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I. Introduction

1. A Problem

Chronicles was composed in the postexilic period when the Jews were without their own king and were living under the rule of the Persian Empire and the Greek dynasties of the Ptolemies and Seleucids.¹ In view of the apparently eternal nature of the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:11b-16), this loss of sovereignty would have posed a difficult problem for the Jews.² To be sure, Zerubbabel, grandson of Jehoiachin, penultimate king of the Davidic kingdom, was appointed as governor of Yehud by the Persian king Darius (Hag 1:1) and received YHWH’s promise of being his ‘signet ring’ (Hag 2:23); however, he could not and did not re-establish the kingdom of David.³

When the Jews lost their political leadership in the postexilic period, religious personnel appeared to play an increasingly important role as leaders of the Temple-centered community. Along with Zerubbabel, Joshua, the high priest of the Jewish community that had returned from the exile, led the project of rebuilding the Temple (Hag 1:1; Ezra 3:2).⁴ The book of Chronicles reflects this Temple-centered community and deals in much detail with issues relating to the cultic personnel. The two main figures in Chronicles, David and Solomon, are presented respectively as the

---

¹ Here, the term ‘Jews’ (יהודים/יודים) carries ethnic connotations. Shaye J. D. Cohen points out that the term ‘Jew’ in modern English could convey religious overtones rather than having an ethnic sense. That is to say, in modern English, a ‘Jew’ could mean someone who believes and practices Judaism but is not a Jew in an ethnic sense. To avoid confusion, if יורד occurs before the end of the second century B.C.E., Cohen translates it not as the religious term, ‘Jew’, but as the ethnic-geographic term, ‘Judaean’. Lester L. Grabbe also notes that before the Roman period, the term ירדיה was understood ethnically. See Shaye J. D. Cohen, The Beginnings of Jewishness (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 69-70 and Lester L. Grabbe, A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period II (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 153-154.

² Although the word ברק ('covenant’) does not occur in 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicles 17, God’s promise of an eternal kingdom to David and his descendants of a kingdom and kingship is referred to as ‘the covenant’ elsewhere in the Old Testament (e.g., 2 Chr 13:5; 21:7).

³ Lester L. Grabbe, Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian (London: SCM, 1992), 79.

⁴ Joshua the high priest takes one wing of the leadership of the Jewish community returned from the Exile. However, as Deborah Rooke points out, Joshua’s leadership does not have an effect on civil affairs; rather, its influence remains in the Temple-centred cultic arena. See Deborah W. Rooke, Zadok’s Heirs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 151.
one who prepares (1 Chr 22: 28:1-29:20), and the one who completes (2 Chr 2:1-5:1) the Temple building project. Furthermore, the Chronicler evaluates the Judaic kings who reigned after Solomon in relation to their piety and their service in the Temple. Those who were considered ‘good’ kings worshipped God in the Temple according to the divine commandment, diligently repairing and restoring the Temple, whereas those who were considered ‘bad’ kings were negligent in their worship of YHWH and in their preservation of the Temple.

In the context of this postexilic Temple-centred cultic society, the question may be asked: Does the Chronicler hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom in view of the seemingly and eternally binding (ךְּלִי), unconditional Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:12-16; 1 Chr 17:11-14), or is he satisfied with its replacement by the postexilic, Temple-centered cultic society?

With regard to the Chronicler’s view of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom, scholarly opinion is divided. On the one hand, some scholars argue that the book of Chronicles advocates the re-establishment of the Davidic kingdom on the basis of the continued relevance of the covenant. That is, they suggest that the Davidic covenant remains operative in the future and underpins the future restoration of the Davidic kingdom. On the other hand, a number of scholars claim that the Chronicler is not

---


interested in the revival of the Davidic kingdom. Rather, they contend that the Chronicler’s sole interest lies in the Temple and its cultus and it is through them that the Davidic covenant may be realized.

Scholars on both sides of this debate base their contentions upon textual considerations within Chronicles: in particular, its terminology, structure, genealogy, and its portrait of David. Thus, scholars supporting the former view cite terminological evidence from the text that they claim evokes the eschatological restoration of the Davidic kingdom: for example, the use of the phrase ‘all Israel’ (e.g., 1 Chr 11:1, 4; 12:39 (38); 14:8), a word which is normally used for chaotic situations outside of Israel, and the exaggeration of the numbers of people (1 Chronicles 24-25), which reflect the ideal eschatological religious establishment in the restored future kingdom. In terms of structure, it has also argued that the Chronicler’s decision to jump directly to the narrative about David from the genealogy, while skipping the so-called ‘Salvation History’, implies his interest in the revival of the Davidic kingdom. With regard to the genealogy in 1 Chronicles 1-9, those scholars who argue in favour of the Chronicler’s interest in the restoration of the Davidic line point to the elaborate

---


9 Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, 128.


11 Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes*, 120.
genealogy of the Davidide Zerubbabel in 1 Chr 3:17-22. Moreover, with respect to the Chronicler’s portrait of David, they also stress the sanitized presentation of David (e.g., the Chronicler’s non-inclusion of the Bathsheba narrative and the rebellion of Absalom) that is found within these traditions.

In contrast, scholars who claim that the Chronicler is uninterested in Davidic restoration argue that eschatological terminology is scarce and indistinct in Chronicles compared to the prophetic literature. In addition, they suggest that the lack of hatred against other nations, which is common in other messianic prophecies, indicates the Chronicler’s disinterest in the eschatological restoration of the Davidic kingdom. Moreover, it is also noted that the Chronicler highlights David as ‘the man of the Temple’ more than ‘the man of war’ by inverting the order of 2 Samuel 5 (David’s war against Philistines) and 2 Samuel 6 (David’s transfer of the ark) in 1 Chronicles 13-14. That is, the Chronicler’s placement of the ark account prior to the war account indicates that his cultic interest prevails over political and military affairs. Furthermore, the Chronicler’s failure to mention the release of the Davidide Jehoiachin (2 Kgs 25:27-30) and his decision to end the book with Cyrus’s order to restore the Temple are cited by some scholars as evidence to support the view that the Chronicler’s principal interest lay in the Temple and its cultus rather than in the revival of the Davidic line. Finally, scholars who adopt this reading of Chronicles

---

12 Im, Das Davidbild in den Chronikbüchern, 184; J. A. Thompson, 1, 2 Chronicles, NAC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 71. The term ‘Davidide’ means of the Davidic family or of Davidic descendant.

13 Rothstein and Hänel, Das erste Buch der Chronik, XLIII; Von Rad,, Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes 122, 131.

14 Rudolph, Chronikerbücher, xxiii., “Problems of the Books of Chronicles,” 408;


16 Caquot, “Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l’oeuvre du Chroniste?,” 115.

17 Ibid.

have also noted the insignificant place of David’s genealogy in 1 Chr 2:3-4:23, the presentation of the king’s shortcomings in 1 Chronicles 21 and the portrayal of Solomon, rather than David, as the ideal figure within the book.  

It is widely agreed that the Davidic covenant forms a fundamental basis for the hope of the reestablishment of the Davidic kingdom. It seems to me, then, that the key to discovering the Chronicler’s view of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom surely lies in uncovering his understanding of the Davidic covenant. An important issue is the Chronicler’s understanding of the nature of the Davidic covenant; that is, was it a covenant that depended on the moral behaviour of kings or was it absolute and independent of any of the monarchs’ deeds? In other words, was it conditional or unconditional? The Davidic covenant appears to be unconditional in its central texts of 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Chronicles 17. Phrases – such as ‘But I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you’ (2 Sam 7:15), and ‘I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you’ (1 Chr 17:13b) – indicate that, unlike the divine promise of kingship granted to Saul, this promise to David was eternal and not conditioned by what the Davidic kings actually did.

Elsewhere, however, the covenant appears to have been established on the premise that certain behaviour was required from the reigning king. In 1 Kgs 8:25, for instance, the Davidic line will continue, ‘if only your children look to their way, to walk before me as you have walked before me’ (cf., 1 Kgs 8:25//2 Chr 6:16; 1 Kgs 9:4-9//2 Chr 7:17-22).

If the covenant were conditional, then it would be easier for Jews to explain why the kingdom was lost; namely, the Israelites’ disobedience resulted in the downfall of the kingdom. However, it is not so simple. As I will show in the

---

19 Sparks holds that the Chronicler’s genealogy forms a chiastic structure centred upon the genealogy of cultic personnel, i.e., the sons of Aaron and the Levites in 1 Chr 6:33-38 (48-53). See Sparks, The Chronicler's Genealogies, 365.


21 Hearafter, English translation is from NRSV unless indicated.
following, the difficulty lies in the coexistence of both the conditionality and unconditionality of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles as well as in Samuel-Kings

2. Review of Previous Scholarship

As mentioned above, scholars have yet to reach a consensus on how the Chronicler understood the revival of the Davidic kingdom in view of the Davidic covenant. Several issues need to be unpacked.

2. 1. Nathan’s oracle

There is debate regarding how Nathan’s oracle is used by the Chronicler. 1 Chr 17:4-14 differ from its synoptic text of 2 Sam 7:5-16 in three ways. First, the phraseology that describes the continuation of the Davidic kingship is אֲשֹּׁר לֹא נָחַל in 2 Sam 7:12 whereas it is אֲשֹּׁר לֹא נָחַל in 1 Chr 17:11. Secondly, the possible chastisement of the Davidic offspring prescribed in 2 Sam 7:14 (‘when he commits iniquity, I will correct him with the rod of men and the strokes of the sons of man’) does not appear in Chronicles. Thirdly, there is a series of differences between the personal pronouns in 1 Chr 17:14 (‘But I will confirm him in my house and in my kingdom forever, and his throne shall be established forever’) and those of 2 Sam 7:16 (‘Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever’).

C. F. Keil argues that these three differences are not merely textual variations, but exegetical alterations that reflect the Chronicler’s interest in the coming of the Messiah through the Davidic line.\(^{22}\) While אֲשֹּׁר לֹא נָחַל in 2 Sam 7:12 refers to Solomon, אֲשֹּׁר לֹא נָחַל in 1 Chr 17:11 refers to David’s remote descendant, who will be the Messiah.\(^{23}\) Keil contends that אֲשֹּׁר לֹא נָחַל in 1 Chr 17:11 is not ‘to belong to’ but ‘to arise or be born from’, as in Gen 17:16 and Eccl 3:20.\(^{24}\) Moreover, he argues that the Chronicler’s exclusion of the chastisement from 2 Sam


\(^{23}\) Ibid., 223.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.
7:14 is understandable if we assume that the Messiah, who is free from sin and chastisement, is the inheritor of the Davidic kingdom. According to Keil, the third difference may also be interpreted in light of messianic expectation. Whereas the promise in 2 Sam 7:16 is spoken to David, the promise in 1 Chr 17:16 is for the seed of David, that is, the Messiah whose throne shall be established forever in the kingdom of God.

With regard to the contentious clause, יִהְיֶה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשָּׂרָאֵל בָּהֶרֶם (1 Chr 17:11), H. G. M. Williamson disagrees with Keil by contending that it refers to Solomon based on the context of the chapter in which Solomon is referred to as the Temple builder. According to Williamson, since יִהְיֶה בְּיִשָּׂרָאֵל could be rendered syntactically as either ‘be born’ or just ‘from among’, it is the context of the clause that provides the key for its exegesis and supports Solomon as the referent of this phrase. The focal point for the interpretation of יִהְיֶה בְּיִשָּׂרָאֵל is the use of יִהְיֶה בְּיִשָּׂרָאֵל within its context. In the following, I will discuss the use of יִהְיֶה בְּיִשָּׂרָאֵל in detail in other Old Testament texts as well as within the context of Nathan’s oracle.

With regard to the third difference, Keil holds that the change from the 2nd person pronoun to 3rd person pronoun in 1 Chr 17:14 is indicative of the Chronicler’s expectation of the Messiah. However, this is an oversimplification and the exegetical changes must be seen in light of the chapter’s overall presentation of its shared material. There are more complex issues to explore, such as the meaning of ‘my house’ and the meaning of ‘establishing him in my house and my kingdom’, which I will detail in the chapters to follow.

As to the lack of the chastisement clause (2 Sam 7:14) in Chronicles, Williamson argues that it could be better understood if we assumed that the Chronicler is referring to the Temple builder, Solomon, as the inheritor of the

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid., 224.


28 Ibid., 306-308.
kingdom, who does not go astray from God’s commandments in Chronicles. In other words, since Solomon is described as an impeccable figure, there is no need for chastisement. According to Williamson, David’s reception of God’s promise of the eternal dynasty, and Solomon’s fulfilment of the conditions (i.e., obedience to God’s commandments) make this promise unconditional after the death of Solomon.

However, Williamson’s further contention that Solomon’s obedience to God’s commandment makes the Davidic covenant eternal is not convincing. As Kenneth E. Pomykala points out, with reference to 2 Chr 6:16b, the conditions of the Davidic covenant are applied not just to Solomon but also to David’s other descendants: ‘There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel ‘if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me’. The succession of the Davidic throne is conditioned on the obedience of ‘sons’ rather than Solomon alone.

Pomykala maintains that the Davidic covenant in Chronicles is conditional and its nature can explain the downfall of the Davidic kingdom. He argues that the lack of conditions in the covenant does not necessarily mean that it is ‘unconditional’. However, Pomykala has not adequately taken account of the unconditional elements in the text, such as 1 Chr 17:13 (‘I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you’), which call his views into question. It is difficult to see how the covenant could only be conditional.

With regard to the fall of Judah, Pomykala also contends that the phrase נאarily attached to the Davidic covenant is not to be understood as ‘eternity’ but as ‘remote time’. He finds a clue for this interpretation from another temporal phrase
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in 1 Chr 17:17, which he translates as ‘far off’. However, it will be shown in the following that his understanding of the temporal sense of מְרוֹם, based on מְרוֹם, is open to challenge.

Pomykala follows his predecessors, Adam C. Welch and Wilhelm Rudolph, in seeing no hope expressed within Chronicles for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. The Davidic covenant has been discarded on account of the Israel’s disobedience. Welch cites 1 Chr 28:7 to stress the significance of the Davidic descendants’ obedience to the Torah:

I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today. (italics added)

Rudolph also negates the hope of restoration by stating that the Chronicler’s concern is not for the Davidic kingdom but the Temple and its cultus:

The failure of the Davidic dynasty could be borne, so long as the second pillar of the theocracy, the Jerusalem Temple, stood firm…The significance of the house of David for salvation was then limited to the fact that David and Solomon had created for the Temple those ordinances upon which the acceptable worship of the present community depended.

Along this line, Pomykala minimizes the significance of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10 (‘He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever’) and 1 Chr 28:7, arguing that these are presented in the context of David’s commission to Solomon to build the Temple.

35 Ibid., 96-97.
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D. N. Freedman and Steven L. McKenzie do not see the issue as unambiguously as Welch, Rudolph and Pomykala. There is ambivalence in the Chronicler’s view of the nature of the Davidic covenant. 2 Chr 7:12-14 and 2 Chr 7:17-20 seem to advocate both a conditional and unconditional covenant:

40 If my people who are called by my name humble themselves, pray, seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land. (2 Chr 7:14)

41 As for you, if you walk before me, as your father David walked, doing according to all that I have commanded you and keeping my statutes and my ordinances, then I will establish your royal throne, as I made covenant with your father David saying, ‘You shall never lack a successor to rule over Israel’. (2 Chr 7:17-18)

Both Freedman, who underscores the overruling grace of God in 2 Chr 17:12-14, and McKenzie, who highlights the eternal aspect of the covenant in 2 Chr 7:14 as well as the ‘conditional’ aspect in 2 Chr 7:17-18, believe that the Chronicler expresses hope for the restored kingdom within the Davidic covenant. The ambivalent nature of the covenant, its apparent conditionality and unconditionality, is clearly vital to the present thesis and I will attempt to untangle the complex nexus of issues in the following chapters.

2. Solomon’s prayer

The end of Solomon’s prayer during the dedication of the Temple in 2 Chr 6:41-42 is another point of debate amongst scholars. In 1 Kgs 8:53, Solomon’s prayer includes a recounting of YHWH’s redemptive act in bringing Israel out of Egypt through Moses. By contrast, the Chronicler utilizes Psalm 132:8-10 with its reference to the Ark’s close relationship to YHWH and the phrase יִדְּרוֹנָא, which derives from Isa 55:3. G. von Rad, M. Noth, and M. Saebo assert that these differences tell us


something of the Chronicler’s hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. However, their view is disputed by other scholars. Rudolph acknowledges the slightly heightened importance of the Davidic covenant in 2 Chr 6:41-42, but he minimizes its effect by saying that the theme of endurance of the Davidic dynasty is rarely found and is indistinct in Chronicles as compared to the prophetic literature. Rudolph’s reasoning is unconvincing exegetically as we shall show below.

Concerning of 2 Chr 6:42, A. Caquot and S. Japhet insist that it should be read as a subjective genitive (i.e. the phrase does not mean God’s loving kindness for David, but rather David’s faithfulness). They therefore do not see any hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom within this phrase. The phrase is crucial for this debate and I will discuss it in the following chapters and argue that it is better understood as an objective genitive.

2. 3. Abijah’s speech

The Judaean king Abijah’s address against Jeroboam and the northern Israelites in 2 Chr 13:4-12 is another disputed passage. According to some, it accentuates the significance of the Davidic kingdom. Von Rad, for instance, argues that the Davidic kingship over Israel is described by the Chronicler as ‘the covenant of salt’ (2 Chr 13:5) and the naming of the Davidic kingdom as the kingdom of YHWH (e.g. 2 Chr 13:8) suggests the eschatological hope, transcendence, and godliness in the Davidic kingdom. For him, these points reinforce the Chronicler’s hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom.

W. Riley, by contrast to von Rad, claims that Abijah’s resort to ‘the covenant of salt’ in 2 Chr 13:5 does not necessarily represent an unending Davidic dynasty. Moreover, the Chronicler’s identification of the kingdom of David with the kingdom
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of YHWH implies that David is a vassal of YHWH and not that the Davidides hold an eternal status. Pomykala likewise denies that the ‘covenant of salt’ implies the enduring validity of the Davidic covenant. He contends that if ‘the covenant of salt’ signifies God’s confirmation of the eternity of the Davidides, then one cannot explain the period from the fall of Judah to the Chronicler’s time (about 150-200 years) when Israel was without a Davidic king. In the following, I will investigate the concept of the ‘covenant of salt’ and the description of the Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom, arguing for their significance in the Chronicler’s understanding of the eternal validity of the Davidic covenant.

Caquot too sees little relevance in the ‘covenant of salt’ in 2 Chr 13:5. He argues that a distinction should be maintained between Abijah and the Chronicler’s views. For him, Abijah’s speech reflects the Judaean king’s view and not the Chronicler’s confession. While one must distinguish between the Chronicler’s point of view and that of a character within its narrative, Caquot’s point is weakened when it is realized that 2 Chr 13:5 is not paralleled in the Deuteronomistic history. It is the Chronicler’s Sondergut.

2. 4. Other disputed passages

Von Rad adduces two exegetical variances in 2 Chr 7:18 (cf., 1 Kgs 9:5) to support his view that the Chronicler envisions a re-establishment of the Davidic kingdom. He argues that was changed to , and to .
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Then I will establish the throne of your kingdom over Israel forever, as I spoke unto David, your father, saying, ‘A man upon the throne of Israel shall not be cut off for you’. (1 Kgs 9:5, my translation)

The covenanted throne of David is everlasting, and the Chronicler suggests that the coming of the Davidic Messiah is preordained. (2 Chr 7:18, my translation)

For von Rad, the first alteration evokes the hope of restoration in the Davidic covenant, while the second adaptation, which is cited from the well known messianic passage of Mic 5:1 (2), indicates strongly the Chronicler’s interest in the coming of the Davidic Messiah.51 Riley, however, disagrees with von Rad about the first variance. For him, it is meant to accentuate the covenantal nature of the word to David, rather than to reinforce the eternity of the Davidic covenant.52 In addition, he notes that the phrase follows the condition of the covenant in 2 Chr 7:17.53 Riley’s work is valuable in the way that it points out the conditional element of the Davidic covenant, but it fails to address the rationale: why does the Chronicler want to accentuate the covenant in this way?

Concerning what he considered the ‘messianic’ phrase, of 2 Chr 7:18, Riley denies that it is an alteration made by the Chronicler.54 He proposes that the Chronicler simply followed his Vorlage, which is the Hebrew text behind 3 Kgdms 9:5 in the LXX (paralleled in LXX 2 Chr 7:18).55

καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸν θρόνον τῆς βασιλείας σου ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καθὼς ἐλάλησε τῷ Δαυίδ πατρί σου λέγων σύκ εξαρθήσεται σου ἀνήρ ἡγούμενος ἐν Ἰσραήλ
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Then I will establish the throne of your kingship over Israel forever, as I spoke to your father David, saying, ‘There shall not be taken from you a man ruling in Israel’. (3 Kgdms 9:5, my translation)

With regard to מֹשֶׁלְךָ בְּרָם אֲלֵיהֶם of 2 Chr 7:18, I will therefore attempt to ascertain the most plausible Vorlage of the Chronicler between 1 Kgs 9:5 of the MT and 3 Kgdms 9:5 of the LXX, and argue that מֶשֶׁלְךָ בְּרָם אֲלֵיהֶם is the Chronicler’s own exegetical shaping rather than his use of a textual variant that is also attested in the text of 3 Kgdms 9:5.

A related issue is the difference between the text of 2 Chr 21:17 and 2 Kgs 8:19. In place of the phrase, ‘for the sake of David’ (2 Kgs 8:19), the Chronicler includes a longer clause, ‘because of the covenant that he had made with David’ in 2 Chr 21:17:

Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David for the sake of the covenant that he covenanted with David, and since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever. (my translation)

Additionally, the Chronicler uses the phrase ‘the house of David’ for ‘Judah’ (2 Kgs 8:19) within this verse. While von Rad and Williamson read the Chronicler’s hope for a restoration of the Davidic kingdom within these discrepancies, Riley remains opposed to such a reading. Rather, he claims that the emphasis on the Davidic covenant in 2 Chr 21:7 in fact refers to the need for the dynasty until such a time that the lamp (יְלִי), which is, according to him, the Temple or Temple cultus, is established. However, as will be shown below, ‘the lamp’ may be otherwise explained.

Finally, in the reign of Athaliah, the sole non-Davidic ruler in the history of Judah, the high priest Jehoiada conspires to restore the Davidic line through Joash proclaiming that ‘Here is the king’s son! Let him reign, as the LORD promised concerning the sons of David’ (2 Chr 23:3).
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Given that Jehoiada’s proclamation is not paralleled in the Deuteronomistic history, von Rad and Williamson view this as evidence for the Chronicler’s longing for the lost kingdom of David. On the contrary, Pomykala asserts that Jehoiada’s proclamation does not spell out the Chronicler’s longing for the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom but rather his conviction of YHWH’s continued commitment to the Davidic family in the midst of the threat against the Davidides. According to Pomykala, if someone focuses on the renewal of the Davidic dynasty in this passage after two hundred years of the demise of Judah, his or her focus would be inappropriate. Pomykala does not see a restoration motif in the Davidic covenant of Chronicles because he views the Davidic covenant as conditional. In his view, because the Israelites did not meet the conditions, there is no place for restoration. However, as I will discuss below, the weakness of Pomykala’s view is his failure to consider the unconditional aspect of the Davidic covenant.

2. 5. Terminology

In scholarly circles, the view supporting the Chronicler’s hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom is often referred to as ‘eschatological’ while the position supporting the Chronicler’s satisfaction with the status quo – that is, the postexilic Temple-centred cultic society – is known as ‘theocratic’. Here, the term ‘eschatology’ incorporates both a narrow and a broad sense. Eschatology in its narrow sense concerns the end time of the world accompanying cosmic catastrophe ordered by God, whereas eschatology in a broader sense concerns the expectation of better
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things in the context of the existing world.\textsuperscript{62} The ‘eschatological’ position may be further subdivided into the two categories: ‘messianic’ and ‘royalistic’.\textsuperscript{63} The ‘messianic’ viewpoint expects the coming of the Messiah at the end of time\textsuperscript{64} whereas the ‘royalistic’ perspective anticipates the political restoration of the Davidic kingdom without assuming such an end time.

This survey of scholarship shows that several interrelated issues remain unresolved in the study of the Chronicler’s understanding of the nature of the Davidic covenant. It is for this reason that we must take a comprehensive look at all the relevant passages in 1 and 2 Chronicles in order to help us better understand what was his understanding of the fulfilment of the Davidic covenant.

3. Methodology

What I should like to do in this work is to ask the following question: does the book of Chronicles support \textit{in the Davidic covenant} the restoration of the Davidic kingdom for the future or does it replace God’s promise of an eternal Davidic kingship with the Temple and its cultus? I will attempt to answer this question by making a thorough investigation of all the texts in Chronicles that deal with the Davidic covenant. Although the importance of this covenant within Chronicles is widely recognized by scholars, there has not been a comprehensive, exegetical study of the Davidic covenant in relation to the Chronicler’s hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. I will not deal with other issues, such as the genealogy of Zerubbabel, the absence of the release of Jehoiachin, or the lack of hatred against other nations in Chronicles; these topics are important in themselves but are secondary to the purpose of this work. However, I will discuss these related issues in


the final chapter, once I have ascertained the Chronicler’s understanding of the Davidic covenant in relation to the restoration of the monarchy.

The method adopted in this investigation will be exegetical. I will investigate by detailed exegesis all the passages to which the Davidic covenant is referred in Chronicles: 1 Chr 17:1-27; 22:6-13; 28:2-10; 2 Chr 1:8-10; 6:3-17, 40-42; 7:17-22; 13:1-22; 21:2-7; and 23:1-3.65 In order to discern fully the import of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles, I will conduct textual, linguistic, semantic, syntactical, and grammatical investigations through a close reading of the texts. I will discuss the texts which refer to the Davidic covenant in their literary context and, where appropriate, compare them to their synoptic parallels in Samuel-Kings. Where the passages in Chronicles have parallels in Samuel-Kings, it will be important to compare them both in order to understand better the Chronicler’s view. If there is no parallel passage to be found in Samuel-Kings, then one could argue that it is part of the Chronicler’s Sondergut and will reveal the Chronicler’s ideology, even though the extra-biblical source cannot be specifically identified.

Since the Chronicler’s source may be different from the textus receptus of the MT Samuel-Kings, the Chronicler’s deviation may not be the result of the Chronicler’s Tendenz but rather is the result of his using different sources.66 Thus, in
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my investigation of the nine passages in Chronicles, it will be important to consider any relevant synoptic texts in the Qumran scrolls (4QSam^a, 4QSam^b, 4QSam^c, 4QKgs, 4QChr), in order to discern fully the Chronicler’s Tendenz on the Davidic covenant.

The main text I will use in this research is the Masoretic Text (MT) (Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, eds., K. Elliger and W. Rudolph), as well as the Septuagint (LXX) (Septuaginta, ed., Alfred Rahlfs), when required. For English translations of the MT, I will primarily cite the NRSV along with my own translations. For English translations of the LXX, I will use NETS as the default version along with my translations. Versification follows the MT and the LXX and if the versification of the English translation is different from that of the MT and LXX, I will add it in a parenthesis.

II. The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chronicles 17:1-27

1. Setting

Nathan’s oracle of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is preceded by David’s transfer of the ark of the covenant of YHWH from Obed-Edom to Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 15-16). Having transferred the ark to Jerusalem, David thinks of building a house for the ark. However, Nathan’s oracle interferes with David’s plan as the oracle reveals that it is not David who will build a house for YHWH, but YHWH who will build the house for David. 1 Chronicles 17 consists of two parts: Nathan’s oracle of God’s royal promise for David and his family (vv. 1-15), and David’s prayer in response to the promise (vv. 16-27). In particular, elements of the Davidic covenant are present in vv. 10b-14, v. 24b, and v. 27a. Several differences in the following synoptic comparison between 1 Chronicles 17 and its parallel text, 2 Samuel 7, disclose the Chronicler’s Tendenz.

2. Synoptic Comparison

2. 1. 2 Sam 7:6//1 Chr 17:5

The first noteworthy point of synoptic comparison is in 1 Chr 17: 5, where of 2 Sam 7:6 is not present:

כִּי לֹא נִשָּׁבֵה בְּבֵית לָמוֹד הָעֵדֶת אֲשֶׁר-נִשָּׁבֵה אֲשֶׁר נִשָּׁבֵה

I have not lived in a house since the day I brought up the people of Israel from Egypt to this day, but I have been moving about in a tent and a tabernacle. (2 Sam 7:6)

כִּי לֹא נִשָּׁבֵה בְּבֵית מֹרְחֵבָּה אֲשֶׁר נִשָּׁבֵה אֲשֶׁר נִשָּׁבֵה

For I have not lived in a house since the day I brought out Israel to this very day, but I have been from tent to tent and from a tabernacle. (1 Chr 17:5, my translation)
In Japhet’s judgment, the lack of ‘Egypt’ in 1 Chr 17.5 should be viewed in the same light as the Chronicler’s exclusion of the so-called Salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*), which includes the Exodus and Conquest narratives. After the long genealogy in the first nine chapters, the Chronicler skips the Exodus-Conquest narrative and jumps straight to the short narrative of Saul's death, which functions as a steppingstone to the David narrative. Japhet holds that the limited role of the Exodus in Chronicles is not only detected in the omission of the Salvation history but also in the omission of the reference to the Exodus from Egypt. As for the Chronicler’s preference of the Davidic covenant to the Sinai covenant, R. North states:

The primary vehicle of Israel’s ‘chosenness’, he shows, was not Moses on Sinai at all. No, it was David on Zion! Only some such firm and avowed intention accounts for the ruthlessness with which he suppresses any allusion to the whole exodus event.

Since one popular explanation for the lack of the Exodus narrative in Chronicles is the Chronicler’s preference for the Davidic covenant as opposed to the Sinai covenant of the Exodus, we need to explore whether the Chronicler did indeed intentionally suppress the Sinai covenant. Comparing Chronicles with the Deuteronomistic history, there are four more places, in addition to 1 Chr 17:5, where the Chronicler does not mention ‘Egypt’ in relation to the Exodus: these are 2 Chr 3:2; 6: 11, 39, 40:

(1) 1 Kgs 6:1//2 Chr 3:1-2
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69 North, “Theology of the Chronicler,” 378. Along the same lines, A. M. Brunet asserts that ‘Si l’élection d’Abraham et l’alliance que Dieu a conclue avec lui amorcent en quelque sorte le royaume de Dieu, l’Exode et l’alliance du Sinai ne sont que des étapes qui acheminent Israël vers le régime politique parfait: la théocratie davidique. Dans ces conjuncture, on comprend facilement que la mention de l’Exode et meme celle de l’alliance du Sinai deviennent superflues au moment où Dieu vient de poser son dernier acte dans la réalization de la théocratie, en permettant au fils de David d’édifier le Temple. Ce qui importe alors c’est de souligner l’alliance par excellence, celle que Dieu a conclue avec David.” in “La Théologie du Chroniste Théocratie et Messianisme,” 391
In the four hundred eightyeth year after the Israelites came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon’s reign over Israel, in the month of Ziv, which is the second month, he began to build the house of the LORD. (1 Kgs 6:1)

Solomon began to build the house of the LORD in Jerusalem on Mount Moriah, where the LORD had appeared to his father David, at the place that David had designated, on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite. He began to build on the second day of the second month of the fourth year of his reign. (2 Chr 3:1-2)

Having prepared all the needed materials and personnel for the building of the Temple (2 Chronicles 2), Solomon begins to build the Temple in 2 Chronicles 3. 2 Chr 3:1-2 is the introduction of the actual Temple building narrative, where any reference to ‘Egypt’ is absent. While the Deuteronomist begins the Temple building narrative with a temporal phrase counting the time passed from the Exodus out of Egypt, the Chronicler begins with a geographical detail.

(2) 1 Kgs 8:21//2 Chr 6:11

There I have provided a place for the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with our ancestors when he brought them out of the land of Egypt. (1 Kgs 8:21)

There I have set the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with the people of Israel. (2 Chr 6:11)

This is a part of Solomon’s dedication speech after he finished building the Temple and had brought up the ark of YHWH. While יָהּ appears in the subordinate clause, יָהּ in 1 Kgs 8:21, it is wanting in 2 Chr 6:11.

(3) 1 Kgs 8:49-51//2 Chr 6:39

Then hear in heaven your dwelling place their prayer and their plea, maintain their cause and forgive your people who have sinned against you, and all their transgressions that they have committed against you; and grant them compassion in the sight of their captors, so that they may have compassion on them (vv. 49-50) for they are your people and heritage, which you brought out of Egypt, from the midst of the iron-smelter. (1 Kgs 8:49-51)
Then hear from heaven your dwelling place their prayer and their pleas, maintain their cause and forgive your people who have sinned against you. (2 Chr 6:39)

This is also part of Solomon’s dedication prayer. 2 Chr 6:39 is shorter than 1 Kgs 8:49-50, and 1 Kgs 8:51, which include God’s deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, is absent in Chronicles.

(4) 1 Kgs 8:52-53//2 Chr 6:40-42

Let your eyes be open to the plea of your servant, and to the plea of your people Israel, listening to them whenever they call to you. 53 For you have separated them from among all the peoples of the earth, to be your heritage, just as you promised through Moses, your servant, when you brought our ancestors out of Egypt, O Lord GOD. (1 Kgs 8:52-53)

Now, O my God, let your eyes be open and your ears attentive to prayer from this place. 41 ‘Now rise up, O LORD God, and go to your resting place, you and the ark of your might. Let your priests, O LORD God, be clothed with salvation, and let your faithful rejoice in your goodness. 42 O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one. Remember your steadfast love for your servant David’. (2 Chr 6:40-42)

Once again, in Solomon’s dedication prayer, 2 Chr 6:40 is shorter than 1 Kgs 8:52, and God’s promise to Moses, which mentions the Exodus from Egypt (1 Kgs 8:53), is not present in Chronicles. Instead, the Chronicler includes God’s promise to David (2 Chr 6:42).

However, there are also four places in Chronicles where reference to ‘Egypt’ in relation to the Exodus occurs as in the Deuteronomistic history: 1 Chr 17:21; 2 Chr 5:10; 6:5; 7:22-8:1.

(1) 2 Sam 7:23//1 Chr 17:21

Who is like your people, like Israel, one nation on the earth whom God went to redeem for himself as a people and to make a name for himself, and to do a great thing for you and awesome things for your land, before your people whom you redeemed for you from Egypt, nations and their gods? (2 Sam 7:23, my translation)
Who is like your people Israel, one nation on the earth whom God went to redeem to be his people, making for yourself a name for great and terrible things, in driving out nations before your people whom you redeemed from Egypt? (1 Chr 17:21)

Having received the awesome promise of the dynasty through Nathan, David gives thanks to God in his responsive prayer. David praises God for his redemption of Israel from Egypt.

(2) 1 Kgs 8:9//2 Chr 5:10

There was nothing in the ark except the two tablets of stone that Moses had placed there at Horeb, where the LORD made a covenant with the Israelites, when they came out of the land of Egypt. (1 Kgs 8:9)

Nothing was in the ark except the two tablets which Moses put there at Horeb, when the LORD made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they had come out of Egypt. (2 Chr 5:10)

When the work of the Temple building was finished, Solomon brings the ark into the Temple. The temporal phrase, ‘when they had come out of Egypt’ occurs in the description of the ark.

(3) 1 Kgs 8:16//2 Chr 6:5

Since the day that I brought my people Israel out of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, that my name might be there; but I chose David to be over my people Israel. (1 Kgs 8:16)

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, so that my name might be there, and I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel. (2 Chr 6:5)

This is Solomon’s quote of what God promised to David. As seen in 1 Chr 17:5 (2 Sam 7:6), God has not dwelt in a fixed house from the Exodus from Egypt until Solomon’s completion of the Temple.
(4) 1 Kgs 9:9//2 Chr 7:22

And the answer will be, ‘Because his people forgot the LORD their God, who brought their ancestors out of Egypt, and they worshiped other gods instead. That is why the LORD has brought all these disasters upon them’. (1 Kgs 9:9)

Then they will say, ‘Because they abandoned the LORD the God of their ancestors who brought them out of the land of Egypt, and they adopted other gods, and worshiped them and served them; therefore he has brought all this calamity upon them’. (2 Chr 7:22)

Upon Solomon’s dedication of the Temple, God appears to Solomon and says that if the Israelites forsake God’s decrees and turn away from his commandments, then God would uproot Israel from their land. Then, neighboring peoples would remark on Israel’s affliction by identifying YHWH as the God who redeemed the Israelites from Egypt.

As seen above synoptic comparison between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, the Chronicler shares the reference to Egypt of the Exodus in four places out of nine. Our question here is whether the Chronicler excludes ‘Egypt’ in order to suppress the Exodus-Sinai tradition and simultaneously magnify the Davidic covenant. One can answer negatively based on the following reasons.

The strongest argument comes from the Chronicler’s own lack of consistency in dealing with the reference of ‘Egypt’ of the Exodus. While מָצַחֲרֵי לֵבָב is absent in God’s oracle through Nathan in 1 Chr 17:5, it occurs in David’s responsive prayer to the oracle in 1 Chr 17:21. If the Chronicler intends to exclude ‘Egypt’ completely, he would not exclude it one place and include it in another within the same narrative unit. The same phenomenon is observed in 2 Chronicles 6. Whereas the Chronicler includes ‘Egypt’ in v. 5, he excludes it in v. 11 within the same speech by Solomon to the whole assembly of Israel. Furthermore, the Chronicler’s inconsistency in referencing ‘Egypt’ of the Exodus is seen in the two identical contexts. When God declares that his dwelling has not been in a built house since the Exodus, he uses similar expressions in 1 Chr 17:5 and 2 Chr 6:5:
Since the day I brought out Israel to this very day (1 Chr 17:5)

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of Egypt (2 Chr 6:5)

As one can see, the Chronicler excludes any reference to ‘Egypt’ in the former verse but he mentions it in the latter.

In addition, the contextual evidence does not support the notion that the lack of ‘Egypt’ of the Exodus can be attributed to the Chronicler’s magnification of the Davidic covenant over the Sinai covenant. In 2 Chr 6:11 one finds one of the five places where ‘Egypt’ is absent:

There I have set the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with the people of Israel. (2 Chr 6:11)

Unlike 2 Chr 6:11, its parallel text, 1 Kgs 8:21, includes at the end the subordinate clause, ‘when he brought them out of the land of Egypt’. If the lack of this subordinate clause indicates the weakening of the Sinai covenant in Chronicles, it is difficult to understand the presence of a more direct reference to the Sinai covenant as ‘the ark, in which the covenant of the Lord that he made with the people of Israel’. If the Chronicler desired to suppress the Mosaic-Sinai covenant of the Exodus in order to magnify the Davidic covenant, he would be more interested in excluding more direct references to the Mosaic covenant, such as the law of Moses, the Torah of Moses, and the statutes and the ordinances that the Lord commanded through Moses, than the more obtuse reference to Egypt. However, the text of Chronicles does not provide any hint of suppressing those more direct references of the Mosaic-Sinai covenant. The synoptic comparison between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles on the use of those references reveals that there are more occurrences of Moses’ law in Chronicles than in Samuel-Kings. Chronicles contains nine references to the law of Moses:
In Samuel-Kings there are seven references to the law of Moses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 2:3</td>
<td>'the law of Moses'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 8:9</td>
<td>'the two tablets of stone that Moses had placed there at Horeb, where the Lord made a covenant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 14:6</td>
<td>'the book of the law of Moses’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 18:6</td>
<td>'the commandments that the Lord commanded Moses’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 18:12</td>
<td>'his covenant—all that Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 21:8</td>
<td>'all the law that my servant Moses commanded them'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 23:25</td>
<td>'all the law of Moses’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of those occurrences in Chronicles, there are four synoptic places, 1 Kgs 8:9//2 Chr 5:10, 2 Kgs 11:18//2 Chr 23:17-18, 2 Kgs 14:6//2 Chr 25:4, 2 Kgs 21:8//2 Chr 33:8, where we cannot find any vestige of the Chronicler’s attempt to suppress references to the Mosaic law. In three passages, 2 Chr 5:10; 25:4; 33:8, references to the Mosaic law occur as in 1 and 2 Kings, and in 2 Chr 23:17-18, a reference to the Mosaic law occurs while the reference is not present in its parallel passage, 2 Kgs 11:18.

Clearly, the Chronicler adheres to the Davidic covenant. However, it is doubtful that the Chronicler purposely suppresses allusions to the Mosaic-Sinai covenant of the Exodus. The above synoptic comparison reveals that the absence of references to ‘Egypt’ cannot be satisfactory proof that the Chronicler showed a preference for the Davidic covenant over the Sinai covenant. Moreover, the Chronicler does not suppress more direct references to the Mosaic covenant such as ‘the law of Moses’ and, in fact, adds a reference of the Mosaic law. Thus, the lack of
in 1 Chr 17:5 cannot be an indicator of the Chronicler’s longing for the suppression of the Sinai covenant for the sake of the magnification of the Davidic covenant.

The lack of ‘Egypt’ in 1 Chr 17:5 is may be explained by the Chronicler’s abridgement of the parallel text, 2 Sam 6. In 1 Chr 17:5-6, the narrow context of this absence, the Chronicler makes his text concise by omitting other words besides \( \text{מִפְּלָרֶיךָ} \), such as \( \text{בַּנָּי} \) (2, 2 Sam 7:6, 7) and \( \text{שָׁמַר בָּנָיָּה} \) (2 Sam 7:7), without significantly changing the meaning of the passage:

\[
	ext{כִּי לֹא שָׁבֵּתָ֣ בָּתי לְמֵימָ֑וֶת נַעֲלֵיָ֖ה אֲשֶׁר חָוָ֑יָה יִשְׂרָ֖אֵל}
\]

I have not lived in a house since the day I brought up the sons of Israel from Egypt to this day, but I have been moving about in a tent and a tabernacle.

\[
	ext{כִּי לֹא שָׁבֵּ֣תָ֑י בָּתי לְמֵימָ֑וֶת נַעֲלֵיָ֖ה אֲשֶׁר חָוָ֑יָה יִשְׂרָ֖אֵל}
\]

For I have not lived in a house since the day I brought out Israel to this very day, but I have lived in a tent and a tabernacle.

2. 2 Sam 7:12//1 Chr 17:11

Another important synoptic comparison in light of the Davidic covenant lies in the different relative clauses between \( \text{אֱלֹהִי} \) of 2 Sam 7:12 and \( \text{אֱלֹהִי} \) of 1 Chr 17:11:
When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, and I will establish his kingdom. (2 Sam 7:12)

When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, and I will establish his kingdom. (1 Chr 17:11)

With regard to this discrepancy, Keil contends that of 2 Sam 7:12 refers to Solomon, but of 1 Chr 17:11 designates David’s remote descendant, who is the Messiah. According to Keil, ‘ does not mean ‘be of one, i.e. to belong to’ but ‘to arise, be born, or go forth from one’. To support his claim, Keil adduces Gen 17:16 and Eccl 3:20, where ‘ is used in a sense of ‘to arise, be born, or go forth from one’. Let us first examine Gen. 17:16:

אברהם את הכתובת תשלמה כל ממלכתו ויהיה
לנ_MATERIAL
I will bless her, and moreover I will give you a son by her. I will bless her, and she shall give rise to nations; kings of peoples shall come from her. (Gen 17:16)

This is God’s blessing that will allow Abraham to have offspring through his wife Sarai. ‘ is seen in , which is translated as ‘they will be from her’, and ‘they’ refers to the antecedent, ‘kings of people’. Since Isaac, the son of Sarai/h is not called (‘king’), the ‘kings of people’ must refer to remote descendants of Sarai/h. In this sense, according to Keil, ‘ is used to mean ‘to arise, be born, or go forth from one’. However, there is a different sense between of Gen 17:16 and of 1 Chr 17:11. While the prepositional object in of Gen 17:16 is singular (‘her’) and the sense of preposition is limited to ‘origin’ (from), the prepositional object in is the plural (‘your sons’) and here can carry the


partitive sense (of) as well as the sense of origin (from). To apply the use of מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙 הָיוּ הָיוַתִּי נִפְגַּשְׁה (of) Gen 17:16 onto מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙 הָיוְהוּ מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙 of 1 Chr 17:11, one must first explain that מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙 in 1 Chr 17:11 that carries the sense of ‘origin’ rather than a partitive sense. But Keil does not explain this. Namely, though the meaning of מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙 is plainly ‘they will be from her’, מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙 of 1 Chr 17:11 leaves room for two possible meanings: ‘the one who shall arise from your sons’ and ‘the one who shall be one of your sons’.

The other passage Keil adduces is Eccl 3:20:

הַ֣בַּל הָוֹלֵקָּה אָלֹ֥֣מִיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵסֵכְּ֖֣֣֭֮ם הוֹיִ֣֣֭֮ם מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵסֵכְּ֖ם הַבַּלַּּ֭֮֫ם יָהְדִירֵscribed

All go to one place; all are from the dust, and all turn to dust again.

This is part of the Qoheleth’s speech about man’s origin and destiny. The Hebrew phrase, מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙 is included in מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙 מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵsubscribe (‘all are from the dust’). As Williamson expounds, the point of the argument is that while Adam himself is called as ‘dust’ directly in Gen 2:7, Qoheleth describes Adam’s descendants indirectly by way of מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵ子孙. 73

Then the LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being. (Gen 2:7, my translation)

As Williamson maintains, in Gen 2:7 there is direct relationship between Adam and dust. However, it is not convincing to view מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵsubscribe (‘all’) in Eccl 3:20 as Adam’s descendants excluding Adam. There is no indication in Eccl 3:20 that Qoheleth distinguishes Adam and his descendants through the use of מִּיּוֹם יָהְדִירֵsubscribe to designate Adam’s descendants.


descendants. In יְהֹוָה Qoheleth refers to men in general including Adam. If יְהֹוָה designates men in general, Keil’s use of Eccl 3:20 as corroborative evidence is questionable.

In sum, though Keil attempts to prove the sense of ‘to arise, be born, or go forth from one’, ‘remoteness’, ‘indirectness’ in the Hebrew phrase, יְהֹוָה by adducing the use of יְהֹוָה in Gen 17:16 and Eccl 3:20, the investigation of the two passages only reveals the irrelevance of the two verses for his argument. Contrary to Keil’s contention, the Hebrew phrase יְהֹוָה carries more ‘direct’ and ‘close’ sense than ‘indirect’ and ‘remote’ sense as seen the following two examples, Mal 1:9 and 2 Chr 22:7:

(1) Mal 1:9

וְהָעָלֶה חֵלֶרֶה אֶפְרָיאָם לָיִהְיָה מְרִיבָה לָיִהְיָה זוֹא הָיוֹשָׁה

וַאֲשֶׁר יִצְרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵי זָרָה יָשְׁבַּת בִּימֵי

And now implore the favour of God, that he may be gracious to us. This is from your hand. Will he show favour to any of you? says the LORD of hosts. (my translation)

The phrase, יְהֹוָה is used in מְרִיבָה לָיִהְיָה (‘this is from your hand’). In this prophecy against unholy priests, Malachi reminds the priests of their detestable practices in sacrifices:

O priests, who despise my name. And you say, ‘How have we despised your name?’ When you offer polluted bread (לִקּוֹנַם) upon my altar. And you say, ‘How have we polluted you?’ By saying that the table of the Lord is contemptible. And when you offer the blind (רֵעֲשָׁה) for sacrifice, is it not evil? And when you offer the lame (רֵעֲשָׁה) and sick (רֵעֲשָׁה), is it not evil? Offer it to your governor! Will he be pleased with you? says the Lord of hosts. (Mal 1:6b-8, my translation)

מְרִיבָה in מְרִיבָה לָיִהְיָה refers to the detestable practices described in the previous verses of Mal 1:6b-8. In RSV, it is rendered as ‘gift’ and מְרִיבָה
is translated as, ‘With such a gift from your hand’. However, it is unlikely that the feminine pronoun \textit{זאת} corresponds to the sacrificial gifts in the masculine forms (תְּלַלְתָּה, פֶּסַח, צְעֵר, לָחֵם).

Malachi stresses that direct connection between the detestable sacrificial practice and the priests by saying this is done not by others but by ‘you’.

(2) 2 Chr 22:7

But it was ordained by God that the downfall of Ahaziah should come about through his going to visit Joram. For when he came there he went out with Jehoram to meet Jehu son of Nimshi, whom the LORD had anointed to destroy the house of Ahab.

2 Chr 22:7 shows the Chronicler’s use of ‘דריה מַל’ in the initial clause, (lit. ‘The downfall of Ahaziah was from God’). Ahaziah, who does evil in the eyes of YHWH as the house of Ahab has done (1 Chr 22:4), is judged by God. The Chronicler expresses the direct relationship between God and the downfall of Ahaziah by using the phrase, ‘דריה מַל’. Namely, the clause means: ‘The downfall of Ahaziah was from God himself’.

Thus Keil’s attempt to argue for the Chronicler’s messianism in the alteration from מַלְעַר הָרָע הָנַעַר לְשֵׁאָר מִמֵּיתָך is unsuccessful. The discrepancy is more likely due to stylistic variation than any substantial theological motivation. In a divine speech, the Chronicler prefers the term בִּשְׂפַת than a visceral term, בָּשָׂר, which originally meant entrails or intestines (2 Sam 20:10; 2 Chr 21:15). In fact, the interchangeable relationship between נֵפְעָה מַל and נֵפְעָה הָרָע is attested in the texts of

\begin{footnote}
\end{footnote}
the Old Testament. I. L. Seeligmann shows the parallelism of וְיִתַּנְךָ מִן מֵעַיִּךְ and יִתַּנְךָ מִן מֵעַיִּךְ of Gen 17:6 with וְיִתַּנְךָ מִן מֵעַיִּךְ of v. 16 of the same chapter:75

I will make you exceedingly fruitful; and I will make nations of you, and kings shall come from you. (Gen 17:6)

I will bless her, and moreover I will give you a son by her. I will bless her, and she shall give rise to nations; kings of peoples shall come from her. (Gen 17:16)

Williamson also finds in Jeremiah 30:21 that both וְיִתַּנְךָ מִן מֵעַיִּךְ and יִתַּנְךָ מִן מֵעַיִּךְ are used synonymously:

Their prince shall be one of their own, their ruler shall come from their midst.

With regard to the variance between ואָשֶׁר רָצַף מָצָאִית and, the LXX does not give the difference any significance in translation. The LXX reads both relative clauses equally as δὲ ἐστάτω ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου (lit. ‘who will be from your bowels’). Most of all, the text plainly confines to the one who shall build the house (אֶת הָיוֹם יְבִין, מַלֵּיא), which, clearly refers to the Temple of God in the following verse, and the promise is fulfilled through Solomon (2 Chr 3:1; 5:1).

It is possible that the Chronicler’s wording, ואָשֶׁר רָצַף מָצָאִית links to the ‘son’ in 1 Chr 17:13, ‘I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me’.76 In sum, there is no satisfying evidence that the Chronicler alters

---


76 Japhet, I and II Chronicles, 333.
for the sake of messianic colouring. The variance is not so much theological as stylistic and still plainly refers to Solomon.

After the contested phrases, the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler choose different words in the subsequent clauses, one opting for מְלָכָה and the other מַלֶּכֶת respectively:

מַלֶּכֶת (‘And I will establish his kingdom’, 2 Sam 7:12)
מְלָכָה (‘And I will establish his kingdom’, 1 Chr 17:11)

This variance does not seem to carry any significance concerning the nature of the future Davidic kingdom. מְלָכָה is commonly viewed as a late biblical term that is semantically equated with מַלֶּכֶת. Both terms refer to ‘dominion’, ‘kingship’, and ‘kingdom’. Since the semantic range of the two words overlaps and the use of מַלֶּכֶת in the Late Biblical Hebrew is prominent, it would seem that the selection of מְלָכָה over מַלֶּכֶת is attributable to the Chronicler’s choice of a word more commonly used in his time. Whereas there are only two occurrences of מַלֶּכֶת in Samuel-Kings (1 Sam 20:31; 1 Kgs 2:12), the Chronicler utilizes it 28 times. מְלָכָה occurs a good number of times in both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, 29 times and 22 times respectively.

While מַלֶּכֶת occurs in 1 Chr 17:11, it is absent in the next verse in comparison to 2 Sam 7:13:

---

77 BDB 574-575; HALOT I 592-593, 595.


79 1 Chr 11:10; 12:24 (23); 14:2; 17:11, 14; 22:10; 26:31; 28:5, 7; 29:25, 30; 2 Chr 1:1, 18 (2:1); 2:11 (12); 3:2; 7:18; 11:17; 12:1; 15:10, 19; 16:1, 12; 20:30; 29:19; 33:13; 35:19; 36:20, 22

80 1 Sam 10:18; 13:13, 14; 24:21 (20); 27:5; 28:17; 2 Sam 3:10, 28; 5:12; 7:12, 13, 16; 1 Kgs 2:46; 5:1 (4:21); 9:5; 10:20; 11:11, 13, 31, 34; 12:26; 14:8; 18:10 (x2); 2 Kgs 11:1; 14:5; 15:19; 19:15, 19

81 1 Chr 16:20; 29:11, 30; 2 Chr 9:19; 11:1; 12:8; 13:5, 8; 14:4 (5); 17:5, 10; 20:6, 29; 21:3, 4; 22:9, 10; 23:20; 25:3; 29:21; 32:15; 36:23
He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. (2 Sam 7:13)

He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. (1 Chr 17:12)

The absence of לְשָׁם הַכְּסָא (L'шам ха-ксЭ) does not seem to weaken in any sense the importance of the Davidic kingdom for the Chronicler. The absence could be explained by the Chronicler's intention of making the two declarative clauses concise, in the same way that he appears to have shortened יְהוָה לְכִתּ בֵּית הַמֶּגֶד (YHVH le-кит бет ха-мегд) of 2 Sam 7:13 to יְהוָה לְכִתּ (YHVH le-кит) in 1 Chr 17:12. Thus, the textual minus of לְשָׁם הַכְּסָא (L'шам ха-ксЭ) in 1 Chr 17:12 is not so much an omission but an intentional, stylistic abridgement of יְהוָה לְכִתּ (YHVH le-кит).

2. 3. 2 Sam 7:14-15//1 Chr 17:13

It is noteworthy that the so-called chastisement clause in 2 Sam 7:14 is not present in 1 Chr 17:13:

When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings.

Thus, we can compare 2 Sam 7:14-15 with 1 Chr 17:13 as follows:

I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings. But I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. (2 Sam 7:14-15)

I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you. (1 Chr 17:13)

To account for this absence Keil explains that, as בָּךְ (‘your seed’) in 1 Chr 17:11 refers to the Davidic Messiah, there is no need to mention what would be tantamount
to a theoretical transgression and punishment.\textsuperscript{82} Von Rad likewise holds that the
omission of the chastisement clause signifies the Chronicler’s hope for the coming
of the Davidic Messiah.\textsuperscript{83} However, as we showed that אַחֶרֶתֵּ֣ים (אַחֶרֶתֵּ֣ים) of 1
Chr 17:11 most likely refers to Solomon, this line of reasoning for the textual minus is
called into question.

Another explanation of the textual minus is to appeal to the Tendenz of the
Chronicler. E. L. Curtis and A. A. Madsen assert that the Chronicler would be
uncomfortable to speak of any expected fault of David’s house through the mouth of
YHWH.\textsuperscript{84} Lemke counters, however, by suggesting that throughout the book the
Chronicler speaks of the sins and chastisements of many kings of Judah.\textsuperscript{85} The
Chronicler even records how David sins against God in taking a census of Israel, and
how God subsequently punished him (1 Chr 21:1-22:1). Of the twenty one kings of
Judah after David, seventeen kings are viewed negatively in Chronicles, whether on
the whole or a part of their reigns: Rehoboam (2 Chr 12:14), Asa (2 Chr 16:7-9),
Jehoshaphat (2 Chr:19:2-3; 20:35-37), Jehoram (2 Chr 21:6-7, 12-13), Ahaziah (2 Chr
22:3-4), Athaliah (2 Chr 22:10), Joash (2 Chr 24: 24), Amaziah (2 Chr 25:2, 15-16, 20,
27), Uzziah (2 Chr 26:16), Ahaz (2 Chr 28:1-2, 19, 22; 29:19), Hezekiah (2 Chr
32:25), Manasseh (2 Chr 33:2, 19), Amon (2 Chr 33:22-23), Josiah (2 Chr 35:22),
Jehoiakim (2 Chr 36:5, 8), Jehoiachin (2 Chr 36:9), Zedekiah (2 Chr 36:12-13)

Some scholars suggest that the lack of the chastisement clause implies the
Chronicler’s ‘conditionalization’ of the Davidic covenant.\textsuperscript{86} Whereas the promise
of YHWH’s יְשֵׁשׁ follows the possible iniquity and chastisement clause in 2 Sam 7:14-
15, the Chronicler only includes the promise of YHWH’s יְשֵׁשׁ without the iniquity
and chastisement clause in 1 Chr 17:13. According to this view, by excluding a

\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{84} E. A. Curtis & A. A. Madsen, \textit{The Books of Chronicles}, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1910), 227.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Lemke, “Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler’s History,” 40-41.
\item \textsuperscript{86} See Japhet, \textit{I & II Chronicles}, 334; Becker, \textit{Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament}, 671; Riley,
\textit{King and Cultus in Chronicles}, 73.
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possible case of iniquity, the Chronicler intends to convey that the Davidic covenant
does not transcend the iniquity of the Davidic family but its efficacy depends on the
faithful obedience of the Davidic offspring.

Japhet asserts that if the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant is the main
point of 2 Sam 7:14-15, then this unconditionality is not retained in 1 Chr 17:13.87
The comparison of the \( \text{ היהי } \) of 2 Sam 7:15 would be most naturally rendered as ‘but’ after the
chastisement clause, the \( \text{ היהי } \) of 1 Chr 17:13, after the adoption formula, ‘I shall be his
father and he shall be my son’, would be aptly translated ‘and’. The \( \text{ היהי } \) of the former
sentence carries the concessive sense, ‘in spite of’, which seems to underscore the
unconditionality of the promise while the \( \text{ היהי } \) of the latter sentence is less emphatic for
the unconditional aspect of the promise.

However, if the Chronicler excluded the chastisement clause in order to make
the Davidic covenant conditional, how can we explain the Chronicler’s retaining of
the next clause, ‘And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him
who was before you’? Here YHWH speaks about his different dealing with David in
comparison with his dealings with one ‘who is before you’, which is an indirect
reference to Saul. Then what is the difference more specifically? The difference
certainly is not revealed in their obedience to God. When they faithfully walk in the
way of YHWH, his \( \text{ יהוהי } \) does not depart from them. Then God’s different dealing
with David and Saul is betrayed when they deviate from his commandments. That is

87 Japhet, I & II Chronicles, 334.
to say, although YHWH’s שׁלôm left Saul when he was unfaithful to him, it would not depart from David despite the transgression of the Davidic house. Consequently, the unconditional character of the Davidic covenant is not erased by the exclusion of the chastisement clause. If the Chronicler desired to make the Davidic covenant conditional, he would have excluded not only the chastisement clause but also the ensuing clause, ‘And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you’.

In addition, the adoption formula (‘I will be his father and he shall be my son’) could be seen as an indicator of the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant. As Schniedewind notes, the adoption formula is found in the Code of Hammurabi in which a father adopts a slave-child by the declaration, ‘You are my son’.

When a seignior’s first wife bore him children and his female slave also bore him children, of the father during his lifetime has ever said ‘My children!’ to the children whom the slave bore him, thus having counted them with the children of the first wife, after the father has gone to (his) fate, the children of the slave shall share equally in the goods of the paternal estate, with the first-born, the son of first wife, receiving a preferential share. However, if the father during his lifetime has never said ‘My children!’ to the children whom the slave bore him after the father has gone to (his) fate, the children of the slave may not share in the goods of the paternal estate along with the children of the first wife.

Concerning the use of the powerful adoption formula in the Nathan’s oracle, William Johnstone states:

The nature of the relationship between God and Davidic king can only be expressed in the closest familial terms, ‘father’ and ‘son’. Here is a solemn act of adoption, with again, the use of emphatic personal

88 ‘So Saul died for his unfaithfulness; he was unfaithful to the LORD in that he did not keep the command of the LORD; moreover, he had consulted a medium, seeking guidance, and did not seek guidance from the LORD. Therefore the LORD put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David son of Jesse’. (1 Chr 10:13-14)

89 William M. Schniedewind, Society and the Promise to David (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 39

pronouns: ‘I shall become father to him; and he shall become son to me’. The bond thus transcends even that of covenant: it goes beyond the voluntary, contractual status of a mere agreement between two parties and has become the necessary and inescapable tie as between of the same family. It is a relationship that is irrevocable; the loyalty within it is unconditional.\(^\text{91}\)

If, following Johnstone, we conclude that the Chronicler maintains the unconditional character of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 17:13, then we are left with an apparent incongruity. How could this unconditional nature be seen together with 1 Chr 28:6-7; 2 Chr 6:16; and 2 Chr 7:17-20 where the Davidic covenant appears to be qualified?:

He said to me, ‘It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts, for I have chosen him to be a son to me, and I will be a father to him. I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today’. (1 Chr 28:6-7)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him, saying, ‘There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me’. (2 Chr 6:16)

As for you, if you walk before me, as your father David walked, doing according to all that I have commanded you and keeping my statutes and my ordinances, then I will establish your royal throne, as I made covenant with your father David saying, ‘You shall never lack a successor to rule over Israel’. But if you turn aside and forsake my statutes and my commandments that I have set before you, and go and serve other gods and worship them, then I will pluck you up from the land that I have given you; and this house, which I have consecrated for my name, I will cast out of my sight, and will make it a proverb and a byword among all peoples. (2 Chr 7:17-20)

Both the conditional and unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant exist in Chronicles as well as in the Deuteronomistic history. There is tension and the common explanation is that it derives from the redaction of the Deuteronomistic

This approach views the covenant of 2 Samuel 7 as originally unconditional, and the contingencies as the secondary development of the Deuteronomist who needs to account for the destruction of the Davidic kingdom by the Babylonian empire. The Deuteronomist justifies the downfall of the Davidic kingdom in the Israelites’ failure to meet the condition, which is to keep the Mosaic law. Thus, it is commonly understood that the unconditional Davidic covenant of 2 Samuel 7 derives from a pre-Deuteronomistic source distinct from the later dynastic and conditional promise.

When we turn to Chronicles, it seems more difficult to explain the coexistence of the conditional and unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant. While the unconditionality and conditionality of the covenant in the Deuteronomistic history can be accounted for by the two different redactional layers, the pre-Deuteronomistic and Deuteronomistic or preexilic and (post)exilic, the writing of Chronicles takes place in the postexilic period when the Davidic kingdom has been destroyed.

The question is why the Chronicler left both the unconditional and conditional aspects of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles. Considering the Chronicler’s dynamic utilization of his source, had he wished to do so he could have reduced the two formulations of the covenant into one unified promise, either as unconditional or conditional. In this line of thinking, one would expect that it would be more likely that the Chronicler would opt for the conditional form of the covenant, given that he wrote in the postexilic period when there was no Davidic kingdom. If so, then the question becomes more specific; why did the Chronicler leave in the unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant?

I find the answer in the organic relationship between the unconditional and conditional aspects of the dynastic promise. The Chronicler would see the two aspects of the promise as complementary rather than contradictory; they are two sides of one

---


93 Ibid.

The Davidic covenant is conditional in the sense that the kingdom has been punished, destroyed, and has ceased to function while it is unconditional in the sense that YHWH’s ṣĕr̂ab would not depart from it though the kingdom goes through the time of chastisement due to their unfaithfulness. In other words, the Chronicler believes and hopes for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty after the period of God’s discipline is over.

1 Chr 17:13 is crucial for understanding the uniqueness of God’s promise to David:

And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you.

When Saul was unfaithful and did not keep his commandments, YHWH took away his mercy (ṣĕr̂ab) from Saul’s house, and his would-be dynasty ended and his kingdom was turned over to David (1 Chr 10:13-14). Unlike this promise to Saul, however, God’s assurance to the Davidic house remains, in that he would not take his mercy from it. The Davidic kingdom could, and would, be punished when it transgressed, but the kingdom would be restored according to God’s steadfast mercy.

The combination of both conditional and unconditional features of the Davidic covenant is not unique. In ancient Near Eastern regulations the two aspects coexist:

After you, your son and grandson will possess it, nobody will take it away from them. If one of your descendants sins the king will prosecute him at his court. Then when he is found guilty… if he deserves death he will die. But nobody will take away from the descendant of Ulmi-Tešup either his house or his land in order to give it to a descendant of somebody else.  

This Hittite document is a treaty between Hattušiliš III (or Tudhalyaš IV) and Ulmi-Tešup of Dattaša. In the event that Ulmi-Tešup’s descendants commit sins, they will

---

be punished accordingly, but Ulmi-Tešup’s house and land are unconditionally granted for his offspring.

Another document of the ancient Near East illustrates the combination of conditionality and unconditionality:

Nobody in the future shall take away this house from dU-manava (or Tešup-manava), her children, her grandchildren and her offspring. When anyone of the descendants of dU-manava provokes the anger of the kings… whether he is to be forgiven or whether he is to be killed, one will treat him according to the wish of his master but his house they will not take away and they will not give it to somebody else.96

This is a royal decree of Tudhaliyaš IV and Puduhepa for the descendants of Šahurunuwaš, a Hittite official. Once again, the descendants of dU-manava are to be punished if they provoke the anger of kings, but their house is granted to their family regardless of their sins.

In the Old Testament, Psalm 89 precisely reflects this organic relationship between the unconditional and conditional aspects of the Davidic covenant:

I have found my servant David; with my holy oil I have anointed him …

Forever I will keep my steadfast love for him, and my covenant with him will stand firm. I will establish his line forever, and his throne as long as the heavens endure.

If his children forsake my law and do not walk according to my ordinances, if they violate my statutes and do not keep my commandments, then I will punish their transgression with the rod and their iniquity with scourges; But I will not remove from him my steadfast love, or be false to my faithfulness. I will not violate my covenant, or alter the word that went forth from my lips. Once and for all I have sworn by my holiness; I will not lie to David. His line shall continue forever, and his throne endure before me like the sun. It shall be established forever like the moon, an enduring witness in the skies. Selah. (Ps 89: 21-38 (20-37))

The inclusion of the enduring nature of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 17:13

---

means that the Chronicler must not have regarded the downfall of Judah in 586 BC as the abandonment of the Davidic covenant. It would seem that for the Chronicler the period from the fall of Judah to his own time may have been the time of God’s discipline for Israel. Based on God’s promise of unceasing ḫāḇēr for Israel, the Chronicler would hope for the revival of the Davidic kingdom. For the Chronicler, the promise to David is not an expendable, expired covenant, but an enduring promise which also plants the seed of the future restoration of Israel.

In 1 Chr 17:13, the Chronicler underscores YHWH’s ḥāḇēr for the Davidic house more than in its synoptic text, 2 Sam 7:15:

חַבֵּר לְאָרִיסְרָא מַעַט

But my steadfast love will not turn away from him (2 Sam 7:15, my translation)

וָחָבָר לְאָרִיסְרָא מַעַט

And I will not take my steadfast love from him. (1 Chr 17:13)

The Chronicler’s emphasis is two-fold. First, by using the first person hifil form, ḥāḇēr, the Chronicler stresses YHWH’s own will.97 Second, the emphatic double preposition מַעַט underscores YHWH’s attachment to Solomon.98 In these emphases, the Chronicler discloses his hope for the restoration of the Davidic house in YHWH’s steadfast love.

The absence of the chastisement clause in Chronicles is consistent with its flawless portrayal of King Solomon, the Temple builder.99 The Chronicler portrays Solomon as an ideal king throughout the first nine chapters of 2 Chronicles; he does not include his alleged wrongdoings, such as his intermarriage with foreign women, his turning to their gods, and his building of high places for the foreign gods (cf., 1 Kings 11).

97 Cf., ḥāḇēr is attested in LXX 2 Sam 7:15: τὸ δὲ ἔλεος μου ὁκ ἐποστήσω ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ...

98 Johnstone, 1 & 2 Chronicles I, 206.

The focal point of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is verse 14:

He will establish his throne forever, and your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me.

2 Sam 7:16, the parallel text of 1 Chr 17:14, reads as follows:

Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever.

‘Your (David’s) house and your kingdom’ of 2 Sam 17:16 corresponds to ‘my (YHWH’s) house and my kingdom’ in 1 Chr 17:14, and ‘your throne’ of 2 Sam 17:16 matches ‘his (Solomon’s) throne’ in 1 Chr 17:14. The identification of בֵּיתָיו in 1 Chr 17:14 is pivotal to the discussion of the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant. Does it mean ‘Temple’ or ‘kingdom’? If it is rendered as the Temple, the house of YHWH, then it can buttress the position that the Davidic covenant is realized through the Temple and its cultus. This position accords with Rudolph’s claim:

The failure of the Davidic dynasty could be borne so long as the second pillar of the theocracy, the Jerusalem Temple is stood firm. 100

The LXX’s rendering of the two verses is different from that of the MT:

καὶ πιστωθήσεται ὁ οίκος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν αἰώνων.

And his house and his kingdom shall be made sure forever before me, and his throne shall be established forever. (2 Kgdms 7:16, my translation)

καὶ πιστῶσαι αὐτὸν ἐν οἴκῳ μου καὶ ἐν βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐώς αἰώνας καὶ ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἀνωρθωμένος ἐώς αἰώνας.

And I will confirm him in my house and in his reign forever. And his throne shall be established forever. (1 Chr 17:14, NETS\(^{101}\))

One notices that the focus has shifted from David to Solomon in LXX 2 Sam 17:16 by the change of the suffix: ‘your house and your kingdom…your throne’ to ‘his house and his kingdom… and his throne’. In LXX 1 Chr 17:14, the first person suffix of the MT is likewise changed to the third person: ‘my kingdom’ to ‘his kingdom (reign)’. Lemke’s chart is helpful for seeing the difference.\(^{102}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. House</th>
<th>2. Kingdom</th>
<th>3. Throne</th>
<th>Referring to whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 17:16 (MT)</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 17:16 (LXX)</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 17:14 (MT)</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>YHWH (1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 17:14 (LXX)</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>YHWH (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon (2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although it is difficult to explain all the variations of the suffixes, what is evident is that there is a noticeable change in Chronicles; God will establish him (Solomon) in the house of God.

Concerning the reference of בָּנָי, let us first examine the use of בָּנָי in 1 Chronicles 17. There are fourteen occurrences of בָּנָי in 1 Chronicles 17. Excluding the בָּנָי in verse 14 for the time being, the meanings of the other 13 occurrences are clear: palace (vv. 1a, 1b), Temple (vv. 4, 5, 6, 12), and dynasty (vv. 10, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 27).

McKenzie argues that the parallel structure of verse 14, ‘my house and my kingdom’ should lead us to understand בָּנָי as God’s dynasty.\(^{103}\) McKenzie views

\(^{101}\) Hearafter, English translations of the LXX follow NETS unless indicated

\(^{102}\) Lemke, “Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler’s History,” 43.

\(^{103}\) McKenzie, 1-2 Chronicles, 158.
the structure of the phrase as tautological. From the phrase יתיהו המלוכה, Williamson claims that God is the real king of Israel, his kingdom.\textsuperscript{104} Namely, ‘my house’ refers to God’s kingdom of Israel. Williamson bolsters his view with other passages in Chronicles:\textsuperscript{105}

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:5)

Yours, O LORD, are the greatness, the power, the glory, the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heavens and on the earth is yours; yours is the kingdom, O LORD, and you are exalted as head above all. (1 Chr 29:11)

Then Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD, succeeding his father David as king; he prospered, and all Israel obeyed him. (1 Chr 29:23)

Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on his throne as king for the LORD your God. Because your God loved Israel and would establish them forever, he has made you king over them, that you may execute justice and righteousness. (2 Chr 9:8)

And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. (2 Chr 13:8)

Thus, for both McKenzie and Williamson, ‘my house’ does not mean the Temple but the kingdom of Israel, which is God’s dynasty. In this line of interpretation, God’s house is bigger than the Temple. God’s house has been extended to the kingdom of Israel.

However, textual evidence does not support this expanded interpretation of ‘God’s house’. As we examined in 1 Chronicles 17 the other four occurrences of God’s יב (vv. 4, 5, 6, 12) designate the Temple of God. We need to examine more closely the book of Chronicles to ascertain if יב is ever used to designate the


\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.
kingdom of Israel. The following is the examination of the 325 occurrences of יִשְׂרָאֵל in Chronicles.

The 325 uses of יִשְׂרָאֵל in Chronicles occur in a variety of contexts. Upon examination, it is observed that 324 occurrences (except for 1 Chr 17:14) of יִשְׂרָאֵל fall into 14 distinct groups: the Temple of YHWH, clan, palace, dynasty, house, family, Temple of other gods, room, storehouse, home, inside, factory, tabernacle, prison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage (324)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td>5:36 (6:10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:16 (31), 17 (32), 33 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:11, 13, 23a, 26, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:4, 5, 6, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:4, 24b, 28a, 28b, 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:6a, 6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:12, 20, 22, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:2, 3, 6, 10, 12a, 12b, 13a, 13b, 20, 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:2, 3a, 3b, 3c, 7, 8, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of YHWH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(207)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:18a (2:1a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: 3 (4), 4 (5), 5a (6a), 5b (6b), 8 (9), 11a (12a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8b, 11, 12, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:11, 16, 19, 22a, 22b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1a 1b, 7, 13a, 13b, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2, 5, 7, 8, 9a, 9b, 10, 18, 20, 22, 24, 29, 32, 33, 34, 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1, 2a, 2b, 3, 5, 7, 11a, 11c, 12, 16, 20, 21a, 21b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1a, 16a, 16b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:4, 11a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:9a, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:5, 9a, 9b, 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:3, 5b, 6, 7, 9, 10a, 10b, 10c, 12, 14b, 18a, 18b, 19, 20a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:4, 5, 7a, 7b, 8, 12a, 12b, 12c, 13, 14a, 14b, 16, 18, 21, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:24a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:19, 21b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:21a, 24a, 24b, 24c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:3, 5, 15, 16a, 16b, 17, 18, 20, 25, 31, 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:1, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:10b, 11, 13, 16, 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | 33:4, 5, 7a, 7b, 15a, 15b  
|---|---|
|   | 34:8a, 8b, 9, 10a, 10b, 10c, 14, 15, 17, 30a, 30b  
|   | 35:2, 3, 8, 20  
|   | 36:7, 10, 14, 17, 18a, 18b, 19, 23  
| Clan (40) | 1 Chronicles  
|   | 2:55  
|   | 4:38  
|   | 5:13, 15, 24a, 24b  
|   | 7:2, 4, 7, 9, 40  
|   | 9:9, 13a, 19  
|   | 12:29 (28), 31 (30)  
|   | 21:17  
|   | 23:11, 24a  
|   | 24:4a, 4b, 6, 30  
|   | 26:6, 13  
|   | 28:4a, 4b, 4c  
|   | 2 Chronicles  
|   | 10:16  
|   | 11:1  
|   | 17:14  
|   | 19:11  
|   | 22: 10  
|   | 25:5,  
|   | 31:10a, 17  
|   | 35:4, 5a, 5b, 12  
| Palace (26) | 1 Chronicles  
|   | 14:1  
|   | 17:1a, 1c  
|   | 2 Chronicles  
|   | 1:18b (2:1b)  
|   | 2: 2 (3), 11b (12b)  
|   | 7:11b, 11d  
|   | 8:1b, 11b  
|   | 9:3, 11b  
|   | 12:9b, 10  
|   | 16:2b  
|   | 19:1  
|   | 21:17  
|   | 23:5a, 15, 20b  
|   | 25:24b  
|   | 26:21c  
|   | 28:7, 21b  
|   | 33:20, 24  
| Dynasty (19) | 1 Chronicles  
|   | 12:30 (29)  
|   | 17:10, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 27  
|   | 2 Chronicles  
<p>|   | 47 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House (6)</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 13:7, 13, 14b, 15:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Chronicles 8:11a, 26:21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (5)</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 7:23, 10:6, 13:14a, 14c, 16:43b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of other gods (4)</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 10:10a, 10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Chronicles 23:17, 32:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room (Nave) (4)</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 28:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Chronicles 3:8a, 10, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storehouse (4)</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 26:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Chronicles 9:16, 9:20, 16:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home (4)</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 16:43a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Chronicles 11:4, 18:16, 25:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside (2)</td>
<td>2 Chronicles 4:4, 23:14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory (1)</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 4:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabernacle (1)</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 9:23b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison (1)</td>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above survey of יְהֹוֹה הבֵית betrays that of the 324 other occurrences, there is not a single use of יְהֹוֹה הבֵית that refers to the kingdom of Israel. This fact strongly suggests that it is highly unlikely that the יְהֹוֹה הבֵית in 1 Chr 17:14 means the expanded house of God, the kingdom of Israel.

In my view, the passages cited by Williamson (1 Chr 28:5; 29:11, 23; 2 Chr 9:8; 13:8) evidence YHWH’s lordship over Israel; the real king of Israel is YHWH. This phrase corresponds well to יְהֹוֹה הבית (`and my kingdom’) of 1 Chr 17:14. However, it is highly problematic to connect the cited passages to יְהֹוֹה הבית (`in my house’). In fact, ‘YHWH’s יְהֹוֹה הבית does not occur in the cited passages at all. YHWH’s lordship over Israel is indicated by the phrases ‘(YHWH’s) kingdom’ and ‘(YHWH’s) throne’.

McKenzie’s point about the parallel structure of ‘my house and my kingdom’ is insufficient to show that ‘my house’ refers to the kingdom of Israel. McKenzie does not explain why the parallel structure is to be understood tautologically. In the parallel structure, it is not necessary that the first word is semantically limited or defined by the second word. Thus, as with the other occurrences of God’s יְהֹוֹה in 1 Chronicles 17, it is most appropriate to understand יְהֹוֹה הבית in 1 Chr 17:14 as ‘in the Temple of God’.

Then, what is the meaning of the following clause in 1 Chr 17:14?

וַיֵּשָׂא יְהֹוָה בָּנִי וְבָנָי לְבֵית אֲזֹאתוֹ
And I will establish him in my house and in my kingdom

Since the interpretation of בָּנִי is the key for this investigation, let us first examine the use of the preposition בַּיִת particularly with יְהֹוָה. בַּיִת occurs 40 times with various prefixes and suffixes in the book of Chronicles: בַּיִת (31), בַּיִית (4), בַּיִית (1), בַּיִית (1), בַּיִית (1). The following chart highlights the 40 uses of ‘בַּיִית’ in Chronicles.
As the examination of the use of בּ with בָּאָב shows, out of the 40 times בּ occurs with בָּאָב, 38 uses concern spatiality with the sense of ‘in’, and once in the sense of an adversative ‘against’. The preposition בּ with בָּאָב of 1 Chr 17:14 is our concern here. The outcome of the examination indicates that the use of בּ with בָּאָב in Chronicles does not exhibit much variation, and the dominant use of בּ with בָּאָב is spatial. Since there is no idiosyncratic use of בּ with בָּאָב discovered in Chronicles, and it is most natural to apply the spatial use ‘in’ for the בּ with בָּאָב in the context of 1 Chr 17:14, the most appropriate translation of בָּאָב is ‘in my house’, which is ‘in the Temple of God’.

If the בָּאָב is rendered as ‘in the Temple of God’, we can rephrase the sentence of 1 Chr 17:14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Use of בּ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:36 (6:10)</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:23</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:14</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:1a, 1b, 5, 14</td>
<td>In, ? (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:17</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:12</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:4</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:3</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:11</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:22, 24</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:11a, 11b</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:11</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:16</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:19</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:5, 9</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:12</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:3, 5</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:14</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:19, 24</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:19</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:11</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:4, 7a, 7b, 24</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:10a, 10b, 15, 17</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:3</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:17</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘And I shall establish him in the Temple and in my kingdom’.

Since the third suffix is clearly Solomon, we can apply this sentence to the scene of Solomon’s coronation in 1 Chr 29:21-25:

On the next day they offered sacrifices and burnt offerings to the LORD, a thousand bulls, a thousand rams, and a thousand lambs, with their libations, and sacrifices in abundance for all Israel; and they ate and drank before the LORD on that day with great joy. They made David’s son Solomon king a second time; they anointed him as the LORD’s prince, and Zadok as priest. Then Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD, succeeding his father David as king; he prospered, and all Israel obeyed him. All the leaders and the mighty warriors, and also all the sons of King David, pledged their allegiance to King Solomon. The LORD highly exalted Solomon in the sight of all Israel, and bestowed upon him such royal majesty as had not been on any king before him in Israel. (1 Chr 29:21-25)

In 1 Chr 29:22, though there is לָשׁוֹנָה (‘second time’) in the MT, some other texts (e.g., LXX\(^B\)) omit לָשׁוֹנָה. Whether this is the first or second coronation feast cannot be decided; it takes place in any case before Solomon’s building of the Temple.\(^{106}\) Simply because there was no Temple building yet, it is not possible to apply the clause, ‘And I shall establish him in the Temple’, into the scene of Solomon’s coronation.

Schniedewind makes an attempt to specify the meaning of the clause:

The meaning of ‘my house and my kingdom’ (בֵיתוֹ הַבָּרוּךְ) is amply clear when the Chronicler reuses this language to refer to Solomon’s temple and palace. In 2 Chr 1:18, we are told that Solomon resolved to build ‘a house for the name of YHWH and a house for his kingdom’ (בֵית יְהוָה וּבֵית לֹויָם). In 2 Chr 2:11, Hiram praises Solomon who has the wisdom to build ‘a house for YHWH and a house for his kingdom’ (בֵית יְהוָה וּבֵית לֹויָם). This pairing of the house of God and the house of the kingdom, that is the temple

\(^{106}\) It is possible that the Chronicler omits the first coronation, which is described in 1 Kgs 1:32-36.
and the palace, relies on the Chronicler’s version of the Dynastic Oracle in 1 Chr 17:14...107

Schniedewind draws on 2 Chr 1:18 (2:1) and 2:11 (12) for the interpretation of the phrase in 1 Chr 17:14. By relying on the two passages, 2 Chr 1:18 (2:1) and 2:11 (12), he interprets the phrase, ‘in my house and my kingdom’ as ‘in the Temple and the palace’. However, his connection of these two passages to the phrase in 1 Chr 17:14 is problematic when we notice that יהוה (“and in my kingdom”) of 1 Chr 17:14 is different from אלוה (“and the house of his kingdom”) of the two 2 Chronicles phrases. Elu (“of the two 2 Chronicles passages means ‘the palace’ as Schniedwind says, but אלוה of the 1 Chr 17:14 does not mean ‘the palace’. Elu is a Late Biblical Hebrew word, which means ‘dominion’, ‘kingdom’, or ‘kingship’. 108

As Knoppers avers, it is most appropriate to interpret the phrase יהוה as an indication of a special tie between the Temple and David’s heir.109 Through the book of Chronicles the kings of the Davidic dynasty play important roles in the Temple. Not only does the Chronicler describe David and Solomon as the preparer and completer of the Temple building project, but the kings of the Davidic dynasty appoint and assemble Temple personnel for various roles such as priests, singers, gatekeepers, and treasurers (e.g., 1 Chronicles 23-26; 2 Chr 29:4), provide offerings (e.g., 2 Chr 30:24; 35:7), and repair the Temple (e.g., 2 Chr 24:4-5; 29:3).

Nevertheless this special tie between the Temple and David’s heir should not be understood as tantamount to the king’s right to exercise full priestly duty. The Chronicler confirms the exclusive privilege of Aaronic descendants in cultic officiation (1 Chr 6:33-34 (48-49), 2 Chr 13:10-11) and offers no exception to the rule. Though the kings of Judah take important roles in the house of YHWH in Chronicles, it does not mean that kings can do everything that priests do. A good illustration of this is God’s punishment for Uzziah’s involvement in the priestly role:


But when he had become strong he grew proud, to his destruction. For he was false to the LORD his God, and entered the temple of the LORD to make offering on the altar of incense. But the priest Azariah went in after him, with eighty priests of the LORD who were men of valor; they withstood King Uzziah, and said to him, ‘It is not for you, Uzziah, to make offering to the LORD, but for the priests the descendants of Aaron, who are consecrated to make offering. Go out of the sanctuary; for you have done wrong, and it will bring you no honor from the LORD God’. Then Uzziah was angry. Now he had a censer in his hand to make offering, and when he became angry with the priests a leprous disease broke out on his forehead, in the presence of the priests in the house of the LORD, by the altar of incense. (2 Chr 26:16-19)

Here, God punishes King Uzziah for usurping the priestly function by burning incense in the Temple. There is an apparent description of the king’s violation of cultic holiness, when the reader is told that ‘he had a censer in his hand to make offering’ (v. 19).

Regarding the king’s role in the offering, the details in 1 Chr 29:20-35 are helpful:

Then King Hezekiah rose early, assembled the officials of the city, and went up to the house of the LORD. They brought seven bulls, seven rams, seven lambs, and seven male goats for a sin offering for the kingdom and for the sanctuary and for Judah. He commanded the priests the descendants of Aaron to offer them on the altar of the LORD. So they slaughtered the bulls, and the priests received the blood and dashed it against the altar… (2 Chr 29:20-35)

As v. 21 shows, the king’s role in the offerings was not to perform the cultic function but to order priests to carry out the cultic work: ‘He commanded the priests to offer sacrifices on the altar of the Lord’.

To explicate the intriguing phrase יתייהב, 2 Chr 31:21 supplies an important clue:
And every work that he undertook in the service of the house of God, and in accordance with the law and the commandments, to seek his God, he did with all his heart; and he prospered.

Hezekiah undertook every work (‘in the service of the house of God’). The phrase בּיתָיָהוּ בּיִשְׁרוּתָהּ may be an expanded form of בּיתָיָהוּ of 1 Chr 17:14.

Consequently the clause, בּיתָיָהוּ בּיִשְׁרוּתָהּ of 1 Chr 17:14 is to be interpreted as: ‘And I shall establish him in the service of the Temple of God and in the kingdom of Israel’. God establishes Solomon as the supervisor of the Temple service. If the Levites carry the specific jobs of the Temple such as priests, singers, gatekeepers and treasurers, King Solomon takes the responsibility for supervision of the Temple. In this interpretation, בּיתָיָהוּ (‘in the Temple of God’) of 1 Chr 17:14 would not serve to weaken the Davidic covenant by pointing to the influence of the Temple and its cultus. On the contrary, the Davidic kings play an important role in the service of the Temple and the centrality of the Davidic dynasty is enhanced.

2. 5. 2 Sam 7:20//1 Chr 17:18

A comparison between 1 Chr 17:18 and its corresponding passage in 2 Sam 7:20 discloses the Chronicler’s conviction regarding David’s significance:

And what more can David say to you? For you know your servant
(2 Sam 7:20)

And what more can David add to you for honoring your servant? You know your servant. (1 Chr 17:18, my translation)

There are two notable differences. First, the phrase, בֻּלְכֹּלֶד אֶחְדַּת אֲמוֹרֵהּ אֲדֹנֵי אֲבָרֶחִים, occurs only in 1 Chr 17:18. This phrase emphasizes the honour of David and his kingdom. By mentioning David as YHWH’s אֲבָרֶחִים again, the Chronicler reminds the reader of
David’s privilege. In the Old Testament, the dominant recipients of the honorary title, YHWH’s נְבֵי, are Moses and David, 37 times and 38 times respectively.\textsuperscript{110} Klein observes that while YHWH’s נְבֵי applies to Moses, Joshua, and David in the Deuteronomistic history, the Chronicler uses the title only for David.\textsuperscript{111} In Chronicles, even Solomon, the one who completes the Temple, does not receive the title. Second, the Chronicler places the object, יָדָו in the second clause. Considering the natural ‘verb-object’ word order of Hebrew, this reversal highlights the Chronicler’s emphasis of David as YHWH’s servant.\textsuperscript{112}

3. Further Issues

3. 1. Ideology for the revival of the Davidic dynasty

The text of 1 Chronicles 17 upholds in the Davidic covenant the revival of the Davidic kingdom as the following arguments support. The arguments here concern those issues not already addressed in the synoptic comparison above.

3. 1. 1. נְלָלָם

In 1 Chronicles 17 נְלָלָם occurs 8 times with the two propositions, דּוּ (vv. 12, 14 (x2), 22, 23, 24) and לִי (v. 27 (x2)) as it does in the synoptic text of 2 Samuel 7 (vv. 13, 16 (x2), 24, 25, 26, 29 (x2)). Though נְלָלָם occurs 8 times in 2 Samuel 7 and the same number of times in its parallel section, 1 Chronicles 17, the 8 occurrences of 1 Chronicles 17 have greater significance for the Chronicler’s Sitz im Leben. Unlike 2 Samuel 7, which is generally viewed as preexilic, 1 Chronicles 17 was composed in the postexilic period when the Israelites were still under foreign power.\textsuperscript{113} The issue is the sense of the phrases נְלָלָם or נְלָלָם וְהָוָה attached to the Davidic covenant, which are generally rendered as ‘forever’. Was not the eternal


\textsuperscript{111} Klein, \textit{I Chronicles}, 377. Moses as YHWH’s נְבֵי: Josh 1:2, 7; 2 Kgs 21:8, Joshua as YHWH’s נְבֵי: Josh 24:29, David as YHWH’s נְבֵי: 2 Sam 3:18; 7:5, 8; 1 Kgs 11:13, 32, 34, 36, 38; 14:8; 2 Kgs 19:34; 20:6.

\textsuperscript{112} GKC § 142 f, 456.

\textsuperscript{113} Schniedewind, \textit{Society and the Promise to David}, 29.
Davidic covenant abrogated when Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon captured Jerusalem in 586 BC? Braun claims that the eight fold repetition of נַחֲלָם in 1 Chronicles 17 denotes that the Davidic covenant is not abrogated nor is it necessary to be abrogated.114 On the contrary, Pomykala reckons נַחֲלָם in 1 Chronicles 17 as ‘remotest time’ rather than ‘everlasting’, and views the year 586 BC as the end of the remotest time.115

 נַחֲלָם probably derives from נִלָּה (‘to conceal’) and the basic meaning of נַחֲלָם is ‘obscure time’, ‘remotest time’, or ‘long time’.116 The range of ‘remoteness’ or ‘long time’ varies in its context.117 It could mean ‘for a great while’ (e.g., 1 Sam 1:22), or ‘eternity’ (e.g., Exod 15:18):118

But Hannah did not go up, for she said to her husband, ‘As soon as the child is weaned, I will bring him that he may appear in the presence of the LORD, and remain there forever (כָּלַלָּה). (1 Sam 1:22)

The LORD will reign forever and ever (כָּלַלָּה). (Exod 15:18)

In 1 Sam 1:22, Hannah says to her husband that when Samuel is weaned, she will bring him to the tabernacle of the Lord and leave him there forever (כָּלַלָּה). Here, כָּלַלָּה means the lifespan rather than eternity. Exod 15:18 is the part of the Song of Moses, where Moses sings a song exalting the eternal reign of YHWH.

114 Braun, 1 Chronicles, 200.
115 Pomykala, The Davidic Dynastic Tradition in Early Judaism, 96-97.
117 James Barr points out that ‘most important is to notice that in the sense “the remotest time” no specification is given of how remote the time referred to is; precisions of this kind may be inferred from the context.’ in Biblical Words for Time (London: SCM Press, 1969), 73; HALOT I, 798-799.
To specify what the Chronicler means by מֵרֵחַּה in the context of 1 Chronicles 17, Pomykala argues that one must look to another temporal phrase in 1 Chronicles 17, מְרַחְךָ, in v. 17, which he translates as a reference to the future:

And even this was a small thing in your sight, O God; you have also spoken of your servant’s house for a great while to come (מְרַחְךָ).

Pomykala contends that מְרַחְךָ, which does not mean ‘eternal’, or ‘everlasting’, but ‘far off’ in the other Old Testament texts, provides a time frame for specifying the meaning of מֵרֵחַּה. It means ‘for a great while to come’ rather than ‘eternal’.

However, an examination of the occurrences of מְרַחְךָ in the Old Testament questions Pomykala’s contention. מְרַחְךָ occurs 8 times in the Old Testament: 2 Sam 7:19; 2 Kgs 19:25; 1 Chr 17:17; 2 Chr 26:15; Ezra 3:13; Job 36:3; 39:29; Isa 37:26. Among them only half of the occurrences carry temporal sense (2 Sam 7:19; 2 Kgs 19:25; 1 Chr 17:17; Isa 37:26) and the others carry spatial sense. Since 2 Kgs 19:25 parallels Isa 37:26, and 2 Sam 7:19 parallels 1 Chr 17:17, there are really only two examples of temporal use of מְרַחְךָ in the Old Testament: מְרַחְךָ in 2 Sam 7:19/1 Chr 17:17 and 2 Kgs 19:25/Isa 37:26. 2 Kgs 19:25 reads:

Have you not heard that I determined it long ago (מְרַחְךָ)? I planned from days of old what now I bring to pass, that you should make fortified cities crash into heaps of ruins.

This is part of God’s word against Sennacherib through the mouth of Isaiah.

Concerning Sennacherib’s arrogance for his victories over the other nations, God says that Sennacherib’s victories are under God’s ordained plan. Here, מְרַחְךָ is used in a temporal sense looking to the distant past, ‘long ago’ rather than distant future.

While there are only 8 incidents of מְרַחְךָ in the Old Testament, מְרַחְךָ without the lamed occurs 23 times and may shed more light on the meaning of the

---

119 There is no difference between the two passages of 2 Kgs 19:25 and Isa 37:26 concerning the use of מְרַחְךָ.
temporal use of qǝ'el. Among them the most common use of qǝ'el is spatial, basically meaning ‘from a far distant place’. Only 3 passages use it in the temporal sense: Isa 22:11; 25:1; Jer 31:3:

You made a reservoir between the two walls for the water of the old pool. But you did not look to him who did it, or have regard for him who planned it long ago (qǝ'el). (Isa 22:11)

O LORD, you are my God; I will exalt you, I will praise your name; for you have done wonderful things, plans formed of old (qǝ'el), faithful and sure. (Isa 25:1)

The Lord has appeared to me long ago (qǝ'el) ‘I have loved you with everlasting love, therefore I have drawn you with loving-kindness’. (Jer 31:3, my translation)

Isa 22:11 speaks of God’s condemnation of the Israelites, who look at the old reservoir without looking at God, the maker of it long ago, while Isa 25:1 praises the Lord whose works and counsels have been wonderful from the past. Jer 31:3 is a part of God’s word of restoration for Israel. From the above examination of qǝ'el, every occurrence of temporal qǝ'el in the Old Testament concerns a long time before the present rather than a long time from the present.

In sum, since the other occurrences of the temporal phrase qǝ'el other than 2 Sam 7:19/1 Chr 17:17 and all the occurrences of the temporal phrase qǝ'el in the Old Testament direct towards the past, it is adequate to translate qǝ'el of 1 Chr 17:17 as ‘long ago’ rather than ‘long ahead’. Thus qǝ'el in 1 Chr 17:17 is not able to serve as the time frame of the futuristic use of qǝ'el in 1 Chronicles 17.

Furthermore, the meaning of ‘long ago’ fits well in the context of David’s responsive prayer to God. The second clause of 1 Chr 17:17, tvawhr iq'me yǝ'el qǝ'el (You have spoken about the house of your servant long ago) is David’s response to God’s speech about the early history of Israel from which the Davidic house originated, and God’s election of David and his prosperity:

120 Deut 28:49; 2 Kgs 2:7; Neh 12:43; Job 2:12; 36:25; Ps 139:2; Prov 7:19; Isa 5:26; 22:3, 11; 23:7; 25:1; 43:6; 49:1, 12; 59:14; 60:4, 9; Jer 30:10; 31:3; 46:27; 51:50; Hab 1:8
For I have not lived in a house since the day I brought out Israel to this very day, but I have lived in a tent and a tabernacle. Wherever I have moved about among all Israel, did I ever speak a word with any of the judges of Israel, whom I commanded to shepherd my people, saying, why have you not built me a house of cedar? Now therefore thus you shall say to my servant David: Thus says the LORD of hosts: I took you from the pasture, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people Israel; and I have been with you wherever you went, and have cut off all your enemies before you. (1 Chr 17:5 – 8b)

In this sense, though most translations of the Bible (e.g., NRSV, NKJV, NJPS, NASV, NJB) and most commentators renders לִמְנָה הַיָּמִין of 1 Chr 17:17 in a future sense, I agree with Knoppers in translating it as ‘from a long time ago’.  

The question remains: does נַעַלְמָא of 1 Chronicles 17 mean ‘eternal’ or ‘far off’? A clue can be found in the uncompromising nature of 1 Chr 17:13:

וְיֵשָׁר לֵאמֹר לַאֲמֶר וְנִבְצַדְקָם קָפַר לְהַסְרָרָתוֹ מָאָסֶר מָאָסֶרָה לְהָיָה נַעַלְמָא

And I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you. (my translation)

God expresses his intention using the strongest negative particle לא with an imperfect verb form, יָכְרָה. YHWH solemnly declares the continuation of his steadfast love for the Davidic house by contrasting it to the cessation of his יָכְרָה given to Saul. In this proclamation there is no hint that YHWH grants his יָכְרָה to the Davidic house for a while and removes it at some point in the future. Unlike the house of Saul, God promises the Davidic house unceasing, perpetual יָכְרָה and this firm promise renders נַעַלְמָא ‘eternal’ rather than ‘far off’.

Another clue revealing the specific range of נַעַלְמָא in the Davidic covenant is the Chronicler’s use of נַעַלְמָא within the narrative unit of 1 Chronicles 17. Out of the eight occurrences of נַעַלְמָא in 1 Chronicles 17, six are attached to the Davidic throne (vv. 12, 14), the Davidic kingdom (v.14 - the Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom),


122 GKC § 107 O, 317.
the Davidic house (v. 27 (x2)), and the Davidic covenant (v. 23), all of which are
significant to the נִלְלָה of the Davidic covenant:

v. 12 - I will establish his throne forever.
v. 14 - I will confirm him in my kingdom forever and his throne shall be established forever.
v. 23 - O Lord, as for the word that you have spoken concerning your servant and concerning his house, let it (the Davidic covenant) be established forever.
v. 27 - The house of your servant, that it may continue forever before you. For you, O Lord, have blessed (it) and it is blessed forever.

The other two occurrences appear in vv. 22 and 24 referring respectively to the נִלְלָה of Israel as YHWH’s chosen people, and the firmness and greatness of YHWH’s name:

v. 22 - You have made your people Israel your very own people forever.
v. 24 - Your name will be established and magnified forever.

It is our interest here to specify the range of נִלְלָה in association with the Davidic covenant through these two occurrences of נִלְלָה. These are not directly connected to the dynastic promise but occur in the same context as Nathan’s oracle concerning the Davidic house and David’s prayerful response. Unlike לָהֶם of 1 Chr 17:17, which turns out to be inappropriate for providing the time frame of נִלְלָה with regard to the Davidic covenant, the two occurrences of נִלְלָה in vv. 22 and 24 support the specific range of the נִלְלָה of the Davidic covenant as perpetual. God’s appointment of Israel as his own people in v 22 is the unending destiny for Israel; it is not a ‘how long’ issue since it is a perpetual relationship. Even in the midst of Israel’s evil and rebellion against God, he would not forsake Israel as his people. Samuel indicates as much:

For the LORD will not cast away his people, for his great name’s sake, because it has pleased the LORD to make you (Israel) a people for himself. (1 Sam 12:22)
The İlham of v. 24 in the context of praising YHWH’s name signifies eternity as well. When İlham is attached to God or something belonging to God such as his name (e.g., Exod 3:15; 2 Kgs 21:7; 1 Chr 17:24; 2 Chr 7:16; 33:4, 7; Isa 63:12, 19; Ps 113:2; 135:13), his word (e.g., Isa 40:8), his glory (e.g., Ps 104:31), his power (e.g., Ps 66:7), and his loving-kindness (הָעִֽנְיָ֣ן), e.g., Ps 89:3 (2)), it tends to refer to eternity. Thus, for example, we read in Psalm 90:2:

Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever you had formed the earth and the world, from everlasting to everlasting you are God (וֹדְעַתְּךָ אַלֹהֵי אֲלֵיהֶם).

If the two instances of İlham (vv 22, 24), apart from the other six uses of İlham associated with the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17, convey ‘perpetuity’, the eternal sense of İlham with reference to the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 gains support.

The Chronicler’s understanding of İlham as ‘eternal’ in his postexilic context when the Davidic dynasty had ceased to exist sheds light on his understanding of the nature of the Davidic covenant. For the Chronicler, the Babylonian exile does not signify the end of the Davidic dynasty; rather, he believes in the revival of the Davidic dynasty based on the perpetual promise made by God to David. The period of the exile and the loss of the Davidic dynasty is God’s discipline against the unfaithful Davidic house and the Israelites, yet it does not mean the failure of the everlasting Davidic covenant. If the Chronicler regards the destruction of the Judaic kingdom by Babylon in 586 BC and the cessation of the Davidic throne as the failure of God’s royal promise to the Davidic house, he would have excluded the Davidic covenant of 1 Chronicles 17 or radically emended Nathan’s oracle. The Chronicler’s faithful preservation of the Davidic covenant suggests that the perpetual dynastic promise

---


could include the dynastic lacuna and the dynastic lacuna shall be overcome on the
ground of God’s unfailing לֹא־יִשָּׁךְ towards the Davidic house.

3. 1. 2. The Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom

As seen in the synoptic comparison, the Chronicler’s designation of the Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom in 1 Chr 17:14 is markedly different from its parallel verse in 2 Sam 7:16:

Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me;
your throne shall be established forever. (2 Sam 7:16)

But I will confirm him in my house and in my kingdom forever, and his throne shall be established forever. (1 Chr 17:14)

The Chronicler’s designation of the Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom in Nathan’s oracles is not by accident but by intention. Besides 1 Chr 17:14, the clear equation of the Davidic kingdom (or throne) with the kingdom (or throne) of YHWH occurs in 1 Chr 28:5; 29:23; 2 Chr 9:8 and 2 Chr 13:8:

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:5)

Then Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD, succeeding his father David as king; he prospered, and all Israel obeyed him. (1 Chr 29:23)

Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on his throne as king for the LORD your God. Because your God loved Israel and would establish them forever, he has made you king over them, that you may execute justice and righteousness. (2 Chr 9:8)

And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. (2 Chr 13:8)

1 Chr 28:5 forms part of David’s final instruction to the assembly of Israel and 1 Chr 29:23 illustrates Solomon’s accession to the throne. 2 Chr 9:8 is part of the compliment of the queen of Sheba to Solomon and 2 Chr 13:8 is a portion of the
speech of the Judahite king, Abijah, against Jeroboam and northern Israelites. Out of these four passages, 1 Chr 28:5 and 2 Chr 13:8 lack a synoptic parallel while 1 Chr 29:23 and 2 Chr 9:8 parallel with 1 Kgs 2:12 and 1 Kgs 10:9 respectively. Comparing the Chronicler’s two synoptic passages with the two passages from Kings, we notice that the designation of the Davidic kingdom (or throne) as the kingdom (or throne) of YHWH is the Chronicler’s own contribution:

So Solomon sat on the throne of his father David; and his kingdom was firmly established. (1 Kgs 2:12)

Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on the throne of Israel! Because the LORD loved Israel forever, he has made you king to execute justice and righteousness. (1 Kgs 10:9)

Whereas the Deuteronomist designates Solomon’s accession as being to the throne of David (1 Kgs 2:12) and the throne of Israel (1 Kgs 10:9), the Chronicler identifies the throne as the kingdom of YHWH (1 Chr 29:23) and to YHWH (2 Chr 9:8). The Chronicler’s deliberate equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH’s kingdom implies a strong tie between the Davidic kingdom and YHWH. One might suggest that through this explicit equation, the Chronicler bestows divine authority and affection upon the Davidic kingdom more than the Deuteronomist does.

Becker contends that the Chronicler’s alteration of 2 Sam 7:16 in 1 Chr 17:14 bespeaks the Chronicler’s disinterest in the revival of the Davidic kingship.¹²⁵ According to Becker, the Chronicler speaks of the kingship as YHWH’s rather than being tied to David and Solomon, the earthly representatives.¹²⁶ Because the kingship is not David’s but YHWH’s, there is no need for the reestablishment of the ‘Davidic’ kingship in the Chronicler’s theocratic society.¹²⁷ In other words, by changing the ownership of the monarchy, the Chronicler reveals his disinterest in the political

¹²⁵ Becker, Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament, 81-82.
¹²⁶ Ibid., 82.
¹²⁷ Ibid., 81.
revival of David’s regime in the cultic society in which YHWH maintains his kingship.

However, within the same oracle, the Chronicler does not seem to deprive David and Solomon of the ownership of kingship because the Chronicler still insists that the kingdom is for David and Solomon in 1 Chr 17:10-11:

Moreover I declare to you that the LORD will build you a house. When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and I will establish his kingdom. (1 Chr 17:10-11)

The kingdom is YHWH’s in one place (1 Chr 17:14) and David’s in the other (1 Chr 17:10-11). That is, the Chronicler does not suggest David and his descendant are mere participants in YHWH’s kingdom but renders the Davidic kingdom as the kingdom of God. The Chronicler’s equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH’s kingdom does not refer to any change of ownership of the kingdom but rather is concerned with enhancing the Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom.

Thus, the equation of the Davidic dynasty to YHWH’s dynasty is noteworthy evidence, which is directly opposed to Rudolph’s dismissal of the Davidic dynasty in Chronicles:

The failure of the Davidic dynasty could be borne, so long as the second pillar of the theocracy, the Jerusalem Temple, stood firm… The significance of the house of David for salvation was then limited to the fact that David and Solomon had created for the Temple those ordinances upon which the acceptable worship of the present community depended.\(^\text{128}\)

Rudolph posits the Chronicler’s strong support of the Temple and worshipping community when the Davidic dynasty no longer existed. Thus, according to Rudolph, the significance of the Davidic dynasty, for the Chronicler, severely diminishes and lies only in its establishment of the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus.

However, the Chronicler’s equation of the Davidic dynasty as YHWH’s dynasty speaks against the decreased significance of the Davidic dynasty; in fact, the Chronicler augments the importance of the Davidic dynasty through this equation. If the Chronicler considers the Davidic dynasty as expired and finds its role only in begetting the second pillar, the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus, he would not term the expired dynasty as YHWH’s dynasty. As Knoppers points out, the Chronicler’s association of the Davidic-Solomonic throne with the throne of YHWH and his repetition of the eternal dynastic promise for David’s descendants connote the Chronicler’s interest in the political as well as the cultic function of the Davidic dynasty.129

Certainly, the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus are important subjects for the Chronicler; he spends the bulk of Chronicles on Temple-related subjects such as the appointment of the Temple builder (1 Chr 17:4-14), the site of the Jerusalem Temple (1 Chr 21:18-22:1), the preparation for the Temple building (1 Chr 22:2-19), the Temple personnel: the Levites, the priests, the singers, the gatekeepers, the treasurers (1 Chr 23:1-26:28), David’s instruction of the Temple building (1 Chr 28:1-29:9), and Solomon’s preparation, completion, and dedication of the Temple building (2 Chr 1:18 (2:1)-7:22). However, that does not mean that the Jerusalem Temple totally absorbs Davidic royalism in Chronicles. Consequently, the Davidic dynasty cannot be reduced to a mere vehicle to give birth to the Temple and its cultus and then to expire. Rather, the Davidic dynasty itself is pivotal for the Chronicler, and he expresses his hope for the restoration of the temporarily ceased kingdom in his equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH’s kingdom.

3. 1. 3. The Davidic covenant in David’s prayer

The Chronicler addresses his interest in the Davidic dynasty in David’s responsive prayer to Nathan’s oracle in 1 Chr 17:16-27. There is no significant discrepancy between 1 Chr 17:16-27 and its parallel text, 2 Sam 7:18-29 with regard to the Davidic covenant. As the Deuteronomist highlights the Davidic covenant in

129 Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10-29*, 673.
David’s prayer, the Chronicler focuses on the eternal promise in spite of the nonexistence of the Davidic dynasty in the Chronicaler’s time. In David’s response to Nathan’s oracle, the Chronicler does not indicate the replacement of the Davidic dynasty with the Temple and its cultus in the postexilic age. Rather, David exclusively focuses on his dynasty without mentioning the Temple. All six occurrences of בֵּית in this section refer to David’s family/dynasty:

v. 16: Who am I, O LORD God, and what is my house, that you have brought me thus far?

v. 17: You have spoken about the house of your servant long ago. (my translation)

v. 23: O LORD, as for the word that you have spoken concerning your servant and concerning his house, let it be established forever, and do as you have promised.

v. 24: The house of your servant David will be established in your presence.

v. 25: For you, my God, have revealed to your servant that you will build a house for him.

v. 27: Therefore may it please you to bless the house of your servant.

In particular, it is remarkable that the Chronicler includes David’s request for the fulfillment of the dynastic promise using imperative form, רֻפֵּא הַבֵּית אֲבַע (‘and do as you have promised!’) as in the text of 2 Sam 7:25. If the Chronicler views the Davidic dynasty as an expired regime, he could have excluded David’s strong demand of the fulfillment of the eternal dynastic promise. It sounds as if the Chronicler himself cries out to God for the revival of the Davidic dynasty in this demand for the fulfillment of the eternal covenant during this time when the Davidic dynasty does not exist.

3. 1. 4. Eschatological reading of the Davidic covenant

130 Klein, 1 Chronicles, 375.
The same statement can convey a different message depending on the time when the statement is read. When we inquire after the Chronicler’s reading of the Davidic covenant in his post-Davidic dynasty period, it is possible to make two assumptions; first, the Chronicler could read the eternal Davidic covenant as something past rather than eternal, and thus reduce its import in his time. Secondly, he could revisit the perpetuity of the dynastic promise and hold the future hope of the Israelite Davidic kingdom by confirming the eternal dynastic promise upon David. 1 Chronicles 17, the key text to determining the Chronicler’s view on the Davidic covenant, suggests the latter view. There is neither a hint of the Chronicler’s perplexity over the non-existence of the Davidic kingdom nor any trace of the Chronicler’s effort to reduce the import of the Davidic covenant in Nathan’s oracle and David’s responsive prayer. Certainly, the faithful preservation of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is contrasted with the Chronicler’s radical elimination of the Mosaic-Sinai Covenant and the so-called Salvation History in Chronicles. When the Davidic covenant is read in light of the future hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingship, the promise remains relevant even in the post-dynasty period.

Keil contends that the Chronicler’s alterations of 2 Samuel 7 reveals his hope for the Messiah from the seed of David. He presents three alterations supporting his argument: the change from אָשֶׁר רָאוֹת מִמַּעַךְ אֶלָּא יַמְלֹךְ לְדָוִד in 1 Chr 17:11; the omission of this chastisement clause after 1 Chr 17:12; and the replacement of ‘Your (David) house’ and ‘Your kingdom’ with ‘My (YHWH) house’ and ‘My kingdom’ in 1 Chr 17:14. Agreeing with Keil’s messianic interpretation of 1 Chronicles 17, von Rad accepts the Chronicler’s eschatological hope is manifested in 1 Chronicles 17. However, as shown in the synoptic comparison, the difference between אָשֶׁר רָאוֹת מִמַּעַךְ and אָשֶׁר רָאוֹת מִמַּעַךְ אֶלָּא יַמְלֹךְ לְדָוִד in 1 Chr 17:11 and the absence of the chastisement clause after 1 Chr 17:12 do not indicate the Chronicler’s eschatological hope through the coming of the awaited Messiah.

132 Ibid.
133 Von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes*, 123-125.
Concerning the equation of the Davidic with YHWH’s kingdom implies the Chronicler’s hope for the revival of the Davidic dynasty, as already shown above. Yet the Chronicler’s hope of the restoration of the kingdom indicated by YHWH’s ownership of the Davidic kingdom does not refer to the coming of the Messiah in eschatological time. By referring to the Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom, the Chronicler expresses a stronger tie between the Davidic dynasty and YHWH than the Deuteronomist, and by doing so, the Chronicler shows his longing for the Davidic kingdom. Yet, the text does not support or provide evidence for the implication that the revival of the Davidic dynasty is to be with the coming of the Messiah.

To investigate the eschatological aspect of the Davidic dynasty is intricate due to the fluidity in defining ‘eschatology’. Japhet provides us with a helpful delineation of its concept in its narrow and broad sense:

Literally the word means ‘the teaching of the last things’ (πάσα ἐσχάτη), which may be interpreted in a number of ways, and differences of definition are sometimes the source of controversy as to whether or not the Bible contains eschatology. Biblical scholarship has produced two main definitions – we may speak of ‘eschatology in the narrow sense of the word’ and ‘eschatology in the broader sense’. ‘Eschatology in the narrow sense’ anticipates the annihilation of the existing world and the birth of a new world of everlasting salvation. It views the eschaton as something beyond history, beyond the time and space of the world as we know it. Very few biblical texts may be classified as eschatological in this sense, apart from primarily apocalyptic passages such as Isaiah 24-27 and certain chapters in Daniel. Today, however, most scholars define eschatology in the broader sense of the word, characterizing the eschaton as the ‘dawn of the age of salvation in the course of history.’ According to this definition, eschatology envisions the creation of new and different world in the context of the existing world linked to time and history, to space and form. Nevertheless, the idea that the new world will be altogether different

David Peterson sensibly explains conceptual differences between Apocalypticism and Eschatology:

‘A related but by no means identical issue is the relationship between two conceptual terms eschatology and apocalypticism. At the outset it seems important to affirm that all apocalypticism involves eschatology, but not all eschatology involves apocalypticism. All apocalyptic literature in the Old Testament, which may be conveniently subdivided into early (e.g., Isaiah 24-27; Zechariah 9-14; Joel 3-4) and developed (Daniel 7-12), involves some notion of a momentous time during which Yahweh will act decisively to create a time of peace for Israel. Nonetheless, not all literature which has been labeled as eschatological shares the characteristics of this aforementioned apocalyptic literature, whether early or developed.’ in “Eschatology (OT),” ABD II. 576.
from the world we know remains central to the definition of eschatology. \(^{135}\)

If we consider the equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH’s kingdom as eschatological, it is eschatological in the broader sense that the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty is a salvation to the Israelites in the course of history.

1 Chr 17:9 is another possible indicator of the Chronicler’s eschatological hope for the Davidic dynasty:

\[
\text{וְשָׁם יִקְהֶםּ בָּעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל וַנַּטֳעֵהוּ וְשָׁבָּה תַּחְתוֹן לֶא}
\]
\[
	ext{וְרֵעוֹן שָׁוֶר לָא-רָפָאְם בָּן-שָׁעֲלוֹת לְבָנָהוּ בָּאֶשֶׁר בְּרֶמֶלֶתָה}
\]

I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, so that they may live in their own place, and be disturbed no more; and evildoers shall wear them down no more, as they did formerly. (1 Chr 17:9)

In the light of synoptic comparison between 1 Chr 17:9 and its parallel passage, 2 Sam 7:10, there is no conspicuous difference:

\[
\text{וְשָׁם יִקְהֶםּ בָּעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל וַנַּטֳעֵהוּ וְשָׁבָּה תַּחְתּוֹן לֶא}
\]
\[
	ext{וְרֵעוֹן שָׁוֶר לָא-רָפָאְם בָּן-שָׁעֲלוֹת לְבָנָהוּ בָּאֶשֶׁר בְּרֶמֶלֶתָה}
\]

And I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them, so that they may live in their own place, and be disturbed no more; and evildoers shall afflict them no more, as formerly. (2 Sam 7:10)

Textually, there are only three slight differences that do not convey any significant ideological variation: first, the repetitive preposition ל before יִשְׂרָאֵל is wanting in Chronicles; secondly, while the Deuteronomist uses third person masculine suffix י in נַטֳעֵהוּ, the Chronicler takes another third person masculine suffix י in נַטֳעֵהוּ; and finally, Chronicles has the piel form of בָּלָה (‘to wear out’) rather than הָנָד (‘to afflict’).

None of these reflect noteworthy semantic differences. Nevertheless, as Johnstone notes, the highly emotive terms of 1 Chr 17:9 in the context of the post-dynasty period.

implies the Chronicler’s eschatological hope for the realization of the Davidic covenant in the end time.\textsuperscript{136}

God’s promise of land and safety to the Israelites in 2 Sam 7:10//1 Chr 17:9 is realized in the Solomonic era:

See, a son shall be born to you; he shall be a man of peace. I will give him peace from all his enemies on every side; for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quiet to Israel in his days. (1 Chr 22:9)

Is not the LORD your God with you? Has he not given you peace on every side? For he has delivered the inhabitants of the land into my hand; and the land is subdued before the LORD and his people. (1 Chr 22:18)

However, the same promise does not signify the same notion for the Chronicler. God’s promise of planting and protecting Israel in 1 Chr 17:9 seeks the revival of the lost Davidic dynasty.

There is an issue about the identification of the object of the verb נְהַלֵּוהּ, which is the pronominal suffix יְ in 2 Sam 7:10 and יָ in 1 Chr 17:9. K. McCarter interprets מִקְדֹּם of 2 Sam 7:10 as a sacred place and views it as the object of נְהַלֵּוהּ: ‘I shall fix a place for my people Israel and plant it (a place), so that it will remain where it is and never again be disturbed’.\textsuperscript{137} However, in terms of the relation between מִקְדֹּם and יָ, it is more plausible to have something to plant in the appointed place (מִקְדֹּם) than to plant ‘the appointed place’ itself. If it is difficult to find the antecedent of יְ, מִקְדֹּם could be a possible candidate. Yet, there is no difficulty in finding the antecedent in the preceding word, יָ: נָהָרָאָל נָהָרָאָל נָהָרָאָל נָהָרָאָל נָהָרָאָל נָהָרָאָל נָהָרָאָל נָהָרָאָל

\textsuperscript{136} Johnstone, 1 & 2 Chronicles I, 204.

\textsuperscript{137} P. Kyle McCarter, Jr. II Samuel, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 190, 203.
People as the object of the verb נָטַל ('to plant') is not unfamiliar in biblical Hebrew. Besides 2 Sam 7:10 and 1 Chr 17:9, there are 8 passages in the Old Testament, where נָטַל is used metaphorically for the planting of people:

You brought them in and planted them on the mountain of your own possession, the place, O LORD, that you made your abode, the sanctuary, O LORD, that your hands have established. (Exod 15:17)

I will plant them upon their land, and they shall never again be plucked up out of the land that I have given them, says the LORD your God. (Amos 9:15)

The LORD of hosts, who planted you, has pronounced evil against you, because of the evil that the house of Israel and the house of Judah have done, provoking me to anger by making offerings to Baal. (Jer 11:17)

You plant them, and they take root; they grow and bring forth fruit; you are near in their mouths yet far from their hearts. (Jer 12:2)

I will set my eyes upon them for good, and I will bring them back to this land. I will build them up, and not tear them down; I will plant them, and not pluck them up. (Jer 24:6)

I will rejoice in doing good to them, and I will plant them in this land in faithfulness, with all my heart and all my soul. (Jer 32:41)

If you will only remain in this land, then I will build you up and not pull you down; I will plant you, and not pluck you up; for I am sorry for the disaster that I have brought upon you. (Jer 42:10)

You with your own hand drove out the nations, but them you planted; you afflicted the peoples, but them you set free. (Ps 44:3 (2))

It is remarkable that the ‘planting people’ metaphor refers to the restoration of Israel in half of the eight passages: Amos 9:15, Jer 24:6; 32:41; 42:10. These four passages suggest that the ‘planting people’ metaphor refers to the restoration of Israel when it is used with reference to the future. A similar feature between the planting image of 1 Chr 17:9 and the other four planting passages is the promise of future protection:

2 Chr 17:9: ‘…they may live in their own place, and be disturbed no more…’

Amos 9:15: ‘…they shall never again be plucked up out of the land…’
Jer 24:6: ‘… I will not pluck them up’

Jer 32:40: ‘… I will not turn away from doing them good…’

Jer 42:10: ‘… I will not pluck you up…’

In her study on the biblical imagery on the planting of man, Tikva Frymer-Kensky reports that:

The plant image is particularly important to describe God’s actions at the restoration. As the destruction was an uprooting and a razing, the restoration is a planting and a building… In the eschaton envisioned by Deutero-Isaiah, the people will all be righteous, inherit the land forever, and be the ‘branch of my planting, the work of my hands to glory in’ (Isa 60:21) and ‘righteous oaks, the plant of God to glory in’ (Isa 61:3).138

The Chronicler’s use of the ‘planting people’ metaphor in the post-dynasty context undergirds his longing for the restoration of Israel as seen in its other Old Testament uses.

3. 1. 5. The Chronicler’s faithful retention of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17

The Chronicler’s faithful preservation of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 works against the cultic interpretation of the dynastic promise. In agreement with 2 Samuel 7, God expresses his special love for David: He took David from the pasture to be a ruler over Israel (v. 7) and has been with him wherever he has gone (v. 8). Not only did God cut off all past enemies of David (v. 8), he will subdue all future enemies (v. 10). God will make David’s name like the names of the greatest men of the world (v. 8). God will provide a place for his people under David and he will plant them so that they will not be disturbed any more (v.9). God proclaims the establishment of the eternal Davidic kingdom (v.12) and his unfailing love for the

Davidic house (v. 13). God even referred to the relationship between himself and David’s son to be that of father and son (v. 13).

In David’s responsive prayer, the Chronicler includes all the elements of God’s blessing upon David and his eternal dynastic promise upon his family. David wonders at God’s honouring of him as the most exalted of men (vv. 17-18). David reiterates God’s promise regarding the eternity of the Davidic dynasty, and David asks for the fulfillment of that promise (vv. 23-24). God is pleased to bless the Davidic house, and David requests eternal blessing of God upon his house (v. 27).

3. 2. Ideology against the revival of the Davidic dynasty

Now, let us consider the arguments against the revival of the Davidic dynasty in 1 Chronicles 17, which were not treated in the previous two sections.

3. 2. 1. Solomon, not David, as the protagonist of the Chronicler

As examined in the synoptic comparisons, the chastisement clause of 2 Sam 7:14, (‘When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings’) is absent in 1 Chr 17:13, thereby promoting a flawless image of Solomon. According to Caquot, this absence is one instance where the Chronicler’s idealizes Solomon over David.139 Besides this absence, Caquot also enumerates the following points supporting the superiority of Solomon.

While bloodshed has made David unworthy to build the Temple, Solomon is a king of peace and wisdom. A king like Solomon would have been more attractive in the Greek period.140 Moreover, Caquot also suggests that the lack of the Bathsheba narrative is not intended to conceal David’s sin, but to prevent the reader from remembering Solomon as a son of adultery.141 Caquot also points to the lack of reproach toward Solomon in Chronicles, which is different from the Deuteronomistic

---
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The account of abandoning the law only begins in Chronicles with Rehoboam, rather than with Solomon as in 1 Kings 11. Furthermore, if David prepares for the Temple building, Solomon is the one who built the Temple, and by the time of his completion of the Temple, the totality of the cult was realised. Caquot also suggests that it is important to see Solomon as the unifier of the cultic legacies of Moses and David. In the Pentateuch, the ark is before the tent of meeting, whereas the Deuteronomistic history speaks of the ark exclusively; the Chronicler reconciles these two sources. David brought the ark, which had been returned from the Philistines, to Jerusalem. Concerning the tent, which is not an issue in the Deuteronomistic history, the Chronicler supposes that it has been deposited in the high place of Gibeon (1 Chr 21:29), thereby justifying the presence of Solomon in Gibeon for a sacrifice (1 Kgs 3:4) in 2 Chr 1:3:

For the tabernacle of the LORD, which Moses had made in the wilderness, and the altar of burnt offering were at that time in the high place at Gibeon. (1 Chr 21:29)

The king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the principal high place; Solomon used to offer a thousand burnt offerings on that altar. (1 Kgs 3:4)

Then Solomon, and the whole assembly with him, went to the high place that was at Gibeon; for God’s tent of meeting, which Moses the servant of the LORD had made in the wilderness, was there. (2 Chr 1:3)

Thus, the unification of the cultic legacies of Moses and David (i.e., the tent of meeting and the ark) takes place when Solomon completes the Temple building.
So they brought up the ark, the tent of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the tent; the priests and the Levites brought them up. (2 Chr 5:5)

For Caquot, the Chronicler’s description of David is far from ideal in comparison to the idealized presentation of Solomon. The report of David’s sin regarding the population census in 1 Chronicles 21 is harsher than that found in 2 Samuel 24. Unlike the Deuteronomist’s record, the Chronicler’s presentation of David as a man of war seems to include the following judgment:

But the word of the LORD came to me, saying, ‘You have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood in my sight on the earth’. (1 Chr 22:8)

This is part of Caquot’s argument against Davidic messianism in Chronicles. Certainly, the change of the protagonist from David to Solomon weakens the Davidic eschatological messianism in Chronicles. By denying the Davidic messianism in Chronicles, Caquot argues that the Chronicler is satisfied with the hierocratic society and does not express hope for the reestablishment of the political Davidic kingdom of Israel. Does the Chronicler render Solomon as the protagonist? Let us examine Caquot’s arguments for Solomon’s superior position over David in Chronicles.

3. 2. 1. 1. The lack of reproach towards Solomon

The lack of the chastisement clause in 1 Chr 17:13 certainly contributes to a rather impeccable image of Solomon but this does not necessarily suggest that Solomon occupies a greater position than David in the text of Chronicles. The place of the expected chastisement clause is within God’s promise of the dynasty for David:

… I declare to you that the LORD will build you a house. When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up
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your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. (When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings.) I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from him who was before you. (1 Chr 17:10-13)

In the beginning of the dynastic promise, Nathan indicates that the promise is made for the sake of David (David שְׁלֹשׁ). God will raise offspring to succeed him and establish the kingdom of David’s descendant for David’s sake. In terms of the relationship between David and Solomon, the thrust of the promise suggests that God does good to David through David’s son, Solomon, rather than suggesting that God bypasses David for Solomon.

Caquot points to the Chronicler’s inclusion of David’s census sin in 1 Chr 21:1-1 Chr 22:1, which is contrasted with his irreproachable portrait of Solomon. Yet the Chronicler does not include the census event in order to lessen the portrait of David as compared to Solomon. Rather, the Chronicler includes David’s census because it informs the reader how the Temple site was determined. David’s census results in God’s punishment upon Israel, and when David repents, the angel of God orders David to build an altar on the threshing floor of Araunah, the Jebusite, which is the future site for the Jerusalem Temple (1 Chr 22:1). Before David’s preparations for the Temple building in 1 Chronicles 22-1 Chronicles 29, the Chronicler arranges the pericope of 1 Chr 21:1-1 Chr 22:1 to spell out how David determines the Temple site. David’s sin is part of that narrative thread.

3. 2. 1. 2. The lack of the Bathsheba narrative

The Bathsheba narrative is absent from Chronicles. The hypothetical place for the Bathsheba narrative in Chronicles is between 1 Chr 20:1a and 1 Chr 20:1b as illustrated below:

---

Ibid., 116
1 Chr 20:1a
In the spring of the year, the time when kings go out to battle, Joab led out the army, ravaged the country of the Ammonites, and came and besieged Rabbah. But David remained at Jerusalem.

(The Bathsheba narrative in 2 Sam 11:2-2 Sam 12:25)

1 Chr 20:1b
Joab attacked Rabbah, and overthrew it.

2 Sam 11:1
In the spring of the year, the time when kings go out to battle, David sent Joab with his officers and all Israel with him; they ravaged the Ammonites, and besieged Rabbah. But David remained at Jerusalem.

2 Sam 12:26
Now Joab fought against Rabbah of the Ammonites, and took the royal city.

Caquot claims that the Chronicler’s omission of the conspicuous Bathsheba narrative of the Deuteronomistic history is not intended to conceal David’s sin of adultery, but to prevent the reader from remembering Solomon as a son of adultery. However, Solomon is not the outcome of the sin of adultery. The son of adultery between David and Bathsheba died as the punishment of God:

David said to Nathan, ‘I have sinned against the LORD’. Nathan said to David, ‘Now the LORD has put away your sin; you shall not die. Nevertheless, because by this deed you have utterly scorned the LORD, the child that is born to you shall die’. Then Nathan went to his house. The LORD struck the child that Uriah’s wife bore to David, and it became very ill… On the seventh day the child died. (2 Sam 12:13-18)

Solomon is born after David has repented of his sin of adultery and received due punishment for the sin. Solomon is not the product of the adultery but God’s blessing upon David, named יְדִידִי, ‘beloved of YHWH’:

Then David consoled his wife Bathsheba, and went to her, and lay with her; and she bore a son, and he named him Solomon. The LORD loved him, and sent a message by the prophet Nathan; so he named him Jedidiah, because of the LORD. (2 Sam 12:24-25)
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Therefore, the Chronicler’s removal of the Bathsheba narrative is not intended primarily to prevent readers from remembering Solomon as a son of adultery; rather, it attempts to exclude an indiscretion of David.

3. 2. 1. 3. The totality of the cult in the Solomonic period.

Caquot finds that Solomon occupies a superior position over David in Chronicles through the totality of the cult with the completion of the Temple building and the unification of the cultic legacies of Moses and David during the Solomonic era.\(^{152}\) Caquot seems to consider the one who completes the Temple as greater than the one who prepares for the building project.

The Chronicler unequivocally informs us why David’s role in the Temple building is limited to preparation in 1 Chr 22:8 and he repeats this in 1 Chr 28:3:

But the word of the LORD came to me, saying, ‘You have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood in my sight on the earth’. (1 Chr 22:8)

But God said to me, ‘You shall not build a house for my name, for you are a warrior and have shed blood’. (1 Chr 28:3)

The Chronicler reveals that David is not able to build the Temple because of the blood David shed in war. However, it is misleading to regard the Chronicler’s disclosure of this reason as the Chronicler’s condemnation of David. On the contrary, the Chronicler supplies a favourable statement about David immediately following each text:

*Behold a son, who shall be born for you!* (מהיָה ילֵי לך וַגוֹ נַעַלֶד) He shall be a man of peace. And I will give him rest from all his enemies on all around; for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quietness to Israel in his days. He shall build a house for my name. (1 Chr 22:9-10, my translation)

\(^{152}\) Ibid., 117.
Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever... And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. He said to me, 'It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts'. (1 Chr 28:4-6)

It is noteworthy that encouraging words follow the reason for God’s prohibition of David’s Temple building. In 1 Chr 22:9, God encourages a disappointed David with an interjection particle, הָנֵי. God, who does not want David to be depressed by his disqualification from building the Temple, promises that one who shall be born from David shall undertake the project. God gives the objective reason for David’s disqualification from the Temple project without judgment, and promises the completion of the project through David’s own son.

Thus, Solomon is not a rival of David in any sense. Rather, God lets the son of David complete the Temple building for David’s sake. If God prohibits David from the building project and grants this honor to another, who has little relation to David, then it is possible to say that God has higher regard for that individual than David. However, God does not set David and Solomon against one another. God allows the Davidic family to prepare for and complete the Temple building.

Likewise, God’s election of David follows immediately after the reason for David’s disqualification from the Temple building in 1 Chr 28:4, and he promises that David’s son will take over the project: ‘It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts’. (1 Chr 28:6)

Since God approves of David’s wars and gave him victories in these wars, it is difficult to condemn David for his war-waging and bloodshed. For instance, the Chronicler records God’s support for David’s war in 1 Chr 14:10 and 1 Chr 18:6:

David inquired of God, ‘Shall I go up against the Philistines? Will you give them into my hand?’ The LORD said to him, ‘Go up, and I will give them into your hand’. (1 Chr 14:10)

The LORD gave victory to David wherever he went. (1 Chr 18:6)
The relationship between David and Solomon bears some analogy to that of Moses and Joshua. As God does not allow Moses to enter the land of Canaan and lets Joshua take over Moses’ leadership, God does not allow David to complete the Temple building project and lets David’s son Solomon construct the Temple building. Just as Moses is not inferior to Joshua due to Moses’ failure to enter Canaan, so is David not undervalued compared with Solomon in Chronicles. The reason for God’s prohibition of David’s building plans is a statement of fact rather than a statement of condemnation.

Moreover, the Chronicler highlights the vital role played by the preparer of the Temple building project. The preparation was done by David, a man of maturity and experience:

For David said, ‘My son Solomon is young and inexperienced, and the house that is to be built for the LORD must be exceedingly magnificent, famous and glorified throughout all lands; I will therefore make preparation for it’. So David provided materials in great quantity before his death. (1 Chr 22:5)

In addition to the Temple building, Caquot holds that Solomon’s unification of the cultic legacies of Moses and David contributes to the realization of the totality of the cult. Caquot considers the cultic legacy of Moses as the presence of both the ark and the tent of meeting, while the cultic legacy of David is the sole presence of the ark. Although David carries the ark of the covenant from Baalah, which is Kiriath Jearim, through the house of Obed-Edom to Jerusalem (1 Chr 13, 15-16), the tent of meeting is left in Gibeon until Solomon’s construction of the Temple. In Caquot’s understanding, Solomon unifies the cultic legacy of Moses with that of David in the Temple as indicated in 2 Chr 5:5:

---
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So they brought up the ark, the tent of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the tent; the priests and the Levites brought them up.

However, it is inequitable to attribute the realization of cultic unification more to Solomon than David. The unification of the ark and the tent of meeting requires both David and Solomon; David carries the ark of the covenant of God and Solomon builds the house of God, which replaces the tent of meeting. The unification happens in the Solomonic era, but David, as well as Solomon, played his part in this unification. Furthermore, it is not fitting to equate the unification of the ark and the tent of meeting with the unification of the cultic legacy of David and the cultic legacy of Moses. Since Moses’ cultic legacy from Sinai in itself contains the two constituents, the ark and the tent of meeting, the unification of the two constituents in the Solomonic era is not the unification of Moses’ cultic legacy and David’s cultic legacy, but the restoration of Moses’ cultic legacy in the Solomonic era.

3. 2. 1. 4. Solomon’s attraction in the Greek period

Caquot finds evidence for Solomon’s superior portrayal over David in the compositional setting of Chronicles. Caquot dates Chronicles in the Greek period, and maintains that the Chronicler depicts Solomon, a king of peace and wisdom, as superior to David in order that he might appeal to the Greeks.\textsuperscript{157} The key for Caquot’s dating of Chronicles into the Greek period is Jaddua in Neh 12:22:

As for the Levites, in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua, there were recorded the heads of ancestral houses; also the priests until the reign of Darius the Persian.

Based on Josephus’ \textit{Jewish Antiquities}, Caquot identifies ‘Darius the Persian’ as Darius III, Codomannus (336 – 330 BC), who is the last Darius in Persia, and places the latest figure in the list, Jaddua, in the early Greek period:\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., 116.

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 111.
When Jōannēs departed this life he was succeeded in the high priesthood by his son Jaddūs. He too had a brother, named Manassēs, to whom Sanaballetēs – he had been sent to Samaria as satrap by Darius the last king.

When Alexander died, his empire was partitioned among his successors (the Diadochi); as for the temple on Mount Garizein, it remained. And, whenever anyone was accused by the people of Jerusalem of eating unclean food or violating the Sabbath or committing any other such sin, he would flee to the Shechemites, saying that he had been unjustly expelled. Now by that time the high priest Jaddūs was also dead, and his son Onias succeeded to the high priesthood. This, then, was the way things were with the people of Jerusalem at that time.

Josephus indicates that Jaddua, son of Joannes, lived in the time of the last Darius (§302), and when Alexander the Great died in 323 BC, Jaddua had also died by that time and his son Onias succeeded him (§346-347). According to Caquot, Jaddua served as a high priest in the early Greek period and thus Chronicles, which is the work of the same author as Ezra-Nehemiah, was composed in the Greek period. This argument, of course, assumes that Joannes, the father of Jaddua, is Johanan of Neh 12:22. Assuming that this is correct, it is plausible to date Nehemiah in the Greek period if the appearance of the two names in the two sources is not mere coincidence.

Caquot’s dating of Chronicles in the Greek period lies in his belief in the common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. However, dating Chronicles in the Greek period based on the text of Nehemiah is not a position that commands consensus in current Chronicles scholarship. After Japhet challenged the notion of the common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah and Williamson substantiated arguments for separate authorship, the majority of scholars no longer
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assume common authorship.\textsuperscript{165} The main arguments for common authorship, such as the repetition of the Cyrus edict in 2 Chr 36:22-23 and Ezra 1:1-3a, the conjunction of some portions of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah in the book of Esdras, and the linguistic/stylistic/theological similarity of the works, are untenable.\textsuperscript{166} If the common authorship theory is unsustainable, Caquot’s attempt to posit Solomon’s superiority over David as a function of the composition of Chronicles in the Greek period fails.

3. 2. 2. Anti-Samaritan polemic

Rudolph claims that the core motif of the Chronicler concerns true Israel, which is only found in Judah and thus Chronicles forms a polemic against Samaria.\textsuperscript{167} According to Rudolph, the Chronicler focuses on the Davidic monarchy as the legitimate dynasty and the Jerusalem Temple as the legitimate cult site in order to discredit the northern kingdom, while he omits the history of the Exodus and Sinai, which are shared by both Jews and Samaritans.\textsuperscript{168} Along this same line, Becker contends that the Chronicler’s glorification of David and Solomon does not come from his interest in kingship itself but from his anti-Samaritan polemic.\textsuperscript{169}

Does the Chronicler preserve the Davidic covenant as a polemic against the Samaritans, the northern kingdom, rather than as an expression of hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingship? Rudolph’s argument for the Chronicler’s anti-Samaritan polemic is four-fold.\textsuperscript{170}

First, the Chronicler spells out Judah’s prominent position among the ancient Israelite tribes in 1 Chr 5:1-2:
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The sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel. He was the firstborn, but because he defiled his father’s bed his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph son of Israel, so that he is not enrolled in the genealogy according to the birthright; though Judah became prominent among his brothers and a ruler came from him, yet the birthright belonged to Joseph.

Secondly, unlike the order of Israel’s sons in 1 Chr 2:1-2, the Chronicler places the headquarter tribes of the northern kingdom, Manasseh and Ephraim, at the end of his genealogical list in 1 Chr 7:14-28. This betrays the Chronicler’s unfavorable stance toward the northern kingdom.

Thirdly, the narrowing of YHWH’s election from all Israel to Judah is due to the rebellion of Jeroboam and the northern tribes (2 Chronicles 10). Afterwards, the northern kingdom’s role is reduced to that of a ‘breeding rod’ (2 Chr 25:17ff; 28:9) and a seducer of Judah (2 Chr 18:1f; 19:2; 20:37; 22:7):

E.g., (breeding rod)
But a prophet of the LORD was there, whose name was Oded; he went out to meet the army that came to Samaria, and said to them, ‘Because the LORD, the God of your ancestors, was angry with Judah, he gave them into your hand…’ (2 Chr 28:9)

E.g., (seducer)
Then Eliezer son of Dodavahu of Mareshah prophesied against Jehoshaphat, saying, ‘Because you have joined with Ahaziah, the LORD will destroy what you have made’. (2 Chr 20:37)

Finally, the northern kingdom practised improper worship after all the priests came to Judah (2 Chr 11:13-17). After the fall of the northern kingdom, Hezekiah invites northerners to Jerusalem for the Passover and receives a contemptuous response of the northern kingdom:

So the couriers went from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh, and as far as Zebulun; but they laughed them to scorn, and mocked them. (2 Chr 30:10)

However, upon investigation, Rudolph’s arguments for the Chronicler’s anti-Samaritan polemic do not look so cogent as they seem to be. In 1 Chr 5:1-2, though
the Chronicler distinguishes Judah as the strongest among the sons of Jacob, and the ancestor of David, his praise of Judah is not a slight toward Joseph, the ancestor of the main tribes of the northern kingdom. As the Chronicler acknowledges the prominence of Judah, he highlights the privilege of birthright upon Joseph. Noting that this is the only place in the Old Testament where the birthright is granted to Joseph, the Chronicler’s consideration for the northern kingdom is heightened.\(^{171}\) Thus, 1 Chr 5:1-2 does not imply a polemic against the northern kingdom. Rather both Judah and Joseph are deemed to be equally important.

Rudolph’s second argument is the Chronicler’s marginalization of Manasseh and Ephraim by placing them at the end of the tribal genealogical list.\(^{172}\) Let us first sketch the general structure of the genealogy. The tribal genealogical list extends from 1 Chr 2:3 to 1 Chr 9:1 in the order of Judah, Reuben, Gad, the half tribe of Manasseh, Levi, Issachar, Benjamin, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, Asher, Benjamin. Out of the twelve tribes, the Chronicler omits Dan and Zebulun, and the genealogy of Benjamin occurs in two places: the short genealogy in 1 Chr 7:6-12 and the more detailed genealogy in 1 Chr 8:1-39. Though there are two entries for the genealogy of Manasseh, this is more natural than that of Benjamin’s double listing, considering the geographical division of Manasseh. The Chronicler structures the genealogy around the three frame tribes: Judah in 1 Chr 2:3-4:23, Levi in 1 Chr 5:27 (6:1)-6:66 (81), and the main Benjamin genealogy in 1 Chr 8:1-39.\(^{173}\) The genealogies of those three tribes are the most detailed and extended, and function as three posts: Judah in the beginning, Levi in the middle and Benjamin at the end. The Chronicler places Simeon, Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh between Judah and Levi in 1 Chr 4:24-5:26, and

\(^{171}\) Although Gen 48:5 implies Jacob’s special blessing upon Joseph, the direct attestation of Joseph’s possession of the birthright occurs only in 1 Chr 5:1-2. Gen 48:5 - ‘Therefore your two sons, who were born to you in the land of Egypt before I came to you in Egypt, are now mine; Ephraim and Manasseh shall be mine, just as Reuben and Simeon are’.

\(^{172}\) Manasseh is the tribe to which Samaria, the capital of the northern kingdom belongs. Later Samaria, Ephraim, and Israel are used interchangeably referring to the northern kingdom. E.g., ‘when I would heal Israel, the corruption of Ephraim is revealed, and the wicked deeds of Samaria; for they deal falsely, the thief breaks in, and the bandits raid outside’. (Hos 7:1)

\(^{173}\) McKenzie, 1-2 Chronicles, 67.
Issachar, the short genealogy of Benjamin, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, and Asher between Levi and the long genealogy of Benjamin in 1 Chr 7:1-40.

Based on the above data, the seemingly random order of the tribal genealogy could be explained in the following way. The Chronicler first selects the two Judean tribes of Judah and Benjamin to place them at the beginning and the end. Levi is located in the middle as the Levites take central place in the Israelites encampment (Num 2:17). Having set these three posts, the Chronicler fills the two areas between the posts according to the geographical position of the tribes. He first puts Simeon and the transjordanian tribes between Judah and Levi. Simeon is probably located right after Judah because of its absorption into Judah at an early stage (Josh 19:9). As for the transjordanian tribes, the Chronicler places three tribes from south to north in the order of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh. Lastly, the Chronicler places cisjordanian tribes between the two posts of Levi and Benjamin. Unlike the transjordanian tribes, the cisjordanian tribes are not arranged from south to north.

Though the genealogies of Manasseh and Ephraim, the headquarter tribes of the northern kingdom, are placed in the latter part of the list of cisjordanian tribes, they are not at the end of the list. Rather, Asher is the last tribe in this group. While Judah the protagonist tribe’s genealogy appears first, we cannot reckon that the Chronicler arranges the tribes in any order of preference. As examined above, the order of the tribal genealogy from 1 Chr 2:3 through 1 Chr 9:1 unfolds based on the Chronicler’s multi-schemed frame. Thus the simple change of the order of the Joseph tribes from being 8th in 1 Chr 2:1 to 10th and 11th does not reflect the Chronicler’s polemic against the northern kingdom.

In Rudolph’s third argument, he imputes the narrowing of YHWH’s election of Judah to the northerners’ rebellion against the Davidic house. However, as
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Williamson maintains, the division was brought by God in order to keep his word as seen in 2 Chr 10:15:\textsuperscript{177}

So the king did not listen to the people, because it was a turn of affairs brought about by God so that the LORD might fulfill his word, which he had spoken by Ahijah the Shilonite to Jeroboam son of Nebat. (2 Chr 10:15)

Here the Chronicler assumes the reader’s familiarity with Ahijah’s prophecy for Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 11:30-33:

When Ahijah laid hold of the new garment he was wearing and tore it into twelve pieces. He then said to Jeroboam: Take for yourself ten pieces; for thus says the LORD, the God of Israel, ‘See, I am about to tear the kingdom from the hand of Solomon, and will give you ten tribes… this is because he has forsaken me, worshiped Astarte the goddess of the Sidonians, Chemosh the god of Moab, and Milcom the god of the Ammonites, and has not walked in my ways, doing what is right in my sight and keeping my statutes and my ordinances, as his father David did’.

Thus, the genuine reason for the division of the Davidic house is not due to the northerners’ rebellion but to Solomon’s transgression. Furthermore, God confirms his initiative of the division in the speech of Shemaiah to Rehoboam, who is ready to fight against the northerners:

Thus says the LORD: You shall not go up or fight against your kindred. Let everyone return home, for this thing is from me. (2 Chr 11:4)

It is also notable that the northerners are called ‘kindred’\textsuperscript{178}. After the rebellion, Rudolph contends, the northerners become reduced to being a breeding rod and seducer of Judah. Though northerners cause Judah to turn away from YHWH’s will (2 Chr 18:1f; 19:2; 20:37; 22:7), their being a breeding rod (2 Chr 25:17ff; 28:9)

\textsuperscript{177} Williamson, Israel in the Books of Chronicles, 110.

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid.
for Judah does not invoke a negative image in that they play a proper role as God’s instrument.

Finally, Rudolph’s argument that the northerners engage in improper worship does not necessarily reflect an anti-Samaritan polemic. The Chronicler clearly points out the digression of worship ever since Jeroboam appointed his own priests and built high places for idolatry:

The Levites had left their common lands and their holdings and had come to Judah and Jerusalem, because Jeroboam and his sons had prevented them from serving as priests of the LORD, and had appointed his own priests for the high places, and for the goat-demons, and for the calves that he had made. (2 Chr 11:14-15)

There is no doubt that the Chronicler condemns the unrighteous worship of Jeroboam and the northerners through the mouth of Abijah:

And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. Have you not driven out the priests of the LORD, the descendants of Aaron, and the Levites, and made priests for yourselves like the peoples of other lands?. But as for us, the LORD is our God, and we have not abandoned him…for we keep the charge of the LORD our God, but you have abandoned him. (2 Chr 13:8-11)

However, the Chronicler’s inclusion of Hezekiah’s invitation for the northerners to celebrate the Passover at the Jerusalem Temple (2 Chr 30:1-31:1), which is the Chronicler’s Sondergut, attests to the Chronicler’s sympathetic concern for the northerners. Namely, the Chronicler reprehends the northerners’ improper worship itself, but aims to embrace northerners. The Chronicler does not exclude the northern transgressor in order to render Judah as the true Israel, but alludes to the unification of all Israel through the northerners’ return to proper worship. Hezekiah’s command in the hand of the couriers to the northerners tersely reflects the point:

---

Do not now be stiff-necked as your ancestors were, but yield yourselves to the LORD and come to his sanctuary, which he has sanctified forever, and serve the LORD your God, so that his fierce anger may turn away from you. For as you return to the LORD, your kindred and your children will find compassion with their captors, and return to this land. For the LORD your God is gracious and merciful, and will not turn away his face from you, if you return to him. (2 Chr 30:8-9)

In his research on the concept of ‘Israel’, Williamson demonstrates that the Chronicler is inclusivist of the northerners rather than demonstrating an anti-Samaritan polemic. A good example of the Chronicler’s attitude toward Judah and the northerners is his use of ‘Israel’ in the time of the monarchial division and its sequel in the reign of Rehoboam. There is no ‘true Israel’ bias in the Chronicler’s use of ‘Israel’ for the southern kingdom and the northern kingdom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southern Kingdom</th>
<th>Northern Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דֶּנִּהְשֶׁרַיאל</td>
<td>2 Chr 11:3; 12:1</td>
<td>2 Chr 10:16; 11:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נוֹרֵזְהֶרַיאֶל</td>
<td>2 Chr 10:17</td>
<td>2 Chr 10:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>סוֹרְאָל</td>
<td>2 Chr 12:6</td>
<td>2 Chr 10:16, 19; 11:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, Rudolph’s four arguments for the anti-Samaritan polemic in Chronicles does not gain strong support from the text of Chronicles. In 1 Chr 5:1-2, the Chronicler points to the privilege of Joseph’s birthright as well as Judah’s dominance among the tribes. Given that the Chronicler arranges the tribal genealogical list based on his multi-schemed frame, it is problematic to find the Chronicler’s anti-Samaritan polemic simply in the shift of the Joseph tribes (Manasseh and Ephraim) in his genealogies from 8th (1 Chr 2:1) to 10th and 11th (1 Chr 7:14-29). The Chronicler attributes the division of the kingdom not to the rebellion of Israel but to God, assuming the readers’ familiarity with Ahijah’s prophecy for Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11:30-33) in which Ahijah regards Solomon’s transgression as the

---
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cause of the division. The role of the northern kingdom in the life of Judah is characterized as both positive and negative. If the northerners’ seduction of Judah is negative, then their being a ‘breeding rod’ of Judah as an instrument of God is positive. Regarding the northerners’ inadmissible worship of golden calves and their cultic corruption, the Chronicler unequivocally condemns their iniquity. Yet his attitude toward the northern kingdom is embracing and inclusive rather than polemical and exclusive, as seen in Hezekiah’s invitation for the northerners to visit the Jerusalem Temple and the Chronicler’s unbiased use of the term ‘Israel’ for both the southern and the northern kingdoms. Without this anti-Samaritan polemic, Rudolph’s attempt to understand the Chronicler’s focus on the Davidic dynasty as a flashpoint in the southerner/northerner does not succeed.

4. Conclusion

1 Chronicles 17, the core chapter of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles, is almost identical with its parallel text, 2 Samuel 7. The slight differences between the two texts reveal the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant as follows. Given that the Chronicler does not exclude מִשְׁמַר הָגִיד consistently, it is difficult to regard the lack of מִשְׁמַר הָגִיד in 1 Chr 17:5 as evidence of the Chronicler’s intended suppression of the Sinai covenant with a view to magnifying the Davidic covenant. The intriguing variance between מִשְׁמַר הָגִיד of 2 Sam 7:12 and מִשְׁמַר הָגִיד of 1 Chr 17:11 is due to stylistic, rather than theological, differences. The Chronicler’s use of מִשְׁמַר (1 Chr 17:11) for מִשְׁמַר (2 Sam 7:12) does not carry any substantial implications about the Davidic kingdom. Rather, it reflects the Chronicler’s invocation of a word more commonly used in his own time. The lack of מִשְׁמַר in 1 Chr 17:12 does not attempt to weaken the Davidic kingdom because, strictly speaking, it is not an exclusion but an abridgement of מִשְׁמַר מְלָכַת שָׁם into מְלָכַת שָׁם. The conspicuous lack of the chastisement clause in 1 Chr 17:13 suggests neither messianism nor the conditionalization of the Davidic covenant, but corresponds to the following idealized portrayal of Solomon. The coexistence of the conditional and unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant reflects the organic relationship between the two. The Davidic covenant is conditional in that God punishes and
disciplines his people, and unconditional in that God’s KING does not depart from the Davidic house. Since the most plausible interpretation of the clause, לְקַמַּהוּ מַהְционֶהֶם in 1 Chr 17:14 is ‘I shall establish him in (the service of) God’s Temple and in my kingdom’, this implies the strengthened role of the Davidic dynasty in the Temple rather than the weakening of the Davidic dynasty by the influence of the Temple and its cultus. The expression נָקָם בָּאֲבֹתֶיךָ in 1 Chr 17:18 referring to David and the emphasis on David as YHWH’s נָקָם by breaking the natural word order in 1 Chr 17:18 highlight the honour of David and his house.

The Chronicler’s hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingship is attested by the following. Most of all, the Chronicler’s use of נָקָם for the Davidic kingdom advocates for the revival of the Davidic dynasty. The range of נָקָם of the Davidic dynasty is not specified by the past-oriented phrase, לְקַמַּהוּ מַהְーション in 1 Chr 17:17, but by a stark phrase, נָקָם אֲבָטָי, which bespeaks God’s unfailing upon the Davidic house, and the two uses of נָקָם (vv. 22, 24) other than its connection to the Davidic dynasty in 1 Chronicles 17. The use of נָקָם in 1 Chr 17:22 and 24 refers to the perpetuity of God’s taking Israel as his people and the eternal praise of YHWH respectively. The Chronicler’s deliberate equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH’s kingdom (1 Chr 17:14) underscores the strong tie between the Davidic kingdom and the kingdom of YHWH. The reference to David’s kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom does not deprive David of ownership but enhances YHWH’s attachment to the Davidic kingdom. David’s responsive prayer to the oracle of Nathan, in which David exclusively focuses on his dynasty without even mentioning the Temple, disproves the cultic interpretation of 1 Chronicles 17. The Chronicler’s faithful preservation of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 manifests his belief in the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty. The ‘planting Israel’ metaphor in 1 Chr 17:9 suggests viewing Chronicles as eschatological in a broad sense.

Though the Chronicler provides a description of a flawless Solomon, the Temple builder, throughout Chronicles, it does not require a competitive view of Chronicles as being either ‘Solomonic’ or ‘Davidic’. The blessing of Solomon in Chronicles is read within God’s blessing of David and his descendants. Since the text
of Chronicles does not indicate anti-Samaritan polemic, the attempts to understand the Chronicler’s focus on the Davidic covenant with a view to an anti-Samaritan polemic rather than the hope of the restoration of the Davidic dynasty loses its force.
III. The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chr 22:7-13

1. Setting

The main proclamation of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is followed by a series of incidents: David’s wars in 1 Chronicles 18-20; David’s census, God’s punishment, David’s offering and the selection of the Temple site in 1 Chr 21:1-22:1, and David’s preparation for the Temple construction in 1 Chr 22:2-19. As we have discussed before, the Chronicler’s inclusion of David’s census is not so much to point out David’s inferiority to Solomon by revealing his dark side as to inform how the Temple site was selected.\(^\text{182}\) Although there is no explicit link between the account of David’s census and the selection of the Temple site in 2 Sam 24:1-25 (the synoptic passage of 1 Chr 21:1-27), the Chronicler renders 1 Chr 21:1-22:1 a useful bridge between David’s war narrative in 1 Chronicles 18-20 and his preparation for the Temple construction in 1 Chronicles 22.

From 1 Chr 22:2, the Chronicler describes David’s preparation for the Temple construction. After David assembles workers and collects materials (1 Chr 22:2-5), he calls Solomon and charges him with the Temple construction. In this charge, one finds the covenant as expressed in the familiar paternal-filial relationship and v. 10, in particular, forms the core of this promise:

\[
\text{הוֹאָרוּבְּנָה בֵּית לְשֵׁם הוה וּמֵהִיהֶלְךָ לְבַּבְּךָ אֲלֵה}
\]

He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever.

2. Textual Comparison\(^\text{183}\)

1 Chr 22:10 corresponds to the Davidic covenant of Nathan’s prophecy in 2 Sam 7:13-14 as well as 1 Chr 17:12-13:

---

\(^\text{182}\) See p.76 of this work.

\(^\text{183}\) Since there is no synoptic text of 1 Chr 22:10, I have used the title ‘Textual Comparison’ rather than ‘Synoptic Comparison’ for this section.
He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. (2 Sam 7:13-14)

He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. (1 Chr 17:12-13)

Comparing 1 Chr 22:10 with 2 Sam 7:13-14 and 1 Chr 17:12-13, one finds slight differences among them. Let us first compare 1 Chr 22:10 with 1 Chr 17:12-13. Both 1 Chr 22:10 and the corresponding portion of 1 Chr 17:12-13 consist of four clauses. The table below matches the four clauses of 1 Chr 22:10 with the corresponding clauses of 1 Chr 17:12-13, though the order of the clauses has been altered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Chr 17:12-13</th>
<th>1 Chr 22:10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a לָבֶד הַבָּנה, בְּתֵי</td>
<td>A לָבֶד הַבָּנה, בְּתֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b הָוָא יִשְׁמָרְתָּ לָבֶד</td>
<td>B הָוָא יִשְׁמָרְתָּ לָבֶד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c אֶל אֲלֵי לֵאמֶב</td>
<td>C אֶל אֲלֵי לֵאמֶב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d נְכַסְתָּ נְעַלְוָהּ</td>
<td>D נְכַסְתָּ נְעַלְוָהּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we label the four clauses of 1 Chr 22:10 as A, B, C, and D in the order of the text and the four corresponding clauses of 1 Chr 17:12-13 as a, b, c, and d, the actual order of 1 Chr 17:12-13 is a-d-c-b. Only B and b are identical. To compare A with a, A’s לָבֶד corresponds to a’s לָבֶד. As for C and c, no verb occurs in C, while the verb מִלְּחַזֶּה is present in c. The most notable difference is between D and d. Whereas the hifil form of מִלְּחַזֶּה is used in D, the polel form of מִלְּחַזֶּה occurs in d. D has the longer phrase נְכַסְתָּ נְעַלְוָהּ, while d has only נְכַסְתָּ נְעַלְוָהּ with object marker מִלְּחַזֶּה. Lastly, D’s מִלְּחַזֶּה, which does not occur in d, defines the realm of the kingdom. The comparison between 1 Chr 22:10 and 1 Chr 17:12-13 discloses that 1 Chr 22:10
follows 1 Chr 17:12-13 closely, and the few changes in wording do not significantly alter the sense of the passages.

When we compare 1 Chr 22:10 and the corresponding part of 2 Sam 7:13-14, the similarity is further tightened. 2 Sam 7:13-14 is made up of four clauses, a’, b’, c’, d’ which correspond to the four clauses of 1 Chr 22:10, A, B, C, D as the following chart shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Sam 7:13-14</th>
<th>1 Chr 22:10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a’ יָמוֹי לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לָשֵׁם</td>
<td>A יָמוֹי לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לָשֵׁם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b’ יִתְנַחֲלֵל לָבֶן</td>
<td>B יִתְנַחֲלֵל לָבֶן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c’ אֶתְנַחֲלֵל לָבֶן</td>
<td>C אֶתְנַחֲלֵל לָבֶן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d’ יָגוֹלוֹת מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ</td>
<td>D יָגוֹלוֹת מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to 1 Chr 17:12-13, the order of the four clauses of 2 Sam 7:13-14 is a’- d’- c’- b’. In this comparison, A and a’ and B and b’ are identical. Comparison between C and c’ reveals that the verb, יָדַע, does not exist in C. The comparison between D and d’ demonstrates a tighter correspondence between 1 Chr 22:10 and 2 Sam 7:13-14 than between 1 Chr 22:10 and 1 Chr 17:12-13. Though the hifil form of בַּלָּא of D and polel form of בַּלָּא in d’ are different as the difference between D and d, מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ of D and מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ of d’ marks the closeness between 1 Chr 22:10 and 2 Sam 7:13-14. Instead of מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ of d’ the Chronicler takes מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ because it was a more popular form in the time of the Chronicler.184 As in 1 Chr 17:12-13, 2 Sam 7:13-14 has the object marker לְאֹת before מֶלֶךְ but D’s phrase, יָגוֹלוֹת מֶלֶךְ, does not exist.

The comparisons above indicate that there is no significant difference between the Davidic covenant of 1 Chr 22:10 and Nathan’s prophecy of the promise in 1 Chr 17:12-13 and 2 Sam 7:13-14. In terms of wording, 1 Chr 22:10 reflects the wording of 2 Sam 7:13-14 more tightly than 1 Chr 17:12-13.

The Davidic covenant of 1 Chr 22:10 occurs within the context of David’s charge to Solomon for the construction of the Temple, which consists of three units:

---

184 See p. 33 of this work.
vv. 7b-10, vv. 11-13, and vv. 14-16. The three units are clearly divided by three markers: בְּנֵי ('My son') in v. 7, בתא ('Now my son') in v. 11, וַתִּתְקַנָּה ('And behold!') in v. 14.

David’s charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:7b-13 is the Chronicler’s Sondergut. Though David’s charge to Solomon in 1 Kgs 2:2-4 includes David’s encouragement and summons for Solomon to keep the decrees of the Mosaic law as in 1 Chr 22:13, there is no trace of 1 Kgs 2:2-4 in 1 Chr 22:7b-13.186

In the first unit (1 Chr 22:7b-13), the Chronicler notably stresses the peacefulness of Solomon. God chooses Solomon, a ‘man of peace’ (חֶזְקָא הַנָּחָה), as the Temple builder and promises that he will give Solomon (שלום) peace (שלום) and quiet (שֶׁמֶר) in his days:

As well as שֶׁמֶר, the two words from the root נָחָה (and) in 1 Chr 22:9 also highlight the peace that Solomon will enjoy.

Synoptic comparison between 1 Chronicles 17 and 2 Samuel 7 discloses that the Chronicler does not use נָחָה with reference to David. It is observed in the following comparisons between 2 Sam 7:1-2a and 1 Chr 17:1, and 2 Sam 7:11 and 1 Chr 17:10:

185 Qere. cf., Kethib - בְּנֵי

186 1 Kgs 2:2-4 - I am about to go the way of all the earth. Be strong, be courageous, and keep the charge of the LORD your God, walking in his ways and keeping his statutes, his commandments, his ordinances, and his testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses, so that you may prosper in all that you do and wherever you turn. Then the LORD will establish his word that he spoke concerning me: ‘If your heirs take heed to their way, to walk before me in faithfulness with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail you a successor on the throne of Israel’.
Now when the king was settled in his house, and the LORD had given him rest from all his enemies around him, the king said to the prophet Nathan. (2 Sam 7:1-2a)

In 1 Chr 17:1, the clause containing David’s request to the LORD (2 Sam 7:1) does not exist.

From the time that I appointed judges over my people Israel; and I will give you rest from all your enemies. (2 Sam 7:11)

From the time that I appointed judges over my people Israel; and I will subdue all your enemies. (1 Chr 17:10)

Here, the Chronicler utilizes the verb, rather than נῦנ, which results in the different wordings at the end of the verse: מְשַׁלֶּל אֲבוֹתֵךְ (1 Chr 17:10)// מְשַׁלֶּל אֲבוֹתֵךְ (2 Sam 7:11). Namely, unlike the author of Samuel, who writes of the divine gift of rest to David (2 Sam 7), the Chronicler uses the term, מְשַׁלֶּל אֲבוֹתֵךְ, first not in the synoptic 1 Chr 17, but only in 1 Chr 22:9, where the Chronicler underscores the peacefulness of Solomon.

3. Further Issues

3. 1. Is ‘peace’ an indicator of messianism?

Noticing the emphasis on ‘peace’ in 1 Chr 22:9, Theodor Lescow claims that 1 Chr 22:9 expresses hope for the birth of the Messiah.187 He supports his contention

with the messianic passage of Isa 9:1-6 (2-7), where peace characterizes the messianic age: 188

…For all the boots of the tramping warriors and all the garments rolled in blood shall be burned as fuel for the fire. For a child has been born for us, a son given to us; authority rests upon his shoulders; and he is named Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. His authority shall grow continually, and there shall be endless peace for the throne of David and his kingdom…

In this passage, the Messiah is called ‘Prince of Peace’ and his age means a time of endless peace, when a warrior has no use for his combat gear other than as ‘fuel for the fire’. Lescow argues that 1 Chr 22:9 carries this same messianic ideology that is seen in Isa 9:1-6 (2-7):

See, a son shall be born to you…
He shall be a man of peace…
For his name shall be Solomon… (1 Chr 22:9)

As we have seen, the Chronicler, who is alert to the use of נַחֲלֹת, emphasizes ‘peace’ in 1 Chr 22:9 with five words of peace, רְשִׁית. שָׁלוֹם. שֵׁלֶמֶח. מֶנְחָה. מִנְחָה. and word play between רְשִׁית. שָׁלוֹם. and רְשִׁית. שֵׁלֶמֶח. Nevertheless, although the Chronicler highlights the peaceful image of Solomon here, it is unlikely that this verse was influenced by Isa 9:1-6 (2-7). With regard to the Hebrew word ‘peace’, the most relevant part of Isa 9:1-6 (2-7) for comparison with 1 Chr 22:9 is Isa 9:5-6a (6-7a):

For a child has been born for us, a son given to us; authority rests upon his shoulders; and he is named Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace (שַׁהֵר-שֲׁלָלָה). His authority shall grow continually, and there shall be endless peace (רְשִׁית. שָׁלוֹם).

There are two places where ‘peace’ is directly mentioned in Isa 9:5-6a (6-7a). The first is in the epithet of the Messiah, ‘prince of peace’ (שַׁהֵר-שֲׁלָלָה) in v. 5 (6) and the second is in the second clause of v. 6 (7), ‘and there shall be endless peace’

188 Ibid., 205-206.
The messianic epithet, ‘prince of peace’ (שָׂרֵי בְּשָׂרִים הָעָם) in Isa 9:5 (6) seems to correspond to ‘man of peace’ (אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה) in 1 Chr 22:9:

See, a son shall be born to you; he shall be a man of peace (אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה). I will give him peace from all his enemies on every side…

If the Chronicler intended a messianic sense in 1 Chr 22:9 under the influence of Isa 9:5-6 (6-7), he would surely have used the distinctive epithet, שָׂרֵי בְּשָׂרִים of Isa 9:5 (6) rather than the different phrase, אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה, literally ‘man of rest’. Since the Chronicler is sensitive to the use of שָׂרֵי בְּשָׂרִים as shown, it is improbable that the Chronicler would have ignored the different wording between the phrases, שָׂרֵי בְּשָׂרִים and אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה. It is possible to match the ‘peace’ clause ‘and there shall be endless peace’ (לְצָלֶּלְם אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה) of Isa 9:6 (7) to the clause in 1 Chr 22:9, ‘I will give him peace from all his enemies on every side’ (לְצָלֶּלְם אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה).

However, there is no evidence that the messianic clause of Isa 9:6 (7) had an influence on 1 Chr 22:9. There is no similarity in wording between the two clauses.

Most of all, the clear mention of the past historical figure of Solomon in 1 Chr 22:9 militates against the messianic interpretation of 1 Chr 22:9. Earlier we investigated the attempt to read a messianic interpretation into the difference between אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה of 2 Sam 7:11 and אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה of 1 Chr 17:11. We argued that the Chronicler’s wording was due to stylistics rather than any messianic intent.¹⁸⁹ 1 Chr 22:9 is different from 1 Chr 17:11 in that the Chronicler clearly refers to the historic figure, Solomon, which opposes the messianic rendering of 1 Chr 22:9. Unlike the ambiguity around the clause of 1 Chr 17:11, אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה, the Chronicler clearly names the man of peace as Solomon in 1 Chr 22:9, ‘For Solomon shall be his name’ (כִּי שָׂרֵי בְּשָׂרִים אֲשֶׁר נְתַנְתָּה).

That the Chronicler does not present his desire for the coming of Messiah in 1 Chr 22:9 does not mean that the Chronicler is theocratic, in support of a Temple-centered society without political independence. If he supported the suppression of the

¹⁸⁹ See pp. 27-33 of this work.
Davidic dynasty with the religious cultic hierarchy of postexilic society, he would not have inserted God’s promise of the eternal Davidic dynasty in this non-synoptic passage about the Temple construction at a time when the Davidic dynasty no longer existed. The insertion of the non-obligatory Davidic covenant reveals the Chronicler’s hope for the resurgence of the Davidic dynasty based on the eternal Davidic covenant.

3. 2. Coexistence of unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant

As with the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 17:13-14, the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10 seems unconditional. However, the charge includes the requirement of observance of the Mosaic commandments as shown in 1 Chr 22:13:

> Then you will prosper if you are careful to observe the statutes and the ordinances that the LORD commanded Moses for Israel. Be strong and of good courage. Do not be afraid or dismayed.

Though this conditional statement is not directly connected to the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10, the conditional statement in 1 Chr 22:13, which is within the same charge of David to Solomon, complements the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant. This statement of 1 Chr 22:13 resembles Josh 1:7 found within the Deuteronomistic History, where obedience and success are inseparable:

> Only be strong and very courageous, being careful to act in accordance with all the law that my servant Moses commanded you; do not turn from it to the right hand or to the left, so that you may be successful wherever you go.

As argued previously, the unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles complement each other. The Davidic covenant is conditional in the sense that God punishes Israel when they break the covenant, and unconditional in that God’s mercy upon Israel does not cease. 1 Chr 22:6-13 reveals that the Chronicler embraces both the unconditional and conditional aspects of the Davidic covenant as he arranges them together in one statement as David’s charge to Solomon.

---

190 See pp. 38-41 of this work.
4. Conclusion

The Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10 is the first occurrence of the dynastic promise following Nathan’s oracle in 1 Chronicles 17. It appears within David’s charge to Solomon regarding the Temple construction as David begins to prepare for the building project after the Temple site was selected. The wording of 1 Chr 22:10 does not deviate in any significant way from the two main Davidic covenant passages, 1 Chr 17:12-13 and 2 Sam 7:13-14. In terms of similarity, 1 Chr 22:10 traces the words of 2 Sam 7:13-14 more closely than 1 Chr 17:12-13.

The context of the Davidic covenant is David’s speech to Solomon, which comprises three distinctive units: vv. 7b-10, vv. 11-13, and vv. 14-16. In the first unit, providing the reason for God’s choice of Solomon as the Temple builder, the Chronicler stresses the peace of Solomon using five terms for peace (1 Chr 22:9). Lescow has attempted to show a messianic interpretation of 1 Chr 22:9 by comparing it with the messianic oracle in Isa 9:1-6 (2-7), but there is insufficient evidence to justify his assertion. Furthermore, the clear mention of historical figure Solomon in 1 Chr 22:9 opposes a messianic approach to the passage.

The Chronicler’s inclusion of the Davidic covenant in this non-synoptic passage about the Temple construction reveals his longing for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty rather than his satisfaction with the postexilic Temple-centered cultic society. 1 Chr 22:7-13 express the Chronicler’s hope in nuce in which the unconditional and conditional aspects of the Davidic covenant coexist. Whereas the Davidic covenant of 1 Chr 22:10 is unconditional, 1 Chr 22:13 includes the condition of obedience for ongoing success. The coexistence of the unconditional and conditional aspects of the promise in one passage provides evidence of the complementary relation between the two.
IV. The Davidic Covenant in 1 Chr 28:2-10

1. Setting

If 1 Chr 22:6-16 is David’s private charge to his son, then 1 Chr 28:2-10 is David’s public commission of Solomon in the midst of all the people of Israel. It begins with an imperative clause, ‘Hear me my brothers and my people!’ in v. 2. 1 Chr 28:2-10 has two parts: King David’s charge to the officials in vv. 2-8 and David’s charge to Solomon in vv. 9-10. The plural forms of the imperative רָמָה and רָשָׁה, and the 2nd person plural suffix בּוּבָי in v. 8 lucidly demonstrate a different set of recipients for David’s charge from the individual indicated by the singular forms of 2nd person imperative, רְמָה and רְשָׁה, and 2nd person singular suffix בּוּ in v. 9. In this public commission, the Davidic covenant is present in vv. 4-7.

There is no synoptic text of 1 Chr 28:2-10, but it is worthwhile to compare it with David’s private instruction to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:7-13. Judging from the similarity between the two passages, it is conceivable that the Chronicler had 1 Chr 22:7-13 in mind when he composed 1 Chr 28:2-10.

---

191 It is remarkable that a similar bipartite structure appears in Moses’ summons to the Israelites and Joshua in Deut 31:1-8 when Joshua succeeds Moses. Moses summons the Israelites in vv. 1-6 and then directly summons Joshua in vv. 7-8:

When Moses had finished speaking all these words to all Israel, he said to them: ‘I am now one hundred twenty years old. I am no longer able to get about, and the LORD has told me, “You shall not cross over this Jordan”. The LORD your God himself will cross over before you. He will destroy these nations before you, and you shall dispossess them. Joshua also will cross over before you, as the LORD promised. The LORD will do to them as he did to Sihon and Og, the kings of the Amorites, and to their land, when he destroyed them. The LORD will give them over to you and you shall deal with them in full accord with the command that I have given to you. Be strong and bold; have no fear or dread of them, because it is the LORD your God who goes with you; he will not fail you or forsake you’. (vv. 1-6)

Then Moses summoned Joshua and said to him in the sight of all Israel: ‘Be strong and bold, for you are the one who will go with this people into the land that the LORD has sworn to their ancestors to give them; and you will put them in possession of it. It is the LORD who goes before you. He will be with you; he will not fail you or forsake you. Do not fear or be dismayed’. (vv. 7-8)

2. Textual Comparison

As the beginning of David’s private charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:7 (‘My son, I had planned to build a house to the name of the LORD my God’), the Chronicler expresses David’s unfulfilled plan of the Temple construction at the beginning of his public commission of Solomon in 1 Chr 28:2 (‘I had planned to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD’). This is reminiscent of David’s words to Nathan in 1 Chr 17:1, ‘I am living in a house of cedar, but the ark of the covenant of the LORD is under a tent’. Whereas God’s rejection shortly follows David’s hopes of building the Temple in 1 Chr 22:8, there is one more clause, לַעֲבוֹדָה לְגֹן, inserted between these two events:

David said to Solomon, ‘My son, I had planned to build a house to the name of the LORD my God. But the word of the LORD came to me, saying, “You have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name”’. (1 Chr 22:7-8)

I had planned to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD, for the footstool of our God; לַעֲבוֹדָה לְגֹן. But God said to me, ‘You shall not build a house for my name’. (1 Chr 28:2-3)

Most English versions of the Bible translate the clause as David’s preparation for the Temple construction:

And I made preparations for building. (NRSV)
And I had made preparations to build it. (NKJV)
And I laid aside material for building. (NJPS)
And I was preparing to build it. (NAB)

In Jewish Antiquities, Josephus interprets the clause as the gathering of the building materials:

Brothers and fellow-countrymen, I wish you to know that with the intention of building of a temple to God I collected a great quantity of gold and one hundred thousand talent of silver; but God, through the prophet Nathan, has kept me from doing so.\footnote{Flavius Josephus, Josephus: Jewish Antiquities V-VIII, trans by H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus, VII-371 (London: William Heinemann, 1958), 559.}
Josephus’ writing is more specific than the clause in the LXX:

καὶ ἤτοίμασα τὰ εἰς τὴν κατασκήνωσιν ἐπιτήρεια
And I prepared the materials for the encamping.

All of the above translations suggest that in 1 Chr 28:2-3, David not only planned to build the Temple but also made preparations to build it. The translation of NAB, ‘was preparing’, gives the clearest sense that David’s plan to build was frustrated by God in the midst of his preparations.

When did God prohibit David’s Temple building project? Did he initiate an interdict when David only planned to build it as 1 Chr 17:1-4\(^{194}\) and 1 Chr 22:7-8 suggest, or was it when David prepared labour and materials for the Temple building as the above translations of 1 Chr 28:2 indicate? To solve this tension, Keil maintains that ἔτοιμον λῆμνα refers to David’s preparations of labour and materials for the Temple building narrated in 1 Chr 22:2-4, 14-16.\(^{195}\)

David gave orders to gather together the aliens who were residing in the land of Israel, and he set stonecutters to prepare dressed stones for building the house of God. David also provided great stores of iron for nails for the doors of the gates and for clamps, as well as bronze in quantities beyond weighing, and cedar logs without number— for the Sidonians and Tyrians brought great quantities of cedar to David.

...With great pains I have provided for the house of the LORD one hundred thousand talents of gold, one million talents of silver, and bronze and iron beyond weighing, for there is so much of it; timber and stone too I have provided. To these you must add more. You have an abundance of workers: stonecutters, masons, carpenters, and all kinds of artisans without number, skilled in working gold, silver, bronze, and iron. Now begin the work, and the LORD be with you.

\(^{194}\) ‘Now when David settled in his house, David said to the prophet Nathan, “I am living in a house of cedar, but the ark of the covenant of the LORD is under a tent.” Nathan said to David, “Do all that you have in mind, for God is with you.” But that same night the word of the LORD came to Nathan, saying: “Go and tell my servant David: Thus says the LORD: You shall not build me a house to live in”’.

According to Keil, הָנָךְ כַּנְיָהוֹת לֵבָנָה of 1 Chr 28:2 corresponds to David’s preparations of labour and materials for building the Temple in 1 Chronicles 22, and thereupon, in terms of temporal order, הָנָךְ כַּנְיָהוֹת לֵבָנָה is later than God’s subsequent prohibition of David’s Temple building project, which corresponds to 1 Chr 17:1-4. Leslie C. Allen clarifies this argument, saying:

David’s ‘preparations’ sound like those made by the king in 1 Chr 22:2-5; yet, the text reads as if they occurred before the prophetic oracle of 1 Chr 17. The clause ‘and I made preparations for building’ (v. 2) probably breaks the continuity and has the sense ‘and [subsequently] I have in fact…’. 196

However, Keil and Allen’s harmonization of the text seems forced since no temporal breaks are evident in the clause. הָנָךְ כַּנְיָהוֹת לֵבָנָה. In terms of chronology, it is frankly bizarre for David to speak of his past plan and recent preparations of the Temple building only to go back to God’s past prohibition in 1 Chr 28:3.

To relieve the tension of the clause, הָנָךְ כַּנְיָהוֹת לֵבָנָה I suggest a new rendering of הָנָךְ כַּנְיָהוֹת as ‘And I intended’. Though ‘to prepare’ is the most common translation of the hifil form of לְמֹא in the Old Testament, it also has a sense of ‘to feel inclined’, or ‘to be intent on’. 197 If we apply this rendering, the reading of 1 Chr 28:2-3 no longer clashes with 1 Chr 17:1-4 and 1 Chr 22:7-8:

Hear me my brothers and my people! I planned to build the house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord and for the footstool of our God and I intended to build (it). But God said to me, “You shall not build a house for my name”.

The reason for God’s prohibition of David’s Temple building project is abbreviated in 1 Chr 28:3 when compared with the rationale in 1 Chr 22:8:

You have shed much blood and have waged great wars; you shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood in my sight on the earth. (1 Chr 22:8)

---


197 לְמֹא, HALOT I, 465.
You shall not build a house for my name, for you are a warrior and have shed blood. (1 Chr 28:3)

Though Japhet analyzes 1 Chr 28:3 (a – ‘you may not build’, b – ‘for you are a man of war’, c – ‘and have shed blood’) as an inverted restatement of 1 Chr 22:8 (c – b – a),198 ‘You have shed blood’ (c) appears again at the end of 1 Chr 22:8, and therefore it is more adequate to view 1 Chr 28:3 as an abbreviation of 1 Chr 22:8.

Having provided the rationale for God’s prohibition of David’s Temple building, the Chronicler expands David’s private instruction to Solomon along with David’s public commission of Solomon with different foci in 1 Chronicles 22 and 1 Chronicles 28 respectively. In 1 Chr 22:9 the Chronicler highlights Solomon as a man of peace (הָנָּחֲלָן־בְּשָׂא) before the announcement of the Temple builder and the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10. This is changed in 1 Chr 28:6-7 where the Chronicler skips any mention of Solomon as a ‘man of peace’ and precedes vv. 6-7 with the announcement of the Temple builder and the Davidic covenant by stressing the divine choice of Judah, David’s family, David, and Solomon in vv.4-5:

See, a son shall be born to you; he shall be a man of peace (הָנָּחֲלָן׃). I will give him peace (יהָנָּחֲלָן) from all his enemies on every side; for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace (יהָנָּחֲלָן) and quiet (נָחֲלָן) to Israel in his days. (1 Chr 22:9)

Yet the LORD God of Israel chose (יהָנָּחֲלָן) me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever; for he chose (יהָנָּחֲלָן) Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father’s house, and among my father’s sons he took delight in making me king over all Israel. And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen (יהָנָּחֲלָן) my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:4-5)

This divergence is understandable when we consider the contexts of the two charges. In David’s private charge to Solomon, David needed to enunciate the reason why God designated Solomon rather than David as the Temple builder. In David’s public

---
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commission of Solomon, David needed to declare before the Israelites the divine choice of his family for the throne of Israel. The key words of 1 Chr 22:9 are יָנוֹת ('rest'), יְנַח ('quietness'), and לְחֵב ('peace'), while the word בָּא ('to choose') permeates throughout 1 Chr 28:4-5.

After the announcement of the Temple builder and the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10 and 1 Chr 28:6-7, the private and public charges differ slightly. Within the private charge of 1 Chr 22:11-13, David blesses the Temple builder Solomon and encourages him to stay faithful to the law of God. Within the public charge of 1 Chr 28:8-10, however, David summons the assembly of Israel to keep the commandments of YHWH and instructs Solomon to seek God and be faithful in fulfilling the Temple building project:

Now, my son, the Lord be with you, so that you may succeed in building the house of the Lord your God, as he has spoken concerning you. Only, may the Lord grant you discretion and understanding, so that when he gives you charge over Israel you may keep the law of the Lord your God. Then you will prosper if you are careful to observe the statutes and the ordinances that the Lord commanded Moses for Israel. Be strong and of good courage. Do not be afraid or dismayed. (1 Chr 22:11-13)

Now therefore in the sight of all Israel, the assembly of the Lord, and in the hearing of our God, observe and search out all the commandments of the LORD your God; that you may possess this good land, and leave it for an inheritance to your children after you forever. And you, my son Solomon, know the God of your father, and serve him with single mind and willing heart; for the Lord searches every mind, and understands every plan and thought. If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever. Take heed now, for the Lord has chosen you to build a house as the sanctuary; be strong, and act. (1 Chr 28:8-10)

Once again the differences between the two charges lie in the different addressees. Overall, David’s public commission of Solomon in 1 Chr 28:2-10 parallels David’s private charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:6-13 with the deviation due mainly to the public context of the assembly of Israel in 1 Chr 28:2-10.

3. Further Issues
3. 1. Coexistence of unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant

David’s public commission of Solomon in 1 Chr 28:2-10 presents the Davidic covenant twice; once implicitly in v. 4 and then explicitly in v. 7:

Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever. (1 Chr 28:4)

I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today. (1 Chr 28:7)

In comparison with the unconditional Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 22:10, the explicit reference to the covenant in 1 Chr 28:7 is conditional:

He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever. (1 Chr 22:10)

I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today. (1 Chr 28:7)

Interestingly, just as David’s private charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:6-13 includes both unconditional (v. 10) and conditional (v. 13) aspects, so too both coexist in David’s public commission of Solomon in 1 Chr 28:2-10. In contrast to the conditional Davidic covenant mentioned explicitly in 1 Chr 28:7, the Davidic covenant alluded to implicitly in 1 Chr 28:4 is without condition.

Along with the conditional statement of 1 Chr 28:7, there are strong conditional elements in 1 Chr 28:9, where covenant terminology ידיע (‘to know’) and

---

199 ‘Then you will prosper if you are careful to observe the statutes and the ordinances that the LORD commanded Moses for Israel. Be strong and of good courage. Do not be afraid or dismayed’.
David’s strong warning for Solomon,יָדַעֲךָ נָא (‘he will reject you forever’) are present:

And you, my son Solomon, know (יָדַעֲךָ נָא) the God of your father, and serve him with single mind and willing heart; for the LORD searches every mind, and understands every plan and thought. If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever. (1 Chr 28:9)

As Herbert B. Huffmon observes, the technical covenantal use of יָדַעֲךָ נָא appears in both ancient Near Eastern treaty documents and the Old Testament. In one Hittite treaty document, Hittite king, Suppiluliumas speaks as a Suzerain to his vassal, Huqqanas:

And you, Huqqanas know only the Sun regarding lordship; also my son (of) whom I, the Sun, say, ‘This one everyone should know… Moreover, another lord… do not know! The Sun (alone) know 201

In this treaty ‘to know’ implies a technical legal recognition with responsibility rather than a simple acquisition of knowledge or information. In the Old Testament, Hos 13:4-5 and Amos 3:2 serve as good examples of יָדַעֲךָ נָא as a technical covenantal term:

Yet I have been the LORD your God ever since the land of Egypt. And you shall know (יָדַעֲךָ נָא) no God but Me; For there is no Savior besides Me. I knew you (יָדַעֲךָ נָא) in the wilderness, in the land of great drought. (Hos 13:4-5, my translation)

You only have I known (יָדַעֲךָ נָא) of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. (Amos 3:2)

As Huffmon points out regarding Hos 13:5, God’s ‘knowledge’ of Israel in the wilderness is unmistakably God’s covenant at Mount Sinai. In the context of Hos 13:4, Israel’s ‘knowing’ God involves the fulfillment of the covenant stipulation on

201 Ibid., 31-32.
202 Ibid., 35.
the part of Israel. In Amos 3:2, God ‘knowing’ involves his recognition of Israel as a covenant partner. Since Israel did not obey God’s covenant stipulations, God proclaims a punishment upon Israel through the mouth of Amos. Likewise, the imperative form of ידוע appearing in David’s charge to Solomon (1 Chr 28:9) carries a sense of covenantal stipulation. The following בַּא (if) clauses reinforce this sense:

If you seek him, he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever. (1 Chr 28:9).

3. 2. Originality of 1 Chr 28:4-5

Braun argues in his commentary that vv. 4-5 of 1 Chronicles 28 is not original to the Chronicler but is a secondary addition. Since vv. 4-5 include implicit mention of the Davidic covenant, we need to examine Braun’s arguments, which may be summarized as follows:

(1) The connection between vv. 6 and 10 [sic] is interrupted by vv. 4-5.
(2) The concern elsewhere in this pericope is with Solomon as temple builder, not, as here, with Solomon as king.
(3) Several other items, while not contradicting the views of the Chronicler, are expressed here in an unusual way:
   (a) The omission of כל ‘all’ before Israel in both vv. 4 and 5 (although ‘all Israel’ does occur one time in v. 4) seems strangely reticent for the Chronicler in this connection. (cf., 1 Chr 29:21-26)
   (b) The reference to an election of Judah is unparalleled elsewhere in Chronicles.
   (c) The root דָּעַת (‘to be pleased’), used here of the election of David, occurs elsewhere in Chronicles only in the difficult 1 Chr 29:3, where its meaning is entirely different.
   (d) The reference to the ‘throne of the kingdom of YHWH over Israel’, while in general agreement with the Chronicler’s thought (cf. 1 Chr 29:3), is unusually extended and verbose as compared to the simpler ‘throne of Yahweh’ of that verse, as well as the direct בָּלָהוּ ‘his kingdom’ of v. 7.

203 Braun, 1 Chronicles, 268.
204 Braun certainly means vv. 3 and 6.
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Let us examine each argument. With regard to the first point, Braun suggests that v. 6, where God declares Solomon as the Temple builder, smoothly connects to v. 3, which provides the rationale for God’s prohibition of David’s Temple construction. However, one could argue that vv. 4-5 do not interrupt the flow of David’s speech to the assembly of Israel. Rather, vv. 4-5 play the important role of introducing the Temple builder, Solomon. Before the announcement of the Temple builder, David informs the assembly about Solomon. Solomon is chosen as king of Israel, just as his ancestors and ancestral tribe Judah were elected by God. To mention the divine election of Solomon is important given that it could elicit the support of the Israelite assembly for Solomon’s Temple building. The declaration of Solomon as the Temple builder follows the process of narrowing down the divine choice from Judah, to David’s family, to David, and then to Solomon. Like 1 Chr 28:4-6, Nathan prophesies in 1 Chr 17:10-12 concerning the establishment of the Davidic kingdom and Solomon’s enthronement before the announcement of the Temple builder:

Moreover I declare to you that the LORD will build you a house. When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for me.

Thus, it is not necessary to view 1 Chr 28:4-5 as an interruption between 1 Chr 28:3 and 28:6.

Braun’s second argument that Solomon is viewed in this pericope not as a king but only as the Temple builder may also be challenged as it appears to run counter to the flow of the text. Though the pericope is mainly about the Temple building project, the kingship of Solomon is not ignored in the text outside of vv.4-5. The explicit Davidic covenant in v.7 unequivocally manifests the Chronicler’s interest in the kingship of Solomon:

I will establish his kingdom forever if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances, as he is today.
This pericope views Solomon not only as the Temple builder but also as a king of the Davidic dynasty.

Braun’s third argument is based upon the presence of four unusual elements in vv. 4-5. The first element is the lack of הלל (‘all’) before ‘Israel’ in these verses. There are four occurrences of Israel in vv. 4-5:

Yet the LORD God of Israel ( אלהי ישראל) chose me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel ( אלהי ישראל) forever; for he chose Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father’s house, and among my father’s sons he took delight in making me king over all Israel ( אלהי כל ישראל). And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel ( אלהי כל ישראל).

As one can see, and even as Braun acknowledges, the absence of הלל is not consist in vv. 4-5. The third occurrence of Israel in the passage is accompanied by הלל. Moreover, the other two expressions, אלהי ישראל, and the two occurrences of אלהי כל ישראל, are not unfamiliar phrases to the Chronicler. Throughout Chronicles the phrase, אלהי ישראל, occurs 32 times\(^{206}\) and אלהי כל ישראל occurs 25 times.\(^{207}\) Even though ‘all Israel’ is one of the core subjects in Chronicles, we do not need to regard the lack of ‘all’ before ‘Israel’ as non-Chronistic.\(^{208}\) In fact, there is no phrase like אלהי כל ישראל (‘God of all Israel’) in Chronicles, and אלהי כל ישראל (‘over all Israel’) occurs only eight times.\(^{209}\) Thus, it would appear that the phrases אלהי ישראל and אלהי כל ישראל are not at all unusual for the Chronicler.

Braun also compares 1 Chr 29:21-26, in which ‘all Israel’ is used frequently, to 1 Chr 28:4-5:

---


\(^{207}\) 1 Chr 6:34 (49); 11:3, 10; 14:2; 16:40; 21:1; 22:9, 10, 12, 13; 23:1; 26:29; 27:24; 28:4, 5; 29:25, 27, 30; 2 Chr 1:13; 2:3; 13:5; 17:1; 24:9; 28:13; 35:25

\(^{208}\) Regarding ‘all Israel’ see p. 89 of this work.

\(^{209}\) 1 Chr 12:39 (38); 14:8; 18:14; 28:4; 29:26; 2 Chr 9:30; 29:24; 30:1
On the next day they offered sacrifices and burnt offerings to the LORD, a thousand bulls, a thousand rams, and a thousand lambs, with their libations, and sacrifices in abundance for all Israel (כֵּלֵי שְׁנַת אֲלֵית); and they ate and drank before the LORD on that day with great joy. They made David’s son Solomon king a second time; they anointed him as the LORD’s prince, and Zadok as priest. Then Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD, succeeding his father David as king; he prospered, and all Israel (כֵּלֵי שְׁנַת אֲלֵית) obeyed him. All the leaders and the mighty warriors, and also all the sons of King David, pledged their allegiance to King Solomon. The LORD highly exalted Solomon in the sight of all Israel (כֵּלֵי שְׁנַת אֲלֵית), and bestowed upon him such royal majesty as had not been on any king before him in Israel (כֵּלֵי שְׁנַת אֲלֵית). Thus David son of Jesse reigned over all Israel (כֵּלֵי שְׁנַת אֲלֵית).

However, as above, כֵּלֵי does not always precede ‘Israel’; the fourth occurrence of Israel in v. 25b lacks כֵּלֵי. Furthermore, Braun’s delimitation of the passage to 1 Chr 29:21-26 is arbitrary. Immediately following 1 Chr 29:26, there is another occurrence of ‘Israel’ without כֵּלֵי:

The period that he reigned over Israel (כֵּלֵי שְׁנַת אֲלֵית) was forty years; he reigned seven years in Hebron, and thirty-three years in Jerusalem. (1 Chr 29:27)

Braun refers to the election of Judah in v. 4 as the second unusual element in 1 Chr 28:4-5. However, the election of Judah is not an unusual theme for the Chronicler. In the Chronicler’s genealogy of chapters 1-9, Judah not only takes first place among the twelve tribes of Israel even though he is not the firstborn, he also takes a large portion of the tribal genealogy in 1 Chr 2:3-4:23. Unlike the Deuteronomistic history, where the kings of Judah and northern Israel are included in the narrative, Chronicles unfolds the history of Israel exclusively through the kingdom of Judah. Particularly, in 1 Chr 28:4-5, the election of Judah forms the foundational backdrop to point to the divine choice of David’s family, David, and Solomon. The election theme using בהר runs through vv 4-5 and continues in v. 6:
He said to me, ‘It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts, for I have chosen him to be a son to me, and I will be a father to him’. (1 Chr 28:6)

The penetrating theme of ‘election’ through vv. 4-6 suggests the cohesiveness of vv. 4-5 and the following verse(s).

Braun suggests that there is a third unusual element, דנה (‘to be pleased’) in 1 Chr 28:4, but this is, in fact, not unusual to the Chronicler at all. Braun points to 1 Chr 29:3 as the only other occurrence of דנה in Chronicles, but this is simply not the case. In addition to 1 Chr 28:5 and 1 Chr 29:3, there are three more places where דנה appears in Chronicles:

I know, my God, that you search the heart, and take pleasure (הכדנ) in uprightness. (1 Chr 29:17)

They answered him, ‘If you will be kind to this people and please them (ךכדנ), and speak good words to them, then they will be your servants forever’. (2 Chr 10:7)

To fulfill the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed (ךכדנ) her Sabbaths. All the days that it lay desolate it kept sabbath to fulfill seventy years. (2 Chr 36:21, my translation)

Considering there are only two occurrences of דנה in Samuel-Kings (1 Sam 29:4; 2 Sam 24:23) one can argue that דנה is not such an unusual term for the Chronicler after all.

The fourth unusual element Braun identifies in 1 Chr 28:4-5 is a verbose phrase ‘the throne of the kingdom of YHWH over Israel’ in 1 Chr 28:5:

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel (ככמא מלכאת יוהו עלת עלייתא). (1 Chr 28:6)

Braun compares this long phrase with the shorter phrases ‘throne of YHWH’ or ‘his kingdom’ in 1 Chr 28:7. However, the Chronicler already used a longer phrase, ‘the
throne of his kingdom over Israel’ in David’s private charge to Solomon in 1 Chr 22:10:

He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him; and I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel (כִּסְאֹת מְלֹאכָהּ לְאָלִילָיו) forever. (my translation)

Thus it is unconvincing to view the long phrase, ‘the throne of the kingdom of YHWH over Israel’ as secondary to the Chronicler’s writing.

In sum, there is no reason to view 1 Chr 28:4-5 as secondary. Rather, as De Vries demonstrates, 1 Chr 28:4-5 contributes to the chiastic structure of the larger context:

a        David’s perpetual rule (v. 4a)
 b        David’s selection by tribe, family, individual (v. 4b)
 b’       Solomon’s selection out of numerous sons (v. 5)
 a’       Solomon’s perpetual rule (v. 7)\(^{210}\)

By determining 1 Chr 28:4-5 as original to the Chronicler, we can perceive the significance of the Davidic covenant for this ancient author. On top of the explicit reference to the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 28:7, the Chronicler reinforces the importance of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 28:4-5 by mentioning the kingship of the Davidic house three times:

Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever; for he chose Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father’s house, and among my father’s sons he took delight in making me king over all Israel. And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:4-5)

3. 3. Implications of 1 Chr 28:4-5

The implication of vv.4-5 in David’s public commission of Solomon lies in the significance for the Chronicler of the Davidic covenant as well as the Temple

\(^{210}\) De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 217.
building project. God’s refusal to permit David to build the Temple in v. 3 is compensated for by God’s choice of David for the kingship of Israel in the following verse. It begins with an adversative waw conjunction clause:

Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever.

Having stated God’s election of David for the kingship over Israel in v. 4a, the Chronicler then narrates a more specific procedure of the election in v. 4b:

For he chose Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father’s house, and among my father’s sons he took delight in making me king over all Israel.

It is noticeable that in 1 Chr 28:4-5, God’s choice of Solomon occurs alongside God’s choice of David:

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon (בִּנְיָםָן בֶּן שָׁלֹמֹם) to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:5)

As for the divine choice of Solomon, Japhet asserts that it is the selection of Solomon ‘which in effect diminishes the value of David’s election and the dynastic promise’. According to Japhet, Solomon, who was individually elected by YHWH like David, is different from the subsequent kings of Judah.

It is certainly a special election considering the significance of the term בָּרָanchise.

Throughout the Old Testament, when God is the subject of בָּרָanchise, there are only seven individuals, who became the privileged objects of בָּרָanchise - Abraham (Neh 9:7), Aaron (Num 16:5, 7; 17:20 (5); Ps 105:26), Moses (Ps 106:23), Saul (1 Sam 10:24; 2 Sam
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Abraham

You are the Lord, the God who chose Abram (יהוה יִתְבָּחֵן אַבְרָם) and brought him out of Ur of the Chaldeans and gave him the name Abraham; (Neh 9:7)

Aaron

In the morning the Lord will make known who is his, and who is holy, and who will be allowed to approach him; the one whom he will choose (אַבְרָם יִתְבָּחֵן) he will allow to approach him. (Num 16:5)

And tomorrow put fire in them, and lay incense on them before the Lord; and the man whom the Lord chooses (יהוה יִתְבָּחֵן בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) shall be the holy one. (Num 16:7)

And the staff of the man whom I choose (יהוה יִתְבָּחֵן בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) shall sprout. (Num 17:20 (5))

Moses

He sent his servant Moses, and Aaron whom he had chosen (יהוה יִתְבָּחֵן בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). (Ps 105:26)

Therefore he said he would destroy them-- had not Moses, his chosen one, stood in the breach before him (יִתְבָּחֵן בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל), to turn away his wrath from destroying them. (Ps 106:23)

Saul

Samuel said to all the people, “Do you see the one whom the Lord has chosen (יהוה יִתְבָּחֵן בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל)? There is no one like him among all the people.” (1 Sam 10:24)

Let seven of his sons be handed over to us, and we will hang them before the Lord in Gibeah of Saul, whom the Lord chose (יהוה יִתְבָּחֵן בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל). (2 Sam 21:6, my translation)

David

David said to Michal, “It was before the Lord, who chose me (יהוה יִתְבָּחֵן בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל) in place of your father and all his household, to appoint me as prince over Israel. (2 Sam 6:21, my translation)

213 The divine choice (בחר) of Jacob in Ps 135:4; Isa 41:8, 9; 44:1, 2 are in a collective sense, viz., Israel.
But I chose David to be over my people Israel (בְּתַנּוֹת בְּנֹרְוָה לַהוָה עַל-יְמָנָיָם). (1 Kgs 8:16)

Nevertheless I will not take the whole kingdom away from him but will make him ruler all the days of his life, for the sake of my servant David whom I chose (לְמִצְרַיִם הָדוֹר). (1 Kgs 11:34)

He chose his servant David (נִבְשֵׂר בְּנֹרְוָה עֲבָדֹת), and took him from the sheepfolds. (Ps 78:70)

You said, 'I have made a covenant with my chosen one (כֹּherent בֶּרֶית לֶבַח), I have sworn to my servant David'. (Ps 89:4 (3))

Yet the LORD God of Israel chose me (נִבְשֵׂר יְהוָה) from all my ancestral house to be king over Israel forever. (1 Chr 28:4)

And I have chosen David to be over my people Israel (נִבְשֵׂר בְּנֹרְוָה לַהוָה עַל-יְמָנָיָם). (2 Chr 6:6//1 Kgs 8:16)

Solomon

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon (נַגַּר בְּרִית בְּנֵי שָׁלָלָה בָּנָה) to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel. (1 Chr 28:5)

He said to me, 'It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts, for I have chosen him to be a son to me (כֹּherent בֶּרֶית מַלְכוּת לְבָנָה)'. (1 Chr 28:6)

Take heed now, for the LORD has chosen you (כֹּherent בֶּרֶית בָּנָה) to build a house as the sanctuary. (1 Chr 28:10)

My son Solomon, whom alone God has chosen (שָׁלָלָה בְּנֵי אַחֶר בְּרִית בֶּרֶית אֲלֵיהוֹם). is young and inexperienced, and the work is great. (1 Chr 29:1)

Zerubbabel

I will take you, O Zerubbabel my servant, son of Shealtiel, says the LORD, and make you like a signet ring; for I have chosen you (כֹּherent בְּרִית בָּנָה). (Hag 2:23)

However, it is not convincing to suggest that the application of the important term בְּרִית to Solomon implies a diminished view of David’s election and the dynastic
promise. It does not signify that God’s election of Solomon is independent of God’s promise to David. There are four places where רַבּוֹן is applied to Solomon in Chronicles: 1 Chr 28:5, 6, 10, and 1 Chr 29:1. All of these occur in David’s speech. Of these four occurrences, רַבּוֹן in 1 Chr 28:6, 10 and 1 Chr 29:1 refers to God’s election of Solomon in light of becoming the Temple builder rather than in view of the kingdom and the dynastic promise. Among them, 1 Chr 28:10 is most straightforward:

> Take heed now, for the LORD has chosen you to build a house as the sanctuary. (1 Chr 28:10)

In 1 Chr 28:6, רַבּוֹן is likewise used in the context Solomon’s Temple building mission:

> He said to me, ‘It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts, for I have chosen him to be a son to me’. (1 Chr 28:6)

In 1 Chr 29:1, Solomon, though ‘young and inexperienced’, is chosen for the great work of Temple building:

> My son Solomon, whom alone God has chosen is young and inexperienced, and the work is great.

The only location that speaks of God’s election of Solomon in view of the kingdom and the dynastic promise is 1 Chr 28:5:

> And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel.

There is no sense that God’s election of David and the dynastic promise upon David is somehow denigrated by God’s election of Solomon. In 1 Chr 28:5, Solomon is qualified twice by David as his son. God chooses Solomon to sit on the throne of God’s kingdom because he is a son of David. That is to say, to be chosen by God, one
should be a descendant of David. To emphasize the qualification, the Chronicler places the adverbial phrase, יָנוּכֶל בְּנֵי (‘and of all my sons’) at the beginning of the sentence:

יתוכל בני כי בני בנים לא לי יהוה נבואה מש所提供 בני
(1 Chr 28:5)

Solomon is once again qualified by בֶּן, ‘my son’, in the middle of the verse. Namely, God’s election of Solomon is to be understood under the shadow of David whom God elected and upon whom he conferred the dynastic promise.

David’s charge also mentions Solomon in v. 6 and v. 9, and again Solomon is qualified as David’s son:

He said to me, ‘It is your son Solomon who shall build my house and my courts’. (1 Chr 28:6)

And you, my son Solomon, know the God of your father, and serve him with single mind and willing heart. (1 Chr 28:9)

Considering that no other Israelite kings after Solomon become the object of YHWH’s election (מלך בֶּן), God’s election of Solomon is special. However, it is also true that throughout Chronicles the efficacy of the dynastic promise comes not from God’s election of Solomon but from God’s election of David. The Chronicler repeats the importance of David’s election and his dynasty:

O LORD God, let your promise to my father David now be fulfilled, for you have made me king over a people. (2 Chr 1:9)

And I have chosen David to be over my people Israel. (2 Chr 6:6)

Now the LORD has fulfilled his promise that he made; for I have succeeded my father David, and sit on the throne of Israel, as the LORD promised. (2 Chr 6:10)

214 Principally, all the Israelite kings are God’s chosen ones as Deut 17:15 reveals: ‘You may indeed set over you a king whom the LORD your God will choose (מלך בֶּן)’.
You who have kept for your servant, my father David, what you promised to him. Indeed, you promised with your mouth and this day have fulfilled with your hand. (2 Chr 6:15)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him, saying, ‘There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me’. (2 Chr 6:16)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, let your word be confirmed, which you promised to your servant David. (2 Chr 6:17)

O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one. Remember your steadfast love for your servant David. (2 Chr 6:42)

Then I will establish your royal throne, as I made covenant with your father David saying, ‘You shall never lack a successor to rule over Israel’. (2 Chr 7:18)

Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? (2 Chr 13:5)

Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David because of the covenant that he had made with David, and since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever. (2 Chr 21:7)

Jehoiada said to them, ‘Here is the king’s son! Let him reign, as the LORD promised concerning the sons of David’. (2 Chr 23:3)

Solomon’s election to inherit the kingdom is, unlike God’s election of David, never mentioned after Solomon’s reign.

In summary, God’s election of Solomon for the kingship of Israel using the term יְהֹוָה puts Solomon in a special place, separate from the following kings of Judah. However, the Chronicler views this special election under the shadow of God’s election of David. Accordingly, God’s election of David and the dynastic promise is not diminished in Chronicles.

4. Conclusion

The Davidic covenant is referred to both implicitly in 1 Chr 28:4 and explicitly in 1 Chr 28:7. Just as 1 Chr 22:6-13 includes both unconditional (v. 10) and conditional (v. 13) aspects of the covenant, these unconditional (v. 4) and the
conditional (v. 7) aspects also occur in 1 Chr 28:2-10. In addition to the conditional
dynastic promise in 1 Chr 28:7, the technical covenantal term יִדְּרָע and the strong
warning of God’s rejection in 1 Chr 28:9 represent the conditional character of the
Davidic covenant.

With regard to 1 Chr 28:4-5 where the Davidic covenant is present, Braun
contends with multiple arguments that 1 Chr 28:4-5 is not original to the Chronicler
but is a later expansion. However, as demonstrated above, his arguments do not stand
up to scrutiny. In opposition to Braun’s argument, the cohesive chiastic structure of vv.
4-7 advocates for the originality of vv. 4-5. Having shown that vv. 4-5 is original to
the Chronicler, one can suggest that the Chronicler has a keen interest in the Davidic
kingdom and the dynastic promise as well as the Temple building project.

In the short passage of vv. 4-5, the Chronicler mentions the kingship of the
Davidic house three times. Contrary to Japhet’s claim, although God’s choice of
Solomon as indicated by the verb דִּבָּר is certainly special, this privileged election
does not diminish the value of David’s election and the Davidic covenant. Of the four
references in 1 Chronicles 28 and 29 of God’s election of Solomon using the root
dבָּר, only one occurrence (1 Chr 28:5) concerns Solomon’s kingship. The two
qualifiers ‘and of all my sons’ and ‘my son’ in 1 Chr 28:5 suggests that God’s election
of Solomon for the kingship falls under the umbrella of God’s dynastic covenant
made with David.
V. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 1:8-10

1. Setting

2 Chronicles begins with the Solomon narrative and *his seeking of YHWH* (יהוה, 2 Chr 1:5) in offering a thousand burnt offerings at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:1-6). This act of godly worship pleases YHWH and he gives Solomon an opportunity to ask for that which he wants (2 Chr 1:7). Solomon answers God in 2 Chr 1:8-10, an answer, which in v. 9, includes a reference to the Davidic covenant:

Let your promise to my father David now be fulfilled!

2. Synoptic Comparison

The synoptic passage of 2 Chr 1:8-10 is the longer passage of 1 Kgs 3:6-9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1Kgs 3:6-9</th>
<th>2 Chr 1:8-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 And Solomon said, 'You have shown great and steadfast love to your servant my father David, because he walked before you in faithfulness, in righteousness, and in uprightness of heart toward you; and you have kept for him this great and steadfast love, and have given him a son to sit on his throne today.</td>
<td>8 Solomon said to God, 'You have shown great and steadfast love to my father David, and have made me succeed him as king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 And now, O LORD my God, you have made your servant king in place of my father David, although I am only a little child; I do not know how to go out or come in. 8 And your servant is in the midst of the people whom you have chosen, a great people, so numerous they cannot be numbered or counted.</td>
<td>9 O LORD God, let your promise to my father David now be fulfilled, for you have made me king over a people as numerous as the dust of the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Give your servant therefore an understanding mind to govern your people, able to discern between good and evil; for who can govern this your great people?'</td>
<td>10 Give me now wisdom and knowledge to go out and come in before this people, for who can rule this great people of yours?'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subordinate clauses in 1 Kgs 3:6, ‘because he walked before you…toward you’ along with the next clause which repeats the first clause of the same verse, ‘and you have kept for him this great and steadfast love’, are absent from 2 Chr 1:8. Likewise, the subordinate clause in 1 Kgs 3:7, ‘although I am only a little child’ is not present in 1 Chr 1:9, and the following clause, ‘I do not know how to go out or come in’ appears in 2 Chr 1:10 as ‘wisdom and knowledge to go out and come in’. In 2 Chr 1:9, the short close ‘you have made me king’ corresponds to 1 Kgs 3:7 and the short phrase, ‘over people as numerous as the dust of the earth’ squares with 1 Kgs 3:8. However, rather strikingly, in 1 Chr 1:9 there is a textual plus, a clause in the jussive mood, which appeals to the Davidic covenant:

 (('let your promise to my father David be fulfilled!')). This clause reminds us of David’s prayer in 1 Chr 17:23:


And now, O LORD, as for the word that you have spoken concerning your servant and concerning his house, let it be established forever, and do as you have promised.

A crucial question concerns the identification of the promise, in 2 Chr 1:9a. The subordinate clause that follows provides a clue to this question:


For you have made me king over a people as numerous as the dust of the earth. (2 Chr 1:9b)

It is often asserted that since 2 Chr 1:9b points to the fulfillment of the kingship promise, the desire expressed in the jussive clause, concerns the building of the Temple. This view putatively gains textual support

215 Curtis & Madsen, The Books of Chronicles, 317; Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 196, Kelly, Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles, 161; McKenzie, 1-2 Chronicles, 230; Hill, 1 & 2 Chronicles, 381.
from 1 Chr 17:12 and 1 Chr 22:10 where both Solomon’s kingship and his building of the Temple are foretold:

He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. (1 Chr 17:12)

He shall build a house for my name. He shall be a son to me, and I will be a father to him, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever. (1 Chr 22:10)

However, 2 Chr 6:17, which is markedly closer to 2 Chr 1:9a, is a decisive key in identifying the promise of 2 Chr 1:9a in a different way:

The verse prior to 2 Chr 6:17 informs us about the content of this promise (םָאָרָךְ דִּבְרָתָה לְעַבְרָיו לַרְוִי)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him, saying, ‘There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me’. (2 Chr 6:16)

In this prayer of Solomon, the promise is identified as the continuation of the Davidic dynasty from generation to generation with the condition of obedience. This identification of the promise also fits the reading of 2 Chr 1:9a. When we apply this to 2 Chr 1:9, we may suggest that Solomon wishes, as the first successor of the Davidic kingship according to the Davidic covenant, that the Davidic kingly line should never fail. That is to say, Solomon’s enthronement is a partial fulfillment of the Davidic covenant (2 Chr 1:9b), and the continuation of the Davidic kingdom completes the Davidic covenant (2 Chr 1:9a). Considering the postexilic time when the Israelites were still under a foreign power, this reading gains more support. The Chronicler
conveys his desire for the resurgence of the Davidic dynasty in the clause, 

יָאָמוֹת הַבֵּית הַדָּוִד הַיּוֹם אֵבָרִי. In fact, as well as 2 Chr 6:16-17, 1 Chr 17:23, another passage with textual affinity to 2 Chr 1:9, also buttresses this reading:

And now, O LORD, as for the word that you have spoken concerning your servant and concerning his house, let it be established forever (יהולא עַד תֵּקֵלָה).

Thus, the jussive clause יָאָמוֹת הַרְדָּעֹלֶה would appear to refer to the continuation of the Davidic dynasty rather than the construction of the Temple.

However, a number of scholars have argued that Solomon’s request of wisdom and knowledge in v. 10 is directly related to his completion of the Temple, and this request ought to lead us to identify the promise in 2 Chr 1:9 as referring to the completion of the Temple.216 Thus, for example, McKenzie asserts that the wisdom ‘to go out and come in’ (הָעַבֵּד הַתָּמָם לְפַרְשַׁי אָבַרְנָה, lit ‘and I may go out and come in before this people’) in 2 Chr 1:10 is referring to Solomon’s leadership for the construction of the Temple. However, he does not explain why ‘wisdom and knowledge to go out and come in’ should refer specifically to the wisdom required for the Temple construction.217 In fact, the text states that ‘wisdom and knowledge’ are for judgment during Solomon’s reign:

Give me now wisdom and knowledge to go out and come in before this people, for who can rule (惮, יָכְלַת הָעַשְׁפַּת) this great people of yours? (2 Chr 1:10)

In a similar vein to McKenzie, Riley claims that Solomon asks God for wisdom and knowledge in 2 Chr 1:10 in order to complete the project of Temple construction. In order to substantiate his argument, he refers to 2 Chr 2:11 (12):218

216 Riley, King and Cultus in Chronicles, 85; McKenzie, 1-2 Chronicles, 230; Hill, 1 & 2 Chronicles, 381.


218 Riley, King and Cultus in Chronicles, 85. Elsewhere in the same monograph (p. 173) Riley contradicts his view saying that the promise of 2 Chr 1:9 is about the establishment of the dynasty, but he regards the dynastic promise as narrated past and ignores its importance in Chronicles. However, if
Huram also said, ‘Blessed be the LORD God of Israel, who made heaven and earth, who has given King David a wise son, endowed with discretion and understanding, who will build a temple for the LORD, and a royal palace for himself’.

There is no doubt that Solomon’s wisdom in 2 Chr 2:11 (12) is for the Temple project, as Huram states in reply to Solomon’s request for the necessary materials and skilled men. However, the text of 2 Chr 1:10 lacks this connection between wisdom and Temple building, while explicitly stating that the wisdom Solomon seeks is to enable him to judge his people.

3. Conclusion

At the beginning of the Solomon narrative, the Chronicler inserts the Davidic covenant, ‘Let your promise to my father David now be fulfilled!’ (2 Chr 1:9a) in the midst of the remarkable textual minuses apparent through synoptic comparison. Judging from its close textual affinity with 2 Chr 6:17 and 1 Chr 17:23, the promise being referred to here does not relate to the completion of the Temple; rather it concerns the continuation of the Davidic dynasty through Solomon. Though some argue that the promise points to the Temple building project by viewing the wisdom Solomon requests in 2 Chr 1:10 as wisdom for Temple building, textual evidence does not support this view. Rather, the text unequivocally states that Solomon desires wisdom for the purpose of ruling the people of Israel. The prominent plus in the jussive phrase within Solomon’s prayer reveals the Chronicler’s own cry for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom when the Israelites were still under foreign rule in the postexilic period.

---

the dynastic promise is simply narrated past without carrying the Chronicler’s intention, a question remains as to why the Chronicler includes this dynastic promise in the midst of the noticeable minuses in comparison with the synoptic text, 1 Kgs 3:6-8.
VI. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 6:3-17, 40-42

1. Setting

Solomon’s setting of the ark of the covenant in the newly constructed Temple, as recorded in 2 Chronicles 5, and his dedication prayer in 2 Chronicles 6 constitute high points within the Chronicler’s narrative. The priests, along with the Levites, praise YHWH following the laying of the ark in the most holy place (־ריי) of the Temple. YHWH responds to them through his presence in a cloud (2 Chronicles 5). In this august moment, Solomon makes a dedicatory declaration to YHWH: ‘I have built you an exalted house, a place for you to reside in forever’ (2 Chr 6:2). Then, in 2 Chr 6:3-11, Solomon turns to the assembly of Israel to bless them and delivers an address followed by a prayer of dedication in 2 Chr 6:12-42. The Davidic covenant is present in both Solomon’s address to the assembly and his dedication prayer in vv. 6, 10, 15, 16-17, and 42. In particular, the Davidic covenant is located at the beginning (vv. 12-17) and the end (vv. 40-42) of the dedication prayer and thereby creates a chiastic structure for the prayer. The organization of the dedication into the introduction (vv. 12-17), main body (vv. 18-39), and conclusion (vv. 40-42) is unequivocal. Solomon praises God for his faithfulness to his promise in the introduction, and he invokes God’s salvation and steadfast love in the conclusion. In the middle section, Solomon appeals to God to listen to prayers in or toward the Temple in various difficult situations such as war, famine, and plague. As the theme of the Davidic covenant is proclaimed through the mouths of prophet and king in 1 Chronicles 17, 22, 28, 2 Chronicles 1, the royal promise is found in the mouth of King Solomon in 2 Chronicles 6.

2. Synoptic Comparison

Solomon’s address to the assembly of Israel and his prayer of Temple dedication in 2 Chr 6:3-42 agrees almost verbatim with its synoptic portion in 1 Kgs 8:14-53 except in a few noteworthy places.
The first remarkable difference in relation to the Davidic covenant is seen between 2 Chr 6:5-6 and 1 Kgs 8:16:

Since the day that I brought my people Israel out of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, that my name might be there; but I chose David to be over my people Israel. (1 Kgs 8:16)

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, so that my name might be there, and I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel; 6 but I have chosen Jerusalem in order that my name may be there, and I have chosen David to be over my people Israel. (2 Chr 6:5-6)

There are two notable differences between these passages. First, 1 Kgs 8:16’s מַעְרַת הַשָּׁרוֹן corresponds to מַעֲרַת יְרוּשָׁלָיִם in 2 Chr 6:5a. In 2 Chr 6:5, while מַעֲרַת יְרוּשָׁלָיִם is absent, the longer מַעְרַת הַשָּׁרוֹן corresponds to the shorter מַעֲרַת יְרוּשָׁלָיִם of 1 Kgs 8:16. The second important difference, which is more pertinent for our discussion, is the plus of two clauses, 5b-6a, in Chronicles, which are not present in 1 Kings 16:

Many scholars explain this difference by homoioteleuton (identical ending); the copyist of MT Kings seems to pass over the phrase due to the double occurrences
of the phrase הַקָּרָאתָּהּ.219 The correspondence between fragment 7 of 4QKgs and 2 Chr 6:5-6 supports this view. Though all the letters are not preserved in fragment 7 of 4QKgs, the remaining letters are enough to prove the existence of the parallel clauses of 2 Chr 6:5b-6a in 1 Kgs 8:16 of 4QKgs.220 In support of the phenomenon of homoioteleuton in 1 Kgs 8:16 (MT), Emanuel Tov points out the abruptness of the passage, viz., the election of David takes place where the election of Jerusalem is expected.221

Looking at 1 Kgs 8:16 and 2 Chr 6:5-6 in the LXX, Lemke contends that the text of 2 Chr 6:5-6 (MT) is superior not only to the text of 1 Kgs 8:16 (MT) but also to the LXX texts of 2 Chr 6:5-6 and 1 Kgs 8:16 (3 Kgdms 8:16):222

αὐτῷ ἐξήγαγον τὸν λαὸν μου τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου οὐκ ἔξελεξάμην ἐν πόλει ἐν ἑνὶ σχῆματι Ἰσραήλ τοῦ οἰκοδομήσας οἶκον τούτῳ εἶναι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἕκει καὶ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν Ἰερούσαλημ εἶναι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἕκει καὶ ἐξελεξάμην τὸν Δαυὶδ τοῦ εἶναι ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

Since the day that I brought my people Israel out of Egypt, I have not chosen in a city, in one scepter of Israel, to build a house for my name to be there, but I chose in Jerusalem for my name to be there, and I chose David to be over my people Israel. (3 Kgdms 8:16)

ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐξήγαγον τὸν λαὸν μου ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου οὐκ ἔξελεξάμην ἐν πόλει ἀπὸ πολὺν φυλῶν Ἰσραήλ τοῦ οἰκοδομήσας οἶκον τούτῳ εἶναι ὄνομά μου ἕκει καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν ἄνδρὶ τοῦ εἶναι εἰς Ἰερούσαλημ ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν μου Ἰσραήλ ᾧ καὶ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν Δαυὶδ ὡστε εἶναι ἐπάνω τοῦ λαοῦ μου Ἰσραὴλ.

From the day when I brought my people up out of Egypt, I did not choose for a city out of all the tribes of Israel to build a house that my name be there, and I did not choose for a man to be leader over my people Israel. 6 and I have chosen for David to be over my people Israel. (2 Chr 6:5-6)


221 Tov, 239.
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The texts of 1 Kgs 8:16 (LXX) and 2 Chr 6:5-6 (LXX) are not as complete as the text of 2 Chr 6:5-6 (MT).1223 1 Kgs 8:16 (LXX) lacks 2 Chr 6:5b (MT; ‘and I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel’) and 2 Chr 6:5-6 (LXX) is missing 2 Chr 6:6a (MT; ‘but I have chosen Jerusalem in order that my name may be there’).1224

Preserving the entire Vorlage, the Chronicler seems to highlight the significance of God’s election of David by the literary device of antithesis.1225 The Chronicler suggests that God’s choice of David for the kingship of Israel is special because God has never chosen a man ( ולא בראתי אדם) to be ruler (מלך) of Israel before. By contrasting the negative clause ( ולא בראתי אדם) with God’s choice of David, the Chronicler maximizes the significance of the divine choice of David for kingship.

2. 2. 1 Kgs 8:21//2 Chr 6:11

The next noticeable divergence is observed in 1 Kgs 8:21 and 2 Chr 6:11:

There I have provided a place for the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with our ancestors when he brought them out of the land of Egypt (וירבדתי מקום לארק כן Contracts הכתובת עם העם של ישראל=head שאר כבישם). (1 Kgs 8:21)

There I have set the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD that he made with the people of Israel. (2 Chr 6:11)

In this case, contrary to the case of 2 Chr 6:5-6, the Chronicler’s text is shorter than 1 Kgs 8:21. Compared to 1 Kgs 8:21, the subordinate clause, ממלאי העולם יושב is absent in 2 Chr 6:11. Also, the mentions of ‘the Exodus from Egypt’ in 1 Kgs 8:51 and 1 Kgs 8:53 are not present in the corresponding text of 2

1223 Ibid.

1224 While the LXX8 lacks 2 Chr 6:6a as Lemke states, other versions, such as LXX0, LXX1, LXXR include a clause, καὶ ἔξελεξαίμην ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ γενέσθαι τὸ δόμον μου ἐκεῖ (And I have chosen for Jerusalem for my name be there). See Leslie C. Allen, The Greek Chronicles II (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 56.

1225 For the Chronicler’s literary device of antithesis see Isaac Kalimi’s The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 325-349.
As dealt with previously, the lack of ‘the Exodus from Egypt’ occurring in Chronicles is not due to the suppression of the Mosaic-Sinai covenant in order to magnify the Davidic covenant. In 2 Chronicles 6, not only does the Chronicler retain the mention of ‘the Exodus from Egypt’ (v.5), he also leaves the more direct mention of the Mosaic-Sinai covenant in the phrase, כְּהֹונַת אֶדֶם הָעָלָה בְּיוֹמָה (v.11). If the Chronicler excluded any mention of the Exodus out of Egypt in order to suppress the Mosaic-Sinai covenant, he would have excluded the whole of v. 11. Though the Chronicler views the Davidic covenant as more vital than the Mosaic covenant, he also embraces the Mosaic-Sinai covenant as being still in force.

2. 3. 1 Kgs 8:22-23//2 Chr 6:13

The next conspicuous divergence from 1 Kings 8 is the plus of 2 Chr 6:13, which is missing from 1 Kgs 8:22-23:

Solomon had made a bronze platform מַעֲשֶׂה בְּיוֹמָה five cubits long, five cubits wide, and three cubits high, and had set it in the outer court חֵוֵר הָעָלָה; and he stood on it. Then he knelt on his knees in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands toward heaven. (2 Chr 6:13, my translation)

The מַעֲשֶׂה בְּיוֹמָה (‘platform of bronze’) in v. 13 is a temporary podium structure located in the חֵוֵר (‘outer court’), which is not in the list of the Temple furnishings in 2 Chronicles 4. 2 Chr 6:13 could either be a plus in 2 Chronicles 6 or a minus in 1 Kings 8. In favour of it being a plus, it is argued that the Chronicler added v. 13 lest

---

226 1 Kgs 8:51 - ‘For they are your people and heritage, which you brought out of Egypt, from the midst of the iron-smelter’, 1 Kgs 8:53 - ‘For you have separated them from among all the peoples of the earth, to be your heritage, just as you promised through Moses, your servant, when you brought our ancestors out of Egypt, O Lord GOD’.

227 See pp. 19-27 of this work.

228 כְּלֵי in 2 Chr 6:13 is different from כְּלֵי in 2 Chr 4:6, which refers to a washing basin. See כְּלֵי in HALOT 1, 472.
King Solomon should stand before the sacred altar of v. 12. J. Wellhausen states that the king’s presence before the altar is unlawful without providing any evidence for his assertion. However, this argument is weak because in v. 12, Solomon does stand before the altar:

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the LORD in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel.

If the Chronicler added v. 13 with a view to expunging the scene of Solomon’s standing before the altar, the Chronicler would surely have deleted v. 12 first before adding v. 13. In fact, Solomon’s standing before the altar is not illegitimate nor should it be cited to indicate the Chronicler’s loose view on the holiness of the priestly duty. The Chronicler states unequivocally in the genealogy of Levi the holiness of the role played by Levites and priests:

And their kindred the Levites were appointed for all the service of the tabernacle of the house of God. But Aaron and his sons made offerings on the altar of burnt offering and on the altar of incense, doing all the work of the most holy place, to make atonement for Israel, according to all that Moses the servant of God had commanded. (1 Chr 6:33-34 (48-49))

In addition, the Chronicler underscores the significance of the priestly role through the mouth of King Abijah speaking against Jeroboam and the northern Israel:

But as for us, the LORD is our God, and we have not abandoned him. We have priests ministering to the LORD who are descendants of Aaron, and Levites for their service. They offer to the LORD every morning and every evening burnt offerings and fragrant incense, set out the rows of bread on the table of pure gold, and care for the golden lampstand so that its lamps may burn every evening; for we keep the charge of the LORD our God, but you have abandoned him. (2 Chr 13:10-11)

---


230 Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, 186.
Another suggested explanation for the synoptic discrepancy of 2 Chr 6:13 is the Deuteronomist’s omission of the passage of 2 Chr 6:13 from his Vorlage due to *homoiooteleuton*. The end of 1 Kgs 8:22 is almost identical with that of 2 Chr 6:13:

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the LORD in the presence of all the assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands to heaven (גְּנֶדֶר כְּלִי-חָלֶל שְׁרָאֵל וְפָרַשׁ כְּפֶרֶת הַשְּׁמִימִים) (1 Kgs 8:22)

Then he knelt on his knees in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands toward heaven (גְּנֶדֶר כְּלִי-חָלֶל שְׁרָאֵל וְפָרַשׁ כְּפֶרֶת הַשְּׁמִימִים) (2 Chr 6:13b)

The last seven words in the two passages are identical save for the existence of the directional ה', attached to the last word of 2 Chr 6:13b. Positing the supposed placing of 2 Chr 6:13 between 1 Kgs 8:22 and 1 Kgs 8:23, it is argued that the Deuteronomist missed the intervening section in his Vorlage and went directly to 1 Kgs 8:23 due to the very similar ending (*homoiooteleuton*). However, although the endings of 1 Kgs 8:22 and 2 Chr 6:13 are similar, they are not the same as seen above. Thus, strictly speaking, it is not a case of *homoiooteleuton*. A meticulous Hebrew scribe would surely notice the difference between ה', and כְּפֶרֶת הַשְּׁמִימִים. Moreover, if we compare 1 Kgs 8:22 with its parallel text 2 Chr 6:12, we can observe the Chronicler’s manipulation of the text of 1 Kgs 8:22:

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the LORD in the presence of all the assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands to heaven (גְּנֶדֶר כְּלִי-חָלֶל שְׁרָאֵל וְפָרַשׁ כְּפֶרֶת הַשְּׁמִימִים) (1 Kgs 8:22)

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the LORD in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands (גְּנֶדֶר כְּלִי-חָלֶל שְׁרָאֵל וְפָרַשׁ כְּפֶרֶת הַשְּׁמִימִים) (2 Chr 6:13)

---

Though the Chronicler follows 1 Kgs 8:22, he markedly omits יָשַׂרְטָן moving it from v. 12 to the end of v. 13, which is his addition, before the beginning of Solomon’s prayer.

Another piece of evidence for the Chronicler’s addition of 2 Chr 6:13 is the postexilic term, נֵרְס (‘outer court’) corresponding to the earlier and more popular term, נִרְס (‘court’). The use of נֵרְס as the outer court of the Temple is witnessed only here and in 2 Chr 4:9 in the Old Testament.

What, then, is the purpose of the Chronicler’s interpolation of 2 Chr 6:13? The Chronicler places Solomon on a podium in the centre of the assembly of Israel so that the whole assembly of Israel may see Solomon and hear the following dedication prayer better, as 2 Chr 6:13a implies:

For Solomon made a bronze platform and placed it in the midst of the outer court (בראש דניינא דנ ingress).

Solomon’s standing place in 2 Chr 6:13 is different from that in 2 Chr 6:12 (‘And he stood before the altar of YHWH’). Verse 12 is situated in the inner court of the priests (הַמָּטֶרֶת), but v. 13 takes place in the outer court (הַרְוָלָל), a space intended for laity. By the addition of v. 13, the Chronicler moves Solomon to a place that is near to the whole assembly of Israel.

2. 4. 1 Kgs 8:52-53//2 Chr 6:40-42

The Chronicler’s record of the end of Solomon’s dedication prayer in 2 Chr 6:40-42 is remarkably different from its parallel text 1 Kgs 8:52-53:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Kgs 8:52-53</th>
<th>2 Chr 6:40-42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 Let your eyes be open to the plea of your servant, and to the plea of your people Israel, listening to them whenever they call to you.</td>
<td>40 Now, O my God, let your eyes be open and your ears attentive to prayer from this place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


233 2 Chr 4:9a witnesses the division of the two courts, ‘He made the court of the priests (を集ר הַמָּטֶרֶת), and the great court (הַרְוָלָל).’
For you have separated them from among all the peoples of the earth, to be your heritage, just as you promised through Moses, your servant, when you brought our ancestors out of Egypt, O Lord GOD.

Now rise up, O LORD God, and go to your resting place, you and the ark of your might. Let your priests, O LORD God, be clothed with salvation, and let your faithful rejoice in your goodness. O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one. Remember your steadfast love for your servant David.

2 Chr 6:40 is shorter than 1 Kgs 8:52. While in 2 Chr 6:40 Solomon invokes God to listen to the prayer from the Temple, in 1 Kgs 8:52 he asks God to listen to the plea of his people whenever they call to Him. After 2 Chr 6:40, unlike 1 Kgs 8:53, the Chronicler appears to use passages from Ps 132:8-10 and Isa 55:3 as his source material. Whereas Solomon refers to God’s promise through Moses in 1 Kgs 8:53, the Chronicler shows Solomon turning to God’s promise through David in 2 Chr 6:42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ps 132:8-10, 1, 16; Isa 55:3</th>
<th>2 Chr 6:41-42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps 132 8 Rise up, O LORD, and go to your resting place, you and the ark of your might. 9 Let your priests be clothed with righteousness, and let your faithful shout for joy. 10 For your servant David’s sake do not turn away the face of your anointed one. 1 O LORD, remember (ךַּפֵּר) in David’s favor all the hardships he endured; 16 Its priests I will clothe with salvation, and its faithful will shout for joy. Isa 55 38 I will make with you an everlasting covenant, my steadfast, sure love for David. (italics added)</td>
<td>41 Now rise up, O LORD God, and go to your resting place, you and the ark of your might. Let your priests, O LORD God, be clothed with salvation, and let your faithful rejoice in your goodness. O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one(s). 42 O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one(s). Remember (ךַּפֵּר) your steadfast love for your servant David. (italics added)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above comparison reveals, the Chronicler takes Ps 132:8-10 as the basic framework and reshapes it with other materials such as vv. 1 and 16 from the same

---

234 Concerning the difference between 1 Kgs 8:53 and 2 Chr 6:40-42, Auld suggests that the two texts are two independent additions to the shared text of the prayer of Solomon (1 Kgs 8:12-50a/2 Chr 6:1-39). For more details, see Kings without Privilege, 1-3.

235 In the MT it is in plural form, רֹאשׁיִים.
Psalm and Isa 55:3. The Chronicler, who desires to highlight the Davidic covenant in the context of Solomon’s dedication of the Temple, ingeniously utilizes Psalm 132, which consists of two parts: David’s oath to find a place for God in vv. 1-9 and God’s oath regarding the throne for David in vv. 10-18.

(v. 2) נָשַׁבֶּת לְשָׁלוֹן הַדֵּר He (David) swore to the Lord.

(v. 11) נָשַׁבֶּת לְשָׁלוֹן הַדֵּר The LORD swore to David.

The Chronicler’s citation from Ps 132 lies across these two parts. In the cited passage, the Chronicler smoothly moved from the theme of the ark to the theme of מְשֹׁרֶת דֶּרֶךְ. After citing Ps 132:8-10, he reworked the passage at four points, all of which contribute to his focus on the Davidic covenant.

Firstly, the Chronicler alters ‘righteousness’ in Ps 132:9 to ‘salvation’ in 2 Chr 6:41. This change is not the Chronicler’s own invention but is another citation from Ps 132:16, which belongs to the second part of this psalm. That is, even before the natural transition from the theme of the ark to the theme of the Davidic covenant in 2 Chr 6:42, the Chronicler takes the word מְשֹׁרֶת דֶּרֶךְ (‘salvation’) from the second part of Ps 132 which deals with the Davidic covenant. In the Chronicler’s postexilic milieu, מְשֹׁרֶת דֶּרֶךְ in the context of the Davidic covenant could rouse up sentiments regarding the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, and the Chronicler presumably makes this alteration with that in mind.

The other three alterations to Psalm 132 carried out by the Chronicler occur in 2 Chr 6:42, where he restructures Ps 132:10 substantially:

(Ps 132:10) בָּשָׁבוּר דֶּרֶךְ עַמְּךָ אֲלֵי-שָׁלוֹם אֶפְּרִי מְשֹׁרֶת דֶּרֶךְ

(2 Chr 6:42) יְתֹלוּ אֶל-אֱלֹהִים אֶל-שָׁלוֹם אֶפְּרִי מְשֹׁרֶת דֶּרֶךְ

236 Italics indicate the Chronicler’s borrowing.
Firstly, the Chronicler alters מְשִׁיחַ to the plural form, מְשִׁיחִים. Some English versions and commentators view this change as a scribal error and emend it as a singular form following Ps 132:10. However, the plural form, ‘anointed ones’, fits well in the context as referring to both David and Solomon. To reinforce Solomon’s petition, the Chronicler has Solomon entreat God’s favor not only for himself but also for David, the original recipient of the Davidic covenant, by using the plural form מְשִׁיחִים. Secondly, there is the insertion in 2 Chr 6:42 of the imperative הָרָקָע, which is probably borrowed from Ps 132:1. The Chronicler’s use of this imperative verb heightens the significance of its object, which is מְשַׁפֵּךְ. Thirdly, the most significant alteration in 2 Chr 6:42 is the Chronicler’s use of the phrase מְשַׁפֵּךְ, which only occurs twice in the Old Testament; here and in Isa 55:3. Considering its rareness, one can suggest that the Chronicler is likely to have borrowed this phrase from Isa 55:3:

Incline your ear, and come to me; listen, so that you may live. I will make with you an everlasting covenant, my steadfast, sure love for David.

Scholars almost unanimously construe the מְשַׁפֵּךְ in Isa 55:3 as an objective genitive rather than a subjective genitive, thus suggesting the phrase refers to (God’s) steadfast love for David rather than David’s faithfulness (to God).

---

237 NRSV; NIV; NJPS; Curtis & Madsen, The Books of Chronicles, 345; Japhet, I & II Chronicles, 584, 603-604; McKenzie, 1-2 Chronicles, 247.


240 English versions such as NRSV, NKJV, NEB, NAB, NASB, NIV, and NJPS render the phrase as an objective genitive. A. Caquot and W. A. M. Beukent attempted to argue for a subjective genitive in “Les ‘Grâces de David’ A propos d’Isaïe 55/3b,” Semitica 15 (1965), 45-59 and “Isa. 55, 3-5: The Reinterpretation of David,” Bijdragen 35 (1974), 49-64, respectively.
which is in an appositional relationship to the preceding phrase יִרְחַיָּהוּ, refers to God’s steadfast love for David in the Davidic covenant of 2 Samuel 7.241

However, scholarly opinion as to the rendering of the other occurrence of יִרְחַיָּהוּ in 2 Chr 6:42b is somewhat divided between viewing it as an objective genitive and as a subjective genitive, as the different translations of English versions show:

Subjective genitive
Remember thy servant David’s loyal service (NEB)
Remember the devotion of David, your servant. (NAB)
Remember the loyalty of Your servant David. (NJPS)

Objective genitive
Remember your steadfast love for your servant David. (NRSV)
Remember Thy lovingkindness to Thy servant David. (NASB)
Remember the great love promised to David your servant. (NIV)

Among the defenders of the subjective genitive, Japhet provides the most detailed reasoning.242 One can summarize her argument as follows:243

1. God’s promise to David does not fit the atmosphere of the prayer’s conclusion.
2. All plural forms of יִרְחַיָּהוּ either as constructs or with possessive pronouns are used as a subjective genitive.
3. God’s steadfast love is consistently expressed by phrases such as רָאָשׁ יְרֵצָה, וְרָאָשׁ יְרֵצָה.
4. To view the phrase as an objective genitive is to force upon it a unique and exceptional usage.
5. Neh 13:14 is its close parallel: ‘Remember me (םָּרָאָשׁ יְרֵצָה), O my God, concerning this, and do not wipe out my good deeds (םָּרָאָשׁ יְרֵצָה)’.


243 Japhet, I & II Chronicles, 604-605.
Also, דוד אדיש in 2 Chr 32:32 and 35:26 means the ‘good deeds’ of Hezekiah and Josiah respectively.

However, these five arguments fail to provide a decisive rationale for viewing the expression as a subjective genitive. First, contra Japhet’s reasoning, the objective genitive sense, that is, ‘God’s promise to David’, does fit well within the context of the end of the prayer. In v. 42, the objective genitive of דוד אדיש matches its preceding clause, ‘O LORD God, do not reject your anointed one’. Solomon invokes God to remember the Davidic covenant to reinforce the preceding invocation. Moreover, in terms of the structure of the dedication prayer, דוד אדיש as an objective genitive constitutes an inclusio of the dedication prayer with its introduction in vv. 14-17, where Solomon repeatedly refers to God’s promise to David:

He said, ‘O LORD, God of Israel, there is no God like you, in heaven or on earth, keeping covenant in steadfast love with your servants who walk before you with all their heart you who have kept for your servant, my father David, what you promised to him. Indeed, you promised with your mouth and this day have fulfilled with your hand. Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him, saying, “There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me”. Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, let your word be confirmed, which you promised to your servant David’.

Japhet’s second argument loses its force when we construe דוד אדיש of Isa 55:3 as an objective genitive, for which there is broad consensus. Her third argument is rather irrelevant to the issue. The common use of God’s אדיש in phrases such דוד אדיש would not be relevant evidence to refute the sense of objective genitive of דוד אדיש in 2 Chr 6:42. As noted in Isa 55:3, God’s loving kindness is expressed in the phrase דוד אדיש. Also her fourth argument can be challenged when we consider that the only other occurrence of דוד אדיש in the Old Testament (Isa 55:3) carries the sense of the objective genitive; therefore, it is not forced, unique, or exceptional to propose this same sense for 2 Chr 6:42. Similar to

244 De Vries, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 260; Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 221.
her third argument, Japhet’s fifth argument is also extraneous to the issue. The sharing of the two words כְּרֵ בֵּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר and וֹ אַ בֵּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר in 2 Chr 6:42 and Neh 13:14 would not necessarily make these two verses close parallels, as Japhet maintains. It should not be overlooked that the occurrence of כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר with David carries strong covenantal import. In this sense, there is a clear distinction between the כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר of David and the כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר of Nehemiah. As a consequence, though many other forms of כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר either as a construct or with a pronominal suffix are dominantly rendered as subjective genitives, the particular phrase כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר in 2 Chr 6:42 ought to be rendered in the same way as its parallel in Isa 55:3.

In sum, the Chronicler, unlike 1 Kgs 8:53, includes Solomon’s reliance upon YHWH’s promise to David as given voice in Ps 132:10. He also makes the Davidic covenant explicit by altering the phrase כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר (‘for the sake of David’) of Ps 132:10 to the exhortation, כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר (‘remember the loving kindness for David’ viz., the Davidic covenant). The Chronicler’s citation of the particular phrase כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר as well as his other alterations in 2 Chr 6:40-42 (i.e., the change from ‘righteousness’ to ‘salvation’, the addition of the imperative כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר, and the modification of the singular כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר into the plural כְּרֵ בֵּּ יָדְרָ בֶּ יָדָר), reflect the Chronicler’s longing for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty by relying on the Davidic covenant.

3. Further Issue: Identification of the Promises

In 2 Chr 6:3-17, Solomon refers to God’s promise to David on five occasions:

And he said, ‘Blessed be the LORD, the God of Israel, who with his hand has fulfilled what he promised with his mouth (כַּ אֶ שְׁלָחֶ יְ דֵ בֶ יָ דָר בֶּ יָ דְרָ בֶּ יָ דָר) to my father David’. (v. 4)

Now the LORD has fulfilled his promise that he made (כַּ אֶ שְׁלָחֶ יְ דֵ בֶ יָ דָר בֶּ יָ דְרָ בֶּ יָ דָר), for I have succeeded my father David, and sit on the throne of Israel, as the LORD promised, and have built the house for the name of the LORD, the God of Israel. (v. 10)

You who have kept for your servant, my father David, what you promised to him (כַּ אֶ שְׁלָחֶ יְ דֵ בֶ יָ דָר בֶּ יָ דְרָ בֶּ יָ דָר). Indeed, you promised with your mouth and this day have fulfilled with your hand. (v. 15)
Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, keep for your servant, my father David, that which you promised him (yeqawqaw), saying, ‘There shall never fail you a successor before me to sit on the throne of Israel, if only your children keep to their way, to walk in my law as you have walked before me’. (v. 16)

Therefore, O LORD, God of Israel, let your word be confirmed, which you promised to your servant David. (v. 17)

Solomon mentions ‘what God promised to David’ twice in his address to the assembly and three times in the introductory portion of his dedication prayer. To what do these promises refer? The first promise in v. 4, (qawqaw) is commonly equated with the Temple construction. Here, however, the promise not only refers to the Temple construction but also to the royal promise for the house of David. The last term of v. 4, (‘saying’), leads to the content of the promise in vv. 5-6:

Since the day that I brought my people out of the land of Egypt, I have not chosen a city from any of the tribes of Israel in which to build a house, so that my name might be there, and I chose no one as ruler over my people Israel; but I have chosen Jerusalem in order that my name may be there, and I have chosen David to be over my people Israel.

The structure of vv. 5-6, ABAB (A – Temple construction, B – royal promise), informs the two-fold promise to David. The second promise in v. 10 (qawqaw) is self-explanatory as the following part of v. 10 identifies it as the royal promise for the Davidic family and the Temple building. The third promise in v. 15 (qawqaw) seems to refer solely to the Temple building. Although the phraseology of v. 15 shares a common element with v. 4 (qawqaw in v. 4), the promise in v. 15 is restricted to the fulfillment of the Temple building. Two pieces of textual evidence support this identification. First, (‘as this day’) at the end of v. 15 connotes the day at the end of the Temple construction. Secondly, the next adverbial

phrase at the beginning of v. 16, הַמִּשְׁמַרְתּוֹ, identifies the distinction between the promise in v. 15 and the fourth promise in v. 16, לֹ֑לֹֽחַ הָבֹ֖רֶךְ לֹ֑כֶל, which is clearly God’s promise concerning the Davidic throne. When God’s promise of the Temple building is fulfilled, Solomon now asks God to continue to fulfill the other promise he made to David, that is, the dynastic promise. This line of transition from the fulfillment of the Temple building to the fulfillment of the royal promise militates against Riley’s assertion that the need for the Davidic dynasty was gone when the Temple was completed.246 Especially in the postexilic context of Chronicles, Solomon’s prayer for the fulfillment of the Davidic covenant would convey the Chronicler’s aspiration for the restoration of the lost kingdom of David. As with the fourth promise in v. 16, the fifth promise in v. 17 (וַיַּעַל רַבִּים וְלָשׁוֹן) refers to the Davidic covenant. Verse 17, which again begins with הַמִּשְׁמַרְתּוֹ, is a confirming invocation to God for the sake of the Davidic dynasty.

In sum, out of these five promises, the first two promises in v. 4 and v. 10 refer to the promise of both the Temple building and the Davidic dynasty. The third promise in v. 15 points to the achieved promise of the Temple building, and the last two promises in vv. 16 and 17 refer to the Davidic covenant. Throughout 2 Chr 6:3-17, the Chronicler interweaves the promise of the Temple building and the promise of the royal dynasty. Acknowledging God’s accomplishment of the promise of the Temple building, the Chronicler now appeals to the other divine promise and longs for the resurgence of God’s chosen dynasty.

4. Conclusion

Having deposited the ark of the covenant in the newly constructed Temple, Solomon mentions the Davidic covenant repeatedly in his address to the assembly of Israel (2 Chr 6:3-11) and his dedication prayer, particularly in the introduction (2 Chr 6:12-17) and in the conclusion (2 Chr 6:40-42). Although the Chronicler’s text of 2 Chr 6:3-42 almost identical with its parallel text in 1 Kgs 8:14-53, some noticeable variances shed light on the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant.

246 Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 179
The plus of 2 Chr 6:5b-6a is due to the Deuteronomist’s omission from his Vorlage by homoioteleuton. In the preservation of 2 Chr 6:5b-6a, the Chronicler could highlight the royal promise to David by the use of antithesis. As the direct reference to the ark of the covenant in 2 Chr 6:11 witnesses, the lack of the phrase ‘the Exodus from Egypt’ in 2 Chr 6:11, which is present in 1 Kgs 8:21, does not indicate the suppression of the Mosaic covenant for the sake of magnifying the Davidic covenant. Judging from the Chronicler’s relocation of (h) from 2 Chr 6:12 to 2 Chr 6:13 and the occurrence of the later word, с, 2 Chr 6:13 is the Chronicler’s addition rather than the Deuteronomist’s omission by a homoioteleuton. By interpolating 2 Chr 6:13, the Chronicler places Solomon in a position at which the assembly could see him and better hear his dedication prayer.

At the conclusion of the dedication prayer, the Chronicler cites Solomon’s appeal to God’s promise to David as found in Psalm 132:8-10 and Isa 55:3 rather than God’s promise through Moses. This citation enhances the meaningfulness of the Davidic covenant in the Chronicler’s time.

Solomon’s repeated mentions of ‘what God spoke to David’ throughout his address and prayer refers to the Temple construction and the royal promise bestowed upon the Davidic family. When the first promise of the Temple building was fulfilled, Solomon turns to the second promise of the eternal dynasty of David as the repeated phrase " in 2 Chr 6:16 and 2 Chr 6:17 implies. Solomon’s petition for the fulfillment of the second promise carries the Chronicler’s aspiration for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom.
VII. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 7:17-22

1. Setting

Sacrifices and a feast (גְּדוֹלָה) in 2 Chr 7:1-10 follow Solomon’s dedication prayer for the Temple (2 Chr 6:12-42). The sacrifices begin with the coming of fire from heaven (2 Chr 7:1), which signals God’s endorsement of Solomon’s prayer. This divine endorsement continues through God’s direct appearance to Solomon in 2 Chr 7:12-22. God’s appearance to Solomon consists of two parts. The first portion of God’s speech to Solomon in vv. 12-16 matches the main body of Solomon’s dedication prayer in 2 Chr 6:18-39, in which Solomon asks for God’s deliverance in manifold difficult situations. In this part, God responds to Solomon with his affirmation of help. The second part of God’s speech in vv. 17-22 includes the Davidic covenant (vv. 17-18), which is the major subject of both the introduction (2 Chr 6:14-17) and conclusion (2 Chr 6:40-42) of Solomon’s dedication prayer. 2 Chr 7:17-22 comprises two conditional promises given first to Solomon in vv. 17-18 and secondly to the Israelites in vv. 19-22. The singular אֵשׁ in v. 17 and the plural אֱלֹהִים in v. 19 clearly reveal two sets of promises in this section.247

2. Synoptic Comparison

Though the text of 2 Chr 7:17-22 is similar to 1 Kgs 9:4-9 several differences reveal the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant in his postexilic milieu. Comparing the conditional promise to Solomon in 2 Chr 7:17-18 with that of 1 Kgs 9:4-5, two differences between 2 Chr 7:18 and 1 Kgs 9:5 are suggestive of the Chronicler’s thoughts: the Chronicler’s use of דְּבָרֶיךָ (cf., דְּבָרֶיךָ in 1 Kgs 9:5) and his use of the phrase, מֹשֵׁל כֹּהֵן בֵּית יְהוָה (cf., מֹשֵׁל כֹּהֵן בֵּית יְהוָה מֹשֵׁל בֵּית יְהוָה in 1 Kgs 9:5).

247 These two sets of promises are reminiscent of 1 Chr 28:2-10, where David makes charges to the corporate assembly of Israel in vv. 2-8 and to the individual, Solomon, in vv. 9-10. Whereas David’s charge to Solomon is located after the corporate charge in 1 Chr 28:2-10, the conditional promise to Solomon is placed before the promise to the Israelites in the divine speech of 2 Chr 7:17-22.
Then I will establish the throne of your kingdom over Israel forever, as I spoke unto David, your father, saying, ‘A man upon the throne of Israele shall not be cut off for you’. (1 Kgs 9:5, my translation)

I then will establish the throne of your kingdom as I covenanted with David, your father saying, ‘A man ruling in Israel shall not be cut off for you’. (2 Chr 7:18, my translation)

The Chronicler’s choice of the term, כַּרְתַּת in 2 Chr 7:18 emphasizes the importance of the Davidic covenant for the postexilic Israelite community. Without a doubt, the strong covenantal term כַּרְתַּת reveals that the Davidic covenant has not expired but is still valid for the time of the Chronicler who hopes for the restoration of the lost kingdom of David based on this eternal covenant. Riley, however, claims that the Chronicler’s use of כַּרְתַּת does not have to do with his desire for the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom:

The reading כַּרְתַּת in 2 Chr 7:18 may, in fact, indicate a stronger concern with the covenantal nature of the word to David, but the restoration of the Davidic dynasty only follows if such a dynastic promise is interpreted by the Chronicler to apply even after the long interruption which began in the sixth century; it should be also be noted that this word כַּרְתַּת has been introduced into a conditioned context (2 Chr 7:17-18).

However, Riley’s two-fold explanation fails to repress the Chronicler’s aspiration for the revival of the Davidic dynasty. His first point, the interruption of the kingdom, would not be an obstacle for the Chronicler’s reemphasis on the Davidic covenant. As

---

248 Rudolph presumes a scribal error with regard to this discrepancy (Chronikbücher, 217), but considering the different number of characters, this is less likely. Another explanation for the difference is to make a wordplay between כַּרְתַּת and כַּרְתַּת in the latter part of the same verse (Thompson, I,2 Chronicles, 236). As Thompson maintains, by using the term כַּרְתַּת, the Chronicler would have achieved two purposes: intensification of the Davidic covenant and wordplay. The Chronicler’s use of כַּרְתַּת in the context of the Davidic covenant is also noted in 2 Chr 21:7a: ‘Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David because of the covenant that he had made with David (טֵבָרָה אֵשׁ כַּרְתַּת כַּרְתַּת).’

249 Riley, King and Cultus in Chronicles, 172-173.
analyzed previously, for the Chronicler, the eternal promise of the Davidic dynasty could have lacunae, such as periods of God’s punishment, but when the retribution ends, the Israelites could hope for the restoration of the kingdom based on the eternal covenant.\textsuperscript{250} His second point, in a conditioned context, does not necessarily imply any weakening of hope for the restoration of the Davidic kingship. As discussed previously, in Chronicles, the conditional and unconditional aspects of the Davidic covenant form an organic relationship with each other.\textsuperscript{251} Here, the Chronicler does not suggest that the Davidic covenant does not mean anything in the postexilic era because the Israelites did not meet the divine condition; rather, he is suggesting that God would revisit the Israelites, who paid for their sins through the exile, based on the unconditional facet of the Davidic covenant.

Besides the Chronicler’s use of משל בֵּיתָאֲל in 2 Chr 7:18 strengthens the meaningfulness of the Davidic covenant for postexilic Israelites. This rests on the understanding of the phrase משל בֵּיתָאֲל as borrowed from Mic 5:1 (2), which prophesies the restorer:

\begin{quote}
But you, O Bethlehem of Ephrathah, who are one of the little clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one ruling in Israel (משלי ביתאלא), whose origin is from of old, from ancient days. (my translation)
\end{quote}

Since Mic 5:1 (2) is the only other place where the phrase משל בֵּיתָאֲל occurs in the Old Testament, one can presume that the Chronicler borrowed the phrase in order to express his longing for the restorer of Israel. By taking the established future-looking phrase משל בֵּיתָאֲל, the Chronicler connotes his hope for a resurgence of Davidic rule. Riley maintains the opposite, however, noting that the phrase משל בֵּיתָאֲל might be original to the Chronicler’s Vorlage.\textsuperscript{252} Having noted the agreement between משל בֵּיתָאֲל of 2 Chr 7:18 in the MT and הַγְּוָּעָה הָעָשָׂר מֵאֵינֶךְ ev

\textsuperscript{250} See pp. 39-42 of this work.

\textsuperscript{251} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{252} Riley, King and Cultus in Chronicles, 173.
Israēl (‘Ruling in Israel’) of 1 Kgs 9:5 in the LXX, Riley reckons

מֵעָלְכָּם מֵישראל

of 1 Kgs 9:5 in the MT to be a corruption:

οὐκ ἔξαρθησεται σοι ἀνήρ ἤγοιμενος ἐν Ἰσραήλ.

There shall not be taken from you a man ruling in Israel. (3 Kgdms 9:5b, my translation)

However, although it is theoretically possible that מֵעָלְכָּם מֵישראל of 1 Kgs 9:5 in the MT is a corruption and מֹשֶל מְישָׁרָאֵל is original, it seems unlikely. Whereas there is no occurrence of מֹשֶל מְישָׁרָאֵל throughout the MT of Samuel-Kings, מַעְלֶל מְישָׁרָאֵל (מ) occurs six more times in addition to 1 Kgs 9:5 (1 Kgs 2:4; 8:20, 25; 10:9; 2 Kgs 10:30; 15:12).253 This statistic indicates the Deuteronomist’s familiarity with the phrase מַעְלֶל מְישָׁרָאֵל, and suggests the originality of מֵעָלְכָּם מֵישראל in 1 Kgs 9:5 of the MT. By introducing the phrase מַעְלֶל מְישָׁרָאֵל, the Chronicler perhaps effects a word play with מֹשֶל מְישָׁרָאֵל (‘proverb’) of 2 Chr 7:20, as he already used a pun on בֵּרָה between בֵּרָה and בֵּרְהָה in 2 Chr 7:18:

וְהָקִיםֵהוּ אַתִּם כִּלְכָּה בַּעֲשָׂר בְּשֵׁם בְּרֵיחַ בַּעֲשָׂר

Then I will establish the throne of your kingdom as I covenanted with David, your father saying, ‘A man ruling in Israel shall not be cut off for you’. (2 Chr 7:18, my translation)

וְהָקִיםֵהוּ מִצְצָל אַרְכֵּר אַשְׁרָה לִשְׁמַע אֲלֵהוּ בֵּרָה אַשְׁרָה לִשְׁמַע אֲלֵהוּ

Then I will pluck you up from the land that I have given you; and this house, which I have consecrated for my name, I will cast out of my sight, and will make it a proverb and a byword among all peoples. (2 Chr 7:20)

3. Conclusion

The synoptic comparison between 2 Chr 7:17-18 and 1 Kgs 9:4-5 reveals that the Chronicler reinforces the Davidic covenant in his postexilic milieu. The

253 Cf., מַעְלֶל occurs in 1 Kgs 5:1//2 Ch 9:26
Chronicler’s use of the strong covenantal term קֵרוֹחָה and the well known phrase for restoration, נֶאֶשֶּׁל בְּרֶשֶׁת, of Mic 5:1(2) reflect the Chronicler’s desire for the resurgence of the Davidic dynasty based on the Davidic covenant. Some attempts to deny the plain textual indications have been examined and found wanting.
VIII. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 13:1-22

1. Setting

2 Chronicles 13 is significant for our understanding of the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant because it includes the speech of Abijah, the Judahite king, against Israel’s king Jeroboam and the Israelites, who rebelled against Davidic descendant, Rehoboam. The Davidic covenant is addressed through the mouth of Abijah in 2 Chr 13:5. Since Abijah’s speech is the Chronicler’s Sondergut, it helps us understand the Chronicler’s own ideology. 1 Kgs 15:1-8, the corresponding passage of 2 Chr 13:1-23, does not have this long speech or the following narrative of the battle between Judah and Israel.

2. Synoptic Comparison

There are several points of difference between the two synoptic texts. In terms of length, the narrative concerning Abijah in 2 Chr 13:1-23 is approximately three times longer than the corresponding 1 Kgs 15:1-8 passage. The Chronicler’s inclusion of Abijah’s speech in vv. 4b-12 and the subsequent battle narrative between Abijah and Jeroboam in vv. 13-21 renders the Chronicler’s account three times longer than the Abijah narrative of 1 Kgs 15:1-8. On the other hand, the text of 1 Kgs 15:3-5 does not exist in the Chronicler’s Abijah account.

In the light of the Chronicler’s ideology on the Davidic dynasty, it is pivotal to perceive how the Chronicler portrays Abijah, the advocate of the Davidic covenant:

Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? (2 Chr 13:5)

If the Chronicler depicts Abijah in a positive way, the validity of his speech is heightened and indicates the Chronicler’s vindication of the kingship for the Davidic descendants. If the portrayal is negative then Abijah’s defense of the Davidic covenant is weakened.

254 While the name is יִבְיָה in 1 Kings 15, the name appears as יִבְיָה in 2 Chronicles 13. Hereafter, I will use Abijah to designate the king except when I need to distinguish the two.
covenant loses weight. In Kgs 15:1-8, the Deuteronomist plainly assesses Abijah as a wicked king:

He committed all the sins that his father did before him; his heart was not true to the LORD his God, like the heart of his father David. (1 Kgs 15:3)

On the contrary, the straightforward negative evaluation of Abijah is not in Chronicles. Nevertheless, the Chronicler does not offer the same compliment to Abijah as was offered to other good kings such as Asa and Hezekiah:

Asa did what was good and right in the sight of the LORD his God. (2 Chr 14:1 (2))

He (Hezekiah) did what was right in the sight of the LORD, just as his ancestor David had done. (2 Chr 29:2)

A close reading of the text of 2 Chronicles 13 in comparison with its synoptic passage in 1 Kgs 15:1-8, reveals how the Chronicler views King Abijah.

2. 1. 1 Kgs 15:1//2 Chr 13:1
The first verse of each history share many common features.

Now in the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam son of Nebat, Abijam began to reign over Judah. (1 Kgs 15:1)

In the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam, Abijah began to reign over Judah. (2 Chr 13:1)

We can note two differences here. The qualifier of Jeroboam, ‘son of Nebat’ does not exist in 2 Chr 13:1, and the Chronicler uses ‘Abijah’ rather than ‘Abijam’ throughout Chronicles. It seems that the Chronicler saves the modifier, ‘son of Nebat’ and uses it later in Abijah’s speech in v. 6 to punctuate Jeroboam’s non-Davidic heritage:255

255 The Chronicler uses the qualifier of Jeroboam, ‘son of Nebat’ only once here in 2 Chronicles 13 while ten occurrences of ‘Jeroboam’ are in 2 Chronicles 13 (vv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 13, 15, 19, 20).
Yet Jeroboam son of Nebat, a servant of Solomon son of David, rose up and rebelled against his lord.

In fact, 2 Chr 13:1 is unique in Chronicles because this is the only place where the Chronicler uses synchronism when he introduces a Judaic king. While synchronism is common to the introduction of Judaic and northern Israelite kings in the book of Kings, it is not used at all in Chronicles with the exception of this verse. As De Vries suggests, the Chronicler uses synchronism here since the report of Abijah’s reign is fully taken up with the battle against Jeroboam. This synchronism functions as a forerunner to betraying a sharp conflict between Abijah and Jeroboam as protagonist and antagonist respectively of the narrative.

The difference between the two names, Abijam in 1 Kings 15 and Abijah in 2 Chronicles 13, may also shed some light on how the Chronicler views King Abijah. For this intriguing variance, C. H. Gordon maintains that Abijam is older and that the Chronicler’s Abijah is puritanized because he wants to remove any vestige of paganism from the theophoric name of a Davidic king. According to Gordon, since YAM is a Canaanite sea-god, the Chronicler intentionally changed the name from YAM to YA; that is, to YHWH. Lemke, on the other hand, opposes Gordon’s assertion of a puritanical name change. He, referring to Noth, holds that ‘יָדָא’

256 Synchronism is a chronological arrangement of historical events and personages so as to indicate coincidence or coexistence. In 2 Chr 13:1, the Chronicler arranges the time of Abijah’s installation in light of the coexistent northern Israelite King, Jeroboam.

257 De Vries, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 291.

258 Cf., Abiou (3 Kgdms 15, LXX), Abia (2 Chr 13, LXX)


260 Michael A. Grisanti’s summary of the deity YAM in the Ugaritic texts is helpful: ‘Throughout the religious texts of Ugarit, El is the head of the pantheon of gods and Athirat (called ‘Athirat of the sea’ at times; KTU (Dietrich, M., Loretz, O., Sammartin, J., Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit 1, Neukirchen, 1976), 1.4 I, 15) is his consort. Yam (the son of El), whose name literally means ‘sea’ and who has the titles ‘Prince Sea’ and ‘Judge River’, sends messengers to demand that the assembly of the gods deliver Baal and his powers over to himself. (KTU, 1.2 I, 30-35) After El grants Yam’s request, Baal protests and sets out to battle with Yam. Using two weapons crafted by Kothar, Baal is able to slay Yam. (KTU, 1.2 IV, 11-27) In light of Athtar’s (consort of Baal) exclamation, ‘Our captive is Prince Yam … our captive is Judge River’; (KTU, 1.2 IV, 29-30) and Yam’s reappearance later in the Baal cycle, the death of Yam apparently does not signify his ceasing to exist, but his total subordination to Baal. Uncontested sovereignty on earth and sea is determined by this battle’ in ‘א’, NIDOTT II, 462.

does not contain any ‘sea’ element but that ‘杄’ could be a hypocoristic ending.\textsuperscript{262}

Noth himself, however, does not support his assertion with satisfactory evidence. He simply suggests ‘ām’ as a hypocoristic ending from his postulation:

\begin{quote}
\text{\large Die Lesung \textit{\begin{small}\(\text{הָיֶבֶן\text{\end{small}}\)} in 1 Kön 14, 31 ff. und Chron. ist sekundäre Erleichterung; das zweite Element ist dunkel, hat aber mit \textit{\begin{small}\(\text{יָם}\text{\end{small}}\) = Meer gewiß zu tun; es könnte wohl ein Gottesname darin stecken, vielleicht ist es auch nur die hypokoristische Endung –ām.”\textsuperscript{263}}\end{quote}

Namely, Noth denies the connection of \textit{\begin{small}\(\text{יָבֶן}\text{\end{small}}\) to ‘sea’, but rather separates ‘י’ from ‘杄’.

Judging from the absence of the Deuteronomist’s negative judgment against Abijah (cf. 1 Kgs 15:3) in Chronicles, it is plausible to suggest that the Chronicler puritanized Abijam to Abijah in order to remove the pagan element in the name of a Davidic descendent. It may have been uncomfortable for the Chronicler to leave the name \textit{\begin{small}\(\text{יָבֶן}\text{\end{small}}\), which literally means ‘my father is YAM’. Although he could not ascertain how the Deuteronomist appreciated the nuance of the name Abijam, whether it is hypocoristic or adverse, the Chronicler could have read \textit{\begin{small}\(\text{יָבֶן}\text{\end{small}}\) as ‘my father is YAM, (a pagan god)’ at first glance and attempted to change the name. Thus, the noticeable discrepancy between Abijam to Abijah is probably explained by more than a simple orthographic variant; rather, the Chronicler made an intentional change in order to present this Davidic king more favorably. G. R. Driver succinctly presents this point:

\begin{quote}
The feeling of the Jews about forms in ‘yam’, which are rare in the Old Testament, is perhaps truly reflected by the compiler of Kings or his editor, in that he calls a king of whom he disapprove Abijam (1 Kgs 14:31-15:3), while the Chronicler signifies his approval of the same king by calling him Abijah or Abijahu. (2 Chr 11:20-22 and 13:1-22)\textsuperscript{264}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{262} Ibid. ‘hypocoristic’ means ‘endearing’.

\textsuperscript{263} M. Noth, \textit{Die Israelitischen Personenennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung} (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928), 234.

\textsuperscript{264} G. R. Driver, ‘The Original Form of the Name ‘Yahweh’: Evidence and Conclusions,” \textit{ZAW} 46 (1928), 13. \(\text{יָבֶן}\), a variant of \(\text{יָבֶל}\), occurs twice in 2 Chr 13:20 and 2 Chr 13:21.
2. 2. 1 Kgs 15:2//2 Chr 13:2

Not only is there variance in Abijah’s name, there is also a discrepancy in his mother’s name. In 1 Kgs 15:2, it is written, ‘He reigned for three years in Jerusalem. His mother’s name was Maacah (מַעֲכָה), daughter of Abishalom’, while 2 Chr 13:2 states ‘Three years he reigned in Jerusalem. The name of his mother is Michayahu (מיכַּיהוּ), daughter of Uriel of Gibeah…’.

Furthermore, the genealogy of Abijah’s mother in 2 Chr 13:2 is different from that of 1 Kgs 15:2. Maacah is the daughter of Abishalom in 1 Kgs 15:2 whereas in 2 Chr 13:2, Michayahu is a daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. Interestingly 2 Chr 11:18-20 seems to agree with 1 Kgs 15:2 while disagreeing with 2 Chr 13:2:

Rehoboam took as his wife Mahalath daughter of Jerimoth son of David, and of Abihail daughter of Eliab son of Jesse. She bore him sons: Jeush, Shemariah, and Zaham. After her he took Maacah daughter of Absalom, who bore him Abijah, Attai, Ziza, and Shelomith. (2 Chr 11:18-20)

It is puzzling that the Chronicler identifies Abijah’s mother as Maacah, daughter of Abishalom in one place and as Micayahu, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, elsewhere.

Let us therefore attempt to untangle the difficulties surrounding the name of Abijah’s mother. First of all, the Chronicler’s Why‘k’ymi in 2 Chr 13:2 seems deliberate. In the name Why‘k’ymi the Chronicler stresses the theological orthodoxy of Abijah’s mother.\(^{265}\) The name, Maacah carries a non-Israelite pagan association as seen in Gen 22:20-24 and 1 Kgs 2:39: \(^{266}\)

Now after these things it was told Abraham, ‘Milcah also has borne children, to your brother Nahor: Uz the firstborn, Buz his brother, Kemuel the father of Aram, Chesed, Hazo, Pildash, Jidlaph, and Bethuel’. Bethuel became the father of Rebekah. These eight Milcah bore to Nahor, Abraham’s brother. Moreover, his concubine, whose

---

\(^{265}\) Johnstone, 1 and 2 Chronicles II, 51.

\(^{266}\) W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), 157-158.
name was Reumah, bore Tebah, Gaham, Tahash, and *Maacah*. (Gen 22:20-24)

But it happened at the end of three years that two of Shimei’s slaves ran away to King Achish son of *Maacah* of Gath. When it was told Shimei, ‘Your slaves are in Gath’. (1 Kgs 2:39)

In Gen 22:24, Maacah is one of Nahor’s descendants, who later became the Israelites’ Aramean ancestors. Terah’s son, Nahor, was married to Milcah daughter of his brother Haran and had eight sons: Uz, Buz, Kemuel, Ched, Hazo, Pildash, Jidlah and Bethuel. Among these sons, Kemuel was the father of Aram, who was eponymous for the Aramean people. Between Nahor and his concubine Reumah, there were four sons: Tebah, Gaham, Tahash, and Maacah. At issue here is the pagan character of non-Israelites, which the name Maacah may invoke. That there is a distinction between the God of Abraham and the pagan God of Nahor is evident from Gen 31:53a:

> May the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, the God of their father judge between us.

In the peace treaty between Laban and Jacob, Laban distinguishes the God of Abraham from the God of Nahor, who is also the God of their father, Terah. This distinction is seen more clearly in Josh 24:2-3:

> And Joshua said to all the people, ‘Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel: Long ago your ancestors-- Terah and his sons Abraham and Nahor-- lived beyond the Euphrates and served other gods. Then I took your father Abraham from beyond the River and led him through all the land of Canaan and made his offspring many. I gave him Isaac’.

---

267 ‘When Terah had lived seventy years, he became the father of Abram, Nahor, and Haran. Now these are the descendants of Terah. Terah was the father of Abram, Nahor, and Haran; and Haran was the father of Lot. Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his birth, in Ur of the Chaldeans. Abram and Nahor took wives; the name of Abram’s wife was Sarai, and the name of Nahor’s wife was Milcah. She was the daughter of Haran the father of Milcah and Iscah’. (Gen 11:26-29)
Here, Joshua reminds the Israelites that the gods which Terah and his sons, Abraham and Nahor, served long ago are different from the God who took Abraham from beyond the River.

In 1 Kgs 2:39, Maacah is recorded as the mother of Achish, who is a king of Gath, a major Philistine city. 1 Kgs 2:39 narrates that Shimei’s two slaves ran off to Achish, son of Maacah in Gath, Philistia. In sum, the Chronicler would not use the name of Abijah’s mother as Maacah, given that this name was related to an Aramean ancestor and Philistine figure.

While the name Maacah contains pagan elements, one finds in 2 Chr 13 that the name Micayahu, which means ‘Who is like YHWH’, has the divine element ‘YA’ within the name. This phenomenon is similar to the Chronicler’s use of Abijah for Abijam as we have already considered. Furthermore, the modifying phrase of Abijah in 2 Chr 13:2, ‘a daughter of Uriel of Gibeah’ has divine and Israelite elements. The name Uriel (‘Uriel’) means ‘My light is God’, and Gibeah is a town of Benjamin, an Israelite tribe (1 Sam 13:2; 14:16). In particular, the Israelite character of Gibeah is clearly seen in a dialogue between a Levite and his servant in Judg 19:11-12:

When they were near Jebus, the day was far spent, and the servant said to his master, ‘Come now, let us turn aside to this city of the Jebusites, and spend the night in it’. But his master said to him, ‘We will not turn aside into a city of foreigners, who do not belong to the people of Israel; but we will continue on to Gibeah’.

In the Levite’s reply to his servant, Gibeah’s Israeliite character is underscored in contrast to the foreign town, Jebus.

In 1 Kgs 15:2, it is written that Abijah’s mother is Maacah, daughter of Abishalom. It is generally agreed that אָלְיוֹבַיָּה in 1 Kgs 15:2 is a variant of אָלְיוֹבַיָּהּ (HALOT I, 6).
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Davidic kingdom, when Abijah proclaims the legitimacy of the Davidic kingship against Jeroboam and the northern Israelites.

Then how do we explain the relationship of the two different modifiers, ‘daughter of Abishalom’ and ‘daughter of Uriel of Gibeah’ respectively in 1 Kgs 15:2 and 2 Chr 13:2? According to Dillard’s reconstruction, Maacah can be a daughter of both Absalom and Uriel. Reading from 2 Sam 14:27, in which Absalom has three sons and one daughter named Tamar, and 2 Sam 18:18, which indicates the death of his three sons in their youth, Dillard presumes that Maacah is, in fact, a granddaughter of Absalom. In Dillard’s presumption, Absalom’s only daughter Tamar was married to Uriel of Gibeah and gave birth to Maacah. Though Dillard’s reconstruction is plausible, it remains unproven.

There is another difficulty that remains surrounding the name of Abijah’s mother. In 2 Chr 15:16a, Maacah appears as the mother of Asa, who is son of Abijah:

Also Maacah, mother of Asa, the king removed her from being queen because she made an abominable thing for Asherah. (my translation)

Accordingly in Chronicles, Maacah is the mother of Asa, son of Abijah (2 Chr 15:16), as well as the mother of Abijah (2 Chr 13:2). John Bright leaves room for brotherhood between Abijah and Asa, yet this is unlikely, simply because the relationship between Abijah and Asa is defined as father and son in 2 Chr 13:23:

So Abijah slept with his ancestors, and they buried him in the city of David. His son Asa succeeded him. In his days the land had rest for ten years.

---
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271 Ibid. 2 Sam 14:27 - ‘There were born to Absalom three sons, and one daughter whose name was Tamar; she was a beautiful woman’. 2 Sam 18:18 - ‘Now Absalom in his lifetime had taken and set up for himself a pillar that is in the King’s Valley, for he said, “I have no son to keep my name in remembrance”; he called the pillar by his own name. It is called Absalom’s Monument to this day’.

It is most plausible, however, to view Maacah as a queen mother, who is in fact the grandmother of Asa. When Asa was enthroned after Abijah’s short three-year reign, Maacah, grandmother of Asa, could have a great influence upon Asa. 1 Kgs 15:9-10 confirms that Maacah, מַכָּה in 2 Chr 15:16 is the mother of Abijah and daughter of Abishalom (1 Kgs 15:1-2):

Now in the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam son of Nebat, Abijam began to reign over Judah. He reigned for three years in Jerusalem. *His mother’s name was Maacah daughter of Abishalom.* (1 Kgs 15:1-2)

In the twentieth year of King Jeroboam of Israel, Asa began to reign over Judah; he reigned forty-one years in Jerusalem. *His mother’s name was Maacah daughter of Abishalom.* (1 Kgs 15:9-10)

Thus, although it is difficult to provide a complete answer to the issues surrounding Abijah’s mother’s name, it can be suggested that the Chronicler intends to portray Abijah’s mother favourably. This is accomplished by first choosing ‘Micayahu’ for ‘Maacah’ and second, ‘daughter of Uriel of Gibeah’ for ‘daughter of Abishalom’. In 2 Chr 11:20, where the Chronicler outlines Rehoboam’s family, the name of Abijah’s mother is ‘Maacah’, but Abijah’s mother’s name, its modifier, and Abijah’s name are presented in a favorable way directly before Abijah’s speech.274 These favorable wordings toward Abijah function to enhance the validity of Abijah’s speech. To convey his ideology affirmatively and convincingly, the Chronicler meticulously chooses the names of the speaker and even his ancestors, which carry orthodoxy and divine components. The Chronicler fully realizes that the speech of an ungodly king would not impact the reader positively no matter how good the content may be. This encouraging introduction of Abijah would prepare readers to affirm the message coming from the mouth of this king.

2. 3. 1 Kgs 15:3-5 // omission in 2 Chronicles 13

273 Cf., Ανὴρ θυγάτηρ Αβισσηλωμ (3 Kgdms 15:10, LXX)

274 2 Chr 11:20-21a: ‘After her he (Rehoboam) took Maacah daughter of Absalom, who bore him Abijah, Attai, Ziza, and Shelomith. Rehoboam loved Maacah daughter of Absalom more than all his other wives and concubines’.
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With very little difference, the introduction of Abijah in 2 Chr 13:1-2 corresponds to the Deuteronomist’s introduction in 1 Kgs 15:1-2. Following this introduction, however, the synoptic text of 1 Kgs 15:3-5 is conspicuously absent in Chronicles:

He committed all the sins that his father did before him; his heart was not true to the LORD his God, like the heart of his father David. Nevertheless for David’s sake the LORD his God gave him a lamp in Jerusalem, setting up his son after him, and establishing Jerusalem; because David did what was right in the sight of the LORD, and did not turn aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, except in the matter of Uriah the Hittite. (1 Kgs 15:3-5)

Without the text of 1 Kgs 15:3-5, the Chronicler immediately enters the war narrative between Abijah and Jeroboam, which is absent from the Deuteronomistic history. Why does the Chronicler appear to fail to include the text of 1 Kgs 15:3-5?

1 Kgs 15:3-5 can be divided into two parts: v. 3 and vv. 4-5. In v. 3 the Deuteronomist makes a negative evaluation of Abijah, who committed all the sins of his father, and in vv. 4-5 he highlights God’s blessing upon David’s house for David’s sake. In Chronicles, the lack of this negative evaluation of Abijah in v. 3 is deliberate. Since the negative assessment damages the image of Abijah, the defender of the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty, the Chronicler excludes it.

However it is intriguing that the Chronicler makes no mention of the tradition found in vv. 4-5, which speaks about God’s promised continuity of the Davidic kingdom based on the righteousness of King David. The ideology of the Davidic covenant in 1 Kgs 15:4-5 is not only acceptable but also desirable for the Chronicler who emphasizes the legitimacy of the eternal Davidic kingdom in the subsequent speech of Abijah. Nevertheless, there is good reason for the meticulous Chronicler to make no mention of the tradition found in 1 Kgs 15:4-5. It is difficult to think of the absence of vv. 4-5 separately from the absence of v. 3. Verses 4-5, beginning with a concessive כִּי, responds to v. 3 by saying that ‘in spite of’ Abijah’s sins, God sustains Judah for his loyal servant David. In the light of the structure, 1 Kgs 15:4-5 responds to 1 Kgs 15:3 and the absence of v. 3 leaves no place for vv. 4-5.
3. Further Issues

Without the synoptic text of Kgs 15:3-5, the Chronicler directly introduces the war narrative between Abijah and Jeroboam in 2 Chr 13:2b that lasts through to v. 21. Since this war narrative, which includes Abijah’s speech, is not present in the Deuteronomistic history, it may reveal more clearly the Chronicler’s own ideology. Abijah’s proclamation of the legitimacy of the Davidic dynasty is key to understanding the Chronicler’s view on the Davidic covenant. Having examined this war narrative, I conclude that the Chronicler expresses his hope for the reinstallation of the lost kingdom of David. The following arguments demonstrate the Chronicler’s support for the revival of the Davidic dynasty.

3. 1. Arguments for the revival of the Davidic dynasty

3. 1. 1. The Davidic kingdom as YHWH’s kingdom

As we have seen already in 1 Chr 17:14, the Chronicler’s equation of the kingdom of David with the kingdom of God reveals the importance he attaches to the Davidic kingdom and the Davidic covenant. Verse 8 clearly shows this equation:

And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. (2 Chr 13:8)

Placed in the mouth of Abijah, the Chronicler declares that Judah is the kingdom of YHWH, who gave it into the hands of the sons of David. Abijah warns Jeroboam and the northern Israelites that however great they are, they cannot withstand the kingdom of Judah, which is in fact the kingdom of the almighty God, YHWH. In v. 12, the Israelites’ battle against Judah is seen as a battle against YHWH:

See, God is with us at our head, and his priests have their battle trumpets to sound the call to battle against you. O Israelites, do not

---
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fight against the LORD, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed. (2 Chr 13:12)

Abijah unequivocally declares that Israelites cannot succeed in the battle against God’s kingdom and the result of the battle appears to justify his speech:

Then the people of Judah raised the battle shout. And when the people of Judah shouted, God defeated Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah. The Israelites fled before Judah, and God gave them into their hands. (2 Chr 13:15-16)

In a war narrative, a proclamation is justified by the result of the war. In the battle narrative of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, and Hezekiah, king of Judah, Sennacherib’s official makes a promulgation against Hezekiah and Judah:

Do you not know what I and my ancestors have done to all the peoples of other lands? Were the gods of the nations of those lands at all able to save their lands out of my hand? Who among all the gods of those nations that my ancestors utterly destroyed was able to save his people from my hand, that your God should be able to save you from my hand? Now therefore do not let Hezekiah deceive you or mislead you in this fashion, and do not believe him, for no god of any nation or kingdom has been able to save his people from my hand or from the hand of my ancestors. How much less will your God save you out of my hand! (2 Chr 32:13-15)

However, this proclamation turns out to be empty when the outcome of the battle fails to favour Sennacherib:

And the LORD sent an angel who cut off all the mighty warriors and commanders and officers in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned in disgrace to his own land. When he came into the house of his god, some of his own sons struck him down there with the sword. (2 Chr 32:21)

Unlike the empty promulgation of Sennacherib, the Chronicler justifies Abijah’s speech against Jeroboam and the northern Israelites through the result of the battle. In other words, the fulfillment of Abijah’s proclamation enhances the validity of Abijah speech as a whole. Consequently, Abijah’s words reflect the beliefs and
ideologies of the Chronicler. In this way, the Chronicler expresses his strong desire for the revival of the Davidic kingdom based on the eternal covenant.

3. 1. 2. Two foci of Abijah’s speech

Abijah’s speech reflects two foci of the Chronicler’s ideology: the legitimacy of the eternity of the Davidic dynasty (vv. 4b-8a) and the legitimacy of sacrifice in the Jerusalem Temple (vv. 8b-12).

The legitimacy of the eternity of the Davidic dynasty (4b-8a):

Listen to me, Jeroboam and all Israel! Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? Yet Jeroboam son of Nebat, a servant of Solomon son of David, rose up and rebelled against his lord; and certain worthless scoundrels gathered around him and defied Rehoboam son of Solomon, when Rehoboam was young and irresolute and could not withstand them. And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David,

The legitimacy of sacrifice in Jerusalem Temple (vv 8b-12):

Because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you. Have you not driven out the priests of the LORD, the descendants of Aaron, and the Levites, and made priests for yourselves like the peoples of other lands? Whoever comes to be consecrated with a young bull or seven rams becomes a priest of what are no gods. But as for us, the LORD is our God, and we have not abandoned him. We have priests ministering to the LORD who are descendants of Aaron, and Levites for their service. They offer to the LORD every morning and every evening burnt offerings and fragrant incense, set out the rows of bread on the table of pure gold, and care for the golden lampstand so that its lamps may burn every evening; for we keep the charge of the LORD our God, but you have abandoned him. See, God is with us at our head, and his priests have their battle trumpets to sound the call to battle against you. O Israelites, do not fight against the LORD, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed.

276 See G. von Rad’s “The Levitical Sermon in 1 and II Chronicles,” The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966), 275-277. In this essay, von Rad attempts to demonstrate that the Chronicler, a Levitical writer, puts his ideology in kings’ speeches, which is a Levitical sermon.
The scrupulous Chronicler cogently connects these two foci in v. 8, where he moves from the issue of the Davidic dynasty to proper sacrifice:

ונחוה את אבותיהם לפני מלחמה יוהיה ביר
בית יהוא
ואמה היהו בין עמים ענלי והב אתא עשה לכס בראש
לאלוהים

And now you think to withstand against the kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of David.
And you are great multitude and with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made for you as gods. (my translation)

The Chronicler accuses the northern Israelites using the same pronoun, יְהוּדָא (‘You’) twice: the first יְהוּדָא is accused of violating the covenant made with the Davidic house and the second יְהוּדָא worshiped false gods. For the Chronicler, the Davidic dynasty as well as the Jerusalem Temple loom large. If the Chronicler desired to replace the Davidic dynasty with the Temple and its cultus in the postexilic age, he would have highlighted only one focus – legitimate worship – rather than the two concerns he mentioned. Doubtless, it would be possible for the Chronicler to accuse the northern Israelites only of their improper worship, but he does not. Rather, he sets the Davidic covenant first in Abijah’s speech, followed by the issue of proper worship in Jerusalem.

The Chronicler’s hope for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty is seen from the fact that Abijah’s speech does not appear in the Deuteronomistic history but only in Chronicles. The Chronicler willingly includes Abijah’s speech, which is absent from Kings. The insertion of Abijah’s speech in Chronicles reinforces the view that the Chronicler did hope for the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty based on the eternally binding Davidic covenant.

In the light of these two foci, it is problematic to say, as scholars have done, that the Chronicler was promoting the replacement of the Davidic dynasty with the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus in the postexilic setting. Knoppers is surely correct when he points out the significance of the Davidic covenant for the Chronicler:
Those commentators who affirm the programmatic importance of Abijah’s emphasis on cultic orthopraxis, but downplay or even ignore the emphasis on the Davidic rule misconstrue the Chronicler’s ideology. Neither Davidic rule nor temple cultus is complete without the other. On the contrary, Abijah’s speech remarkably underscores their ongoing relevance for all Israelites.277

3. 1. 3. The holy war motif

The Chronicler’s narration of the battle between Abijah and Jeroboam takes the form of a so-called ‘holy war’. At the outset let us note briefly the key characteristics of the holy war motif as presented by G. H. Jones:

Holy war began with the sounding of a trumpet as a sign for the troops to assemble (Judg 6:34f); another particularly solemn method for summoning troops was to send pieces of animal flesh among the people in the hands of messengers (1 Sam 11:7). These assembled forces formed the ‘militia of Yahweh’ (Judg 5:11) and were duly consecrated (Josh 3:5). Before setting out to battle, sacrifices were offered and an oracle from Yahweh was sought (Judg 20:23, 26). God’s favorable reply was usually pronounced in the perfect tense: ‘Yahweh has given the enemy into your hand’ (Josh 2:24); the declaration of victory with such certainty was an important factor in Holy War. Then Yahweh went out before them to battle (Judg 4:14). This kind of war was Yahweh’s war, the enemies were Yahweh’s enemies (Judg 5:31). And the campaign was completely in his hands. It was Yahweh too who caused panic to seize the enemies, for his fear fell upon them (Josh 2:8), so that they became faint-hearted (Josh 2:24). The battle itself opened with a loud battle-cry (Judg 7:20), and all through the fighting God was active creating panic and terror among the enemies (Josh 10:10; Judg 4:15). The war was brought to a conclusion with the ban (herem); men and animals were put to death, but silver, gold and other possessions were declared ‘sacred’ to Yahweh (Josh 6:18-19). After this the army disbanded and the men returned to their tents (Judg 20:8). All these formal elements are not preserved together in any single account of a battle, but they become clear in a synopsis of various campaigns.278

Overall, 2 Chronicles 13 conforms to these elements of holy war: the blowing of the trumpet is predicted in v. 12 (‘See, God is with us at our head, and his priests


have their battle trumpets to sound the call to battle against you…”’) and takes place in v. 14 (‘When Judah turned, the battle was in front of them and behind them. They cried out to the LORD, and the priests blew the trumpets’); the battle opens with Judah’s battle cry in v. 15 (‘Then the people of Judah raised the battle shout. And when the people of Judah shouted…) and God routs the Israelites in v. 15 (‘…God defeated Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah’); with God’s intervention, Jeroboam and the Israelites flee in panic and terror, and God gave them into the hands of Judah (יִהְמָלֵךְ הַיָּתֹם יִרְאוּ) in v. 16 (‘The Israelites fled before Judah, and God gave them into their hands’).

In addition, the ambush (v. 13, ‘Jeroboam had sent an ambush around to come on them from behind; thus his troops were in front of Judah, and the ambush was behind them’), pre-battle speech (Abijah’s speech in vv 4b-12), the offer of peace (v. 12, ‘…O Israelites, do not fight against the LORD, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed’), cultic purity (The second part of Abijah’s speech in vv 8b-12), and a large number of armies (v. 3, ‘Abijah engaged in battle, having an army of valiant warriors, four hundred thousand picked men; and Jeroboam drew up his line of battle against him with eight hundred thousand picked mighty warriors’) are holy war motifs.279

In general, a holy war refers to a war in which YHWH fights as warrior.280 In the battle between Abijah, with the Judean army, and Jeroboam, with the Israelite army, God fights on Abijah’s side against Jeroboam, and the battle ends with Judah’s victory. As Abijah speaks in v. 12, the Israelites’ fight against Judah is precisely a fight against YHWH. Though there are battles between Judah and Israel in the book of Kings, the Deuteronomist never portrays the battles in the form of a holy war.281 The Deuteronomist would not portray God as a fighter against any Israelites, whether they are southerners or northerners. For the Deuteronomist, Israel is God’s people and therefore God would not fight against his own people.

279 Thompson, 1,2 Chronicles, 263; Dillard, 2 Chronicles, 105.
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What makes the Chronicler so bold as to depict God as a fighter in a holy war against his people in northern Israel? The reason is found in Abijah’s pre-battle speech with the double foci, as we have already analyzed. The northern Israelites’ rebellion against the Davidic dynasty and their idolatry deserve God’s judgment directed against them in the form of a holy war. Consequently, the result of the war justifies Abijah’s advocacy of the eternal kingship of the Davidic house over Judah and Israel.

In opposition to the holy war motif in 2 Chronicles 13, Japhet contends that divine intervention in a war is a common phenomenon throughout the Old Testament and the battle of Abijah is but one of the wars where such divine intervention is present. Since a standard of the holy war genre does not exist, it is sometimes difficult to judge whether a battle narrative is or is not a so-called holy war narrative. However, in the case of 2 Chronicles 13, and even if the holy war motif is denied, divine intervention on behalf of Abijah is clearly present and it enhances the validity of Abijah’s speech and the perpetuity of the Davidic covenant within the speech.

3. 1. 4. The positive portrayal of Abijah

The significance of the Davidic covenant in his speech is heightened when Abijah is portrayed in a positive manner. In addition to the positive light cast upon Abijah by favorable presentation of his name and the names of his ancestors, the Chronicler portrays Abijah more positively by means of an antithesis between Abijah and Jeroboam. The Chronicler’s negative description of Jeroboam and the Israelites plays a part in stressing the positive image of Abijah.

This antithesis is found in various places in 2 Chronicles 13. In v. 6, for example, Jeroboam is modified by the phrase, ‘son of Nebat’, which is absent in previous verses (vv. 1, 2, 3, 4). This modifier highlights that Jeroboam is not a descendant of David, but a ‘son of Nebat’. The Chronicler also includes the

---
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identification of Jeroboam by another modifying phrase, ‘servant of Solomon, son of David’, which stresses that Jeroboam is not a son of Solomon but simply Solomon’s servant. Another antithesis occurs in the ‘you’ of v. 8 and the ‘we’ of v. 10:

And now you (םַחְצִים) think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you (םַחְצִים) are a great multitude and have with you (םַחְצִים) the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you (םַחְצִים) … 10 But as for us (םַחְצִים), the LORD is our God (םַחְצִים), and we (םַחְצִים) have not abandoned him. We have priests ministering to the LORD who are descendants of Aaron, and Levites for their service.

Thus, the Chronicler is making clear that the golden calves, which Jeroboam made, are gods for ‘You’, then YHWH is ‘our’ God (םַחְצִים).

There are, however, two issues that possibly harm the positive image of Abijah in 2 Chronicles 13. First, Abijah’s three-year reign could be interpreted as a bad sign. Generally, in the history of Judah and Israel, good kings live a long life and bad kings’ reigns are short. However, that is not strictly followed. As Japhet says, wicked king Manasseh’s long fifty-five year reign (2 Chr 33:1) and good king Josiah’s untimely death (2 Chr 35:23-24) are examples of the exception to the longevity criterion: 285 Thus, the short reign of Abijah is not necessarily a negative judgment against him.

The second issue of possible harm upon Abijah’s portrait concerns the initiation of the battle between Abijah and Jeroboam. According to 2 Chr 11:4, it is not desirable to initiate a battle against a brother country:

Thus says the LORD: You shall not go up or fight against your kindred. Let everyone return home, for this thing is from me…

In 2 Chr 11:4, Shemaiah, a man of God, tells Rehoboam and Judah not to go up and fight against Israel. In 2 Chr 13:3, however, we read:

285 Japhet, I and II Chronicles, 688.
Abijah engaged in battle, having an army of valiant warriors, four hundred thousand picked men; and Jeroboam drew up his line of battle against him with eight hundred thousand picked mighty warriors.

Specifically, the issue here is whether of 2 Chr 13:3 implies Abijah’s initiation of the battle. NASB renders it as ‘Abijah began the battle’, and McKenzie agrees with the translation of NASB. Does the Chronicler portray Abijah as the aggressor of the battle?

The basic meaning of מָצַל is ‘to bind’, and accordingly NRSV translates the clause as ‘Abijah engaged in battle’. De Vries translates מָצַל as ‘took on’, and maintains that Abijah’s taking on the battle is in response to Jeroboam’s attack. If we translate מָצַל based on its root meaning, ‘to bind’, a sensible translation of it would be ‘to engage’ in this context, and Abijah’s engagement of the battle does not render him necessarily as an aggressor.

3. 1. 5. לֹא as the Chronicler’s catchword for his ideology

Abijah’s speech in 2 Chr 13:4-12, which begins with הֶעֱרָבָא (‘Hear me’), reflects what the Chronicler himself wants to say. According to McKenzie, ‘The speech is merely a forum for the Chronicler to express his own theology’. This assertion is confirmed when we examine the other five speeches that begin with לֹא in Chronicles: 1 Chr 28:2; 2 Chr 15:2; 20:20; 28:11; 29:5.

Among the five speeches, three speeches are given by the kings whom the Chronicler approves as good kings and two speeches are made by God’s prophets.

---
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1 Chr 28:2 – King David’s speech:
Then King David rose to his feet and said: ‘Hear me (יהוהך), my brothers and my people. I had planned to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD, for the footstool of our God; and I made preparations for building’.

2 Chr 15:1-2 – Prophet Azariah’s speech:
The spirit of God came upon Azariah son of Oded. He went out to meet Asa and said to him, ‘Hear me (יהוהך), Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin: The LORD is with you, while you are with him. If you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you abandon him, he will abandon you’.

2 Chr 20:20 – King Jehoshaphat’s speech:
They rose early in the morning and went out into the wilderness of Tekoa; and as they went out, Jehoshaphat stood and said, ‘Listen to me (יהוהך), O Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem! Believe in the LORD your God and you will be established; believe his prophets’.

2 Chr 28:9-11 – Prophet Oded’s speech:
But a prophet of the LORD was there, whose name was Oded; he went out to meet the army that came to Samaria, and said to them, ‘Because the LORD, the God of your ancestors, was angry with Judah, he gave them into your hand, but you have killed them in a rage that has reached up to heaven. Now you intend to subjugate the people of Judah and Jerusalem, male and female, as your slaves. But what have you except sins against the LORD your God? Now hear me (יהוהך), and send back the captives whom you have taken from your kindred, for the fierce wrath of the LORD is upon you’.

2 Chr 29:5 – King Hezekiah’s speech:
He said to them, ‘Listen to me (יהוהך), Levites! Sanctify yourselves, and sanctify the house of the LORD, the God of your ancestors, and carry out the filth from the holy place’.

1 Chr 28:2 is part of David’s public address concerning the future construction of the Temple by Solomon. God’s prophecy through Azariah in 2 Chr 15:2-7 facilitates Asa’s reform of corrupt Judah. The Jehoshaphat speech of 2 Chr 20:2 encourages Judah and the people of Jerusalem to keep faith in the Lord when they encounter the enemies, Ammon and Moab. 2 Chr 28:9-11 includes Oded’s prophecy for northern Israel to release their kinsmen, Judah. In 2 Chr 29:5-11, Hezekiah charges the Levites to consecrate the Temple and the Temple personnel.
Examination of all the speeches beginning with יִשְׂמְעוֹנִי in Chronicles shows that the Chronicler uses the catchword יִשְׂמְעוֹנִי to express his theology through the mouths of God’s approved agents. Thus, Abijah’s speech with יִשְׂמְעוֹנִי in 2 Chr 13:4-12 reveals the Chronicler’s belief that the Davidic covenant is eternally binding.

3. 1. 6. בֵּית מַלְアクセス

The Chronicler’s hope for the revival of the Davidic dynasty is encapsulated in the phrae בֵּית מַלְ actualizar (‘covenant of salt’) in Abijah’s speech in 2 Chr 13:5.

Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt (בֵּית מַלְ actualizar)?

As von Rad claims, בֵּית מַלְ aktual ‘covenant of salt’ (Salzbund) indicates the permanence of the Davidic covenant. Although we do not exactly know the original context of the phrase בֵּית מַלְ aktual, its occurrence in another biblical text helps us understand that the eternal nature of the covenant is in view. The other occurrence of בֵּית מַלְ aktual in Num 18:19 confirms the meaning of the phrase:

All the holy offerings that the Israelites present to the LORD I have given to you, together with your sons and daughters, as a perpetual due; it is a covenant of salt forever before the LORD for you and your descendants as well.

The phrase ‘covenant of salt’ is used when the Lord speaks to Aaron about the permanent sacrifice due to him and his sons. The permanent character of the בֵּית מַלְ aktual is stressed by two immediately before and after the phrase. Like Num 18:19, בֵּית מַלְ aktual in 2 Chr 13:5 occurs before the recipients (לְנַפְּלוֹת) of the kingship of the covenant of salt:
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Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt?

According to H. C. Trumbull, the phrase ‘covenant of salt’ in the Old Testament implies permanency and unchangeableness. Just as God gives the holy offerings of Israel to Aaron and his sons as a perpetual covenant of salt, so God gives the kingship to David and his sons as an eternal covenant.

William Riley opposes the view that the Chronicler’s interest in the revival of the Davidic dynasty. Riley insists that the focus of Abijah’s speech is Judah’s loyalty to the legitimate cultus rather than his position as a descendant of David. He emphasizes the cultic function of Davidic kings based on the use of the phrase in Num 18:19:

It is possible to construe the significance of the phrase in Num 18:19 somewhat differently, taking the primary significance to be rooted in the bond that arises from a common meal and not in a notion of permanency… The bond ultimately depends on the liturgical role which the priests have been called upon to exercise in Israel, and the perpetuity of the bond is linked to the perpetuity of their function. The Chronicler may have similar significance in mind for his use of the phrase in 2 Chr 13:5, even though there is no explicit reference to a common meal. Yahweh has truly given the kingship to David and his house; their functioning in this role brings about the perpetuation of a bond which can be described as the Chronicler may be using the expression to emphasize this aspect of the bond.

---
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Riley’s link between Aaronide priests’ perpetual sacrificial offerings and the perpetual cultic function of Aaronide priests does seem plausible. Here, two elements – sacrificial portions for the Aaronide priests and the Aaronide’s priestly function – are inseparably connected. In other words, it is impossible to assume perpetual sacrificial offerings for the Aaronide priests without their perpetual priestly function. However, Riley’s link of the cultic function to the בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ of 2 Chr 13:5 is problematic because the phrase בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ in 2 Chr 13:5 is clearly the ‘covenant of salt’ of the Davidic covenant as the רָם clause discloses:

כִּי יְהוָה אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נַחֲמָה מְמֹלֵכָה לְדוֹרֹת עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל
לְעֹלָם לְהַגָּבָה

That the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons

We have already seen that, from the structural point of view, Abijah’s speech has two foci: the legitimacy of the eternal Davidic dynasty in vv. 4b-8a and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem cult in vv. 8b-12. In this clearly divided structure, בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ belongs to the first part where the eternity of the Davidic covenant is proclaimed.

Pomykala also questions that the phrase, ‘covenant of salt’, signals the Chronicler’s hope for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty:

If the message of the passage for the Chronicler’s audience was in fact that ‘the Lord God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt’, by the late Persian period, God would have violated his own ‘covenant of salt’ for between 150 to 225 years, since the sons of David did not possess the kingship during this time. Far from inspiring hope in the Lord’s re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty, it would stand as an illustration of the Lord’s failure to make good on his word. Abijah’s statement makes no allowance for a hiatus in the continuity of Davidic kingship.296

Pomykala is correct to read the text in the context of the postexilic period when the Davidic kingship no longer existed. However, it is too bold to claim that the Chronicler expresses the Lord’s failure to make good on the Davidic covenant as a
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covenant of salt. The text does not provide any evidence that the covenant of salt given to David and his descendants turns out to be wrong. Contrary to Pomykala’s assertion, the Chronicler expresses his hope for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty when it did not exist. The Chronicler’s robust belief in the revival of the Davidic dynasty leads him to insert Abijah’s speech, and the key phrase בְּרֵית מִלַּח within it, which is not included in the Deuternomistic history.

Pomykala maintains that the cessation of the Davidic kingship from the destruction of Judah to the time of the Chronicler is a violation to the covenant of salt. However, as we have already observed, an important concept of the ‘covenant of salt’ is permanence. If we consider God as the giver of the covenant of salt and permanence as its key concept, it is scarcely likely that the Chronicler intends to speak of a violation of the sacred covenant of salt. What the Chronicler points to is not the violation of the covenant, but the revival of the Davidic dynasty founded on this covenant. In fact, contrary to Pomykala’s contention, the hiatus in the Davidic kingship is accepted and is not believed to indicate a failure of the covenant of salt. For the Chronicler, the temporary cessation of the Davidic kingship is insufficient to deny the validity of the Davidic covenant. Rather, the Davidic covenant makes possible the temporary cessation (hiatus) and revival of the Davidic kingship.

3. 2. Arguments against the revival of the Davidic dynasty

Some scholars insist that the Chronicler does not believe in the revival of the Davidic dynasty in 2 Chronicles 13.

3. 2. 1. Caquot

Caquot claims that 2 Chr 13:5 (‘Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt?’) are words taken from the mouth of Solomon’s successor, rather than those of the Chronicler. While it is possible to separate what the narrator says from that of one of the characters in his narrative, I believe that there are three reasons why this is
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not the case here. First, in 2 Chronicles 13, Abijah’s speech is supported by YHWH. Abijah proclaims, ‘YHWH is our God’ (v. 10) and God destroys Jeroboam and his army. God’s support for Abijah is an indicator of the Chronicler’s support for Abijah. Secondly, as we have observed through the Chronicler’s use of מֶלֶךְ, the Chronicler uses the character of King Abijah to express his own ideology. Third, if Abijah’s speech is unrelated to the Chronicler’s own beliefs, then why does the Chronicler include Abijah’s speech and the battle against Jeroboam, which are not in the Deuteronomistic history? It is difficult to escape the conclusion that he includes these in order to express his own ideology.

3. 2. 2. Pomykala

In opposition to the royalist interpretation of Abijah’s speech, Pomykala holds that 2 Chr 13:5 is not used to express hope in the renewal of the monarchy, but rather functions in order to condemn Jeroboam’s usurpation of the kingship of Israel. The difficulty in Pomykala’s argument lies in the inseparability of the condemnation of Jeroboam’s usurpation of the kingship of Israel and the permanent dynastic promise granted to David as the covenant of salt. In 2 Chr 13:5, Jeroboam is condemned for usurpation because he ignores the covenant of salt, that is, the Davidic covenant.

Pomykala also argues that between Abijah’s foci of rebellion against the Davidic kings and the abandonment of proper worship in Jerusalem, only the second point carries a meaningful counterpoint in the Chronicler’s time. However, the main force of the covenant of salt is perpetuity, as we have seen. Just as the Chronicler expresses concern over legitimate worship matters in his cultic society, so too the eternity of the Davidic dynastic covenant matters for the Chronicler, who lives without Davidic kingship. Pomykala says that the Davidic covenant is irrelevant when Davidic kingship did not exist. On the contrary, the eternal Davidic kingship, which is
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the covenant of salt, matters more for the Chronicler now that the Davidic kingship has ceased.

3. 2. 3. Riley

Riley cites 2 Chronicles 13 as a reinterpretation of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles at a time when there were no Davidic kings.\(^\text{301}\) According to Riley, the reinterpretation of the promise is prompted largely by cultic commemoration.\(^\text{302}\) Riley believes that the Davidic dynasty carries out the important role of establishing the Temple and its cultus, and the Davidic covenant persists in the Israelites’ faithfulness to the worship at the Temple and to its cultus.\(^\text{303}\) Riley uses 2 Chr 13:10-12 to show YHWH’s presence with his people who are moreover faithful to the cultus, and 2 Chr 13:13-18 to demonstrate divine victory accompanied by cultic actions:\(^\text{304}\)

But as for us, the LORD is our God, and we have not abandoned him. We have priests ministering to the LORD who are descendants of Aaron, and Levites for their service. They offer to the LORD every morning and every evening burnt offerings and fragrant incense, set out the rows of bread on the table of pure gold, and care for the golden lampstand so that its lamps may burn every evening; for we keep the charge of the LORD our God, but you have abandoned him. See, God is with us at our head, and his priests have their battle trumpets to sound the call to battle against you. O Israelites, do not fight against the LORD, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed. (2 Chr 13:10-12)

Jeroboam had sent an ambush around to come on them from behind; thus his troops were in front of Judah, and the ambush was behind them. When Judah turned, the battle was in front of them and behind them. They cried out to the LORD, and the priests blew the trumpets. Then the people of Judah raised the battle shout. And when the people of Judah shouted, God defeated Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah. The Israelites fled before Judah, and God gave them into their hands. Abijah and his army defeated them with great slaughter; five hundred thousand picked men of Israel fell slain. Thus the
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Israelites were subdued at that time, and the people of Judah prevailed, because they relied on the LORD, the God of their ancestors. (2 Chr 13:13-18)

As Riley states, 2 Chr 13:10-12 illustrates God’s presence in cultic faithfulness, and 2 Chr 13:13-18 holds cultic elements in the divine victory. As we have already seen, the war takes the form of a holy war and the cultic element is a main feature of a holy war narrative. However, Riley does not persuasively explain how these cultic elements can replace the Davidic covenant in the text, particularly in 2 Chr 13:4b-8a:

Listen to me, Jeroboam and all Israel! Do you not know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? Yet Jeroboam son of Nebat, a servant of Solomon son of David, rose up and rebelled against his lord; and certain worthless scoundrels gathered around him and defied Rehoboam son of Solomon, when Rehoboam was young and irresolute and could not withstand them. ‘And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, the kingdom of the LORD, which is in the hand of the sons of David’.

The important factor for Riley’s reinterpretation is the Chronicler’s context, that is, the non-existence of the Davidic kingdom. He highlights the role of the Davidic dynasty in the establishment of the Temple and its cultus. He maintains that as far as there is faithfulness in the Temple worship and its cultus, the Davidic dynastic covenant is fulfilled in it. However, the non-existence of the Davidic kingdom could prompt the Chronicler’s desire for its revival rather than its replacement by the Temple and its cultus. Particularly, as we investigated the structure of Abijah’s speech in 2 Chronicles 13, there are two emphases: the eternity of the Davidic covenant in vv. 4b-8a and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus in vv. 8b-12. 305 Riley needs to acknowledge the significance of the first part of Abijah’s speech, the eternity of the Davidic covenant, along with the second part of the speech. Furthermore, the text does not give any clue that the Davidic covenant is fulfilled through the Israelites’ faithfulness to the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus.
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4. Conclusion

As the above investigation demonstrates, the Chronicler expresses his desire for the revival of the Davidic dynasty in 2 Chronicles 13. The synoptic comparison between 2 Chr 13 and 1 Kgs 15:1-8 reveals the following four results. First, the Chronicler’s only synchronism in 2 Chr 13:1 indicates the sharp contrast between Abijah and Jeroboam as the protagonist and antagonist respectively within the narrative. Secondly, unlike the Deuteronomist’s Abijam, which carries a pagan element, the Chronicler’s Abijah, which denotes a divine element, contributes to the positive image of Abijah. Thirdly, Abijah’s mother’s name and its modifier in Chronicles, ‘Micayahu, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah’ (contra ‘Maacah daughter of Absalom’) further establishes a positive portrait of Abijah. If ‘Maacah, daughter of Absalom’ has pagan elements and denotes rebellion against the Davidic dynasty, then Micayahu and its modifier, ‘Uriel of Gibeah’ have divine and Israelite implications. Fourth, whereas 1 Kgs 15:3-5 includes a negative evaluation of Abijah, the Chronicler does not have this synoptic text in 2 Chronicles 13. Although 1 Kgs 15:4-5 mentions the Davidic covenant, due to its inseparable relationship to 1 Kgs 15:3, where Abijah is negatively assessed, the Chronicler excludes 1 Kgs 15:3-5 as a set.

2 Chronicles 13 sheds light on the Chronicler’s hope for the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty. The six arguments for this are as follows. First, in Abijah’s speech, the Chronicler’s equation of the kingdom of David with the kingdom of YHWH indicates the significance of the Davidic kingdom for the Chronicler. Secondly, the two foci of Abijah’s speech, the eternity of the Davidic dynasty and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus, are of equal import. Thirdly, the battle between Abijah and Jeroboam takes the form of holy war and Abijah’s complete victory reinforces the Davidic covenant in Abijah’s speech. Fourthly, the Chronicler portrays Abijah positively throughout the chapter. Using the literary device of antithesis, the Chronicler discloses the laudible image of Abijah which heightens the validity and significance of the king’s speech. Fifthly, Abijah’s speech begins with יִשְׂרָאֵל and the other five occurrences of יִשְׂרָאֵל in Chronicles occur in the speeches of God’s prophets and the approved kings of Judah. The Chronicler intends to express
his ideology of the eternity of the Davidic covenant in Abijah’s speech. Finally, a strong piece of evidence for the Chronicler’s hope for the revival of the Davidic dynasty is the phrase, מַלְאָה יְהֹוָה, which signifies permanency. The hiatus of the Davidic kingdom does not mean the failure of the covenant of salt, but the permanent covenant of salt is the foundation of the Davidic dynasty even in its hiatus.

Against the Chronicler’s hope for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty reflected in 2 Chronicles 13, Caquot claims that 2 Chr 13:5 is not the Chronicler’s own words but those of Solomon’s successor. However, considering God’s support for Abijah’s speech through the king’s victory in battle, the Chronicler’s use of מַלְאָה יְהֹוָה to express his theology, and his insertion of Abijah’s speech as his Sondergut, we cannot simply accept that 2 Chr 13:5 is the word of a Davidic king which has no relation to the Chronicler’s intention. Pomykala contends that the focus of Abijah’s speech is the condemnation of Jeroboam’s usurpation rather than the renewal of the Davidic dynasty. However, the condemnation of Jeroboam’s usurpation cannot be considered without advocating the Davidic covenant. Riley claims that the Jerusalem Temple and its cultus replaced the Davidic dynasty in the postexilic period so that it is the Israelites’ faithfulness to the Jerusalem Temple that fulfills the Davidic covenant. However, he does not explain how the Davidic covenant persists in the Israelites’ faithfulness to the Temple and its cultus.
IX. The Davidic Covenant in 2 Chr 21:2-7

1. Setting

2 Chr 21:2-7 is the beginning of a larger unit, 2 Chr 21:2-23:21, in which the Davidic line is jeopardized through the reign of Jehoram, Ahaziah and Athaliah. The danger stems from Jehoshaphat’s alliance with Israel’s king, Ahab, who was influenced by his idolatrous wife, Jezebel. Jehoram, husband of Athaliah (Ahab’s daughter), and Ahaziah (Athaliah’s son) followed the idolatry of the house of Ahab, and when Ahaziah died, Athaliah ruled Judah seeking to exterminate the Davidic seed. In this succession of idolatry and the decline of the Davidic dynasty, it is significant that the Davidic covenant is reconfirmed in 2 Chr 21:7, the last verse of the introduction to Jehoram’s reign (2 Chr 21:2-7).

2. Synoptic Comparison

The text of 2 Chr 21:2-7 corresponds to 2 Kgs 8:16-19 of the Deuteronomistic history. The longer text of Chronicles is due mainly to the Chronicler’s insertion of Jehoram’s heinous sin of murdering his brothers in 2 Chr 21:2-4. Without the synchronic introductory formula of 2 Kgs 8:16 (‘In the fifth year of King Joram son of Ahab of Israel, Jehoram son of King Jehoshaphat of Judah began to reign’), the Chronicler includes a fratricide account that is not found in Kings. Remarkably, the fratricide occurs before the introductory resumé of Jehoram (v. 5), which one would normally expect to be placed in the forefront of the unit. In 2 Kings 8, Jehoram’s introductory resumé (v. 17) along with the synchronic introduction (v. 16) appear at the beginning of Jehoram’s account. By locating Jehoram’s heinous fratricide even before the introductory resumé formula, the Chronicler highlights the wickedness of Jehoram. In fact, Jehoram’s killing of his brothers indicates not only his wickedness but also the danger he poses to the Davidic line.

Having inserted the account of Jehoram’s fratricide, the Chronicler places an introductory resumé formula for Jehoram and negative assessment of him in vv. 5 and
6. Jehoram is unfavorably evaluated for his religious unfaithfulness to YHWH as v. 6a states:

He walked in the way of the kings of Israel, as the house of Ahab had done; for the daughter of Ahab was his wife.

2 Chr 21:13 gives a concrete meaning to the phrase ‘walking in the way of the kings of Israel, as the house of Ahab’, explaining it as Judah’s religious harlotry against YHWH:

But have walked in the way of the kings of Israel, and have led Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem into unfaithfulness as the house of Ahab led Israel into unfaithfulness, and because you also have killed your brothers, members of your father’s house, who were better than yourself.

As v. 13 states, Jehoram’s sins are two-fold: idolatry and fratricide. The two sins are already presented in the introduction of Jehoram’s account in 2 Chr 21:2-7.

The introductory resumé and negative assessment of Jehoram forms an inclusio with the concluding resumé formula and negative assessment of Jehoram in 2 Chr 21:20:

He was thirty-two years old when he began to reign; he reigned eight years in Jerusalem. He departed with no one’s regret. They buried him in the city of David, but not in the tombs of the kings.

Between the introduction of Jehoram’s account (2 Chr 21:2-7) and the concluding remark (2 Chr 21:20), there are specific incidents that depict Jehoram as unequivocally negative: Edom’s revolt against Judah (vv. 8-10a); Libnah’s revolt against Judah (v.10b); Jehoram’s apostasy (v. 11); Elijah’s threatening letter (vv. 12-15); the attack of Philistines and Arabs against Judah (vv. 16-17); and the horrible disease of Jehoram and his death (vv. 18-19). All these incidents contribute to the negative portrait of Jehoram and they are the Chronicler’s Sondergut except for the account of Edom and Libnah’s revolts. In this deep darkness of the Jehoram account,
v. 7, being paralleled with 2 Kgs 8:19, sheds a light of hope. Since some discrepancies exist between 2 Chr 21:7 and 2 Kgs 8:19, it is worthwhile comparing them in order to detect what the Chronicler thought of the Davidic dynasty.

2. 1. 2 Kgs 8:19//2 Chr 21:7

Yet the LORD would not destroy Judah, for the sake of his servant David, since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever. (2 Kgs 8:19)

Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David for the sake of the covenant that he had made with David, and since he had promised to give a lamp to him and to his descendants forever. (2 Chr 21:7, my translation)

Three different points are relevant for our discussion of the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Kgs 8:19</th>
<th>2 Chr 21:7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יְהוָה (‘Judah’)</td>
<td>בְּיתוֹ (‘the house of David’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לְפָנָיו (‘for the sake of David, his servant’)</td>
<td>לְפָנָיו (‘for the sake of the covenant that he made with David’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לְבָנָיו (‘to his descendants’)</td>
<td>לְבָנָיו (‘and to his descendants’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the Chronicler’s ‘the house of David’ (*contra* ‘Judah’), scholars suggest different approaches. Curtis and Madsen suppose that Judah’s captivity forced the Chronicler to make this change. They argue that it would be burdensome for the Chronicler to adopt the clause, ‘But YHWH would not destroy Judah’, considering

---

Judah’s destruction and the exile. The Chronicler thus restricted the promise to the house of David. This view is not convincing because יתב אワイד per se refers to the Davidic dynasty, that is Judah. Nathan’s oracle concerning the Davidic covenant clearly shows that to build the house of David is to build the Davidic kingdom:

I declare to you that the LORD will build you a house. When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. (1 Chr 17:10b-12)

Dillard, on the other hand, finds a clue for this divergence in the Chronicler’s postexilic background. According to Dillard, the Chronicler expresses his longing for the rise of the Davidic throne through the expression ‘But YHWH would not destroy the house of David’ at a time when Judah is restored under the rule of Persia but the Davidic throne is lost. However, does the Chronicler believe that Judah is restored in his time? Though many of the Israelites returned from exile under the auspices of the Persian ruler and rebuilt the Temple, Judah (or the province of Yehud) is not independent under the rule of Persia. Hence, it is doubtful that the Chronicler believed Judah as restored thus causing the modification of ‘Judah’ to ‘the house of David’.

Another approach is that of Japhet, who insists that the Chronicler, believing in individual retribution, replaced ‘Judah’ with ‘the house of David’ because the merit of the king would not protect Judah. Japhet suggests that in Chronicles, an individual is awarded for his or her own merit just as an individual is punished for his or her own sin. According to Japhet, since David’s individual merit cannot benefit corporate Judah in Chronicles, he substituted it with ‘the house of David’. The
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The weakness of Japhet’s argument is that ‘the house of David’ is also corporate, either synchronically or diachronically, just as ‘Judah’ is corporate. Though she acknowledges the element of ancestral merit in 2 Chr 21:7, she treats it as an unusual case that does not fit the Chronicler’s scheme of individual retribution.311

Why, then, does the Chronicler use the phrase, בְּנֵי בֵּית דָּוִד? On the surface, the Chronicler achieves an effect of antithesis between ‘the house of David’ and ‘the house of Ahab’ of v.6:312

He walked in the way of the kings of Israel, as the house of Ahab had done; for the daughter of Ahab was his wife. He did what was evil in the sight of the LORD. Yet the LORD would not destroy the house of David because of the covenant that he had made with David… (2 Chr 21:6-7)

More substantially, the Chronicler aims to motivate the postexilic readers to remember the Davidic covenant by using the phrase, ‘the house of David’ which is more specific than the general term, ‘Judah’. Why does the Chronicler want the postexilic Israelites to remember the Davidic covenant? He is motivated, I would submit, by his desire for the restoration of the Davidic throne.

Secondly, the Chronicler’s direct mention of the covenant of David in his phrase, ‘for the sake of the covenant that he made with David’ (contra ‘for the sake of David, his servant’) reinforces the Chronicler’s intention as we have described. Here, the Chronicler’s specification is heightened by his: בְּנֵי בֵּית דָּוִד אֶת עֵאוֹר הַרוֹתֵר (‘the covenant that he made with David’). This is the only place in Chronicles where ‘the covenant made with David’ is explicitly mentioned. Lemke is somewhat hesitant to find the Chronicler’s Tendenz here by attributing the difference to a minor variance.313 However, as we have already discussed in 2 Chr 7:18, the Chronicler prefers specific covenant language to the more general phraseology of 1 Kgs 9:5.314 Both these instances argue for the presence of the Chronicler’s Tendenz:
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Then I will establish your royal throne over Israel for ever, as I spoke (ךֵּבֶר נְכֶדְתָּא) to David your father. (1 Kgs 9:5a, my translation)

Then I will establish your royal throne, as I covenanted (ךֵּבֶר נְכֶדְתָּא) with your father David. (2 Chr 7:18a, my translation)

Here, the Chronicler stresses the covenantal nature by using a more specific term of covenant, כֵּבֶר נְכֶדְתָּא (contra כֵּבֶר נְכֶדְתָּא). The conspicuousness of the first two covenant-specific phrases of 2 Chronicles 21 lies in the full-scale negative assessment of Jehoram. The Chronicler’s explicit mention of the Davidic covenant as the source of Judah’s sustenance, despite the wholesale wickedness of Jehoram, points to the unconditionality of the Davidic covenant.315

The unconditional nature of the covenant is combined with its perpetuity in the next clause where the third discrepancy occurs:

כָּאָשֶׁר אָמַר לְאָלֶלְלָה אֲלֹהִים לְעַד עַל נָגַר לַכֵּל נְכֶדְתָּא קְלָלָה
dayim

Since he said to him to give a lamp to him to his descendants all the days. (2 Kgs 8:19b)

וַכָּאָשֶׁר אָמַר לְאָלֶלְלָה אֲלֹהִים לְעַד עַל נָגַר לַכֵּל נְכֶדְתָּא קְלָלָה
dayim

And since he said to give a lamp to him and his descendants all the days. (2 Chr 21:7b)

While there is no ו attached to לַכֵּל נְכֶדְתָּא in 2 Kgs 8:19, ו is attached to לַכֵּל נְכֶדְתָּא in 2 Chr 21:7, so that the text may read smoothly. Moreover, the Chronicler conveys that the Davidic covenant has an effect on the posterity of David. Though this is a small touch, we can read into it the Chronicler’s hope for the future restoration of the dynasty.316

In particular, within the context of the Davidic dynasty, ‘giving a נְכֶדְתָּא (‘lamp’)’ is a metaphor representing the continuity of this dynasty.317 Rebutting the

---

315 Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 305.

316 Ibid.

317 The form נְכֶדְתָּא occurs four times in the Old Testament: 1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19; 2 Chr 21:7. Paul Hanson suggests a different rendering of נְכֶדְתָּא as ‘dominion’ in his article, “The Song of Heshbon and David’s NIR,” HTR 61 (1968), 297-320. Whether נְכֶדְתָּא is identified as either ‘lamp’ (BDB, 633,
Chronicler’s belief in the eternity of the Davidic dynasty, Riley claims that "惆 is an indicator of the Jerusalem Temple or its cultus. According to Riley, 2 Chr 21:7 states that the Davidic dynasty needs to continue until the establishment of "惆, that is, the Temple or the Temple cultus. However, if "惆 refers to the Jerusalem Temple, Riley’s view is untenable because the Jerusalem Temple was established in the Solomonic period, several decades before Jehoram’s reign.

It is also unconvincing to view "惆 as referring to the Jerusalem temple cultus. In Riley’s view, the Davidic dynasty continues in Jehoram’s time despite his wickedness due to the uncompleted task of the Temple cultus. He finds the completion of the Temple cultus during Josiah’s reign, which is the beginning of the end of the Davidic dynasty in Chronicles:

After all this, when Josiah had set the temple in order ( Decrypt: After all this, when Josiah had set the temple in order), King Neco of Egypt went up to fight at Carchemish on the Euphrates, and Josiah went out against him. (2 Chr 35:20)

Riley regards the circumstantial clause as an indication of the completion of the Temple cultus and the remainder of Chronicles (2 Chr 35:20b – 2 Chr 36) as the description of Judah’s destruction. Josiah was killed by Neco’s archers and his followers, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, took the steps necessary to ensure the dynastic collapse.

However, a close reading of the text reveals that the clause does not signal the completion of the Temple cultus

---

318 Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 173, 179.
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but is the Chronicler’s literary device for summing up a section and for introducing the following part.\textsuperscript{322} In fact, Josiah’s setting up (\(דלת\)) the Temple designates the particular Passover celebration in the Temple narrated in 2 Chr 35:1-19, rather than the completion of the cultic system of the Temple. This summary clause (‘After all this, when Josiah had set the Temple in order’) also functions as a bridge to a new episode about Josiah’s war against Neco, king of Egypt. As Japhet observes, there is a similar case in 2 Chr 32:1a:\textsuperscript{323}

\textit{After these things and these acts of faithfulness (חנורוים המקרכים \(\text{ימאנה} \text{אלל} \text{אלל}\)) King Sennacherib of Assyria came and invaded Judah.}

\(\text{חנורוים} \text{ימאנה} \text{אלל}\) refers to Hezekiah’s faithful service in the Temple of God as the previous verse reveals:

\begin{quote}
And every work that he undertook in the service of the house of God, and in accordance with the law and the commandments, to seek his God, he did with all his heart; and he prospered. (2 Chr 30:21)
\end{quote}

In 2 Chr 32:1, the Chronicler likewise uses the literary device of a circumstantial summary clause to bridge the new episode of Sennacherib’s invasion of Judah as he did to introduce a new account of Neco’s invasion in 2 Chr 35:20. Just as the Chronicler compliments Hezekiah and his cultic faithfulness (2 Chr 29-31) before the new episode in 2 Chr 32:1, so also Josiah’s cultic faithfulness is mentioned before the new episode in 2 Chr 35:1. Thus, the circumstantial clause of 2 Chr 35:20 (‘\textit{after all this, when Josiah had set the Temple in order}’) is to be viewed as a literary device of recapitulation and anticipation. It is not the Chronicler’s declaration of the completion of the Temple cultus.

Against the Chronicler’s belief in the renewal of the Davidic dynasty, Pomykala asserts that the Chronicler’s two alterations (‘the house of David’ instead of

\textsuperscript{322} Japhet, \textit{I & II Chronicles}, 1055.

\textsuperscript{323} Ibid.
‘Judah’ and ‘for the sake of the covenant that he made with David’ instead of ‘for the sake of David, his servant’) only suggest YHWH’s commitment to Davidic dynasty rather than the idea that it continues without end.324 Pomykala holds that the evidence lies in the 150 to 225 years between the fall of Judah and the Chronicler’s time.325 However, Pomykala’s approach to the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic covenant is too simplistic. As discussed above with regard to 1 Chronicles 17, YHWH’s promise for the Davidic house in Chronicles would not depart from it even after his chastisement.326 When the period of God’s discipline of Israel is over, the Israelites were entitled to hope for the renewal of the Davidic dynasty based on YHWH’s promised to David. McKenzie’s statement aptly exemplifies my point:

The reign of Athaliah is particularly instructive in this regard. That there is no Davidide on the throne for six years is not seen by the Chronicler as negating the promise to David. Rather, it is the promise that accounts for the survival of Joash and his eventual replacement of Athaliah. In the Chronicler’s postexilic context this must have been a source of hope for the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. God had promised David an enduring dynasty; like Athaliah’s reign, the exile represented a hiatus that did not negate the promise. Moreover, the exile, like Athaliah’s reign, was preceded and even occasioned by wicked kings. But human wickedness does not nullify divine promise.327

3. Conclusion

2 Chr 21:7 witnesses the Chronicler’s firm belief in the renewal of the Davidic dynasty based on the Davidic covenant. In the midst of the full-scale negative assessment of Jehoram, the Chronicler explicitly mentions that God is not willing to destroy the Davidic kingdom because he made a covenant with David. It is remarkable that in Chronicles, the sole mention of the explicit phrase of the Davidic covenant (מדבריה אֵשֶׁר קִרָּובָה לְרוֹאֵי) occurs in the account of Jehoram’s heinous sins of idolatry and fratricide that endanger the Davidic line. The three divergencies

324 Pomykala, The Davidic Dynastic Tradition in Early Judaism, 102.

325 Ibid.

326 See pp. 39-42 of this work.

327 McKenzie, 1-2 Chronicles, 312-313.
between 2 Chr 21:7 and its parallel text of 2 Kgs 8:19 are significant signals for understanding the Chronicler’s view of the Davidic kingdom. With the first two covenant-specific phrases, the Chronicler rouses the postexilic readers’ expectations for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty based on the covenant. In the third divergence, it is observed that the Chronicler emphasizes the efficacy of the promise for the posterity of David. In particular, God’s granting a lamp to David and his descendants stresses the Chronicler’s hope in the continuity of the Davidic line. For the Chronicler, this continuity is not necessarily without interruption; the cessation of the Davidic dynasty is not a sign of the breaking up or expiration of the Davidic covenant. Rather, the Chronicler finds hope for the renewal of the Davidic throne in the Davidic covenant, which is not abandoned even in the darkness of Jehoram’s reign.
1. Setting

In the history of the kingdom of Judah, Athaliah’s reign (2 Chr 22:10-12) is conspicuous because it is the only period in which a non-Davidic line ruled over Judah. Upon the murder of Ahaziah by Jehu, Athaliah, Ahaziah’s mother, sat on the throne of Judah presuming that no Davidic line survived. However, her presumption was incorrect as Joash was hidden and secretly raised by Jehoshabeath, wife of Jehoiada, the high priest. In the seventh year of Athaliah’s reign, Jehoiada conspired to restore the Davidic kingdom by crowning Joash, the sole survivor of the Davidic line, as king.

2 Chr 23:1-3 concerns the beginning of Jehoida’s counter-coup against Athaliah. Significantly, the Davidic covenant is included in Jehoida’s proclamation to those assembled (v. 3). This is followed by Jehoida’s specific instructions to the assembly for the coup (2 Chr 23:4-7).

2. Synoptic Comparison

2 Kgs 11:4 is the synoptic partner of 2 Chr 23:1-3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Kgs 11:4</th>
<th>2 Chr 23:1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>והנה השכינה שליה זוהרה</td>
<td>והנה השכינה שליה זוהרה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נleck 아주ות</td>
<td>נleck 아주ות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דער מיכים</td>
<td>דער מיכים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואת משניהם כפרינו ואות אלאישם</td>
<td>ואת משניהם כפרינו ואות אלאישם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונרבני העם</td>
<td>ונרבני העם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובארם י.Validate</td>
<td>ובארם י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לארם י.Validate</td>
<td>לארם י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מקים י.Validate</td>
<td>מקים י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לארם י.Validate</td>
<td>לארם י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והנה כילה וכלמך</td>
<td>והנה כילה וכלמך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תעדה בכל הארץ</td>
<td>תעדה בכל הארץ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואת עמדן</td>
<td>ואת עמדן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והנה השכינה שליה זוהרה</td>
<td>והנה השכינה שליה זוהרה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נleck 아주ות</td>
<td>נleck 아주ות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דער מיכים</td>
<td>דער מיכים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואת משניהם כפרינו ואות אלאישם</td>
<td>ואת משניהם כפרינו ואות אלאישם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ונרבני העם</td>
<td>ונרabı העם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובארם י.Validate</td>
<td>ובארם י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובארם י.Validate</td>
<td>ובארם י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מקים י.Validate</td>
<td>מקים י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לארם י.Validate</td>
<td>לארם י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מקים י.Validate</td>
<td>מקים י.Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לארם י.Validate</td>
<td>לארם י.Validate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But in the seventh year Jehoiada summoned the captains of the Carites and of the guards and had them come to him in the house of the LORD. He made a covenant with them and put them under oath in the house of the LORD; then he showed them the king’s son.

As the above comparison shows, 2 Chr 23:1-3 is longer than 2 Kgs 11:4 and some differences exist between the two texts. The Chronicler list more names of the participants of Jehoiada’s conspiracy. Whereas in the 2 Kings account, Jehoida conspires with the captains of the Carites and of the guard (חניאים כרימות), who are the foreign bodyguards of the king (2 Kgs 11:4), the Chronicler presents more co-conspirators: the five captains of hundreds (...חניאים כרימות), Levites from all the cities of Judah, and the heads of the families of Israel. The Chronicler’s (כליות למים) (‘all the assembly’) in 2 Chr 23:3 demonstrates unequivocally a larger participation in the coup. As ‘all Israel’ (כליות למים) gathered in Hebron for David’s coronation (1 Chr 11:1) and ‘all the assembly’ (כליות למים) joined in David’s bringing of the ark (1 Chr 13:4), made a covenant with the Davidic king, Joash, in 2 Chr 23:3. It is significant that the Chronicler designates Joash as king even before the completion of the coup. This early designation of Joash as king even before the completion of the coup. This early designation of Joash as king betrays the Chronicler’s conviction that Joash is the only legitimate king of Judah even before his coronation.329

This large group of supporters match the Chronicler’s use of a more spacious place for the gathering of the assembly. While the gathering place is the Temple in 2

328 BDB, 501.

329 Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 315.
Kgs 11:4 (וָיֶּלֶן אֶלֶּה אֲשֶׁר בָּהָיִם בֵּית יְהוָא, ‘And he had them come to him (in) the house of God’) the Chronicler presents Jerusalem as the gathering place (וִיהָֽוָא אֲשֶׁר יָהַשָּׁבוּ, ‘And they came to Jerusalem’). It is also noteworthy that while the Deuteronomist describes the partakers’ gathering in the clause, אֲשֶׁר ובָּהָיִם (the hifil form of בָּהָיִם with the object אֲשֶׁר), the Chronicler renders the partakers of the coup as active voluntary supporters by using בָּהָיִם. The implication of the larger and more proactive support for the coup is to enhance its justification. That is to say, the Chronicler carries a much stronger message than the Deuteronomist that the Davidic line is to be restored in the kingdom of Judah as YHWH promised to the Davidic family.

The difference in the Chronicler’s account of the coup-supporters is qualitative as well as quantitative. While the coup in 2 Kgs 11:4 unfolds only with the assistance of the Carites, the Chronicler’s account includes important leaders of the Israelites community, such as the Levites and family heads.330 ‘רֶאֶשׁ, הָאָבֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל?’ (‘the heads of the fathers of Israel’) are a group who play an important part elsewhere in Chronicles. They are present as a representative of Israel in David’s final address (1 Chr 29:6), in Solomon’s worship at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:2), and in Solomon’s installation of the ark in the Temple (2 Chr 5:2). Additionally, Jehoshaphat appoints them as the administrators of the Judgment of YHWH (2 Chr 19:8). ‘The heads of the fathers of Israel’, more so than ‘the heads of the fathers of Judah’, reflect the theologically idealistic representative of the whole of Israel.331 In sum, Jehoiada’s rebellion with the support of a large group of people is no longer a coup. It is, in the Chronicler's conception, a grassroots revolution! For the Chronicler, it may be more appropriate to consider it as Jehoiada’s reformation.

330 Some argue that the five captains over hundreds in 2 Chr 23:1 are the Levites (Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 271; Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 315; McKenzie, 1-2 Chronicles, 309), but this assertion is without certainty. Citing Kalimi’s work, Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten, 71-72, McKenzie states that all the names in 2 Chr 23:1 occur in other lists of priests and Levites in Chronicles, but, in fact, Kalimi does not say that all the names in 2 Chr 23:1 are the names of priests and Levites in other places of Chronicles. In fact, ‘Elishaphat’ as priest or Levite, does not occur in Chronicles. As Japhet holds, the names are too common to be used for their Levitical identity and the particular title, רֶאֶשׁ לְיִשְׁרָאֵל (‘captains of the hundreds’) does not attest in Chronicles for the Levites (I & II Chronicles, 830).

331 Johnstone, I & II Chronicles II, 123.
The Davidic covenant is placed on the lips of Jehoiada in 2 Chr 23:3b:

יִאמָרִי לָהֶם לֵאמֹר: יִשְׂרָאֵל הַכֹּהֵן הֵם תַּעֲנָנֵו יִשְׂרָאֵל אָבַר חָכָם

And he said to them. ‘Behold the son of the king! Let him rule as the Lord spoke to the descendants of David!’ (my translation)

Jehoida’s statement corresponds to the last clause of 2 Kgs 11:4:

הָן אֲחָכִי אֻתְּם המלך

Then he (Jehoida) showed them the king’s son.

The Chronicler’s insertion of the Davidic covenant itself implies his longing for the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom. Riley, however, opposes this implication. Rather, he believes that Jehoida’s coup is to be read in the context of the reign of the non-Davidic usurper and not of the lost kingdom.332 According to Riley, when there is a Davidide, he should be a king, but the promise does not speak of the permanent installation of the Davidic dynasty.333 However, we do not need to assume that there was no available Davidide who survived in the Chronicler’s time. Riley argues that the precedence of הֵם as a subject before the verb, המלך in 2 Chr 23:3b is atypical in terms of word order and it reveals the Chronicler’s interest in the coup against a non-Davidide when a Davidide survives.334 The inverted word order indicates the Chronicler’s emphasis on the Davidide. However, there is no implication in this word order that the Chronicler emphasizes the Davidide only when a Davidide exists. In the postexilic context, the plea, ‘Let him rule as the Lord spoke to the descendants of David!’ resounds with the aspiration of a Davidide sitting upon the throne.

3. Conclusion

332 Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles*, 124.

333 Ibid.

334 Ibid
Not only the Davidic covenant on the lips of Jehoida in 2 Chr 23:3, but the Chronicles’ textual pluses and divergencies in comparison with 2 Kgs 11:4 reveal a more thorough justification for Jehoida’s coup in Chronicles. The larger list of the partakers of the coup (2 Chr 23:1) with the inclusion of important figures such as the Levites and the heads of the fathers of Israel (2 Chr 23:2), and the explicit designation of the participants, כְּלָלֵי הָעַם (2 Chr 23:3), witness widespread support for Jehoida’s restoration of the Davidic line. Furthermore, the Chronicler renders the partakers voluntarily as part of the coup by the term, יִשהָנוּ (contra יִשָּׁנָו of 2 Kgs 11:4) in 2 Chr 23:2. The Chronicler, as a meticulous writer, does not forget to designate Jerusalem (contra the Temple of 2 Kgs 11:4) as the place of assembly for the large group of partakers of the coup. Also, the early designation of ‘king’ to Joash even before the completion of the coup (2 Chr 23:3) enhances the legitimacy of the restoration of the Davidic line. The Chronicler reveals in his justification of Jehoida’s restoration of the Davidic king a longing for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom in his own postexilic time.
XI. Conclusion

The foregoing investigation of all the texts of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles (1 Chr 17:1-27; 22:6-13; 28:2-10; 2 Chr 1:8-10; 6:3-17, 40-42; 7:17-22; 13:1-22; 21:2-7; 23:1-3) has been conducted to answer the main question of this research: ‘Does the Book of Chronicles support in the Davidic covenant the restoration of the Davidic kingdom, or does it replace that promise with the Temple and its cultus?’ A close reading of the nine texts which mention the Davidic covenant reveals that the Chronicler, as the author of the book of Chronicles, is consistent in putting forth his hope for the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom in the postexilic age. Both the synoptic texts of Chronicles and Samuel-Kings and the non-synoptic passages witness the Chronicler’s longing for the revival of the royal house of David.

The synoptic texts are as follows: 1 Chr 17:1-27; 2 Chr 1:8-10; 2 Chr 6:3-17; 40-42; 2 Chr 7:17-22; 2 Chr 13:1-22; 2 Chr 21:2-7; 2 Chr 23:1-3. The text of 1 Chr 17:1-27 takes prime position in the discussion of the Davidic covenant, not just among the synoptic texts but among all the texts that deal with the dynastic promise in Chronicles, because it presents the divine conferral of the royal promise to the Davidic house; the other Davidic covenant texts either refer to or rely upon it. In particular, our investigation of the crucial divergence between the two texts, ‘Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever’ (2 Sam 7:16) and ‘I will confirm him in my house and in my kingdom forever’ (1 Chr 17:14) leads us to conclude that the Temple and its cultus do not replace the Davidic dynasty in Chronicles. Rather, the Chronicler enhances the role of the Davidic house in the cultic institution of the Temple.

It was also observed that the Chronicler faithfully includes the Davidic covenant. For instance, Nathan’s oracle in 1Chr 17:1-27 agrees closely with 2 Sam 7:1-29, the most significant text of the Davidic covenant in the Deuteronomistic history. Moreover, in 2 Chr 1:8-10, the Chronicler rather conspicuously includes the Davidic covenant with a jussive form (v. 9), which is not present in its synoptic text, 1 Kgs 3:7-8.
It was also argued that the Chronicler underscores the Davidic covenant by presenting the covenant or covenant-specific terms. At the end of Solomon’s Temple dedication prayer, the Chronicler inserts God’s promise through David (2 Chr 6:42, *contra* the divine promise through Moses of 1 Kgs 8:52). However, and despite the priority of the Davidic covenant, the Chronicler does not appear to have suppressed the Mosaic-Sinai covenant in order to magnify the Davidic covenant. The Chronicler prefers a covenant-specific term, ‘to covenant’ (2 Chr 7:18) to a generic term, ‘to speak’ (1 Kgs 9:5); he also chooses the phrases, ‘the house of David’ (*contra* ‘Judah’ of 2 Kgs 8:19) and ‘for the sake of the covenant that he made with David’ (*contra* ‘for the sake of his servant David’ of 2 Kgs 8:19) in 2 Chr 21:7.

We also discovered that in the synoptic texts that there are circumlocutory elements that have been included because of the Davidic covenant. In 2 Chronicles 13, the Chronicler presents the name and genealogy of the speaker of the Davidic covenant favorably: ‘Abijah’ (*contra* ‘Abijam’ of 1 Kings), and ‘Michayahu, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah’ (2 Chr 13:2, *contra* ‘Maacah, daughter of Abishalom’ of 1 Kgs 15:2). If ‘Abijam’ and ‘Maacah, daughter of Abishalom’ of 1 Kings carries pagan and rebellious elements, then the Chronicler’s ‘Abijah’ and ‘Michayahu, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah’ import divine and Israelite elements, thereby enhancing the validity of the covenant. Abijah’s speech begins with the command phrase, ‘Hear me!’; it was shown that this was a catchword used in the mouth of God’s approved agent to articulate the theology of Chronicles. In addition, the holy war motif in the war narrative between Abijah and Jeroboam, and Abijah’s complete victory over Jeroboam both serve to reinforce Abijah’s proclamation of the Davidic covenant. Moreover, the Chronicler’s use of strong covenant terminology, ‘covenant of salt’, in 2 Chr 13:5 points to his belief in the perpetuity of the Davidic kingdom.

When we compared the account of Jehoida’s coup against Athaliah 2 Chr 23:1-3 with its parallel 2 Kgs 11:4, it was suggested that, besides the explicit insertion of the Davidic covenant, other indirect factors heighten the centrality of the Davidic dynasty in this text. These include the large number of participants in the coup, the participation of prominent figures, the explicit designation ‘all the assembly’ as...
supporters, the subsequent large gathering place, and the calling of Joash as ‘king’ even before the completion of the coup.

Out of the nine texts in Chronicles that mention the Davidic covenant, two are non-synoptic texts: 1 Chr 22:6-13 and 1 Chr 28:4-5. The Chronicler’s inclusion of the dynastic promise in the non-synoptic texts per se reveals his concern for the Davidic house. Though there are arguments for considering 1 Chr 28:4-5 as a secondary expansion, those arguments do not withstand close scrutiny. Rather, 1 Chr 28:4-5 is part of the cohesive chiastic structure of 1 Chr 28:4-7.

Furthermore, across both the synoptic and non-synoptic texts of Chronicles that discuss the Davidic covenant, there is other evidence that highlights the Chronicler’s hope for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty. The Chronicler often attaches ‘ōlām to the Davidic covenant (e.g., 1 Chr 17:12, 14, 23, 27; 22:10; 28:4, 7; 2 Chr 13:5; 21:7). Since its semantic range varies from ‘far off’ to ‘eternal’ based on its context, it was argued that the original context of the Davidic covenant of Nathan’s oracle in 1 Chronicles 17 is key to narrowing down the meaning of this word. In the investigation of ‘ōlām in 1 Chronicles 17, it has been argued that its meaning is ‘eternal’ rather than ‘far off’ in the future.

It was also found that both unconditional and conditional elements occur in Chronicles and that the former intends the revival of the Davidic dynasty. In terms of the inclusion of unconditionality and conditionality, the nine texts relating to the Davidic covenant may be divided into four groups: unconditional (1 Chr 17:11-14; 2 Chr 13:5; 21:6-7; 23:1-3), conditional (2 Chr 6:3-17; 7:17-22), both unconditional and conditional (1 Chr 22:10-13; 28:4-7), and neutral (2 Chr 1:8). The retention of both the unconditionality and conditionality of the Davidic covenant does not, however, mean that the Chronicler was inconsistent. Rather, in my view, the Chronicler views the two as complementary. The royal promise is conditional in the sense that the Davidic kings are disciplined and punished, and the kingdom ceases to exist when it does not meet the conditions set down by YHWH; it is unconditional in that YHWH’s mercy will never depart from the kingdom.

The Chronicler’s equation of the Davidic kingdom with YHWH’s kingdom (1 Chr 17:14; 28:5; 2 Chr 13:8) enhances the significance of the Davidic dynasty.
Contrary to the common assumption that the Chronicler deprives the Davidic house of ownership over the kingdom by this equation, it has been argued that in this designation the Chronicler deliberately expresses the heightened importance of the Davidic dynasty.

Although it is often asserted that the Chronicler’s preservation of the Davidic covenant supports his anti-Samaritan polemic rather than any interest in the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, it was argued that a close reading of the text shows that the Chronicler instead wants to include the northern kingdom of Israel.

In order to downplay the importance of the Davidic covenant in Chronicles, some scholars insist that the protagonist of Chronicles is Solomon, not David. However, the texts betray the view that the Chronicler does not regard David and Solomon in competition; rather, the divine blessing upon Solomon is to be understood under the umbrella of the Davidic blessing.

Our analysis of the Chronicler’s presentation of the Davidic covenant sheds some light upon other issues concerning his views of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom, which are not discussed in this work, such as the elaborate genealogy of the Davidide Zerubbabel in 1 Chr 3:17-22, the lack of hatred of other nations, and the exclusion of the account of Jehoiachin’s release. If, as we have argued, the Chronicler hopes for the resurgence of the Davidic house when he uses the Davidic covenant, it would be natural to assume that the same Chronicler would include the Davidides’ detailed genealogy in his search for their restoration. Moreover, the absence of hatred of other nations in Chronicles is not an indicator of his disinterest in the future restoration of the Davidic kingdom. As argued above in the discussion of the Chronicler’s portrayal of the Davidic covenant, his expectation of the resurgence of the Davidic kingdom is political rather than messianic. Thus, in my view, the Chronicler would not have needed to embrace the hatred of other nations, which is a common feature of messianic prophecy within the prophetic literature.

Meanwhile, the Chronicler’s exclusion of the account of the release of Jehoiachin, which closes the Deuteronomistic history, is often used by scholars to suggest that the Chronicler was indifferent to the Davidides and their revival. However, Chronicles ends with a stronger restoration account; that is, the Cyrus edict
concerning the release of the Jews (2 Chr 36:23). Whereas Jehoiada is released from prison but is still confined in Babylon, the Cyrus edict releases Jews from Babylon to their own land. In other words, as I have argued, as the Chronicler expresses his hope for the restoration in his presentation of the Davidic covenant, he also seem to betray his longing for the revival of the Davidic kingdom by placing Cyrus’ edict of the Jews’ release at the end.

After a close reading of all the texts that mention the Davidic covenant in Chronicles, we find that the Davidic covenant is not absorbed into the Temple and its cultus. For the Chronicler, the Davidic kingdom takes its rightful place alongside the Temple and its cultus. The two foci of Abijah’s speech (2 Chronicles 13), which concern the eternity of the Davidic kingdom and the legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple, mirror the Chronicler’s intentions. As I see it, the Davidic covenant in Chronicles is not simply a narrated history or the account of past historical figures; rather, it is the Chronicler’s own profession of his belief. The Chronicler’s intensification of the royal promise in Chronicles shows that he is not satisfied simply with a Temple-centered priestly society. Rather, he longs for further change through the restoration of the lost kingdom by appealing to the Davidic covenant. The Davidic covenant expresses both the preservation of the Davidic kingdom in the preexilic period and its restoration in the post-exilic period.
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