCarter 1984: 164.
Greek Chronicles has ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ ἐν ψαλτρῷ which aligns well with Chronicles' and 4QSama's ἐν οὐκ ἔσχαι. Greek Samuel has ἐν ἄρογνοις ἰμασμένοις (LXXA καὶ) ἐν ἰσχύι καὶ ἐν ὑδαίς, which may be rendered 'on well-tuned instruments mightily and melodically'. This text-string provides the clue for deciphering the history of Samuel's wording. The first and second prepositional phrases in Greek Samuel are a double reading in which each element corresponds to MT Samuel's ἐν οὐκ, and the third prepositional phrase in Greek Samuel corresponds to MT Samuel's ἐν ψαλτρῷ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Samuel</th>
<th>MT Samuel</th>
<th>Chronicles and 4QSama²⁶⁷</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐν ἄρογνοις ἰμασμένοις</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν οὐκ ἔσχαι</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν ψαλτρῷ // ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(καὶ) ἐν ἰσχύι</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν οὐκ ἔσχαι</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν ψαλτρῷ // καὶ ἐν ψαλτρῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐν ὑδαίς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ulrich argues that this is one of six instances in 2 Samuel 6 of hebraising revision by a 'later translator' or the 'kaige recensionist' in which the general practice of the reviser is to prefix to the preserved OG translation his approximation toward MT:

... the latter member ἐν ἰσχύι καὶ ἐν ὑδαίς clearly reflects 4Q C (omitting ἐν). The former member (also omitting ἐν), is enigmatic (cf. 6:14 where ἐν ἄρογνοις ἰμασμένοις = ἐν ἰσχύι [,?] ...), but G is apparently attempting to reflect a plural construct chain (= M), not a conjoined pair (= 4Q C).²⁶⁸

Chronicles' and 4QSama's ἐν ἰσχύι is primary and MT Samuel's ἐν ψαλτρῷ is secondary²⁶⁹, yet the latter is meaningful²⁷⁰ and its provenance and role in the

²⁶⁷ Alternatively, does Greek Samuel's ἐν ἄρογνοις ἰμασμένοις in 2 Sam. 6.5, 14 reflect ἐν ἰσχύι ἐν ψαλτρῷ or ἐν ἰσχύι ἐν ψαλτρῷ? Observe ἐν ἰσχύι / ψαλτρῷ τερμην. in Ps. 81.3 (LXX 80.3). For the adjective ἐν see also 2 Sam. 1.23; 23.1; Ps. 16.6, 11; 81.3; 133.1; 135.3; 147.1; Job 36.11; Prov. 22.18; 23.8; 24.4; Cant. 1.16.

²⁶⁸ Ulrich 1978: 198; cf. 197-202; cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 331. Some believe Samuel's ἐν ἄρογνοις ἰμασμένοις (LXXA καὶ) ἐν ἰσχύι conflates ὑπὲρ ἔλεος and ἐν ἰσχύι (e.g., Driver 1890: 266; Herbert 1997b: 123-124; McCarter 1984: 163-164; McKenzie 1984: 48-49; Rehm 1937: 26). However, Murray 1998: 57 correctly points out that ἐν ἰσχύι would have been rendered by either ἐν ἄρογνοις ἰσχύις or ἐν ἄρογνοις ἰμασμένοις.

²⁶⁹ Most take this view, e.g., Wright 2002: 204-207. Soggin 1964: 377 emends MT Samuel to ἐν ἰσχύι ἐν ψαλτρῷ by the addition of ἐν.

²⁷⁰ MT Samuel's ἐν ἰσχύι is retained in toto as the lectio difficilior by Barthélemy 1982: 242; Bergen 1996: 329; Seow 1989: 97 n. 51.
canonical book of Samuel should be explored. The roots צר and סעס do not play a
significant role in Samuel and the Former Prophets in comparison with Chronicles²⁷¹, but
 turno is prominent in Solomon’s temple building narratives²⁷², and notably in the form
משהו (1 Kgs. 5.22, 24; 6.34; 9.11; cf. turno in 2 Chron. 3.5). The phrase צר
משהו in 2 Sam. 6.5 does not have the same referent as it does in the aforementioned
passages, but ‘May there not be hidden behind the language of TM and Pesh. a
reminiscence of that cultic practice which exercised such a powerful literary influence
upon 2 Sam. 6?²⁷³.

Samuel and Chronicles disagree on the latter word pair. By consensus Chronicles
substitutes המשהו and המשהו for Samuel’s המשהו (2 Sam. 6.5) and המשהו (2 Sam. 6.5;
twice in Ps. 150.5) because Samuel’s terms are exceptional whereas the others are
common in Chronicles: המשהו occurring 11 times, and elsewhere once in each of Ezra
and Nehemiah; המשהו occurring 16 times, and elsewhere five times in Numbers, three times in
Kings, twice in Nehemiah, and once in each of Hosea, Psalms and Ezra. However, this
approach has problems. (1) The terms in Hebrew and Greek Chronicles line up well, but

²⁷¹ Both צר and סעס are developed more fully in Chronicles. Chronicles uses the noun צר (‘strength’)
most often (6 times; 1 Chron. 13.8; 16.11, 27-28; 2 Chron. 6.41; 30.21) following only Psalms (31 times),
Proverbs (9 times) and Ezekiel (8 times), whereas Samuel only has it twice (1 Sam. 2.10; 2 Sam. 6.14). The
adjective צר occurs in 2 Sam. 22.18 but not in Chronicles, and the verb צר occurs in neither book. On the
theme צר in Chronicles see Johnstone 1997: 1, 322. Chronicles uses the noun סעס most often (14 times; 1
Chron. 6.16-17; 13.8; 15.16; 16.42; 25.6-7; 2 Chron. 5.13; 7.6; 23.13, 18; 29.27-28; 34.12) following only
Psalms (42 times), whereas Samuel does not have the noun. However, Samuel does have the noun סעס in 2
Sam. 22.1 and the verb סעס in 1 Sam. 18.6 and 2 Sam. 19.36. Chronicles also uses the verb סעס (17 times; 1
Chron. 6.18; 9.33; 15.16, 19, 27; 16.9, 23; 2 Chron. 5.12-13; 9.11; 20.21; 23.13; 29.28; 35.15, 25), equal to
the number of occurrences in Nehemiah, and following only Psalms (27 times).

²⁷² 1 Kgs. 5.22, 24; 6.15, 34; 9.11; 2 Chron. 2.7; 3.5. סעס occurs elsewhere in 2 Kgs. 19.23; Ps. 104.17,
and also ten times in the Latter Prophets. Compare סעס in Cant. 1.17.

²⁷³ Carlson 1964: 64; cf. 77. Seow 1989: 97 n. 51 thinks צר סעס is a cognate of Akkadian burāšu,
‘crushed wood’ or ‘wood shavings’, used in rituals.
Greek Samuel does not reflect נְתֵנִים, and αὐλός generally stands for נְתֵנִים. (2) The agreement of κύμβαλον in all versions of Samuel and Chronicles shows that Chronicles also does not reflect נְתֵנִים, but there is partial agreement between Greek Samuel (αὐλός) and Hebrew and Greek Chronicles (נַעֲרָתִי and σάλπιγξ) on the inclusion of wind instruments. The differences between MT Samuel and MT Chronicles are not due to simple substitution. (3) The affiliation of 4QSam’s text is uncertain, and Herbert raises the possibility of an additional musical instrument in 4QSam.\(^{274}\) (4) Many assert that Chronicles’ נְתֵנִים is a late equivalent for Samuel’s וְלָלַיַּה, but נְתֵנִים in 2 Sam. 6.5 and twice in Ps. 150.5 can also be construed as a late term.\(^{275}\) (5) Several scholars notice the absence of aerophones from MT 2 Sam. 6.5, and Wright considers this sufficiently troublesome to conclude that they are nevertheless present in the first procession even if not to the degree that they are in the second.\(^{276}\) (6) It is a logical fallacy to conclude that a term which is frequent in Chronicles and on occasion stands opposite an uncommon term in Samuel or Kings is substituted because of ordinariness. This could be the case, but frequency can only suggest the probability of such a substitution. Both נַעֲרָתִי and נַעֲרָתִי occur first in Chronicles in 1 Chron. 13.8 and perhaps these initial (and original?) occurrences prompt the independent large-scale inclusion of both instruments in Chronicles’ non-synoptic supplements dealing with music (1 Chronicles 15–16, 25; 2 Chronicles 5, 13, 15, 20, 29).\(^{277}\) These issues make it impossible to know the earliest wording in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8.

\(^{275}\) See appendix 3.
3.1.5 The Attendants' Identity and Position

3.1.5.1 2 Sam. 6.3 1 Chron. 13.7

Five persons have the name גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה (Uzzah), a hypocoristic or shortened theophoric name for גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה or גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה. Three persons have the name גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה (Ahio) which some suggest is similarly short for גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה or גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה. Most scholars retain MT's punctuation (גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה) although some re-point the consonants as גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה ('his brother') or גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה ('his brothers'; cf. οἱ δὲ θείου τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Greek Samuel and Chronicles). The textual implications favour the view that גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה is the proper name 'Ahio'. Three persons have the name גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה ('Abinadab') and in this context Uzzah and Ahio are called גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה, understood to mean 'sons' rather than 'grandsons' of Abinadab. It is pointless to discuss here the literary and historical difficulties related to the identification of Uzzah and Ahio. The pragmatic assumptions are that גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה refers to a temple or a complex containing a temple and that מִזְבַּח גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה serves to authenticate Uzzah's and Ahio's appropriate cultic status. In light of this fact it is remarkable that 1 Chron. 13.7 has גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה but not מִזְבַּח גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה. Furthermore, an investigation of similar descriptions based on formal criteria suggests that גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה defining Uzzah and Ahio would not have been omitted if it had stood in Chronicles' Vorlage. There are 86 statements of personal identification in parallel passages in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles that consist of 'proper noun + X + proper noun' in which the proper nouns are not Israel or Ammon and in which X is any of נַפְשִׁים, בֵּית, כִּבְגָדָהש, כִּבְגָדָהש/אש/אש/אש/אש/אש/אש/אש. In summary: 55 times Samuel–Kings and Chronicles share an identical phrase or a similar phrase involving an orthographical difference, a substitution, or a smaller or larger number of words; 15 times the parallel in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles

278 Are they sons or grandsons of Abinadab? Are Uzzah and Eleazar brothers or one and the same person? Is גָּדוֹל/עַזְצָה an obscure reference to Zadok? What implications does the seemingly long period of time between 1 Sam. 7.2 and 2 Sam. 6.1 have for the identification of these characters? See the commentaries and also Brettler 1992b; Edelman 1992; Propp 1992; Ramsey 1992; Thompson 1992b.
is inexact or uncertain; 4 times Chronicles has a plus; 12 times Samuel–Kings has a plus: 8 of the 12 revolve around figures who are clearly defined or known contextually, or who appear in non-parallel material in Samuel–Kings, or other issues related to shared/non-shared material are involved; 3 of the 12 are complicated and arguments can go in either direction. This instance of Samuel's plus and Chronicles' minus does not tally well with the data just mentioned. Consequently, the burden of proof falls on scholars who suggest that Chronicles has gratuitously omitted the phrase. The description is literarily significant in Samuel, and potentially so in Chronicles, because it serves to authenticate Uzzah's and Ahio's appropriate cultic status, and in so doing it also implicates Uzzah (the rhetorically foregrounded character in 2 Sam. 6.3) rather than David for cultic negligence or Yahweh for inexplicable caprice in MT 2 Sam. 6.6-7. Uzzah should have known better!

3.1.5.2 2 Sam. 6.3 // 1 Chron. 13.7
1 Chron. 13.7
2 Sam. 6.4
2 Sam. 6.7
1 Chron. 13.10

The disjunctive construction ... in 2 Sam. 6.3 // 1 Chron. 13.7 introduces background information which vivifies the story and prepares the reader for subsequent events. The details in 2 Sam. 6.3, 6 // 1 Chron. 13.7, 9 allow the following reconstruction using extra-biblical data: the ark is on a two-wheel flat-bed wood cart, drawn by a pair of oxen, each ox with a yoke harness attached to either side of a long pole

279 2 Sam. 3.3 // 1 Chron. 3.1; 2 Sam. 3.5 // 1 Chron. 3.3; 1 Kgs. 12.21 // 2 Chron. 11.1; 1 Kgs. 15.1 // 2 Chron. 13.1; 1 Kgs. 15.18 // 2 Chron. 16.2; 2 Kgs. 11.2 // 2 Chron. 22.11; 2 Kgs. 18.1 // 2 Chron. 29.1; 2 Kgs. 23.34 // 2 Chron. 36.4.
280 2 Sam. 8.3 // 2 Chron. 18.3; 2 Sam. 23.18 // 1 Chron. 11.20; 2 Kgs. 22.3 // 2 Chron. 34.8.
281 The writer suggests in 3.1.2.3 that is interpolated in 1 Chron. 13.7 from 2 Sam. 6.3. In view of the present discussion the interpolation was likely completed prior to the insertion of in 2 Sam. 6.3.
extending forward from the cart, and each ox with a nose-ring to which a cord is attached, and which Uzzah and Ahio hold as they guide (דְּהַם) the oxen, cart and ark along the road.

Scholarship maintains that MT 2 Sam. 6.3-4 contains a classic example of dittography through homoioteleuton, in which the second נַעַל далו gave rise to the accidental insertion of the first נַעַל далו (after the first נַעַל далו) together with the repetition of the following יָדָהוּ מִכָּה אֹבִינר בָּשֶׁר בַּנְבָּעָה. Indeed, the MT reflects several difficulties in its current form: (1) a tautologous report of the לא-יִנָּה of the ark; (2) an obvious case of grammatical disagreement in the second לְנַעַל далוּ; (3) distant anaphora for the suffix of the second יָדָהוּ; and (4) the words following the presumed dittography, יָּשִֹא רִאשׁ הַאֲלָלוֹת, cannot be made to fit on to the repeated clause; that is, it is illogical to say: 'They brought it [the ark] out of Abinadab's barn, which is Hunan, with the ark of God'.

After eliminating the presumed dittograph, the MT reads:

This emended text has additional difficulties: (1) The combination יָדָהוּ מִכָּה אֹבִינר בָּשֶׁר בַּנְבָּעָה is unidiomatic; rather, one might expect a clause containing the preposition על, such as עַל הַאֲלָלוֹת יָדָהוּ וְלֹא תְאַרֵּר ... ('... the cart on which was the ark of God'). (2) The omission of any comment on the position of Uzzah is striking. The MT points out that Ahio is located לפני הַאֲרָך but where is Uzzah, who is the principal character in v. 6? In view of these problems some scholars suggest the insertion of יָדָהוּ מִכָּה אֹבִינר בָּשֶׁר בַּנְבָּעָה: 'And Uzzah was walking beside God's ark and Ahio was walking before the ark'.

---

The emended MT also fails to do justice to other versional evidence. LXX$^1$ Samuel's καὶ Ὀζα ... ἐπορεύοντο is often used to generate the phrase ἔτη καὶ ἐπορεύοντο with which scholars emend MT to ἔτη καὶ ἐπορεύοντο, and LXX$^1$ Samuel's καὶ ἐκ πλαγίων τῆς κιβωτοῦ is usually considered an independent adjustment to clarify the attendants' position vis-à-vis the ark or to stress their care for the ark. Contrary to these ad hoc corrections of MT, LXX$^1$'s ἐμπροσθεν καὶ ἐκ πλαγίων is a doublet which conflates two originally independent prepositional phrases: ἐμπροσθεν stands for ὑπὲρ and ἐκ πλαγίων corresponds to ἔπειτο. $^{283}$ Trebolle Barrera argues that the textual evidence in Hebrew and Greek 2 Sam. 6.3-4, 7 // 1 Chron. 13.7, 10 attests three traditions regarding the role of Uzzah and Ahio.$^{284}$

The brothers conducted the cart. 
The brothers marched in front of the ark. 
The brothers marched beside the ark.

The first tradition is primary. Chronicles has this tradition alone, and it is also reflected in all versions of Samuel. Consequently, 'C appears to contain the most pristine text in this passage,$^{285}$ with the exception of which is probably interpolated from Samuel (3.1.2.3).$^{286}$ 4QSam$^a$ clearly shares the longer form of the text, but its exact wording is uncertain.$^{287}$ The pluses and minuses in Greek Samuel attest forms of the received text at various stages in its composition, although the Greek versions also reflect the hands of their own editors. In the first half of 2 Sam. 6.4 it is impossible to determine with certainty the sequence of the gradual supplementation with which presumably include, and LXX$^A$ is revised toward MT with τὴν καλήν καὶ ἡπατὶν αὐτῆς ἀπὸ οἴκου Ἀμώναβα βοῦν, and LXX$^L$ is revised with τοῦ θεοῦ. In the latter half of

$^{283}$ See appendix 3.
$^{286}$ See appendix 3 on ἔπειτο versus ἔπειτο.
2 Sam. 6.4 the *earliest supplement* to the story was probably רכובו החוצה [לולא למשה]. LXX^B was revised in full whereas LXX^L was revised in part with the insertion of ἐμπροσθεν only, thus creating the double reading in LXX^L. LXX^A is incoherent.

Originally, the brothers were the conductors of the oxen, cart and ark. Later, biblical editors positioned the brothers beside the ark in order to account for the fate of Uzzah. Finally, editors took Ahio away and stationed him in front of the ark so as to explain his survival and shield his character. These editors simultaneously made the story unclear with respect to Uzzah’s location. This remarkable ambiguity entices scholars to emend MT Samuel, but its editorial intention encourages the reader to doubt Uzzah’s adherence to his role and ultimately Uzzah’s confidence in the deity’s self-sufficiency. Again, the homicide in 2 Sam. 6.7 is not the result of David’s cultic negligence or Yahweh’s inexplicable caprice. Rather, Uzzah’s ‘unfaith’ proved fateful.

3.1.6 The Ark’s Epithets

3.1.6.1 1 Chron. 13.5
2 Sam. 6.3
1 Chron. 13.7
2 Sam. 6.4
2 Sam. 6.4

See appendix 2.

3.1.6.2 2 Sam. 6.2
1 Chron. 13.6

The construction ו… אחר (in this order or reversed) occurs 33 times, 20 times outside an במagine clause either with (nine times) or without (11 times) an ל…” element, and thirteen times within an במagine clause that functions to characterise more precisely an
antecedent. With regard to the second type of clause, on 11 occasions the construction occurs with a לעה element and consists of the following parts:

\[ \text{Z לעה Y י.flash X} \]

(1) an antecedent main subject (X)
(2) followed by a sub-clause introduced with the relative pronoun י._flash and containing
(3) the verb י.ך and
(4) the embedded subject י. with a pronominal suffix (Y) and
(5) the preposition ל with a resumptive pronominal suffix (Z) referring back to the main subject (X)

2 Sam. 6.2 is exceptional among the 11 examples because the embedded subject י. lacks the pronominal suffix Y and is duplicated and because there is a noticeably long interval between the י. and 'Z לעה' elements.\textsuperscript{288} Again with regard to the second type of clause, on one occasion the construction occurs without the 'Z לעה' element (Dan. 10.1), and in 1 Chron. 13.6 the construction occurs without both the Y and 'Z לעה' elements. The expression 'לעה ... י. ... י.ך' (in this order or another) denotes ownership and/or authority over places or people(s), and over an object in the case of the ark.\textsuperscript{289} Therefore, the absence of the 'Z לעה' element makes 1 Chron. 13.6 exceptional.\textsuperscript{290} In view of these stylistic incongruities, and other difficulties highlighted below, it is proposed that the earlier text common to both Samuel and Chronicles was י. י.ך י.ך ('which happened to be there'; י.ך II [cf. י.ך I]). Ehrlich's brilliant suggestion, developed further by

\textsuperscript{288} The antecedent main subject (X) is the temple in Jer. 7.10, 11, 14, 30; 32.34; 34.15; Jerusalem in Jer. 25.29; Dan. 9.18; the Israelite people in 2 Chron. 7.14; the gentile nations in Amos 9.12; and the ark in 2 Sam. 6.2.

\textsuperscript{289} BDB 1027-1028; Coppes 1980b: 810; Jonker 1997: 973.

\textsuperscript{290} The phrase in Dan. 10.1 is an interpolation (e.g., Hartman and Di Lella 1978: 13-14, 255), and it is also semantically distinct in that it does not denote ownership and/or authority.
Seeligmann, and adopted by Japhet, supplies a plausible origin for the present textforms.²⁹¹

Most are convinced that 2 Sam. 6.2 has undergone interpolation. Accordingly they retain none of ידוהי-כבוד-ארק or ידוהי-כלוי, or keep only ידוהי-כבוד-ארק or ידוהי-כלוי. The literary evidence against the primitive use of ידוהי-כבוד-ארק is substantial²⁹², and historical and theological factors also weigh heavily against the views that ידוהי-כבוד-ארק originated in the pre-Jerusalem cultus at Shiloh (cf. 1 Sam. 1.3, 11) and that the formula ידוהי-כבוד-ארק (1 Sam. 4.4; 2 Sam. 6.2) is the earliest or official epithet of the ark.²⁹³ Additional difficulties with 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6 are: (1) the different placement of ידוהי-כבוד-ארק in Samuel and Chronicles; (2) the absence of ידוהי-כבוד-ארק from 4QSam²⁹⁴, and from Chronicles, in spite of the fact that the word appears in 2 Sam. 5.10 // 1 Chron. 11.9 and 2 Sam. 7.8, 26 // 1 Chron. 17.7, 24 (but not in

²⁹¹ Ehrlich 1910: 286; Japhet 1993: 278; Seeligmann 1961: 204-205. Sasson 2000 uses the versions injudiciously and he is insensitive to 'Hebrew idiomatics' in spite of his claim to the contrary. He naively 'go[es] back to the Masoretic text'.

²⁹² The usage of ידוהי-כבוד-ארק is conspicuous. It is distributed unevenly and is strongly associated with prophetic speech. ידוהי-כבוד-ארק occurs 259 times: ten times in Samuel; two times in Kings; three times in Chronicles; eight times in Psalms; and 236 times in the Latter prophets, notably 77 times in Jeremiah, 62 times in Isaiah, 53 times in Zechariah, 24 times in Malachi, and 14 times in Haggai. ידוהי-כבוד-ארק occurs 19 times: one time in Samuel; two times in Kings; five times in Jeremiah; six times in Amos; and five times in Psalms. Interestingly, ידוהי-כבוד-ארק appears 82 times in MT Jeremiah, but only 12 occurrences are reflected in the shorter and more authentic Greek version, and perhaps only six are original (cf. Olofsson 1990: 122-124).

²⁹³ Albertz 1994: I, 132, 300 n. 31 says: 'While the tradition of the title "Yahweh Sabaoth, who is enthroned on the cherubim" ... is connected with the ark (1 Sam. 4.4; II Sam. 6.2), and this leads some scholars, to derive it and the conception of Yahweh as king from the sanctuary of Shiloh (cf. I Sam. 1.3, 11), it draws so much on the cultic decoration of Solomon's temple with its cherubic throne that here we very probably have a back-projection of the Jerusalem temple theology.... In its present form the ark narrative is doubtless conceived from the end backwards, i.e. from its introduction into the Jerusalem temple. If the ark, which in the meantime had been accepted almost universally, was not itself a divine throne, we must assume, first, that a cherubic throne had already stood in the sanctuary of Shiloh, and secondly, that its static imagination had clung to the ark despite its vagabond fate. However, there is no evidence for the first, and the second is a difficult assumption'. With reference to 1 Sam. 4.4, MT has תִּיָּדָהָיָו יִכְבוֹד־אָרָק but the OG text is τιβροιεόν Κυρίου θησαυρολ ἵππον, whereas LXXAL are revised toward the MT. See Driver 1890: 46; Klein 1983: 37; McCarter 1980a: 103; H. P. Smith 1899: 34.

Chronicles in 2 Sam. 6.2, 18; 7.27 // 1 Chron. 13.6; 16.2; 17.25); (3) the absolute singular נָשָׁה in MT Samuel and Chronicles which is highly uncharacteristic of biblical Hebrew; (4) the insertion of αὐτοῦ in LXX Chronicles which eases the occurrence of the absolute singular δικύα; (5) the insertion of ℓект in LXX Chronicles which suggests the double reading נָשה and נַחַת; and (6) the repetitious נָשָׁה נָשָׁה in MT Samuel in which the second נָשָׁה serves to editorially reinterpret the first נָשָׁה as נַחַת rather than נָשָׁה. These points call attention to substantial editing in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6: נָשָׁה was reinterpreted as נַחַת in an earlier אֲדֹנָי נָשָׁה נַחַת נָשָׁה נַחַת נָשָׁה was interpolated, and נָשָׁה was inserted. The versions reflect this editorial process at various stages. Nevertheless, MT Chronicles' consonants are closest to the earlier form of the text.²⁹⁵

3.2 Summary of Chapter Three

The texts and stories of 2 Sam. 6.1-5 and 1 Chron. 13.5-8 differ appreciably. This chapter is concerned with editorial adjustments in the compositions which are signalled by textual variation and grammatical and stylistic incongruities and lexical discrepancies. The major differences between the texts may be classified as pluses/minuses and substitutions. With the exception of the pluses in 1 Chron. 13.5 (מורשא מריהו ודרל) and 6 (אֵל קִדְרִי יִדְרִי אֱשֶּר) the text of Samuel is regularly fuller. Most differences between Samuel and Chronicles are expansions in Samuel. Consequently, Chronicles' text is generally closer to the (shorter and) earlier form of the story. Twice it is suggested that words in Chronicles were interpolated from Samuel. See הנָשָׁה in 3.1.2.3 and הנָשָׁה הנָשָׁה in 3.1.6.2. It is not surprising that biblical editors occasionally adjusted Chronicles on the basis of Samuel since Samuel 'ranked higher in canonical esteem' than

²⁹⁵ See appendix 2.
Chronicles. In several cases it is unclear whether the text of Samuel or Chronicles is closer to the earlier textform and/or it is probable that lexical or stylistic preferences more than polemic determined the forms of the texts. See, e.g., תהל מיכל in 3.1.1.3; and perhaps אַלֶה in 3.1.1.2. Three factors influenced the editing of MT Samuel. First, the theme apology of Davidic kingship. See 3.1.1.2, 3.1.2.3, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.3.2, 3.1.3.3, 3.1.3.4, 3.1.4.1. David rather than Saul is rightfully king. This editorial polemic, for example, explains Samuel's terminology in 6.1, which never served as the start of a (now lost) military campaign; rather, the language was adjusted to highlight David's achievements in comparison with Saul's. In particular, several connections between MT 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Samuel 14 were observed. Second, the theme apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character. See 3.1.5.1, 3.1.5.2. The elucidation of Uzzah's identity and the ambiguous record of his location prepare for the misfortune in MT 2 Sam. 6.6-7 which is clearly due to his misconduct rather than David's cultic negligence or Yahweh's inexplicable caprice. Third, the theme influence of cultic practice. See 3.1.4.2, 3.1.5.1, 3.1.6.2. Many recognise the influence of religious traditions in the story's moulding. These factors greatly influenced the rest of the story of David's transfer of the ark.

Würthwein 1979: 18.
CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of 2 Samuel 6.6-10 and 1 Chronicles 13.9-13

4.0 Introduction

The exposition in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8 supplies information fundamental to the story: the protagonist, the situation, the setting and other background information. Accordingly, the analysis in chapter 3 of the procession's beginning is organised topically: context and occasion, geography, the participants' identity, number and performance, the attendants' identity and position, and the ark's epithets. The procession barely begins, however, when Uzzah is impelled to seize the ark and Yahweh promptly executes him (2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10). This inciting incident initiates the conflict (or complication) which will drive the plot until its climax (or turning point) (2 Sam. 6.17a // 1 Chron. 16.1a): the encounter between Yahweh and Uzzah is ultimately a conflict between the deity and the king. Commentators remark on the problematic character of the material in 2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10: it is marked by textual variation, literary ambiguity, and theological difficulty. These phenomena are interconnected. The section following the inciting incident, yet still within the conflict, and prior to the climax, is the rising action. This material alternately conveys David's response to Yahweh's homicidal act (2 Sam. 6.8-10 // 1 Chron. 13.11-13), Yahweh's response to David's rejection (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14), and David's response to Yahweh's blessing (2 Sam. 6.12b-15 // 1 Chron. 15.25-28). This chapter focuses on 2 Sam. 6.6-10 // 1 Chron. 13.9-13 which relates the inciting incident and the commencement of the rising action.
4.1 Analysis

4.1.1 Uzzah's Error

4.1.1.1 2 Sam. 6.6
1 Chron. 13.9

The Israelite threshing-floor was a flat hard circular surface outside on a hill near the edge of a rural or urban locale. The hard surface (of packed soil or smoothed stone or bedrock) prevented earth from mingling with the grain and open air breezes aided winnowing.\(^{297}\) The procession's route and the location of the threshing-floor(s) in 2 Sam. 6.6 // 1 Chron. 13.9 are unknown and will remain so regardless of the manner in which MT's בֵּית and כּוֹזְבוֹן are construed.\(^{298}\) The textual variation among the versions is extensive.

The following tables give the evidence and possible textual antecedents or Vorlagen:

\(^{297}\) Here it is unfeasible and also unnecessary to review historical aspects of the ancient Israelite threshing-floor, such as threshing methodology, the structure of a threshing-floor, temporary versus permanent threshing-floors, community versus privately owned threshing-floors, and the connection of threshing-floors and cult sites. The latter can be confirmed for some ancient societies, but scholars debate the association in biblical literature (e.g., Münzerlein 1978: 64-65), although the relationship between 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15-16 and 2 Samuel 24 // 1 Chronicles 21 is notable.

\(^{298}\) Nevertheless, the comments in Mullins 1992: 904 are suggestive: 'While no name resembling Chidon or Nacon has been preserved, there are two plausible routes for the transport of the ark to Jerusalem. The most direct, but more difficult access would have been to go somewhere along the line of the present Jerusalem–Tel Aviv highway, a distance of about 13 km/8 mi. The easier, but longer way would have been to go from Kiriath-jearim to Gibeon (el-Jib); and then on to Jerusalem via Gibeah of Benjamin (Tell el-Ful). Thus the ark would have been brought through Benjamin in full view of the local population. Given the political tensions between the Benjaminites house of Saul and the Judean house of David, this would have served as a bold statement by David that he is now the one in charge. This latter route also has the benefit of high ground exposed to westerly winds needed for threshing grain. Several threshing floors still exist in the region today.'
Preliminary remarks: (1) Most are uncertain about the earliest/original reading(s). (2) Most believe Chronicles' reading does not entail a tendentious alteration of the book's Vorlage. (3) Most text-critical discussions are incomplete: they fail to consider the entirety of the evidence and they neglect literary facets of the textual traditions. (4) The witnesses cited above may be placed into about five groups, broadly defined, and within each group, except for the one reflecting נָאָה, additional textual variation is evident. (5)
The letter ס (followed by י) is most consistent throughout the witnesses. (6) OG Samuel may be נוודא ו and OG Chronicles is certainly a minus. Is the latter due to haplography through homoioteleuton (י 베) or is the simple reading וס וטב תסא the starting point for the compositional processes in the versions? (7) In anticipation of the conclusion reached below, the readings in MT Samuel and MT Chronicles are genetically unrelated but perhaps conceptually similar. Each reading may be an independent expansion of an original וס ו歷史. Otherwise, if one of the MT traditions is secondary to the other, then MT Samuel's וס ו以色列 is probably secondary to MT Chronicles' וס וירדן. The bases for this assertion are (a) greater variation among witnesses to Samuel and (b) discernible literary motives for the readings וס וandatory (and וד nå) in Samuel.

The words וס י and וס י are construed as proper names, common nouns, or in the case of וס י, as an adjective. The greater part of medieval and modern commentators, most ancient versions (see below for other renderings), and almost all modern English translations, construe the second element in the phrases וס וירדן and וס וירדן as proper nouns: 'the threshing-floor of Nacon' or 'Nacon's threshing-floor' (except for NAB's 'Nodan' which is based on 4QSam⁵) and 'the threshing-floor of Chidon' or 'Chidon's threshing-floor' (except for the NJB which has 'the threshing-floor of the Javelin'). Some emend Samuel on the basis of Chronicles³⁰¹ or Chronicles on the basis of Samuel³⁰², but the variants do not have an obvious genetic relationship. No view has garnered broad support because none convincingly relates the two major families of variants, those beginning with יים and those beginning with יים. The potential orthographical and phonological errors are self-evident in the table above. A thorough analysis of the readings with possible derivations and revisions requires an entire chapter. Two points require mention. First, it is specious to conclude that Josephus was dependent on

---

³⁰¹ Rehm 1949b: 81.
³⁰² Braun 1986: 172-175.
Chronicles for Xελδωνος. Second, most reject the textual originality of the Samuel variants having the Araunah/Ornan of 2 Samuel 24 // 1 Chronicles 21. Many ancient and medieval commentators favoured this reading in 2 Sam. 6.6 // 1 Chron. 13.9, but thematic links between the two narratives and the unlikelihood that an Araunah/Ornan in the preceding story would be altered are arguments against the reading's originality. In spite of its popularity, the view that הָרִים and נָבְנִים are proper nouns in MT Samuel and Chronicles must be rejected. First, the notion of private ownership of a threshing-floor is questionable. The only other possible examples are doubtful:

The ownership of the threshing-floor in Ruth is unstated.

Second, neither the author nor his readers would be familiar with the name of the owner of every threshing-floor between Kirjath-jearim and Jerusalem.

Some construe the second element in the phrases נָבְנִים and נָבְנִים as common nouns. In addition, OL Chronicles has sceptri. Keil and Delitzsch relate Chronicles' דִּים to the noun דִּים, a hapax legomenon used in Job 21.20, and translate 'the threshing-floor of destruction/disaster'. Youngblood suggests that Chronicles' דִּים is a defectively written form of דִּים ('dart, javelin, spear'), which is used nine times and is also written defectively in Jer. 50.42. This is the natural understanding of דִּים in MT 1 Chron. 13.9 and only bias in favour of Samuel can reasonably lead one to abandon it.

304 The ownership of the threshing-floor in Ruth is unstated.
305 Seow 1989: 97-98 n. 52.
307 Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 332 (emphasis added).
308 Josh. 8.18, 26; 1 Sam. 17.6, 45; Jer. 6.23; 50.42; Job 39.23; 41.21
threshing-floor of a spear' or 'a "piercing"-threshing-floor'. Similarly, some scholars entertain the common noun view for Samuel's דָּשֵׁן which they relate to the verb דָּשֵׁת and translate as 'the threshing-floor of the blow/stroke' (cf. Job 12.5). Literally factors in support of this view are mentioned below. The interpretation of דָּשֵׁן and דָּשֶׁן as common nouns is more defensible than their interpretation as proper names. Furthermore, דָּשֶׁן and דָּשָּׁן would also be similar in concept.

A few interpret Samuel's דָּשֵׁן as a N participle of דָּשֵׁת, thus as an adjective. Several ancient witnesses also support this interpretation: the Targum's פָּרֵךְ, the Peshitta's אַבּ, Aquila's אֶתְנְכִּים, and cognate קְפָשׁ in Mishnah Baba Bathra 2.8 and the Gemara thereon. The meaning of דָּשֵׁן may be construed as 'a certain threshing-floor', or 'a prepared threshing-floor' (i.e., smoothed and swept), or more likely 'a fixed/permanent threshing-floor'. The reader, upon being informed that the oxen had come to a "permanent threshing floor" would immediately picture a floor either of rock or of very hard earth, on which a slip such as that of Uzzah was quite natural. Scholars raise four objections to this interpretation:

1. Aquila often renders proper names adjectivally.
2. קְפָשׁ may not be the exact equivalent of דָּשֶׁן.
3. The noun דָּשֶׁן is given as feminine by lexicographers, but the evidence is sparse and the gender seems to have varied.
4. Some say the phrase so construed would be pointless, 'But we have seen that the sense is satisfied if the description can be shown to have direct bearing on the accident'.

310 The derivation of דָּשֶׁן from דָּשֵׁת is similar to other nouns derived from דָּשֵׁת verbs, such as מָשֵׁה from מָשַׁה, מָשָׁה from מָשַׁה, and מָשָׁה from מָשַׁה. The typical noun for a 'blow' is דָּשֵׁת (cf. 1 Sam. 6.19).
311 Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 332; Tur-Sinai 1951: 279. Also see HALOT II, 698. Emphasis added.
312 Marget 1920: 75.
313 See Carlson 1964: 77-78.
314 However, see Jastrow 1903: 1311.
315 Interestingly, דָּשָּׁן is usually but not always construed as feminine (HALOT III, 1197-1198), and also when modified by an adjective (e.g., רָבָּה דָּשָּׁן, דָּשָּׁן מִידָּלָה, etc.), but Ps. 51.12 has רָבָּה דָּשֶׁן, and this is the only other attributive adjective use of דָּשֶׁן.
316 Marget 1920: 72.
The minus in OG Chronicles may reflect the earliest form of the text: 'and they came to the threshing-floor'. The article is either the simple identification or well-known ('celebrity', 'familiar') usage317. The expressions זָר יָדָיו and תָּשַׁלְתִּי are anarthrous, and since the nomen rectum in each case is doubtfully a proper name, the phrases must be translated indefinitely:

Samuel 'a fixed/permanent threshing-floor'
'a threshing-floor of a blow/stroke'
'a "striking"-threshing-floor'
Chronicles 'a threshing-floor of a spear'
'a "piercing"-threshing-floor'

The comment creates tension in the narrative and foreshadows the incident to follow, e.g.,: 'and they came to a "killer"-threshing-floor [oh no!] and Uzzah reached out ... and Yahweh's anger was kindled against Uzzah and God struck [הָנָה] him there ...'. Is the phrase solely metaphorical or does the story hint at the manner in which the ark's military escort dispatched Uzzah? Moreover, does Chronicles have the word כַּה(ה) for this reason? Furthermore, word-linkage in 2 Sam. 6.6-7 suggests that הָנָה and נָבָה play on one another. The verb נָבָה also recalls 'the wave of plague and death' of 1 Samuel 5–6318, and continues too a theme that is played out in Saul's and David's military escapades in between the two stories, most recently in 2 Sam. 5.8, 20, 24-25.

4.1.1.2 2 Sam. 6.6
1 Chron. 13.9

The absence of 'his hand' in MT Samuel could be the result of ellipsis but the collective evidence suggests that the phrase originally stood here, as most commentators conclude. First, the phrase appears in the preponderance of ancient witnesses, including 4QSam⁹, LXX Samuel, Josephus, and Chronicles. Second, 'hand' is absent in prose from

317 See, e.g., Judg. 6.37; 2 Kgs. 6.27; Ruth 3.2-3, 6, 14.
318 McCarter 1984: 169; cf. 1 Sam. 5.6, 9, 12; 6.19 (also with מָמֶה).
an implicit ר in והלשנ construction only in 2 Sam. 6.6, although the ellipsis of other objects following והלש, especially 'word/letter/message', is not uncommon. Third, Chronicles' construction with the complementary infinitive is frequent but an investigation of the formal structures in which והלש is used points out the awkwardness of the object following והלש in MT Samuel and 4QSam, which is generally a person ('send a message to a person') and less commonly a place ('send a messenger to a place'), but a non-geographic place in Samuel only in 1 Sam. 17.49 and 2 Sam. 6.6. This stylistic incongruity together with המת in LXX Samuel (LXXס is revised to πρῶς) may indicate that MT Samuel's והלש is unoriginal. The phrase והלש perhaps dropped from MT Samuel by haplography through homoioarcton (וָלֶשֶׁל שָׁר עַשְׁתִי מִזְמַר מִזְמַר [אָלָר Nutzung]), in which case the omission is subsequent to the adjustment of an original והלש to והלש. Then again, Murray argues that the minus is original and should not be restored for good rhetorical reasons ... The addition of והלש before והלש considersably weakens the impact of the latter, whereas the ellipsis heightens its impact by placing it in the position where והלש would be expected, and thus demanding increased processing effort from the listener/reader.

This argument, however, may explain the intentional omission of the phrase, and the collective evidence mentioned above should not be dismissed either. Finally, the evidence of usage is inconclusive regarding the ethical force of והלש in 2 Sam. 6.6 and 1 Chron. 13.9, 10, and must be construed by context and the force of the complementary verb phrase. The phrases והלש והלש are used to express both hostile and non-hostile והלש-ing, and hostility would be expressed more pointedly by means of והלש. Many think Chronicles' infinitival form (והלש) is a tendentious alteration of Samuel's wayyiqtol (ו הב). The Chronicler from a feeling of reverence shrinks from

---

319 See appendix 3.
saying, and took hold of it (2 Sam. vi. 6). For the Chronicler, 'even the intention' to touch the ark was sufficient to incur God's wrath. The versions are key to resolving the editorial history of the text. 4QSam’s reading is unclear. Fincke reconstructs the text as חָיָּם ( !) and Herbert as הָיָּם, but McKenzie and Ulrich favour חָיָּם. The Greek witnesses to Samuel reflect either Chronicles' infinitival form or both the infinitival form and the finite verb form, but no Greek witness to Samuel attests only MT Samuel’s finite verb form. On one hand, LXX and four cursives have κατασχέων αὐτήν, lacking καὶ ἐκράτησεν αὐτήν altogether, and similarly Josephus has κατασχέων ἐθελήσαντα. On the other hand, most cursives and the Lucianic recension have a doublet (κατασχέων αὐτήν καὶ ἐκράτησεν/ἐκραταῖσεν αὐτήν) and LXX and three cursives have a triplet (κατασχέων αὐτήν καὶ ἐκράτησεν αὐτήν ... τοῦ κατασχέων/σχιζεῖν αὐτήν). The correspondence between Chronicles' κατασχέων and Greek Samuel's κατασχέων validates the view that Chronicles' infinitive is not editorial, as many commentators recognise.

Few seem to ponder whether MT Samuel's ב נַחֲשׁ could be a tendentious modification to the story, but this may be the case. The G stem of נַחֲשׁ ('take possession of, lay/take hold of, hold fast, seize, grasp') generally implies 'a certain vivacity or forcefulness', and this is due to the punctual Aktionsart of the verb which portrays a
swift and immediate change. The object of the G stem of הָפַך is expressed by ב (20 times), a pronominal suffix (12 times), an accusative (ten times), and הָפַך (five times), and each of these is used for hostile or violent grasping. Consequently, the statement that הָפַך with ב is used 'sometimes perh. intensifying action of verb' is true insofar as the context of the situation somehow specifies a more intensive than usual act of grasping. Furthermore, a perfective form (in this case wayyiqtol) of a verb with punctual Aktionsart relates an instantaneous or momentary occurrence but it does not and cannot accentuate the act of grasping. A suitable contrast, however, between Samuel's וב וְאָבַת בּוֹ לְאַחַז אֶדֶם and Chronicles' לְאַחַז אֶדֶם may be the grammatical completed-ness of the former and incompletely of the latter. Of course, 1 Chron. 13.10 explicitly says Uzzah placed his hand on the ark, but 1 Chron. 13.9 does not go this far. Consequently, Samuel's wayyiqtol vis-à-vis Chronicles' infinitive may stress that Uzzah definitely handled the ark, and this in turn may serve to rationalise Yahweh's behaviour in 2 Sam. 6.7. See below.

4.1.1.3 2 Sam. 6.6  
1 Chron. 13.9

The Hebrew and Greek versions effectively agree on וב but the significance of the clause is paradoxically mysterious. The verb הָפַך occurs nine times, seven times in the G stem and once each in the N and H stems. The G form is presumably transitive and is generally glossed 'release, relinquish, remit, loosen, let drop, let loose, let rest'. However, assuming הָפַך is the subject, the Hebrew clause lacks the requisite object. Consequently, many commentators and some modern translators supply 'it'.

---

329 See the note on Aktionsart (and tense and aspect) in the discussion of 2 Sam. 6.1 // 1 Chron. 13.5 in section 1.4.5 of appendix 1.
330 DCH I, 186.
331 On the ark's epithet see appendix 2.
332 It is unnecessary to discuss here the interesting conjectures in the Syriac and Latin texts regarding the meaning of the clause.
333 See Exod. 23.11; Deut. 15.2; 2 Kgs 9.33; Jer. 17.4.
However, many others, including most modern translators, render the clause intransitively: 'the oxen stumbled'. Others wish to construe the subject and object of the verb in unique ways. For example: Uzzah and Ahio are the subject and the oxen are the object, i.e., 'they dropped the leads'; but this is unlikely since the object marker ְי is lacking. MT's וה is pointed as a G perfect 3cp form. Some re-point as וַיַּפְסִלֶה, a G perfect 3ms form with a 3ms suffix (cf. כָּלֶךָּרָאֵתָנְדֵא/ךָכָּרָאֵתָנְדֵא עֵיתַנְו) or perhaps a dual form with a 3ms suffix (*שְמַטָהּ). The collective noun יָפִּיס is employed for a team of oxen, and therefore the noun should be construed with a plural verb, which makes rather unlikely. However, the evidence is sparse. Finally, W. R. Arnold adopts Bochart's view based on Arabic analogy that the oxen defecated: Uzzah slipped because the oxen shot! Whatever the solution, MT Samuel and Chronicles agree, and the textual traditions are more concerned with pinning the blame on Uzzah than in resolving the exact role of the oxen. They may have caused it but he did IT!

4.1.2 Yahweh's Response

4.1.2.1 2 Sam. 6.7 1 Chron. 13.10

The Hebrew versions of Samuel and Chronicles are identical except for the spelling of Uzzah's name: 'the anger of Yahweh burned/ was kindled/ was aroused against Uzzah' or 'Yahweh was angry/ was incensed with/at Uzzah'. The Greek traditions vary in two matters. First, was ק presente in the Hebrew texts used by the translators? Allen and Nysse have shown that both followed a Vorlage lacking ק. As additional evidence, the G stem of הָרָע is used 82 times in the following constructions:

---

335 GKC §145b, p. 462.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X ב Y רָעָה</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>'anger of Y burns against X'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y ל דָּרֶךְ</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>'burns to Y'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 1 infinitive construct (object only implied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y רָעָה</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>'anger of Y burns'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(object only implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X ב Y רָעָה</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>'Y burns against X'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X ל י דָּרֶךְ</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>'anger of Y burns against X'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X ל י דָּרֶךְ</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>'anger of Y burns against X'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>twice</td>
<td>'burns in the eyes of Y'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth construction appears only in the poetry of Hab. 3.8. The first represents nearly half of all occurrences of רָעָה. An earlier X ב Y רָעָה in Samuel and Chronicles was (independently?—or was Chronicles revised on the basis of Samuel?) assimilated to the more common construction. Second, do τῷ οὐτα in some manuscripts of Samuel and εἵπε OÇα in Chronicles attest Vorlagen distinct to יָנוּחַ? In Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint the verb θυμάω appears with no personal dative and no preposition (27 times), or it is construed with εἵπε (14 times; with an accusative or dative), a personal dative (eight times), εἴς (four times), ἐν (four times), περί (three times), πρὸς (twice), and κατὰ (once). Omitting further details, except to say that the Greek translators (of Samuel and Chronicles too) are inconsistent in rendering the preposition in the phrase ב (ץ) רָעָה, Nysse concludes correctly regarding Samuel that 'the use of a preposition is only a potential revision toward the MT, for it could also be a stylistic alteration on the part of G:B+ [=MSS Bya2] or G:L'. The same may be said for Chronicles. It will be shown below that Yahweh's anger expressed by X ב Y רָעָה (2 Sam. 6.7 // 1 Chron. 13.10) and David's anger expressed by Y ל י דָּרֶךְ (2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11) are not qualitatively different; rather, the latter is a stylistic circumlocution for the maintenance of reverence.

---

339 Yahweh's anger is rarely directed against a specific person, and never with the dire outcome handed out to Uzzah: Moses (Exod. 4.14), Miriam and Aaron (Num. 12.9), Balaam (Num. 22.22), Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar (Job 42.7), Amaziah (2 Chron. 25.15), and potential anger against Abraham (Gen. 18.30, 32) and Gideon (Judg. 6.39).
The verbs ἐπαύσεν and ἐπάταξεν are intra-Greek variations based on idiomatic considerations rather than alternate Vorlagen. The adverb אָבָע occurs 834 times, including 90 times in Samuel, 101 times in Kings, and 40 times in Chronicles. אָבָע appears 31 times in synoptic passages: it is shared 17 times and it is a plus eleven times in Samuel–Kings and three times in Chronicles. However in ten of the latter fourteen cases the plus is part of a more significant difference or expansion of which אָבָע is merely one element. Thus, Samuel has a plus in the present passage, Kings has a plus in 1 Kgs. 8.9 // 2 Chron. 5.10, and Chronicles has pluses in 2 Sam. 5.6 // 1 Chron. 11.4 and 2 Kgs. 19.37 // 2 Chron. 32.21. Furthermore, the adverb אָבָע marks the location of an act of יָשָׁב on six occasions, in 2 Sam. 5.20 // 1 Chron. 14.11, and in 2 Sam. 3.27; 6.7; 10.18; 18.11, and in each case אָבָע is superfluous to a reference to a particular location. The absence of אָבָע in MT Chronicles may relate to an editor's attempt to avoid repetition (cf. אָבָע רֵית), but it may also reflect an idiomatic addition in Samuel. Regarding LXX Chronicles, Allen and Rehm believe ἐκεῖ is an example of assimilation to the parallel (Greek) text. Some consider Chronicles' shorter text the original whereas others consider only אָלָה אָבָע a pleonasm. W. R. Arnold and Youngblood consider אָלָה אָבָע original. Youngblood believes אָבָע emphasises the threshing floor as the locale of Uzzah's death: God struck him there and he died there. W. R. Arnold believes the superfluous reference to the deity is 'thoroughly characteristic of the author's style'. There is no plausible reason for the

341 Allen 1974: 1, 191; Rehm 1937: 44.
345 W. R. Arnold: 64.
omission of מַלְאָךְ הַגֵּ を from Chronicles, but Fokkelman explains the significance of 'God' and involuntarily supplies a reasonable explanation for the insertion in Samuel:

Except in v. 7b, the word 'God' serves only as a modification of the ark in the set phrase 'the ark of God', and occurs only in vv.2-7 and 12, seven times to boot. From v.9 onwards the set phrase is relieved of duty by 'the ark of Yahweh', which remarkably enough occurs the same number of times. ... The priest who wants to support 'the ark of God' and must die right next to it is killed by God, after Yahweh has become angry – a remarkable variation. Line 7b is the only place where 'God' is more than a modifier; He is now the subject who acts. It seems as if this passage wants to link the general term 'God' to Uzzah (just as the previous one withholds the specific yhwh from his brother in 4b) so as to suggest that this priest no longer had any insight into the uniqueness of the God of Israel. Then 6b and 7bc repeat the focalisation of Uzzah, whilst the narrator in 7a actually does have an eye for what is specific about this God and designates him by his own name, as does David immediately afterwards in vv. 8-9. The victory of the name of Yahweh has become a fact after this blow.346

Fokkelman's comment that 'this passage wants to link the general term "God" to Uzzah ... so as to suggest that this priest no longer had any insight into the uniqueness of the God of Israel' is striking. Samuel's version of Uzzah's slaughter is revisionary, the product of enhanced theological acumen. Again, Uzzah rather than David or Yahweh is held responsible for his own death.

The explanation for Yahweh's execution of Uzzah is textually and theologically fascinating. According to 2 Sam. 6.7 the reason is צִוְּת הֲצָרִים but according to 1 Chron. 13.10 it is שֶׁל אָרָרָיו וְיִר שַׁלֹּא אָרָיו וְיִר. What is the earliest reading and what is the basis for Yahweh's outburst? The textual evidence is:

---

346 Fokkelman 1990: 180, 188.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samuel</th>
<th>بدل</th>
<th>'for/because of (his) crime / error / fault / inadvertence / inadvertent act / indiscretion / irreverence / irreverent act / neglect / negligence / rashness / remissness'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>פל</td>
<td>'because he erred/failed himself'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targum</td>
<td>על ראשות</td>
<td>'because he erred'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX A (om τῆ), 19/b', 52/e, 56/i, 82/o, 92/m, 93/ε, 108/b, 127/ε (sub δε), 158/γ, 243/j mg (sub δε), 247/x, 314/w, 376/c, 489/f</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τῇ προπτείᾳ</td>
<td>'on account of rashness' This reading is the Lucianic recension, is marked in Origen's Hexapla as an addition, and is also reflected in the Armenian version, Barhebraeus' Scholia and in the Syro-Hexaplar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquila</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκνολο</td>
<td>'on account of senselessness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome's Vulgate</td>
<td>super temberitate</td>
<td>'in the matter of recklessness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome's Dialogi contra Pelagianos</td>
<td>pro ignorantia</td>
<td>'(as punishment) for ignorance' This is cited as the OL by Sabatier, but whether this is really the OL reading is disputed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QSam²</td>
<td>Herbert³⁵⁰: (על𦭜 תֶּהֶל) בַּיְהֶל יִדְוַיָא מָאָרוֹנ</td>
<td>'because he reached out his hand toward/against the ark'³⁵²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshitta</td>
<td>הַלַּחֲכֵל יִדְוַיָא מָאָרוֹנ</td>
<td>'because he stretched out his hand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX B, M, N, 29/b₂, 55/h, 106/p, 107/d, 119/n, 120/q, 121/y, 130/s, 134/t, 243/j, 245/v, 370/l, 372/u, 509/a₂, 554/z, 707/a</td>
<td>minus</td>
<td>The minus is also reflected in the Coptic and Ethiopic versions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

³⁴⁷ Dhorme 1910: 321.
³⁴⁸ Bressan 1960: 525.
³⁴⁹ For discussion see Nysse 1984: 30-31; Ulrich 1978: 219.
³⁵¹ Fincke 2001: 150.
³⁵² Also see Pisano 1984: 104-106; Ulrich 1978: 159, 179, 195, 205-206, 233.
Josephus' Antiquities 7.4.2 has ἐκτείναντα τὴν χεῖρα καὶ κατασχεῖν ἐθελήσαντα, ὅτι μὴ ὄν λεγεῖς ἦψατο ταύτης, but it is unclear from where he derived the longer plus or whether it is his logical deduction. The minus in LXXBMN and numerous other cursives of Samuel cannot convincingly be explained away as omission out of desperation over a supposedly incomprehensible Hebrew Vorlage. Rather, this is the OG reading. The OG apparently lacked the plus, going back to an early, characteristically concise, Egyptian Hebrew text.353

The G:L reading is a marked, hexaplaric addition. This is the only one of the three such readings in this section in which MSS Acx corroborate G:L. The OG Vorlage lacked this plus. The Pal tradition has expanded the text independently. Three text types are in evidence.354

There are effectively four possibilities for the genesis of the textual variation.

- MT Samuel's shorter text is original and Chronicles' and 4QSam"s longer text is a clarification.
- Chronicles' and 4QSam"s longer text is original and MT Samuel's shorter text is either a mutilation or a purposeful alteration.
- Both the shorter and longer texts are 'original': each represents an alternative Vorlage or tradition.
- Neither the shorter nor the longer text is original: each is an independent expansion.

353 Ulrich 1978: 205.
The extant traditions could be based on (1) textual sources, (2) oral information, (3) free composition or (4) logical deduction. Excepting the (N)RSV, which emends Samuel on the basis of 4QSam\(^a\) and Chronicles, modern English translations retain the shorter reading in Samuel and the longer reading in Chronicles.

Most commentators (but not translators) think Samuel’s shorter text is corrupt, a mutilated fragment of a reading like Chronicles’, and Samuel is restored accordingly. Driver gives the classic statement:

> Ch. has יוכלוה סהל הדוהי הוא_words cited from Ch., which were either still read here in their integrity by the Chronicler, or (as the sense is sufficiently plain without them) were introduced here as a gloss from the parallel text of Ch., and afterwards became corrupted.\(^{355}\)

However, it is impossible that the shorter reading is solely the result of parablepsis, since the difference between the two MT versions is more than simple subtraction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronicles</th>
<th>Samuel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>תול אונר שהלד יוהי עלק האודו ימכה שמ</td>
<td>יוכלוה סהל הדוהי הוא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two versions clearly show editorial adjustments in Samuel’s סהל הדוהי and Chronicles’ יוכלוה, and one must also account for the additional י in MT Samuel. Even if the shorter reading is the result of scribal error, it must also be an editorially restored version, and presumably one in which the intentionally inserted י was meaningful. The 'corruption' must have been substantial for סהל הדוהיERRUPT to remain!

Some think Samuel’s shorter text is the remnant of another non-extant reading, and should be restored through conjectural emendation. W. R. Arnold, followed by Marget, thinks the text originally had יוכלוה (from יוכלוה, 'slip').\(^{356}\) An original יוכלוה phrase in this context could just as easily refer to (1) the manner in which Uzzah died, i.e., by means of X, or to (2) a location, i.e., Uzzah was killed on/upon/in front of a given place or object.

---

\(^{355}\) Driver 1890: 268.

\(^{356}\) W. R. Arnold 1917: 63; Marget 1920: 72.
Thus several suggest that the residue most likely represents an attempt to give a location which is now unintelligible. H. P. Smith takes this view but does not venture to suggest a particular locale.\(^{357}\) Klostermann likesHealthy, 'on the side beam' of the cart on which Uzzah sat.\(^{358}\) Dhorme likesHealthy, 'near the tamarisk tree' (cf. 1 Sam. 22.6; 31.13).\(^{359}\)

Several medieval Jewish scholars, some modern scholars\(^{360}\), and most modern English translators, think Samuel’s shorter reading is understandable and should be retained as original. In this view the preposition ב is causal\(^{361}\), and יָשָׁע’s translation should be 'crime, error, fault, inadvertence, inadvertent act, indiscretion, irreverence, irreverent act, neglect, negligence, rashness, remissness'. This perspective is based on cognate vocabulary.\(^{362}\) Akkadian evidence is the verbs šelū ('be negligent, careless, inattentive') and šullū/sullū ('treat disdainfully') and the nouns šilātu ('negligence'), šillatu ('blasphemy, sacrilege, insult, insolence, slander, offence, misdeed') and šullū/sullū ('impudence, disloyal speech'). Aramaic evidence is the noun יָשָׁע ('error') and the verb יָשָׁע ('err'). The noun יָשָׁע occurs in Dan. 3.29; 6.5; Ezra 4.22; 6.9; and both the noun and the verb are frequent in post-biblical Aramaic. The related adverbial expression יָשָׁע ('suddenly') can also be mentioned. In addition, the Hebrew cognate verb יָשָׁע occurs eight times.\(^{363}\) Notice that the noun and verb are used for cultic 'negligence' in Dan. 3.29; Ezra 6.9; 2 Chron. 29.11. Thus יָשָׁע is the Hebrew cognate to Aramaic יָשָׁע. Apocope is frequent in the nominal and verbal forms of יָשָׁע roots\(^{364}\), but it has been suggested that יָשָׁע could be the exact equivalent of יָשָׁע if the waw on the following word

---

\(^{357}\) H. P. Smith 1899: 294.

\(^{358}\) Klostermann 1887: 152.

\(^{359}\) Dhorme 1910: 321.


\(^{361}\) BDB 753-754; HALOT II, 826; GKC §158, p. 492; JM §170h, p. 639.


\(^{363}\) 2 Kgs. 4.28; Jer. 12.1; Ps. 122.6; Job 3.26; 12.6; 27.8; Lam. 1.5; 2 Chron. 29.11

\(^{364}\) JM §17f, p. 75.
were doing double duty\textsuperscript{365} or if the final \textit{waw} disappeared via haplography.\textsuperscript{366} In spite of this lexical and grammatical evidence most scholars still believe לֹֽא in 2 Sam. 6.7 is 'dubious, corrupt, meaningless, unintelligible, untranslatable', and very often a reference is made to Driver: '(1) לֹֽא is scarcely a pure Hebrew word: where it occurs, it is either dialectical (2 Ki. 4) or late (2 Ch.); so that its appearance in early Hebrew is unexpected; (2) the unusual apocopated form (לֹֽא for לֹֽא) excites suspicion'.\textsuperscript{367} However, Driver's presupposition is that Samuel is an 'early' biblical composition, and even if his historical linguistic argument were correct, it would not cancel out the view that לֹֽא is a late editorial revision in 2 Sam. 6.7.\textsuperscript{368} The exact derivation of לֹֽא is uncertain, but it is certainly 'meaningful, intelligible, translatable' in 2 Sam. 6.7, as evinced in the translations and commentaries of quite a few ancient, medieval and modern scholars.

Scholars who argue for the integrity of MT Samuel's reading suggest that perplexity over לֹֽא's meaning led to (1) its erasure in the OG translation and to (2) the explanation in the tradition represented by 4QSam\textsuperscript{6} and Chronicles. However, these assumptions are baseless. The view taken here is that both pluses, לֹֽא ἢ אֶתְכֶם שָלָלָה and לֹֽא + אָכָלָה, are independent expansions of the original story which failed to supply an explanation for Yahweh's behaviour. On one hand, 1 Chron. 13.10 actualises through logical deduction the intention of 1 Chron. 13.9 (see above): 'Uzzah extended his hand to grasp the ark (incompleted-ness) and Yahweh struck him dead because he extended his hand upon/against the ark (completed-ness)'. Barthélemy is correct in concluding that 'le texte le plus coulant provienne d'un développement inspiré par le contenu du verset précédent'.\textsuperscript{369} On the other hand, 2 Sam. 6.7 concretises Uzzah's grasping and also

\textsuperscript{366} Fokkelman 1990: 378.
\textsuperscript{367} Driver 1890: 267-268.
\textsuperscript{368} See appendix 3.
\textsuperscript{369} Barthélemy 1982: 243.
emphasises the nature of Uzzah's act: 'Uzzah extended his hand upon/against the ark of God and he grasped it (completed-ness) and God struck him dead there because of his negligence'. Chronicles has the rhetorically weaker text, but both texts exemplify ancient editors' desire to justify God's behaviour.

The big questions are: Why did the deity become angry? Why did Uzzah die? Did Uzzah sin? Did David sin? Did both sin? Did neither sin? Who, if anyone, did anything, whatever it might be, wrong? Scholars offer these explanations for Yahweh's anger and Uzzah's death.

- Yahweh killed Uzzah because of David's hubris. The king illegitimately sought to transfer the ark for religio-political purposes. He acted with ambition, presumption, calculation, manipulation. Yahweh's message to David and Israel is that the deity cannot be controlled by any human being. Furthermore, Chronicles implicates all Israel in the hubristic transfer since the people took part in the decision to do so.

- Yahweh killed Uzzah because David failed to involve the Levites in the ark transfer. There is no evidence that Uzzah was a Kohathite Levite, which he should have been according to cultic law (Num. 3.29-31; 4.5-6, 15; 7.9; Deut. 10.8; 31.9, 25). In addition, Chronicles explicitly makes this point in the expansive treatment on levitical preparation and participation in the second attempt to transfer the ark (1 Chron. 15.2-28). The unfortunate incident permits the Chronicler to develop further a theology of immediate retribution.

- Yahweh killed Uzzah because David disregarded the ark's proper method of transport. He had the ark transported on a cart rather than with poles, carried on the shoulders of the Kohathite Levites (Exod. 25.12-15; 35.12; 37.5; 39.35; Num. 4.5-6, 15; 7.9). Again, Chronicles explicitly makes this point (1 Chron. 15.13, cf. 15.2, 15, 26), and it could be the implication of several differences in Samuel's continuation of the ark transfer story. Furthermore, transport by cart is ritually undesirable or disagreeable to God, because it was a solution used first by the uncircumcised Philistines. Some blame may have attached to Uzzah and his family, since for years they had been in charge of the ark and should have known better.

---


371 The writer suggests that similar exculpatory theologising is worked out in the former ark narrative, where MT Samuel attempts to account for the smiting by appeal to cultic taboo (cf. Num. 4.20). LXX 1 Sam. 6.19 says that some Israelites were struck down when they saw the return of the ark and failed to join in on the celebration (καὶ οὗκ ἐμένονσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἑσσωνίου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώπινοι Ἐβραίοις ἐκτὸς ἐκεῖνον τοῦ κυρίου; but the MT says they were struck down because they looked into the ark of Yahweh (νῦν ἐμένει αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος)).

372 The writer omits citations of adherents since more than sixty are represented in this list.
Yahweh killed Uzzah because of Uzzah's familiarity with the ark. Uzzah acted with presumption, contempt, mistrust, profanity, irreverence. God can take care of his own, and doesn't need faithless human assistance. The ark cannot be treated casually, and according to law should never be touched (Num. 4.15), especially by someone who may not even be a priest. Uzzah's instinct is outdone by the consummate behaviour of the draught animals in 1 Sam. 6.12, who hold their Creator in higher esteem than their maternal instinct (to echo Isa. 1.3).

Yahweh killed Uzzah because Uzzah (unintentionally) frustrated the divine will by his failure to recognise that the falling of the ark was a sign indicating Yahweh's desire to halt the procession.

Uzzah was killed because he and the procession happened upon a sacred site possessed by a(n evil) spirit. The story retains a relic of some primitive animistic belief.

Uzzah was killed because of a ritual accident. The ark partook of God's numinous holiness which could and did break out with destructive force against any unconsecrated person who offended. A very holy object is also very dangerous, and utmost care is needed in its manipulation. The story illustrates holiness contagion.

Uzzah was killed because the forces of man or nature simply had their way. A member of the ark's military escort used his spear to dispatch Uzzah. Uzzah was crushed when the ark moved backward and fell on him. Uzzah was horrified at his own action, and overcome by fear suffered a heart attack. Uzzah slipped on dung, hit his head on the hard rock surface, and died. Uzzah was electrocuted by the strong static electricity of the (gold overlaid) ark, which it picked up as it bumped along the rocky road (!).

The strongest argument for the failure of David and/or Uzzah is the explicit legal statements concerning the transport of the ark using poles carried on the shoulders of levitical attendants. If cultic law was broken, then Yahweh's outbreak against Uzzah could be justified on a legal basis. Blatant sin brings swift judgment. The argument based on legal infringement is pervasive, and few fail to cite the Pentateuchal legislation. However, this view faces several difficulties. First, the perspective presupposes a relative chronology of legislation on the proper transfer of the ark. In actual fact, the story of Uzzah's death may have led to the genesis of later legal tradition.

---

373 Exod. 25.12-15; 35.12; 37.5; 39.35; Num. 3.29-31; 4.5-6, 15; 7.9; Deut. 10.8; 31.9, 25

At the very least, uncertainty about the relative dating of legal and narrative texts such as these precludes a compelling argument that Uzzah was supposed to have violated one or more specific commandments.375

Second, if one insists that some form of legal tradition prohibiting the touching of holy objects predated the story of Uzzah's death, there is still evidence elsewhere in Samuel that those who touched the holy things did not always die. For example, in 1 Sam. 4.17; 5.1-2; 6.11, none of the Philistines were struck dead for presumably touching the ark; and in 1 Sam. 21.6, David eats the bread of the presence. Furthermore,

The ark was handled at the start of the journey ..., patently by Uzza and Ahio ..., and that with undeniable impunity. Furthermore, as a result of the present incident, David will have it deposited (... actual handlers unspecified) in the house of Obed Edom, also with impunity. Finally, at the journey's eventual end the reader will see the ark installed ..., again with impunity, and that by anonymous attendants ..., whose cultic fitness to handle the ark is thus nowhere made as evident as that of Uzza.376

Third, if it were clearly understood to be a sin to carry the ark on a cart, then someone would have had to be punished for this breach of divine law. But then why would Uzzah have been the one to be killed since any number of individuals might have been responsible for placing the ark of God on the cart?377

Fourth, the implication of several differences in Samuel's continuation of the ark transfer story (2 Sam. 6.13-14) may have nothing to do with a previous violation of legal tradition. See 5.1.3.3. It is readily admitted that 1 Chron. 15.2-28 addresses the issue of the failed transfer, however, Chronicles' expansion is unparalleled in Samuel, and 1 Chronicles 15 is not 1 Chronicles 13. Fifth, following up on the first point, it is remarkable that priests and Levites are explicitly absent from 2 Samuel 6 (and indeed the shared version of the story), while they are transparently present in the stories about the crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 3–4), the conquest of Jericho (Joshua 6), the former ark narrative (1 Samuel 4–7),

and Solomon's installation of the ark in the temple (1 Kings 8 // 2 Chronicles 5–6), as well as in Josh. 8.33 and 1 Kgs. 2.26, and even 2 Sam. 15.24-29.

With justification, then, a few recognise that Yahweh's homicidal anger against Uzzah is inexplicable. There is no sin in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13. Gelander's perspective on the theological message of 2 Samuel 6 was discussed in 1.2.2. The important point is that he unequivocally disavows any error on David's or Uzzah's part:

In the description the only thing that is out of place is the apparently unreasonable outburst of the Lord's wrath, and it seems to me most reasonable to regard this as having no cause or explanation. Like other outbursts of wrath or other manifestations of 'the dark side of the Deity', here too we have a manifestation of God's demonic aspect. However, this is not the main point of the text, which is rather David's reaction. From it we learn not only that David turned 'the Lord's wrath into blessing', but that he was bringing the Ark up to Jerusalem after it had been 'cleansed' and could no longer do any harm. The symbolism of bringing the Ark up to Jerusalem is complex. Clearly the story tells us not only that David promises the continued sanctification of ancient traditions by adopting their symbols, but also that adopting these symbols marks a turning-point, since he uproots from them elements that he regards as undesirable. As I have indicated above in the Introduction, what we see here is a substantive change in the perception of the Deity. The historiographer apparently wishes to ascribe something like a revolution to David and his work, namely, an attempt to establish belief in a Deity who can no longer be regarded as capricious, ill-tempered, wrathful.378

Sunoo's unpublished doctoral thesis seeks to elucidate the theological complexity and rich variety of biblical narrative by reading three 'unexpected disruptions' in the narrative landscape in conversation with the wisdom books of Job and Qoheleth. These passages are Exod. 4.24-26, 2 Sam. 6.6-11 and 2 Samuel 24. These passages are chosen since they fit the following paradigm:

- God bursts forth.
- God bursts forth violently.
- The victims are, so far as the text reveals, innocent.

In successive chapters, she subjects each narrative to textual, contextual, and theological analysis. Reception history figures prominently in her discussions. In the case of each narrative, the history of reception (from ancient to modern times) is characterized by attempts to circumvent the theological question it raises: Why is no clear explanation offered for Yahweh's behaviour? In each case, three strategies emerge:

- Scholars deny that it was really Yahweh who burst forth.
- Scholars deny that what Yahweh did was in fact a sudden act.
- Scholars supply appropriate reasons for Yahweh's behaviour.

The history of scholarship on these passages has been profoundly influenced by the drive to find rationality, morality, and consistency in the character of Israel's God. A common strategy, for example, is the inclination to read these puzzling narratives in light of legal traditions (e.g., concerning circumcision, or the proper handling of the ark, or census-taking), which may or may not predate the narratives in which these laws were supposedly disobeyed.

These three stories share other features as well. For example, they contain enigmatic terminology and syntax, ambiguity and/or logical and chronological inconsistency, and two of the three have textual problems:

In two of the three narrative passages, a difficult word or phrase appears in the Hebrew text at a key point in the story. In the case of Exod 4:24-26, not only the identity but even the significance of a 'bridegroom of blood' (חֵרֵב דָּם) in the plot is shrouded in mystery. In the case of 2 Sam 6:6-11, at the very point when the reader hopes to be told why Uzzah has suddenly been killed, there appears in the MT the untranslatable expression עליתא. Traditional interpretations of each passage have proceeded from the assumption that behind these difficult Hebrew expressions lie clues as to why the human victims in the stories meet their respective fates. Since Yahweh would never burst forth against anyone without just cause, the logic goes, perhaps the Hebrew text itself ought to be translated in such a way that it offers a reason—a neglected circumcision, for instance (in the case of Exod 4:24-26), or the violation of a clear rule concerning the handling of the ark (in the case of 2 Sam 6:6-11). Once prior assumptions about the rationality and predictability of divine behavior are set aside, however, it appears equally
plausible that the Hebrew text betrays no comprehensible motive on Yahweh's part in either of these two situations.379

In her analysis of the Uzzah story, Sunoo rightly focuses her textual analysis on the enigmatic לֹא חֲזַקָּם and and לֹא חֲזַקָּם. Her contextual analysis focuses on the reading of the story in light of biblical traditions concerning the transportation of the ark and/or within the context of biblical traditions concerning the touching of holy objects. Her theological analysis surveys the attempts to circumvent the theological problem of Yahweh's behaviour:

- Naturalistic explanations.
- Explanations that soften the language of the text, made by interpreters reluctant to note the fierceness of David's reaction, and whose aim is to show that David had no right to be angry at Yahweh because Yahweh's actions are always just.
- Explanations that rationalise God's behaviour by suggesting that human error or sin is to blame.

This brief review of Sunoo's thesis is concluded with these citations:

... the danger for exegetes lies in the temptation ... to assume that Uzzah must have erred because God became angry and killed him. The logical fallacy proceeds as follows: (1) When humans sin, God punishes them. (b) Therefore, if God bursts forth against someone that individual must have done something to provoke God's wrath. The logic breaks down in at least two places, however. The second half (b) is nullified at the very least by the presence of the books of Job and Ecclesiastes in the Hebrew canon, books which insist that sometimes even blameless individuals suffer at the hands of God. Neither can the first half be maintained, simply by virtue of the number of times God offers opportunities for repentance before striking out against those who have committed crimes against God and one another. In other words, the very premise of the argument, (a), is nullified by divine grace. God's sovereignty means, among other things, that God is full of surprises, sometimes graciously forgiving when punishment is due, and sometimes apparently allowing or even causing unmerited suffering.380

Such efforts to supply human errors (errors unspecified in the MT) would be considered superfluous if the texts could simply be received in the light of a different biblical tradition, a tradition of dissent or protest. The alternate biblical paradigm of intra-wisdom critique may in fact be the best heuristic device for interpreting the theological perspectives espoused in Exod 4:24-26, 2 Sam 6:6-11,

379 Sunoo 1999: 110.
380 Sunoo 1999: 78.
and 2 Samuel 24. How differently these individual pericopes would be received if, rather than being examined exclusively in the light of the dominant theological paradigms of Exodus and the Deuteronomistic History, they were read in conversation with the wisdom books of Job and Ecclesiastes. Viewed from this alternate perspective, narrative characters who are victims of Yahweh's violent outbursts would be given the benefit of the doubt. The possibility would be more seriously entertained that Yahweh may have burst forth against faithful servants in these instances without warning and without just cause.

The present writer's intention is to highlight (1) the perceived inexplicability of God's wrath in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, (2) the drive by ancients and moderns to supply an explanation, and (3) the relationship of that driving desire to the textual variation in the ark narrative's portrayal of Uzzah's slaughter. This thesis will not discuss Yahweh's 'dark, shadow, dreadful, sinister, amoral, savage, pernicious, cruel, hostile, demonic, satanic' side. God's 'violent outbursts of destructive fury and incomprehensible wrath' and 'inexplicable caprice' are addressed elsewhere. Crenshaw in particular has skilfully written on theodicy, and on anthropodicy whereby God's justice is salvaged by placing the blame on humans. These topics are taken up in a series of essays in honour of Crenshaw and in particular within that volume in an essay by Steussy, in which she addresses 'the problematic God of Samuel' by examining 'God's inner life', 'God's "walk"', 'God's talk' and 'God-talk from human characters' in the book. She shows that the characterisation depicts a God of strong likes and dislikes, wrathful and destructive, more inclined to anger than love, more adept at terrorising and smiting than at healing and encouraging. She goes on to suggest that her observations

---

386 Crenshaw 1983a.
387 Penchansky and Redditt 2000.
388 Steussy 2000.
help free us from the automatic assumption that the picture in Samuel must be pro-David and pro-God. They raise the possibility that the Samuel narratives do not attempt to create bright legend from murky fact but may instead deliberately darken an existing legend.389

This view should be entertained by all, and will be welcomed by some, but insofar as 2 Sam. 6.7 is concerned, the opposite is true: the text is anti-Uzzah, and consequently pro-Yahweh and pro-David.

Sunoo says 'a single translational difficulty has thus revealed the central theological problem of the text', and she suggests that the original Hebrew version may have lacked a rationale for Uzzah's death, and also that early readers may have been bothered by this and so they supplied one.390 This conclusion is supported by the present analysis. Although biblical editors allowed the Uzzah episode to remain as part of the canonical portrayal of Israel's God, they did not allow it to remain without intervention. Just as modern scholars strive to make sense of this narrative, so did medieval scholars, and the ancients before them, but separating us from them is the textual permanence and canonical status of the Bible, which we cannot adjust, but which the early transmitters of the traditions adjusted freely when it seemed necessary to do so. See 2.3.

4.1.2.3 2 Sam. 6.7
1 Chron. 13.10

Did Uzzah die 'next to the ark of God/Yahweh' (MT Samuel, LXX Samuel #1)391 or 'before God' (4QSam, LXX Samuel #2, Chronicles)?392 Some argue (unjustifiably) that the Chronicler intentionally heightened the narrative by personalising the deity, conceivably as an expression of post-exilic monotheism. However, many conclude that Greek Samuel has a conflated text retaining two synonymous readings, and that this

389 Steussy 2000: 158.
391 On צ as 'beside, next to' see BDB 768.
392 See appendix 2.
evidence (1) releases Chronicles from the accusation of tendentious modification of its Vorlage, and (2) suggests that Chronicles' reading is in fact original. McCarter says 'the reading of MT Sam is reminiscent of v. 4' and he rejects it on the basis of assimilation, whereas for Murray is 'a more graphic representation, which links better with v. 4'. Both are correct—and both stray by failing to recognise the significance of the persistent doublet throughout MT 2 Sam. 6.3-4, 7. According to MT Samuel, Uzzah is located 'next to the ark of God' and 'before God'. MT Samuel reflects a conflated and extensively reworked version of several traditions. See 3.1.5.2. Trebolle Barrera says:

A similar double reading is to be found in v. 7b. The MT of Samuel has here את יährה, while the parallel in Chronicles reads ‘וַיָּאוֹרָה. The Septuagint in Samuel has a conflated reading: παρὰ τὴν κυβερνὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἐνεργοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. We have, therefore, two traditions relating the manner in which the ark had been transported. Each member of the presumed dittography in the MT introduces the text of one of the two traditions.

4.1.3 David's Response

4.1.3.1 2 Sam. 6.8 1 Chron. 13.11

The Hebrew versions of 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 vary on two points: (1) the preposition introducing the causal clause: ’ל in Samuel and ’כ in Chronicles; (2) the orthography of 'Uzzah': שָׁוָה in Samuel and שָׁה in Chronicles. The statement עַשָּׁה יִרְשָׁה אֲלֵיהָ will be discussed together with עַשָּׁה יִרְשָׁה אֲלֵיהָ in the next section.

The writer suggested that Yahweh's anger expressed by X ב Y נָתְרָה (2 Sam. 6.7 // 1 Chron. 13.10) and David's anger expressed by Y ב X נָתְרָה (2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11) are not qualitatively different; rather, the latter is a stylistic circumlocution for the

397 See appendix 3. The variation is stylistic, although the direction of the change is uncertain.
maintenance of reverence. Many, however, feel compelled to mitigate David's anger against Yahweh, and they adopt one of three strategies to accomplish this. First, some render הָרָע as David 'was/became annoyed, despondent, disheartened, displeased, distressed, disturbed, frustrated, grieved, ill-humoured, troubled, vexed'. Second, some direct David's anger against something else, such as the interruption of his plan, or toward someone other than Yahweh, such as David's advisers, for failing to instruct him on the proper method of transport, or even against David himself. Third, on the basis of ἀθυμέω in the Greek translations some wish to emend MT 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 to ἔφεσσε ('tremble, be terrified'), ἐμφάνισε ('be bitter') or ἔπιστεω ('be hard pressed, depressed'). Nevertheless, Hebrew usage and Greek translation technique back the standard interpretation that David is truly angry with Yahweh. The seven constructions with the G stem of הָרָע were reviewed above. It is impossible here to give a complete account of biblical usage. The important points are these: (1) Most often Yahweh is the angry one, and almost always against Israel or an Israelite. (2) Frequently a person is angry with another person, and in these cases a superior is almost always angry with an inferior. (3) In the few cases when a person expresses anger with Yahweh the construction is inevitably יָהַב and Yahweh is the implied object: Cain is angry with Yahweh when he does not receive his sacrifice (Gen. 4.5-6). Samuel is angry with Yahweh because of the deity's change of heart regarding the kingship of Saul (1 Sam. 15.11). David is angry with Yahweh over the homicide of Uzzah (2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11). Jonah is angry with Yahweh because he has mercy on the Ninevites (Jonah 4.1, 4, 9). The Greek translation paves the way for modern scholars who wish to avoid anger altogether in these passages. Contra Nysse, ἀθυμέω is not synonymous to הָרָע; rather, it is a euphemistic substitution which aims to create a theologically less offensive passage, as Ulrich

---

398 See, e.g., the following modern English translations: ASV, DRA, JPS, KJV, NAB, NJB, TNK, but not ESV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, RSV, which retain 'angry'.

---
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argues. Finally, most presuppose that the report of David's anger against Yahweh is intended as a negative reflection upon David, implicating him for his 'fault, indignity, impiety, inability, irritation', but this assertion is not corroborated. On the contrary, Sunoo says (correctly):

David's reaction to Uzzah's death could imply that David himself was believed to have felt God's outburst against Uzzah to have been an arbitrary, capricious act. Like the figure of Job, David complained to God, expressing both anger and fear, when God's ways seemed strange and unjust.400

4.1.3.2 2 Sam. 6.8 1 Chron. 13.11

The only significant difference in the Greek versions of 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 is the passive ἐκλήθη in Samuel and active ἐκάλεσεν in Chronicles. Both MT versions have אָמַרְנָה. Greek Samuel's ἐκλήθη probably does not reflect an original אָמַרְנָה. This conclusion is based on a examination of (ה) אָמַר in naming clauses and on an investigation of the translation of these clauses in the Greek version. The G verb form in both versions is original and should be rendered impersonally as 'and they named that place' or 'and that place was named'.401 The passive verb in Greek Samuel is an inner-Greek phenomenon. Rabin has shown that the 3ms verb form is used impersonally to a much greater extent than is generally thought and that the deviation in the Greek version does not provide evidence for a different Vorlage.402 In addition, there is no reason to suggest that אָמַר רֵעַ is an editorial addition, and the presence of the adverbial phrase clearly fails to cohere with the interpretation that makes David the subject of אָמַר רֵעַ. The simplest solution is that the verse in its entirety is authentic and that it was composed

401 GKC §144d, p. 460; JM §155e, p. 578. McCarter 1984: 165 suggests reading a yiqtol form: 'and they call that place'.
402 Rabin 1962.
substantially later than the events narrated therein.\(^{403}\) In any case Samuel and Chronicles agree on the text of the passage.

The story says Yahweh burst out against Uzzah and consequently the place received the name Perez-uzzah or 'the breach of Uzzah'. What is the motive for this naming? McCarter gives genealogical and geographical explanations for Perez-uzzah (a break in Uzzah's family line and a breach in the fortifications of Jerusalem, respectively)\(^ {404}\), and Zakovitch offers a religious perspective (a monument to the miracle wrought there)\(^ {405}\), but possible associations with several other stories are noteworthy. Astonishingly few mention Yahweh's warning in Exod. 19.22, 24, and one certainly wonders about the direction of influence if a connection is intended. Langston thinks יִשָּׁר refers back to Judg. 21.15,

where Yahweh was said to have made a יִשָּׁר among the tribes of Israel [יהוה יִשָּׁר וְיִשָּׁר שְׂכָל לַמִּצְרֶים] ... Both events underscore the illegitimacy of any Benjaminitc claims to cultic dominance since Yahweh has demonstrated that even he is against their control.\(^ {406}\)

\(^{403}\) The formula יִשָּׁר... occurs 84 times, and is employed with the ark seven times, more than with any other object or institution. Childs 1963 is the seminal essay. After briefly reviewing the groundwork laid by Alt, Bright, and Noth, Childs summarises the basic etiological and non-etiological uses of יִשָּׁר... and related formulas, and then continues with a detailed analysis of seven categories of usage. He considers the formula in 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 an example of an etymological etiology. He reaches three conclusions: (1) 'In the great majority of cases, the formula "until this day," has been secondarily added as a redactional commentary on existing traditions'. (2) 'The formula reflects the age of many different redactors'. (3) 'The biblical formula, יִשָּׁר... seldom has an etiological function of justifying an existing phenomenon, but in the great majority of cases is a formula of personal testimony added to, and confirming, a received tradition'. Geoghegan 1999 thoroughly reviews the history of interpretation and use of the formula. Geoghegan 2003 is a summary of his research. Geoghegan acknowledges Child's first point, but argues instead that in the DH the formula belongs to the pre-exilic Deuteronomistic historian (Dtr\(^ {1}\)), not to numerous redactors from diverse time periods. Geoghegan has written a helpful study, but his thesis suffers several faults, including especially his two paragraph treatment in an appendix of Chronicles. He argues that the five non-shared occurrences of יִשָּׁר... in Chronicles 'belonged to a preexilic, perhaps Deuteronomistic, source that was used by the Chronicler in constructing his history' but which the Deuteronomistic historians decided to eliminate from their final composition (I).


\(^{405}\) Zakovitch 1992: 856.

\(^{406}\) Langston 1998: 192-193. The distribution of the root יִשָּׁר in the Former Prophets is interesting: Judg. 21.15 (noun); 1 Sam. 3.1 (N); 25.10 (HD); 28.23 (G); 2 Sam. 5.20 (G, noun); 6.8 (G, noun); 13.25 (G), 27 (G); 1 Kgs. 11.27 (noun); 2 Kgs. 5.23 (G); 14.13 (G); cf. יִשָּׁר in Judg. 5.17 and יִשָּׁר in Judg. 19.7; 1 Sam. 15.23; 2 Kgs. 2.17; 5.16. A close look suggests that Judg. 21.15 and 2 Sam. 5.20; 6.8 are related.
In the nearer context the occurrence of the root יְּשָׁה seven times in 2 Sam. 5.20 // 1 Chron. 14.11 and 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 is hardly coincidental. For some, the link comments largely on Uzzah (and his family), who is implicitly compared with the enemies of Israel.\(^{407}\) For others, the negative spotlight falls on David; and his anger, naming, fear and refusal are part and parcel of his 'inchoate realization that Yahweh's will and power, far from being at his disposal, may even be set against him'.\(^{408}\) In light of previous discussion of the inexplicability of Yahweh's homicidal anger against Uzzah it is suggested that the naming makes a pointed comment about the deity. To adopt the words of Polzin,

As the presence of the ark was first harmful to Philistines but then mysteriously noxious to Israelites themselves in 1 Samuel 4-6, so here in 2 Samuel 5-6 the LORD first bursts forth against the Philistines but then mysteriously erupts against an Israelite.\(^{409}\)

Finally, several link the name 'Uzzah' and the noun יַעֲשָׁה in [2 Sam. 6.5 // ] 1 Chron. 13.8 and 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27. The root יַעֲשָׁה, which is the nominal root of Uzzah's name, occurs three times in MT Samuel: in 1 Sam. 2.10, where it is an attribute given by Yahweh to the king; in 2 Sam. 6.14; and in 2 Sam. 22.18, where the adjective יַעֲשָׁה is applied to David's enemy Saul from whom Yahweh delivered David. With the exception of other proper names containing יַעֲשָׁה, the root appears in MT Chronicles in 1 Chron. 13.8, and in 1 Chron. 16.11, 27, 28; 2 Chron. 6.41 where it is an attribute of Yahweh. It also appears in 2 Chron. 30.21 where it modifies musical 'instruments'. Auld offers astute observations on יַעֲשָׁה in 2 Samuel 6:

The place name (6:8) that commemorates the worrying incident has an interesting double resonance. The Perez part of Perez-uzzah refers to the same sort of eruption or breakthrough as was celebrated in the previous chapter at Baal-perazim, where the Deity broke through the enemy like a flood (5:20). And the


\(^{408}\) Murray 1998: 157; cf. 235; also see McConville 1984: 39.

\(^{409}\) Polzin 1993: 63-64.
Uzza part reminds us of the Hebrew word for might. The same word is used to describe the enthusiasm or strength of David’s dancing (v. 14). This word 'oz is often associated with Yahweh, and memorably with his ark in the psalm which celebrates David’s efforts to find a dwelling place for the Almighty: 'Arise, O Yahweh, and go to thy resting place, thou and the ark of thy might' (Ps 132:8). Baal-perazim is translated 'Lord of breakthroughs.' Perez-uzzah is ambiguous: it could, in the spirit of the psalm, suggest 'Breakthrough of Might'; but it is understood in our story as 'Breakthrough on Uzzah'. The versions we read in Samuel and Chronicles were not the only biblical recollections of the arrival of the ark.410

The name н/зв means 'Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength' and is a short form related to the names Uzziah/Uzziel, 'Yahweh/El (God) is my Strength'.411 Ironically, then, Yahweh becomes angered (נ/זר) and strikes down (נ/זר) 'Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength'. Consequently, Yahweh’s breakthrough (נ/זר) against 'Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength' incites David’s anger (נ/זר) and the place of the irruption is memorialised as н/зв н/זר, 'breakthrough of/on "Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength"'. As Auld observes, the name is ambiguous, and the second element could be interpreted as a subjective or objective genitive, although the latter is indicated by н/зв н/זר earlier in the verse. However, this may not end the story. It is difficult not to make a connection between Yahweh’s mysterious and inexplicable homicidal anger against н/зв and David’s response with н/זר.412 Is David 'strength' redivivus? Or is David 'strong' in spite of Yahweh’s breakthrough against 'Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength'? Gelander says:

The events that occurred in the house of Obed-edom the Gittite can be interpreted as a victory won by David. Moreover, the feeling that it is David who is doing the reprimanding also comes from the description of his initial reaction: 'And David was angry because the Lord had broken forth upon Uzzah' (2 Sam. 6:8); and 'So David was not willing to take the ark of the Lord into the city of David; but David took it aside... (2 Sam. 6:10). These expressions suggest that the initiative and the decision were David's. ... Thus all the indications are that the text is emphasizing David’s initiative and his control of the situation. ... Like other outbursts of wrath or other manifestations of 'the dark side of the Deity', here too we have a manifestation of God's demonic aspect. However, this is not the main point of the

412 Notice that whereas David dances with н/זר prior to the Uzzah incident in MT Chronicles he does so after it in MT Samuel.
text, which is rather David's reaction. From it we learn not only that David turned 'the Lord's wrath into blessing', but that he was bringing the Ark up to Jerusalem after it had been 'cleansed' and could no longer do any harm.\textsuperscript{413}

4.1.3.3 2 Sam. 6.9
1 Chron. 13.12

The versions deviate solely over הוה in Samuel and אלוהים in Chronicles.\textsuperscript{414} זוהי (וה) occurs 64 times, most frequently in Psalms, Kings and Deuteronomy. The concept appears elsewhere in Samuel only in 1 Sam. 12.14, 24, where Samuel exhorts Israel to 'fear' and serve and obey Yahweh, and in Chronicles only in 2 Chron. 6.31, 33 (// 1 Kgs. 8.40, 43). זוהי (וה) occurs 18 times, but only here in Chronicles, and never in Samuel. זוהי is certainly not a Deuteronomistic addition\textsuperscript{415} since David's fear is unrelated to 'fearing Yahweh' as a facet of maintaining loyalty to the God of the covenant. David's fear is 'fear associated with terror', not fear associated with respect or worship.\textsuperscript{416}

Apart from Jonathan's reassurance to David (1 Sam. 23.17) this is the only other occasion where the verb זרה is applied to David. Even the dangerous rebellion of his son Absalom, from whom David flees for his life, is not said to induce fear in David. For most commentators, David's fear is the recognition of his (supposed) fault, and some nuance it as 'respect'. Others, more acceptably, relate David's anger to Yahweh's mysterious and inexplicable homicidal anger. 'David is afraid ... realizing that he is in the presence of a mysterious power he can neither control nor comprehend'.\textsuperscript{417} Sunoo says:

Indeed, why would David react with fear, and insist that the ark remain far from his presence, unless he was horrified at what had happened to Uzzah and feared the destructive power of God might again be unleashed without warning? David's

\textsuperscript{413} Gelander 1991: 43-44.
\textsuperscript{414} See appendix 2.
\textsuperscript{415} Contra, e.g., Caquot and de Robert 1994: 416.
\textsuperscript{416} Van Pelt and Kaiser 1997: 528-529.
\textsuperscript{417} Allen 1999: 386.
reaction to Uzzah's death could imply that David himself was believed to have felt God's outburst against Uzzah to have been an arbitrary, capricious act.\textsuperscript{418}

Similarly, Josephus' \textit{Antiquities} 7.4.2 suggests that David was fearful at the thought that he might suffer the same fate as Uzzah.

\begin{itemize}
\item 4.1.3.4 2 Sam. 6.9
\item 1 Chron. 13.12
\end{itemize}

The principal witnesses to both Samuel and Chronicles agree against MT Samuel's finite verb \textit{אֶלֶךָ}. In addition, for every \textit{wayyiqtol} verb followed by \textit{אֶלֶךָ} in MT Samuel and Chronicles, Samuel (3:1) has a greater tendency than Chronicles (2:1) to have the \textit{wayyiqtol} form of \textit{אֶלֶךָ}. To these facts one may add the fact that on only three occasions does Chronicles have \textit{לֶאֶלָךְ} where Samuel–Kings has the \textit{wayyiqtol} form of \textit{אֶלֶךָ}. Consequently, the original reading in the passage is \textit{לֶאֶלָךְ}, and MT Samuel was adjusted due to stylistic preference. \textit{כָּאֹר} and \textit{כָּמֹן} are two of five interrogative adverbs for manner.\textsuperscript{419} The others are \textit{אֲכֹלָה}, \textit{אֲכֹלָה} and \textit{כָּמֹן}, the latter sometimes in combination with other elements, as in \textit{כָּמֹנָה}. This set of interrogative adverbs is seldom used to pose the ordinary question of manner 'how?'. The main uses are\textsuperscript{420}:

\begin{itemize}
\item Introducing a simple question, 'how?', 'by what method?'.
\item Introducing a rhetorical question, 'how is it possible that?', 'surely it is not possible that?'.
\item As an interjection expressing enormity of catastrophe, typically within a lament, 'how terribly!'.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{418} Sunoo 1999: 77; cf. Polzin 1993: 64.

\textsuperscript{419} See appendix 3.

\textsuperscript{420} DCH I, 208-209.
The primary function is rhetorical, and this is evident in about half of all occurrences. It is used to clarify that some event or state of affairs is out of the question. The nature of David's question is addressed below.421

In Samuel, the question is 'how will Yahweh's ark come to me?', and in Chronicles, 'how will I bring God's ark to me?' Johnstone believes the alteration in Chronicles indicates 'The focus has changed from blind fear of the irrational to the necessary preparations which David knows he must make to receive the token of the very presence of God within his own residence'.422 Dhorme says 'Il est clair que ἔστω ἐς πρώτῳ de I Chr.; d'ailleurs «j'amènerai vers moi» serait assez étrange'.423 Nysse thinks Chronicles clears up ambiguity regarding the subject of ἄρα by using the first person.424 However, what is strange or ambiguous about the grammar or phraseology of either text? Barker says 'One is tempted to argue that this is the Chronicler's theology at work, heightening the centrality of David. However, with so many unknowns, it would seem best to relegate this to a stylistic variation'.425 Samuel probably has the original verb form, but there is no firm basis for deciding between the readings or identifying a rhetorical difference between them.

LXX - Samuel and perhaps 4QSam (according to Herbert426) have the additional clause καὶ ἠλθὲν ἡ κιβωτός τοῦ κυρίου / ἑρυθρὸς ἀραβαρι. Nysse considers the longer reading to be secondary427, whereas McCarter thinks it is original and all other witnesses were shortened by haplography.428 The longer reading is not a doublet, in agreement with both scholars. It may indicate that subsequent to Uzzah's homicide the ark continued its

421 On the ark's epithets see appendix 2.  
424 Nysse 1984: 283.  
426 Herbert 1997b: 125.  
movement to a point closer to the City of David, and was diverted by David at that time, to another location in 'greater Jerusalem'. A more certain element of the narrative is the repetition of the first person singular pronoun on each occasion of David's speaking in 2 Samuel 5–6 and in the synoptic parallels, except in 5.8 (but notice 'those whom David hates'): 'my hand' (5.19 // 14.10), 'my enemies' (5.20 // 14.11), 'come/bring to me' (6.9 // 13.12), 'chose me' (6.21). Furthermore, in 6.10 // 13.13 the goal of the transfer is ... אליי. Therefore, Steussy says David 'now speaks as if everything happens for his own sake. Will God correct the king's vision?'429, and Murray says 'The one whose first recourse in 5.17-25 was to consult Yahweh ... is now remarkably reluctant, even when brought up sharp by Yahweh, in any way to confide in him!'430 Conversely, David's unwillingness reflects his practical awareness that there is 'an unpredictable danger, a risk, in seizing the ark' and bringing it near him and his home.431 Therefore, in the rhetoric of the passage, 'Surely it is not possible that the ark of Yahweh will come to me!' David was no less prudent than the people of Beth Shemesh (1 Sam. 6.20): Jerusalem and the Davidides were at stake!

4.1.3.5 2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13

The principal difference here is the variation between חמה ... חמה in Samuel versus חמה ... חמה in Chronicles. For some, Chronicles' minus intentionally avoids attributing Samuel's unworthy motivation to David.432 Was חמה deleted from Chronicles in order to make David look better? Does the presence or absence of חמה have an effect on the portrayal of David? The verb חמה occurs 54 times, always in the G stem, and then

431 Polzin 1993: 64; cf. 63.
432 Barker 1984: 113 (cautiously); Murray 1998: 60.
twice as often in Samuel (14 times) as in any other book. It means 'will, want, consent, accept', but since in all but two cases (Isa. 1.19; Job 39.9) it is preceded by a negative adverb\(^{433}\), the resultant idea is 'refuse, decline, not want'. The term itself is neutral. It is used in contexts having a positive or negative tone. For example, BDB makes 1 Sam. 15.9; 2 Sam. 13.14, 16 'bad' uses, and 1 Sam. 22.17; 26.23; 31.4; 2 Sam. 6.10 'good' uses.\(^{434}\) B. Johnson discusses specific theological considerations, including (1) God as subject, (2) hardness of heart, and (3) as an attitude toward God. He does not place 2 Sam 6.10 in either (2) or (3).\(^{435}\) He also says 'The primary emphasis here is not on the intention as a psychological factor in the inner man ... but on the main behavioral patterns and actions in which the intention is manifested'.\(^{436}\) In this context David's inner motivation is the anger and fear reported in the previous verses, neither of which should be construed as negatives about David. Finally, Murray considers Chronicles' minus ' terser and less characterful'\(^{437}\), and Fokkelman remarks that the sounds יָבֹא יָלָי in 2 Sam. 6.9 are picked up at the beginning of v. 10 by וֶלוֹא יָבָא ... יָלָי, which 'reinforces the lines' coherence'.\(^{438}\) Both points may argue for the originality of Samuel's text; however, both are also good reasons for a stylistic adjustment in Samuel.

The verb יָסָר occurs nearly 300 times. The H form is usually translated 'cause to turn aside/depart, remove, eliminate, take away', and the object marker יָסָר frequently follows the verb, as do the prepositions יָבֹא and יָלָי. Several factors may hint at the complicated editorial history of 2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13. For example, this is the only place where the preposition יָסָר is used with the H of יָסָר, and elsewhere the H of יָסָר

---

\(^{433}\) Always יָסָר, except for יָסָר in the second of two occurrences of יָסָר in Ezek. 3.7, and except for יָסָר in Prov. 1.10.

\(^{434}\) BDB 2. 2 Sam. 2.21; 12.17; 13.25; 14.29; 23.16, 17 are unclassified.


\(^{437}\) Murray 1998: 60.

\(^{438}\) Fokkelman 1990: 190.
is rarely accompanied by any comment on to where something is removed, and in the handful of passages where this information is given an additional verb follows. With respect to the usage of מֵא in general there are a remarkable number of textual difficulties in the MT, discrepancies in synoptic passages, and translation equivalents in the Greek version. These factors, which cannot be related in detail here, raise a question about what if any of the material prior to the וְסָר clause is original to the passage. Was David's unwillingness in the rhetorical question of 2 Sam. 6.9 // 1 Chron. 13.12 originally followed by 'and he diverted it to the house of Obed-edom the Gittite'? In any case, since מֵא does occur in both 2 Sam. 6.10 and 1 Chron. 13.13, it is more prudent to focus the discussion on the presence or absence of מֵא.

The different locations of מֵא in the texts are related to the diverse verb and object formulations. See appendix 2 for the variation in the ark's epithet. See 3.1.2.3 and appendix 3 on the interchange between וָא and וָע. Here, MT Samuel's וָע is secondary. All versions agree on מֵא רֵאָשׁ / (רְמֵי) פֹּלָמִן דָּאָוִד, which is in apposition to מַלְאָךְ / πρὸς αὐτῶν/ἐξαντον, thus furnishing 'to himself, to the city of David'. Although this construction may seem redundant, it is neither awkward nor necessarily a conflation or double reading.

The name Jerusalem has been clearly avoided, and systematically replaced by 'the city of David' (in triplicate; vv. 10a-12c-16a). This stresses the personal aspect of

---

439 Typical Hebrew word order is verb + רָאָשׁ-phrase + וָא-phrase when the object is compact, and verb + וָא-phrase + רָאָשׁ-phrase when the object is extended, so as to avoid distant separation and/or ambiguity.

440 Observe Samuel's רֵאָשׁ רָמֵי ... וָע. MT Chronicles' וָא, and εἰς in LXX Samuel and Chronicles, suggest that MT Samuel's וָע is secondary. In biblical Hebrew, וָע with an object of person or place following a verb of movement normally means 'upon' or 'against', and this cannot be the intended significance in 2 Sam. 6.10. Driver 1890: 268 says 'Read וָא, as in 1 Ch. 13, 13'; cf. Dhorme 1910: 322.

441 מֵא רֵאָשׁ occurs 44 times in the MT, and only three times outside Samuel, Kings and Chronicles (Isa. 22.9; Neh. 3.15; 12.37). There are five occurrences in 2 Samuel (5.7, 9; 6.10, 12, 16) and five in 1 Chronicles (11.5, 7; 13.13; 15.1, 29). The remainder are in Kings (17 times) and 2 Chronicles (14 times).

442 See, e.g., Gen. 8.9; Num. 10.3; Josh. 2.8; 11.7; Judg. 4.7; 2 Kgs. 10.15; Jer. 38.14; 48.44; 51.56; 2 Chron. 32.6.
the removal led by the king: he finds that the ark ought to be housed in the crown lands, and so be permanently connected with them.443

But 2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13 briefly reverses the truth of this appraisal: David refuses to bring Yahweh's ark 'to himself, to the city of David', and this locution hints at why he refuses Yahweh's presence for the moment: the deity is so dangerous and unpredictable that his presence could place in danger David and his city! After all, who can predict against whom Yahweh's homicidal anger might next erupt?

4.1.3.6 2 Sam. 6.10
1 Chron. 13.13

The H of נָנָּה means 'turn (aside), steer sideways, guide away', is roughly equivalent to רָאָה in the previous verse, and is generally construed with an accusative object and the prepositions ם,ระบ and וב, but with an adverbial accusative of place here only. The grammar of both versions is acceptable, and the presence of εἰς in Greek Samuel does not necessarily suggest the loss of רָאָה. The reading in Chronicles may be secondary. See 5.1.1.1. Only LXXλε Samuel has Μηνας τρευες in 2 Sam. 6.10 as well as in v. 11, where 'three months' appears in all versions. McCarter rightly concludes that the reading is 'the remnant of a long haplography from "the house of Obed Edom the Gittite" in v. 10 to "the house of Obed Edom the Gittite" in v. 11, which has been repaired (the restored material standing under the Hexaplaric asterisk in ε2)'.444

Much ingenuity is exercised in explaining David's entrusting the ark to 'Obed-edom the Gittite'. A surface reading suggests that the ark was sent to the house or temple of a (former or current?) servant of the god Edom, a man of Philistine Gath by birth. 'Edom' is interpreted as the name of a deity, a king, or a tribe, but few disfavour the theophoric interpretation: Edom is a particular deity. It is unclear whether Obed-edom is a

443 Fokkelman 1990: 180.
444 McCarter 1984: 165.
convert to Yahwism or whether he maintains allegiance to Edom. יָדָ(ן) describes Obededom (2 Sam. 6.10, 11; 1 Chron. 13.13), Ittai (2 Sam. 15.19, 22; 18.2), and Goliath (2 Sam. 21.19; 1 Chron. 20.5), and is used generically as 'the Gittite' (Josh. 13.3) and 'the Gittites' (2 Sam. 15.18). יה, used five times as 'winepress', most often refers unambiguously to Philistine Gath (33 times), and this is especially true in Samuel. Consequently, יָד(ן) cannot refer unambiguously to an individual from Gath-hepher (Josh. 19.13; 2 Kgs. 14.25—in Zebulun), Gath-rimmon (Josh. 19.45; 21.24, 25; 1 Chron. 6.54—in Dan) or Gittaim (2 Sam. 4.3; Neh. 11.33—in Benjamin). These Gaths (and other Gaths mentioned in Amarna correspondence) are modified precisely to distinguish them from one another. Of course, this means that the ark was sent into the care of a (former or current?) servant of a god other than Yahweh, whose origin was from among David's enemies the Philistines. The consensus is that Obededom was a Philistine יָד from Gath who probably attached himself to David during David's period of mercenary service among the Philistines under 'King Achish of Gath' (1 Samuel 21, 27–31).

Some insist that Obededom was a Levite, by birth or possibly by adoption, but the consensus is that the Chronicler tendentiously gifted Obededom levitical status. There is no basis in 2 Sam. 6.10-12 // 1 Chron. 13.13-14; 15.25 for attributing levitical status to Obededom. Also, the Obededom in these passages and the Obededom in 2 Chron. 25.24 (the keeper of הַנְּכָר הַנְּכָר הַנְּכָר ... בֶּבְיָדָ(ן) ... minus in 2 Kgs. 14.14) are different individuals, although Chronicles intends to link the latter to the family of the former.⁴⁴⁵ How is/are the Obededom(s) in Chronicles' non-synoptic material (1 Chron. 15.18, 21, 24; 16.5, 38; 26.4, 8, 15) related to the Obededom in the parallel material given above? The editorial history of the levitical personnel in 1 Chronicles 15–16 is complex, and by

⁴⁴⁵ Many believe this (non-shared) reference to Obededom is a post-Chronistic addition, e.g., Japhet 1993: 871; Rudolph 1955: 280; Williamson 1982: 331.
all accounts divergent layers of tradition are attested side by side.\textsuperscript{446} Obed-edom is presented as a gatekeeper (1 Chron. 15.18, 24; 16.38), a musician (1 Chron. 15.21; 16.5, 38—together with 68 brothers!), and a son of Jeduthun (1 Chron. 16.38). In addition, Obed-edom is a descendant of Levi through Korah, and the progenitor of a sizeable and qualified family of gatekeepers (1 Chron. 26.4, 8, 15—with 62 descendants, including 8 sons!). 'Obed-edom is not a conveniently expendable alien (cf. 1 Chron. 8.13, where the original population were driven out by Benjamin), but a Levite, one of the approved personnel'.\textsuperscript{447} 'The precise relationship between these four remains unclear due to the nature of the Chronicler's work where one or more families of temple servants claiming ties to the Philistine caretaker of the ark are given levitical ancestry'.\textsuperscript{448} In two in-depth studies Dirksen reviews scholarly opinion and seeks to explain the redactional growth of the Obed-edom traditions.\textsuperscript{449} He concludes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronist</th>
<th>Later Redactor</th>
<th>Still Later Glossator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.11-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.19-24a (musician)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5 (musician)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.17-18 (gatekeeper)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.24b (gatekeeper)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.38b (gatekeeper)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.38a (musician) [misplaced]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chs. 23-27 (Williamson et al.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dirksen sorts out the relationship of chapter 13 to chapters 15–16, 26 by arguing that the Obed-edom of the ark narrative (1 Chron. 13.13-14; 15.25) was elevated into a gatekeeper (1 Chron. 15.18, 21, 38b; 26.4, 8, 15), and that Obed-edom the musician (1 Chron. 15.21, 24; 16.5, 38a) was an altogether different person:


\textsuperscript{447} Johnstone 1997: I, 173.

\textsuperscript{448} Thompson 1992a: 6.

\textsuperscript{449} Dirksen 1995, 1996.
The best is to begin with vs 21, which belongs to the Chronicler's own composition. In this verse Obed Edom is unambiguously listed as a singer, one among many. There is no reason to assume that this Obed Edom was thought by the Chronicler to be identical with the one in whose house the ark had remained for three months (I 13:14). If the Chronicler had any intention to elevate this Obed Edom to the rank of the (levitical) singers, he would at least have omitted the then embarrassing fact of his being a Gittite (I 13:13). Elsewhere, however, this Obed Edom is indeed elevated to the rank of a Levite, though not as a singer but as a prominent gatekeeper, who established a family of gatekeepers, viz. in I 26:4-9, which belongs to the secondary material in ch. 23-27. Now he is no longer a Gittite, but a Korahite (vs 1). That the writer is thinking of the Obed Edom of the ark narrative is clear from his allusion to that narrative in vs 5 «for God had blessed him». That as a Levite Obed Edom would be made a gatekeeper is much more natural that his becoming a singer, since he had actually been a gatekeeper _avant la lettre_ during the three months the ark had been in his house.450

Samuel's and Chronicles' presentations differ remarkably on this point of the story, and Chronicles goes to great lengths to gift a levitical pedigree to Obededom (he _had to be_ a Levite!—cf. Deut. 10.8 etc.—in defence of David?), but in the end:

The text is ambiguous and open-ended here, leaving the implicit tension unresolved. In any case, Chr's attempt to explain this possible inconsistency neither resolves nor conceals this problem, but merely heightens the degree of ambiguity that characterizes Israel's relationship with the Philistines. The presence of Obed-Edom among the levites remains a textual aporia.451

Why did David redirect the ark to the house or temple of Obed-edom? The difficult question to answer is 'Why Obed-edom?'. Suggestions are:

- **Expedient choice**: Obed-edom's home was close (a quick exit from danger/embarrassment).
- **Default choice**: no Israelite would accept the dangerous thing.
- **Test-case choice**: David's thinking was 'better him (a Philistine!) than me; let's see what happens!'.
- **Religious choice**: Obed-edom had a ַָנֶּה ('temple').
- **Narrative choice**: this is yet another Philistine interlude in David's and the ark's story.

The easy answer is that the deity was too dangerous and unpredictable for David to bring Yahweh's ark into David's city near David and the Davidides!

Two points conclude this chapter. First, besides the close association between David and Philistine Gath, 2 Sam. 6.10-11 cannot effortlessly be taken independently of 1 Sam. 5.8-9, whatever the relationship between the two passages.\(^{452}\) Second, Fokkelman's thought merits reflection:

But in any case an irony has come about; the God who has just been an extreme stickler for detail and very demanding of his priest now tolerates the housing of his ark in an uncircumcised man's residence thus behaving like a moderate towards, and even blessing, a man from another religion.\(^{453}\)

'Gittite' in Samuel and Chronicles again highlights the enigmatic behaviour of Yahweh towards Uzzah.

4.2 Summary of Chapter Four

The material in 2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10 relates the story's inciting incident in which Yahweh executes Uzzah and thereby brings an abrupt albeit short-lived halt to David's relocation of the ark to Jerusalem. The writer remarks in 4.0 that many observe the problematic character of this material, which is characterised by textual variation, literary ambiguity, and theological difficulty. The principal text-critical and interpretative issues are: (1) All witnesses exclusive of LXX\(^B\) Chronicles (= OG) have a word modifying 'the threshing-floor'. The witnesses to Samuel in particular are marked by acute textual variation. Most mistakenly seek in the nomina recta a specific locale where the Yahweh–Uzzah incident transpired, but the route of the procession and the location of the threshing-floor are unknown. The expansive readings in Samuel and Chronicles were not intended as proper names. See 4.1.1.1. (2) The direct object phrase 'his hand' is absent

\(^{452}\) McKane 1963: 208.
\(^{453}\) Fokkelman 1990: 192.
from MT Samuel only and it undoubtedly once stood in this textual tradition. The minus may be unintentional or perhaps intentional. See 4.1.1.2. (3) The indirect object of Uzzah's action is 'the ark of God' in Samuel but only 'the ark' in Chronicles. See 4.1.1.2. (4) The double and triple references to Uzzah's 'grasping' in Greek Samuel suggest that Chronicles' infinitive phrase is original; the finite verb phrase in MT Samuel is an intentional adjustment intended to stress Uzzah's slip-up. He is the culprit. See 4.1.1.2. (5) MT Samuel and Chronicles were stylistically updated by the insertion of 'nose' in the expression of Yahweh's anger. See 4.1.2.1. (6) Yahweh is the subject of the 'striking' in Chronicles but Samuel alters the subject to God, and following Fokkelman this adjustment generates a lack of insight on the part of Uzzah into the uniqueness of Yahweh the God of Israel. See 4.1.2.2. (7) LXXB and a number of cursive Samuel do not have an explanatory clause justifying Yahweh's homicide of Uzzah. This is the original reading. The ancient versions, and subsequent commentators to the present day, have struggled to comprehend Yahweh's behaviour. Gelander and Sunoo, among others, place this text and its interpretation in proper perspective. See 4.1.2.2. (8) Uzzah's fuzzy position vis-à-vis the ark results from editors' efforts to situate him in the spot where he might suitably become the object of Yahweh's malice. See 4.1.2.3 and also 3.1.5.2. (9) Remarkably, the meaning of 'גּ יֵיָּלֵי is unclear, and revisers did not seek to spell out its meaning, which however is irrelevant since Uzzah alone is responsible for his death. See 4.1.1.3.

The material in 2 Sam. 6.8-10 // 1 Chron. 13.11-13 is more certain and less difficult than the material just described; text-critical issues are minor. Samuel has the plus יָּקָש. See 4.1.3.5. Chronicles has the plus נְיָמ preceding יָּאָש. See 4.1.3.6. Chronicles' יָּאָש is (probably) secondary to Samuel's יָּאָש. See 4.1.3.4. Two issues occupy interpreters. First, exactly who is 'Obed-edom the Gittite' and why was the ark entrusted into his care?
Second, how should one construe David's response to Yahweh? Did he respond inappropriately, or are his anger and fear and his refusal to continue the transfer, understandable rejoinders to Yahweh's baffling slaughter of Uzzah? It is argued here that interpreters have naturally but mistakenly criticised David's behaviour and by so doing they have misunderstood the significance of David's triumph in the relocation of the ark. David really was angry, and he really was terrified, but ultimately he succeeded in settling the potent deity in a fixed abode.

Three themes which influenced the editing of MT Samuel are outlined in 3.2. How do these manifest themselves and sway the revision of MT 2 Sam. 6.6-10? First, the theme apology of Davidic kingship is relatively insignificant in this material in 2 Samuel 6. Second, the theme apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character stands in the foreground, but the story focuses less on the positive depiction of these characters than on the negative portrayal of Uzzah. Third, the theme influence of cultic practice is implied by תֵּש in Samuel, a term which is used for cultic 'negligence' in Dan. 3.29; Ezra 6.9; 2 Chron. 29.11. Furthermore, ancients and moderns are inclined to interpret Uzzah's identity and behaviour in keeping with legal stipulations regarding the transport of the ark, but at best these are belated implications in the story. Finally, Obededom stands as a final highlight of the mysteriousness of Yahweh's behaviour towards Uzzah.
CHAPTER FIVE

Analysis of 2 Samuel 6.11-15, 17-20a
and 1 Chronicles 13.14; 15.25-28; 16.1-3, 43

5.0 Introduction

The material in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8 (and 13.1-4) is the exposition of the main plot which presents information essential to the story. This is followed by the inciting incident in 2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10 which initiates the conflict or complication and in turn gives way to the rising action, which extends or develops the conflict. This material alternately conveys David's response to Yahweh's homicidal act (2 Sam. 6.8-10 // 1 Chron. 13.11-13), Yahweh's response to David's rejection (2 Sam. 6.11-12a // 1 Chron. 13.14), and David's response to Yahweh's blessing (2 Sam. 6.12b-15 // 1 Chron. 15.25-28). Following the unexpected introduction of an additional character in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 (which is developed further in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23), the story reaches its climax or turning point in which the outcome of the story is made clear: David successfully relocates the ark to its designated place in the capital Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6.17a // 1 Chron. 16.1a). Afterward, the main plot of the narrative is brought to a close in what may be denominated the resolution or denouement or falling action (2 Sam. 6.17b-20a // 1 Chron. 16.1b-3, 43 [and 16.4-42]).

This chapter will address the second and third parts of the rising action, the climax, and the resolution of the story. The sections in this chapter are:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1.1</th>
<th>5.1.2</th>
<th>5.1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yahweh's Response to David's Rejection: Blessing</td>
<td>David's Response to Yahweh's Blessing: The Successful Removal of the Ark to Jerusalem</td>
<td>The Attendant Circumstances of the Ark's Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel 6.11-12a</td>
<td>2 Samuel 6.12b, 15a, 17a, 19b, 20aα</td>
<td>2 Samuel 6.12c-14, 15b, 17b, 18-19a, 20aβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles 13.14</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 15.25α, 28a, 16.1a, 43a</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 15.25b-27, 28b, 16.1b-3, 43b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material in 5.1.2 regarding the removal's completion alternates with elements in 5.1.3 relating the adjuncts accompanying David's success.

The analysis of the material in these portions of the story is abbreviated considerably. This abridgement is forced by the textual and interpretative difficulties in the passage. The two issues go hand in hand. Ancient editors and scribes preceded us long ago in the struggle to comprehend the significance of this material. The greater part of chapter 5 deals with the attendant circumstances of David's transfer of the ark—David's, because he and his kingly capacity are in focus. David's entourage is elaborated greatly in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 (and in 1 Chron. 13.5-8) in contrast to the focus on David in 2 Sam. 6.12b-20a, where the participants are mentioned briefly in v. 15 and then are presented in vv. 18-19 more as recipients of David's benevolence than as participants in his transfer of the ark. Observe, however, that 1 Chron. 15.25-16.3, 43 focuses less acutely on David. The occasion overall is marked by celebration and reverence. A joyful mood is set at the very start followed by descriptions of sacrifices, movements (dance), garments, noises (voices and instruments), blessings and gifts.

Most pay inadequate attention to the function of verbs in delimiting the passage's narrative structure. In particular, the story in 2 Sam. 6.12-20a // 1 Chron. 15.25-16.3, 43 focuses on the end points of the transfer: its start (the first steps) and finish (the ascent and entrance). The attendant circumstances which are described accompany the ark's
departure and arrival. The interval between these points is left undescribed, thus eliminating any potential doubt regarding David's accomplishment.

The narrative in 2 Samuel 6 is structured by (1) a large number of movement verbs together with (2) significant pauses in activity (vv. 6b-10a, 11-12a, 17b-19a, 20b-23) and (3) verbal spotlights. The latter are fashioned by predicative participles in vv. 3-5 and 14-16. These do not describe David's and the people's activity throughout the duration of the transport of the ark. Such an interpretation misconstrues the participles as finite rather than circumstantial.454

- רֵאָשׁ in v. 3 is circumstantial to נַחֲלַת in the same verse. This verse asserts the punctililar departure of the ark and relates the attendants' (their) position relative to it.

- לְאָל in v. 4 is circumstantial to רֵאָשׁ in the same verse. This verse asserts the punctililar departure of the ark and relates the attendant's (his) position relative to it. The doublet in vv. 3-4 is discussed in 3.1.5.2. Neither רֵאָשׁ (twice) nor לְאָל refer to activity during a period of travel from Abinadab's הָבָה to the threshing floor.

- רֵבֶּע in v. 5 is circumstantial to רֵאָשׁ in v. 6, and is intended to describe the activity of David and Israel as they arrived at the threshing floor. The participles in v. 5 and vv. 14-15 function similarly: attendant circumstance at an arrival.

---

454 (1) *Qotel* forms have adjective, substantive, relative, predicate, and periphrastic uses, but the periphrastic use is reliant on a finite verb (וְחָלַת), and the predicate use is generally circumstantial in biblical narrative, with true finite verb function limited to statements about the present–future in discursive texts. In biblical narrative the participle as predicate frequently occurs in circumstantial clauses. In these instances, the participle does not make an independent statement (primary) but a dependent comment (secondary). In general, the primary storyline of biblical narrative is carried along by a series of wayyiqtol forms. The secondary or subsidiary storyline, the background or circumstantial information which supplements and sets the stage for the main events, is often described with participial forms of the verb, and frequently introduced using disjunctive syntax. The wayyiqtol forms may be equated with the big picture, the view of an entire parade from the blimp above (perfective aspect), whereas the participles place the reader in the grandstands alongside the passing parade, giving an up-close and personal view (imperfective aspect). The two viewpoints are not mutually exclusive and normally occur together in good story-telling. The wayyiqtol forms keep one turning the pages of the book; the participles are the pauses to look at the pictures. (2) The participles in 2 Samuel 6 are frequently yet inconsistently rendered as finite verbs in modern versions and in translations in commentaries. (3) The vividness conveyed by the participles in this material is described by Campbell 1975: 138; Driver 1892: §135 [1], p. 166; Kleven 1991: 373; 1992: 309; Murray 1998: 134; Polzin 1993: 61.
V. 12 is a synopsis of the transport of the ark to the city of David. The entire event and its mood are summarised in a single initial statement.

V. 13 focuses on the departure of the ark and the commencement sacrifice.

In v. 14, and מָשָׁה and מְסַכְּרָה in v. 16, are circumstantial to מְסַכְּרָה in v. 15, and to מָשָׁה in v. 16, and to רִמְוצָה in v. 17, and describe David's activity as he ascends and arrives at his city. In general, vv. 14-17 focus on the ascent and arrival of the ark to the city of David, stressing David's participation and the fanfare of the arrival. The eyes and ears are stimulated by vivid descriptions of appearances and sounds.

5.1 Analysis

5.1.1 Yahweh's Response to David's Rejection: Blessing

This material prolongs or raises anew difficult or impossible-to-answer questions. Who is the Gittite Obed-edom and what is his הָבֶּה (cf. 4.1.3.6)? What and how did Yahweh bless? Why did Yahweh bless? By whom was the blessing reported to David and why? What part, if any, did the prophets Gad\(^456\) and Nathan\(^457\) have in reporting to David? It is noteworthy that Yahweh's blessing inspires the second attempt to transfer the ark (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14; 2 Sam. 6.12a) and that the successful completion of the transfer is capped by David's blessing of the people and his move to bless his own בֵּית (2 Sam. 6.18, 20 // 1 Chron. 16.2, 43). Murray takes (the report of) Yahweh's blessing as the turning point in the plot (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14; 2 Sam. 6.12a)\(^458\), but the story's climax rather lies in the entrance of the ark into the city of David and its deposit in its tent in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1. Nevertheless, the fact that Yahweh's blessing prompts the successful transfer of the ark which in turn leads to David's blessing of Israel suggests that Yahweh's blessing forecasts a favourable outcome to the relocation.

\(^{455}\) Fokkelman 1990: 194 takes מְסַכְּרָה in v. 14 as circumstantial to v. 13, but the repetition of מְסַכְּרָה in v. 16 suggests that the verb should be construed with the ark's arrival rather than departure.

\(^{456}\) 1 Sam. 22.5; 2 Sam. 24.11, 13-14, 18-19.

\(^{457}\) 2 Sam. 7.2, 3, 4, 17; 12.1, 5, 7, 13, 15, 25.

The meaning of \( \text{שֵׁשׁ} \) ('dwell, lodge, abide, continue, endure, remain, stay, tarry') and its representation by \( \text{kαθίζω} \) are unremarkable except to say that the usage of the latter in Greek Chronicles may indicate that an original \( \text{kατοικέω} \) was revised to \( \text{kαθίζω} \) on the basis of Greek Samuel. This is an inner-Greek issue and does not require further discussion here.\(^{459}\) Both MT versions have \( \text{שֵׁשׁ} \) \( \text{הַשֵּׁשֶׁת} \), as does LXX\(^B\) Chronicles with \( \text{τρεῖς} \) \( \text{μήνας} \), but Greek Samuel and LXX\(^L\) Chronicles have \( \text{μήνας} \) \( \text{τρεῖς} \), and LXX\(^A\) Chronicles has \( \text{τρεῖς} \) \( \text{ἡμέρας} \).\(^{460}\) The period of 'three months' appears in seven biblical passages, including 2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14 and 2 Sam. 24.13 // 1 Chron. 21.12.\(^{461}\) Two questions regarding this period are unanswerable. First, did three months elapse before Yahweh's blessing was discernible or reported or did David deliberately wait three months to reassure himself of the ark's or deity's beneficent character?\(^{462}\) Second, how did Yahweh bless Obed-edom such that the blessing was evident after three months? What happened to Obed-edom, or perhaps what \textit{did not} befall him (!) in this brief period of time? Murray suggests that 'three months' in Samuel echoes the ark's sojourn in Philistia for seven months (1 Sam. 6.1): three months in Ashdod, three months in Gath, and one month in Ekron\(^{463}\); but the time spent in each city is unspecified in 1 Samuel 5. The narrative function of Chronicles' 'three months' has a dual purpose. First, 1 Chron. 14.1-17 shows how in the interim David 'grew progressively greater' in the eyes of the neighbouring states: 'He too, like Obed-edom, is continuing to be blessed in all he

---


\(^{460}\) See appendix 3 on the numerical syntax, and also appendix 2 on the ark's epithet.

\(^{461}\) Also: Gen. 38.24; Exod. 2.2 (בְּשָׁפֶם אֶרֶץ בֵּית אָדָם); 2 Kgs. 23.31 // 2 Chron. 36.2; 2 Kgs. 24.8 // 2 Chron. 36.9; Amos 4.7.

\(^{462}\) Caquot and de Robert 1994: 416.

\(^{463}\) Murray 1998: 130 n. 62.
does'. Second, many observe that (non-synoptic) 1 Chron. 15.1-24 makes clear that proper care of the ark is a levitical prerogative, such that the interim stimulated David's acquiescence to cultic regulations.

The accounts differ on the indirect object. First, MT Samuel has וב... ושב, MT Chronicles has וב... ושב, and the Greek translations have either καὶ ἐκάθισεν εἰς οἶκον (LXXAB Samuel) or καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν (τῷ) οἶκῳ (LXXL Samuel, Greek Chronicles). Second, the story in Samuel continues with והי but MT and LXXL Chronicles (but not LXXAB Chronicles) have both פֶּסֶחָה עֲבֹר אֲרֵץ וְהָרוֹאֵב / ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ אֵבֶדֶדדָדָא and והי... / ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ αὐτόν. Regarding the first issue, the absence of a preposition in MT Samuel has elicited two responses: either הב was lost through haplography or הב is an adverbial accusative. It is suggested in 4.1.3.6 that the absence of a preposition in MT Samuel's וְהָרוֹאֵב (as opposed to לְאֵל/eis preceding וְהָרוֹאֵב/οἶκον in the other versions) is possibly original. The same could be true here but the state of affairs is not straightforward. The verb וְהָרוֹאֵב in 2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13 requires that the ark go to Obed-edom's וב. However, the verb וְהָרוֹאֵב in 2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14 can be construed with adjuncts meaning 'at' but also 'beside' and 'in'. First, what is the וב? Obed-edom's house or the deity's house, i.e., a temple or a complex containing a temple? Second, where is the ark deposited? It is clearly 'at' Obed-edom's וב, but was it kept inside or outside the וב proper, perhaps in a tent or in another nearby edifice? Third, is MT Samuel's vague reading secondary (accidentally or intentionally) or are the other versions adjusted to eliminate this?

465 Also see 3.1.2.3 on וב扫码版.
Static location (‘where?’) is normally expressed with ב or ה although an adverbial accusative of certain nouns can express 'place at which' or 'local determination'. For example, יה (without a preposition) is used with הב, meaning 'dwell in a/the house', in Gen. 38.11; 2 Sam. 13.20; Isa. 44.13; Jer. 20.6; 36.22; Prov. 25.24; 2 Chron. 26.21. This evidence also sustains the point that Samuel's means 'and the ark lodged in—not "at" or "beside"—the Gittite Obed-edom's הב'. It is also significant that הב is rendered ἐν (τῷ) ὶκῶ in the Greek translations of the aforementioned passages. The other constructions attested in 2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14 are summarised.

- καθιζω + ἐν (LXX Samuel; LXX Chronicles) = הב + ב. This construction is common in both Hebrew and Greek, occurs with הב (e.g., 2 Sam. 7.1, 2, 6), and consequently it is the lectio facilior.
- καθιζω + εἰς (LXX AB Samuel) = הב + ἐν. הב + ה occurs in 1 Kgs. 13.20 but elsewhere the construction is doubtful. הב + ב occurs in Judg. 5.17 (LXX παρά); Ps. 9.5 and 132.12 (LXX ἐν [i]); and Prov 9.14 (LXX ἐν [i]). καθιζω + εἰς occurs elsewhere in Lam. 2.10 and interestingly in 1 Sam. 5.11, where it stands parallel to MT's הב + ב.
- הב + ב (MT Chronicles). The other valid example of this construction is Gen. 25.11; elsewhere the Hebrew and Greek examples express personal accompaniment (i.e., sit/remain with a person, donkey, baggage, etc.). ב may mean 'by, beside, alongside' but in many cases 'at' and 'near, close to' are equally viable interpretations.

The most interesting versional reading is shared by MT and LXX: ל: ל ἐν τῷ ὶκῶ Αβεδδαδαν ἐν τῷ ὶκῶ αὐτοῦ. The preposition ב is generally represented by μέτα or παρά in the Greek version, but on occasion ἐν (the

---


467 Prov. 25.24 has ἐν ὶκῶ.

468 A thorough presentation of the evidence is unreasonable. The comments here focus on הב with different prepositions rather than the latter with ב, although the writer has thoroughly investigated both.

469 Would καθιζω + μέτα equal הב + ב? καθιζω never occurs with παρά or σῶν in biblical Greek. Or is ἐν the original translation?

470 BDB 768.
workhorse of Greek prepositions) evidently stands for ἐν, as in Gen. 35.4 and 1 Chron. 21.15, where ἐν is used for locality. Curtis and Madsen, followed by others, think

the ark was in its tent alongside or near the house of Obed-edom. This statement is a modification of that of 2 S. 6:11 ... where the ark is represented as placed in the house of Obed-edom. The Chronicler, however, evidently could not conceive of the ark placed in an ordinary dwelling and modified the text accordingly.472

This view must be rejected for the following reasons: (1) The noun ἐν may refer to a family home or a king’s or god’s home (i.e., a palace or temple) so that the Chronicler did not necessarily understand ἐν as an ‘ordinary dwelling’. Furthermore, if the Chronicler was so concerned to have the ark in the proper place he could have supplied ἐν, as in 1 Chron. 15.1; 16.1 (// 2 Sam. 6.17); 2 Chron. 1.4; 5.5 (// 1 Kgs. 8.4). (2) If the ark was not in Obed-edom’s ἐν (whatever it is) then why did Yahweh bless it in 1 Chron. 13.14, and why did David and Israel bring up the ark after three months from it (2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25)? (3) Fokkelman remarks that ‘the house of Abinadab (the father of Uzzah) fulfilled ... the same function (as emergency accommodation for attending to the ark after a terrible blow from God) which the house of Obed Edom has here ...’473 Japhet, among others, discards Curtis’ and Madsen’s view, thinking Chronicles’ ἐν functions to place ‘the greater emphasis on “in his house”’; but why the emphasis? Nevertheless, she is right to discount the idea that Chronicles wishes to avoid ἐν, since Obed-edom was already labelled a Gittite. Finally, although Samuel’s ἐν and Chronicles’ ἐν are far from wholly different in appearance, Chronicles’ ἐν does not seem to be either an intentional or unintentional variant of ἐν.

471 Hatch and Redpath 1897: II, 174-174; Johannessohn 1925: 324-336; Muraoka 1998: 111. On the other hand, based on the usage of καθʼ ζω, the occurrence of ἐν, and the spelling of Obed-edom’s name, Greek Chronicles may reflect dependence on Samuel, but this seems less than likely for the preposition ἐν. See Allen 1974: I, 181-182, 191-192 for discussion.
472 Curtis and Madsen 1910: 206.
Textual variation in the versions suggests that editorial activity has fundamentally altered the original account, which was probably not simply meaning 'in the house' (the lectio facilior). An explanation which has not been suggested until now is that // ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ᾿Αβεδδάδαν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ is a double reading in which an original ἐν-statement is revised to ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ in MT Chronicles, followed by the Lucianic recension: 'the ark lodged "in proximity" to Obed-edom's, in his ἐν. The exact nuance of ἐν is difficult to pinpoint. It could mean 'at' or 'by, beside, alongside' or 'near, close to'. One reasonably concludes, however, that ἐν should not be construed as ἐν. The notion that the ark was housed 'at' (L7/ἐν) Obed-edom's ἐν was transformed to say that it was housed 'in' (ἐν) it. The original thought remains in the first member of MT Chronicles' doublet and in LXXAB Samuel which is also the OG translation. In summary, the story was revised to ἐν (ἐν) and glossed by τῷ in MT Samuel, and it was adjusted by the insertion of ἐν in MT Chronicles. This change's motivation may be to properly house the ark in the 'cultic' ἐν.

5.1.1.2 2 Sam. 6.11
1 Chron. 13.14

The object of Yahweh's blessing is expressed in two phrases, the first referring to 'Obed-edom' or '(all) Obed-edom's ἐν' and the second referring to 'all his ἐν' or 'all his belongings'. Regarding the second clause, an earlier ἐν Σαλομὼν Αβραὰμ ἐν Αἱλάα ἐν αὐτῷ was revised to ἐν Σαλομὼν Αβραὰμ ἐν Αἱλάα in MT Samuel's tradition, and this revision is reflected also in LXXA Samuel's καὶ δόλων τῶν οἴκων. Some think the second clause in Greek Samuel and in Chronicles was adjusted toward 2 Sam. 6.12a's καὶ δόλων αὐτῶν ἐν ᾿Αβδαδαν. This is improbable since 2 Sam. 6.12a is a plus, and its first half is not reflected uniformly in the

474 Nysse 1984: 449 implies the final point.
allegedly revised texts. MT and LXX\textsuperscript{A} Samuel are the exceptions to consistent language in all other accounts. Regarding the first clause, the relationship of the witnesses is complex. Again, LXX\textsuperscript{A} Samuel probably reflects revision toward the received text. The discrepancy in the location of \(�\) in Samuel, and its occurrence in MT and LXX\textsuperscript{L} Chronicles, but its non-appearance in LXX\textsuperscript{AB} Chronicles, suggest that the presence or absence of this word was the focus of the revisionary process. Beyond this, the data precludes a definitive answer.\textsuperscript{475} Except for possible parablepsis related to \textit{taw} in an original \(�\) \(�\) in Chronicles, there is no apparent motive for the absence of the noun in LXX\textsuperscript{AB} Chronicles.

In spite of the fact that \(�\) occurs nearly twice as often in Kings (344 times) and Chronicles (330 times) as in Samuel (176 times), the noun occurs more often in 1 Samuel 31; 2 Samuel 5–8, 23 (33 times) than in 1 Chronicles 10–18 (29 times). On twenty-three occasions Samuel and Chronicles agree on \(�\).\textsuperscript{476} Chronicles has \(�\) in non-synoptic material in 1 Chron. 12.29-31; 15.1 (four times), and Samuel has it in 2 Sam. 5.8; 6.3, 12, 21; 7.29; 23.5 (six times). In synoptic material Samuel but not Chronicles has \(�\) in 1 Sam. 31.9 // 1 Chron. 10.9; 2 Sam. 5.9 // 1 Chron. 11.8; 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8; and 2 Sam. 6.15 // 1 Chron. 15.28. The reverse is true in 1 Sam. 31.6 // 1 Chron. 10.6\textsuperscript{477} and 2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14, but it is suggested in 5.1.1.1 for the second set of passages

\textsuperscript{475} See the discussion in Nysse 1984: 381, 474. He thinks three Hebrew textforms are attested.

\textsuperscript{476} Once in 1 Samuel 31 // 1 Chronicles 10; once in 2 Samuel 5 // 1 Chronicles 14; seven times in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16; and fourteen times in 2 Samuel 7 // 1 Chronicles 17.

\textsuperscript{477} Here Chronicles says Saul's entire \(�\) perished whereas Samuel refers to 'Saul and his three sons and his armour-bearer and all his men'. Nine reasons (!) underlie the alteration in Samuel: Saul's son Ishbaal (2 Samuel 2–4); Saul's sons Armoni and Mephiboseth by Rizpah (2 Samuel 21); Saul's five grandsons by Merab (2 Samuel 21); and Jonathan's son Mephiboseth (2 Samuel 4, 9, 16, 19, 21). Samuel's revisers were forced to alter the original reading since otherwise David could not have received a positive response to his question in 2 Sam. 9.1, and Samuel's story of protracted warfare between the houses of David and Saul would have faced literary obstacles as well. Auld 2003: 242 says: 'In the Book of Two Houses, in this case faithfully preserved in 1 Chronicles 10, Saul, like Elhanan and Goliath, had simply a walk-on part: he was killed, 'and his three sons, and his whole house together' (10:6). But the authors of Samuel first build him into a major tragic character and then prolong the death agonies of his house'. See Ho 1995: 85-87.
that Chronicles' is an alternative reading for the preceding phrase בְּהַלֵּךְ. In light of these statistics, the frequency and variations in these chapters with respect to בְּהַלֵּךְ suggest that Samuel has a somewhat greater interest in this notion than does Chronicles. It is pointed out in the discussion of בְּהַלֵּךְ in 3.1.3.4 that plays a key role in Samuel. The evidence suggests (see below) that Yahweh's blessing of Obed-edom's בְּהַלֵּךְ is a 'disguised' blessing upon David and his בְּהַלֵּךְ (to the detriment of Saul and his בְּהַלֵּךְ).

'Blessing' is important in this story, and in Samuel and Chronicles in general, which follow only Psalms, Genesis and Deuteronomy in frequency of usage of בָּרָךְ. Blessing makes its first appearance in 2 Sam. 6.11-12 // 1 Chron. 13.14, where Yahweh blesses Obed-edom (or his בְּהַלֵּךְ or belongings—see above) and then David blesses the people (6.18 // 16.2) and goes to bless his own בְּהַלֵּךְ (6.20 // 16.43). The issues here are the significance and shape of Yahweh's blessing. Normally Yahweh or Yahweh God blesses, and rarely God. In Samuel and Chronicles the deity is blessed more frequently than he blesses. One person may (potentially or actually) bless something or somebody, and Yahweh may be blessed or his blessing wished upon another, but the deity explicitly blesses only three times: He blesses Israel's people in 2 Chron. 31.10, Jabez in 1 Chron. 4.10, and Obed-edom in 2 Sam. 6.11-12; 1 Chron. 13.14; 26.5. Also, David requests Yahweh's blessing in 2 Sam. 7.29 // 1 Chron. 17.27, and the realisation of his petition seems more than certain since Yahweh explicitly promises the content of the requested blessing ('an eternal house') in 2 Sam. 7.5-16 // 1 Chron. 17.4-14. Just as Yahweh fulfilled his promise to deliver David from his enemies (compare, e.g., 2 Sam. 3.18 and 2 Sam. 5.20; 7.1, 9, 11) so also does he pledge a Davidic dynasty.

478 See appendix 2 on the variation in the reference to the deity in Hebrew and Greek Chronicles.
479 See Greek Chronicles and appendix 2.
McKane and Murray remark on the irony in Yahweh's blessing of a Gittite given the consequences of the ark's presence among the Philistines (Gittites et al.) in the earlier ark narrative. Indeed, only here does the deity bless anyone or anything in the ark's presence. (Canonically) earlier legal stipulations stress the proper care and transport of the ark by Levites and its separation from the people in the sanctuary and/or behind/under a curtain or screen. Positively, the ark embodies Yahweh's presence, guidance and gift of victory in warfare, but on a personal level the ark also lives up to its 'standoffish' reputation by bringing terror in battle, plague and destruction, and sudden death. The ark is charged with (by?) a vicious force.

The dissimilar consequences of the ark's Philistine interludes summon to mind David's own experiences among the Philistines. If Israel's experiences with her archenemy were mostly negative, or at best a mixed state of affairs (especially under Saul), David had a positive experience under Philistine patronage, and he brought about a change of fortune for Israel as well, including the ark's recovery. Samuel even records the personal names of some Philistines, and in each case they function to authenticate David's political, social, and military achievements: patronage under Achish, loyalty and service from Ittai and Obed-edom, and victory (by David or his soldiers) over the Philistine giants Goliath, Ishbi-benob, Lahmi, and Saph.

The deity's blessing of Obed-edom and his house (in some versions—see above) provokes other potential ironies and connections. only occasionally has רֶבֶן as its object. The referents are the houses of an Egyptian (Gen. 39.5), a Philistine, David (twice), and the nation Israel (Ps. 115.12), and the subject in each case is the deity, except

---

481 McKane 1963: 208; Murray 1998: 130 n. 62. Compare 2 Sam. 6.10-11 with 1 Sam. 5.8-9.
482 Steussy 1999: 60.
483 Delilah is the only other named Philistine in the Bible.
484 Polzin 1993: 219 n. 6 overstates the facts saying 'It is not hard to find the LORD blessing all kinds of houses outside the History ...'
in 2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43, where it is David. The parallel between Yahweh's blessing of the Egyptian officer Potiphar on account of Joseph, a נ in Egypt, and his similar blessing of the Philistine guardian of the ark, Obed-edom, a נ in Israel, is intriguing. Is this blessing on account of or for the benefit of David? The messenger's and David's responses indicate that at least they believe the answer is affirmative. Alternatively, Murray says '... the blessing of Obed Edom's household "on account of the ark" was a sign, not that Yahweh was now happy for David to remove the ark from there to David's city, but rather that he approved of its present lodgement', but Murray's explanation is dependent on reading behind the text rather than reading the text itself, which construes the blessing as a sign in David's favour, and eventually in Israel's favour too, since the populace also receives David's blessing.

Yahweh's infrequent blessing in Samuel and Chronicles is sketched above. In addition, elsewhere in the Former Prophets Yahweh blesses only Israel as a people (Josh. 17.14) and the boy Samson (Judg. 13.24). The very fact that Yahweh blesses at all in the story of the ark's transfer is significant. Indeed, Yahweh's blessing is the go-ahead for David to continue the ark's transfer, a sign that no further harm will come to him or others, and ultimately a 'disguised' blessing of David himself. In the Former Prophets Yahweh struggles or refuses to give his blessing, and perhaps for this reason the blessing on David is portrayed as a blessing on Obed-edom, a figure who never reappears in biblical literature aside from Chronicles' superfluities. Finally, it may be argued that David successfully elicited Yahweh's blessing by refusing to bring the ark to Jerusalem following Uzzaz's slaughter. The text emphasises David's reprimanding; the ark emits

---

485 is applied to the 'house' of Israel (Ezek. 44.30).
messages of reconciliation and appeasement. The focus falls on David's initiative, control and victory.

Speculation on the content of the deity's blessing of Obed-edom includes descendants, riches, livestock, crops, goodness, and others, but what if any of this would become visible after three months? Caquot and de Robert speak of 'un charme de fécondité attaché à l'arche'.\(^{488}\) According to 1 Chron. 26.4-8 Obed-edom had 62 descendants, including 8 sons, and 1 Chron. 26.5 must certainly allude to 1 Chron. 13.14. According to post-biblical legend, the women in Obed-edom's house gave birth after a pregnancy of two months only, and bore six children at one time, and Solomon's temple began to bud cedars and cypresses and to bear fruit when the ark was transferred there.\(^{489}\) In the end, however, the shape of the blessing of Obed-edom is disregarded.\(^{490}\) The focus of the blessing is David and his enterprise—not the ark's provisional attendant.

5.1.1.3 2 Sam. 6.12

Samuel's plus is attested uniformly (except for LXX\(^L\) with \(\text{ἀπηγγείλαν}^{\text{491}}\) versus LXX\(^{\text{AB}}\)'s \(\text{ἀπηγγέλη}^{\text{491}}\)). In addition, LXX\(^L\) and the OL append additional material. The content of the messenger's report in v. 12a repeats the narrator's statement in v. 11b, but as noted above the wording in v. 12a, \(\text{αὐτὲς ἀπέβησαν ἀπὸ οἴκου Αβεδαρα καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτῶν}^{\text{491}}\), agrees with the wording in v. 11a of LXX\(^{\text{BL}}\) and also with MT and LXX\(^L\) 1 Chron. 13.14. The query here concerns the authenticity of the plus: was it in Chronicles' Vorlage? Observe that the material in 2 Sam. 6.11-12 is separated in

\(^{488}\) Caquot and de Robert 1994: 416.
\(^{489}\) Ginzberg 1928: 275; Patai 1947: 90-91.
\(^{490}\) Alternatively (as asked earlier) did Yahweh bless Obed-edom by not causing anything to befall him during the ark's three months stay in his n?'\(^\text{7}\)?
\(^{491}\) Hp τῶν in usually represented by \(\text{ἀπηγγέλη}^{\text{491}}\) in LXX\(^{\text{AB}}\) of Samuel–Kings, whereas LXX\(^L\) prefers \(\text{ἀπηγγείλαν}\).
Chronicles by 1 Chron. 14.1-17 (// 2 Sam. 5.11-25) and Chronicles' own plus in 1 Chron. 15.1-24:

2 Sam. 6.11  //  1 Chron. 13.14
2 Sam. 6.12a //  Ø
2 Sam. 6.12b //  1 Chron. 15.25

1 Chron. 15.1-24 recounts David's preparations for the ark's transport from Obed-edom's house: he prepares a 'place' and a 'tent' for the ark (v. 1), and he appoints levitical carriers (vv. 2-15) and musicians (vv. 16-24). Some suggest that following the lengthy composition in 1 Chron. 15.1-24 the Chronicler accidentally omitted the report found in 2 Sam. 6.12a when he returned to his Vorlage.492 Some believe the Chronicler's omission was intentional but not tendentious, since in their view the minus in Chronicles is understandable following the lengthy span created by the insertion of 1 Chron. 14.1-15.24.493 Most think the Chronicler tendentiously omitted the report in his Vorlage since David carefully planned the ark's return to Jerusalem. The Chronicler avoided portraying David as an opportunist.494 On one hand, the frequent suggestion that David's response to the report in 2 Sam. 6.12a portrays him as an opportunist is baseless. Even if the report was in Chronicles' Vorlage, the Chronicler 'could equally well have taken it as evidence of David's piety, to sincerely desire the blessing of God' rather than as an unseemly incentive for fetching the ark.495 On the other hand, scholars overlook the significant role of מִי in Samuel which may enlighten the insertion of the plus.496 This verb occurs 370

494 E.g., Rothstein and Hänel 1927: 300; Rudolph 1955: 115; Williamson 1982: 119-120.
495 Lemke 1963: 36 n. 42; cf. 35-36; cf. McKenzie 1984: 62. The comment in Murray 1998: 61 on the LXXı and OL plus is also pertinent here. It is unlikely that ancient editors would have perceived David's motivation in this way given that David's action brings a general blessing to all the people. Josephus saw nothing objectionable in David's conduct (Jewish Antiquities 7.84).
496 Campbell 1975: 137 suggests that 'the impersonal passive construction throws the emphasis on to the reappearance of David in the narrative'. Both the H wayyiqtol 3mp (יָשָׁה; nine times) and the Hp wayyiqtol 3ms (יָשָׁה; eight times) function impersonally in Samuel to introduce a report. It is not obvious that the
times, 335 times in the H stem (‘make known, disclose, declare, report’) and 35 times in the Hp stem, and most often in Samuel, which has 89 occurrences (24%) in 33 (of 55) chapters, followed by Kings (37 times), Genesis (36 times), Isaiah (32 times), Judges (28 times), Jeremiah (28 times), and Psalms (20 times). Chronicles has a mere eight instances of this verb, seven of which are shared with Samuel–Kings. 2 Chron. 20.2 has the only non-shared occurrence. Aside from the current passage, Chronicles lacks an occurrence in a shared passage only in 2 Sam. 24.13 // 1 Chron. 21.11, where Samuel may very well have a doublet in which an original יִדּוּ is supplemented by (the superfluous) יֵדּוּ, but this must be argued elsewhere. In Samuel the verb frequently serves for a messenger’s report, often in the context of a reconnaissance mission or military operation, and especially in material dealing with Saul versus David and Absalom versus David. However, יֵדּוּ also has a prophetic facet in Samuel; from a theological perspective the verb יֵדּוּ is used primarily in prophetic and cultic texts.497 Samuel’s bias for יֵדּוּ, Chronicles’ consistent replication of the verb in synoptic material in spite of its non-appearance elsewhere, the possible doublet in Samuel in 2 Sam. 24.13 // 1 Chron. 21.11, and the verb’s prophetic connections in Samuel, suggest that the יֵדּוּ-clause was inserted into Samuel. This should be considered in light of Gelander’s argument that Yahweh’s ‘ark emitted messages of reconciliation and appeasement’, as if reaching out to David to continue the transfer. After all, is there a better reason for carrying on than a prophetic message from the deity that he had blessed the attendant rather than slay him too? It is equally if not more likely that

---

absence of an explicit personal subject for יֵדּוּ serves to highlight another figure in the context, in this case David, as if subtraction from one side of the balance (i.e., the messenger) causes the other to weigh heavier (i.e., David). The impersonal construction likely represents ordinary idiom, but it still causes us to wonder who mediated the report and why.

Samuel encourages (by supplementation) a cautious or fearful David than that Chronicles eliminates (by deletion) an opportunistic one.\footnote{It is relevant that Murray 1998: 131-132 argues that 'v. 12a is a rhetorically heightened repetition of v. 11b'.}

This is the first time 'king' has been used as a title for David since 2 Sam. 5.17, and the designation appears twice more in 2 Samuel 6: 'King David' in v. 16 and 'the king of Israel' in v. 20.\footnote{See appendix 3 on the grammar of לְעִבְרָכָה.} Otherwise, 'David' is used seventeen times and the 'city of David' three times (vv. 10, 12, 16) in 2 Samuel 6. Chronicles' ark story has the word 'king' for David only in 1 Chron. 15.29 (// 2 Sam. 6.16).\footnote{A generic reference to 'kings' appears in 1 Chron. 16.21.} Murray says 'Thus it is pointedly in his persona as melek that David responds to the news of the blessing brought by the ark to the household of Obed Edom'.\footnote{Murray 1998: 132 n. 67.} Campbell says 'It is a pointer which already in this introduction to the second expedition augurs well for its success'.\footnote{Campbell 1975: 137.} Should 'king' be construed as a commentary on David's person, as a foreshadowing of the outcome of the ark's transfer, both or neither? 'King' here and twice in the Michal material is significant. It may be suggested that a shared reference to David's kingship in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 is extended into Samuel's pluses in 2 Sam. 6.12, 20, and that the triple reference to David's kingship highlights his status vis-à-vis Saul, who is the father of Michal and also the former 'king'. According to Samuel, as soon as Saul's kingship begins (1 Sam. 15.1; המלך ... מָלָכָה), his disobedience (vv. 2-9) causes Yahweh to regret the decision to make him ruler (vv. 10-11; המלך ... מָלָכָה). The first occurrence of the phrase 'מלך ישועה המלך' occurs when the women of Israel come out to meet 'King Saul' (18.6) while paradoxically singing the pro-David refrain 'Saul has killed his thousands, and David his ten thousands' (v. 7). In fact, 'מלך ישועה המלך' comes in an MT plus, in the form of the supposedly late phrase
and is the only time in the Bible that Saul is called 'King Saul'. Ironically, the first reference to David's kingship (דוד מלך דוד) in 1 Sam. 21.12 is connected with the repetition of the same pro-David refrain. Elsewhere in Samuel 'the king' is used with reference to Saul, but the final reference to Saul's kingship comes in 1 Sam. 29.3 (שמואל מלך דוד), which once again is connected with the repetition of the same pro-David refrain (v. 5).\textsuperscript{504} Throughout Samuel Saul's 'kingship' is slighted in favour of David's, and in the present context, and again in v. 16, דוד implicit says what Michal, the daughter of Saul, is soon to explicitly recognise herself (v. 20).

See 5.1.1.2 on the shape and content of the messenger's report (ברך יוהו אדרבת עבד). An additional element here is the causal statement (because of, on account of, on behalf of, for the sake of; 31 times, including 10 in Samuel and 9 in Genesis) or finality (so that, in order that; 18 times, including 6 in Genesis and 5 in Samuel). According to J. A. Swanson the causal usage of הבשור expresses either causality (because of, on account of, on behalf of, for the sake of) or finality (so that, in order that). The object of הבשור is usually a person or group of people (21 times), but may also be an abstract concept (6 times) or an inanimate object (4 times). Does הבשור express the reason that Yahweh blessed Obed-edom (because/on account of the ark) or the participant that is benefited by his blessing (on behalf/for the sake of the ark)? The idea of the second option is that Yahweh blessed Obed-edom for the sake of the ark, so that David would return and take this significant object to its proper place.

\textsuperscript{503} See appendix 3.
\textsuperscript{504} It is remarkable that in the first account the women alone sing 'Saul has killed his thousands, and David his ten thousands' (1 Sam. 18.6-7), but in the subsequent reports (1 Sam. 21.12; 29.5) the verb is 'they sang' (ющим), which blurs the gender and extent of the group of singers.
\textsuperscript{505} See appendix 2 on the ark's epithet.
At this point, LXX\textsuperscript{L} and the OL have additional material which is attested in three forms. The hypothetical Hebrew Vorlagen are:

\begin{align*}
\text{אַהֲרֹן} & \text{ אָשֶׁב} \\
\text{יִשָׁרָה} & \text{ אָשֶׁב} \\
\text{יִשָׁרָה} & \text{ אָשֶׁב}
\end{align*}

Most consider the plus an unoriginal expansion. However, McCarter and Murray think the plus is original, but accidentally omitted by haplography due to homoioarcton (נְאִמֵּר וּדְרֹד).\textsuperscript{510} H. P. Smith believes the plus is original, but purposefully omitted 'on account of its frank egoism'.\textsuperscript{511} The following points disfavour the originality of the plus: (1) The plus does contribute to the structure, form, and content of the story, as some argue, but it is methodologically erroneous to equate suitability with originality. Primary and secondary hands are both capable of (re-)writing biblical stories. (2) The evidence for the plus is early and strong, thus its antiquity may be affirmed, but no trace of it exists in the Hebrew traditions. (3) The plus is the fullest of three distinct forms of the 2 Sam. 6.11b-12a narrative, and all things considered, and barring unintentional error, scribes and editors usually add rather than subtract. (4) The plus is attested with three different wordings and this is evidence of scribal activity in the ongoing composition of the plus.

\textsuperscript{507} LXX mss 82 (α), 93 (ε), 108 (b), 127 (c), 158 (g), 554 (z) = LXX\textsuperscript{L}: καὶ εἶπε Δαυὶδ ἐπιστρέφω τὴν εὐλογίαν εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου; Vercellone, Cod. Leg. Goth., L91.95 (OL marginal notes in Spanish Vulgate Bibles): et dixit david revocabo benedictionem in domum meam.

\textsuperscript{508} Sabatier, Cod. Germ. no. 7: dixitque daveid ibo et reducam arcam cum benedictione in domum meam.

\textsuperscript{509} LXX ms 19 (b\textsuperscript{b}): καὶ εἶπε Δαυὶδ ἐπιστρέφω τὴν καβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου.

\textsuperscript{510} McCarter 1984: 165-166; Murray 1998: 61, 132-133. In Greek, haplography due to homoioteleuton is also possible: θεοῦ καὶ ... μοῦ καὶ.

\textsuperscript{511} H. P. Smith 1899: 295-296.
5.1.2 David's Response to Yahweh's Blessing: The Successful Removal of the Ark to Jerusalem

The discussion in this section focuses on David's realisation of the ark's transfer whereas the next section looks at the circumstances accompanying this event. The chief elements in 2 Sam. 6.12b, 15a, 17a, 19b-20a // 1 Chron. 15.25a, 28a, 16.1a, 43a are the subjects of the activities, the verbs of moving and placing, the ark and its epithets, and the locations involved. With respect to verb usage the successful completion of David's mission is narrated by נִלְגָּל (2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25), נִלַּע (2 Sam. 6.12, 15 // 1 Chron. 15.25, 28), נִלַע (2 Sam. 6.13), נְה (2 Sam. 6.16, 17 // 1 Chron. 15.29; 16.1) and especially נָע (2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1). This vocabulary and its repetition conclusively 'carry out' the earlier endeavour to retrieve the ark. The arrival of the ark in the city of David and its positioning 'in its place' inside the tent (2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1) constitute the high point of the story.

5.1.2.1 2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25

Chronicles expands the shared subject 'David' by incorporating both וַיַּנָּהֲלָה and וַיַּנָּהֲלָה, thus transforming the focus on David as the chief performer into an act carried out by him and many others. It is widely recognised that Chronicles' focus on 'all Israel' is one of the book's characteristic traits: unanimity and unity, consultation and collaboration, between the king and the people, in important matters affecting national and cultic life. However, one must use cautiously the word 'Tendenz' as a label for Chronicles' plus.513

512 The narration of the abortive effort to transfer the ark makes use of the verbs נָלַג (2 Sam. 6.2), נָלַע (2 Sam. 6.2), נָלַע (2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6 [twice]), נָלַג (2 Sam. 6.3 // 1 Chron. 13.7), נָלַג (2 Sam. 6.3-4) and נָלַג (2 Sam. 6.6, 9 // 1 Chron. 13.9, 12). The story's progress is brought to a standstill by the verbs נָלַג (2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13), נָלַג (2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13), and especially נָלַג (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14).

513 See appendix 1.
Also observe that Samuel includes the participation of others. David clearly has the leading role in the procession, but 2 Sam. 6.13 has נָבֹאשׁ צֶדֶק, 2 Sam. 6.15 has מִשְׁלַחְתָּו שְׁרָאָל, and the verbs יָצְרוּ ... יִרְבֹּא in 2 Sam. 6.17 imply a plurality of participants.

The starting point of the ark's transfer is Obed-edom's בֵּית and its goal is 'the city of David', but in this synoptic verse only Samuel explicitly states the latter.514 The instances of שָׂרְרָה דָּוִד) are summarised in 4.1.3.5. 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles share the phrase on four occasions. Samuel has a plus in synoptic 2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25 and Chronicles uses it in non-synoptic 1 Chron. 15.1. The facts that 'the city of David' is a Leitmotiv in 2 Samuel 5–6 // 1 Chronicles 11, 13–16 and that Chronicles has the phrase more than any other book suggest that שָׂרְרָה דָּוִד was inserted secondarily into 2 Sam. 6.12. The ark's epithet is נְּרִי in 2 Sam. 6.12 and בְּרֹדְוָהוֹ in 1 Chron. 15.25, and both are probably secondary to an earlier 515.

Contrary to most commentators and modern English translations Chronicles' רְוִי cannot be a periphrastic construction due to the definite article preceding the participle and to the disparity in grammatical number, i.e., רְוִי rather than רְוִי would be required. רְוִי is introductory516 and the verse as it stands must be rendered 'And it was/happened (that) David and the elders of Israel and the chiefs of the thousands (were) "the goers" to bring up the ark of the covenant of Yahweh from Obed-edom's בֵּית'. Some scholars emend the text by deleting an allegedly dittographic he from בֵּית, but this emendation is unnecessary517, and it also creates an incongruence in the sequence of activity, i.e., an inept ellipsis in narrative sequence. Chronicles' expansion of the subject accentuates David's collaborators and the grammar anticipates the vivid portrayal of activity in 1 Chron. 15.26-28 (// 2 Sam. 6.13-15). Conversely, the action in Samuel's

514 On נָבֹאשׁ versus נָבֹא see appendix 3.
515 See appendix 2.
516 See appendix 3.
517 Kropat 1909: 13; cf. the discussion of 1 Chron. 15.26 in 5.1.3.3.
... is perfective and bounded (due to the limit or terminus expressed in אַב וּלְהוּ and thus portrays the ark's transfer as completed. יִשָּׂא יִשָּׂא is proleptic. From the very start Samuel's grammar draws attention to the certainty of the end result.\(^{518}\)

5.1.2.2 2 Sam. 6.15 1 Chron. 15.28

Some think the absence of הד in 1 Chron. 15.28 is due to haplography, following the הד of הד in 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27, but most think the Chronicler eliminated both הד and הד as part of a pan-Israelite Tendenz. 'And David' is reflected in all versions of Samuel and in the Peshitta of Chronicles. 'The house' is present in Samuel (including apparently 4QSam\(^a\) based on space considerations) and absent from Chronicles with the following exceptions: the noun is present in the Peshitta of Chronicles but it is absent from the Peshitta, Lucianic and Jacob versions of Samuel, and it is also lacking in three medieval Hebrew manuscripts.\(^{519}\) McCarter and McKenzie believe (mostly on the basis of LXX\(^b\)) that יִשָּׂא is original in Samuel, to which they think the name 'David' was added secondarily.\(^{520}\) The discussion in 3.1.3.4 of 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 supports their first point. It is suggested further that both MT 2 Sam. 6.5 and MT 2 Sam. 6.15 are revised to correspond in terminology (as they do in subject matter, to a degree).\(^{521}\)

The participle יִשָּׂא is reflected in all witnesses to Samuel and Chronicles (including the imperfect verb forms in the Latin versions) except for Greek Samuel, which has either διειται (LXX\(^{BL}\) = תָּשַׁע \([?) or διεיִת (LXX\(^A\) and mss cx = תָּשַׁע

\(^{518}\) Campbell 1975: 137; Fokkelman 1990: 194.

\(^{519}\) De Rossi 1785: II, 169.

\(^{520}\) McCarter 1984: 166; McKenzie 1984: 51-52. Nyssen 1984: 236 is cautious about labelling the plus in LXX\(^b\) (and LXX\(^A\)) a revision toward MT Samuel. He is unsure whether LXX\(^b\) or LXX\(^L\) reflects the OG. The plus in LXX\(^b\) could easily occur independently or the minus in LXX\(^L\) could be due to haplography.

\(^{521}\) See appendix 1. Campbell and O'Brien 2000: 289 reiterate the view, held formerly by most, that 'The status of 6.5, 15 as later additions is probable but not demonstrable (cf. Psalm 150). It may rather be that only specific aspects of these two verses are 'later'. See 5.1.3.2.
These variants together with the Greek translators' consistency in rendering predicative participles in this passage\(^{522}\) suggest that a qatal verb form, probably הָעָשַׁה, stood in Greek Samuel's Vorlage. If so, the revised reading contributes 'to give the reader a[n even more] vivid impression of the scene'.\(^{523}\) In both versions, נָשַׁל functions grammatically to refer to attendant circumstance at an arrival. The pragmatic effect of the participles in these verses is to vivify the scene. In any case, this occurrence of the Leitwort הָעָשַׁה\(^{524}\) in 2 Sam. 6.15 // 1 Chron. 15.28 is the grammatical realisation of the proleptic statement in 2 Sam. 6.12 (// 1 Chron. 15.25) and the fulfilment of David's original intention in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6. David, his entourage, and Yahweh's ark and its transporters finally come up the south-eastern hill of Jerusalem to the city of David.\(^{525}\)

The climax of the ark story lies in the entrance (וה) of the ark into the city of David and its deposit (ות) 'in its place') inside the tent' in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1. These acts fulfil the literary intent and objective of the story of David's ark transfer.

\(^{522}\) Except for this verse, all predicative participles in 2 Samuel 6 are rendered by imperfect or participle verb forms: בָּשַׁל (v. 3), תָּשַׁל (v. 4), עָשָׁל/תָּשַׁל (v. 5), הָעָשַׁה/תָּשַׁל (v. 14), הָעָשַׁה (v. 15), נָשַׁל/תָּשַׁל (v. 16), נָשַׁל/תָּשַׁל (v. 16), הָעָשַׁה/תָּשַׁל (v. 16).


\(^{524}\) Gelander 1991: 47. With regard to Samuel, Seow 1989: 118-131 discusses the language of Psalms 29 and 47 and the ascent of Baal to his mount of victory in the Ugaritic literature, focusing on the royal connection of the verb סָעַל in West Semitic, and he is thereby enabled to confer the notion of enthronement on David's and Yahweh's ascent to Jerusalem. With regard to Chronicles, Johnstone 1997: 1: 189 thinks the participle נָשַׁל is a word play on נַשָּׁל which in 1 Chronicles is applied only to Judah (9.1) and Saul (10.13).

\(^{525}\) This view is supported by (a) the wording of Ps. 47.6, which is either an allusion or ritual re-enactment of 2 Sam. 6.15, and by (b) the use of נַשָּׁל as a technical term for the procession of the ark up to the sanctuary on the hill (1 Sam. 6.21; 7.1; 2 Sam. 6.12, 15; 1 Kgs. 8.1, 4; 1 Chron. 13.6; 15.3, 12, 14, 25, 28; 2 Chron. 1.4; 5.2, 5). See HALOT II, 828-830. On the ark's epithets see appendix 2.
The versions differ regarding two issues in the first clause of this material. First, the ark's epithet in Samuel is 'Yahweh' whereas it is 'God' in Chronicles, except for the Targum and Peshitta of Chronicles which have 'Yahweh'. Second, LXX Samuel and Chronicles disagree concerning the grammatical forms and lexemes used to represent אֱלֹהִים. Greek Samuel has a present active indicative verb form whereas Greek Chronicles has an aorist active indicative form, but the use of the historical present in Greek Samuel, as well as the use of φέρω rather than εἰσφέρω in LXXAB Samuel, are inner-Greek issues which do not require additional discussion.

The H stem of אָחַר means 'bring (in/near), introduce, conduct, lead' and is normally accompanied by an adverbial modifier(s) expressing either or both the origin or destination from or to which the object of the verb is brought. For example, this is the case in 35 of 42 cases of the H stem of אָחַר in the book of Samuel. Nevertheless, the geographical goal of the transfer is clear, בָּאָר (2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13; 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29; 2 Sam. 6.12; 1 Chron. 15.1). The absence from 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 causes the focus of the narrative to fall on David's placement of the ark '(in its place) inside the tent'.

The analysis of the second clause of this material looks at three issues: (1) the verb אִשָּׁה with its object; (2) the modifying adverbial phrase describing where the ark was placed; and (3) the defining relative clause introduced by כי.

First, the Semitic versions use a form of חָרַס or סָמַך to represent אִשָּׁה since the latter has no known cognate outside Hebrew. The OG of Chronicles is ἀπεξεῖςάντο (from ἀπεξεῖσομαι, 'fix, set on/upon') and in spite of the varied evidence for the reading

526 See appendix 2.
527 The exceptions are 1 Sam. 1.22; 15.20; 16.12; 18.27; 2 Sam. 5.2; 6.17; 9.10.
528 Consequently, Murray 1998: 137 n. 81 is correct to say: 'Thus, although the bringing of the ark by our David into his city is undoubtedly implicated by our narrative as being highly significant for Jerusalem, in making his analogy with Mesopotamian texts concerning the inauguration of new royal cities, McCarter ... is seduced into rather misrepresenting the focus of our text, in the interests of his alleged parallels'.
in Samuel it is clear that a form of τ(θημι) is the OG reading in that book.\textsuperscript{529} The verb ἀπεφέρετο (set, place') is relatively uncommon\textsuperscript{530}, occurring only sixteen times. The fact that the verb appears only in 1 Sam. 5.2 and 2 Sam. 6.17 in Samuel and only in 1 Chron. 16.1 in Chronicles is unquestionably intentional and significant. See below. \textit{BDB} considers ἀπεφέρετο 'a vivid and forcible syn. of ὢς\textsuperscript{531} and Meier concurs\textsuperscript{532}, as does B. Johnson: 'The choice of [ἀπεφέρετο] in a particular context means ... that the speaker sees a special importance in the act of placing.'\textsuperscript{533} Indeed, ἀπεφέρετο is fitting for the climax of David's ark transfer.

Second, the adverbial phrase describing where the ark was deposited survives in two forms. A bipartite tradition is found in most versions of Chronicles (MT, LXX, Targum, OL, Vulgate), as well as in the Peshitta and Jacob versions of Samuel, and evidently also in Josephus. A tripartite tradition is reflected in most versions of Samuel (MT, LXX, Targum, OL, Vulgate), as well as in the Peshitta of Chronicles. The affiliation of 4QSama\textsuperscript{a} is unclear. Herbert reconstructs the text with ἀπεφέρετο\textsuperscript{534} whereas Fincke and McCarter do not include this noun.\textsuperscript{535} Almost all agree that the reference to ἀπεφέρετο was omitted from Chronicles 'for some reason'.\textsuperscript{536} However, this is unlikely. McCarter is

\textsuperscript{529} It is unclear whether the form was simple or composite (ἀναπεφέρετο, ἀποφέρετο- or ἐπεφέρετο). It is fairly certain, however, that the form of the verb was an aorist active indicative third person plural. It is noteworthy that excepting 2 Sam. 6.17 and Judg. 6.37 (where LXX\textsuperscript{AMN} and many cursive have the lexeme ἐπεφέρετο(σσεμι) rather than LXX\textsuperscript{AE}'s τ(θημι) there is no significant lexical variation in the Greek version for any other occurrence of ἀπεφέρετο.

\textsuperscript{530} Other verbs belonging to the semantic category of 'placement, appointment, stand, station' are ἓχουσι (6 times), ἐστὶ (74 times), ἔστω (75 times), ἐστιν (83 times), ἐστά (218 times), ἐστάσιν (522 times), ἐστάσει (612 times), ἐστάτα (662 times), ἐστάτα (2017 times).

\textsuperscript{531} \textit{BDB} 426.

\textsuperscript{532} Meier 1997: 501: 'Of the sixteen occurrences of ἀπεφέρετο, some are largely synonymous with ἔστω and ἐστι (cf. Gen 30:38, 41, 42), but a persistent overtone of willful, deliberate, or intentional action (Judg 7:5; Hos 2:3 [5]), often in the context of formal presentation (Gen 43:9; 47:2; Amos 5:15) and cultic establishments (Judg 8:27; 1 Sam 5:2; 2 Sam 6:17 [/1 Chr 16:1]), seems peculiar to and characteristic of only this vb'.

\textsuperscript{533} B. Johnson 1990: 251-252.

\textsuperscript{534} Fincke 2001: 156; McCarter 1984: 167.

\textsuperscript{535} De Vries 1989: 147.
correct to conclude that Chronicles displays the primitive situation.\textsuperscript{537} Indeed, the Chronicler's supposed deletion would be extraordinary in light of the dual reference to the preparation of this 'place' in 1 Chron. 15.1, 3, and Chronicles' inclusion of הֵיכָן in 1 Chron. 21.22, 25 unlike its exclusion in synoptic 2 Sam. 24.21, 24 is not irrelevant to the discussion. Scholars' 'for some reason' is reason-less.

The noun הֵיכָן is used about four-hundred times and frequently refers to religious places, both unclean/profane and clean/sacred sites. A theophany of Yahweh may occur at a הֵיכָן, and a הֵיכָן may be a place of worship, where an altar is built and sacrifice(s) is made. Deuteronomy's הֵיכָן is significant for the notion of centralised worship (cf. Deuteronomy 12), which many scholars believe was inspired by Josiah's seventh century BCE reform (2 Kings 22–23), and which is supposedly the Deuteronomist's principal doctrine: one God, one priesthood, one altar, and one place of worship. Most hold that this place was (in) Jerusalem, but some have argued that the 'place' where God causes his name to dwell was not a single place but rather multiple places, so that other worship centres were not precluded. In biblical narrative (Genesis–Kings, Ezra–Chronicles), interestingly, הֵיכָן is used in these religious senses in many passages, and most frequently in Chronicles outside the Pentateuch.

In addition to the suggestion of McCarter that the insertion of הֵיכָן in 2 Sam. 6.17 derives from 1 Kgs. 8.6\textsuperscript{538}, scholars make three very different connections, two literary and one historical.\textsuperscript{539} First, הֵיכָן in 1 Sam. 5.2 and 2 Sam. 6.17, and הֵיכָן in 1 Sam. 5.3, 11; 6.2 and 2 Sam. 6.17, suggest a close connection between these passages: 'Nous avons donc ici comme la contrepartie positive de cet épisode malheureux, qui met un point final

\textsuperscript{537} McCarter 1984: 167.
\textsuperscript{538} McCarter 1984: 167.
\textsuperscript{539} In addition, Murray 1998: 137 n. 80 thinks הֵיכָן refers to some kind of pedestal within the tent; and Cross 1959: 222; G. H. Davies 1962b: 506; and Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 337, think הֵיכָן refers to the inner sanctuary (ךְֶ֥לֶּשׁ הֵיכָן) of the tent. Neither suggestion has much worth.
aux pérégrinations de l'arche dans la perspective de l'auteur commun à ces deux passages.\

Alternatively, the insertion of נְפֹשַׁת in 2 Sam. 6.17 may derive from the pen of the composer(s) of the (canonically) earlier ark story. Second, surprisingly few emphasise the theme of the ark's home which closely links 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16, and 2 Samuel 7 // 1 Chronicles 17.\

Third, 'in its place' (בַּכְסַמְתּוֹ) is taken by some as an allusion to a pre-existing Jebusite sanctuary which stood on the 'threshing floor of Araunah'\

Those taking this view go on to argue that the following definition 'is really superfluous and is not prepared for in any way by the course of the narrative; ... So it probably comes from the reviser who oriented the ark narrative on the earliest stage of Nathan's promise (2 Sam 7:1-4a...11b...16'). 'In its place' (בַּכְסַמְתּוֹ) could refer to a Jebusite sanctuary, but the scenario just described requires excessive historical supposition and insufficiently considers the belatedness of נְפֹשַׁת in 2 Sam. 6.17, which was probably not 'dans le texte primitif' as suggested by Vermeylen.

The noun נָבָא ('tent') is used 345 times in the Bible for a travelling or immobile dwelling for human or divine inhabitation, although it is only one member in a group of terms referring to the deity's residence. Examples of such terms in the book of Samuel are נָבָא (1 Sam. 2.22; 2 Sam. 6.17; 7.6); תָּבִי ('house, temple'), either alone (2 Sam. 7.5-7, 13) or as נָבָא נְבָא (1 Sam. 1.7, 24; 3.15; 2 Sam. 12.20) ('palace, temple'; 1 Sam. 1.9; 3.3; 2 Sam. 22.7); יְדֹעַ (['tent]-curtain'; 2 Sam. 7.2); בְּשַׂמְתּוֹ ('sanctuary, tabernacle'; 2 Sam.

---

\[541\] Eslinger 1994: 14-15, 42 correctly emphasises the importance of the relationship in 2 Samuel 6–7, but Gakuru 2000 and Schniedewind 1999a do not properly relate the chapters. Also see the relevant discussions throughout Carlson 1964; Gelander 1991; Murray 1998.
\[545\] Also see 1 Sam. 5.2, 5; 7.1; 31.10; 2 Sam. 6.3-4, 10, 12.
Scholars focus their exposition of 2 Sam. 6.17 on the identification of David's קַשָּׁה. How is David's קַשָּׁה related to the above mentioned terms for the deity's residence? Furthermore, how is David's קַשָּׁה related to other biblical קְדָמֵי, most notably קְדָמֵי מְשֻׁרָה, but also to קְדָמֵי נְאֹתְו, קְדָמֵי נָו, and קְדָמֵי לָרָה קְדָמֵי לָרָה קְדָמֵי לָרָה קְדָמֵי לָרָה קְדָמֵי לָרָה קְדָמֵי ? The persistent issue in this verse is the relationship of David's קַשָּׁה to the wilderness tent/tabernacle. The secondary literature on this issue is considerable. According to the once widely-accepted view of Wellhausen:

The representation of the tabernacle arose out of the temple of Solomon as its root, in dependence on the sacred ark, for which there is early testimony, and which in the time of David, and also before it, was sheltered by a tent. From the temple it derives at once its inner character and its central importance for the cultus as well as its external form.551

With few exceptions scholars concur with Wellhausen that the ark–tent association has a lengthy history, but the trend in recent generations is to reject Wellhausen's view that the priestly portrayal of the tent/tabernacle is merely an idealised retrojection of the temple in Jerusalem to the wilderness period of Israel's history. Rather, the attribution (by some) of 'P' to the Iron Age together with the citation of Bronze Age comparative examples has caused some to assert that David's tent was new, but not novel, in that it was intended as a recollection of the earlier wilderness tent/tabernacle. Therefore, on one hand, David's tent is an early predecessor of the later yet retrojected wilderness tent/tabernacle, and on the other hand, David's tent is an early successor to the still earlier wilderness tent/tabernacle.

In both scenarios David's tent is considered a primitive and reliable example of the ark–

546 Another related term, but unused in Samuel, is שֵׁדֵר ('sanctuary'). Two other terms to keep in mind are שִׁבֵּר (altar'; 1 Sam. 2.28, 33; 7.17; 14.35; 2 Sam. 24.18, 21, 25) and רִע (high place'; 1 Sam. 9.12-14, 19, 25; 10.5, 13 [cf. 2 Sam. 1.19, 25; 22.34]).
547 133 times in Exodus–Numbers and 13 times elsewhere: Deut. 31.14; Josh. 18.1; 19.51; 1 Sam. 2.22; 1 Kgs. 8.4; 1 Chron. 6.17; 9.21; 23.32; 2 Chron. 1.3, 6, 13; 5.5.
548 32 times in Exodus and Numbers and seven times elsewhere: Deut. 31.15; 1 Kgs. 1.39; 8.4; 2 Chron. 5.5; 1 Chron. 9.19, 23.
549 Num. 9.15; 17.22-23; 18.2; 2 Chron. 24.6.
550 1 Kgs. 2.28-30.
551 Wellhausen 1885: 45; cf. 17-51.
tent association. In addition to 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 and logical deduction (a religious relic needs a shelter, and a religious shelter is not normally empty) scholars generally cite the following (non-'P') evidence for the antiquity of the ark–tent association: Exod. 33.7; 1 Sam. 2.22; and 2 Sam. 7.6 // 1 Chron. 17.5. However, a close comparison of the received text with the Greek versions points out the textual instability in each of these verses. The foregoing review hardly covers the expansive literature and range of views on the biblical tent(s)/tabernacle(s), but it does illustrate a number of conjectures regarding the referents of רַבָּא and בַּזָּא and the place of 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 in the broader discussion. The Bible's variegated portrait of the deity's residence is not reducible to a simple chronology and clear-cut associations. In view of this diversity it is impossible to prove that David's tent is a primitive and reliable example of a long-held ark–tent association.\footnote{David's choice of habitation for the ark is presumably an example of his political sagacity. He wished to provide continuity with the past during a time of transition and thus to foster unity in Israel. Many holding this view presumably believe that the earlier wilderness tent/tabernacle was destroyed upon the destruction of Shiloh (cf. 1 Sam. 1.7, 9; 2.22, 24, 3.3 and also Josh. 18.1, 19.51), a destruction which is not reported in the Former Prophets but to which Jer. 7.12, 14; 26.6, 9 may allude. Contrary to this perspective, some commentators suppose with the Chronicler that the wilderness tent/tabernacle was situated at Gibeon (1 Chron. 16.39, 21.29; 2 Chron. 1.3, 13). Both of these hypotheses require excessive historical supposition far beyond the textual evidence.} Perhaps David's בַּזָּא in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 contains the seed whose offspring are diversely born and displayed in different biblical texts and traditions.

Third, the relative clause introduced by בַּזָּא relates that David had erected the tent into which the ark was placed. The verb בַּזָּא is used more than 200 times and appears previously (in a different stem) in 2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13. On a dozen occasions בַּזָּא has בַּזָּא as its object\footnote{Pitching a tent was a common activity in ancient Israel, so it is striking that בַּזָּא occurs so infrequently. In less than twenty additional instances בַּזָּא and/or בַּזָּא are governed by the verbs בָּקָשָׁה, בָּקָשׁוּ, בָּקָשׁ, בָּקָשָׁה, בָּקָשׁוּ and בָּקָשָׁה. The verb בַּזָּא occurs in Gen. 13.12, 18; Isa. 13.20. The verb בַּזָּא must, by implication, involve the pitching of a tent.}, and of these the combination is used five times for the establishment of 'sacred quarters' for communication with the deity or as lodging for the
deity's ark.\textsuperscript{554} Some associate 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 with Exod. 33.7 due to in both passages, although the referent of לְ in the former set of passages is more clearly the ark than it is in the latter passage. Based on this catch-phrase Johnstone suggests that the ark story portrays David as a new Moses.\textsuperscript{555} This may be, but the direction of influence is unclear.

5.1.2.4 2 Sam. 6.19-20 // 1 Chron. 16.43

The differences between Chronicles' רְ and with reference to Samuel's לְ and are unrelated to 'late' Hebrew. The different verb in MT Samuel (רְ) and MT Chronicles (רְ) is explained by Japhet as a case of phonetic confusion, and she concludes that it is not clear which text is original.\textsuperscript{556} An analysis of translation equivalents in the Septuagint does not permit a decision regarding the Hebrew Vorlagen in 2 Sam. 6.20 and 1 Chron. 16.43. Nevertheless, the entirety of the evidence suggests that one would expect the verb רְ rather than in the phrase 'David ___ to bless his house'.\textsuperscript{557}

Following 2 Sam. 6.19a // 1 Chron. 16.3, Chronicles has a lengthy expansion prior to the resumption of the shared story. Chronicles' supplement relates David's appointment of levitical musicians and singers and his/their psalm of thanksgiving. The absence in Chronicles of the material on Michal in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is discussed in the next chapter. For now it is sufficient to observe that the finale in 2 Samuel 6 is a more pointed religious focus and climax in 1 Chronicles 16. The Chronicler by no means neglects the supremacy of David's dynasty over Saul's, but this theme is subordinated to, or better encompassed

\textsuperscript{554} Exod. 33.7; 2 Sam. 6.17; 1 Chron. 15.1; 16.1; 2 Chron. 1.4.
\textsuperscript{555} Johnstone 1997: I, 190, 242.
\textsuperscript{556} Japhet 1987: 41.
\textsuperscript{557} See appendix 3.
by, David's religious accomplishments. Indeed, the ark's transfer sets the stage for Solomon's future accomplishments.\footnote{2 Chronicles 5–7; esp. 5.12-13; 6.14, 42; 7.3-4, 6. See 1.2.3.}

The dual departure in 2 Sam. 6.19b-20a // 1 Chron. 16.43 leads to a denouement following significant movement and activity in the story of David's transfer of the ark. Again, the dual theme of 'blessing' and 'house' is brought into focus.\footnote{On David's blessing see 5.1.1.2, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.9, 5.1.3.10.}

5.1.3 The Attendant Circumstances of the Ark's Transfer

5.1.3.1 2 Sam. 6.12

1 Chron. 15.25

All witnesses reflect תְּכַלָּתָה; thus the brief observations here concern literary rather than textual factors. The predominant vocabulary of 'joy', the verb רָגָע ('rejoice'), the noun רַגָע ('joy'), and the adjective רָגָע ('joyful'), appears most frequently in Isaiah and Chronicles (25 times in each book) next to Proverbs (28 times) and Psalms (68 times). It is noteworthy that only four of Chronicles 25 occurrences are in synoptic material and then at significant junctures in each case.\footnote{2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25; 1 Kgs. 8.66 // 2 Chron. 7.10; 2 Kgs. 11.14, 20 // 2 Chron. 23.13, 21.} Is this coincidence? In any case, the theme of 'joy' is closely linked with cultic activity in biblical literature, and indeed it appears in all three ark stories: 1 Sam. 6.13 (also LXX 1 Sam. 6.19\footnote{See the note on this passage in 4.1.2.2.}); 2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25; 1 Kgs. 8.66 // 2 Chron. 7.10. In the story at hand, רַגָע in 2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25 resumes the joyous fête of 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 following Uzzah's execution and David's ensuing anger and fear, and 'joy' also encapsulates the mood of the remainder of the story.\footnote{The significance of this theme is discussed further in 5.1.3.5.}
The phrase חַגָּלֵל שֶׁפֶר is attested uniformly. An analysis of the dissimilar terminology in LXX Samuel and Chronicles reveals nothing regarding the history of the biblical text or its interpretation by the Greek translators.563 'Shouts' (דַּרְעֵת) and 'trumpets' (הַצְּגִּרָה, שֶׁפֶר) are frequently mentioned together and on some occasions a particular phrase may be a hendiadys.564 The adjuncts כל שֶׁפֶר וְדַרְעֵת announce (forewarn?) the ark's (Yahweh's?) arrival in the city of David. They did not accompany the ark en route from Obed-edom's נַנִּים to the City of David, movement which in fact is not related in the narrative.

The noun דַּרְעֵת has the general meanings 'shout' (of a voice) or 'blast' (of a trumpet) and one sometimes determines with difficulty which meaning is intended. Furthermore, it is difficult to clearly distinguish between secular and religious uses of דַּרְעֵת, especially in the context of warfare.565 Commentators often overlook the fact that, excepting a few cases in the Latter Prophets and Writings, דַּרְעֵת recurrently appears at times of initiation or accomplishment, as an alarm or an announcement. This thread of usage is an argument against the view that the ark story intends to depict activity throughout the duration of the ark's conveyance, rather than at the point of David's and the ark's ascent and arrival. The essence of דַּרְעֵת here is a jubilant announcement (or is it a warning alarm?) of the ark's (Yahweh's?) arrival in the city of David. Finally, the verb יָרַע ('shout, give a blast') and the noun יָרֵע ('shouting') are cognates of דַּרְעֵת, and the former occurs in Samuel in 1 Sam. 4.5; 10.24; 17.20, 52. The occurrence in 1 Sam. 4.5 is an

563 The transliteration of בלש by ωφέλ/αρ rather than its translation with σάλπιγγς is due to the fact that the translator of Chronicles reserved the latter for רָקָם. The noun קֶפָרְתִיִּים also represents בֶּשֶר in portions of certain books but it occurs in Chronicles only once and then in the revised texts (= LXXAL) of 2 Chron. 15.14. It is unnecessary to discuss this passage further.
564 Bressan 1960: 528.
additional link between the stories of the ark in Samuel and also substantiates the point made above regarding the ark's ascent and arrival.

The curved goat's or ram's horn (i.e., it is non-metallic) as a wind instrument is typically designated by יָדַשׁ. The noun appears 72 times in the Bible including 20 occurrences in the phrase יָדַשׁ (יָדַש). Whereas the noun's origin is obscure, its function is clear: to proclaim, remind, inspire or summon in civil, military or liturgical contexts. The יָדַשׁ is part of an ensemble only in Ps. 98.6 and 150.3, and in Chronicles' supplement to 1 Chron. 15.28. The noun occurs predominately in battle and cultic contexts. 'Such cultic uses may relate to the religious significance of the יָדַשׁ as an awe-inducing instrument'. McCarter and Robinson correctly relate the mention of the יָדַשׁ to the proclamation of the ark's (and its deity's) ascent and arrival.

Chronicles' supplement in 1 Chron. 15.28 is in line with 13.8 and 15.16, 19-21, 24, and reflects the book's special interest in music. Music was important in both secular and religious contexts in the ancient world, as also reflected in the Bible, and especially in Chronicles' non-synoptic material. It is unnecessary to address the details in Chronicles' supplement.

The proposal summarised in the following pages requires a full chapter to argue thoroughly, so important primary and secondary evidence is excluded. In short, a thorough analysis of the versions suggests that Samuel's יָדַשׁ-clause and Chronicles' יָדַשׁ-clause.

---

566 Other terms are יָדַשׁ, יָדַשׁ, יָדַשׁ, יָדַשׁ, יָדַשׁ, יָדַשׁ. See appendix 3 on the statement in BDB 1051: 'horn, mostly as used in war, rarely, and chiefly late, as sacred instr'.
567 The standard musical instruments in ensembles were idiophones and chordophones.
568 O'Connell 1997: 68.
570 See appendix 3 on the statement in BDB 348 that יָדַשׁ is 'mostly P and late'. This noun in Chronicles is the priests' instrument par excellence.
clause developed independently, perhaps from a more simple and less explicit report like the one in LXX and OL Samuel and in several other witnesses.

The verb יד in MT Samuel and MT Chronicles (and also יד in 4QSam and קא תבלמ in Chronicles) is an impersonal introductory or preparatory formula, which together with the following preposition (ב in MT Samuel and 4QSam, ב/לפ in Chronicles) forms a subordinate temporal clause.571

MT Samuel and 4QSam continue with the verb יד, a qatal 3cp form from the root יד, generally rendered 'walk, step, pace, advance, stride, march', although most modern English translations simply have 'had gone' in 2 Sam. 6.13. It is necessary to bypass a discussion of Hebrew and Semitic cognates in order to focus on the distribution of יד and its three main associated nouns: twice in 'archaic' poetry (Jacob's blessing and Deborah's song), four times in Samuel, three or four times in the Latter Prophets, and 18 times in the Writings. Seow links יד in David's transfer of the ark with 'the march of the divine warrior' in other biblical and non-biblical literature, but more significant for the present discussion is his point that 'not enough attention has been paid to the vocabulary of David's procession', especially the lexical and sequential similarities between Yahweh's יד and יד in 2 Sam. 5.20, 24 // 1 Chron. 14.11, 15, and Yahweh's יד and David's יד in 2 Sam. 6.8, 13 // 1 Chron. 13.11; 15.25.572 The choice of יד rather than more common verbs such as יד and יד, and the distribution of the terminology as a whole, are not arbitrary. Yahweh's יד against the Philistines and his subsequent יד are analogous to

---

571 Many translators and commentators give Chronicles' ב/לפ a causal meaning. The extensive evidence against this interpretation cannot be presented here. Briefly, causal clauses in biblical Hebrew are normally expressed by one of seven particles (לע, ל, ב, ב, ל, ו, מת) either alone or compounded. In addition, ellipsis, asyndeton, disjunction, and even wayyiqtol may give rise to causal interpretations. JM §170j, pp. 639-640, correctly says 'ל rarely has a nuance which strictly speaking is causal'. Jenni 1992: 324, 355; correctly construes 1 Chron. 15.26 as temporal. Kropat 1909: §6, p. 23; §31, p. 68, inadvertently cites the verse in his discussions of both temporal and causal clauses. Finally, יד + ב + infinitive occurs 44 times in the Bible, always with a manifestly temporal nuance. See appendix 3.

Yahweh's response against Uzzah and David's responsive בְּעֵינְךָ (with_view in 2 Sam. 6.14), a response which can be interpreted as a victory won by David. See 4.1.3.2.

Most scholars believe Chronicles' response is a 'change' related to Chronistic Tendenz, but some grant the Chronicler a measure of neutrality by relating the 'change' to a corrupt or misunderstood Vorlage. The verb צָהָר occurs 81 times and 25 of these are in Chronicles whereas only four are in Samuel. The related common nouns רֶזֶף and צָהָרָה do not appear in Samuel, and the latter is found only once in Chronicles. It is also significant that 21 names of people and places in the Bible incorporate the root צָהָר, and 15 of these occur in Chronicles. The root צָהָר is normally used in contexts describing human or divine aid against enemies (especially in narrative texts) or in times of distress (especially in poetic texts). In these texts the focus is on cooperation, rather than on the nature or duration of the action, which could be either punctiliar or durative. Israel's deity is the subject or provider of צָהָר in about half of the verses in which the verb and nouns occur. In 1 Chron. 15.26 the deity's assistance is the collective experience of the Levites, and this is the only passage where they are the object of divine צָהָר. Chronicles' interest in the Levites is evident in the fact that the book has 32% of all occurrences of צְָהָר and סְָהָר in the Bible, followed by Numbers with 21% and Nehemiah with 13%, whereas these are virtually absent from the Former Prophets, and especially Samuel, where they are mentioned only twice (1 Sam. 6.15; 2 Sam. 15.24).

1 Chron. 15.26 has been interpreted and assimilated to the preceding plus in 1 Chron. 15.1-24, reflecting the Chronicler's interests in promoting liturgical propriety according to (Pentateuchal?—see v. 15) cultic legislation, stressing David's uprightness through compliance with the divine mandate, and demonstrating God's protective care for the

573 On the vocalisation צָהָר rather than the expected צָהָר see GKC §63i, p. 167; JM §22a-d, pp. 89-90; Bergsträsser 1918: I, §28k, p. 156; Bauer and Leander 1922: §49h, p. 348; cf. Ehrlich 1914: 341.

574 See appendix 3.
Levites in contrast to Uzzah. Most importantly, God 'helped' the Levites in the sense that 'they were not struck down, as Uzzah had been (13:10).\textsuperscript{575}

A very different situation confronts us upon turning to Greek Samuel: καὶ ἡσαυ μετ' αὐτῶν (ol. αἱροῦτες)—no ἠσαυ and no ἀρσενικός. In addition, very similar forms of the text, or at least forms devoid of 'step' and 'help', appear in Josephus' \textit{Jewish Antiquities} 7.84, Jacob of Edessa's \textit{Books of Samuel}, and Theodoret of Cyrus' \textit{Quaestiones in 2 Regum}. Similarly, the OL according to Sabatier and Vercellone has a double reading: \textit{et erant cum David septem chori (et victima vituli)} at the end of 2 Sam. 6.12, followed in the next verse by \textit{cumque transcendentissent (qui portabant arcam Domini sex passus immolabat bovem et arietem)}. Most suppose that Greek Samuel's καὶ ἡσαυ is an adjustment of MT Samuel's ἠσαυ.\textsuperscript{576} On one hand, καὶ ἡσαυ may reflect free composition, but on the other, ἠσαυ may be an assimilation to the ubiquitous narrative stock phrase. In general, \textit{and especially in Samuel}, ἠσαυ is rendered as καὶ ἐγένετο or καὶ ἐγενήθη when the verb is introductory, and as καὶ ἠσαυ when it is copulative.\textsuperscript{577} In addition, a comprehensive analysis of καὶ ἡσαυ in the Greek Bible suggests that the translator found ἠσαυ in his Hebrew Vorlage.\textsuperscript{578} Herbert thinks Greek Samuel's καὶ ἡσαυ corresponds to 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} ἠσαυ but this is doubtful.\textsuperscript{579} Greek Samuel's καὶ ἡσαυ ... [ol. αἱροῦτες can be

---


\textsuperscript{576} The variation in the versions with respect to the initial verb phrase (Ἠσαυ, καὶ ἡσαυ, καὶ ἐγένετο), and similar variations elsewhere, merits a lengthy discussion since the phenomenon helps to clarify misconceptions regarding the history of biblical Hebrew and the linguistic aptitude of post-exilic editors and scribes. See appendix 3.

\textsuperscript{577} ἠσαυ and καὶ ἡσαυ correspond on only seven occasions in biblical literature. On six of these the Greek reading is related to the manner of expression in the Greek language. ἠσαυ in MT 2 Chron. 5.9 (// 1 Kgs. 8.8) is an assimilation to the ubiquitous narrative stock phrase.

\textsuperscript{578} Space does not present a detailed presentation, but it is noteworthy that in Samuel καὶ ἡσαυ represents ἠσαυ five times, ἀρσενικός once, ἠσαυ once, and once MT has a minus, and six times MT does not have a parallel passage. See appendix 3.

\textsuperscript{579} Herbert 1997b: 126. He also suggests that καὶ ἡσαυ could conceivably be a translation of a clause beginning with ὅσα. He mistakenly cites 2 Sam. 17.17 as an example. Furthermore, this writer is unaware of
interpreted as a periphrastic participle construction or as a copulative construction in which case \([\circ] \alpha\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron\varepsilon\varsigma\] is a substantival participle. However, the (superfluous) inclusion of the article in LXX\textsuperscript{L} and Theodoret (and also in the Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopic versions) and the grammar of the remainder of the list (\(\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha \chi\omicron\omicron\omicron \ldots\); see below) suggest that the clause in Greek Samuel is a copulative construction. The essence of this third textform is *accompaniment*, either implicitly as in Josephus, or alternatively as 'with them', 'with him', 'with David' or 'after him'. The primary reading is 'with them' (LXX\textsuperscript{ABMN} and most cursiveś, Jacob and Theodoret), is attested most widely, is the *lectio difficilior* considering internal factors, and could easily have given rise to the singular referent 'him' and secondarily 'David'. Besides David others are involved in the second attempt to transfer the ark, as in the first attempt. The OG reading is \(\mu\epsilon\tau' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron = \beta\omicron\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\) with reference to the ark carriers' presence with David and other Israelites, whereas \(\mu\epsilon\tau' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron = \gamma\omicron\omicron\) and *cum David* = \(\rho\omicron \circ\omicron \) are secondary readings influenced by the contextual focus on David and with reference to the ark carriers' presence with him.

The grammatical function of 'the carriers' varies in the versions. In MT Samuel and 4QSama\textsuperscript{a} they are the subject of the verb \(\tau\omicron\omicron\). In Greek Samuel they are one of three subjects of \(\kappa\alpha\iota \h\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu\). In Chronicles they stand in apposition to the preceding 'the Levites' which in turn is the object of the verb \(\tau\omicron\omicron\). 'The carriers' are unidentified in Samuel, and this may be due to the focus on David and his role. Does 2 Sam. 6.13 share the Chronicler's perspective? Does David now take Yahweh seriously? Should 'the carriers' be interpreted as (Kohathite) Levites who are 'correctly' transporting the ark according to legal stipulations? Many answer these questions affirmatively, but this view stands on shaky ground. The points stated in 4.1.2.2 against the view that David and/or Uzzah

---

\textsuperscript{a} A single biblical example where \(\kappa\alpha\iota \h\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu\) represents \(\delta\omicron\kappa\alpha\iota\mu\nu\) in Gen. 40.6 and to \(\tau\omicron\omicron\) in Exod. 39.43, and \(\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\) corresponds to \(\h\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu\) in Gen. 14.13 and \(\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\) to \(\kappa\alpha\iota \o\omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron \h\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu\) in Num. 11.26.
violated legal stipulations are equally valid here, and the following may be added. First, priests (and often Levites alongside them) are explicitly mentioned in 28 of the 34 verses where לְנָשָׁה has לְנָשָׁה as its object. In addition to 2 Sam. 6.3, 4, 13, the exceptions are Exod. 25.14 and 37.5 which discuss the construction of the ark, and 1 Sam. 4.4 where the priests Hophni and Phinehas are mentioned by name. In all 15 verses where the substantival participle לְנָשָׁה or its construct equivalent are used, with the single exception of 2 Sam. 6.13, priests (and sometimes Levites) are explicitly mentioned. Second, the view that 'the carriers' must be identical in each version or tradition is eisegetic and harmonistic for interpretative or ideological comfort. It is methodologically unjustified to read into 2 Sam. 6.13 the Chronicler's perspective, or the statement of 2 Sam. 15.24, or (canonically) earlier Pentateuchal legislation. Third, this view implicitly or explicitly reflects a questionable interpretation of the earlier attempt to transfer the ark to Jerusalem, namely, that it was done illicitly. The writer argued previously that Yahweh's homicidal anger against Uzzah is inexplicable. Fourth, other interpretations of 2 Sam. 6.13 are more reasonable in this context. Several suggest that the switch from לְנָשָׁה to לְנָשָׁה reflects practical considerations, since the ascent to the citadel of David's city was probably too steep and winding for a wheeled vehicle. Others conclude, correctly in this writer's judgment, that David was so fearful that he made every safeguard to avoid the former debacle, and for this reason he transported the ark with human hands and shoulders rather than on a cart.580

Regarding the ark's epithet, 'the ark' in Greek Samuel is original. The text is revised in MT Samuel, followed by LXX Samuel581, and in Chronicles.582

582 See appendix 2.
Greek Samuel's χοπόα stands in parallel to MT Samuel's and 4QSama's שִׁפְּרֵי. The basic meaning of υπόζων is 'step', either literal 'footstep' or figurative 'steps [i.e., path] of life'. The noun χοπόα may refer to a dance, a choir or band of dancers and singers, or a place for dancing, although the latter is unattested in the Greek Bible. שִׁפְּרֵי and χοπόα overlap somewhat in meaning since both refer to activity done with the feet or legs, but this semantic similarity is insufficient to regard the two words as translation equivalents. Furthermore, the noun υπόζων is not translated consistently in the Greek Bible, but it is translated equitably. διάβημα, for instance, would have been an appropriate translation equivalent for υπόζων. Others suggest that the Greek translator understood שִׁפְּרֵי as a participle ('those processing')⁵⁸³ or that his Vorlage had שִׁפְּרֵי חַלְמָה ('seven bands')⁵⁸⁴ or שֵׁבֵעַ תַּאֲרוֹן שְׁבֶעַ מַחֲלֶלָה ('seven dancers').⁵⁸⁵ Nonetheless, a thorough analysis of biblical uses and translation equivalents reveals the improbability of these suggestions. For example, הָעֲבָדִים I ('band, company'), and its Ugaritic cognate, require a nomen rectum explaining the kind of people or animals of which there is a 'band' (cf. 1 Sam. 10.5, 10). In contrast to the abovementioned suggestions, it has gone unnoticed that consistent translation technique and contextual suitability favour the view that χοπόα reflects שַׁלָּחֲה ('whirling dances, dances in a ring') in the Vorlage. This correspondence occurs in a dozen passages, including three in Samuel, and interestingly, in the latter the terminology refers to the persons singing the pro-David refrain 'Saul has killed his thousands, and David his ten thousands' (1 Sam. 18.6; 21.12; 29.5⁵⁸⁶; cf. 5.1.1.3).⁵⁸⁷ Samuel's editors may have discarded שַׁלָּחֲה, thus unfastening an outlying link between the David and Saul

⁵⁸³ Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie 2003: 665.
⁵⁸⁵ Jackson 1962: 104.
⁵⁸⁶ In lieu of χοπόα a participle form of the related verb χορεύω is used as a substantive in 1 Sam. 18.6 and 21.12.
⁵⁸⁷ The exceptions to this correspondence, in addition to 2 Sam. 6.3 and 1 Sam. 10.5, 10 (mentioned above), are Judg. 9.27; 1 Kgs. 1.40; and Jer. 31.4, 13. These do not cancel out the view suggested here.
narratives, in order to forge by means of הָעָרֶשׁ a bond between David and Yahweh in 2 Samuel 5–6. Additionally, it should not go unnoticed that the verb מָזוֹן and its derivatives מְזוֹנָל refer to dancing women in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets\footnote{Exod. 15.20; Judg. 11.34; 21:21, 23; 1 Sam. 18.6 (cf. 21.12; 29.5). The verb does not refer to dance in 2 Sam. 3.29.} except in Exod. 32.19. Was David’s festivity too similar for comfort to the calf incident, with its מָזוֹנָל/יִשָּׂשָׂכֹס (vv. 4, 8, 19-20, 24), offerings and sacrifices (vv. 6, 8), and self-indulgent partying (vv. 6, 17-19, 25) with מָזוֹנָל? See 6.1.1.3.4.

MT and LXX Samuel have the numbers מֶשֶׂן and אֶפֶן modifying the nouns מָזוֹנָל and חֵרֹה respectively, whereas MT and LXX Chronicles have the number מְזוֹנָל/אֶפֶן twice in the next clause, modifying the sacrifices (see 5.1.3.4). 4QSama\footnote{Tilley 1992: 48.} has the reading of MT Samuel as well as the reading of Chronicles. This text-critical problem is complicated due to different numbers in different places, the chance of orthographic (משתתפת/משתתפת) or shorthand (i = 6, r = 7) confusion, and not least, numerical symbolism in the Bible. The number 'seven' is the religious number par excellence, the 'prime sacred number'\footnote{J. B. Segal 1965: 14; cf. 14-19.}, having the 'divinity of good fortune'.\footnote{J. B. Segal 1965: 13-14.} The number 'six' tells a different story:

In the numeral 6 we have, I believe, the only digit which may be regarded as neutral – with neither favourable nor unfavourable implication; in consequence, it does not appear often. ... The numbers I have just analysed – 4 and 8 and 6 – occur, I have pointed out, comparatively rarely. They are even numbers; and they are found for the most part in contexts of an unpleasing or ill-omened character – 6 is, at best, neutral in significance.\footnote{J. B. Segal 1965: 13-14.}

The number 'six' is a number in waiting, one less than the sacred number: perfection at seven, or just six, or something worse? Who knows? And who knew how Yahweh would respond? What would the seventh step bring? 'Wait'—says David—'a sacrifice instead'. 'Seven X' for a sacrifice to appease the deity, of course, but 'seven steps' could press him over the edge—again! It may be true: 'Each number had its own significance; and each

---

\footnote{Exod. 15.20; Judg. 11.34; 21:21, 23; 1 Sam. 18.6 (cf. 21.12; 29.5). The verb does not refer to dance in 2 Sam. 3.29.}

\footnote{Tilley 1992: 48.}

\footnote{J. B. Segal 1965: 14; cf. 14-19.}

\footnote{J. B. Segal 1965: 13-14.}
context dictated the choice of numeral.\textsuperscript{592} But what can be made of ἐπτά χοροί? Seven of these, granting any interpretation—seven dances, seven choirs of dancers, seven bands of dancers—is difficult to comprehend. Perhaps the number is present solely for the sake of the number (revision?), and then 'seven' so that it is the best number.

5.1.3.4 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26

This and the following section (5.1.3.5) consider the sacrifices made at the start (2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26) and finish (2 Sam. 6.17-18 // 1 Chron. 16.1-2) of David's successful transfer of the ark. The ḫיב-clause in 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26 has engendered much controversy. (1) When were the sacrifices made? At the commencement, continuously throughout, at the conclusion, or at various points of the procession according to different versions? (2) Where were the sacrifices made? (3) Who sacrificed? David, priests, Levites, others, several of these? (4) Which animals and how many were sacrificed? (5) Why were the sacrifices made? Scholars give different answers to each of these queries. The question of the identification (and its significance) of the agent(s) of these sacrifices is addressed in 5.1.3.5.

There are three principal readings, and one conflate reading, for the activity of sacrifice: (1) ḫבג in MT Samuel and in the following versions of Samuel: Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate, Aquila, Symmachus, and Josephus (but after the ark's arrival in Jerusalem, in 7.86). 4QSama\textsuperscript{4} may have the singular ḫבג, but the manuscript certainly reads like Chronicles for the remainder of the verse.\textsuperscript{593} (2) ḫיבג / καὶ ἔθησαν in MT and LXX Chronicles, and in all other witnesses to Chronicles. The versions of Chronicles hardly differ from one another in this clause except for the matter of ἄν in the OG,

\textsuperscript{592} J. B. Segal 1965: 20.
\textsuperscript{593} Fincke 2001: 155; Herbert 1997b: 126-127; Ulrich 1978: 196 does not commit.
seemingly indicating potentiality or unreality. (3) θυμα (a sacrifice) in LXX Samuel, a nominative (or accusative) neuter singular noun, which may reflect the noun να in the Vorlage. This reading is also found in Theodoret and Jacob. A secondary reading for LXX Samuel is the plural θυματα in ms 119 (n) (and also in the Bohairic Coptic version).

(4) The OL according to Sabatier and Vercellone reflects both MT Samuel (immolabat bovem et arietem in v. 13) and LXX Samuel (et victima vituli in v. 12).

The root να is commonplace, occurring 134 times as the verb, 162 times as the noun να (sacrifice), and 401 times as the noun ναν (altar), and its distribution is also unexceptional—except in 2 Samuel (of Genesis–Kings and Chronicles), where these terms occur a total of only six times, and then in only three passages: 2 Sam. 6.13, 17-18 (// 1 Chron. 15.26; 16.1-2; David); 2 Sam. 15.12 (Absalom); 2 Sam. 24.18-25 (// 1 Chron. 21.18-26; David).

Question 1: When were the sacrifices made? Most think, correctly so, that sacrifices were offered on a single occasion at the commencement of the procession in 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26. A few, preceded long ago by Sotah 35b.2-4 of the Talmud, think sacrifices were offered repeatedly throughout the journey to Jerusalem. Recent adherents to this view usually cite McCarter and Miller and Roberts. In turn, these cite Assyrian inscriptions recounting processions by Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal in which sacrifices were offered all the way from Assur to Babylon—a considerable distance indeed. Consequently, they and others assert that such a procedure in David's case would not have been needlessly cumbersome nor hampered by distance, time, or supplies. If Solomon (1 Kgs. 8.5, 63) then why not David too?! Needless to say, this view rests on

595 Myers 1965: 119 thinks sacrifices were offered on a single occasion in Chronicles but on multiple occasions in Samuel.
unwarranted recourse to comparative material and on excessive historical assumption\textsuperscript{597}, and it also reflects inattention to the language of MT 2 Sam. 6.13, in which the verb forms in both the protosis (יָדַע, כָּן) and apodosis (יָדַע) stand at odds with this interpretation.\textsuperscript{598} McCarter recognises this, and consequently he is constrained to adopt 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}'s בַּר for the protosis and LXX Sam's καὶ θυμαretteverved to בְּנֵי for the apodosis.

Question 2: Where were the sacrifices made? The answer to this question is a series of unanswerable questions. Was there a single or multiple altars? If sacrifices were offered on multiple occasions, did an altar accompany the ark along the way, or did it remain at a single location, while the ark slowly progressed but paused every six steps for a sacrifice? How large and of which material(s) (stone, earth, metal) was/were the altar(s)? Do the narratives envision something like Bezalel's portable altar\textsuperscript{599} or an improvised structure (e.g., 1 Sam. 14.33-34)?


Question 4: Which animals and how many of them were sacrificed? On one hand, the witnesses to Greek Samuel agree on the lexemes μόσχος (= רָא, or רֶם) and ἄρην (= שְׂבֹא, less probably סְלֹם), which are repeatedly joined in Numbers and sporadically elsewhere. On the other hand, variation between the manuscripts regarding the number and/or case of the sacrificial animals is significant, and this variation reflects revision for the purposes of (1) infra- and inter-version harmonisation and/or (2) linguistic correction, the prime example of the latter being the genitive forms in LXX\textsuperscript{L} Samuel and several additional manuscripts. It is impossible to efficiently describe the textual variation here, especially the accusative forms of μόσχος and ἄρην, including the accusative masculine

\textsuperscript{597} Thenius 1842: 153.
\textsuperscript{598} Driver 1890: 269; Thenius 1842: 153; Wellhausen 1871: 169.
\textsuperscript{599} Exod. 27.1-8; 37.1; 37.25-38.7.
singular ἀρπα in LXX\textsuperscript{AB} and several other cursives, which however as the lectio difficilior is considered the OG in the Cambridge and Rahlfs editions. The text of LXX 2 Sam. 6.13 must be rendered 'And there were with them carriers of the ark, seven dances, and a sacrifice, namely, an ox and a lamb':

The textual situation is equally complex when looking beyond the Greek versions to the gamut of witnesses. All in all there are three patterns of readings, referring to large cattle (גֵּחוֹן or רָצִי or כְּפר) and small cattle (group 1 = רוּחָל or כְּלֶשׁ or בֶּן) or to large cattle and a fattened head of large or small cattle, i.e., a bull, ox, steer, or lamb (= מִמְּרָי). The latter reading, which may also be interpreted as a hendiadys, appears in the MT, Targum, Aquila and Peshitta versions of Samuel. Scholars usually stress the 'non-priestly' nature of the sacrifices in MT Samuel, although a few highlight the רֵיָּשֶׁ as part of the sacrifice in Lev. 4.10; 9.4, 18-19. רוּחָל and מִמְּרָי are combined elsewhere only in 1 Kgs. 1.19, 25, and elsewhere in the Former Prophets רֵיָּשֶׁ occurs only in Judg. 6.25 and מִמְּרָי only in 1 Kgs. 1.9. מִמְּרָי is one of five biblical terms for an animal fattened for sacrifice, but overall the concept is uncommon in the Bible. The agreement between 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and Chronicles concerning the types and numbers of sacrificial animals is most interesting. The suggestion that the reading in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} is derived from Chronicles is unfounded; rather, the evidence suggests that Chronicles closely followed its Vorlage. In contrast to MT Samuel, most scholars stress the 'late' and 'priestly' nature of the sacrifices in 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} and Chronicles, although their minutiae do not correspond to any legal prescription in the Pentateuch. רֵיָּשֶׁ and מִמְּרָי are frequently joined in the Bible, 46

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{600} The reading may be due either to confusion in case endings in Hellenistic Greek or to confusion over the fact that the noun ἀρπα (a third declension masculine noun) is used for the oblique cases of ἀρπας (a second declension masculine noun).
\end{footnotesize}
times in Numbers and 21 times elsewhere. The sevenfold sacrifice of any kind of animal is uncommon, and seven שָׁנָה and seven שָׁנִים even less so (Num. 23.1, 29; 1 Chron. 15.26; Job 42.8; Ezek. 45.23). Milgrom and Wenham observe that שָׁנָה and שָׁנִים are the most expensive, hence efficacious, animals in the sacrificial system, and thus Balaam and Balak are represented as doing their utmost to ensure Yahweh's favourable response.

Is this the objective in 1 Chron. 15.26? To conclude, the genesis of the present forms of the נִנְדַּי-clause in 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26 is uncertain, but Greek Samuel may be the type of text which was independently stretched into the present forms of MT Samuel and MT Chronicles.

**Question 5:** Why were the sacrifices made? For most interpreters the significance of the commencement sacrifices is twofold: (1) *backward looking* gratitude and celebration for an auspicious beginning and (2) *forward looking* consecration and intercession for a successful completion. In view of (a) the fear and uncertainty running throughout the passage, and of (b) the comments above on שָׁנָה and שָׁנִים, and of (c) the comments above on the numbers '6' and '7', and of (d) the reasonable observation that 'we may safely presume that the first expedition proceeded more than six paces before Uzzah was struck down', the first point should be dismissed entirely.

5.1.3.5 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1
1 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2
1 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2

The shared narrative of David's transfer of the ark commences and concludes with animal sacrifice. In addition, the theme of sacrifice appears in non-synoptic 1 Chron. 16.29, 40. MT 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26 relates the sacrifice (נִנְדַּי) of particular

---

602 Eight in Ezekiel, four in Leviticus and Chronicles, twice in Exodus, and once in Isaiah, Job and Ezra.
animals (אָנָיִם פָּרִים וְרֵזִים) which served as consecration and intercession for the successful completion of David's enterprise. MT 2 Sam. 6.17-18 // 1 Chron. 16.1-2 deals with specific categories of sacrifices (שָׁלָם וּלְעָלָה) which were performed (וַיְכַרְּבֵהוּ וּלְעָלָה) as celebration and thanksgiving for the triumphant arrival of the ark to Jerusalem (see below). The theological adverbial 'before Yahweh/God' in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 is a further difference which can be added to the diverse vocabulary and purpose associated with each set of sacrifices. The question of the identification (and its significance) of the agent(s) of the commencing and concluding sacrifices will be addressed upon the completion of the detailed analysis which follows.

MT 2 Sam. 6.17-18 and MT 1 Chron. 16.1-2 disagree on the verb lexeme for sacrifice (ַּלְעָלָה versus וַיְכַרְּבֵהוּ) and on the placement of שָׁלָם in the object clause. Before examining these matters, however, two other issues may be briefly discussed. First, where were the concluding sacrifices made? One supposes either that David prepared a new altar or that he adopted (a Jebusite?) one already there.605 Kings assumes that an altar stood in the deity's tent (1 Kgs. 1.49-53; 2.28-35). However, the relationship of the presumed altar in the story of David's transfer of the ark (a) to the altar in the story in non-synoptic 1 Kings 1–2, and also (b) to the altar constructed by David in 2 Samuel 24 // 1 Chronicles 21, cannot be addressed here. Second, in this verse, all traditions of Samuel have 'before Yahweh'. Chronicles has 'before God' with the exceptions of Targum Chronicles with 'before Yahweh' and Peshitta Chronicles with 'before the ark of Yahweh'. In summary606, לְעָלָה in contexts of sacrifice is very common in Exodus–Numbers, and occurs elsewhere in Judg. 20.26; 1 Sam. 7.6; 11.15; 2 Sam. 6.17; 1 Kgs. 8.62, 64; 9.25; 2 Kgs. 16.14; Ezek. 43.24; 1 Chron. 23.13, 31; 2 Chron. 1.6; 7.4, 7. In contrast, and in addition to 1 Chron. 16.1, לְעָלָה in contexts of sacrifice occurs only in Exod. 18.12

605 See the discussion of וַיְכַרְּבֵהוּ in 5.1.2.3.
606 See appendix 2.
and Num. 10.10. Chronicles uses לָכַּשׁ (יִשְׂרָאֵל) on five occasions (1 Chron. 13.8, 10; 16.1; 2 Chron. 33.12; 34.27), but never uses the phrase elsewhere in a context of sacrifice. Instead, לָכַּשׁ וּדְרִי is used in both synoptic and non-synoptic texts. Finally, some suggest that the role of לָכַּשׁ וּדְרִי in 1 Chron. 15.28 and its use in Num. 10.10 share a common origin, and it seems beyond coincidence that 1 Chron. 16.1 and Num. 10.10 also share the nouns לָכַּשׁ and the theological adverbial נְלֶכַח לֹא נָעַשׁ. Nevertheless, the direction of influence is uncertain.

Samuel and Chronicles disagree on the verb lexeme for sacrifice, but they share the same meaning. 2 Sam. 6.17 has לָכַּשׁ וּדְרִי and 1 Chron. 16.1 has בֹּרֶךְ וְחָיָם. Other versions' readings are unremarkable. The assertion that Chronicles' reading is secondary is unsubstantiated. It is possible that Chronicles' reading is the result of free variation (לָכַּשׁ וּדְרִי) but it is equally if not more probable that the text of Samuel was altered related either to stylistic assimilation or to catchword influence (ברך וחיים). First, and on one hand, the verb לָכַּש (‘ascend, go up’) occurs 889 times, including 258 times in the H stem (‘cause to ascend, offer sacrifice’), of which 77 instances are used for the offering of sacrifice, and of these 61 occur in conjunction with the noun לָכַּש. Fuhs makes the comment that ‘... Usage [of לָכַּש] is concentrated in the Dtr History (377 occurrences) and the Tetrateuch (169 occurrences). The Chronicler's History lags well behind with 104 occurrences. ...’ This is deceptive. The occurrences of לָכַּש make up 1.84% of all verb forms in Deuteronomy–Kings, 1.17% of all verb forms in Genesis–Numbers, and 1.77% of all verb forms in Ezra–Chronicles. On the other hand, the (Hebrew and Aramaic) verb

---

607 See Kleinig 1993: 36.
608 Other biblical verb synonyms that approximate the meanings of לָכַּשׁ וּדְרִי in sacrificial contexts are: נָבַל (‘slaughter’), נָבַל (‘slaughter’), נָבַל (‘make a sacrifice, cause to go up in smoke’), נָבַל (‘slaughter’), and some occurrences of לָכַּש, לָכַּש, נָבַל, נָבַל, נָבַל, and נָבַל.
609 There is no consensus as to whether this usage is meant to express the placing of the sacrifice upon the altar or its rising in smoke.
610 Fuhs 2001: 80, emphasis added.
(‘approach, come near’) occurs 289 times, including 177 times in the H stem (‘bring near, present’). Altogether, the verb occurs 181 times in the ‘Tetrateuch’, 44 times in the ‘Dtr History’, and six times in the ‘Chronicle’s History’. The verb occurs six times in Samuel in non-sacrificial contexts and two times in Chronicles in sacrificial contexts (synoptic 1 Chron. 16.1; non-synoptic 2 Chron. 35.12). The principal differences between the H stems שלח and קряд are these: (1) קרד appears almost exclusively in cultic contexts, whereas the contexts of usage of שלח are wide-ranging. (2) ‘P’ and Ezekiel prefer קרד, whereas other strands of biblical literature, including synoptic and non-synoptic Chronicles, prefer שלח. Statistics rebuff the view that Chronicles altered שלח to קרד. Second, Chronicles has שלח + שלח + שלח in 1 Chron. 16.1 but שלח + שלח + השל + השל + השל in 1 Chron. 16.2, just like 2 Sam. 6.18. Similarly, Chronicles has שלח + השל in 2 Chron. 35.12 but שלח + השל twice in 2 Chron. 35.14, 16. 2 Chron. 35.1b-17 is non-synoptic. It is more likely that an original שלח + השל in 2 Sam. 6.17 was assimilated to שלח in 2 Sam. 6.18 then vice versa. Third, some believe the Chronicler used ‘an expression that is more familiar to him and probably more common in his day’.

However, although שלח + השל is used in Ezek. 46.4, Ezra 8.35, 2 Chron. 35.12, and in Leviticus–Numbers, שלח + השל + השל is found in Num. 6.14 and 1 Chron. 16.1 only. On what basis is Chronicles’ expression more common? Fourth, the verb שלח is a Leitwort throughout 2 Samuel, and perhaps motivated a tendentious revision in 2 Sam. 6.17. The assonance in Samuel’s ... is also conspicuous. Furthermore, שלח is never used for sacrifice in Deuteronomy–Kings, and this too may support the view that an out-of-place שלח was altered to השל in 2 Sam. 6.17.

611 Fuhs 2001: 90-91; Japhet 1987: 34.
The content of the sacrifices in 2 Sam. 6.17-18 // 1 Chron. 16.1-2 is given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Sam. 6.17-18</th>
<th>1 Chron. 16.1-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>LXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָ֤לַע</td>
<td>óλοκαυτώματα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שָׁמַ֣לְתָּם</td>
<td>εἰρήνικάς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תָּ֣ס όλοκαυτώμαטֶּס</td>
<td>ρήμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תָּ֣ס εἰρήνικάς</td>
<td>ρήμα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attention here focuses on the deviation in the versions regarding the number of 'burnt offerings', the only phenomenon which is not inner-Greek related. 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 has the plural נָלַע/ὀλοκαυτώματα; MT 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 has the singular נָלַע(שֵׁנ); and LXX 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 has the plural τὰς όλοκαυτώσεις/τὰ όλοκαυτώματα. 614 Majority opinion is that the singular forms of נָלַע in MT 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 are collective and that the plural forms in the parallel Greek texts are the result of attraction to the plural forms in the previous verse. McCarter, however, believes that the plural form is original in MT 2 Sam. 6.18, but he does not offer any evidence in support of his view. 615 One piece of evidence which favours McCarter's view is the distinctive lexemes for 'burnt offerings' in Greek Samuel, όλοκαυτώματα in v. 17 and (τὰς) όλοκαυτώσεις in v. 18, which argues against the view that the latter was assimilated to the former. Apart from the relationship of 'burnt offerings' in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 to 'burnt offering(s)' in 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2, one must assume either that the development occurred independently in Samuel and Chronicles or that the change was made first in one book followed by a change in the other. Considering all possibilities, it seems most probable that an earlier plural form in Samuel was altered to the singular and that Chronicles was updated on the basis of Samuel. The noun נָלַע occurs

---

614 'David' is spelt defectively in 2 Sam. 6.17-18 and plene in 1 Chron. 16.1-2, but 'burnt offering' is spelt plene and with variation in both verses of Samuel (ܢܠܘܥ;ܐܠܘܟܐܘܛܡܵܐܬܐ), and plene in 1 Chron. 16.1 (ܢܠܘܥ) but defectively in 1 Chron. 16.2 (ܢܠܘܥ). See appendix 3.

286 times in the Bible but only 67 times as a plural, including six times in Samuel and twenty times in Chronicles. In general, the singular form is the conventional form, used as an absolute, collective or abstract singular. A detailed look at נֵבְעָה in Samuel and Chronicles reveals that context often indicates whether more than one sacrificer, animal or occasion is in view, apart from whether the singular or plural form is used. On a number of occasions, however, the singular form is used in Samuel (five times) and Chronicles (thirteen times) when the number of sacrifices is difficult to pinpoint. Is the singular form a 'true' singular (one נֵבְעָה), a 'collective' singular (one נֵבְעָה standing for multiple נֵבְעָה) or 'abstract' singular (one נֵבְעָה for the concept of נֵבְעָה in general)? These passages in Samuel are 1 Sam. 13.9 (twice), 10, 12 and 2 Sam. 6.18, and this distribution seems beyond coincidence. See below.

Along with נֵבְעָה (the basic term for 'sacrifice'), the nouns נֵבְעָה ('burnt offering') and נִשָּׁה ('peace/fellowship offering') are most common in Samuel and Chronicles.616 Of the main types of sacrifices, meaning those oblations which are wholly or partly burned at the altar, and in addition to נֵבְעָה and נִשָּׁה, Samuel, but not Chronicles, has נֵבְעָה ('guilt/reparation offering'), and Chronicles, but not Samuel, has נֵבְעָה ('sin/purification offering') and נֵבְעָה (as 'cereal/grain offering', not as 'gift, tribute, offering' in general, which occurs in both Samuel and Chronicles).

HALOT says the נֵבְעָה is 'probably [an] abbreviation for נֵבְעָה נָפָה 'tribute rising (in the fire)'' and means 'sacrifice which is wholly burned, comprising domestic animals and occasionally birds'.617 The נֵבְעָה was the only Israelite sacrifice to be wholly (except for the skin) rather than partially burned and distributed for consumption. Primarily according to 'P', the נֵבְעָה is 'a gift for "an aroma pleasing to Yahweh"', and serves (1) as a thank (תָּרוּחַ),

616 It is impossible and unnecessary to address the large number of biblical terms for sacrifices and offerings, the meaning of each term, and the persons, places, occasions, materials and ritual processes associated with each of them.
617 HALOT II, 830.
votive (ניר) or freewill (דיבר) offering; (2) as a part of prayer and supplication; (3) as a part of the daily, weekly, and monthly, and festival cultic pattern in the sanctuary cult; and (4) to make atonement either alone or in combination with the grain offering, but especially with the sin offering.\textsuperscript{618} In essence, the שׁלֹחַ is the sacrifice that constitutes the basic nourishment for the deity.\textsuperscript{619}

The noun שׁלֹחַ occurs 87 times: 53 times in Exodus–Numbers, 17 times in Joshua–Kings, eight times in Chronicles, and nine times in other books. The term has puzzled translators and commentators from antiquity to the present day, but this is not the place to discuss issues such as the numerous and diverse renderings of the noun in English translations; the provenance and etymology of the noun; cognate nouns in Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Phoenician and Punic; explanations for the appearance of the noun in the plural only (שלמים) except in Amos 5.22; and the constructions or expressions in which the noun occurs. Regarding the latter, however, it should be pointed out that all but seven occurrences of שׁלֹחַ follow one of six patterns, of which three occur in Samuel and four in Chronicles. More specifically, the pattern 'singular שׁלֹחַ followed by שלמים' in a chain occurs ten times, including 1 Sam. 13.9; 2 Sam. 6.18; 1 Chron. 16.2; 2 Chron. 31.2; and the pattern 'plural שׁלֹחַ followed by שלמים' in a chain occurs eleven times, including 2 Sam. 6.17; 24.25; 1 Chron. 16.1; 21.26. Finally, (1) concerning שלמים/שלח (and all other terms) together with שלמים is always last in the list; and (2) according to Levine, שלמים is used as a merismus for the entire sacrificial system (e.g., Exod. 20.24).\textsuperscript{620}

\textsuperscript{618} Averbeck 1997: 1020-1021.
\textsuperscript{619} G. A. Anderson 1992: 879.
\textsuperscript{620} Levine 1974: 21.
The raison d'être of בֵּיתַן is communion, and more specifically, the provision of victuals for communal celebration. As discussed above, whereas the בֵּיתַן was entirely (except for the skin) burned on the altar, only the fatty portions of the בֵּיתַן were burned, while the remainder was distributed in part to the officiating priest but mostly to the person bringing the בֵּיתַן. The בֵּיתַן constituted the basic nourishment of the deity, whereas the בֵּיתַן in turn nourished the people. This is the essence of the בֵּיתַן sacrifice, but three other connotations are evident. (1) Joy. The בֵּיתַן is especially appropriate to occasions of joy (Num. 10.10; Deut. 27.7). (2) Politics. The political function of the בֵּיתַן sacrifice is evident in Enuma Elish and the Hebrew Bible. (3) Inauguration. Levine develops this association in his discussion of the historical development of the בֵּיתַן sacrifice. He says:

The priesthood of Jerusalem sought to avail itself of a sacrifice identified with great cultic moments in Israelite history – the initiation of the monarchy under Saul, sanctioned by a cultic convocation; the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, marking the rise of that city to cultic pre-eminence, and the dedication of Solomon's temple. There was also the tradition of the selâmîm offered at Sinai (Exodus 24:25), and its association by the Deuteronomist with the initiation of Yahwistic worship in Canaan (Deuteronomy 27:7). The selâmîm epitomized significant beginnings ...

Levine's suggestion is well taken. In addition, scholars pay unsatisfactory attention to the rhetoric of בֵּיתַן in Samuel. The noun occurs six times in the book, and it is instructive to compare and contrast (a) 1 Sam. 11.15, and (b) 1 Sam. 10.8; 13.9, with (c) 2 Sam. 6.17, 18; 24.25. This topic must be developed in another context. The following comments suffice for now. 1 Sam. 11.15. Apart from many occurrences of בֵּיתַן in the cultic legislation of Exodus–Numbers, where isolated discussion of the individual types of offerings and sacrifices is to be expected, בֵּיתַן is repeatedly accompanied in context by

---


622 The notion of the distributed portion will be taken up again in 5.1.3.8.

offerings, except in Prov. 7.14; 1 Sam. 11.15; and 2 Chron. 30.22; 33.16. 1 Sam. 11.14-15 presents the so-called 'renewal' of Saul's kingship. According to the story, Samuel and the people proceed to Gilgal where they 'make Saul king before Yahweh' and then 'sacrifice before Yahweh'. Why do they not sacrifice the as well? In all of Levine's 'great cultic moments' or 'significant beginnings' (see above) both types of sacrifices are offered, except at the initiation of monarchy under Saul. Is this mere coincidence? Is it accidental as well that occurs in context with the verbs or the nouns in Samuel only in 1 Sam. 11.15 and 2 Sam. 6.17 (see above)? In 1 Sam. 11.15, are offered (an act not attributed to Saul alone) 'before Yahweh' at a moment of great celebration in Israel, but the which served primarily for the deity rather than for the people (= ) are absent, ironically. 1 Sam. 10.8; 13.9. 1 Sam. 13.9 and 2 Sam. 6.17, 18 share the themes of and , but there is also some similarity related to , since both Saul and David are said to give a blessing in these passages (1 Sam. 13.10 and 2 Sam. 6.18, 20). In 1 Samuel 13, Saul completes an sacrifice ( ) and then goes out to meet ( ) Samuel and 'bless' him ( ), but he is rebuked by Samuel for his disobedience. In 2 Samuel 6, David completes and sacrifices ( ) and then blesses ( ) the people, before he returns to bless ( ) his house, but on his way David is met ( ) by Saul's daughter Michal, who rebukes David. It cannot be coincidental that ('finish offering') occurs in the Bible in three passages only: 1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2; and 2 Chron. 29.29. To add to the ironic presentation of these kingly figures, 1 Sam. 13.9-10, 12 is the only passage in the Bible where and sacrifices are planned, but only the former is completed. In the case of Saul, the cultic activity for him and by him is incomplete; and Saul's attempted sacrifice to Yahweh was

624 See 5.1.3.9 and 5.1.3.10.
incomplete in another way as well, since it is not, after all, †שֶלֶם יְהֹוָה. Saul tries his hand at sacrifice when the situation around him spins out of control. David, however, does sacrifice in 2 Samuel 6 following several great successes. In addition to 1 Sam. 10.8 and 13.9-10, 12, Saul involves himself in sacrifice in two other passages. Saul's cultic activity in 1 Sam. 14.32-34 is sometimes viewed as licit. However, the chapter as a whole is strongly anti-Saul: '... all the glory accrues to Jonathan, and Saul is made to look ridiculous'; 'Saul's loss is Jonathan's gain. His resolution and prompt action, attended by signs of divine approval, are in sharp contrast to Saul's hesitation and fumbling after divine guidance.'\(^{625}\) Saul is neither military nor religious leader. David is both. In 1 Sam. 15.15, 21-22, Saul's illicit cultic activity results in his rejection as king. No so with David. To conclude, Hawk reads Saul's story in 1 Samuel as a tragedy-like drama in four acts that hinges on the leitmotif of sacrifice.\(^{626}\) Indeed, Saul's endeavours and David's achievements in this regard accentuate the dissimilarities between the two kings.

It is vital to address the placement of †שֶלֶם in Samuel's object clause with the former discussion in mind. MT Samuel's word order is reflected in all versions of Samuel except for Peshitta Samuel, which looks like Chronicles. The placement of the sacrifices in 4QSam\(^{a}\) is uncertain. Many regard the separation of †תֵלַה from †שֶלֶם in 2 Sam. 6.17 as an indication that †שֶלֶם is a late addition to the story, probably on the basis of †תֵלַה in 2 Sam. 6.18, and perhaps analogous to the occurrence of †שֶלֶם in 1 Sam. 13.9, and they consider the placement of †תֵלַה adjacent to †שֶלֶם in 1 Chron. 16.1 a stylistic adjustment of the awkward syntax of the Vorlage. Jackson does not favour this opinion regarding Samuel, arguing that if †שֶלֶם were a late addition, then based on its attestation in Greek Samuel, it would have to be very ancient, to say the least.\(^{627}\) However, this said,


\(^{626}\) Hawk 1996.

\(^{627}\) Jackson 1962: 106, 188.
Samuel's syntax may reflect scribal editing posterior to the original composition of the Hebrew versions of Samuel and Chronicles, but antecedent to their translation. Clearly, the conventional word order in Chronicles could be an intentional emendation, but could the inelegant word order in Samuel be an intentional accent to the story? This is the view of Fokkelman ('epiphora') and Murray ('prominence').\(^{628}\) This case of hyperbaton or transposition is an attempt by Samuel's editors to accentuate David's offering of \(ךֵּרֶם\) in contrast with Saul's failed attempt (see above): 'and David offered up \(ךֵּרֶם\) before \(יְהוָה\)—and \(ךֵּרֶם\) too!'.

The identification (and its significance) of the agent(s) of the sacrifices in 2 Sam. 6.13, 17-18 and 1 Chron. 15.26; 16.1-2 is perhaps the hottest issue in this material. Did David carry out the sacrifices or did others do so on his behalf? The broader issues which this material raises are (1) how sacrificial activity by David should be construed in view of sacrificial prerogative in priestly literature and (2) whether Chronicles intends to attenuate an 'inappropriate' assertion in Samuel. This section focuses on the second issue.

Most believe David alone makes the sacrifices in 2 Sam. 6.13 whereas the Levites, and in all probability apart from David's participation, make the sacrifices in 1 Chron. 15.26.\(^{629}\) No subject for the verb \(זָבחָה\) is explicitly mentioned in either text (unless the same \(לַרְאָתָה\) also attend to the sacrifices in Chronicles) but very few think the verb is impersonal\(^{630}\) in either text or that it is factitive\(^{631}\) in Samuel. However, the clause (\(קָאִי \(חֵרֶם\) [and a sacrifice]) is impersonal in Greek Samuel, in the first instance (v. 12) in OL Samuel, and in Jacob's version of Samuel. This textual and literary 'neutrality' may be the

---


\(^{629}\) Some try to harmonise the discrepancies in the two accounts by claiming, e.g., that David makes the smaller sacrifice (in Samuel) and (he and) 'the elders' make the larger sacrifice (in Chronicles).

\(^{630}\) French on or German man.

\(^{631}\) That is, David is the person who authorises the sacrifices and on whose behalf they are offered, but he himself does not make them.
clue to tracking the developments in the texts. It should be considered whether later editors independently and tendentiously adjusted the Vorlage according to a royal-sacral thrust in Samuel and a corporate-levitical thrust in Chronicles.

Scholars hold similar perspectives on the concluding sacrifices in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1. Most think Chronicles verb form seeks to attribute the sacrifices to priestly attendants, or conversely stated, to attenuate David's sacerdotal activity. However, in this case, most scholars seem unaware that in the following verse Chronicles does attribute the sacrifices to David, or at least some of them. Those calling attention to this 'discrepancy' suggest either that the verb is factitive or that the Chronicler was careless or misunderstood his Vorlage. First, Japhet says 'Although the king assumes responsibility for the cult and initiates change or activity, he is excluded from any direct part in the ritual itself'. Consequently, the Chronicler 'rework[s]' and 'qualify[es]' and 'limit[s]' his sources, but his methodology is 'incomplete' and 'inconsistent'. To the contrary, there are only five synoptic passages relating a king's (licit) participation in cultic activity (עֲסָרוֹת, הָעֹלָה, בּוֹדֵי):

- David in (1) 2 Sam. 6.13, 17-18 // 1 Chron. 15.26; 16.1-2; (2) 2 Sam. 24.18-25 // 1 Chron. 21.18-26.
- Solomon in (3) 1 Kgs. 8.5, 62-64 // 2 Chron. 5.6; 7.4-5, 7; (4) 1 Kgs. 9.25 // 2 Chron. 8.12; (5) 1 Kgs. 10.5 // 2 Chron. 9.4.

In view of the paucity of related material in his Vorlage, and in view of his ideological bent, it is doubtful that the Chronicler is guilty of such oversights and shortcomings.

Second, De Vries thinks the Chronicler misunderstood his Vorlage:

Rather than suppose a theological quirk in allowing the congregation to sacrifice ... it is better to assume that ChrH [the historian, not the redactor] misunderstands the verb wayēkal as seen in the Samuel Vorlage. There it functions as a transition from the actual sacrificing, 2 Sam 6:17b, and the blessing of the people that follows. The sentence has a resumptive quality that escapes ChrH's understanding,

---

632 Japhet 1997: 441-442.
and he assumes that the congregation first had to sacrifice in order for David to 'complete' the process. All the same, the absence of priests and Levites at this point is an odd deficiency, and can be accounted for only on the supposition that their participation would have been assumed. It is to be assumed, furthermore, that in ChrH's mind the people and David did not perform the actual ritual, but presented the victims to the proper, unnamed officiants.634

This is a novel yet unsustainable interpretation. First, the claim that הָלַכֶה + infinitive is used with the meaning 'finish off/up what somebody else began' is unsubstantiated. Second, how could the Chronicler have misunderstood the alleged Samuel Vorlage? Samuel portrays David as the person making the sacrifices in v. 16, and the repetition in v. 17 serves to intensify the view that David himself was the agent.635 Yes, the repetition functions as a transition, as De Vries claims, but its aim is more pointedly intensification. The text could very well have said וַיַּעַל וַיִּשְׁלַח לֵאמֶר וַיְשָׁלְמוּ יְבֵרְךָ וַאֲרֻמֵּהוּ בֵּשָׁם יָהָ֣וה֙ הוֹיָ֔ה זֶרֶךְ, in which case the verb sequence consisting of two wayyiqtol forms would have left no ambiguity concerning the sequence of events: David sacrificed and [then] David blessed. De Vries assumes that in reality (a) David did not sacrifice and (b) the repetition is merely transitional or resumptive. The text of Samuel, however, disfavours both these assumptions. Rather, it says: 'And David sacrificed burnt offerings before Yahweh, and peace offerings [too]. And David finished sacrificing the burnt offerings and peace offerings, and he blessed the people in the name of Yahweh of armies-hosts'.

Three additional points substantiate the claim that the verb form in Chronicles does not aim to attenuate David's 'priestly' activity in this story. First, David's dress in an ephod (2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27), his blessing of the people צִוֶּה (2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2), and perhaps his distribution of foodstuff (2 Sam. 6.19 // 1 Chron. 16.3), carry cultic implications. See below. Second, David's priestly role as sacrificer is not altered in 1 Chron. 21.26 (// 2 Sam. 24.25), and Chronicles independently augments it in 1

635 Bressan 1960: 529.
Chron. 21.28. To the contrary, Hoglund says David is the only royal figure the Chronicler portrays positively when he acts in a priestly manner\(^\text{636}\), although Solomon should also be included. Third, David's sons are called 'priests' in MT 2 Sam. 8.18, but not in the OG nor in 1 Chron. 18.17. In the past, the difference between the received versions was usually attributed to Chronicles' unwillingness to accept that non-Levites could be or act as priests, but recently the view that נָשִּׁים stood in Chronicles' Vorlage and that MT Samuel's כְּהֶנֶּים is a subsequent 'corruption' has become fashionable.\(^\text{637}\) But is MT Samuel's כְּהֶנֶּים an unintentional corruption or an \emph{intentional appointment}, precisely related to MT Samuel's focus on David's priestly duties?

5.1.3.6  2 Sam. 6.14  // 1 Chron. 15.27

The material summarised in 5.1.3.6 and 5.1.3.7 demands a full chapter for a comprehensive presentation; accordingly much primary and secondary evidence is excluded. Few acknowledge the full extent of the textual and theological difficulties in 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27. 2 Sam. 6.14 shares (1) either the theme of dance with vv. 5, 16, 21 (and perhaps 20b) or the theme of music and song with vv. 5, 15 (one's answer depends on the interpretation of מְצוּרֵךְ); (2) the theme of attire with v. 20; (3) with vv. 5, 16, 17, 21; (4) and possibly מְצוּרֵךְ with v. 5. Chronicles addresses David's attire in 1 Chron. 15.27 only, and then twice as an inclusio or doublet (חקר בר; בַּמֶּשֶׁת בִּישָׁן); but the themes of music and song (also shared with 2 Sam. 6.5, 15) and religious attendants (i.e., priests and Levites) appear in chapter 13 and dominate chapters 15–16. The grammar of the clauses with מְצוּרֵךְ and מַסְרֵךְ is circumstantial. See 5.0.

\(^{636}\) Hoglund 1999: 517.

Working backwards, Chronicles' plus, which reports that the Levites, the singers, and Chenaniah, the director of music, also wear linen robes (מטלת בגדים), is considered by Keil and Delitzsch as original to the common source used by Samuel and Chronicles\(^{638}\), but others rightly conclude that the Chronicler or a subsequent editor is responsible for this material. The writer must pass by the variation in the spelling of the proper name and the elliptical grammar in MT and LXX\(^{L}\) and simply put forth the suggestion which must be argued elsewhere that the grammar of חנניא הנביא also indicates that these words are glosses on an original פִּסְחָה וּדָרָם. Of what? Of what? (as in 15.22). Of what? (פִּסְחָה as by itself can refer to the lifting of music or the ark.) Of what? (מַעֲרָרָה). The original supplement had '… as also were the Levites, i.e., the carriers of the ark, and the singers, and Chenaniah, i.e., the leader [in the matter of lifting the ark]'. Moving on, Samuel situates David 'before Yahweh'. One should hesitate to agree with Curtis and Madsen that the change from מַעֲרָרָה to מָכַרֵךְ is 'intentional, as the omission of מָכַרֵךְ would show'.\(^{639}\) Regarding Samuel's בָּכָל הִוָּד בִּי הָרוּם it is argued in 3.1.4.2 that 2 Sam. 6.5's מִכָּל הֵוָּד is probably secondary to 4QSam\(^{a}\)s and 1 Chron. 13.8's מִכָּל הֵוָּד בִּי הָרוּם.

The versions attest five textual and interpretative traditions for the main activity in the first clause of 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27.

- **Dancing (a dance).** This tradition is attested in MT Samuel and 4QSam\(^{a}\) according to the majority interpretation of מָכַרֵךְ, and it is also evident in the Vulgate of Samuel.
- **Wearing (certain attire).** This tradition is supported by all versions of Chronicles.
- **Praising (in general).** This tradition is attested in the Targum and Peshitta of Samuel.\(^{640}\)

---

\(^{638}\) Keil and Delitzsch 1872: 206-208.

\(^{639}\) Curtis and Madsen 1910: 219. See 3.1.4.1 and appendix 2.

\(^{640}\) Did the Targum influence the Peshitta (Englert 1949: 74)?
- Playing (musical instruments). This tradition is attested in MT Samuel and 4QSam according to the minority interpretation of מְכִרֵךְ, and it is the tradition reflected in the LXX and OL of Samuel as well as in Josephus.\(^641\) In addition, Midrash Rabbah on Numbers 4.20 transmits this understanding.

- Praising (in general) and playing (musical instruments). Jacob of Edessa combines the alternative traditions preserved in the Peshitta and Septuagint.

**MT Samuel.** The verb מְכִרֵךְ in MT Samuel and 4QSam\(^9\) has elicited much debate. The root's essence is 'to be round', and the occurrences in 2 Samuel 6 are rendered as

- 'Play' or 'dance', in general
- 'Gallop, hop, jump, leap, prance, skip, spring', a vertical movement
- 'Circle, pirouette, revolve, rotate, spin, turn, turn round, twist, whirl, whirl round, writhe', a circular movement
- 'Clap' or 'snap or 'finger, strum or 'intertwine, twirl, twist, twiddle', an activity of the hands or fingers

The verb מְכִרֵךְ occurs in biblical Hebrew in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 only, but it is used more frequently in post-biblical Aramaic and Hebrew, and cognate roots are attested in Arabic, Coptic, Ethiopic and Ugaritic. The single occurrence of the verb in Ugaritic, in El's response to Athirat in the Baal Cycle (KTU 1.4 IV 29) is particularly significant since w ykrkr usb'ıth is clearly an activity done with the fingers, as recognised also by translators and lexicographers.

Most translations and commentaries assume the conventional interpretation of מְכִרֵךְ, 'dance'. The Bible has a rich assortment of terminology for dance, but the basic terminology for human dancing is the verbs שָׁמַךְ, רָדָךְ, קָנָךְ, מְכִרֵךְ, אֵל, חַלָּל, דָּלָל and the nouns מֵרָחֵל and מַחְלָל.\(^642\) The subjects of dance in biblical literature are Israelites or other

---

\(^641\) The OL has percutiebat in organis et armigatis. Josephus' Jewish Antiquities 7.85 has αὐτοῦ δὲ ἐν κυνύρᾳ παίζοντος καὶ κρυζόντος. It is impossible to address the details here.

\(^642\) Gruber 1981 discusses some of this terminology.
people in general, and often women, but as far as this writer can determine the only named 'dancers' in the Bible are Miriam and David. Focusing on Samuel and Chronicles, and considering the total range of vocabulary for the dance activity of people, one finds that dance occurs only in context with David's activities:

- 1 Sam. 18.6-7; 21.12; 29.5, for the dance of Israelite women upon the return of David and Israel after war with the Philistines.

- 1 Sam. 30.16, for the dance of the Amalekites after pillaging Ziklag and prior to their defeat by David and Israel.

- 2 Sam. 6.5, 14 (?), 16, 21 // 1 Chron. 13.8; 15.29, for the dance of David (and the Israelites in 6.5 // 13.8) upon transferring the ark.

Dance in Chronicles occurs in shared material only, and the book's references are doubly remarkable due to dissimilar terminology and to the Chronicler's (independent) interest in music and song elsewhere.

Dance in the ancient orient was usually done by women. Israel's corporate joy was commonly expressed in great celebration, accompanied by music, song and dance, often with additional adjuncts such as thanksgiving, offerings, food and drink. Dance embodies happiness and gratitude and has complemented personal, political and religious occasions and triumphs from time immemorial. It generally accompanied military victories, royal processions, and religious celebrations, as well as other significant rites of passage such as marriage and mourning. Dance is associated with Yahweh's cult in Ps. 30.12; 87.7; 149.3; 150.4, and with cultic activity in Exod. 32.19 and 1 Kgs. 18.26. Accordingly, some believe מַחֲבֶּרָה in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 is (positively) some form of sacred dance, or relates (negatively) to Canaanite ritual, or functions as a fertility rite or prelude to sacred marriage. Most, however, view David's מַחֲבֶּרָה in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 as simply an expression of joy without either the positive or negative associations just mentioned.
The Ugaritic cognate moves several scholars to abandon the meaning 'danced' for מָכָר in 2 Sam. 6.14 in favour of an activity of the fingers or hands. If this is the 'primitive' meaning of מָכָר it should not come as a surprise since David's skills as a poet, musician, and sponsor of music were renowned ... His compositions in 2 Samuel and the Davidic psalms demonstrate a poetic genius. His sponsorship of, and involvement in, religious celebrations in connection with the ark show his musical talents and interests. We even read of 'instruments of David' that he created or that were somehow associated with him (2 Chr 29:26; Neh 12:36; cf. Amos 6:5).

David's musical interest and talent are enlarged chiefly in Psalms, in Ezra-Chronicles, and even more so in post-biblical literature. In Samuel, the Song of the Bow (2 Sam. 1.18-27) and the Song of Thanksgiving (2 Sam. 22.1-51) are attributed to him, and he is labelled 'Israel's pleasant/sweet psalmist/singer' (2 Sam. 23.1), but his activity as musician is limited to playing a stringed instrument in 1 Sam. 16.16-18, 23; 18.10; 19.9 (always with מַכָּר; ± בַּכְפָּר; ± בָּרֹד).

MT Chronicles. All versions of Chronicles depict David wearing certain attire. Scholars explain this tradition in eight ways:

- The change is a non-tendentious clarification/correction of an indistinct Vorlage (#1).
- The change is a non-tendentious modernisation of obsolete or uncommon terminology (#2).
- The change is a non-tendentious alteration based on the Chronicler's interest in describing the king's and priests' dress (#3).
- The change is a tendentious mitigation of the scandal of David's dress (רֶשֶׁת/στόλη) which was indecently revealing (#4) ...
- or impertinently priestly. In these scenarios (#4-5) most believe the Chronicler altered the text to וַיַּרְדֶּד מֹכָּר and an editor subsequently appended מָכָּר on the basis of Samuel (#5).

643 Avisniur 1976, 1984: 719-723; McCarter 1984: 171; Murray 1998: 62-63. Gruber 1981: 338-340 entertains this view, and he also points out on the basis of ethno-archaeological evidence that the verb could mean both dancing and a gesture(s) of the hand(s) or fingers.
• The change is a tendentious mitigation of the scandal of David's dance (#6).
• The change is a tendentious augmentation of the liturgical portrayal of David who exercised a priestly function as a priest-king (#7).
• Samuel and Chronicles each abridges a more complete account, from which each tradition has selected the material pertinent to its focus (#8).

Scholars disagree on whether the alteration is intentional or tendentious. Indeed, they reasonably express dissatisfaction with the notions of graphic confusion, modernisation, subsequent glossing on the basis of Samuel, and the so-called 'scandal' of David's dance, which after all is mentioned in 1 Chron. 13.8; 15.29.

'The frequent reference to dress or ornamentation indicates the social and symbolic importance of clothing for ancient Israelite society'.646 Clothing is worn for protection, aesthetics/status and ethics/religion. The main garments in the ancient world were the outer/over garments, inner/under garments, headgear, footwear, accessories and ornamentation.647 There are dozens of nouns for outer and inner garments and five main verbs for putting on clothes (מַעַל, מַגָה, לִבְשׁ, כֵּסָד), and these occur relatively often in Samuel and less so in Chronicles. Chronicles and its synoptic parallels regularly agree on the issue of attire, and neither Samuel nor Chronicles reflects an interest in sacral dress. The special attire of Aaron and his sons is described in Exodus 28–29, 39 and Leviticus 8, but the only piece of priestly clothing mentioned outside 'P' is the ephod.648

The derivation of Chronicles' פרסנו ('clothe, be-mantle, bind/wrap around') is uncertain, and it is also unclear, contra Japhet649, that the verb 'is a clear sign of Aramaic

---

647 Clothes in the ancient world were made from skin/hide/leather (goat, sheep), hair (goat, camel), wool (white, tan, grey, black), linen (flax) and cotton, and much less commonly from hemp, jute and silk. The principal colours of clothing were white, black, red/crimson/scarlet, blue and purple/violet.
David's attire is described in MT and LXX 1 Chron. 15.27a, where he is dressed with a לְשֵׁעַ/στολή, and again in MT and LXX 2 Sam. 6.14b // 1 Chron. 15.27c, where he wears an כְּפָנָה/στολή. The noun לְשֵׁעַ occurs twenty-eight times, referring to an outer-garment ('coat, cloak, mantle, robe, outer/over-garment') which was wrapped and then belted or pinned over the inner-garment which was worn next to the skin. כְּפָנָה is used figuratively on four occasions, as a priestly garment ten times in Exodus and Leviticus, and fourteen times for the attire of a person of rank: Samuel (1 Sam. 2.19; 15.27; 28.14), Saul (1 Sam. 24.5, 12), Jonathan (1 Sam. 18.4), David (1 Chron. 15.27), Tamar (MT 2 Sam. 13.18), Ezra (Ezra 9.3, 5), Job (Job 1.20), Job's friends Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar (Job 2.12), and princes of the sea (Ezek. 26.16). It is reasonable to conclude that לְשֵׁעַ in 1 Chron. 15.27 (and also in 1 Sam. 2.19) should not be construed as sacral apart from an additional indicator in the context that this is so. The adjective בָּשָׂם ('byssus') modifying לְשֵׁעַ is characterised as a late synonym of לְשֵׁעַ but this view is problematical. The discussion of כְּפָנָה continues in 5.1.3.7.

5.1.3.7 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27

This clause, and the phrase כְּפָנָה בָּשָׂם in particular, have received insufficient technical discussion. The textual evidence is:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb/Preposition Phrase</th>
<th>Ephod</th>
<th>Robe Etc.</th>
<th>Byssus</th>
<th>Linen</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S: Pesh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Pesh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Symm. kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| S: MT                    |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: 4QSam                  |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: Vulg. porro David erat accinctus |       |       |        |       |       |
| C: MT                    |       |           |        |       |       |
| C: Vulg. David autem etiam erat etam |       |       |        |       |       |

| C: LXXL kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ |       |           |        |       |       |
| C: Theod. kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ |       |           |        |       |       |

| S: Targ.                 |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: Jacob                 |       |           |        |       |       |
| C: Targ.                 |       |           |        |       |       |
| C: LXX A kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ  |       |           |        |       |       |
| C: LXX B kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ  |       |           |        |       |       |
| C: Aquila kai ἐπὶ Δαὐὶδ |       |           |        |       |       |

| S: Symm. kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: LXX A kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ  |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: LXX B kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ  |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: LXX L kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ  |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: Theod. kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ  |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: Aquila kai ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ  |       |           |        |       |       |
| S: OL indutus erat       |       |           |        |       |       |

The (original) impersonal construction lacking the proper name may have been adjusted to David in other witnesses.\(^{654}\) The passive construction with an accusative is unexceptional. However, the variation in the verb/preposition phrase is remarkable. Japhet thinks Chronicles avoids the phrase ἐπὶ ἐνδυθεὶς ('gird an ephod') since it is rare,\(^{655}\) occurring only in 1 Sam. 2.18 and 2 Sam. 6.14, but other evidence suggests that here the verb ἐπὶ may be a revision. First, the authors and editors of Samuel 'like' the verb ἐπὶ and its cognates. Ten of a total forty-four occurrences of the verb are in Samuel\(^{656}\), whereas

---

\(^{654}\) McCarter 1984: 166.

\(^{655}\) Japhet 1987: 10.

\(^{656}\) 1 Sam 2.18; 17.39; 25.13 (three times); 2 Sam 3.31; 6.14; 20.8; 21.16; 22.46.
there are none in Chronicles, and Samuel also uses two of four cognates related to יִנָּה (יִנָּה and יִנָּה, but not יִנָּה and יִנָּה). Furthermore, the text of MT 2 Sam. 20.8 is disordered, but יִנָּה appears secondary, and יִנָּה in MT 2 Sam. 22.46 is certainly secondary to יִנָּה in synoptic Ps. 18.46, as the context, parallelism and versions demonstrate. Second, ἐνδεδευκός/ἐνδεδεμένος in LXX 2 Sam. 6.14 indicates that the Greek translator had a form of נַלְכָּה rather than יִנָּה in his Vorlage. On one hand, the Septuagint reserves ἐνδοῦ for נַלְכָּה in ninety-five of ninety-nine cases, including 1 Sam. 17.5, 38 and 2 Sam. 14.2. On the other hand, and excluding 2 Sam. 6.14, יִנָּה and its less frequent synonyms (יִנָּה, יִנָּה, יִנָּה and יִנָּה twice) are represented by ἐνδεδυμένος or a related cognate in 46 of 64 cases657, by σύσφ(γγ)ω twice, by one of ten other verbs due to special (including poetic) circumstances in eleven cases658, and five times the LXX has a minus.659

The nouns יִנָּה and יִנָּה occur forty-nine and three times respectively, and the verb יִנָּה ('put on tightly, put on the ephod') occurs twice in context with the substantive. Cognates are Akkadian epattu ('costly garment') and Ugaritic 'pd ('garment'). In the Bible, יִנָּה is associated with the high priest in 'P', the leader Gideon (Judg. 8.27), the priest of Micah (Judg. 17.5; 18.14, 17, 18, 20), the judge-prophet(-priest?) Samuel (1 Sam. 2.18, 28), 'Saul's' priest Ahijah (1 Sam. 14.3), 'David's' priests Ahimelech (1 Sam. 21.10; 22.18 [and other priests]) and Abiathar (1 Sam 23.6, 9; 30.7), and with David himself (2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27). The three main uses are:

- The ephod is an ornate high priestly garment (33 times), made of יִנָּה, worn by the high priest in 'P'.
- The ephod is a simple (sacral? priestly?) garment (three times), made of יִנָּה, worn by Samuel (1 Sam. 2.18) and David (2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27).

---

657 E.g., 1 Sam. 2.4, 18; 17.39; 25.13; 2 Sam. 3.31; 20.8; 21.16.
658 E.g., 2 Sam. 22.40, 46.
659 E.g., twice in 1 Sam. 25.13.
The ephod is a cultic or divinatory device (or garment?) (sixteen times), distinguished six times from מַעֲשֶׂה, מַעַשֶּׁה, and מַעַּשֶׁה, made of בָּשָׂל at least twice, made of רָד once (MT 1 Sam. 22.18), carried in the hand seven times (1 Sam. 2.28; 14.3; 22.18; 23.6, 9; 30.7 [twice]), and appearing an equal number of times in cultic contexts which are either illicit and licit (the latter in 1 Sam. 2.28; 14.3; 21.10; 22.18; 23.6, 9; 30.7 [twice]).

This synopsis draws attention to the complicated use of 'ephod' in biblical literature. Three matters are highly debated: First, is David's vesture (solely?) in an ephod the reason for Michal's rebuke? Second, is the simple ephod (#2) a priestly garment (as most commentators assume)? Third, is the divinatory ephod (#3) a garment, and what is its relationship to the simple ephod? The first issue is addressed in the next chapter. It is impossible within the scope of this thesis to convey the writer's thorough investigation of the second and third issues. Regarding the second question, Samuel's and David's ephods may be construed as priestly in a canonical context but based on the usage in Samuel alone they are not intended as such.660 The aim of the identical phraseology is literary—to correlate the two characters in the literature: Samuel is David-like, and David is Samuel-like, and both are unlike Saul. Regarding the third question, scholars approach this issue in three ways, but these approaches do not ease the awkward array of adjuncts associated with this usage of 'ephod'.661 Rather, the peculiar usage of 'ephod' in Samuel is interconnected with the literary development of the conflict between David and Saul, and their relationships to 'ephod' and 'ark'.

The Greek translational evidence for רֹאֵשׁ and לִשְׁעָה is instructive. רֹאֵשׁ is routinely rendered by ἐπωμίς and ἐφοῦδ/ἐφῳδ/ἐφῶθ, but רֹאֵשׁ is parallel to ἱεράτεια in Hos. 3.4, and to στολή in 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27 only. לִשְׁעָה is rendered by a number of

---

660 Cody 1969: 77-78; cf. 75-78; Phillips 1969; although Phillips' view that the ephod is 'a brief loin cloth suitable for young children' is certainly mistaken (Tidwell 1974).

Greek terms, including διπλοίς, ύποδυτα/ἐπενδύταις, ἱμάτιον, ποδήρας and χιτών, but ἄσπαρ and στόλη are parallel in Job 2.12 and 1 Chron. 15.27 only. στόλη occurs 81 times in the Greek portions equivalent to the Hebrew Bible canon. The term characteristically (45 times) represents ἄσπας (the most common term for garments in general), commonly in Exodus and Leviticus, and six times\(^{662}\) stands for λευκός and five times\(^{663}\) for τόσσος. Elsewhere στόλη represents one of nine other Hebrew words or a minus. στόλη occurs in Greek Samuel in 2 Sam. 6.14 only, but appears six times in Greek Chronicles: twice in 1 Chron. 15.27 (ἵλας, ἰδίος), once in 2 Chron. 5.12 (MT minus), 2 Chron. 18.9 (ἵλας), 2 Chron. 23.13 (ἵλας) and 2 Chron. 34.22 (ἵλας). Translation equivalency and consistency suggest that στόλη does not represent ἱλασμός in the Vorlage of either 2 Sam. 6.14 or 1 Chron. 15.27. Rather, the Greek translators had a more generic term, perhaps ἄσπας, in their Vorlagen.

The table above shows that the versions attest the noun phrase in six combinations of readings:

- Ephod + byssus
- Ephod + linen
- Ephod + alone
- Robe + byssus
- Robe + linen
- Robe + special

The non-Hebrew versions differ greatly regarding the noun phrase. The following comments summarise a larger study. There are ten words for linen of which the most common in descending order of frequency are ἀσπάς, ἄσπας, μᾶλετος and χάλκη. The noun χαλκή occurs twenty-three times and refers to (1) priestly garments in 'P'; (2) Samuel's, the priests' and David's linen ephods in 1 Sam. 2.18; 22.18 (MT); 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27; and (3) the celestial 'men' clothed in linen in Ezek. 9.2, 3, 11; 10.2, 6, 7; Dan. 10.5;

\(^{662}\) Three in Esther.

\(^{663}\) Four in Genesis.
12.6, 7. The nouns בּר and בּוּר occur in the same book in Ezekiel and Chronicles only and they occur together in 1 Chron. 15.27 only. בּוּר modifies בּוּר in 1 Sam. 2.18; 22.18 (MT); 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27 only. It should not go unnoticed that בּוּר links Samuel, the priests of Nob, and David in these three passages in the MT, but this connection is absent from Greek Samuel's εφοῦδ βαρ (LXX B et al.) εφοῦδ (LXX 1), εφοῦδ and στόλην εξαλλαν, respectively. Fokkelman and Polzin capitalise on the literary significance of בּוּר in Samuel.664

Some suggest that the retention of בּוּר alongside בּוּר reflects the Chronicler's carelessness or peculiar methodology, while others harmonise the two versions, believing David really did wear both, and still others suggest that in the Chronicler's era both garments were actually one and the same. Most who think the Chronicler tendentiously mitigated the scandal of David's dress, which was either indecently revealing or impertinently priestly, a mitigation which the Chronicler accomplished by dressing David with a בּוּר rather than an בּוּר, also think a subsequent editor appended בּוּר in Chronicles on the basis of Samuel. The following scenario may account best for the evidence. The earliest form of the text portrayed David playing an instrument (מְכֶרֶךְ) and made a more 'neutral' reference to David's attire, probably using בּוּר. In Samuel, the verb מְכֶרֶךְ was reinterpreted as 'dance' and the reference to David's outfit was adjusted to include an בּוּר as part of the pro-David polemic. In Chronicles, related to the book's interest in describing the dress of the king and priests, the verb מְכֶרֶךְ was transformed to מְכֶרֶכֶל and the reference to David's clothing was incorporated into this same statement. At a later stage in the development of the text the revised בּוּר-clause in Samuel was integrated into Chronicles thus creating a doublet with regard to David's dress.

The 'banquet' or 'feast' in 2 Sam. 6.19 // 1 Chron. 16.3 appropriately follows the themes of festivity (dance, music and song, jubilation) and cult (attire [?], sacrifice, blessing) in 2 Sam. 6.13-15, 17-18 // 1 Chron. 15.26-28; 16.1-2. This section focuses on textual variation related to the expression of the direct and indirect objects. The broader query concerns the reason for David's distribution of foodstuff.

The meaning and use of the verb נושק and the corresponding versional evidence are unremarkable. In general, the verb's meaning emphasises distribution (among partners) rather than the dividing procedure (into portions). Possible literary connections are discussed below.

The wordy triple, quadruple and quintuple indirect object is generally shorter in Chronicles and longer in Samuel, and within this partition, shorter in the MT and Targum texts and longer in the Greek and Latin versions. Josephus and the Peshitta of Chronicles each has a unique reference. Jacob's version of Samuel reflects close affinity to Greek Samuel. The readings in the Peshitta versions of Samuel and Chronicles are interesting since they are similar except for the extension in the Peshitta of Chronicles. Each version contains from three to five of the seven distinct phrases which are attested overall, and this diversity makes it impossible to lay out and explain each phrase and each arrangement of phrases in the body of this thesis.665

The consensus on the present material is that the Chronicler deleted לָעָלָהֲךָ, altered אֶת to הָנָּךְ, and simplified the compound preposition in מִן to לָאָשָׁךְ מִן. Although he retained the distributive idea, the Chronicler supposedly economised on the pretentious details of his Samuel Vorlage, which were not pertinent to the message of his story.

---

665 Appendix 1 enlarges this discussion.
First, on see 3.1.3.3 and appendix 1. appears in the immediately preceding 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 and is found in the immediately following 2 Sam. 6.19b // 1 Chron. 16.43a. In addition, non-synoptic Chronicles has elsewhere in the immediate context (1 Chron. 13.4; 16.36, 43), and with the same referent as in 2 Sam. 6.19a // 1 Chron. 16.3. Finally, Samuel's liking for , and the use of the phrase in synoptic material, suggest that the phrase was added in Samuel rather than omitted from Chronicles.

Second, the second phrase is attested as לְלֵלְכָּדַר in MT Samuel (cf. the Targum, Peshitta, Jacob) but rather as לְלֵלְכָּדַר in MT Chronicles (cf. the Targum, LXX). Conversely, the Peshitta of Chronicles has 'to all (those of) the house of Israel' and LXX Samuel has 'to the entire army of Israel'. The noun הָרָעָה is used as

- 'Din, murmur, noise, roar, rush, sound' (#1)
- 'Agitation, bustle, commotion, confusion, tumult, turmoil' (#2)
- 'Crowd, multitude' (#3)
- 'Abundance, great number, wealth' (#4)

The noun's distribution and usage in Samuel are noteworthy. In 1 Sam. 4.14 (#1), Samuel asks about Israel's הָרָעָה upon the Philistine's capture of the ark, and Polzin points out that the sound of Israel crying (קלט הָרָעָה) in 1 Sam. 4.14 becomes the blessed Israelite multitude (רֹבֵעַ) in 2 Sam. 6.19. In 1 Sam. 14.16 (#3), 19 (#2), the narrator refers to the Philistines' הָרָעָה upon Jonathan's success against them. In 2 Sam. 18.29 (#2), the messenger informs David of Israel's הָרָעָה related to the execution of Absalom. In 2 Sam. 6.19 (#3), הָרָעָה refers to the people who received gifts from David upon his successful transfer of the ark (and after his victory over the Philistines too). In view of the textual instability here, and the use of הָרָעָה in the book, it is suggested that הָרָעָה is a programmatic

---

modification intended to inflate still more the character and achievements of David. Gain, not loss. Success, not failure. David, like Jonathan, unlike Saul and Absalom.

A review of δύναμις in Greek Samuel suggests that the translator found either לֶחֶם or זָכָר in his Vorlage. This is the case nearly three-hundred times in the Bible, and is true for Samuel on more than two dozen occasions, with the sole exception of 2 Sam. 6.19. Overall, δύναμις corresponds to מִצְוָה only four times among the nearly four-hundred occurrences of δύναμις in the Greek version of the Hebrew canon, and although the writer has not investigated Jer. 3.23 and Ezek. 32.24, it is likely that the prophet's promise of delivery in MT 1 Kgs. 20.28 (LXX 21.29) was assimilated to the earlier promise in MT 1 Kgs. 20.13. From the reverse angle, the 83 occurrences of מֵתָנָה are translated most frequently by a term related to 'multitude' (e.g., πληθος, ὕπαλας), whereas terms related to 'noise' (e.g., ἤχος) are metonymies of cause (the crowd) for effect (their hustle and bustle, etc.).

In view of these literary and text-critical observations, it is reasonable to suggest that the earliest of the attested readings was לֶחֶם or זָכָר. This terminology fits the context well, since the festivity in view follows both David's military victories over the Philistines (2 Sam. 5.17-25) and his retrieval of the sacred relic which they had plundered long ago (1 Samuel 4). Furthermore, נְדָרָה is David's patron in 2 Sam. 5.10; 6.2, 18. It should also be mentioned that Murray thinks MT Samuel's מִצְוָה יִשָּׁרֵאָל is contextualised by מִצְוָה יִשָּׁרֵאָל in the first verse, i.e., the מִצְוָה is David's מִצְוָה יִשָּׁרֵאָל. Regarding Chronicles, the book uses מִצְוָה ten times, in non-synoptic material, nearly as frequently as all the books of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets together (fourteen times), and usually with the meaning 'crowd, multitude'. Therefore, it is more likely that an original

---

667 ἤχος in Ezekiel (and once in Ps. 37.16) and πλοῦτος in Isaiah are idiosyncratic to these books.
was polemicised in MT Samuel to פִּנְנִי and generalised in MT Chronicles to צְרַצָּן (on the basis of 1 Chron. 10.1, 7?) than that פִּנְנִי was altered to צְרַצָּן in Chronicles.

Third, the construction 'בְּ(וֹ) ... בְּ(וֹ) is one member in a group of similar constructions expressing distributive 'from ... to', of which the most frequent in biblical literature is 'וּרֶשֶׁת(וֹ) ... וּרֶשֶׁת', and in which X and Y may be (anarthrous or arthrous) nouns, adjectives, verbs or adverbs, though not necessarily identical in category in both the 'וּרֶשֶׁת' and 'וּרֶשֶׁת(וֹ)' clauses. Many take the view\(^{669}\) that an original בְּ(וֹ) is simplified to צְרַצָּן in Chronicles. Conversely, Budde and Caspari excise "lamed" from Samuel.\(^{670}\) The textual evidence is disappointingly unhelpful except perhaps for the counter-evidence provided by three to ten medieval Hebrew manuscripts of Samuel and by the Syriac witnesses to Samuel. In spite of this, the following data cast some doubt on the consensus. The double preposition "lamed + min (לַמְּדֵן) always governs a (anarthrous or arthrous) noun or adjective phrase, is followed by a complementary יָשָׁה (usually יָשָׁה; 'from ... [and] to ...') clause in about half its occurrences, and may designate temporal, spatial and personal data as well as physical age and moral or social status. The compound occurs 48 times, most often in Chronicles (ten times) followed by Jeremiah (seven times) and Samuel (six times total; four times in 2 Samuel 6–7). In non-synoptic material, צְרַצָּן occurs twice in Samuel (2 Sam. 13.22; 19.25) and eight times in Chronicles (1 Chron. 5.9; 15.13; 27.23; 2 Chron. 15.13 [twice]; 25.5; 26.15; 30.3), and in synoptic material, Samuel and Chronicles share צְרַצָּן twice (2 Sam. 7.11, 19 // 1 Chron. 17.10, 17) and twice Chronicles lacks the "lamed", here and in 2 Sam. 7.6 // 1 Chron. 17.5. Observe that the identical phrase צְרַצָּן יָשָׁה occurs in synoptic 2 Sam. 6.19 and in non-synoptic 2 Chron. 15.13. Finally, the use of צְרַצָּן and צְרַצָּן (side by side in singular or plural forms and in a variety of

\(^{669}\) Citing Driver 1890: 270.

\(^{670}\) Budde 1890: 231; Caspari 1924: 474.
constructions) as a merismus for 'people' is uncommon. In the present passage the phrase reveals the extraordinary nature of the occasion.\textsuperscript{671}

David's gift to the assembly of people consists of לָהֶל, רֵאֵשׁ and רַבָּשׁ. The versions have conjectures for obscure Hebrew terms; they do not attest alternate Vorlagen. The etymology and meaning of רַבָּשׁ, which occurs only here, are uncertain. The noun is understood as

- 'Fruit cake', 'date cake', 'raisin cake', 'portion of dates', 'portion of raisins'
- 'Portion of (roast) meat' (related to לָהֶל)
- 'Measure of wine' (related to לָהֶל)

Most accept the first option, following Koehler, who argues for a connection with Arabic sufrat, meaning 'victuals', and more specifically, 'a traveller's provisions for a journey'.\textsuperscript{672}

The noun רַבָּשׁ occurs five times (2 Sam. 6.19 // 1 Chron. 16.3; Isa. 16.7; Hos. 3.1; Cant. 2.5) and is interpreted as 'raisin-cake'. Scholars often point to (a) the delicacy of the food, evident in Isa. 16.7 and Cant. 2.5, or to (b) the cultic usage, evident in Hos. 3.1. The notions of delicacy and cult are not mutually exclusive. With respect to the cultic usage, scholars also mention that cakes are offered to the queen of heaven in Jer. 7.18; 44.19. Consequently, רַבָּשׁ may have some connection to Canaanite fertility rites or a New Year's Festival, but the evidence is inadequate for drawing certain conclusions.

The received versions disagree on two points. First, the synonymous terms לָהֶל and רֵאֵשׁ precede רַבָּשׁ in Samuel and Chronicles, respectively. The etymology and physical shape of רֵאֵשׁ-bread are obscure, but it is clear that the noun, which occurs a total of fourteen times in 2 Sam. 6.19 and elsewhere only in P\textsuperscript{673}, is a cultic term. Thus some suggest that here it was part of the לָהֶל sacrifice which was subsequently distributed to the

\textsuperscript{671} Halpern 2001: 333.
\textsuperscript{672} Koehler 1948: 397-398; 1956: 15.
\textsuperscript{673} Exod. 29.2, 23; Lev. 2.4; 7.12 (twice), 13; 8.26 (twice); 24.5 (twice); Num 6.15, 19; 15.20.
people. The noun נַחַם occurs sixty-eight times in the Bible, most frequently in Chronicles (21 times), and means 'a round district, loaf or weight, i.e., talent'. The particular meaning 'a round of bread' occurs seven times, always as נַחַם לָהָי, in Exod. 29.23; Judg. 8.5; 1 Sam. 2.36; 10.3; Jer. 37.21; Prov. 6.26; 1 Chron. 16.3. It is uncertain whether the term refers to a portion ('some, piece, crust') or whole loaf of bread. Finally, the substitution of נַחַם for נַחַמ may have been made in Chronicles, but the modification is neither an indication nor a result of chronological changes in biblical Hebrew.674 Second, the numerical adjective 'one' appears (1) three times in the MT, Targum, Peshitta and Jacob versions of Samuel, and in the Targum and Peshitta texts of Chronicles; (2) twice in the OL and Vulgate texts of Samuel; (3) once in LXXAB Chronicles; and (4) is unattested in the LXXABL, Aquila and Symmachus texts of Samuel, in the MT, LXXL, OL and Vulgate texts of Chronicles, and in Josephus. A detailed analysis of נַחַמ and its representation in the versions verifies three points:

- The adjective is the cardinal 'one' rather than the indefinite 'a, a certain' in MT 2 Sam. 6.19.

- Greek Samuel consistently represents the adjective in the Vorlage so that it was probably not deleted from LXX 2 Sam. 6.19.

- The adjective occurs thirty-eight times in Chronicles and is absent in synoptic passages only here and in the description of the accessories for Solomon's temple (1 Kgs. 7.15, 17, 18, 38 // 2 Chron. 3.15, 16; 4.6).

The Chronicler did not remove the threefold enumeration in order to simplify the text or to eliminate extraneous information.675 Finally, Fokkelman points out the threefold occurrences of נַחַמ, the addressee676, and the enumeration of the distribution in 2 Sam. 6.19: 'the diversity of food is mirrored in a threefold enumeration which gives the

---

674 See appendix 3.
676 In his opinion, יְחַמ defines יְחַמ. Rather, the addressee is fourfold in MT 2 Sam. 6.19.
numeral "one" a multiplicative significance in fact.\textsuperscript{677} This may overstate the significance of the threefold occurrence of את in MT 2 Sam. 6.19, which may simply be a stylistic addition.

The theme of food is ubiquitous in the Bible since food is essential for human existence. The ancient diet was broadly vegetarian. The ordinary food consisted of bread, olives and olive oil; milk, yoghurt, curds and cheese from flocks; and fruits, vegetables, legumes, nuts and herbs from wild and cultivated orchards and gardens. Meat was eaten only on rare occasions. Wine was the principal drink. Thus, the production of bread occupied a large part of the daily routine, and was produced according to a variety of preparations and forms. The principal grains were barley and wheat, mostly linked respectively to the poor and rich. The Bible contains more than a dozen nouns for 'disc/wafer' or 'cake/loaf' of 'bread/pastry' (including בְּדָל) and four nouns describing wafers or cakes made with various types of fruit (including שֶׂמֶש and רְכִס).\textsuperscript{678} David's distribution did not consist of the standard daily fare, and food is often symbolic, as many recognise. What is the significance of David's distribution?

- General: (a) Expression of benevolence, generosity, hospitality, munificence, etc. (b) Expression of gratitude, thanksgiving, etc. (c) Demonstration of extravagance, pomp, etc.

- Political: Appeasement, foundation for good relations, alleviation of people's consternation, cause people to be well-disposed towards cultic innovation, etc.

- Religious: (a) Indication of divine presence, provision, fertility, etc.; (b) Enactment of divine-human communion, fellowship, reconciliation (cf. the דָּבָד sacrifices). (c) Correlation of David with Melchizedek, the priest-king (cf. bread and wine in Gen. 14.18).

- Political-religious: Consecration or dedication of Jerusalem, related to the accession, entrance, coronation or enthronement of Yahweh, the divine warrior-king (cf. Ps. 68.19; 132.15; Canaanite [Baal] and Mesopotamian [Enuma Elish, Gudea Cylinder, Assurnasirpal, Shalmaneser] parallels).

\textsuperscript{677} Fokkelman 1990: 197-198.
\textsuperscript{678} The large quantity of related terminology does not require discussion here.
This writer cannot corroborate any of these reasons, but the fourth one is most implausible. From a literary perspective, David's פָּנָה-activity may link 2 Samuel 6 with other stories in Samuel related to the distribution of spoil and gifts. These are: (1) Saul's rash vow and Jonathan's reprimand that the Israelites should enjoy the spoil of war against the Philistines (1 Sam. 14.24-46). (2) Saul's illicit acquirement of the spoil of war against the Amalekites (1 Sam. 15.1-34). (3) David's gift (vv. 11-12) to the Egyptian and his lavish distribution (vv. 26-31) of the spoil of war against the Amalekites (1 Sam. 30.1-31). With reference to Chronicles, the verb 'is to be highly typical of C's presentation of David's reign: David is the one who apportions not only supplies to his people as here but also rosters of duties to the priests and Levites (1 Chr 23:6').

5.1.3.9 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2

The versions differ only on הָעַלְפָּה, which is present in Samuel but not in Chronicles (except for the Peshitta of the latter). The evidence suggests that the epithet is a plus in Samuel in both 2 Sam. 6.2 (1 Chron. 13.6) and here (cf. 3.1.6.2). The phrase שְׂפָה עַלְפָּה לָכֶם occurs only four times, and several point out that it is carefully woven into the structure of 2 Samuel 6, appearing at the start (v. 2) and finish (v. 18) of the ark's movements.

The deity's 'blessing' (ברך, רֵעַ) upon his 'people' (ם) is uncommon and a person(s) blesses Yahweh's people even less frequently.

---

681 The only other occurrences are 1 Sam. 17.45 and Isa. 18.7. However, the three terms are closely associated elsewhere, e.g., 2 Sam. 7.26 // 1 Chron. 17.24.
682 Num. 22.12; Deut. 26.15; 27.12; Josh. 17.14; Ps. 3.9; 29.11; 2 Chron. 31.10.
Lev. 9.22-23. Moses and Aaron bless the people. Observe that the rare phrase והשלמה in Lev. 9.22 occurs elsewhere in 1 Sam. 13.9 (see 5.1.3.5) and 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2.

Josh. 8.33. The 'levitical priests' bless the people. This material falls in an MT plus.

2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2. David blesses the people.

2 Chron. 30.27. The 'levitical priests' bless the people.

2 Chron. 31.8. Hezekiah and his officials bless the people.

In addition, 'to bless in Yahweh's name' is a right explicitly given to the priestly class in Num. 6.22-27 and Deut. 10.8; 21.5, and this privilege is exercised elsewhere only by Aaron (1 Chron. 23.13) and David (2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2). Some observe that Melchizedek blesses Abram (Gen. 14.19), Moses blesses the Israelites (Exod. 39.43; Lev. 9.23 [with Aaron]), and Eli blesses Elkanah and Hannah (1 Sam. 2.20), and these also assert that the only other king to mediate divine blessing is Solomon (1 Kgs. 8.14 // 2 Chron. 6.3), but Chronicles grants this privilege to Hezekiah too (2 Chron. 31.8).683 The foregoing comments permit two conclusions. First, David's blessing of the people in Yahweh's name is 'Priestly from a canonical perspective. Of course, scholars dispute whether the legislation in 'P' is antecedent or subsequent to the composition of the Davidic (and Solomonic) narratives. Second, Chronicles does not attenuate David's sacerdotal activity here, so that assertions that this was done elsewhere in the ark story should be met with suspicion.

683 The assertion that the Chronicler tendentiously omitted the second reference to Solomon's blessing (1 Kgs. 8.55) is equally questionable.
This material is uniform throughout the versions except for slight inner-versional differences in the Aramaic and Syriac texts and in Josephus.684

Murtonen believes מִלְכָּה should be rendered 'greet' in 2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43685, and both Alter and McCarter concur.686 It was common, and still is in some societies, to greet and bid farewell with a blessing. However, the translation 'greet' fails to do justice to מִלְכָּה's significance in this passage. Furthermore, the lexica give only a very few passages where 'greet' is appropriate687, and none includes 2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43.

The theme of blessing, discussed already at several points, is significant in Samuel688 and fundamental to the story of David's transfer of the ark.689 מִלְכָּה and מִלְכָּה together form a concentric structure in 2 Sam. 6.11-20 // 1 Chron. 13.14; 15.25-28; 16.1-3, 43.690 Yahweh blesses מִלְכָּה Obed-edom and then David responds to Yahweh's blessing מִלְכָּה by going מִלְכָּה to retrieve the ark (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14; 2 Sam. 6.12). Yahweh's blessing inspires the second attempt to transfer the object and may be interpreted as a 'disguised' blessing upon David and the success of his enterprise. See 5.1.1. Upon the successful completion of this mission, David blesses מִלְכָּה the people of Israel (2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2) and then goes מִלְכָּה to bless מִלְכָּה his own household

\[
\begin{align*}
684 & \text{ See 5.1.2.4 and appendix 3 on MT Samuel's מִלְכָּה and MT Chronicles מִלְכָּה.} \\
685 & \text{ Murtonen 1959: 167.} \\
686 & \text{ Alter 1981: 124; McCarter 1984: 186.} \\
687 & \text{ Gen. 47.7; 1 Sam. 13.10; 1 Sam. 25.14; 2 Sam. 8.10 // 1 Chron. 18.10; 2 Kgs. 4.29; 10.15; Prov. 27.14.} \\
688 & \text{ Carlson 1964 interprets the figure of David according to the rubrics 'David under the blessing' (2 Samuel 2-7) and 'David under the curse' (2 Samuel 9-24), and irrespective of one's take on his thesis, he does acceptably highlight the significance of מִלְכָּה and מִלְכָּה in the book of Samuel.} \\
689 & \text{ Murray 1998: 139 n. 88; 146 n. 103 discusses the motif of dismissal/dispersal homeward as an episode or narrative close-out in the Bible. Dillard 1987: 58 calls attention to the parallel between David and Solomon (1 Kgs. 8.66 // 2 Chron. 7.10), each of whom dismisses a 'national' assembly.} \\
\end{align*}
\]
(2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43).\(^{691}\) David's blessing of 'the people' in 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 upon the second mission's success complements the participation of 'the people' in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6 in the aborted first mission. Similarly, David's departure to bless his own household in 2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43 continues (but does not yet conclude) the string of references to נָעַם in 2 Sam. 6.3-5, 10-12, 15, 19 // 1 Chron. 13.7, [8], 13-14; 15.25, [28], 43.\(^{692}\)

The theme of 'blessing' is closely related to the Michal material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29; 2 Sam. 6.20b-23; and to the covenant between Yahweh and David in 2 Samuel 7 // 1 Chronicles 17. Some suggest that David's (attempted) blessing on his house is 'undone' by Michal's reproach.\(^{693}\) Rather, the blessing on David to the exclusion of Saul is realised precisely through Michal's childlessness (2 Sam. 6.23) and Yahweh's promise to David in the following chapter.\(^{694}\) In 2 Samuel 6-7 נָעַם and נָעַם occur 6 and 27 times, respectively, and in 1 Chronicles 13, 15-17 they occur 7 and 23 times, respectively. David's success culminates in blessing for each Israelite home—except for Saul's—and this end has an important anticipatory role in both narratives, paving the way for 2 Samuel 7 // 1 Chronicles 17.

5.2 Summary of Chapter Five

Scholars assign cultic relevance to many facets of the ark story: the ark and its epithet; the status of Abinadab, his sons Uzzah and Ahio, and Obed-edom, and the nature of their בָּשׁוּר; the status of the nameless transporters in the second attempt; the mood

\(^{691}\) Selman 1994: 166 discerns a chiastic arrangement in the structure of 1 Chronicles 16: a = 16.1-3 (God's blessing for every Israelite); b = 16.4-7 (Levites appointed for worship at Jerusalem); c = 16.8-36 (psalm of praise); b₁ = 16.37-42 (Levites and priests appointed for worship at Gibeon); a₁ = 16.43 (blessing for David's household). Also see Japhet 1993: 312-313.

\(^{692}\) See 3.1.3.4 and Gelander 1991: 47; cf. 47-50.


\(^{694}\) See 5.1.1.2 and the comments on the ark's home in 5.1.2.3.
(rejoicing), sounds (voices, instruments) and movements (dance) in each attempt; the threshing floor; Michal at the window; the sacrifices; the tent; David's 'self-revelation', clothing (ephod), blessing and distribution of foodstuff; and the significance of the new cart pulled by oxen and Uzzah's extending his hand to the ark, each of which has been interpreted as an instance of cultic error.

A significant challenge in reading this material is keeping in mind well-known features of biblical and ancient near eastern religion without forcing them into the stories of David's transfer of the ark in Samuel and Chronicles. Scholars use 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles, 13, 15–16 as both a source and illustration of the theme 'royal priesthood' or 'sacral kingship'. The story in Samuel and Chronicles certainly depicts David as a king-priest. However, scholars disagree appreciably in their explanation of this image as one which is either 'completely holy' or 'wholly scandalous'. These divergent interpretations are a result of the degree to which scholars interpret particular features in the story in view of descriptions and prescriptions in 'P'. Nonetheless, beyond the fact that canonically earlier legal material may not precede chronologically the stories of David's transfer of the ark in their original or partially revised forms, is the fact that many features of David's story stand at a distance from the 'Priestly' material. This is especially true for the book of Samuel.695 Consequently, one must resist the uncritical acceptance of two common reading strategies for 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16: (1) reading the differences in 2 Sam. 6.11-20 versus 2 Sam. 6.1-10 in light of 'P' and (2) reading the differences in 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 vis-à-vis 2 Samuel 6 in light of 'P'.

695 The origin and development of the Israelite priesthood, as well as the relationship between priests and Levites, constitute one of the major problems of biblical scholarship. Samuel in particular is quite anomalous within the continuum of biblical 'historical' literature. The book stands at a considerable distance from 'P'. In addition to the obscure identification and function of 'ephod' in Samuel, one can also mention as examples the presence of Levites in 1 Sam. 6.15 and 2 Sam. 15.24 only; the depiction of Aaron more as a deliverer than a priest in 1 Sam. 12.6, 8; and the assertions that David's sons (MT 2 Sam. 8.18) and Ira the Jairite (2 Sam. 20.26) are priests.
The balance of this chapter deals with the attendant circumstances of the ark's transfer (5.1.3). This focus is not surprising since textual and interpretative difficulties abound in 2 Sam. 6.12-20a // 1 Chron. 15.25-16.3, 43. The focus on David as king-priest in this story influenced the transmitters such that their changing religious sensibilities led to developments in the transmission of the textual traditions. The following points summarise the significant textual and literary issues discussed in this chapter. First, the only lengthy plus or minus in this material is the נַעֲרֹת clause in 2 Sam. 6.12. It is equally if not more likely that Samuel encourages (by supplementation) a cautious or fearful David than that Chronicles eliminates (by deletion) an opportunistic one. See 5.1.1.3. Second, it is suggested that מַעֲרֹת in 1 Chron. 13.14 (// 2 Sam. 6.11) and מַעֲרֹת בְּבָחוֹר in 1 Chron. 15.27 (// 2 Sam. 6.14) are interpolations in Chronicles from Samuel. See 5.1.1.1, 5.1.3.7. In addition, an original שַׂעֲרֹת in 2 Sam. 6.18 may have been altered to שָׂעֲרֹת, followed by the updating from plural to singular in 1 Chron. 16.2 as well. See 3.1.3.5. Third, the following connections in terminology are additional to the links between the David and Saul stories which are mentioned in the following point. 1 Sam. 4.5 and 2 Sam. 6.15 share והה at the point of entrance of the ark into Israel's camp and capital, respectively. See 5.1.3.2. 1 Sam. 5.2, 3, 11 and 2 Sam. 6.17 share the verb כָּלַע and the noun מָעֻשָּׁה. See 5.1.2.3. Yahweh's retribution against the Philistines and his subsequent vengeance in 2 Sam. 5.20, 24 are analogous to Yahweh's retribution against Uzzah and David's responsive vengeance in 2 Sam. 6.8, 13. See 5.1.3.3. 1 Chron. 15.26 and Num. 23.1, 29 share the sevenfold sacrifice of מַעֲרֹת and נְאֵר. See 5.1.3.4. 1 Chron. 15.28; 16.1 and Num 10.10 share שַׂעֲרֹת, נְאֵר and מָעֻשָּׁה, and כַּלַע (נְאֵר) and מַעֲרֹת. See 5.1.3.2, 5.1.3.5. Fourth, the theme apology of Davidic kingship. The following terminology in 2 Sam. 6.11-20a relates to David's pre-eminence as king: נָר in 6.11, 12, 20 (5.1.1.2, 5.1.1.3, 5.1.3.10); אָפָתָה בְּבָחוֹר in 6.12 (5.1.1.3); נָר in 6.14 (5.1.3.7); and נֶעְרֹת in 6.17, 18 (5.1.3.5); נִפְרָד in 2 Sam. 6.19 (5.1.3.8); and perhaps
Fifth, the theme apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character. David's kingly ability and religious sensibility are implicit throughout the story. He successfully returned the ark with celebration and reverence. David was not an opportunist. Rather, he responded to Yahweh's favourable blessing, guiding the removal of the ark as king-priest and bringing blessing to his people. Sixth, the theme influence of cultic practice. It is shown at many points in 5.1.3 that Samuel rather than Chronicles probably contains the revised form of the story and that in some instances both may have undergone revision from a 'more neutral' original. Scholars tend to assume that editors updated Chronicles according to a corporate-levitical thrust, but this chapter has shown that they may equally or more probably have revised Samuel with an interest in David's royal-sacral status.
CHAPTER SIX
Analysis of 2 Samuel 6.16, 20b-23 and 1 Chronicles 15.29

6.0 Introduction

Previous chapters analyse textual and literary details in 2 Sam. 6.1-15, 17a-20a // 1 Chron. 13.5-14; 15.25-28; 16.1-3, 43 which relate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Exposition of the main plot</th>
<th>2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8 (+ 13.1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The inciting incident, initiating the conflict or complication</td>
<td>2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rising action</td>
<td>2 Sam. 6.8-15 // 1 Chron. 13.11-14; 15.25-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The climax or turning point</td>
<td>2 Sam. 6.17a // 1 Chron. 16.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resolution or denouement or falling action</td>
<td>2 Sam. 6.17b-20a // 1 Chron. 16.1b-3, 43 (+ 16.4-42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The successful transfer of the ark to David's city is narrated in 2 Sam. 6.12-17 // 1 Chron. 15.25-16.1, first by a proleptic portrayal of the event (6.12 // 15.25; שבלמה/ירש), followed by a vivid depiction of the ascent up the south-eastern hill of Jerusalem toward the city (6.15 // 15.28;cljs), and finally by the arrival of the ark into the city and its deposit 'in its place) inside the tent' (6.17 // 16.1; יכזא/ינר; וירש). Immediately prior to this climax, the narrator unexpectedly introduces 'Michal, the daughter of Saul', who observes from 'the window' David's celebratory behaviour 'before Yahweh', and she loathes him extremely (6.16 // 15.29). The storyteller situates the Michal incident at its chronological point in the narrative, in the interval between the ark's ascent (שבלמה) and its explicit introduction (רברת) and placement (רברת) in its abode, and for this reason MT has the qotel form of אבר in 6.16 // 15.29. In contrast, the storyteller's brief comment relates neither Michal's affiliation to David, nor the location of 'the window', nor the reason for her disdain. Does silence in these matters presuppose earlier canonical accounts regarding
Michal or did it suggest their addition? Does previous information concerning Saul sufficiently prepare for his daughter's reaction to King David? If so, are the depiction of Saul's death in 1 Samuel 31 // 1 Chronicles 10 and the brief statement in 2 Sam. 5.2 // 1 Chron. 11.2 adequate for making sense of Michal's disgust?

The unexpected introduction of an additional character in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 launches a secondary or subsidiary or sub-plot in the story of David's transfer of the ark insofar as the brief exposition and inciting incident in 2 Sam. 6.16 is developed, consummated and resolved in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23. In and of itself, 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 is a terse and tantalising remark which neither hinders nor subverts the main plot of the story. Furthermore, the 'conflict' in 2 Sam. 6.16 between King David and Michal, the daughter of Saul the former king, is carefully integrated into 2 Sam. 6.1-5, 11-15, 17-20a, and more so in 20b-23, by means of linkages with material in 1 Samuel which function as an apology for Davidic rather than Saulide kingship.

Following 2 Sam. 6.16 most pay limited attention to vv. 17-20a in their haste to get on with Michal's story in vv. 20b-23. Alter remarks that we might expect the story to precede directly from v. 16 to v. 20b:

Instead of preceding directly to the confrontation between Michal and David, as we might expect, the narrative lingers for a long moment over David's cultic ministrations and royal benefactions to the people. One can imagine that Michal continues to watch from the window at David, performing his role as the people's darling, and that she continues to simmer.698

696 1 Sam. 14.49; 18.20-28; 19.11-17; 25.44; 2 Sam. 3.13-14.
697 1 Samuel 9-31; 2 Samuel 1–4 and 5.2; 1 Chronicles 10 and 5.10; 8.33; 9.39; 11.2; 12.1-2, 19, 23, 29; 13.3.
698 Alter 1999: 228.
On the other hand, following the entrance of the ark, the return of the people to their homes, and David's return to his residence, why was not v. 16 introduced at this point as an antecedent circumstance?699

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>They brought (יאֹבֶד) in the ark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>All the people went (יָלַד) to their houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>David returned (ירָבָר) to bless his house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Now Saul's daughter Michal was looking through the window when Yahweh's ark entered (cf. יָרֵא in 6.17) David's city and she saw King David ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b</td>
<td>So David came (ירַכִּים) to his house and Michal Saul's daughter exited (ירֵשּׁה) to meet David and said (יָרֵכִים) ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the distribution of the Michal material related to logical progression, narrative strategy or literary history? The arrangement of the material raises the possibility that subsequent editors affixed the 'outcome' in vv. 20b-23 to 2 Sam. 6.1-20a since v. 16 was already securely fixed within the literary tradition.

6.1 Analysis

6.1.1 Textual Analysis

6.1.1.1 The Narrator's Report of Michal's Response to David

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1.1</td>
<td>2 Sam. 6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Chron. 15.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samuel and Chronicles share 'the city of David' and the following 'Michal the daughter of Saul'. These phrases set apart (literally) the two dynasties. Chronicles has two pluses vis-à-vis (MT) Samuel: רָבָר and וי. Regarding the first plus, an original 'the ark' (LXX\textsuperscript{BMN} Samuel) is expanded to 'the ark of Yahweh' (MT and LXX\textsuperscript{AL} Samuel) and to 'the ark of the covenant of Yahweh' (MT and LXX\textsuperscript{ABL} Chronicles, 4QS\textsuperscript{Sam})\textsuperscript{700},\textsuperscript{701}

\textsuperscript{699} See Niccacci 1990: §39-40, pp. 62-63. For example, in the earlier ark story, the ark is captured in 1 Sam. 4.11, and after the messenger's report, the deaths of Eli and his daughter-in-law, and the birth of Ichabod, 1 Sam. 5.1 says: 'Now when the Philistines had captured (יָשִׁב בָּא לָו) the ark of God, they brought it from Ebenezer to Ashdod'.

\textsuperscript{700} Herbert 1997b: 127 has רָבָר in one suggested reconstruction of 4QS\textsuperscript{Sam}.

\textsuperscript{701}
Regarding the second plus, Chronicles' preposition יָא or a variant (e.g., יָה) is reflected in all witnesses to Chronicles and Samuel except for MT Samuel. Commentators offer contradictory appraisals of the discrepancy, but Jackson and Stoebe are certainly wrong to consider the 'addition' of the preposition in Chronicles a feature of 'later' or 'younger' speech. Nyssse believes the agreement between Chronicles and non-MT Samuel points to a period of common history.

Samuel and Chronicles disagree on the introductory verb. Most think היה was originally in Samuel, and Chronicles either (1) adopted this reading from its yet uncorrupted Samuel Vorlage having היה or (2) corrected its already corrupt Samuel Vorlage having היה. Some think היה was the original reading in Samuel, and Chronicles altered the form to היה, either to (1) 'correct' the grammar or (2) minimise the rhetoric of the passage (see below). On one hand, היה in 4QSama and MT 1 Chron. 15.29, and καὶ ἔγραψεν ἐν in the Greek versions of both books, suggest that היה is unoriginal in Samuel. Nevertheless, scholars holding this view attribute to the Chronicler either a keen sense of 'classical' Hebrew or interpretative insight (!). On the other hand, the same evidence suggests that היה once stood in MT 2 Sam. 6.16. Indeed, this is more probable than positing sweeping adjustments in all versions except MT Samuel. The form היה is unoriginal to this passage and at the same time it is not the product of historical developments in Hebrew grammar. However, the form is pragmatically effective in MT

---

702 MT observes, however, that many (more than twenty) medieval Hebrew manuscripts lack the preposition יָא. See De Rossi 1784: IV, 180.
703 Fincke 2001: 156, and Herbert 1997b: 127 in one reconstruction, read יָא in 4QSama.
706 Some suggest emending היה to a word other than היה: אֲבָא (infinitive absolute of היה).
707 See appendix 3. Furthermore, היה does not support the view that the whole of 2 Sam. 6.16 is a secondary insertion into the story of the ark. This is suggested in Rost 1982: 13 and by others who believe the verse begins the so-called 'Succession Narrative' or 'Court History'.
2 Sam. 6.16 because it rhetorically introduces a parenthetical scene (in the midst of vv. 11-15, 17-20a) which *stresses* the antipathy of Saul's daughter Michal toward David and *foreshadows* the development of this theme in Samuel's supplement in vv. 20b-23.°8

Finally, it is unnecessary in this context to comment further on the form אָב or its use following parad. רְהַרְחָא, except to remark that the construction could represent (1) an introductory or preparatory formula ('and it happened') followed by an independent qatal or qotel form of אָב or (2) a copulative or predicative verb which in combination with a subsequent qotel form constitutes a periphrastic construction. MT's רְהַרְחָא followed by the qotel of אָב favours the first option.

6.1.1.1.2 2 Sam. 6.16  
1 Chron. 15.29

The Hebrew, Aramaic and Latin versions have 'Michal' or 'Michol' whereas the Greek and Syriac versions have 'Melchol'.°9 Did the form without the first 'L' arise accidentally or is 'Michal' an intentional adjustment?°10 'Michal' (מיכל) is the abbreviated form of 'Michael' (铩א), 'Who is like El?', yet Yahweh appears 21 times in 2 Samuel 6 and 41 times in 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. The (repetitious) identification of Michal as בָּשָׂר (Saul's daughter)°11 rather than just 'Michal' or 'David's wife' or even 'Palti's wife', is significant because the patronymic strategically identifies her as a Saulide

°8 Most commentators considering רְהַרְחָא the original reading in Samuel seek to determine the narrative function of the verb form. Conversely, de Boer 1974 thinks the verse is secondary and unnecessary to vv. 20b-23 but he also thinks the form רְהַרְחָא was deliberately chosen by the reviser in accordance with a particular discourse function. Practitioners of text- or discourse linguistics have elucidated the function of many past-{w}qatal forms in the Bible, e.g., Fokkelman 1991; Isaksson 1998; Longacre 1994; throughout Eskhult 1990; also Kim 1998.

°9 Allen 1974: I, 136, 192 and Englert 1949: 58 discuss Greek Chronicles and Syriac Samuel, respectively. The Greek manuscripts have many variant spellings.

°10 Does the revision of the original μερόθ to μελχολ rather than to the conventional μελχολ in LXX° 2 Sam. 21.8 indicate a Vorlage other than the form מיכל where μελχολ appears in Greek Samuel?

°11 Fincke 2001: 156 does not include מיכל in his reconstruction of 4QSama but this is highly improbable (Herbert 1997b: 127).
representative, and she thinks and acts like one too ('like father, like daughter'). Michal is just 'Michal' in 1 Sam. 19.12-17, after being introduced as David's wife, and in 2 Sam. 6.21 (see 6.1.1.3.1), but elsewhere in Samuel she is:

1 Sam. 14.49: one of Saul's two daughters; Saul's younger daughter
1 Sam. 18.20, 27-28: Saul's daughter (three times); David's wife
1 Sam. 19.11: David's wife
1 Sam. 25.44: Saul's daughter; David's and Palti's wife
2 Sam. 3.13-14: Saul's daughter; David's wife
2 Sam. 6.16 (// 1 Chron. 15.29), 20, 23: Saul's daughter
2 Sam. 21.8: Saul's daughter

Many remark on the abusive use made of Michal in Samuel and some correctly emphasise the polemic of Michal's epithet.712 As the ark and David arrive, Michal is portrayed as peering through 'the window' (of the royal residence?713, cf. 2 Sam. 5.11; 7.1-2) at the arriving procession. Several strands of evidence are brought to bear on the interpretation of Michal's position in the window, including archaeological evidence for windows, and window scenes in iconography and non-biblical literature in which a woman in a window may be a cultic motif.714 Turning to biblical literature: (1) In the immediate context this scene is an interruption in the flow of the narrative, which depicts Michal as a distant non-participant in the events. Why isn't Michal present when many other men and women are? (2) In the book of Samuel a window scene occurs elsewhere only in 1 Sam. 19.12, where (ironically) Michal lets David down through a window so that he can escape from her father Saul. (3) Moving beyond the book of Samuel, the noun יְלָדָה is relatively uncommon (31 times, including twelve in Ezekiel), and rarely is a person portrayed as peering or acting through a window (יְלָדָה אֲשֶׁר): Gen. 26.8; Josh. 2.15 (cf. 18, 21); Judg. 5.28; 1 Sam. 19.12; 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29; 2 Kgs. 9.30 (cf. 32). In all these passages, except for Gen. 26.8, the person at the window is a woman, and sexual

713 In contrast to most private houses ancient palaces had windows (Aharoni 1982: 216-217; Fritz 1995: 134).
714 See the commentaries and Bietenhard 1999: 3-7 who cites the most recent literature.
potential and menacing circumstances are present (as also in Prov. 7.6 and Cant. 2.9).\(^{715}\) However, it is unclear how Michal should be related to one or more of Rahab, Sisera's mother and Jezebel.

6.1.1.1.3 2 Sam. 6.16  
1 Chron. 15.29

All witnesses have 'King David' except Targum Chronicles which has מלכה alone. The distribution (here and in 2 Sam. 6.12, 20) and usage of this phrase are discussed in 5.1.1.3. Michal sees 'King David' dancing and soon she will address him directly as 'the King of Israel'. Commentators correctly assert that the words highlight David's kingly status, not to emphasise his non-kingly behaviour, but to underline Michal's (and her father Saul's) distance from the king, with respect both to personal disposition and to monarchical rank. The significance of the addition of יהוה לי in Samuel is discussed above in 3.1.4.1 and 5.1.3.5 and 5.1.3.6, below in 6.1.1.3.2 and 6.1.1.3.4, and also in appendix 2. Michal sees King David dancing before Yahweh thus suggesting that the theological adverbial here is synonymous with 'before the ark'.\(^{716}\)

The use ofἑγείρων/παίζων in all witnesses to 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 where the nature of David's activity is apparently not an issue stands out against the difficulty one encounters in trying to determine the character of David's activity and enlighten the diverse terminology used for it in 2 Sam. 6.13-14, 16 // 1 Chron. 15.26-27, 29 and in 2 Sam. 6.20b-21. The textual evidence for the verb lexemes in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 is:

This material is difficult. (1) The versions disagree on the precise nature of David’s activity, which is described by verbs ranging in meaning from generic dance (‘dancing’) to aggressive dance (‘jumping, leaping, shaking, skipping, whirling’) to music (‘playing music’) to celebration (‘making merry, laughing, playing, praising, rejoicing’). (2) The meanings of some verbs in this material are unclear. It is uncertain which verbs should be aligned with each other in a diagrammatic presentation. It is difficult to determine to what
extent a particular verb represents either a legitimate attempt on the part of the editor or translator to represent the meaning of the word in his Vorlage, or alternatively, a change related to (a) an interpretation due to unawareness of the meaning, or (b) an assimilation to a verb form in another verse of the passage, or (c) a desire to polemicise (i.e., safeguard David's character). (3) 4QSama\(^a\) is partly intact for 2 Sam. 6.16 and must differ from MT Samuel based on space considerations.\(^717\) (4) The witnesses to Greek Samuel diverge regarding the quantity and order of verbs, and the affiliation of the Greek lexemes to the lexemes in MT Samuel is uncertain.\(^718\) Scholars give different interpretations to Samuel's הביבס, but mostly concur that the Chronicler altered his Vorlage (a) to more ordinary terms to ease readability or (b) to more subdued terms to tone down David's unseemly behaviour. MT Chronicles' vocabulary is more common than MT Samuel's, but see 6.1.1.3.4 on רמם.\(^719\) This fact together with the earlier appearance of קשת in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 may account for the appearance of קשת in Chronicles instead of Samuel's הביבס (cf. הביבס in 2 Sam. 6.14 but מעבר in 1 Chron. 15.27). However, the occurrence of παλζω prior to the other two verbs in LXX\(^c\) Samuel raises suspicion regarding this seemingly straight-forward explanation. The textual evidence raises even greater doubt regarding the originality of Samuel's הביבס which stands parallel to Chronicles' דרכ. The appearance of ḥρיחומא in LXX 2 Sam. 6.16 and the observation that outside 2 Samuel 6 the verb corresponds to דרכ (1 Chron. 15.29; Qoh. 3.4; Isa. 13.21) suggest that MT Samuel has been revised.\(^720\) The absence of דרכ in MT 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-21 may point to


\(^719\) הביבס occurs twice (Gen. 49.24; 2 Sam. 6.16); רמם occurs twice (2 Sam. 6.14, 16); דרכ occurs nine times in the Latter Prophets and Writings (including 1 Chron. 15.29); and the D forms of קשת occur twenty-four times (including 1 Sam. 18.7; 2 Sam. 2.14; 6.5, 21; 1 Chron. 13.8; 15.29).

\(^720\) Is this also suggested by דרכ and מילא in Targum and Jacob Samuel, respectively? Aramaic קשת and Syriac כ are cognate to Hebrew הביבס.
a systematic suppression of the term in the received version of David's transfer of the ark. See 6.1.1.2.3 and 6.1.1.3.4.

6.1.1.1.4 2 Sam. 6.16  1 Chron. 15.29

The reason for the variation in the genitive pronoun in Greek Samuel (αὐτοῦ, ἐαυτῆς, αὐτῆς) is unclear. Greek Chronicles has ἐν τῇ πνεύμῃ αὐτῆς rather than the expected ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς (cf. LXX Samuel). Most consider 'in her soul' a secondary reading whereas Fincke thinks the translator of Greek Chronicles had ἡσύχασε in his Vorlage.\footnote{Fincke 2001: 156.} Unfortunately, a comprehensive analysis of translation technique for בָּלָב and שָׁמָּא in Greek Chronicles gives mixed results, thus making it impossible to discern the origin of ἐν τῇ πνεύμῃ αὐτῆς.\footnote{The Greek version, including LXX Chronicles, normally uses καρδία for בָּלָב and πνεῦμα for שָׁמָּא, but πνεῦμα is parallel to בָּלָב a number of times in some manuscripts of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms and Proverbs, as well as in 2 Kgs. 6.11 (LXX has καρδία) and on nine occasions in Chronicles for which textual variation is absent: 1 Chron. 12.39 (twice); 15.29; 17.2; 22.7; 2 Chron. 7.11; 9.1; 15.15; 31.21. Additional discussion is unrequired.} Fokkelman suggests that the complement denotes intensity, thus meaning 'Michal despised him deeply'.\footnote{Fokkelman 1990: 196 n. 97.}

The verb רָמַה is pointed as a G 3fs wayyiqtol of רָמָּה. On one hand, Ehrlich indicates that the synonym רָמָּה regularly takes a direct object introduced by בָּלָב but that שָׁמָּא does not, and consequently he suggests that רָמַה in Samuel and Chronicles should be emended to רָמָּה.\footnote{Ehrlich 1910: 287; 1914: 341.} This suggestion is accepted in BH\textsuperscript{III} and BHS, and by Rudolph,\footnote{Rudolph 1955: 119.} but it is rejected by BDB, Görg and Stoebe.\footnote{BDB 512; Görg 1975: 61; Stoebe 1994: 196.} On the other hand, the received versions of Samuel and Chronicles do not make use of רָמָּה, which occurs in 2 Kgs. 19.21 and elsewhere thirteen times in the Latter Prophets and Writings, but שָׁמָּא does appear in 1

\footnote{721 Fincke 2001: 156.}
\footnote{722 The Greek version, including LXX Chronicles, normally uses καρδία for בָּלָב and πνεῦμα for שָׁמָּא, but πνεῦμα is parallel to בָּלָב a number of times in some manuscripts of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms and Proverbs, as well as in 2 Kgs. 6.11 (LXX has καρδία) and on nine occasions in Chronicles for which textual variation is absent: 1 Chron. 12.39 (twice); 15.29; 17.2; 22.7; 2 Chron. 7.11; 9.1; 15.15; 31.21. Additional discussion is unrequired.}
\footnote{723 Fokkelman 1990: 196 n. 97.}
\footnote{724 Ehrlich 1910: 287; 1914: 341.}
\footnote{725 Rudolph 1955: 119.}
\footnote{726 BDB 512; Görg 1975: 61; Stoebe 1994: 196.}
Sam. 2.30; 10.27; 17.42; 2 Sam. 12.9, 10 and 2 Chron. 36.16, and elsewhere twice in the Pentateuch and thirty-two times in the Latter Prophets and Writings. The verbs וְ and וּ are synonymous in meaning, the Greek translators render both with ἐξιθανόντα (among other verbs), and neither Hebrew verb is 'earlier' or 'later', so that neither usage nor translation technique nor the chronology of biblical Hebrew enlightens the textual history.

In biblical Hebrew the prepositions יָּ, ג, and י mark the direct object, the so-called 'prepositional object'. In this passage, the direct object is introduced with י in MT Samuel and Chronicles, and perhaps in 4QSam, with י in the Aramaic and Syriac versions, and as a pronominal object alone in the Greek and Latin versions. An examination of Greek translation technique shows that the absence of a preposition does not suggest a Vorlage without י. The verb וּ introduces its direct object with י except in Prov. 1.7; 23.22, and וה takes an accusative direct object. The introduction of the direct object by י in both 2 Sam. 6.16 and 1 Chron. 15.29 is remarkable since many believe this construction is 'late' and due to Aramaic influence. Williams thinks the usage here is a stylistic variant which he calls the 'lamed of specification'. Ewald comments that the construction may be due to 'an object of some importance'. Indeed, וה + י (and the following הננה too—see above) function to accentuate the intensity of Michal's feelings for David.

---

727 Both mean 'belittle, contemn, deride, despise, disdain, dishonour, loathe, repudiate, scorn, spurn, think lightly of, hold as insignificant, look down on, show despite toward, be contemptible toward, show/hold in regard with contempt'.
728 See appendix 3.
729 The Aramaic verb יְסָנָה when it means 'contemn' is regularly construed with the preposition יָ, rather than the usual י or י.
730 See appendix 3.
731 Williams 1976: §273, p. 49.
732 Ewald 1881: 61.
The verb חיה is one of several in this passage and of many in the Bible which are related to the semantic fields of 'respect, honour, acceptance' (e.g., בָּלָה in 2 Sam. 6.20, 22) and 'contempt, shame, rejection' (e.g., כָּלַל in 2 Sam. 6.22). The subject of חיה may be divine or human, and the object may be divine, human or inanimate (e.g., birthright, oath, wisdom, word). The only other instance of חיה in Chronicles is in 2 Chron. 36.16 where the leading priests and the people mock the messengers of God, despising his words, and scoffing at his prophets. Similarly, David despises Yahweh's word and Yahweh too in 2 Sam. 12.9, 10. Elsewhere in Samuel, Eli and his sons despise Yahweh (1 Sam. 2.30), some worthless fellows despise Saul (1 Sam. 10.27), and Goliath despises David (1 Sam. 17.42). Yahweh condemns to insignificance those who despise what he chooses. Finally, Murray emphasises the rhetoric in חיה:

The rhythmic shortness of the phrase, in marked contrast to the longer clauses preceding it, and its intense assonance give it the pointedness of a dagger, a rhetorical thrust enhanced by its being kept to the end of this long sentence.

6.1.1.2 Michal's Words to David

6.1.1.2.1 2 Sam. 6.20b

As David approaches his house to bless it (2 Sam. 6.20a // 1 Chron. 16.43b) Michal (again 'the daughter of Saul') exits (the royal residence?; cf. 2 Sam. 5.11; 7.1-2) to confront him. The textual evidence is unremarkable. The verbs חָיָה II and חָיָה I occur most often in Samuel (23% of all occurrences) and usually as חָיָה I. Gordon and Murray relate the present instance of חָיָה to the stock scene of welcoming the returning hero or warrior. The verb is used this way in Samuel but this usage does not predominate.

---

733 The deity's word is 'despised' elsewhere only in Num. 15.31; Prov. 13.13.
Other meetings are more frequent, and more pronounced in Samuel, including some in which descendants of Saul or other Benjaminites meet David. These (non-synoptic) passages in 2 Samuel are 6.20 (Michal); 16.1 (Ziba); 19.17, 21 (Shimei); 19.25, 26 (Mephibosheth); and 20.1 (Sheba). Fokkelman remarks on the public location of Michal's defiance saying 'The lines 20a and b have the man and his wife as subject and show how their movements cut across each other, which is not a good sign. David returns “to bless his house” ... But Michal goes outside'.

Michal is not a true member of David's house.

Prior to ἐπιτιμάω some versions have a plus, namely LXXABL (but not LXXN) with καὶ εὐλογήσειν αὐτόν, Josephus with αὐτῷ κατηχέτο (she invoked blessing upon him), and Jacob with μηβר IMS (and she blessed him). The presumed Vorlage of the Greek and Syriac witnesses would be ἐπιτιμάω although Caspari thinks it may be μηβρIMS. The verb ἐπιτιμάω ('bless'-not 'greet'; cf. 5.1.3.10) is significant in this chapter, appearing earlier in vv. 11, 12, 18. Some scholars are indecisive or ambiguous about the originality of the verb phrase; others believe the phrase is secondary, perhaps to intensify the irony of Michal's response; and some think ἐπιτιμάω was either accidentally lost due to homoioarcton (on the basis of -ς in ἐπιτιμάω and ἔτημαι) or intentionally deleted as offensive from the lips of 'impious' or 'hypocritical' Michal. Scholars' discord underscores the absence of any firm basis for determining the status of the phrase.

---

737 1 Sam. 4.1, 2; 17.2, 21, 48, 55; 18.6; 2 Sam. 1.6; 10.9, 10, 17; 18.6. It is interesting, however, that all five instances in synoptic texts in Samuel, Kings and Chronicles do entail the battle usage: 2 Sam. 10.5, 9, 10, 17 // 1 Chron. 19.5, 10, 11, 17, and 2 Kgs. 23.29 // 2 Chron. 35.20.
738 Fokkelman 1990: 198.
739 Caspari 1924: 474.
Michal's initial words to David in the third person using his public title are 'How Israel's king today got honour for himself!'\textsuperscript{740} Observe the contrast again between 'Michal the daughter of Saul' and 'David the king of Israel' and the repetition of 'today' twice in this verse. In view of the content of the following relative clause it is clear the queen is derogatorily mocking the king.\textsuperscript{741} He has acted shamelessly, or so she believes. Alter says:

Until the final meeting between Michal and David, at no point is there any dialogue between them—an avoidance of verbal exchange particularly noticeable in the Bible, where such a large part of the burden of narration is taken up by dialogue. When that exchange finally comes, it is an explosion.\textsuperscript{742}

6.1.1.2.3 2 Sam. 6.20b

This difficult relative clause is addressed in three stages: (1) вוּתָנָר, (2) אֲחָר הַרְקָם, (3) אֲחָר נְלָח...כַּלָּתָה נָלָחָה...אֲחָר נְלָח.

First, regarding the subject of the verb phrase in the subordinated comparative clause (אֲחָר הַרְקָם): That which David does he does like one of the ____? The ordinal number שְׁאֵר/אֵלֵג is unremarkable. The readings for the noun fall into five groups:

- 'Empty, idle, stupid, useless, vain, void, worthless': MT (אֲחָר הַרְקָם), Targum (אֶלְגָּר), Peshitta (אֶלְגָּר), Aquila (רֵעֶל כְּנֵבִית), Symmachus (רֵעֶל אֶלְגָּר). Are the readings in Aquila and Symmachus assimilated or revised?
- 'Dancers': LXX\textsuperscript{ABL} (τῶν δραματικών), OL (saltatoribus).
- 'Worthless dancers': Jacob (אֶלְגָּר). This is a conflation of the above variants.
- 'Buffoons': Vulgate (scurris). The affiliation of the Vulgate is unclear (cf. "?" in BH\textsuperscript{111}).

---

\textsuperscript{740} The particle ב (ironically here) expresses admiration or astonishment (BDB 553; GKC §148b, p. 471). The qatal verb form is reflexive (GKC §51e, pp. 137-138; Driver 1890: 271-272).

\textsuperscript{741} C. L. Miller 1996: 274-275.

\textsuperscript{742} Alter 1981: 123; cf. 1999: 228-229.
Unseemly behaviour in dancing ... dance': Josephus (... ὃς ἀκοσμημένος ὀρχούμενος ... ὑπὸ τῆς ὀρχήσεως ...). Observe that Josephus refers to 'dance' here but that for v. 14 he speaks of David playing a musical instrument.

Most scholars retain MT as original, but Klostermann and Schlögl, followed by Orlinsky and several others, believe MT's קִרְקֵר is a post-LXX corruption which should be emended to וְרַקְרַק following the LXX and OL. Orlinsky makes a case for the originality of וְרַקְרַק based on literary context, Greek translation technique, Hebrew style, Hebrew palaeography, and narrative criticism. Regarding the latter point, Polzin considers MT's וְרַקְרַק 'opaque' and an 'obstacle to understanding' and Murray reinforces Orlinsky's view that וְרַקְרַק makes good sense, thus countering statements such as וְרַקְרַק is 'superior' or 'more forceful' or וְרַקְרַק 'destroys the real point of the comparison' or is 'ziemlich nichtssagend'. Orlinsky argues based on palaeography for the accidental loss of ר, causing וְרַקְרַק to become וְרַקְרַק. However, was the received tradition deliberately altered? The root קִרְקֵר is one of many dozens of biblical terms related to the notions of 'emptiness, idleness, stupidity, uselessness, vanity, worthlessness'. The adverb וְרַקְרַק occurs in 1 Sam. 6.3 and 2 Sam. 1.22 but other related terminology occurs infrequently in Samuel. MT's וְרַקְרַק does not clearly link to any other biblical occurrence of the root קִרְקֵר. However, Fokkelman points out the 'decrease in merit' with each term for people in Michal's list ('Israel ... slaves ... layabouts') and Ackroyd says that by her use of וְרַקְרַק ('empty-headed') Michal 'in fact reveals herself as the one who has no proper

---

743 Klostermann 1887: 154; Orlinsky 1946; Schlögl 1904: II, 37
747 Fokkelman 1990: 380; cf. 199.
748 A. A. Anderson 1989: 98.
749 Carlson 1964: 91.
750 Wellhausen 1871: 169.
751 Fokkelman 1990: 199.
Michal's choice of terminology in MT may say more about her than David. Finally, דซ์ doesn't appear in MT 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-21 may point to a systematic suppression of the term in the received version of David's transfer of the ark. See 6.1.1.3.4.

Second, regarding the adverbial and prepositional adjuncts to the principal verb in the relative clause (היה למן אשהת עזרו): That which David does he does in the eyes of society's lowest members. 'Eyes' and David's retort in v. 22 (also with 'eyes') are discussed below. The nouns אשה (56 times) and אשתה (63 times) refer to a female servant or slave and are the feminine counterparts to עבד. Michal's statement is clear: David's activity took place before or in the presence, or better, precisely in the eyes, of the slave girls of his servants. Why does it matter that these words are placed on the tongue of Michal? A look at the usage of אשה and אשתה in Samuel is enlightening:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>אשה</th>
<th>אשתה</th>
<th>Referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS 1.11 (thrice), 16</td>
<td>IS 1.18</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 25.24 (twice), 25, 28, 31, 41</td>
<td>IS 8.16</td>
<td>הושה in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S 6.20, 22</td>
<td>IS 25.27, 41</td>
<td>Abigail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S 14.15-16</td>
<td>IS 28.21, 22</td>
<td>Medium of Endor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S 20.17</td>
<td>2S 14.6, 7, 12, 15, 17, 19</td>
<td>Wise woman of Tekoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2S 17.17</td>
<td>Girl reporting to Jonathan and Ahimaaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wise woman of Abel Beth-maacah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Sam. 6.20 is the only instance where the female and male counterparts of servant/slave occur together in construct, but the wording of 1 Sam. 25.41 cannot be coincidental:

ותקח והשתה אשה ארצה והאמר בה אשתה אשהת חדרתי לזרחי העב אתי

Polzin capitalises on the clear link between the two passages and the obvious contrast between the two wives. He observes that the noun 'only appears in Samuel–Kings to designate a woman who by word or work furthers the cause of kingship in general and the

---

752 Ackroyd 1977: 70.
753 These occur together in the same verse in 1 Sam. 25.41 and 2 Sam. 14.15 but they are not entirely synonymous.
754 Kleven 1991: 375 and McCarter 1984: 187 provide no evidence to support their view that אשת is a synecdoche which applies to all the young women of Israel, whether slave or free.
glory of David's house in particular. Abigail, David's wife, explicitly describes herself as an אשת, and in so doing she advances David's kingship, but Michal, David's other wife and the daughter of Saul, would have nothing to do with an אשת, and thereby she highlights her unworthiness as a member in the Davidic monarchy. Michal is unlike Hannah (1 Sam. 1.11, 16), Abigail (1 Sam. 25.24-25, 28, 31, 41) and the wise women of Tekoa (2 Sam. 14.15) and Abel Beth-maacah (2 Sam. 20.17).

Third, regarding the relative clause with its main verb and the synonymous verbs in the subordinated comparative clause (אשת נחלת ... כחללת נחלת): What does David do? David's נחל-ing is stated triply using the N perfect 3ms, the N infinitive construct, and (perhaps) the N infinitive absolute. Both the form of the (supposed) infinitive absolute, as well as the occurrence of the same root in infinitive forms used side by side (in either order), are unique phenomena in the Bible. The text of 2 Sam. 6.20 is 'extraordinary.' Consequently many dispute the authenticity and meaning of the morphology and grammar of the statement, but to-date a consensus has not been reached. Some believe נחלת נחלת is erroneous (or at least suspicious), either a dittography which has undergone adjustment or a conflation of two alternative readings. Others believe נחלת נחלת is legitimate, and that the second infinitive emphasises ('rhetorically heightens') the first on the analogy of the construction with the finite verb. The form נחלת is explained either as written with ה for the sake of assonance or as an attraction: the infinitive absolute

756 Elsewhere only in Isa. 56.1 and Ezek. 21.29.
757 Elsewhere only in 1 Sam. 2.27, but as the expected form נחלת.
758 GKC §75y, p. 213.
759 GKC §75y, p. 213; Bauer and Leander 1922: §57i", p. 422; Bergsträsser 1918: II, §30c, p. 161; cf. commentaries.
761 Elsewhere in Isa. 22.13; 42.20; Hos. 10.4; Hab. 3.13. See GKC §75n, p. 210; König 1881: I, 536.
passed into the infinitive construct under the influence of the preceding נ.\textsuperscript{762} Talmon gives this explanation for the morphology and grammar:

Here are variant forms of the Niph'al infinitive [construct] which have been conflated, as was observed by Kimchi: 'Both of them are infinitives [construct] of the Niph'al. One has the full form of strong verbs \(= \text{נִלַּע} \), as in רָאוֹס נִלַּע, while in the other there is the usual omission of the nun of the Niph'al (as in weak verbs) [רָאוֹס].\textsuperscript{763}

Talmon's solution has the advantages of explaining why the Hebrew text (1) fails to use the expected form of the infinitive absolute (cf. 1 Sam. 2.27) and (b) contains such exceptional grammar. נִלַּע is an alternative infinitive construct form of the infinitive construct נִלַּע. He adds that the Greek version harmonised the double reading by turning one of the two infinitives into a finite verb, and that the Targum went still further and translated both of them as finite verbs derived from two different Aramaic roots. Otherwise, the Greek version is unremarkable. Adjustments similar to these are also evident in the Syriac and Latin versions. Finally, the Targum (דְּבֵלָן) and Latin (\textit{et nudatus est quasi si nudetur}) versions and Josephus (\textit{γυμνούμενος}) explicitly characterise David's self-exposure as nudity.

The verb נִלַּע means 'uncover, remove' in the G stem, but the N may be either reflexive ('expose, reveal, uncover oneself') or passive ('be exposed, revealed, uncovered'). By consensus the verbs in this verse are understood as reflexive, although the passive understanding may be workable. In either case, Michal's point is that David 'exposed himself' or 'was exposed' (by his own doing). What does this mean? The consensus is that David exposed his body either in partial or full nudity. Most think David was just scantily clad: he was not completely naked and he did not expose his genitalia. Some, however, think David inadvertently exposed his genitalia or completely disrobed himself. On the contrary, Polzin believes David's dress in an ephod is sufficient to

\textsuperscript{762} Ewald 1855: §240c, p. 607.
\textsuperscript{763} Talmon 1960: 174.
disprove all these claims: he was not scantily clad, therefore he could not expose his genitalia, and he was definitely not naked.\textsuperscript{764} Baldwin and Gunn make the implausible suggestion that הַלִּול here means 'to show off'.\textsuperscript{765}

The verb הָלַל does not by itself designate stripping or (full) nudity, except perhaps in Gen. 9.21 where the HtD form is used, but observe שהי in vv. 22-23. Similarly, הָלַל occurs in other passages with הָלַל (mostly in the D stem) when reference is made to nudity\textsuperscript{766}, and לְבַשׁ occurs with הָלַל in Jer. 13.22. In addition, neither David's use of an אָסַר ב in 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27, which may be a belated feature in the story (see 5.1.3.7), nor Michal's intense reaction, necessarily support the view that David wore insufficient clothing. First, the evidence for the ephod's length is purely circumstantial, and based on the present passage, since in fact 'P' describes the composition of the garment but not its size. Second, as illustrated below, the motive for Michal's reaction is unclear, and many scholars do not believe it was self-exposure by David. Conversely, the references to 'eyes' in vv. 20, 22, and the possible revision of הָלַל to לֶלַל in MT 2 Sam. 6.22, may allude to David's bareness. See 6.1.1.3.5.

Pope discusses genitalia, nudity and sexual activity, including measures to reduce offensive language through expurgation and euphemism.\textsuperscript{767} He does not mention 2 Samuel 6. Well-known passages related to these topics in Genesis–Kings are the story of Adam and Eve (Genesis 2-3), the story of Noah's nakedness (Gen. 9.20-27), and priestly material on illicit sexual practices (Leviticus 18, 20). Some scholars compare David's 'offence' with Saul's 'frenzy' in 1 Sam. 19.24, or with the 'tools' of the young men in 1 Sam. 21.6, or they contrast David's 'offence' with Saul's private 'evacuation' in 1 Sam. 24.4. Finally, some relate this passage to Pentateuchal statements in Exod. 20.26 and

\textsuperscript{765} Baldwin 1988: 210-211; Gunn 1978: 74.
\textsuperscript{766} Exod. 20.26; Lev. 18.6-19; 20.11, 17-21; Isa. 47.3; Ezek. 16.36-37; 22.10; 23.10, 18, 29.
\textsuperscript{767} Pope 1992: 720-725.
38.42-43. However, whereas Bergen, for example, thinks David's dancing could not have exposed his nakedness and so violated the Torah requirement since he was wearing an ephod\textsuperscript{768}, De Vaux, for example, thinks the stipulations regarding breeches (דִּפְנָן) were invented precisely because of David's self-exposure in this passage.\textsuperscript{769}

6.1.1.3 David's Words to Michal

David's reply to Michal in vv. 21-22 exhibits many text-critical difficulties in grammar and vocabulary. \textit{MT} can be rendered:

And David said to Michal,
Before Yahweh, ____ ____
who chose me instead of your father and instead of all his house,
to appoint me ____ leader over the people of Yahweh, over Israel,
and I made merry ____ before Yahweh,
and I will be lightly esteemed still more than this,
and I will be abased in my eyes,
but with the maid-servants about whom you spoke, with them I will be honoured.\textsuperscript{770}

The underlined words are problematic. In this writer's opinion, only the shaded words in the following layout comprise the original form of v. 21, which in the received tradition was expanded and then either corrupted or censored.

\textsuperscript{768} Bergen 1996: 303.
\textsuperscript{769} De Vaux 1953: 159.
\textsuperscript{770} The time-frame of the verbs in vv. 21-22 is difficult. \textit{Verse 20}. דִּפְנָן and הָלָּא, \textit{qatal} forms, and the double occurrence of בָּא, delimit the past-time context and the perfective viewpoint on David's activity. \textit{Verses 21-22}. The cohortative הָלָּא at the end of v. 22 has future reference. Preceding this future-refering verb are three \textit{wqatal} verbs. The middle of the three verbs, הָלָּא, is certainly future-refering due to the adjunct יָדָאָה (‘again/still more than this’). The first and the third of the three verbs, הָלָּא and הָלָּא, could have reference to either past- or future-time. Following הָלָּא, and situated between it and the future referring הָלָּא, הָלָּא should be understood to have reference to future time. This leaves הָלָּא. The verb is generally translated as future in modern English translations (ASV, DRA, ESV, JPS, KJV, NAB, NASB, NIV, NJB, NKJV, RSV, TNK), but the NRSV has ‘that I have danced before the LORD’, and Fokkelman 1990: 380 concurs. The verb הָלָּא in v. 21 makes reference to what David has already done, whereas the verbs in v. 22 refer to what will happen from this point onward. As a final note, some scholars take הָלָּא and what follows in v. 21 as the start of a verb sequence that continues on in v. 22, and some take this first step and then proceed to interpret the verb phrases as conditionals or interrogatives. Both approaches are unwarranted.
• 1A, 1B and 1E (without the conjunction) constitute the original form of v. 21. 'And David said to Michal, "Before Yahweh I danced".

• 2B, 1C and 1D are a pre-LXX expansion in line with the pro-David/anti-Saul polemic. On one hand, 2B may have been lost in the MT due to homoioarcton thus resulting in an anacolouthon. 2B is still attested in the LXX. Following the loss of the verb ידכ in 2B, וְדִכְתָּ in v. 20. On the other hand, the absence of ידכ in MT 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-21 may point to a systematic suppression of the term in the received version of David's transfer of the ark. See 6.1.1.3.4.

• 2E may be an independent LXX expansion derived from the occurrence of the same verb lexeme in 2B. Conversely, the minus of ידכ in the MT may be accidental or intentional. See 6.1.1.3.4.

• 1F is a pre-LXX insertion together with 2B, 1C and 1D which replicates the earlier וְדִכְתָּ thus resuming the original story (Wiederaufnahme).

Text-critical information supporting this reconstruction is addressed below. The solution to this passage is the recognition that the Hebrew story underwent pre-LXX expansion (Veijola, Pisano, etc.) and then post-LXX corruption (Orlinsky, Nysse, etc.) or censorship (see 6.1.1.3.4). In this case, text-criticism explains one aspect of textual development, which is elucidated more fully through stylistic and literary analysis, especially the criticism of the blessing/oath formula and the content of the relative clause introduced by מְנָא.

6.1.1.3.1 2 Sam. 6.21

At this point David replies to Michal. David is simply 'David' and Michal is simply 'Michal', as in 1 Sam. 19.12-17 right after she is introduced as David's wife. See 6.1.1.1.2. Why is the patronymic dropped? Clines says:
The answer can only be that purely literary factors outweigh the significative value of 'XbY', e.g. one may sense that the narrative here gathers pace, which the long form would slow down, or perhaps preferably that attention now focusses on David, who is the subject of the sentence, and that it is therefore beside the point to stress the role that Michal is playing.\footnote{Clines 1991a: 128 (= Clines 1972: 272).}

6.1.1.3.2 2 Sam. 6.21

The clause at hand is closely tied to the final clause of this verse by its use of a lexeme for 'dance' and the adjunct לַּא לֶא. The following layout facilitates the analysis of this material:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Before Yahweh</th>
<th>2 Verb</th>
<th>3 Blessing or Oath</th>
<th>4 Rel. Clause</th>
<th>5 (Conj. + Verb(s))</th>
<th>6 Before Yahweh</th>
<th>7 Conj. + Verb (start v. 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targum</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshitta</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX\textsuperscript{A}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX\textsuperscript{B}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX\textsuperscript{L}</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquila</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmachus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoret</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulgate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus</td>
<td>✓ (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Only 1, 4, 5 and 7 are textual constants.
- What is the significance of the double occurrence of 'before Yahweh'? Is the second instance a resumptive repetition?
- Why do the MT, Targum, Peshitta, Jacob, OL and Vulgate texts have an anacoluthon at the juncture between 1 and 4?
- Was 2 in the aforementioned texts lost or deleted or was it added to the other texts to ease the grammatical construction or for some other reason?
- Was 3 in the aforementioned texts (except in the OL) lost or omitted (together with 2) or was it added to the other texts together with or independent of the addition of 2?
Is 4 a gloss, related to the Wiederaufnahme with לֶאָשֶׁנִי יְהוָּה?

Are 5 and 6 original to the passage?

Do 5 and 6 go grammatically with 1 (and 2) (resumptive?) or with 7?

The anacoluthon between 'before Yahweh' and the relative clause in MT is smoothed in most English translations by the insertion of 'it was' prior to the theological adverbal. Based on some of the Greek witnesses, many argue that 'I danced/I dance/I am dancing/I will dance' should be restored to the MT. There are four principal viewpoints regarding the material in 2B (אַרְכֶּךָ בָּרֵךְ יְהוָּה) in the table at the start of 6.1.1.3. (1) Many restore both a verb phrase (ברך וְאֶלְכֶּךָ; אַרְכֶּךָ וּנְרַכֶּךָ) and a blessing/oath formula (יְהוָּה; יְהוָּה). In their view לֶאָשֶׁנִי יְהוָּה אַרְכֶּךָ בָּרֵךְ יְהוָּה was lost from לֶאָשֶׁנִי יְהוָּה אַרְכֶּךָ בָּרֵךְ יְהוָּה when a scribe's eye jumped from the first to the second instance of יְהוָּה. (2) Many restore a verb phrase but not a blessing/oath formula. (3) Hertzberg alone restores בָּרֵךְ יְהוָּה but not a verb phrase.772 (4) Many do not emend the MT in any way. In their view, the MT was adjusted by the versions in order to relieve the anacoluthic grammar. Some holding this view think the material in the relative clause is a(n early) gloss, as shown by the anacoluthon and the Wiederaufnahme with לֶאָשֶׁנִי יְהוָּה.

The second and third views are arbitrary. The fourth view is discredited by the intolerable inconsistency in logic in the MT. The view that both a verb phrase and a blessing/oath formula should be restored in the MT is argued by (among others) McCarter, Nysse, Orlinsky, Thenius, and Wellhausen.773 See 6.1.1.3.4. The aforementioned scholars correctly conclude on the basis of translation tendency that וַיִּגְדַּל לַיְגֵטְל וְאָכַרְכֶּךָ רָכַפֶּךָ reflects the yiqtol אַרְכֶּךָ rather than a participle.

772 Hertzberg 1964: 277.
The blessing formula εὐλογητὸς κύριος / benedictus Dominus = רברכ יהוה ('blessed be Yahweh') is attested in LXX\textsuperscript{B} and the OL. The oath formula זעיו קύριος = ררי יהוה ('as Yahweh lives') is attested in LXX\textsuperscript{L}. The scholars cited in the paragraph above are correct to conclude that ררי יהוה rather than ררי יהוה should be restored in the MT. The blessing formula is extended by the relative clause which defines Yahweh's favour toward David. The reading in LXX\textsuperscript{L} is likely assimilated to the more common phrase in Samuel, זעיו יהוה.\footnote{The oath formula occurs in 1 Sam. 14.39, 45; 19.6; 20.3, 21; 25.26, 34; 26.10, 16; 28.10; 29.6; 2 Sam. 4.9; 12.5; 14.11; 15.21; 22.47.}

If it is accepted that ררי יהוה rather than ררי יהוה is the original reading and that the phrase was lost or omitted from the MT (see 6.1.1.3.4), then the restoration of the phrase is significant. As observed already, ררי is particularly important in 2 Samuel 6. In addition, the phrase ררי יהוה occurs elsewhere in Samuel only in the stories about Nabal (1 Sam. 25.32, 39) and Absalom (2 Sam. 18.28). Saul, Nabal and Absalom are types of one another, each opposed to David.\footnote{See 2.1 and appendix 5.} They are David's enemies (cf. ררי in 1 Sam. 25.22, 26, 29; 2 Sam. 18.29, 32). The stories in 1 Samuel 25 and 2 Samuel 18 intend to show that David relied on Yahweh (and was restrained by him), not taking matters into his own hands. David's relationships to these characters (enemies) never led to his violence. In each passage the text seems intent to prove David's lack of involvement and consequently his innocence. Saul is absent from both 1 Samuel 25 and 2 Samuel 18, but he is implicated as an enemy of David through the persons of Nabal and Absalom. Furthermore, ררי יהוה is a response to the deaths of both these enemies. In 2 Samuel 6, David's ררי יהוה is his response to Michal, the daughter of Saul, whom he supplanted as leader of Israel. Similarly, Saul's death is implicated in 2 Samuel 6.
The terms נָדְיָה and נִנְדָיָה are significant. The relation of this clause to the story's pro-David/anti-Saul thrust is obvious. Many scholars consider this the only non-source material in the story of David's ark transfer. However, the gloss is attributed to very different hands. For example, it is:

- Pre-Deuteronomistic: Campbell, Campbell and O'Brien, Weinfeld.\(^{776}\)
- From the Deuteronomist: McCarter, Peckham, Veijola.\(^{777}\)
- From the 'Solomonic redactor': Vermeylen.\(^{778}\)
- From the author of the 'History of David's Rise' (HDR): Mettinger.\(^{779}\)

The evidence suggests that these and others correctly discern the 'secondary' or 'late' nature of the material in the relative clause. Textual instability surrounds and falls within this material. Furthermore, the grammatical repetition (deictic marker "ז"), the rough syntax (anacoluthon), and the (lexical) resumptive repetition (Wiederaufnahme), are tell-tale signs of editorial activity. See 2.3.2.4.

First, נָדְיָה. The finite verb following the relative, as well as the expression of the object, are unremarkable as far as texts and grammar are concerned. From literary and theological perspectives, however, נָדְיָה is extremely significant.\(^{780}\) The verb occurs most often in Deuteronomy (31 times), Chronicles (26 times), Samuel (21 times), Isaiah (20 times), Kings (15 times) and Psalms (14 times). God as subject makes a choice for his people, Levites, kings, and Jerusalem. After 2 Sam. 6.21, in biblical narrative, the verb נָדְיָה is used to describe the establishment of a king only in 1 Kgs. 8.16 // 2 Chron. 6.6. In

\(^{776}\) Campbell 1986: 60; Campbell and O'Brien 2000: 289 (earlier than the 'Prophetic Record'); Weinfeld 1972: 335.
\(^{777}\) McCarter 1984: 187; 1994: 265 (Dtr\(^1\)); Peckham 1985: 92 (Dtr\(^2\)); Veijola 1975: 66-68 (Dtr\(^5\)).
\(^{779}\) Mettinger 1976: 45.
\(^{780}\) The notions of election in general and the choice of a king in particular cannot possibly be addressed here.
both cases David is chosen. Elsewhere, Yahweh chooses Saul (1 Sam. 10.24; cf. 12.13⁷⁸¹) and rejects him (1 Sam. 15.23, 26; 16.1), and in his place he chooses David (implied in 1 Sam. 16.11-13; 2 Sam. 6.21) over his brothers (1 Sam. 16.7-10).⁷⁸² Reference is also made to David's election in 1 Kgs. 11.13, 34 and 1 Chron. 28.4.⁷⁸³ Finally, Yahweh chooses Solomon in 1 Chron. 28.5-6, 10; 29.1 (cf. 28.1-20.9).

Second, מָצָאָה וּמָצָא, The text and grammar are unremarkable. מָצָא means 'above, in preference to.'⁷⁸⁴ The house of Saul and its descendants, including Michal, are rejected by Yahweh.

Third, לְמָצָא אֶל פִּי. This phrase merits more discussion than is possible. The verb מָצִיא occurs nearly 500, but only 29 times in Samuel, and then as 'appoint' only for Yahweh's appointment of judges over Israel in 2 Sam. 7.11 and for Yahweh's appointment of David as מְצִיא over Israel in 1 Sam. 13.14 ('over his people'); 25.30 ('over Israel'); and 2 Sam. 6.21 ('over Yahweh's people, over Israel'). Apart from the insignificant minus of τοῦ in LXXB 2 Sam. 6.21, the Greek translation is striking due to the correspondence מָצִיא/καθίστημι. This is the only instance where the two verbs stand parallel to one another. In fact, the expected verb is ἐνθίζω, as in Aquila and Symmachus, where revision toward the received text is likely. Based on the consistent rendering of מָצִיא as ἐνθίζω in Greek Samuel (in 26 of 27 cases elsewhere⁷⁸⁵—including 1 Sam. 13.14 and 25.30), one must concur with McCarter that καταστήσαι

⁷⁸¹ MT 2 Sam. 21.6 is related to the issue at hand but space does not permit a discussion of the textual and literary issues.
⁷⁸² In 2 Sam. 16.18, Hushai ironically says to Absalom that he will remain loyal to the one whom Yahweh and his people have chosen—David!
⁷⁸³ The expression of the direct object is an interesting link between 2 Sam. 6.21 and 1 Chron. 28.4. Only in these verses does the first-person singular pronoun serve as the object of the verb מָצָא.
⁷⁸⁴ BDB 582 (#6a).
⁷⁸⁵ The only other exception is 2 Sam. 7.11 with a form of τάσσω. Greek Samuel has phrase and verse minuses in 1 Sam. 2.29 and 17.20, respectively.
probably reflects וֹתִּי. The verb וֹתִּי is commonly used for 'appointment' in the book of Samuel so that the use of מָנַּה here makes a belatedly significant link with 1 Sam. 13.14 and 25.30.

Another text-critical issue is the double direct object in the MT (דָּבָר וֹתִּי) and the direct object plus prepositional object in Greek Samuel (με εἰς ἡγούμενον). On the bases of εἰς, ל preceding מָנַּה in about thirty Hebrew manuscripts, and 1 Sam. 13.14; 25.30, many emend the MT from מָנַּה to דָּבָר וֹתִּי. The double accusative of object and complement can be legitimately expressed as 'to appoint me leader' or 'to appoint me as/into leader', but the inclusion of the preposition is more common with this verb and also with other verbs in similar constructions. Unfortunately, a comprehensive evaluation of מָנַּה-texts renders it impossible to show on the basis of probability whether ל dropped off מָנַּה in the MT or whether εἰς was introduced into the Greek version.

The noun מָנַּה is significant for theological and literary studies of Davidic and Israelite kingship in the book of Samuel. It also figures heavily in redaction-historical views on the relative clause in 2 Sam. 6.21. The noun occurs 44 times: 21 times in Chronicles; seven times in Samuel; four times in Kings; three times in Daniel; and nine times total in seven other books. מָנַּה is related to the verb מָנַּי ('communicate, proclaim') and the substantive (used as preposition) מָנַּי ('opposite'). The noun's range of meaning is 'chief, leader, prince, ruler, officer, official'. The Greek version generally translates with ἡγούμενος (26 times), followed in frequency by ἀρχων (8-9 times). The word is found both as a royal designation and as a general term for a leader, especially in Chronicles,

---

786 McCarter 1984: 186.
787 E.g.: (1) king: 1 Sam. 8.5; 10.19; (2) judicial figure(s): 1 Sam. 8.1; 2 Sam. 15.4; (3) military leader(s): 1 Sam. 8.12; 18.5, 13; 22.7; 28.2; 2 Sam. 17.25; 18.1; 23.23; (4) servants: 1 Sam. 8.11; 2 Sam. 12.31.
788 In theory, the thought in 2 Sam. 6.21 could have been expressed with a pronoun suffixed to the verb or the verb plus וֹתִּי with a suffixed pronoun, standing for the first object; with or without ל + the infinitive construct of מָנַּי; and with or without ל preceding the second object: מָנַּי (לָדָם) (לָדָם or לָדָם) מָנַּי.
789 1 Sam. 9.16; 10.1; 13.14; 25.30; 2 Sam. 5.2; 6.21; 7.8.
referring to governmental, military and religious leaders. Scholars frequently define וַיְהֵם in Samuel and Kings as the *king-designate or -elect* who is appointed by Yahweh to rule his people Israel. וַיְהֵם is widely but inconclusively discussed, and this is not the place to rehearse the etymology, meanings and potential developments in usage. Briefly, with regard to the latter issue, וַיְהֵם in 2 Sam. 6.21 has been interpreted to reflect either an early independent \(^{790}\) or later dependent \(^{791}\) occurrence of the term. It is clear that וַיְהֵם was used in different traditions and at different times. The immediate concern is the noun's role in the polemic of Samuel. The point of David's statement to Michal is clear: David was designated וַיְהֵם in order to replace Saul the rejected king.

The terms דָּעָה and וַיְהֵם are the cornerstone of Murray's *Divine Prerogative and Royal Pretension*. His thesis is that 2 Sam. 5.17-7.29 underscores the glaring difference of interests between David, who desires to be מלך, the monarchical lord over a subject people ('royal pretension'), and Yahweh, who instead desires a דָּעָה, the exemplary leader of Yahweh's people, chosen by Yahweh and subservient to his will ('divine prerogative').\(^{792}\) Murray's interpretation of דָּעָה, which underpins his thesis, greatly misconstrues the role of דָּעָה in the book of Samuel. Ishida, among others, is right that an interpretation closer to king-designate or -elect makes better sense of the data.\(^{793}\) It is foretold in 1 Sam. 9.16 that Saul will be anointed וַיְהֵם and in 10.1 this is done (נָצֹא + וַיָּסֹפָה) by Samuel, and thereafter Saul is מלך (cf. 10.19, 24; etc.). Interestingly, Samuel says in 15.1, 17 that he had anointed (נָצֹא) Saul as מלך. With respect to David it is said in 13.14 that he will be דָּעָה, and reference is again made to this fact in 25.30. Samuel anoints (נָצֹא) David in 16.3, 12, 13, but no explicit reference is made to his דָּעָה-ship there. It is only after Saul's death (the

\(^{790}\) Campbell 1986: 60-61.


\(^{792}\) In brief see Murray 1998: 245-246 and the critique in 1.2.

\(^{793}\) Ishida 1999: 57-67.
death of the anointed; 2 Sam. 1.21 (וֹמְדֵה) that David can be anointed (נָטַן) as מִלְאךְ, and indeed this occurs in 2 Sam. 2.4 (cf. 2.7; 3.39). Interestingly, Nathan says in 12.7 that David had been anointed (נָטַן) מִלְאךְ, and the referent seems to be 1 Samuel 16 rather than 2 Samuel 2. In any case, after David's anointing in 2 Samuel 2 he is מִלְאךְ, and the three subsequent references to David's מִלְאךְ-ship are expressed in terms of his relationship to Saul and his kingship: David's role as מִלְאךְ is explicitly situated in the literary and historical milieu of Saul in 2 Sam. 5.2 (I/1 Chron. 11.2); 2 Sam. 6.21; and 2 Sam. 7.8 (I/1 Chron. 17.7). מִלְאךְ-ship and מְלַחֵן-ship are not roles which one could hold contemporaneously, since one is a forerunner to the other. These terms apply to different times in the office holder's reign. Thus it is not an issue of one or the other in 2 Samuel 6, between David's 'royal pretension' and Yahweh's 'divine prerogative'. Finally, 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 is a story about the rejection of Saul and his house, and the reference to מִלְאךְ in this material is intended to highlight Yahweh's choice of David over Saul.

Fourth, עַל-מִלְאךְוֹ דָּוִדְוֹ עֲלֶה-ישרָאֵל. The evidence for the final phrase of v. 21 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT, Targum, Peshitta</th>
<th>over</th>
<th>Yahweh's people</th>
<th>over</th>
<th>Israel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulgate</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>Yahweh's people</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, LXX^A, LXX^B, Aquila, Symmachus</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>his people</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX^L, OL</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>all his people</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MT is emended from עַל-מִלְאךְוֹ דָּוִדְוֹ עֲלֶה-ישרָאֵל to עַל-מִלְאךְוֹ דָּוִדְוֹ עֲלֶה-ישראל by, among others, Budde, Dhorme, Jackson, McCarter and Nysse. Jackson suggests that the abbreviation for the divine name was read where only ה, similar in form to ל, originally stood. Another possibility is that an earlier 'his people' was intentionally altered to 'Yahweh's people'. Assuming the originality of מִלְאךְ, who is the intended referent of the pronominal suffix? Does David

---

794 The variation regarding the presence or absence of the second preposition בָּלָּאָר is discussed in Nysse 1984: 273, 277.
796 Also see Tov 1997a: 137, 147-148.
mean that his appointment as over יִרְאָל over was over 'His (Yahweh's) people Israel' or over 'his (Saul's) people Israel'? In fact, the nearest referents are 'your father' and 'his house', each clearly referring to Saul, whereas 'Yahweh' is more distant. This is one of two instances in Samuel where it is possible to give two very different interpretations to a coordinated phrase. The other instance is 2 Sam. 5.12, where the editors were not bothered by the potential attribution of יִרְאָל to David, as they were in the case of Saul.797

6.1.1.3.4 2 Sam. 6.21

The MT, Targum, Peshitta, and Vulgate, each with a single verb, are opposed by LXX ἀποκαλυφθήσομαι, OL, Jacob, and Josephus, which have two.798 Some argue that καὶ ὀρχήσομαι (= ὑδραίον) is added following καὶ παίξομαι on the basis of the earlier occurrence of ὀρχήσομαι (= ὑδραίον). Others believe καὶ ὀρχήσομαι (= ὑδραίον) was lost in the MT as a result of homoioteleuton. The doubly restored verb ὑδραίον in David's reply in v. 21 would be an appropriate response to restored ὑδραίον in Michal's rebuke in v. 20, just as the vocabulary of his response in v. 22 takes account of her vocabulary in v. 20.

The following table summarises the terminology related to 'dance' in the story of David's transfer of the ark.

797 See appendix 2. Elsewhere in Samuel, יִישָרֵאֵל may refer to the people of a particular locale, but the noun generally refers to 'the/these people (of Israel)' or to Yahweh's people phrased as 'my/your/his people'. It is remarkable that the people (of Israel) is David's in 2 Sam. 8.15; MT 2 Sam. 22.44; cf. 1 Sam. 27.12; but never Saul's, except perhaps in 1 Sam. 15.30, where ἐνώπιον πρεσβύτερον Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐνώπιον λαοῦ μου in Greek Samuel stands parallel to יִישָרֵאֵל תַבָּא in the MT. In contrast to 'the elders of Israel' elsewhere in Samuel (1 Sam. 4.3; 8.4; 2 Sam. 3.17; 5.3; 17.4, 15), does 'the elders of my people' seek in some way to narrow the application of the nomen rectum?

798 The material within brackets in the following text was lost in LXXA as a consequence of homoioteleuton: v. 21 καὶ παίζομαι καὶ ὀρχήσομαι [ἐνώπιον κυρίου v. 22 καὶ ἀποκαλυφθήσομαι] ἐτείου ὅτως ...
The textual stability in Chronicles is outdone only by the reference to יהע in this book and the fourfold use of the terminology in Michal's rebuke and David's reply in Greek Samuel. The absence of יהע in MT 2 Sam. 6.16 and 6.20b is suspicious. See 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.1.2.3. Scholars offer conflicting explanations for the absence of יהע in MT 2 Sam. 6.21. See 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.1.3.2. On one hand, the phrases יהע and יהע may have dropped accidentally following יהע and יהע respectively. On the other hand, יהע and יהע may have been deleted, in which case יהע would be unwieldy.

The assertion that in v. 16 the Chronicler substituted יהע for יהע on the basis that the latter was unused in his day is questionable. The verb יהע appears elsewhere only in Gen. 49.24, but יהע is hardly an appropriate replacement. Apart from 1 Chron. 15.29, the verb יהע occurs eight times in the Bible. The usage is neutral in Qoh. 3.4 (where
interestingly 'דך is parallel to רך, but in Job 21.11 רך is an activity of the children of the wicked, and elsewhere the verb is only used for the 'dance' of animals.  

With these points in mind, were רך in v. 13 and רך in vv. 6.16, 20b-21 methodically squelched in the received tradition of 2 Samuel 6? Analogous substitutions may be observable in MT 1 Kgs. 1.40 // LXX 1 Kgs. 1.40 (LXX1 25.40) (Solomon's coronation procession) and in MT 1 Kgs. 20.14 // LXX 1 Kgs. 21.15 (Ahab's struggles with Ben-hadad). Interestingly, observe the role of the prophet in each story. Indeed, Schenker 2003 argues that dancing men were edited out of the MT in these three stories.  

In any case, the history of the biblical text is markedly unsure and unclear in 2 Sam. 6.13, 14, 16 // 1 Chron. 13.9; 15.27, 29 and in 2 Sam. 6.20b-21. This observation in and of itself is significant. We must ask why such a dense haze hovers over David's behaviour? Were ancient editors and scribes somewhat like Michal, bothered perhaps by what David did before Yahweh? The state of the biblical texts may reflect this struggle.  

The theological adverbial ולעב is attested at the start of 2 Sam. 6.21 in all witnesses and at the end of the verse in all witnesses except for Jacob (partially with
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799 Isa. 13.21; Joel 2.5; Nah. 3.2; Ps. 29.6; Ps. 114.4, 6.  
800 Analogous substitutions may be observable in MT 1 Kgs. 1.40 // LXX 1 Kgs. 1.40 (LXX1 25.40) (Solomon's coronation procession) and in MT 1 Kgs. 20.14 // LXX 1 Kgs. 21.15 (Ahab's struggles with Ben-hadad). Interestingly, observe the role of the prophet in each story. Indeed, Schenker 2003 argues that dancing men were edited out of the MT in these three stories.  
801 Berlin 1983: 72-73 links the alternative expressions for what Michal sees in 2 Sam. 6.16 ('leaping and whirling; מַלְכַּת תַּעֲבַרְכַּר) to her exaggerated perspective on David. In other words, מַלְכַּת תַּעֲבַרְכַּר reflects Michal's point of view.  
802 Murray 1998: 64 is mistaken to suppose that both וה חוֹלְךָ and רך in 1 Chron. 15.29 point to their original inclusion in 2 Sam. 6.21 with וה חוֹלְךָ and with restored רך.
(due to haplography), and the Vulgate. It is suggested above that the second לָשׁ+יָהְדִים is a resumptive repetition following the editorial insertion of the long relative clause. Although this repetition plays an editorial role it is noteworthy that this particular adjunct both begins and ends David's rejoinder to Michal's criticism. The distribution of לָשׁ+יָהְדִים in Samuel, the concentration of the phrase in 2 Samuel 6, and the repetition of the phrase in this verse and at its boundaries, are not by chance.\textsuperscript{803} David acts by Yahweh's favour, relies on Yahweh, and acts 'before Yahweh' and not before anybody else—neither the slave girls of David's servants (as Michal says), nor Michal, nor Israel. Indeed, the entire exchange between Michal and David (vv. 20b-22) moves toward the Yahwistic claim at the centre\textsuperscript{804}:

Michal:  
\begin{itemize}
  \item honor
  \item maids
  \item shamelessly
\end{itemize}

David:  
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{before Yahweh}
  \item chose me above ... above
  \item prince over
  \item \textit{before Yahweh}
  \item contemptible
  \item maids
  \item honor
\end{itemize}

Finally, Murray makes לָשׁ+יָהְדִים 'the most salient element' in David's retort:

In such pompous terms David repudiates Michal's right to have any view on his behaviour. For her regal disdain of his actions amounts to disdain of Yahweh to whom alone, he proclaims, they are directed. Hence her scorn for David as king is in fact a defiant scorn for Yahweh who gave him his position.\textsuperscript{805}

\textsuperscript{803} See 3.1.4.1 (2 Sam. 6.5), 5.1.3.5 (2 Sam. 6.17), 5.1.3.6 (2 Sam. 6.14), 6.1.1.1.3 (2 Sam. 6.16), and appendix 2.
\textsuperscript{804} Brueggemann 1990: 252.
\textsuperscript{805} Murray 1998: 142, 144.
The MT reading is an N form of the verb הָלַךְ.\(^{806}\) MT's הָלַךְ is attested in all witnesses excluding the LXX (καὶ ἀποκαλυφθῆσομαι) and OL (et denudabor) whose readings suppose רָעַבְנָה ('and I will reveal/uncover myself'). Many neglect to address this variation, thereby assuming MT's originality, and opinions vary among those who do discuss the variation. Two arguments favour the originality of הָלַךְ: (1) הָלַךְ can be 'impeached as reminiscent' of its threefold occurrence in v. 20, i.e., assimilation.\(^{807}\) (2) הָלַךְ at the start and רָעַבְנָה at the end of v. 22 'makes a rhetorically forceful contrastive inclusio'.\(^{808}\) In contrast, three arguments favour the originality of רָעַבְנָה: (1) רָעַבְנָה indeed goes back to v. 20 since David answers Michal's objections with her own words. (2) רָעַבְנָה corresponds well with the references to 'eyes' in vv. 20, 22. (3) רָעַבְנָה can be taken as offensive, since bareness is generally regarded as shameful in the Bible, and it is well known that elsewhere scribes altered MT to conceal offensive language.\(^{809}\) See 6.1.1.2.3.

Under the assumption that the editors of Hebrew Samuel revised the text in order to 'lighten' the forcefulness and forthrightness of David's intention to expose himself still more, why did they replace הָלַךְ with the particular lexeme רָעַבְנָה? The following observations are relevant. (1) The verb הָלַךְ is used 82 times, most often in Samuel (16 times), and never in a synoptic text.\(^{810}\) (2) The verb הָלַךְ has an antithetical relationship to רָעַבְנָה and these verbs and/or their cognates are closely associated in a number of passages, including 1 Sam. 2.8, 29-30; 6.5-6; 2 Sam. 6.20, 22.\(^{811}\) (3) Interestingly, רָעַבְנָה and הָלַךְ appear together in 1 Sam. 2.30 and 2 Sam. 6.16, 22. By despising David Michal

\(^{806}\) G: 'be slight, swift, trifling'; N: 'show oneself swift, appear trifling, be lightly esteemed'.
\(^{807}\) McCarter 1984: 186.
\(^{808}\) Murray 1998: 66.
\(^{809}\) Pope 1992: 722; Revell 1992: 1011-1012.
\(^{810}\) 1 Sam. 2.30; 3.13; 6.5; 17.43; 18.23; 2 Sam. 1.23; 6.22; 16.5, 7, 9, 10 (twice), 11, 13; 19.22, 44.
\(^{811}\) Other passages are 1 Kgs. 12.4, 9-11, 14 // 2 Chron. 10.4, 9-11, 14; Isa. 8.23; 23.8-9; 49.5-6; Hab. 2.14, 16; Prov. 26.1-2.
despises Yahweh, before whom David acts, and whose presence David brings to Jerusalem. Brueggemann says:

David, who is thought to be despised by Michal, is in fact honored in Israel and by Yahweh. Michal, who thinks she is in a position of strength, is dismissed by the narrative as barren and hopeless. There is something here of the exalted being humbled and the humbled being exalted ... David is indeed the one who humbles himself and who, by the power of God, is exalted. The text remembers and enacts the strange singing of Hannah (I Sam. 2:7-8).

6.1.1.3.6 2 Sam. 6.22

The evidence for the adjective is unremarkable. Although ἄχρεος ('useless, unfit, unprofitable') occurs in the Septuagint only here and in the Epistle of Jeremiah, and although the adjective ταχθυός ('lowly, humble') or a cognate is a superior (cf. Aquila and Symmachus) and more frequent translation equivalent of בֶּשָׁע and its cognates, the Greek reading does not suggest a different Vorlage.

The adjective בֶּשָׁע ('deep, low'; 'humble, humiliated, lowly') occurs 17 times but only here in Samuel. English translations of this verse use the words 'base, abased, lowly, humble, humiliated', and commentators construe David's demeanour as a virtue: positive humiliation or pious self-effacement. With reference to people the word generally focuses on worth or status, and the dominant use of the root refers to Yahweh's threat or promise that the arrogant or haughty will be brought low, cast down, or humbled.

It is noteworthy that the root בֶּשָׁע occurs three times in Samuel: the verb בֶּשָׁע in the poetry of 1 Sam. 2.7 and 2 Sam. 22.28, and the adjective בֶּשָׁע in 2 Sam. 6.22. The distribution of the root in Samuel is hardly coincidental and makes a forceful point

---

regarding David vis-à-vis Michal and her father. The Songs of Hannah and David conclude saying:814:

1 Sam. 2.10 'Yahweh! His adversaries shall be shattered; the Most High will thunder in heaven. Yahweh will judge the ends of the earth; he will give strength to his king, and exalt the power of his anointed'.

2 Sam. 22.51 'He is a tower of salvation for his king, and shows steadfast love to his anointed, to David and his descendants forever'.

The phrase 'in the eyes of' grammatically and conceptually modifies only the immediately preceding verb, and although the phrase may refer to sight or judgment (= thought; cf. English 'in my view') it generally means 'in the opinion of'. Is the original phrase בְּעֵינֶי (‘in my eyes’) as in the MT, Targum, Peshitta, the first instance in Jacob815, and the Vulgate, or is it בְּעֵינֶיךָ (‘in your eyes’) as suggested by the OG, Aquila, Symmachus, and the OL? Translators and commentators are divided. Some reject the Greek reading816 whereas just as many believe it is original.817 The arguments based on sense alone are fragile, leading in one or another direction depending on the interpreter's understanding of the passage. For one the Greek rendering gives an appropriate sense while for another it ruins it. There are no persuasive arguments in favour of either בְּעֵינֶי or בְּעֵינֶיךָ.

The form בְּעֵינֶיךָ is attested in one medieval Hebrew manuscript as noted in BHS. Indeed, a reference to Yahweh not only makes excellent sense, but it also provides a reasonable explanation for the other two traditions, which are clearly primitive.818 Who could allow to remain a provocatively original reference to Yahweh in a text in which originally David exposed himself (רָא) before him? Michal accuses David of dishonour

815 The Targum, Peshitta and the first instance in Jacob have 'in the eyes of my soul'.
816 Barthélemy 1982: 244; Wellhausen 1871: 170.
817 Driver 1890: 273; Thenius 1842: 154.
before the slave girls, and David replies: 'My "lowly" behaviour is before Yahweh, and so it will continue, because he elevates me; as for you (and all for which you stand), I actually prefer the slave girls!'

6.1.1.3.7 2 Sam. 6.22

This clause is disjunctive contrastive and the point in MT is this: David will carry on with what he views as 'lowly' behaviour, but with the slave girls he will be honoured. The contrast is principally between David and the slave girls, and more specifically between David's behaviour as he views it and the reaction of the slave girls to the king. Many interpreters see a contrast between Michal and the slave girls, but this is explicitly true only if MT Samuel is emended according to LXX Samuel in the previous clause (i.e., 'my eyes' is changed to 'your eyes'). However, since Michal's reproach in v. 20 implicitly sets her and the slave girls in contrast, it is assumed that David's response in v. 22, in which he alludes to v. 20 and sides with the slave girls, is also an implicit affirmation of inequality between them and her. From this perspective, then, it is true that Michal and the slave girls are thrown in parallel and that their 'respect' shall compensate David for her contempt.

The relative clause, 'about whom you spoke', is uncomplicated, but the following word is not. The suffix in עשת is 3mp whereas its referent אשתה is 3fp. Many address the function of עשת within its clause as well as the repetition of עשת in this verse, but few point out the discrepancy in gender819, and this silence is remarkable since many consider the replacement of second and third person plural feminine suffixes by their masculine equivalents a 'late' Hebrew feature.820 Within its clause the prepositional phrase עשת

---

820 See appendix 3. As expected, the Targum has עשת and the Peshitta and Jacob have עשת.
functions as 'before, in the sight of, almost = in the judgement of' according to Driver\textsuperscript{821}, and Williams labels this the 'consciousness' usage of בּ.\textsuperscript{822} The significance of the repetition is discussed in 6.1.1.4.1.

Rather than a counterpart to בּ, the LXX seems to have in this slot the 1cs accusative pronoun με, and the OL reads the same, although the function of the pronoun is different.\textsuperscript{823} The translators of Samuel consistently render בּ with a suffixed pronoun using μετά with a genitive pronoun, thus suggesting that they would have written μετ᾿ αὐτῶν if בּ had been in the Vorlage. Alternatively, the OG translators may have ignored the resumptive בּ with its suffixed pronoun in order to streamline the sentence, as they may have done in the case of נֵ in v. 23 as well. However, the MT and LXX grammar is different: בּ is a prepositional adjunct to הָּבּא whereas με is the accusative subject of the infinitive δοξασθήναι. The subject in the 1cs verb הָּבּא is clear, but not in the infinitive δοξασθήναι, which requires the explicit mention of the subject by means of an accusative pronoun. Thus με does not really fall in the same slot as בּ, and the Greek version actually attests a minus of בּ, as does the Vulgate: et cum ancillis de quibus locuta es gloriosior apparebo ('and with the slave girls, about whom all was said, [with them] I will appear more glorious'). The Vulgate regularly agrees with the MT against the LXX, so its divergence in this matter is significant. Either the LXX and Vulgate represent streamlined texts, as suggested by Nysse, or the MT (and Targum, Peshitta and Jacob) is revised to include the repetitious 'with them', and this is significant from a literary standpoint. See 6.1.1.4.1.

\textsuperscript{821} Driver 1890: 273.
\textsuperscript{822} Williams 1976: §337, p. 58.
\textsuperscript{823} The OL says et cum puellis cum quibus dixisti me nudatum glorificabor, which can be rendered 'and with the girls, with whom you said I was nude, I will be glorified'. Either ad me or mihi would have been used to say 'with whom you said to me'.
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The verb phrases are:

- 'Let me be honoured' (MT), with cohortative ḫeḇeḵḵa.
- 'I will be honoured' (Targum, Peshitta).
- 'I will be honoured and praised' (Jacob).
- 'I will be glorified' (OL).
- 'I will appear more glorious' (Vulgate).
- 'I was glorified' (LXX), with με δοξασθησαν.

The readings in all versions except the LXX represent an independent statement: 'I will ...', whereas in the Greek version the verb phrase is dependent on the previous clause: 'And I will again reveal/uncover myself thus, and I will be useless (a) in your eyes and (b) with the slave girls of (= by?) whom you said I was glorified/held in honour. The insertion of μή prior to the infinitive in many Greek manuscripts does not suggest a different reading in the Vorlage, but only that at some point the Greek translation was misunderstood. The MT's cohortative also diverges from the remainder of the witnesses. Driver believes the MT should be emended to כבש since the context requires a conviction rather than a wish, but most scholars reject this suggestion, sometimes citing Yahweh's כבש-statement in Exod. 14.4, 17, which is surely a conviction rather than a mere wish. כבש provides emphasis vis-à-vis כבש. Nevertheless, suitability does not mean originality, and the MT may have been revised from כבש to emphasise David's resolve.

6.1.1.4 The Narrator's Summary of Michal's Childlessness

6.1.1.4.1 2 Sam. 6.23

2 Sam. 6.23 is succinct and devoid of textual difficulties yet prompts more questions than it answers (see 6.1.2), and these facts are significant. Textual variation may suggest that scribes and editors attempted to explicate or alleviate perceived

---

825 Driver 1890: 273.
826 GKC §108b, p. 319.
difficulties in the story. Alternatively, the absence of evidence for textual manipulation in a cryptic line such as 2 Sam. 6.23 may indicate that scribes and editors were not bothered by a particular incident or comment, or rather, the absence may indicate that they were unsure of its meaning or preferred to leave their viewpoint unknown or ambiguous.

What is the cause of Michal's childlessness? Is it to be found in the deity, David, Michal, or elsewhere? Suggested answers are:

- The cause is the deity. Yahweh closed Michal's womb. He cursed her. Her childlessness is the result of barrenness. In the biblical world barrenness is considered a curse from God, the greatest of misfortunes, resulting in labels like disgrace, dishonour, humiliation, reproach, shame, etc. This is the dominant reading in the rabbinic period, but many scholars still take this view.

- The cause is David. He refused her. He wished to punish her. This is the dominant reading in the modern era.

- The cause is the deity and David. The curse on Michal was David's denial of her. Divine judgment worked through natural channels. Ackroyd and Caird offer this interpretation.

- The cause is Michal. She refused him. She wished to punish him, perhaps politically as well. No interpreter holds this view, but Clines and Exum ponder the possibility.

- The cause is mutual separation between David and Michal. Statements such as 'broken marriage', 'personal estrangement', 'breakdown in marital relations', 'collapse of dialogue' or 'less of a dispossession than a deadlock' are applicable. This is the view of Baldwin, Bright, Rosenberg and Vos.

- The cause is barrenness, but rather than a curse, her barrenness is 'bitter coincidence' or 'the last painful twist of a wronged woman's fate'. This possibility is raised by Alter.

- The cause is ambiguous or unknowable, or perhaps it is one of the above. This 'I'm unsure' or 'I don't know' view is given in more than a dozen commentaries.

- In fact, Michal did have a child—five to be exact. Several scholars are reluctant to emend MT 2 Sam. 21.8. In addition, a passage in the Talmud,

---

827 Fishkin 1988: 65-72 is a good review.
Sanhedrin 21a: 20-21, 25-26, says Michal had children on the day of her death. See 6.1.2.

This analysis treats this verse according to its natural divisions: (a) 'and to Michal the daughter of Saul'; (b) 'there was not (to her) a child'; (c) 'to/until the day of her death'.

First, 'and to Michal the daughter of Saul' (וּלְמִיכָלָה בַּתָּוַיִּלָּל). Following the heated dialogue between David and Michal, and bringing to an end the story of David's transfer of the ark, one might expect the final comment to overtly relate to the preceding material in some explanatory manner. That is, one might expect a sequential verb form, such as a wayyiqtol, or perhaps an adverb such as 'therefore', but this is the case only in the Latin versions (igitur). Instead, the final comment dangles from the story, and the final mention of Michal is suspended within the comment. Why doesn't this verse begin, for example, ولَا هِيَ لَمْ تُلْمِسْهَا והיָהוֹדָה לִמְסָלָה אָנַּה? Through grammatical disjunction or dislocation together with casus pendens the text lacks a lucid relation to the preceding material and Michal—that is, 'Michal, the daughter of Saul'—is placed in the limelight. In linguistic jargon she—that is, 'Michal, the daughter of Saul'—is fronted or topicalised. This clause is about 'Michal, the daughter of Saul': to her, no, to them, there was no descendant.

Second, 'there was not (to her) a child' (וְלَا אֵין לֶבַע לָהּ). The resumptive pronoun on the preposition ל refers to the dislocated לָמֵסָלָה and helps 'lighten' the sentence. It is impossible to determine whether אֵין was added to the received tradition or whether the Greek translator left it untranslated. The distribution and usage of the root אֵין in Samuel is unremarkable except to note the nearness of the terminology in 2 Sam. 3.2, 5 and 5.13-14. See below. Also, if Michal's childlessness is the result of the deity's curse, it should be observed that other terminology was available for expressing the notion of barrenness.

---

832 Driver 1890: 274.
833 On the Kethib אֵין / Qere אֵין see the grammars, commentaries and De Rossi 1785: II, 169.
See below.

Third, 'to/until the day of her death' (בר ים מצדה). The phrase is infrequent: Judg. 13.7; 1 Sam. 15.35; 2 Sam. 6.23; 20.3 (מות is the infinitive construct); 2 Kgs. 15.5; Jer. 52.11, 34; 2 Chron. 26.21. It cannot be demonstrated that in 2 Sam. 6.23 the phrase means 'She had no child until the day of her death, but on the day of her death she did'. This thought would be expressed using בכם ולא and something similar. It is extremely unlikely that the phraseology of 2 Sam. 6.23 and 20.3 is coincidental (see below).

The emphasis in 2 Sam. 6.23 rests on the fact of Michal's childlessness, not the reason for it. This clause is about 'Michal, the daughter of Saul'—to her, no, to them, there was no descendant. The passage oozes pro-Davidic/anti-Saulide sentiment. The royal
lineage of Saul has come to an end. Furthermore, the passage at hand follows closely after 2 Sam. 3.2-5 and 5.13-16, which share הָרְכָּבָה-terminology. Michal is unlike David's other wives. He impregnated them, but not her!

The cause of Michal's childlessness is ambiguous, or perhaps it should be called open-ended. Josipovici correctly states that our interpretation depends on how we read the book of Samuel as a whole. Amazingly, very few scholars offer evidence in support of one view or another. Some suggested evidence is:

- It is Yahweh: Yahweh blesses obedience with a fruitful womb (e.g., Exod. 23.26; Deut. 7.14; 28.11). Only Yahweh can open and close the womb (e.g., Gen. 20.18; 29.31; 30.2, 22; 1 Sam. 1.5-6; Isa. 66.9).

- It is Yahweh: Hannah's barrenness is explicitly caused by Yahweh, and lexical and conceptual links between 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Samuel 1–2 indicate that he is also to blame for Michal's situation.

- It is Yahweh: (Perhaps) Michal's barrenness is Yahweh's intervention to fulfil the prophecy of Samuel in 1 Sam. 13.13-14.

- It is Yahweh: V. 23 should be construed as referring to the motif of curse, since it is put in contrast to v. 20a referring to that of blessing.

- It cannot be Yahweh: At the points in the Bible when a woman is clearly barren a formulaic expression appears which clearly implicates God as the opener and closer of wombs. This is near the truth, but not precisely. Sometimes the text does identify God as the culprit (e.g., המרה נָשָׂא רָהָב) but other times barrenness is simply reported without comment on its cause. See below.

- It cannot be David: David does not cease conjugal relations with Michal, since this would be expressed differently, e.g., מִכְלָא חֲבָל יָדֵיהָ in Gen. 38.26.

These explanations are unpersuasive, mostly because close examination reveals that they are too general, arbitrary, or rely on loose associations. The following three arguments, however, validate the interpretation that David intentionally set Michal aside. First,

---


Driver speaks of 'the resumption for the sake of emphasis' in 'אֹבֶד ... אֶלֶף' in v. 25\textsuperscript{836}, and Fishkin argues that the redundant usage has significant interpretative implications: '... It conveys a harshness on David's part; he is cruelly rubbing the reality of Michal's situation in her face ...'.\textsuperscript{837} Second, a careful examination of biblical cases of barrenness shows that redundant usage should not be construed to implicate barrenness or divine veto in the absence of a lexeme for 'barren' (e.g., יִשְׁר) in the nearby context or a statement that the deity did indeed intervene. Third, as observed above, the phraseology of 2 Sam. 6.23 and 20.3 is hardly coincidental. This association, mentioned by a few scholars\textsuperscript{838}, clinches the case: Michal was treated like the members of the royal harem, who were first abandoned (15.16), then raped (16.21-22), and finally confined (20.3). Why, then, is the connection made so vaguely? Fishkin says:

The implied literary-critical argument here is that the lexical echo (Heb. 'ad yom motah/n'), implies a similarity also in semantic value and therefore in the narrative situation of the characters ... In this view, Michal receives similar treatment at the hands of David as did the concubines, whose fates however, are spelled out plainly in the text. ... It remains to be asked, however, why the text is so reticent on this important issue. ... I would ... argue the possibility that the silence of the text in 6:23 may indicate not only the text's 'unease' about David's role in her childlessness, but also a discomfort with Michal's larger fate and an unwillingness, for ideological and theological reasons, to clearly define David's role in that fate. For I argue that the narrator hints at the subtext--the 'reality' of Michal's fate--precisely by providing us with the echo of 20:3, which does fully explain the cruel situation of the concubines. Even if David's only offense were his willfully causing Michal's childlessness, it is no surprise that the text would exhibit a reluctance clearly to implicate the Lord's anointed king of Israel. And all the more so if she--his royal wife--received the kind of treatment at his hands which is poignantly described for the concubines in 20:3--if she were condemned by him to a life of childlessness, dishonor, and caged isolation. This is perhaps the real reason for the textual 'unease' which Exum notes. The text wants to, but cannot, express the cruellness of Michal's fate, and the nature of David's role in that fate. But it simultaneously hints at what it represses in 6:23 by providing us with a textual clue to the 'narrative truth': a sad echo of ten more who were widowed alive and imprisoned by David.\textsuperscript{839}

\textsuperscript{836} Driver 1890: 273-274.
\textsuperscript{837} Fishkin 1988: 94-95.
\textsuperscript{839} Fishkin 1988: 72, 74.
Michal, the daughter of Saul, the former king, was not permitted to have children, to provide a successor to the throne of Israel. Queen Michal, the wife of King David, was shut up until the day of her death, living as if in widowhood. Scribes and editors backed David's socio-political agenda—a Davidic Judahite king is superior to a Saulide Benjaminite king—but they were not quite able to content themselves with King David's role in sealing Michal's fate.

6.1.2 Literary Analysis

Space forbids additional discussion of the meanings of the name and patronymic of Michal; the motif of the woman in the window in biblical literature and extra-biblical resources; the themes of sexual activity and progeny in Samuel; the themes of 'respect, honour, acceptance' and 'contempt, shame, rejection' in Samuel; and studies of gender politics in biblical literature and ancient Israel and the role of women in the book of Samuel. A very interesting passage which cannot be examined in detail in this thesis is MT 2 Sam. 21.8, which speaks of the '... the five sons of Michal the daughter of Saul, whom she bore to Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholathite'. The widespread 'solution'

849 Beyond the similar topic, and the occurrence of מִיכָל הבּתּוֹ הַסָּעָל, it has gone unnoticed that elsewhere in the book of Samuel David is 'in' or 'on' his house, but only three times does he 'go' (שבה) or 'return' (שב) to his house: יִשְׁכֶּנָה וּרְבָּה אֶלָּבְדֵּר (2 Sam. 6.20; Michal); יִשְׁכֶּנָה אֲבִיהָ אֲבִיהָ (2 Sam. 12.20; Bathsheba); יִשְׁכֶּנָה וּרְבָּה אֶלָּבְדֵּר (2 Sam. 20.3; cf. 19.12; concubines). For David, going home and issues of sex and progeny appear related; business—or pleasure?—comes first!

841 Studies of women in the Bible often take their point of departure from Samuel, in which at least seventeen women are named and many more are signified by other means. Studies on Michal have focused on her exploitation and victimisation, her role as a pawn who could be used in whatever way her father and husband found advantageous. Jobling 1998: 9 correctly says: '[David's] wives Michal and Abigail, like Hannah, take bold initiatives, but their initiatives are appropriated into a narrative strategy that is anything but pro-woman. Their energy is wholly channeled into the boosting of David's career, and no importance is ascribed to them beyond this'. The best treatments of women in Samuel are Jobling 1998: 127-194; Solvang 2003; and two unpublished doctoral theses: Garcia Bachmann 1999; Todd 1990. The most helpful pieces on Michal from a literary perspective are Jobling 1998 and the contributions by Alter, Berlin, Clines, Exum, Miscall and Polzin in Clines and Eskenazi 1991. Good discussion is given throughout Berlin 1983; Exum 1992, 1993, 1996.
to this puzzling reading is to emend 'Michal' (מיכל) to 'Merab' (מרב). However, this explanation is doubted by Fishkin, Gelander and Noll, and 'Michal' is retained and defended by Barthélemy, Ben-Barak, Exum, Glück, Miscall and Walters. Barthélemy is correct to argue that the variation relates to editorial activity rather than scribal error. The editors of MT Samuel saw fit to revise biblical history by placing Michal in a story which favours neither her nor any other descendant of Saul—one final blow against the royal family, and against the queen herself.

The remainder of this chapter summarises three issues related to Michal in 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23.

- The reason for Michal's reproach of David.
- The role of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 in Samuel.
- The shape of the Vorlage of Chronicles.

6.1.2.1 The Reason for Michal's Reproach of David

Why did Michal react and reply as she did? It is very difficult to pinpoint the reason(s) for Michal's reproach of David, and equally hard to hold down a commentator to a single issue which he or she believes is the cause of Michal's behaviour. Clines aptly says:

Why does Michal reproach David? Here we are not short of textual evidence. There is the report of the narrator (6.16), Michal's own words to David (6.20), and David's reply (6.21-22)–the combination of which provides us with a stereoscopic view of the event. There is almost too much evidence of what passes between them, and yet we still feel that the text has not told us the whole truth, that we are meant to infer some deeper cause, some underlying agenda that Michal and David are addressing. ... No one motivation can account for the course of this episode. As Robert Alter puts it, her anger is 'overdetermined', containing within it all that

has never been said but more than has been hinted about the relation between her and David. Only 'multiple interpretation' can address the complexity of the tale.\footnote{Clines 1991b: 52, 60.}

Most discussions (a) are noncommittal, in that they mention several explanations or are ambiguous in viewpoint, or (b) they make a general statement regarding David's behaviour, considering it undignified or unseemly or out-of-control, inappropriate for a king. This fact substantiates the ambiguity in the story itself. In other discussions one can perceive that the author \textit{leans toward} a single specific explanation for Michal's reproach. These may be divided into two groups: those which focus on David, his activity or dress, and those which focus on Michal, her disposition or circumstances.\footnote{At least one scholar explicitly cites or embraces each explanation; however, references to particular scholars are mostly omitted since about one hundred are represented in the following list.} The explanations related to David's activity or dress focus on the following topics:

- David's ecstatic religious activity is distasteful to Michal. She sees in David the out-of-control religious 'frenzy' of her father which also included nudity.

- David's religious activity seems too unfamiliar or innovative to Michal. David is instituting novel religious practices, or playing an unconventional priestly role, or performing a syncretistic religious ritual which merges Israelite (northern, Yahwistic) and Canaanite religion, including perhaps sacred prostitutes and cultic copulation. David's activity is a 'prelude to the sacred marriage'\footnote{Porter 1954: 165-166.} or a 'form of fertility rite'.\footnote{Carlson 1964: 87, 94-95.} Few, however, accept the Canaanite connection, and even fewer agree with Carlson and Porter. Nonetheless, many recognise a sexual dimension to the story.

- David's religious feat in transferring the ark provokes hostility in Michal because there was 'uneasiness with the ark itself among Saul's constituency'.\footnote{Halpern 2001: 333.}

- David's sexual behaviour is too abundant or vulgar for Michal's taste. David's behaviour is exhibitionistic or immoral. For Clines the real issue is sex\footnote{Clines 1991c: 137-138.}, whereas for Exum sex is a façade for the real issue of kingship.\footnote{Exum 2000: 126; 1991: 183; 1992: 86-87.} There is an odd mixture of royal conflict and sexual conflict here. The result of Michal's outburst ... is that she remains childless until the day of her death. ... [T]he punishment resembles the outburst in that it is for Michal both a sexual
tragedy and a family tragedy, since it means that no children will be born to one of the few surviving offspring of Saul's house.851

- David's behaviour like a commoner or plebeian displeases aristocratic Michal. He lacks royal dignity.

- David's attire is too scanty and thus revealing, showing David's lack of modesty. His use of an ephod and his dance movements are responsible for his undignified self-exposure.

The explanations related to Michal's disposition or circumstances focus on the following topics:

- Michal lacks religious sensibility, just like her father Saul. She is not a person of faith. She has lost sight of God. She is an idolater (1 Sam. 19.13, 16). She does not share the views of David who loves God. She is ignorant of the divine purpose, failing to recognise God's blessing of David. Michal has a more conservative religious outlook than David, or conversely, she is not more strict in her views but rather more arrogant.

- Michal is angry about the fate of her family, the suffering and loss of her father and siblings. David's dynastic ambitions, his political legitimation, arouse bitterness in Michal.

- Michal is angry about her abandonment by David. Since then (1 Samuel 19) she has had a very difficult life. She never had the marriage she wanted with David. She is a dethroned romantic.

- Michal is angry about her broken marriage to Palti. True love was ruined by David.

- Michal is angry about David's acquisition of other wives. She is just one of many for David the womaniser. She is alone, a neglected co-wife. She is full of sexual jealousy.

- Michal is simply a bad wife in a rotten relationship. The marriage has broken down. No wonder she spoils the day!

- Who knows, perhaps Michal desires to lead the procession like her mentor Miriam had done in times gone by!852

It is impossible to know for certain where culpability lies. Does David behave inappropriately or does Michal misperceive his behaviour? Does David engage in 'bad' religious behaviour or is the issue really Michal's 'bad' religious sensibility? Is David's

---

852 F. E. Young 1962: 296 imagines this bizarre view.
dance illegitimate orgiastic dance rather than legitimate liturgical dance? The decisive factor is the credibility of Michal: Is there a basis in the story for adopting her point of view? NO.

On the contrary, the entire story is strongly anti-Saulide. In the end, Michal's childlessness suggests that ultimately she is wrong about David, at least as HIS 'historians' perceive the issue.

6.1.2.2 The Role of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 in Samuel

Leonhard Rost's 1926 Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids more than any other book has influenced modern discussion of 2 Samuel. Relevant to the present study is his conclusion that there are two separate traditions in 2 Samuel 6: the story of the ark (vv. 1-15, 17-20a) and the story of Michal (vv. 16, 20b-23). In his estimation vv. 1-15, 17-20a are part of the AN, which also includes most but not all of 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2, and this narrative is the ἔρως λόγος of the sanctuary of the ark in Jerusalem. Verses 16, 20b-23 are not part of this sanctuary legend, but rather, are the beginning of the 'Succession Narrative', and they function to answer negatively who will occupy David's throne: the heir to the throne will not be a Saulide. Rost says:

The only thing that 6.16 and 20ff. have in common with the ark narrative is that these verses describe an event which happened during and after the transfer of the ark to Jerusalem. They therefore have no place in a ἔρως λόγος of the ark.

Rost's view on this material was accepted by Alt, Noth, and von Rad, among others, but has been criticised heavily since then:

Rost's assessment of the unity and historical worth of 2 Samuel 9–20 and 1 Kgs 1–2 as a unified political document stemming from the early days of Solomon's reign no longer reflects a consensus of scholarly opinion. Almost every aspect of Rost's analysis has required reassessment.

---

853 See the quote on Michal's perspective by Berlin 1983: 72-73 in 6.1.1.3.4.
855 Rost 1982: 87.
856 Forshey 1992: 1178. Rost's arguments for the separation of vv. 16, 20b-23 from the rest of the chapter and for their function as the beginning of the Succession Narrative are the grammar of πως in v. 16.
Some continue to believe that 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 was affixed to the earlier AN as the start of the Succession Narrative/Court History (SN/CH)\textsuperscript{857}, but the majority consider the Michal material a discrete and later tradition to the AN but not the beginning of the SN/CH.\textsuperscript{858} Other scholars suggest that the Michal material is earlier than the AN\textsuperscript{859}; has been relocated from after 2 Sam. 5.1-3 to the AN\textsuperscript{860}; is a 'variant account of the cultic drama led by David' in previous verses\textsuperscript{861}; originates from the composers of the 'History of David's Rise' (HDR)\textsuperscript{862} or the redactors of the 'combined Saul and David story'\textsuperscript{863}; or is indivisibly rooted in the AN.\textsuperscript{864}

This writer's view is that the material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 stands in its original place within the story of David's transfer of the ark, i.e., the story was originally composed with this verse, and the material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is affixed, it is epilogical, and more precisely, it is exegesis on the earlier and briefer mention of Michal. The following support is offered for this view. First, 6.1-20a are a well-defined literary unit whereas 6.20b-23 fall outside the principal plot scheme.\textsuperscript{865} The action in 6.1-20a circles

\textsuperscript{857} Van Seters is one notable adherent (Van Seters 1983: 280; 2000: 81, 89-90).
\textsuperscript{858} Most scholars since Rost set the limits of the SN/CH at 2 Samuel 9-20 and 1 Kings 1-2. Römer and de Pury 2000: 126 say no chapter gives a satisfactory introduction to this narrative and wonder whether the original beginning has been lost or altered at the time of the insertion of the collection into the DH.
\textsuperscript{859} Hempel 1964: 148; Vermeylen 2000: 233-236.
\textsuperscript{860} Gunn 1978: 66-67, 73-76.
\textsuperscript{861} Seow 1989: 136.
\textsuperscript{862} Mettinger 1976: 45; Weiser 1966: 347-348.
\textsuperscript{863} Conroy 1983: 104.
\textsuperscript{865} Campbell 1975: 126-127, 139; Fokkelman 1990: 176-184; Gunn 1978: 73-74; Murray 1998: 145-146; cf. 145-156; Youngblood 1992: 872-873. Also see Gelander 1991: 46-53, who believes, however, that 'it is ... difficult to point to either of the two episodes as an appendage of secondary importance'.

and the theme of the material. Rost's belief that the theme of this material is 'succession' is heavily criticised. The character of David is more central to the material than Rost's hypothesis allows, and a number of subsidiary themes have been detected. See Keys 1996: 14-54, 123-155 and the discussion in 2.2. The dependence on subjective criteria for the demarcation of literary layers, namely, the discernment of different themes, interests or perspectives, both positive and negative, is unsafe.
from Jerusalem to Jerusalem. Amit shows (and illustrates for Samuel) that a 'concentric ending' is 'typical of many biblical narratives'.

See 5.0. Second, 6.16 cannot be separated from 6.1-20a on any basis whatsoever. Yet, as commentators routinely point out, v. 16 'prepares' for vv. 20b-23. However, in this writer's view this description is anachronistic since v. 16 suggested or motivated the addition of vv. 20b-23. Third, 6.20b-23 is preparatory in a negative way to 7.8-9, 11b-16: the heir to the throne will not be a Saulide; rather, he will be a descendant of David. Compare זני in 6.21 and 7.8; זלי in 6.23 with זי in 7.12 and יב in 7.14; and יהב in the sense of 'family, dynasty' in 6.(12?), 20-21 and 7.11, 16. In contrast, the arrival and placement of the ark in Jerusalem in 6.1-20a has its counterpart in 7.1-3, 5-7, 13. Compare ראב in 6.17 with רְשֵׁה in 7.2 and ראָ in 7.6, and יהב in the sense of 'dwelling' in 6.3-4, 10-11 (12?) and 7.5-7, 13. Whereas 6.1-20a led nicely into 2 Samuel 7 with respect to the 'house as [Yahweh's] dwelling' theme, the brief mention of 'Michal, the daughter of Saul' in 6.16 provided the opportunity to develop the theme of 'house as dynasty' in 6.20b-23 in preparation for the promise of a descendant of David in 2 Samuel 7.

Fourth, Conroy, Mettinger, and Weiser connect the Michal material in 2 Samuel 6 with the stories of Saul and David in 1 Samuel. The questions posed by Dietrich and Naumann are appropriate:

... the fact that David makes an end of the Philistines (2 Sam 5:17-25) might be taken as a sensible conclusion to the many reports of confrontations with the Philistines in the Rise story. On the other hand, this passage now appears to be a bridge to the one in 2 Samuel 6 about the bringing in of the Ark, which earlier had actually fallen into Philistine hands. Should this also belong to the Rise of David—even, from a pious point of view, constituting its very climax? Corresponding to this and contradicting it at the same time is the fact that 2 Samuel 6 ends with a fight between David and Michal. Was it not the Rise story that previously again

---

867 The framework of Yahweh's speech is in 2 Sam. 7.4, 17.
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and again illuminated the developed relationship between these two (1 Sam 18.20ff.; 19.11ff.; 25.44; 2 Sam 3.12ff.)?869

Again, it may be suggested that the expansion (vv. 20b-23) of the brief reference (v. 16) to Michal has apologetic intent related to the preceding stories of Saul and David. Fifth, throughout the analysis of 2 Sam. 6.1-20a // 1 Chron. 13.5-14; 15.25-16.3, 43, emphasis is placed on distinctive features of MT Samuel which are textually secondary yet literally linked to the non-synoptic stories in 1 Samuel by means of the theme 'Davidic displacement of the Saulide dynasty'. This is a feature of the story of David's ark transfer in vv. 1-20a which has been inadequately documented, and which closely ties the expansion in vv. 20b-23 to the stories in 1 Samuel. In this writer's view, then, 6.20b-23 is an expansionary supplement of the brief reference to Michal in v. 16 and a parallel supplement related to the stories of Saul and David in 1 Samuel. The exploration of Michal was simultaneously a journey into her father's break-up before Yahweh and David. This is the direction in which the cumulative textual and literary evidence points.

Michal appears in the Bible in four notations (1 Sam. 14.49-51; 25.43-44; 2 Sam. 21.7-9; 1 Chron. 15.29) and four episodes (1 Sam. 18.12-29; 19.8-18; 2 Sam. 3.12-16; 6.12-23).870 Clines says that even though it may be incorrect to speak of a Michal story since the story is no more than a string of somewhat disjointed episodes scattered through the David story, the final scene functions very successfully as a climax to her story.871 Michal's final scene functions to theologically legitimate David's kingship while rejecting Saulide claims to power over Israel. The royal lineage of Saul has come to an end, but the royal lineage of David is just beginning.872 The Michal story is not about David's domestic qualities and it does not warn against cavalier opposition to David's religious

870 The terminology is from Clines 1991b: 26.
871 Clines 1991b: 52.
872 Yahweh declares the Davidic/non-Saulide dynasty in 2 Samuel 7.
practices. Furthermore, David's blessing on his house (v. 20a) is not undone by Michal's reproach; rather, the blessing on David to the exclusion of Saul is realised through Michal's childlessness (v. 23) and Yahweh's promise (2 Samuel 7). Finally, the story does not obstruct a supposed attempt on the part of David to unify the two houses for political gain. The biblical David never hoped for a son from the marriage to Michal, who would eventually become his successor. First, Yahweh declares that no descendant of Saul would sit upon Israel's throne (1 Sam. 13.13-14). Second, 2 Sam. 3.12-16 is regularly understood as a move on the part of David to secure a claim to the throne by repositioning himself back into the house of Saul. However, David's request for the return of Michal can be read in very different ways. Had he simply remembered the loyal partner who saved him when his life was at risk? Did he wish to enlist additional Saulide support through her? Was he concerned that another (Abner?) might take her and through marriage and paternity become a rival to David? Actually, the reason for David's request is given in the story: David wished to test Abner's genuineness. The political intentions of the historical David with respect to Michal are unknowable. To conclude, and for further consideration, Christensen locates the centre-point of the book of Samuel, the transition from judges to David's empire, precisely in Michal's alienation in 2 Sam. 6.20-23. With respect to both the theme and composition of Samuel he may have a point.

---

873 'In Samuel the development of the theme of blessing David's house is interrupted—but also focussed—by the plus in 2 Sam 6.20b-23 reporting the altercation between David and Michal' (Auld 2000a: 20). The blessing is not 'aborted' as some declare.

874 Many hold this view, citing Bright 1981: 208; Noth 1958: 199.

875 McCarter 1984: 114.

6.1.2.3 The Shape of the Vorlage of Chronicles

The lengthy statement by Japhet represents scholarly opinion and encapsulates most of the issues related to this issue.\(^{877}\) Scholars agree on two points. First, 2 Sam. 6.16 was preserved with slight alterations and reinterpreted to demonstrate the contrast between pious David and the impious lineage he had replaced. Michal is an example of the way of unfaithfulness. Yahweh did right in deposing the house of Saul and installing David. *Michal's cameo in 1 Chron. 15.29 is a foil to highlight David's success and concern for the cultus against the backdrop of Saul's failure and disinterest in the things of God.* The view of Curtis and Madsen, that v. 29 '... is a mark of the unskilful art of the Chronicler\(^{878}\), is unacceptable. Second, 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 was omitted for one of the following reasons:

- The Chronicler wanted to continue the dedication festivities uninterrupted.

- The Chronicler wanted to end his account of David's transfer of the ark on a positive note.

- The Chronicler would not allow to stand a harsh judgment on the king from members of the contemptible house of Saul.

- The Chronicler considered this material irrelevant to his message since the dishonour of Saul's house required no further proof (1 Chron. 10.13-14; 13.3; 15.29). It was unnecessary to preserve 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 since the retention of 2 Sam. 6.16 was sufficient for the Chronicler's message.

- The Chronicler was uninterested in the private affairs of David, his *res domestica*. For this reason the material about Michal, Bathsheba (2 Samuel 11-12) and Absalom (2 Samuel 13-20) is set aside.

- The Chronicler was concerned about the image of David, the pious and ideal king. This material is damaging to his image and derogatory to the splendour of the early monarchy. For this reason the material about Michal, Bathsheba and Absalom is not retained. In particular, the Chronicler shared Michal's view that David's attire and activity were inappropriate, and consequently vv. 20b-23 were deleted and the vocabulary of 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27 and 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 was adjusted.

---

\(^{877}\) Japhet 1993: 307-308.

\(^{878}\) Curtis and Madsen 1910: 219.
Several issues merit comment. First, Chronicles' Vorlage should be considered in light of the literary integrity and aims of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23. See 6.1.2.2. Second, Japhet describes the portrayals of Saul and David in the book of Chronicles and it must be remembered that the book does not attempt systematically to present David as an 'ideal' character. Hamilton says:

... for the most part the portions that Chronicles deletes deal with incidents in David's life that are disturbing, questionable, immoral, or inimical toward David. This is not to say that Chronicles whitewashes David and makes a sinner into a saint. Chronicles does include David's second great sin, the taking of the census, and 1 Chron. 22:8 uses much stronger language ("you have shed much blood"), as does 28:3 ("you have shed blood"), than 1 Kings 5:3 does to explain why David cannot build the temple.

Third, the assertion is unverified that 1 Chron. 15.29 requires prior knowledge of Michal in order to make sense of the Chronicler's statement, and the same can be said for claims on 2 Sam. 6.16. The Chronicler has already related Saul's lineage (8.33; 9.39), Saul's and his sons' deaths (10.1-12 // 1 Sam. 31.1-13), David's control of Saul's army (11.2 // 2 Sam. 5.2), David's battles with Saul and the desertion of some of Saul's warriors to David (12.1-2, 19, 23, 29), and he has pointedly articulated Saul's cultic unfaithfulness (10.13-14; 13.3), and he has reported the coronation of David as king over Israel (11.1-3 // 2 Sam. 5.1-3) This information efficiently prepares the reader for comprehending the role of 'Michal, the daughter of Saul' as a foil in 1 Chron. 15.29. Furthermore, exactly what in 1 Sam. 14.49; 18.20-28; 19.11-17; 25.44; and 2 Sam. 3.13-14, is required for understanding 2 Sam. 6.16? What difference does it make here whether or not she is even the wife of David? The contrast is between David and Saul, and she is unmistakably one of Saul's. An evolution in the character of Michal is perceptible in the material prior to the

---

882 As stated by, e.g., McKenzie 1999: 82; Steussy 1999: 110-111.
883 As stated by, e.g., Miller and Roberts 1977: 25; van der Toorn and Houtman 1994: 224.
present context, but here the implicature of 'the daughter of Saul' is clear enough. Assuming 'Merab, the daughter of Saul' is the original reading in 2 Sam. 21.8, would 1 Sam. 14.49 and 18.17-19 be necessary for understanding her role there? No. Auld must be taken seriously:

There are many teasingly brief fragments of information in the biblical narratives. This lone verse about Michal at a window despising David makes perfectly adequate sense in (BTH or) Chronicles. Mention of a daughter of Saul after the report of his death at Gilboa, 'he and his three sons and all his house together' (1 Chron. 10.6), suggests either that the report was proleptic or exaggerated, or that as a daughter she was not reckoned in his house – or that she belonged already in another man's house. The stories in Samuel of David, Saul and Michal may quite as well have been inspired by an earlier reader of BTH glimpsing Michal through that same window and turning story-teller himself.884

The burden of proof rests on scholars who assert that the statement in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 requires prior knowledge of Michal. They must also show that this prior knowledge must be literary in form and could not have been transmitted orally.

It is shown in this and previous chapters that the editors of both 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 adjusted many details in the story. Furthermore, in many cases the evidence does not support the view that words and constructions in Chronicles are the Chronicler's adjustments vis-à-vis Samuel. On one hand, if the Chronicler was so bothered by David's behaviour why did he retain 2 Sam. 6.16 at all?885 On the other hand, if the Chronicler 'lightened' the terminology used for David's attire and activity in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 why could he not reproduce 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 with similar or even more substantial adjustments? There are four options for understanding the origin of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 and its relationship to the book of Chronicles:

---

884 Auld 1999b: 94. Fishkin 1988: 15-57 shows that Michal as a character and person did not remain static in post-biblical literature.
885 'This brief reference to the well-known history, fully reported in 2 Sam. vi. 16, 20-23, of the dispute between David and Michal, shows sufficiently that the Chronist did not wish to be silent concerning this matter from dogmatic or aesthetic considerations. Moreover, ver. 29-xvi. 3 agrees in all essentials with 2 Sam. vi. 16-19a' (Zöckler 1876: 116).
• The material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 is original. It is taken from Samuel by the composers of Chronicles or vice versa, or it is adopted by the composers of both Samuel and Chronicles from a common source. The composers of Samuel add the material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23.

• The material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is original. The composers of Chronicles omit this material. The composers of either Samuel or Chronicles add the material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and it is subsequently transferred into the other version.

• All of 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is original. The composers of Chronicles omit the material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23.

• None of 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is original. The material is added to each version according to the possibilities described above.

A decision regarding what material is original in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 should be taken in light of (1) the periods of composition of these books; however, these are not known with sufficient precision; (2) the editorial history of the Michal episode as a part of the story of David's transfer of the ark; and (3) broader patterns of editorial adjustments within and beyond 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16, which may enable one to discern the direction of movement in the passage at hand.

6.2 Summary of Chapter Six

The Michal material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 clearly backs the Davidic claim to the throne while rejecting the Saulides. David assertively replies to Michal with twice as many words as she uses to rebuke him. His speech redefines Michal's view of honour and dishonour by affirming the maxim 'whoever humbles himself will be exalted'. Murray says: 'With a cruelly sardonic twist to her own words the esteem of haughty, aristocratic Michal is set beneath that of the lowly serving-girls with whom she thought to humiliate David'.

At the outset it should not go unnoticed that there are very difficult text-critical problems in 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-22, but not in v. 23 which, however, on the surface is exceedingly cryptic. As in previous chapters the significant textual and literary issues addressed in this chapter may be summarised according to 'apology of Davidic kingship', 'apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character', and 'influence of cultic practice'. The third theme, influence of cultic practice, is relatively insignificant in this material, but only in this material in the story of David's transfer of the ark. Similarly, the theme 'apology of Davidic kingship' is relatively insignificant in 2 Sam. 6.6-10 // 1 Chron. 13.9-13.

First, the theme apologia of Davidic kingship. Michal's role as representative of the Saulides is underscored by the repetition of the epithet וַיּוֹנָתָלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל in vv. 16, 20b and 23, which also stands opposite עֵרְי הָרְדָה in v. 16. See 6.1.1.1.1, 6.1.1.1.2. The relationship of the long relative clause in v. 21 to the story's pro-David/anti-Saul thrust is obvious. In particular, the terms מַעֲשֶׂה נְאֵי בָּהָר and relate the present passage to the history of David and Saul in 1 Samuel. See 6.1.1.3.3. Verse 23 emphatically asserts by Michal's childlessness the end of Saulide claims to the throne. She, unlike David's other wives, died without children. See 6.1.1.4.1. However, subsequent editors revised biblical history by introducing Michal into a story which favours neither her nor any other descendant of Saul—one final blow against the royal family, and against the queen herself (cf. MT 2 Sam. 21.8). See 6.1.2. Additional expressions in 2 Sam. 6.20b-22 which reinforce David's kingship are מַעֲשֶׂה נְאֵי (6.1.1.2.1), הבֵּית וְזֵכֶר (6.1.1.2.3) and הבָּרוּךְ זֶה (6.1.1.2.3) in 20b; הבֵּית וְזֵכֶר (reinstated?; 6.1.1.3.2) and הבֵּית וְזֵכֶר (6.1.1.3.3) in v. 21; and הבֵּית וְזֵכֶר (6.1.1.3.6), הבֵּית וְזֵכֶר (6.1.1.3.7) and הבֵּית וְזֵכֶר (6.1.1.3.7) in v. 22.

Second, the theme apologia of Davidic and Yahwistic character. First and foremost, David acts לָכֵץ יְהוָה (vv. 16, 21 [twice]). See 6.1.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4. On one hand, by ridiculing Michal's character, David simultaneously upholds his own
character and discredits Saulide rule over Israel. Michal, unlike Hannah, Abigail and the wise women of Tekoa and Abel Beth-maacah, is not an יָשְׂרֵיָה (v. 20b, 22). See 6.1.1.2.3. Similarly, רַעִיָּה in v. 20b says more about Michal's lack of sensibility than about David. See 6.1.1.2.3. On the other hand, David's character is safeguarded by imprecision regarding his precise activity (about which too much is said!), by uncertainty concerning the reason for Michal's anger, and by the hazy (yet precisely stated!) declaration of Michal's childlessness in v. 23. In particular, the absence of רַעִיָּה in vv. 16, 20b and 21 (6.1.1.1.3, 6.1.1.2.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4), and the appearance of יָגִיל (6.1.1.3.5) and בֵּצֵית (6.1.1.3.6) in v. 22, signify editorial interest in upholding the king's piety. MT Samuel's transmitters augmented the negative portrayal of Saul's daughter Michal while portraying David as the valid monarch, yet they also struggled with several aspects of David's personal behaviour. It may be that Michal's attitude toward David inadvertently rubbed off on them! Tension between the Davidic and Saulide dynasties is played out in the story and in the redaction of the text of the story. Ancient editors were pawns in the hands of the text and story as much as the text and story were pawns in the hands of those editors.
CONCLUSION

Chapters one and two are preparatory to the analysis of biblical texts in chapters three through six. **Chapter one** surveys areas of research related to Samuel and Chronicles. First, the writer summarises research and perspectives on these books and their stories of David's transfer of the ark. The review highlights competing approaches to Samuel which centre on either sources or composition and on either a diachronic or synchronic methodology. The literary history of Samuel is inadequate in conventional perspective, and must be freshly unfolded, and consequently the relationship of Samuel and Chronicles must also be re-evaluated. Second, the writer reviews the textual evidence for both books, focusing on the received versions, the Greek translations, and in the case of Samuel, on the Dead Sea Scrolls. The witnesses to Chronicles are relatively uniform, and it is suggested that the pluriformity among witnesses to Samuel, and the character of the MT of this book, are related to Samuel's editorial history. In particular, revisers reshaped the story of David's transfer of the ark in Chronicles and Samuel.

**Chapter two** surveys issues related to synchronic and diachronic approaches to Samuel and Chronicles. The writer suggests that the impasse between these competing approaches may be resolved by the textual-exegetical approach, that is, by using text-critical controls on redactional arguments. The versional evidence substantiates the validity of the diachronic approach—*there are* earlier and later forms of biblical texts and editions of biblical stories—and scholars can use this evidence to discern literary origins and developments—developments in the versions whose special features, and the reasons for them, may be perceived and appreciated through holistic or final-form readings. Related to this, the writer points out that textual variation and grammatical and stylistic incongruities and lexical discrepancies frequently signal editorial developments in
biblical compositions. Three helpful models for understanding this developmental process are considered: McKane's rolling corpus, Tov's and Ulrich's literary layers, and Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis. Finally, it is stated that the principal text-critical aim in this thesis is the detection of earlier and later forms of biblical texts or stories, or to state it differently, the discovery of earlier and later stages in their editorial histories.

**Chapters three through six** closely examine 2 Samuel 6 and the synoptic portions of 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. The writer argues that many details in MT Samuel's story of the ark are secondary, are connected to the language of stories in 1 Samuel, and aim to advance David's kingship and character. In total, the writer discerns three interconnected themes that influenced the revision of MT 2 Samuel 6: an apology of Davidic kingship, an apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character, and cultic practice. The manner in which these themes map onto a particular section of MT 2 Samuel 6 (vv. 1-5; 6-10; 11-15, 17-20a; 16, 20b-23) is summarised at the end of each chapter (3.2, 4.2, 5.2, 6.2). Twenty-nine features special to MT 2 Samuel 6 are associated with one theme, six with two themes\(^8\), and two with three themes\(^8\). The assignment of a variant reading to one theme rather than another is arbitrary to a degree. Politics and religion are related matters.

The story has a royal-sacral thrust. An MT Samuel variant reading may be pro-David and anti-Saul with regard to kingship while simultaneously extolling David's cultic behaviour, i.e. his character, vis-à-vis Saul's. Similarly, the denigration of Uzzah's cultic activity, i.e., an anti-Uzzah stance, may at the same time advance a pro-David and pro-Yahweh perspective by liberating the latter two from any perceivable misconduct. In addition, an implicit comparison between David and Yahweh may give approval to the king's character and behaviour. The following tables sum up these connected themes in MT 2 Samuel 6 as a whole. The reader should consult the appropriate section in the thesis for

---

\(^8\) The text contains some numbers and references that are not clearly visible in the image provided.
the writer's explanation of each variant reading. The non-synoptic material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is summarised separately from the synoptic portions of the stories.

The following variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are secondary to the versions of this book or Chronicles and are related to the theme apologia of Davidic kingship. David is appropriately and rightfully king rather than Saul.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   |oted (3.1.1.2)  
|     |כלזכות האמריק (3.1.3.1)  
|     |שלום אלף (3.1.3.2)  
|     |און (3.1.1.2; perhaps) |
| 2   |כלזכות אמריק (3.1.3.3) |
| 3-4 |בנונה (3.1.2.3) |
| 5   |כלזכות אמריק (3.1.3.4) |
| 5, 14, 16, 17 |לטימ יותר (3.1.4.1, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.6, 6.1.1.1.3; cf. 6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4, appendix 2) |
| 11  |bulan [בנה עבד עבד] (5.1.1.2; perhaps; cf. v 12, [5.1.1.3]) |
| 12  |מדוקדדק (5.1.1.3)  
|     |URITY (5.1.2.1) |
| 14  |אמר או (5.1.3.6, 5.1.3.7;ConfigurationException: 'map is secondary in Chronicles) |
| 15  |כלזכות אמריק (5.1.2.2; cf. v. 5, 3.1.3.4) |
| 16  |והיה (6.1.1.1.1) |
| 17  |שלום (5.1.3.5; placement) |
| 19a |כל בזכות אמריק (5.1.3.8) |

The following variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are related to the theme apologia of Davidic and Yahwistic character. David is a superior person, standing up even to Yahweh, and Uzzah definitely misbehaves rather than the king or the deity.
The following variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are related to the theme of cultic practice. They reinforce the story's royal-sacral thrust (i.e., David as king-priest), add a cultic touch, or link to cultic material elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vv.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>thêm ישב המקדשים (3.1.6.2) is secondary in Chronicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>ífש ישות עמדת ישב המקדשים עליה (3.1.2.3, 3.1.5.2; also secondary in Chronicles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>aal באיתים (3.1.4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 14, 16, 17</td>
<td>וֹלָֽם (3.1.4.1, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.6, 6.1.1.1.3; cf. 6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4, appendix 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>על הסמל (4.1.2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>וֹלָֽם (5.1.1.1; perhaps; in his before is secondary in Chronicles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>וֹלָֽם (5.1.3.4; singular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>אמפ דב אֱלֹהִים (5.1.3.5; singular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>על המאה (5.1.3.5; placement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>כָּל הָֽמוֹן יָשָרִיר (5.1.3.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel in the preceding tables augment the three themes beyond their presence in the shared material in Samuel and Chronicles. For example, the theme of cultic practice is evident already in references to 'before Yahweh/God' (2 Sam. 6.5, 17 // 1 Chron. 13.8; 16.1; cf. 13.10), David's sacrifice (shared in 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2), David's blessing (2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2) and perhaps הַשֵּׁטַח הָרֶשֶׁת (2 Sam. 6.3 [cf. v. 4] // 1 Chron. 13.7).

Some variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are secondary and related to stylistic, lexical or rhetorical preferences.

| v. 6 | (4.1.1.1) |
| v. 7 | (4.1.2.1; also secondary in Chronicles) |
| v. 10 | (4.1.3.5; probably secondary to הָדוּשׁ in 1 Chron. 13.13) |
| v. 13 | (5.1.3.3) |
| v. 18 | (5.1.3.5; also secondary in 1 Chron. 16.2) |
| v. 19a | (5.1.3.8, appendix 1; probably secondary to the minus in 1 Chron. 16.3) |
| v. 19a | (5.1.3.8, appendix 3; probably secondary to בָּאשׁ in 1 Chron. 16.3) |
| v. 19a | Triple הָדוּשׁ (5.1.38) |

The following variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are less certain. In the writer's opinion, Samuel is secondary in the first and second and Chronicles in the third and fourth.

| v. 2 | (3.1.1.3; primary or secondary to יְהוָה יִשָּׁל in 1 Chron. 13.6?) |
| v. 8 | (4.1.3.1, appendix 3; primary or secondary to בָּאשׁ in 1 Chron. 13.11?) |
| v. 9 | (4.1.3.4; primary or secondary to אֶלֶף in 1 Chron. 13.12?) |
| v. 19b | (5.1.2.4; primary or secondary to בָּאשׁ in 1 Chron. 16.43?) |

Finally, some variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are probably antecedent to readings in Chronicles.

| v. 9 | (4.1.3.4, appendix 3; probably primary to דָּוִד in 1 Chron. 13.12) |
| v. 10 | (without preposition (4.1.3.6; cf. 5.1.1.1; probably primary to אֶלֶף in 1 Chron. 13.13) |
| v. 19a | (5.1.3.8, appendix; probably primary to בָּאשׁ in 1 Chron. 16.3) |
| v. 20a | (5.1.2.4; probably primary to בָּאשׁ in 1 Chron. 16.43) |
In the preceding tables the writer refers to variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel that are inserted *secondarily* into MT Chronicles. The reader should consult the appropriate section in the thesis for the writer's argumentation in each case. These interpolations are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Samuel Line</th>
<th>MT Chronicles Line</th>
<th>ffa. References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.2</td>
<td>1 Chron. 13.6</td>
<td>יוהו מש המרותים // יוהו מש אביו (3.1.6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.3</td>
<td>1 Chron. 13.7</td>
<td>말议论 (3.1.2.3, 3.1.5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.7</td>
<td>1 Chron. 13.10</td>
<td>َا ע (4.1.2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.11</td>
<td>1 Chron. 13.14</td>
<td>דבר ערב (in the) // דבר (5.1.1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.14</td>
<td>1 Chron. 15.27</td>
<td>פעלא ידים שם ו (5.1.3.6, 5.1.3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 6.18</td>
<td>1 Chron. 16.2</td>
<td>י avaliação (singular; 5.1.3.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, ירס may have been inserted independently in both Samuel and Chronicles on the basis of style. Second, it is well known that inter-textual dialogue is a widespread feature of biblical literature, and this is all the more understandable for synoptic material. Third, it is not surprising that biblical editors occasionally adjusted Chronicles on the basis of Samuel since Samuel 'ranked higher in canonical esteem' than Chronicles. See 1.3.3 and 2.3.2.1.

Turning to non-synoptic 2 Sam. 6.20b-23, this plus in and of itself, and very many *primary* features within it, uphold Davidic kingship and guard Davidic and Yahwistic character. See the chapter summary in 6.2. The following features of MT Samuel, although they function similarly, are *secondary to the 'original' plus*.

---

889 Würthwein 1979: 18.
The writer argues that vv. 20b-23 are an epilogue, that the lengthy relative clause within it is an addition (v. 21), and that several words ([עָלֶּה, לְהָנָה]) in the plus (v. 21) within the epilogue (vv. 20b-23) are secondary. This series of supplements and alterations underscores the long editorial history of the passage in (MT) Samuel.

The writer discusses the significance of 'doublets' (defined broadly) in chapters one and two. The instances that have been detected in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 are summarised in the following table.

---

890 See 1.3.2, 2.2, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.4, 2.3.2.5.
Samuel shows significantly more instances of this phenomenon than Chronicles, and it is interesting that two of three in the latter are interpolations from Samuel.

There are many links between the stories about David and Saul (1 Samuel 16–31) and David and Absalom (2 Samuel 13–20) (see 2.1 and appendix 5) and there are also many links between the ark stories in 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 and 2 Samuel 6 (see 1.2.2 and appendix 4). In addition, throughout this thesis the writer has pointed out many links between 2 Samuel 6 and other passages in Samuel. Many of these links are secondary (see the tables above). The linked passages occur throughout 1 Samuel, but they cluster in 1 Samuel 10–15 (from Saul's anointing to David's in chapter 16). Chapter 13 is noteworthy. The reader should also observe the significant links with 1 Samuel 2 (Hannah and Samuel) and 1 Samuel 25 (Abigail), and also with 1 Samuel 17 (Goliath). From the perspective of 1 Samuel, the number of links may seem unimpressive; but from the perspective of 2 Samuel 6 (a single chapter!) the large number of links is striking. In addition, scholars have discerned a significant relation between 1 Samuel 1–2 and 2
Samuel 22–23 (see 1.1), and some of the connections between 2 Samuel 22 (David's song) and 2 Samuel 6 are also shared with 1 Samuel 2 (Hannah's song, vv. 1-10; Samuel's service, vv. 11-36). The following list assembles the links which the writer has discerned between 2 Samuel 6 and passages in 1 Samuel outside 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 (and also in 2 Samuel 22).

- The ark and its location. The ark is central in 1 Samuel 3–7 and 2 Samuel 6 only. It appears elsewhere in 2 Sam. 7.2; 11.11; 15.24-25, 29, and in MT 1 Sam. 14.18. Reference is made to (Saul's) før (twice) in 1 Sam. 7.1; 10.5, 10, 26; 11.4; 13.2-3, 15-16; 14.2, 5, 16; 15.34; 22.6; 23.19; 26.1, 3; 2 Sam. 2.24-25; 5.25; 6.3-4; 21.6; 23.29.

- Yahweh's name. יְהֹוָה occurs in 1 Sam. 17.45; 2 Sam. 6.2, 18, and elsewhere in the Bible in Isa. 18.7 only.

- Yahweh's presence. יְהֹוָה appears in 1 Sam. 1.12, 15, 19; 6.20; 7.6; 10.19; 25, 11.15 (twice); 12.7; 15.33; 21.7 ( ); 8; 23.18; 26.19; 2 Sam. 5.3; 6.5, 14, 16-17, 21 (twice); 7.18; 21.9. The theological adverbial rarely occurs in contexts of sacrifice: 1 Sam. 7.6; 11.15; 2 Sam. 6.17.

- Yahweh's abode. יְהֹוָה is used for the deity's dwelling in 1 Sam. 2.22 ( ); 2 Sam. 6.17; 7.6.

- Yahweh's 'break out'. The nominal and verbal forms of יְהֹוָה (once ) occur in 1 Sam. 3.1; 15.23; 25.10; 28.23; 2 Sam. 5.20; 6.8; 13.25, 27. The relation between 2 Samuel 5–6 is also indicated by יְהֹוָה in 2 Sam. 5.21; 6.3-4, and by the root יְהֹוָה in 2 Sam. 5.24; 6.13 (cf. 22.37).

- David's 'supporters'. The numbers 3000 and 30,000 occur in 1 Sam. 4.10; 11.8; 13.2, 5; 24.3; 26.2; 2 Sam. 6.1. ( ) occurs in 1 Sam. 7.2-3; 2 Sam. 1.12; 6.5, 15; 12.8, 16.3. יְהֹוָה appears in 1 Sam. 4.14; 14.16, 19; 2 Sam. 6.19; 18.29. The accompaniment phrase תָּמָא יְהֹוָה אָדָם is used in 1 Sam. 14.20; 2 Sam. 6.20.

- David's dance. The verb יָדְשֹׁר is used in 1 Sam. 18.7; 2 Sam. 2.14; 6.5, 21. Dance in Samuel occurs only in context with David's activities: 1 Sam. 18.6-7; 21.12; 29.5 (dance of Israelite women upon the return of David and Israel after war with the Philistines); 1 Sam. 30.16 (dance of the Amalekites after pillaging Ziklag and prior to their defeat by David and Israel); 2 Sam. 6.5, 14 (?), 16, 21 (dance of David [and the Israelites in 6.5] while transferring the ark).
• 'David's' music. The root שָׁמַי occurs only in 1 Sam. 4.5 (twice), 6 (twice); 10.24; 17.20, 52; 2 Sam. 6.15. David's musical interest and ability are mentioned in 2 Sam. 1.18-27 (Song of the Bow); 2 Sam. 22.1-51 (Song of Thanksgiving); 2 Sam. 23.1 ('Israel's pleasant/sweet psalmist/singer'). Reference is made to David's activity as musician in 1 Sam. 16.16-18, 23; 18.10; 19.9 (always with יָקֹם); רֹבָא, and perhaps (formerly) in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 (cf. מָכָר). Samuel's story is secondary to Chronicles' in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.9, but it is interesting that the root שָׁמַי is used in 1 Sam. 18.6; 2 Sam. 19.36; 22.1 in this book.

• David's clothing. דָּשָׁן is used in 1 Sam. 2.18, 28 (the judge-prophet[-priest?] Samuel); 1 Sam. 14.3 ('Saul's' priest Ahijah); 1 Sam. 21.10; 22.18 ('David's' priests Ahimelech and other priests); 1 Sam 23.6, 9; 30.7 (Abiathar); 2 Sam. 6.14 (David). דָּשָׁן occurs in 1 Sam. 2.18; 2 Sam. 6.14. דָּשָׁן occurs in 1 Sam. 2.18; 22.18; 2 Sam. 6.14.

• David's anger. A person rarely expresses anger with Yahweh in the Bible, and then it is inevitably reported with the phrase יָרֵא יְהוָה. Human anger at the deity appears in 1 Sam. 15.11 (Samuel); 2 Sam. 6.8 (David).

• David's fear. יָרֵא (ץ) occurs in 1 Sam. 12.14, 18, 24; 2 Sam. 6.9.

• David's sacrifice. Saul is associated with sacrifice in 1 Sam. 10.8; 13.9-10, 12, 14.32-34; 15.15, 21-22. The noun הָעַל occurs in 1 Sam. 10.8; 11.15; 13.9; 2 Sam. 6.17, 18; 24.25. The singular הָעַל, in cases where the number of sacrifices is difficult to pinpoint, occurs in 1 Sam. 6.14; 7.9, 10; 13.9, 10, 12; 2 Sam. 6.18; 24.22. The pattern 'singular הָעַל followed by plural הם五金 in a chain' occurs in 1 Sam. 13.9; 2 Sam. 6.18. The pattern 'plural הָעַל followed by singular המ in a chain' occurs in 2 Sam. 6.17; 24.25. מְלַשֵׁה or מְלַשֵׁה הָעַל occurs in context with the verbs מֵלַשֵׁה or מֵלַשֵׁה הָעַל in 1 Sam. 11.15; 2 Sam. 6.17.

• David's distribution. פַּרְנָה is used in 1 Sam. 30.24; 2 Sam. 6.19; 19.30. Other stories in Samuel related to the distribution of spoil and gifts are: 1 Sam. 14.24-46 (Saul's rash vow and Jonathan's reprimand that the Israelites should enjoy the spoil of war against the Philistines); 1 Sam. 15.1-34 (Saul's illicit acquirement of the spoil of war against the Amalekites); 1 Sam. 30.1-31 (David's gift [vv. 11-12] to the Egyptian and his lavish distribution [vv. 26-31] of the spoil of war against the Amalekites).

• David's blessing. In Samuel, David blesses (e.g., 2 Sam. 6.18) or is blessed more than any other person, and blessing is wished on several occasions, but Eli alone blesses another, in this case Elkanah and Hannah (1 Sam. 2.20).

• David's honor and shame. The roots כָּלָה and כָּפֵר are closely associated in 1 Sam. 2.8, 29-30; 6.5-6; 2 Sam. 6.20, 22. The root כָּפֵר occurs in 1 Sam. 2.7; 2 Sam. 6.22; 2 Sam. 22.28. See below on David's honor and shame and Michal's hate.
- David's self-exposure. The expression of Yahweh's self-revelation (וננָלָה ... וננָלָה) in 1 Sam. 2.27 and David's self-exposure (וננָלָה ... וננָלָה) in 2 Sam. 6.20 is beyond coincidence in Samuel and in the Bible.

- David's maid-servants. נָטָתִים and נָטָתִים are used 1 Sam. 1.11 (three times), 16, 18; 25, 24 (twice), 25, 27, 28, 31, 41; 28, 21, 22; 2 Sam. 6.20, 22; 2 Sam. 16.6-7, 12, 15-17, 19; 17.17. Male and maid-servants are closely associated in 1 Sam. 25.41 (האמור ומעמך plastate לhashed רלביד אוצר) and 2 Sam. 6.20 (לפני אמאות מעבר).

- David's selection as king. היה is used for the choice of Saul and David. Yahweh chooses Saul (1 Sam. 10.24; cf. 12.13) and rejects him (1 Sam. 15.23, 26; 16.1). Yahweh chooses David (implied in 1 Sam. 16.11-13; 2 Sam. 6.21) over his brothers (1 Sam. 16.7-10). The verb היה is used 29 times in Samuel, and then as 'appoint' only for Yahweh's appointment of judges over Israel in 2 Sam. 7.11 and Yahweh's appointment of David as אָבִי over Israel in 1 Sam. 13.14 ('over his people'); 25.30 ('over Israel'); 2 Sam. 6.21 ('over Yahweh's people, over Israel'). appears in 1 Sam. 9.16; 10.1; 13.14; 25.30; 2 Sam. 5.2; 6.21; 7.8. occurs in 1 Sam. 25.32, 39; 2 Sam. 18.28.

- David's strength. The root היה is used in 1 Sam. 2.10; 2 Sam. 6.14; 22.18 (cf. נָטָתִים in 2 Sam. 6.3-4, 7-8).

- Michal. Saul's daughter is a character in 1 Sam. 14.49-51; 18.12-29; 19.8-18; 25.43-44; 2 Sam. 3.12-16; 6.12-23; 21.7-9.

- Michal's window. יַצָּה occurs in 1 Sam. 19.12; 2 Sam. 6.16.

- Michal's hate. The verb היה is used in 1 Sam. 2.30; 10.27; 17.42; 2 Sam. 6.16; 12.9, 10. and and היה and סבל are used together in 1 Sam. 2.30; 2 Sam. 6.16, 22.

- Michal's childlessness. Compare Hannah's barrenness in 1 Sam. 1.2, 5-6; 2.5, with Michal's childlessness in 2 Sam. 6.23.

- Michal's death. מֵאָת appears in 1 Sam. 15.35; 2 Sam. 6.23; 20.3 (מֵאָת is the infinitive construct in the latter).

- David's and Michal's confrontation. The confrontation in 2 Samuel 6 has a number of similarities with Samuel's and Saul's confrontation in 1 Samuel 13. See 1 Sam. 13.9-10, 12 and 2 Sam. 6.17-18, 20 in 'David's sacrifice' above. In particular, the phrase 'finish offering' (סְלָלָת + רָכָם) occurs in the Bible only in 1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 6.18. The lexemes רָכָם (1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 6.18, 20) and רָכָם (1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 6.20) can be added to the similarities. See 5.1.3.5.
Lastly, it is interesting that מְשֶלֶת is absent in 2 Sam. 6.14 but is used in 1 Chron. 15.27, as in 1 Sam. 2.19, and הַלְחָם is absent in 2 Sam. 6.19 but is used in 1 Chron. 16.3, as in 1 Sam. 2.36.

The issues of text, language (grammar, vocabulary, style) and story are interconnected. In general, text-criticism is the most dependable means for discerning editorial developments in biblical compositions. The writer has utilised the textual-exegetical method to elucidate earlier and later stages in the editorial histories of Samuel's and Chronicles' stories of David's transfer of the ark. 2 Samuel 6 shows greater textual variation and fluidity, more doublets, and more interpretative difficulties than does 1 Chronicles 13, 15-16. This thesis shows that many readings in 2 Samuel 6 special to MT are interconnected and associated with three intertwined themes.

1 Chronicles 13, 15-16 has one short and two lengthy pluses (13.1-4, 15.1-24, 16.4-42) but the text and story in its synoptic material are more primitive than in synoptic Samuel. 2 Samuel 6 has one short plus (vv. 20b-23) but the text and story in its synoptic material have developed in MT Samuel beyond LXX Samuel and beyond synoptic Chronicles. In other words, MT 2 Samuel 6 is a shorter yet also later version of the story of David's transfer of the ark. To clarify, Chronicles' ark story is supplemented more than Samuel's in quantity of material. Its story is longer. Samuel's ark story is shorter, having only the supplemental Michal material, but this story has developed over a longer period of time. Chronicles' story stopped developing while Samuel's continued 'rolling', for the reasons discussed in 2.3.2.1. These contrasting facts, that is, Samuel's shortness but late wording, and Chronicles' lengthiness but primitive wording, are the reasons for many misjudgements of Chronicles vis-à-vis Samuel(-Kings). Scholars observe the lengthy supplements to Chronicles and they take for granted that Chronicles' terminology is also the result of changes made in this book. To the contrary, a critical examination of the terminology in MT 2 Samuel 6 and MT 1 Chronicles 13, 15-16 indicates that Samuel's
wording is routinely derivative. The story of David's transfer of the ark was edited very differently in (MT) Samuel and Chronicles: (later) word-linkage vs. (earlier) supplements, respectively. The 'poor condition' of the text of MT 2 Samuel 6 is evidence of its editorial history. Specifically, the text reflects much late literary creativity and ideological bias. Its variant readings relate to an apology of Davidic kingship, an apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character, and cultic practice. In addition, many textual manipulations in MT 2 Samuel 6 connect with the language of stories in 1 Samuel, especially chapters 2, 10-15, 17 and 25. All these interconnected adjustments point to successive editorial interventions over a substantial period of time and their cumulative appearance and objective may be labelled a literary layer. Consequently, this writer concurs with Ulrich and Nysse regarding the text of MT 2 Samuel 6 (see 1.3.2). However, the present investigation moves beyond their text-critical investigations by supplying an explanation for the readings in MT 2 Samuel 6 on the basis of a textual-exegetical analysis.

Most accept as true that Chronicles is based on Samuel–Kings in their near-canonical stage of development. Auld argues, however, (1) that Samuel–Kings and Chronicles are revisions by supplementation of a common inherited text and (2) that the stories in 1 Samuel 1–30 were written as a preface to the shared stories in 1 Samuel 31–2 Samuel 24. What are the implications of the present investigation for Auld's theories? First, this thesis does not directly argue for or against either view—the conventional one or Auld's. Second, the results of this thesis suggest that Auld should not base his arguments on the relatively shorter variations between the MT and other texts of Samuel. Most MT 2 Samuel 6 readings post-date readings in LXX Samuel, 4QSam⁹ and synoptic Chronicles. In short, Auld cannot argue his theories primarily on a textual-exegetical basis since the extant versonal evidence is too far removed from the large-scale authorial

⁹¹ 'MT's angularities are probably not mistakes, but evidences of the text's use' (Walters 1993: 290).
procedures which his theories envision. The text-critical evidence suggests, for example, that MT 1 Sam. 2.1-10 and 17.1-58 are relatively later versions of the song of Hannah and the story of David and Goliath, but the textual witnesses cannot be used to show that all of 1 Samuel 1–30 is a supplement to the shared stories in 1 Samuel 31–2 Samuel 24. In addition, Auld must be cautious about building authorial proposals about the non-synoptic Saul stories based on linguistic links between these stories and the synoptic David stories since in the case of the latter the MT may have been influenced in the reverse direction. In other words, for example, revisers adjusted the words in synoptic MT 2 Samuel 6 so as to create word-links with (MT) 1 Samuel 10–15. Consequently, these linkages cannot show that David's ark story prompted the creation of stories about Saul which share similar terminology. Third, the foregoing cautions do not eliminate the possibility that Auld's theories are in fact correct. To the contrary, this writer suggests on several occasions that 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 was written as a preface to 2 Samuel 6, but this contention has a literary rather than a text-critical basis. Furthermore, it is remarkable that many modifications in MT 2 Samuel 6 link to the non-synoptic stories of Saul and the non-synoptic book-ends of Samuel. These late adjustments in MT 2 Samuel 6 may signal the momentum of the earlier supplements to David's story which Samuel and Chronicles share. Finally, the writer suggests that the epilogue in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 was absent from the Chronicler's Vorlage and that this supplement may coincide with the composition of earlier stories involving Michal in 1 Samuel. Much work remains to be done on the unfolding of sources and revisions in the stories about David in Samuel and Chronicles.

892 See, e.g., 1.2.2.