

**The first temple: A comparative study of the presentation of the
roles of David and Solomon in its construction**

Master's Degrees by Examination and Dissertation

Declaration Form

1. This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Name: Doug Holland

Date: 28/12/2020

2. This dissertation is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Biblical Interpretation

Name: Doug Holland

Date: 28/12/2020

3. This dissertation is the result of my own independent work/investigation, except where otherwise stated.

Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references.

A bibliography is appended.

Name: Doug Holland

Date: 28/12/2020

4. I hereby give consent for my dissertation, if accepted, to be available for photocopying, inter-library loan, and for deposit in the University's digital repository

Name: Doug Holland

Date: 28/12/2020

Supervisor's Declaration.

I am satisfied that this work is the result of the student's own efforts.

Signed:

Date:

Contents

Abstract.....	4
Chapter 1: Introduction and Methodology of the Study	5
Chapter 2: Review of Scholarship.....	10
Chapter 3: A Comparative Analysis of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles in their Presentation of David and Solomon as Temple-builders	16
3.1: Context-setting and Language of the Samuel-Kings and Chronicles Narratives.....	16
3.2: The Chronicler's Amendments to Samuel/Kings.....	26
3.3 The Chronicler's Additions.....	30
Chapter 4: Findings of the Dissertation.....	42
Chapter 5: Conclusions	49
Bibliography.....	52

Abstract

The Hebrew bible contains two accounts of the construction of the first temple in Jerusalem in approximately 950 BCE. Each of these accounts, the first of which is found in Samuel-Kings and the second in the books of Chronicles, can be read as independent and comprehensive records of the events leading to and surrounding the building of the temple, and even an initial survey and comparison between the two reveals broad agreement and much commonality of content. However, closer scrutiny of the texts uncovers a considerable amount of discrepancy between the histories, both in terms of the content of the narratives (with some events common to both accounts and others exclusive to one or the other) and in the presentation of those events which appear in both versions.

This dissertation will examine the relevant texts to show the range and extent of the variations between the two accounts as they pertain in particular to their presentation of the roles of king David and his son Solomon in the construction of the temple. It will address the question of the extent to which the widely-accepted demarcation of roles between the two them, with David commonly credited with the notion that a temple should be built but Solomon regarded as the actual temple-builder, stands up to scrutiny, and if it does not survive a close examination what it is the texts which compromises this understanding and how the compromise takes place.

Chapter 1:

Introduction and Methodology of the Study

1.1 Introduction

There are two accounts in the Hebrew Bible of the events leading to and surrounding the construction of the First Temple in Jerusalem in approximately 950 BCE.¹ Both accounts purport to provide a history of the most significant events of this period, stretching from King David's initial plan to construct a temple (cf. 2 Sam. 7:2; 1 Chron. 17:1) to the dedication of the completed building some 12 years into the reign of his son, Solomon² (cf. 1 Kings 8; 2 Chron. 6:1-7).³ While the precise dating of these biblical accounts continues to be a matter of debate,⁴ there is general

¹The primary texts to be examined are as follows: 2 Samuel 7 and 1 Kings 5-9; 1 Chronicles 17, 22-23, 28-29; 2 Chronicles 2-7.

²Construction began in the second year of Solomon's reign (1 Kings 6:1-/2 Chron. 3:2) and took seven years (1 Kings 6:38). The dedication appears to have taken place almost 12 months later (see 1 Kings 6:38; and 2 Chron. 5:3). For the view that Solomon reigned in 962-922 BCE, see Roland E. Murphy, *Solomon*, The Oxford Companion To The Bible, ed. by Bruce M Metzger and Michael D Coogan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 707).

³The title of this dissertation reflects the virtually universal practice of referring to the building in question as the 'temple', and this will be the case throughout the work. Technically, however, the word 'temple' refers only to one of three sections of the building, the entirety of which is the 'house' which was built for God. The temple section of the house can be differentiated from the 'oracle' section – which subsequently, colloquially, became known as the 'holy of holies' – and the porch (1 Kings 6:2, 3, 17, 19). The word *hekhal* ('temple'),¹ is not at first applied, as afterwards, to the whole building, but is the designation specifically of for the holy place, in distinction from the *debhir*, or 'oracle'; (cf. 1 Kings 6:3, 5, 16, 17, 33, etc.; so in e.g., Ezek. 41:1, 2, 4, etc.). The wider usage is later (compare cf. 2 Kings 11:10, 11, 13, etc.).

⁴The main points of this debate are outlined in John W. Kleinig, 'Recent Research In Chronicles', *Currents in Research Biblical Studies* 2 (1994): 43-76, <D:/Masters%20Degree/mafiadoc.com_1-recent-research-in-chronicles-john-w-kleinig-tha_5a1b71e61723dd5532994ae4.pdf>, p.1. [accessed 9 October 2020] where he quotes, for example, Braun (Roddy Braun, *1 Chronicles*, World Biblical Commentary 14, General Eds. David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, (Waco: Word Books, 1986), p.29) and Throntveit (M. A. Throntveit, *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles* (SBLDS, 93; Atlanta: Scholars Press.1987) pp. 97-107), who date the original draft of Chronicles to about 515 BCE. Kleinig, while he notes that Williamson (H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, New Century Bible Commentary series (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1982) p.16) and others argue for a date of 350-350 BCE. The dating of the Samuel-Kings account is largely dependent on whether the books have been correctly identified as part of a Deuteronomistic history composed shortly before and/or during the Babylonian exile or whether they have an independent author. The only candidate for independent authorship is the prophet Samuel, which again places the book before 1 and 2 Chronicles. Williamson observes that the dating of the book 'is a matter of the greatest delicacy'; see - H. G. M. Williamson, 'Eschatology in Chronicles, The Tyndale Old Testament Lecture', *Tyndale Bulletin* 28 (1977), p. 121.

agreement amongst scholars that internal evidence supports the view that the books of Chronicles were written after those of Samuel and Kings. Thus, 2 Chronicles concludes with a description of the events leading to the return of the Jews from their Babylonian exile (2 Chron. 26:22-23) while the final verses of 2 Kings describe the early period of the exile (cf. 2 Kings 25:27). In terms of their chronology, 1 Kings follows 2 Samuel without any overlap, beginning as it does with the final short period before David's death (which is not mentioned in 2 Samuel), with 2 Kings then continuing the narrative, beginning by describing the injury sustained by Ahaziah, who was reigning as king in Israel at the conclusion of 1 Kings.

All of this strongly implies that the combined Samuel-Kings account was available to the Chronicler and probably his readership when he composed his narrative, and this supposition is supported by the many clear correlations between his version of the history of the temple project and that of his predecessor.⁵ This then raises the question: why the Chronicler regarded it as necessary to provide a second record of the events? In addressing this issue, the assessment of H. G. M. Williamson offers a good starting point, 'One of the few points on which all commentators on Chronicles are agreed is that the temple was of central significance to its author'.⁶

Given the sequence and approximate periods of composition for each of the records, we know that the Chronicler's audience differed in two important respects from that for Samuel-Kings. Firstly, the Chronicler's readership was a community returned to and settled in the land they had previously occupied and from which they had been deported rather than one uncertain about where (geographically) their future – if they had one at all – lay. Secondly, the Chronicler's

⁵William J. Dumbrell states..."the traditions on which the books of Chronicles drew would have been common property...to the readers" of Chronicles. William J. Dumbrell, 'The Purpose of the Books of Chronicles', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (JETS, 27/3 September 1984), pp. 257-266, p. 262.

⁶H. G. M. Williamson, 'The Temple in the Book of Chronicles,' in William Horbury, ed, *'Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel'* (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1991), p. 15.

audience knew that the previously glorious status of Israel in the world had not been replicated either immediately or soon after their return, whereas the audience of Samuel-Kings may have still harboured hopes that this would be the case.⁷ Given these differences, it may reasonably be asked what, and for what reason, the Chronicler felt it necessary to amend in the previous record for his new audience?

This dissertation will argue that when the two biblical accounts of the temple-building project are studied side-by side, while it is evident that there is broad agreement between the versions on the main sequence of events there is no verse-for-verse correspondence, and it will identify these discrepancies. Specifically, the Chronicler chooses to apply differing emphases and to use alternative vocabulary in a number of verses which appear to be imparting the same information. Furthermore, it will be demonstrated that the Chronicler's account includes the description of a number of unique events that are not included at all in the earlier history, and these too will be scrutinised to establish the message they provide regarding the roles of David and Solomon in the project. In summary, while both biblical accounts, when read separately, appear to give a systematic and logical account of the building of the temple, significant variations become apparent when they are compared side-by-side, and it is the nature and extent of this variance that will be examined in this dissertation.

One of the opportunities offered by a second account of the same event or sequence of events is that of presenting the narrative's characters and their roles with differing hues of emphasis. While it is not inevitable that such a 're-alignment' of characters and events will occur in a subsequent version of the earlier story-line, the possibility of doing so is presented for the second story-teller.

⁷See below, p. 7 for discussion about the likely composition date of the Samuel-Kings record.

In light of the questions posed above, this study will examine the extent to which the Chronicler carried out such a re-alignment with his temple-related narratives, comparing his presentation of the respective roles of David and Solomon in the construction of the first temple with the one provided by the author/s of the Samuel-Kings account.

The findings of this dissertation will inform considerations of wider issues, some of which have already been mentioned; for example, that of the message the Chronicler wished his readership to receive from his account which (in his reckoning) it would not have received from the previous version. Chronicles was written to the post-exilic remnant who had returned to the land of Israel at the sufferance of non-Jewish regional powers of the day, and who, with the first temple destroyed, had no centralised and organised system of worship. The Chronicler's message to his readers from his account of the four hundred-or-so previous years is critical to understanding why the book was written.⁸ Assessing the variations between his account and that of his predecessor will shed light on the reasons for its composition.⁹

1.2 Outline of the study

The chapter that follows will offer a review of recent scholarly debates about the Chronicler's purpose in recording his account of Israel's history, and of the temple project in particular. This will provide the backdrop against which the insights offered in the remainder of the dissertation can be placed. Using the text of the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) of the Bible, with references to the original Hebrew text where appropriate, a detailed comparison will be presented of the

⁸1 and 2 Chronicles will be referred to in the singular. Because Chronicles is the later of the two accounts, the comparisons will be presented from its point of view i.e. they will be analysed as the Chronicler's additions, amendments and exclusions etc.

⁹The Literature Review (Chapter 2 below) will refer to a number of the issues associated with the Chronicler's purposes in writing his account.

narratives relating to the temple-building project in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. This comparison will begin with an investigation of the broader contexts into which the respective authors place their temple narratives, and this will be deduced on the basis of the scope of their works, the frequency with which David and Solomon are presented 'centre stage', and the context provided for the transfer of power from David to Solomon. After a review of certain aspects of the language used by both authors as their narratives unfold, there will be a detailed study of the passages relating to the building of the temple. Attention will be given first of all to those passages common to both the Samuel-Kings and Chronicles accounts but which the Chronicler amends and/or embellishes, and this will be followed by an investigation of material included by the Chronicler which has no precedent in the earlier version. The findings of the dissertation will then be presented, with these followed by a concluding synthesis.

Chapter 2:

Review of Scholarship

With Martin Noth's formulation of the Deuteronomistic history hypothesis, a new and productive stream of scholarly study emerged of the composition of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings. Noth proposed that these books formed a cohesive and unified whole, composed 'as one' during the exilic period to provide the two exiled tribes of Judah and Benjamin with a history and explanation of how and why they came to find themselves deported to Babylon.¹⁰ The initial consequence of the wide acceptance of this theory was that Chronicles seriously fell out of favour. Its discrepancies with previous histories were regarded as the work of an author who of the same period which were noted evidenced (it was thought) an author who was simply 'playing fast and loose with the facts',¹¹ rather than of one who was regarded as adding valuable content to the biblical canon.

However, more recent study of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles provides an opportunity to understand (and thereby also to appreciate) the Chronicler's work from a very different perspective. This arises from the scholarly challenge to the proposed simplicity of the Deuteronomistic theory in that it underestimates the potential complexities when a later author follows a previous one.¹² Furthermore, there is a growing realisation of the interrelatedness and interdependence of many of the individual aspects of Chronicles. These biblical books came to be

¹⁰Anthony F. Campbell and Mark A. O'Brien, *Unfolding The Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), pp. 11-12 <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=AvZWPFqd2sEC&pg=PP3&redir_esc=y&hl=en#v=onepage&q&f=false> [accessed 17 October 2020].

¹¹John W. Kleinig, 'Recent Research In Chronicles', *Currents in Research Biblical Studies* 2 (1994): pp. 43-76.

¹²See for example, Gary N. Knoppers, 'Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, vol. 6 (no. 3, 2001), pp. 393-415. <JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43724488>> [accessed 12 October. 2020].

described as 'somewhat neglected',¹³ leading to the more recent evaluation of the Chronicler as an author who, 'with considerable literary skill, drafted his history'.¹⁴ In summary, although 1 and 2 Chronicles were previously regarded as in some way superfluous in comparison with the earlier narratives of the Deuteronomistic Historian, this is certainly no longer the case.¹⁵

Critical study of Chronicles (and the ensuing debates it has engendered) has been energised in recent years by Hugh Williamson's commentary on 1 and 2 Chronicles (1982) and Sara Japhet's study entitled *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (1993).¹⁶ As intimated above, central to these works is the question of the Chronicler's eschatology, that is, how the Chronicler viewed the returning community in view of the promises previously made to David regarding an eternal dynasty. Williamson predicates his commentary on the notion that the Chronicler had 'a distinctive approach to the question of Israel as the people of God'.¹⁷ As has already been noted, the Chronicler's audience differed in two significant ways from that of Samuel-Kings author/s, and in these new circumstances, asserts Williamson, 'one of the major issues for the Jewish people was the precise definition of the extent of (their) own community'.¹⁸ Starting from the supposition that the record offered in Chronicles has a particular purpose, it becomes necessary to understand that purpose in order to evaluate the extent to which it was accomplished.

¹³H.G.M. Williamson, *Eschatology in Chronicles*, p. 116; Kleinig, 'Recent Research In Chronicles', p. 1.

¹⁴Roddy Braun, *1 Chronicles*, World Biblical Commentary 14, General Eds. David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker (Waco: Word Books, 1986), pp. 33, 32.

¹⁵This is neatly summed up by W. Johnstone (quoted by Kleinig, *Recent Research In Chronicles*, p16) referencing the canonical placement of the books: "'So far from being regarded as merely bringing up the rear of the Writings, the lowest tier of the Hebrew Bible, the last gasp of waning powers, it may now be seen as summation, standing as the last part of the Hebrew Bible, so far as its normal canonical order is concerned, and by that very fact be recognized as the appropriate portal through which the study of the whole may confidently proceed'" (Kleinig, *Recent Research In Chronicles*, p. 16).

¹⁶Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, New Century Bible Commentary series, (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1982); Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*, 2nd rev ed. edition (London: Peter Lang, 1997) [originally published in Hebrew; Jerusalem: Bialik, 1977].

¹⁷Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 24.

¹⁸*1 and 2 Chronicles*, Ibid, p. 24.

There have been some attempts to interpret the Chronicler's eschatology merely on the basis of the dating and setting of the composition itself.¹⁹ If the composition is dated to the post-exilic restoration of the temple, carried out by Zerubbabel and Joshua, then its eschatological focus is likely to be aligned with that of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah and their hopes of a restored Davidic dynasty.²⁰ A later date of composition date would provide support for the view that the Chronicler adopted a 'fulfilled' eschatological view, and that he regarded the promises made to David as completed in the post-exilic setting and also as eternally secure. This question is itself linked to that of the unity of the composition, as several verses (notably the chronologies included at 1 Chron. 3:19-24 and 9:1-9), require a date considerably later than the late 6th century BCE.. An earlier dating for the book would provide the best evidence for the Chronicler's theology because of the biblical record to which reference already been made, while there is little historical evidence about life in the late Persian period.²¹ Given these difficulties, the result of the scholarly work so far done on Chronicles from this perspective seems to be that establishing the Chronicler's eschatology by means of dating the writing of the text is far from having been achieved.²²

An alternative methodology employed to discerning the eschatological view of the Chronicler has involved the use of typology. This approach has been developed and refined to a significant amount of scholarly approval by R. Mosis in his *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*, in which he proposed that the reigns of Saul, David and Solomon represented a choice of apostasy facing the returning Jews had of apostasy, as characterised by the reign of Saul, or one of restoration and potential, as represented by the combined reigns of

¹⁹Williamson, *Eschatology in Chronicles*, p. 120.

²⁰For example, 'Go up to the hills and bring wood and build the house, so that I may take pleasure in it and be honored, says the LORD.' (Hag. 1:8; also Zech. 3:9-10).

²¹Williamson, *Eschatology In Chronicles*, p. 121; Kleinig, 'Recent Research In Chronicles', p. 3.

²²Williamson, *Eschatology In Chronicles*, p. 130.

David and Solomon. In the latter case, with David's reign regarded as falling short of the final attainment of this restoration and Solomon's as representing the its ultimate fulfilment.²³ The primary difficulty with this model is in fact the element of it which is purported to be its strength i.e. the single categorisation of each of the three reigns mentioned to one of the options available, and in particular the categorisation of Solomon as the idealised king the model requires. Scholars have pointed to, for example, the emphasis placed upon Solomon's inability to complete the temple-building project single handedly, and thus the extensive preparations made for it by David.²⁴

In Williamson's view the most promising means by which the Chronicler's eschatology may be determined is by assessment of the position of the king in his work, because, he says, 'as is well known, the whole work is very much built around the Davidic dynasty'.²⁵ His particular focus is the question of whether the promises made to David could lead to the expectation of the future emergence of a king in Jerusalem who would bring the promises to fulfilment or, alternatively, whether the promises had in effect been transferred to the temple and its cults, so that no further change in the theocracy was to be expected.²⁶ He notes two types of evidence that have been presented to shed light on this matter, (both focused on Nathan's oracle), with the first concerning the difference between the Samuel-Kings and Chronicles records regarding David's seed (2 Sam. 7:12b and 1 Chron. 17:11, and the second concerning the author's subsequent use of and references back to the oracle. Both types of evidence, he says, have been used on both sides of the debate, and thus offer provide no significant insights. His solution to the matter is to interpret

²³*Eschatology in Chronicles*, p. 131. See also, for example, Moshe Reiss and David J. Zucker, 'Chronicles as Revisionist Religious History', *The Ashbury Journal* 68/2, pp. 120-133, where it is stated, 'The sanitized David becomes the idealised ruler' (p. 126).

²⁴E.g. Japhet, 'The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles', p. 468.

²⁵Williamson, *Eschatology In Chronicles*, p. 133.

²⁶*Ibid*, p. 133.

Nathan's oracle in terms of the Chronicler presenting the reigns of David and Solomon as a 'single, unified event within the divine economy for the life of the nation',²⁷ that is, as a narrative in which both characters, and the events of their reigns, are at the same time necessary and inevitable. This concurs with the previously-expressed view of Roddy Braun.²⁸ This, he argues, is achieved largely by limiting the conditions of the fulfilment of the promises to Solomon's obedience rather than, as Kings has it, Solomon and his children (1 Kings 9:6).²⁹ This then leads to the conclusion that the promises made to David were established as unconditional, and that, notwithstanding all subsequent events following the death of Solomon, the Chronicler was encouraging his readership to view the future with a hope centred on the Davidic family.³⁰

All of these considerations and points of debate are dependent upon, and point to, the importance of accurately identifying the Chronicler's manoeuvres (if any) with regard to his modified positioning of the main characters, David and Solomon, in the temple narrative. The proviso 'if any' is included because the possibility cannot be excluded that the Chronicler in fact neither amended or added anything of significance to his predecessor, but merely provided additional, peripheral detail. This is essentially the position assumed by many scholars who study the role of David in the temple-building enterprise, and in particular those who seek to understand why he was apparently prohibited from being the temple-builder himself.³¹ More will be said on this

²⁷Ibid, p. 140.

²⁸Roddy L. Braun, 'Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles', *Journal of Biblical Literature* vol. 92 (1973), p. 515., <www.jstor.org/stable/3263119> [accessed 17 Oct. 2020].

²⁹Braun, 'Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles', p. 141.

³⁰It should not be assumed that it is only in relation to the temple's construction that scholarly interest has been applied to the differences between the Chronicler's account and that of earlier records. See for example, Yosca Zimran, 'The Covenant Made with David: The King and the Kingdom in 2 Chronicles 21', *Vetus Testamentum*, Volume 64, Issue 2, 2014, <https://brill.com/view/journals/vt/64/2/article-p305_10.xml> [accessed 12 October 2020] with its study of the variation between 2 Chronicles 21 and 1 Kings 8 of the reign of Jehoram.

³¹Some examples of this approach – and where differing conclusions are reached – are William D. Barrick, 'Why Was David's Plan To Build The Temple Prohibited By God?', *Papers* <https://drbarrick.org/files/papers/other/David_and_the_Temple.pdf> [accessed 9 October 2020], Gregory Goswell, 'Why Did God Say No To David? (2 Samuel 7)', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament/JSOT* 43 (2019), pp. Vol 43(4) pp. 556-570, <<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0309089218778597?journalCode=jota>> [accessed 9 October 2020], Donald F. Murray, 'Under Yhwh's Veto: David as Shedder of Blood in Chronicles', *Biblica*, vol. 82, no. 4,

below, so it suffices here merely to note that such an approach to the Chronicler's work is limited to a comparison between his and the earlier text, regarding him merely as providing detail previously omitted. The main difficulty with this comparatively shallow exploration of the texts is that it not only ignores the possibility of a wider and over-arching agenda on the part of the Chronicler, but it does so also on the part of his predecessor, in that it fails to ask why the author of Samuel-Kings omitted the detail he did.

The view expressed by Williamson that in investigating the Chronicler's presentation of the Davidic dynasty one must 'inevitably' begin with an examination of his presentation and interpretation of the dynastic (that is, Nathan's) oracle of 1 Chron. 17 is representative of the view as to where the primary interest in the Chronicler's account lies.³² Less prevalent is the view that the Chronicler's larger plan or purpose in relation to his presentation of the the roles of David and Solomon in the temple-building project are to be found in the detail of a study of a wider variety of matters pertaining to that account. That said, while it is clearly the case that the temple narrative is just one element of a much larger work, nevertheless, given the significance of this element, it is reasonable to assume that any wider agenda on the Chronicler's part will be visible within this element.

2001, pp. 457–476 <www.jstor.org/stable/42614322> [accessed 6 October 2020] and Piet B> Dirksen, 'Why Was David Disqualified as Temple Builder? The Meaning of 1 Chronicles 22:8', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, JSOT 70 (1996), pp. 51-56, <<https://web-b-ebshost-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=268efdfd-5a9e-4bba-8b32-4929a78282c3%40pdc-v-sessmgr06>> [accessed 19 December 2020].

³²Williamson, *Eschatology In Chronicles*, p. 133.

Chapter 3:

A Comparative Analysis of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles in their Presentations of David and

Solomon as Temple-builders

3.1: Context-setting and Language of the Samuel-Kings and Chronicles Narratives

This chapter will begin with an overview of the setting of the temple narrative as recorded within the two biblical accounts, noting the context into which the respective authors place their accounts within the larger narrative structure. To achieve this, attention will first be given to certain aspects of their overall narrative schemes, before examining the position of the sections relating to the reigns of David and Solomon within these schemes and, finally, of their details regarding the temple project itself. This section of the chapter will include word counts of several types, which have been carried out as a means to an end, which is to identify and highlight the varying choice of vocabulary made by the respective authors and the result of these choices on the understanding conveyed to the reader.

The Samuel-Kings narrative covers the period from the birth of the prophet Samuel to the release from prison of Jehoiachin, the Judean king, by Evilmerodach, the king of Babylon, during the early years of the Babylonian exile. In contrast to this, the combined narrative in 1 and 2 Chronicles runs from the final throws of the reign and death of King Saul to the declaration by Cyrus that the Jews could return to Jerusalem to re-build the temple, thus marking the end of the exile. The Chronicler therefore surveys and reports on a similar span of years as his predecessor, although the start and end points of his this span have been moved forward slightly. Taking these biblical texts in their

entireties, the Chronicler's work is considerably shorter than that of his predecessor, at 46,434 words compared to 67,648 (the former equating to 68.6% of the latter).³³

In addition to adjusting the chronological span in comparison with that of the Books of Samuel, the Chronicler amends other 'contextual' matters, and David's introduction into the narrative is an example of this. In the earlier work he is introduced in chapter 16 of the narrative in 1 Samuel (16:11), described to the reader within the flow of a larger pericope as being brought forth from keeping his father's sheep to be the replacement for Saul. The reasons for God's rejection of Saul as king of Israel had been covered in detail in the previous chapters, with his eventual downfall noted almost immediately after his appointment (1 Sam. 10:27) and then covered in detail in chapters 13-15. According to this history, David has to wait until 2 Samuel 5 before he is recognised as Saul's replacement, to accommodate the lengthy period of his dispute with Saul as well as the power struggle between the two factions following his death. In contrast, other than a re-statement of the summarising statement of 2 Sam. 5:2 at 2 Chron. 11:2, the Chronicler offers no background to Saul's death in the battle with the Philistines at Gilboa (which constitutes the first narrative of the book, following the lengthy genealogies cf. 1 Chron. 10:1-6) or the consequent appointment of David by 'all Israel' to be their king (1 Chron. 11:1, 3). Aside from mention in the genealogies, then, David is presented to the reader with some abruptness and virtually no background.

With regard to the narration in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles of the reigns of David and Solomon as Israel's kings, the Chronicler devotes a slightly smaller proportion of his overall work to this period

³³All word counts provided (and subsequent numerical (%) analyses) are of the Authorised (KJV) Version. It is recognised that these numbers will vary from counts made of the original Hebrew (and of other bible translations), but they are presented here as broadly representative of the relative lengths of the texts under discussion and thus helpful at the level of generality worked to in this section.

compared to his predecessor, at 41.6% of that work compared to his predecessor's 44.0%.³⁴ One of the main differences between the description of the reigns within the versions is their account of the transition of the kingship from David to Solomon. In Samuel-Kings a tortuous picture is painted of David's physical frailties towards the end of his life (1 Kings 1:1-4) and of the manoeuvrings and machinations of his court and family as both his physical and mental capacities subsided. According to this account, David's son Adonijah takes advantage of his father's infirmities to declare himself king, and to gather the support of a band of followers. David at this time is either too unwell or too disorientated, or for some other reason is unable to oppose him (1 Kings 1:5-9). It then requires the intervention of firstly Nathan and then David's wife (and Solomon's mother), Bathsheba, to secure the throne for Solomon (1 Kings 1:11-34), but it is reported that the whole situation was so perilous through this period that the threat was not only to Solomon's inheritance of Israel's throne but also to his life (1 Kings 1:12).

In contrast, the succession from David to Solomon is presented by the Chronicler as an admirably smooth affair, taking place without difficulties or objections in the sight of, and with the full support of, all interested parties. Furthermore, it is noticeable that the Chronicler trails the transfer of power to Solomon in earlier narrative sections that are focussed on David. He does so with language that implies a sense of unopposed inevitability to the subsequent event, with David fully in control of and approving the unfolding events. So the Chronicler observes that 'When David was old and full of days, he made his son Solomon king over Israel.' (1 Chron. 23:1), that '(all Israel) made David's son Solomon king' (29:22), that '(David) died..and his son Solomon succeeded him.' (29:28) and – to mark the beginning of his reign – that 'Solomon son of David established himself in his kingdom; the LORD his God was with him and made him exceedingly great.' (2 Chron. 1:1). At

³⁴2 Sam. 5:1-1 Kings 11:43 = 29,764 words; 1 Chronicles 11:1-2 Chronicles 9:31 = 19,302 words (latter = 64.9% of the former)

no stage does the Chronicler leave any door open to the possibility of there being any doubt as to whether Solomon was to succeed his father David as king of Israel. John W. Wright regards David's preparations for the temple (both for its construction and its subsequent use) as recorded by the Chronicler as his version of a succession narrative, and Wright supposes that this record effectively replaces the 'woes' which the Samuel-Kings narrative records.³⁵

Moving on to the sections of the descriptions in the respective Samuel-Kings and Chronicles narratives which deal with the temple-building project itself, it is noticeable that the Chronicler once more reduces his coverage compared to that of his predecessor, allocating 13,646 words (29.4% of his entire narrative) to these events compared to the 25,795 words within the Samuel-Kings account (44.0% of this entire narrative).³⁶ Furthermore, within the respective narratives David is given greater prominence by the Chronicler when compared to his Samuel-Kings predecessor. The word 'David' is the third most common word within this section of text (128 occurrences), and it occurs on average every 107 words, while in Samuel-Kings 'David' as used by the author is the fourth most common word (205 occurrences) and occurs on average only every 126 words. By contrast, the Chronicler gives broadly similar prominence to Solomon as his predecessor in Samuel-Kings, mentioning him 55 times (15th most common word of this text, and appearing on average every 248 words), while his Samuel-Kings predecessor mentioned him 93 times (12th most common word, but appearing every 277 words on average). The result of all this is that attention on David is focussed to a much greater extent by the Chronicler than by his predecessor, and this will be discussed more below.

³⁵John W. Wright, 'The Founding Father: The Structure Of The Chronicler's David Narrative', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Spring, 117 (1998), , Vol. 117, No. 1 (Spring, 1998), pp. 55-56. This is view with which De Vries agrees See also- Simon J De Vries, *1 And 2 Chronicles*, (Grand Rapids: Wm B Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1989), p. 217). These preparations will be discussed in detail below.

³⁶2 Sam. 7:1-2 Kings 8:66 compared to 1 Chron. 17:1-2 Chron. 7:11.

One final aspect of the approach to context-setting employed by the Chronicler compared to his predecessor concerns the circumstances of the Solomon's conception and birth, an extensive account of which is provided in Samuel-Kings but are not mentioned by the Chronicler. For the Chronicler it is sufficient to include Solomon in a list of David's offspring (1 Chron. 3:1-9 ; 14:3-7), which effectively summarises a combination of the list in 2 Samuel 3:2-5 and the very detailed narrative regarding Solomon's conception in 2 Sam. 11:1-12:24. In addition to omitting the details of David's affair with the married Bathsheba and of his arrangement for her husband Uriah's death, the reproof of David by the prophet Nathan (2 Sam. 12:1-14) together with his subsequent confession of sin (12:13; cf. Ps. 51) and any implied criticism of Solomon's origins are also absent. The omission of what may be termed the Bathsheba narrative can be accounted for within the context of an argument which sees the Chronicler's presentation of David's as a 'rehabilitation' of him compared to Samuel-Kings, with the unsavoury circumstances of Solomon's conception and birth thus removed from the record. This is effectively the same line of thinking referenced above in which David, in Chronicles, is seen as representing the ideal king in all aspects other than his failure to complete the temple-building project. However, in the same way as there are difficulties in seeing the subsequent fulfilment of the idealisation of kingship in Solomon, it is also true that the Chronicler retains a number of criticisms of David,³⁷ and the reason for the omission of the background to Solomon's birth is therefore likely to lie elsewhere.

Reference was made above to the Chronicler's use of language when presenting the succession of Israel's kingship from David to Solomon. The Samuel account gives the strong impression of a tumultuous period in Israel's history, yet from the Chronicler we receive a sense of

³⁷Sara Japhet, *The ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 468-72, quoted in Williamson, *Eschatology in Chronicles*, p.132; Shipp, Mark, 'Why Are David & Solomon Whitewashed In Chronicles?', Latest News and Articles. <<https://austingrad.edu/blog/why-are-david-solomon-whitewashed-in-chronicles-part-1/>> [accessed 9 October 2020].

straightforwardness which borders on inevitability, making use as he does of matter-of-fact and even arguably under-stated phrases to describe in simple terms what must have been (based on a reading of Samuel-Kings) a most complex situation. To further develop the language theme, and to highlight some of the distinct word choices made by the Chronicler, a detailed examination will now be made of some of the differences between the Chronicler's account of the temple-building project and that of his predecessor, focussing on the phrases containing two specific words, and then the description of one specific particular incident.

The following table shows the occurrences of the phrases in view here:

	Phrase (Hebrew: banah; ³⁸ NRSV translation)	Samuel / Kings	1 and 2 Chronicles
1	The house that king Solomon built for the LORD	1 Kings 6:2	
2	He also built a structure against the wall of the house	1 Kings 6:5	
3	The house was built with stone finished at the quarry	1 Kings 6:7	
4	So he built the house and finished it	1 Kings 6:9	
5	He built the structure against the whole house	1 Kings 6:10	
6	So Solomon built the house, and finished it	1 Kings 6:14	
7	He lined the walls of the house	1 Kings 6:15	
8	He built twenty cubits of the rear of the house with boards of cedar	1 Kings 6:16	
9	He built the inner court with three courses of dressed stone	1 Kings 6:36	
10	I have built you an exalted house	1 Kings 8:13	
11	I...have built the house for the name of the LORD, the God of Israel	1 Kings 8:20	
12	The house that I have built for your name	1 Kings 8:44	
13	The house which I have built for your name	1 Kings 8:48	2 Chronicles 6:34, 38
14	I have built you an exalted house, a place for you to reside in forever		2 Chronicles 6:2
15	Built the house for the name of the LORD, the God of Israel		2 Chronicles 6:10
16	This house that I have built		2 Chronicles 6:18, 33
17	Solomon had built the house of the LORD		2 Chronicles 8:1
18	This house that you have built	1 Kings 9:3	
19	In which Solomon had built the two houses	1 Kings 9:10	

³⁸Strong's Hebrew: 1129 transliteration banah – to build,<<https://biblehub.com/str/hebrew/1129.htm>>[accessed 9 October 2020].

Several observations can be made about this table. Firstly, there are more than twice as many references to 'building' language in the Samuel-Kings account as compared to the Chronicles version (15 against 7). Furthermore, the occurrences listed in question can be categorised into three broad groups, namely, those references within the narrative describing the construction work itself (lines 1-9), those contained within the record of Solomon's speech made at the dedication of the temple (lines 10-16), and those references in the account of the LORD's second appearance to Solomon (lines 18-19). When they are considered according to these groupings it is notable that the Chronicler provides no use of the word 'built' in the first or third groups and then closely matches the earlier record in his use of his terminology in the second group (six instances against four).

When the Chronicler's account of the temple's construction work on the temple is examined, it is evident that he adopts a policy of replacing the word 'built' (Hebrew: *banah*) with that of 'made' (Hebrew: *asah*),³⁹ and this can be seen from the following direct comparisons between the texts:

Example 1: Construction of the most holy place

He **built** twenty cubits of the rear of the house with boards of cedar from the floor to the rafters, and he **built** this within as an inner sanctuary, as the most holy place. (1 Kings 6:16)

He **made** the most holy place; its length, corresponding to the width of the house, was twenty cubits, and its width was twenty cubits; he overlaid it with six hundred talents of fine gold. (2 Chronicles 3:8)

Example 2: Construction of the courts of the temple:

³⁹Strong's Hebrew: 1129 transliteration *banah* – to build, <<https://biblehub.com/str/hebrew/1129.htm>>; 6213 transliteration *asah* – do, make. <<https://biblehub.com/str/hebrew/6213.htm>> [accessed 9 October 2020].

He **built** the inner court with three courses of dressed stone to one course of cedar beams. (1 Kings 6:36)

He **made** the court of the priests, and the great court, and doors for the court; he overlaid their doors with bronze. (2 Chronicles 4:9)

In total, the Hebrew word *asah* ('made') appears 18 times in the Chronicler's account of the temple's construction which matches its frequency within Samuel-Kings.⁴⁰ When the earlier version's 18 occurrences are added to the nine cases of the word 'built', it seems that this version more closely associates Solomon personally with the building work, or, put another way, that the Chronicler in his narrative dilutes this connection. De Vries sees no significance in the Chronicler's selection of 'asah' as his verb of choice for the construction work in preference to 'banah'. He includes it in a list of four verbs which represent nothing more in his view than the 'reportorial nature of the writing', dismissing the observations of Willi that it is in fact 'thematic' in the process.⁴¹ However, there is no obvious reason why the Kings 6 account of the construction (to which he does not refer in this context) is not similarly 'reportorial', and so this dismissal without further investigation is premature.

It is noteworthy that while the word 'built' is absent from the Chronicler's description of the temple work he is not averse to retaining the verb 'to build' from the Samuel-Kings account in other sections of his narrative, and it clearly forms a useful component of his vocabulary. For example, the future tense of 'build' appears in both accounts of Nathan's oracle in relation to the construction of the temple by David's descendant (2 Sam. 7:13; 1 Chron. 17:12), and in this sense it may be argued that the Chronicler has preserved the wording found in Samuel-Kings. Similarly, the Chronicler retains the essence of the earlier account of Solomon's correspondence with

⁴⁰2Ch 3:8, 10, 14-16; 4:1-2, 6-9, 11, 14,18-19; 1Ki 6:4-5, 23, 31, 33; 7:6-8, 16, 18, 23, 27, 37-38, 40, 45, 48

⁴¹De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 249-250

Hiram,⁴² the king of Tyre, keeping Solomon's announced intention to 'build a house for the name of the LORD my God' (1 Kings 5:5; and 2 Chron. 2:4). He again adopts the Samuel-Kings wording for the commencement of the building work used in Samuel-Kings, noting in line with his predecessor that '(Solomon) began to build' (2 Chron. 3:2; cf. 1 Kings 6:1). Once more, immediately after the dedication of the temple, the Chronicler records that Solomon 'built/rebuilt' a number of cities i.e. those restored to him by Hiram, retaining the verb from the earlier version (2 Chronicles 8:2-5; cf. 1 Kings 9:17-19).

In summary for this section of the analysis, it seems that the Chronicler has deliberately provided an alternative for the word 'built' in his account of the construction of the temple and in his record of the subsequent appearance of the LORD to Solomon.⁴³

Secondly, with regard to the table above, the linking of Solomon's name more firmly in Samuel-Kings to the construction work is aided by the three references to his name, compared to only one occurrence in the Chronicler's equivalent account. That this is a deliberate strategy is indicated by the fact that there is no significant distinction in this regard between the 1 Kings 9:17-19 and 2 Chronicles 8:2-5 and passages referred to above, with Solomon's name appearing three times on each occasion.

⁴²Called Hiram rather than Hiram in all Chronicles verses apart from 1 Chronicles 14:1.

⁴³The Chronicler also omits the Samuel-Kings record of 'the word of the LORD' coming to Solomon during the period of the temple's construction (1 Kings 6:11-13), and in which God notes 'this house which thou art building...' (1 Kings 6:12). The function of the word received by Solomon is to encourage him to walk in God's statutes, judgements and commandments (1 Kings 6:12) in order that God would ensure the fulfilment of his promise of an eternal throne made to David. Clearly the Chronicler had no difficulty in including the thrust of this message in his overall account of events pertaining to the temple (cf. 2 Chron. 7:17-18), but he chooses not to include this visitation to Solomon, and God's direct acknowledgement that he is building the temple.

Just as the Chronicler appears to have deliberately chosen to retain references to the verb 'to build' in some instances and not in others in relation to Solomon, and carefully managed the prominence he gives to Solomon's name, the same trait can also be seen with regard to his use of David's name. In this case however, and in distinction to his treatment of Solomon, his choice is to either match the Samuel-Kings usage of the word or increase it. For example, he matches the eight uses of David's name in his record of Solomon's temple dedication speech (1 Kings 8:12-26; and 2 Chron. 6:1-17) and also the two uses of the expression 'your father David/David your father' in his record of the second appearance of the LORD to Solomon after the temple is completed (1 Kings 9:1-9; and 2 Chron. 7:12-22). However, the Chronicler increases the prominence of references to 'David' by inserting his name into his introduction to Nathan's oracle, thus replacing the preference in Samuel-Kings for 'king' to be the identifier of David (see 2 Sam. 7:1-3; and 1 Chron. 17:1-2).

A final illustration can be given of the Chronicler's particular use of language when repeating a narration of events previously covered by the Samuel-Kings version, and specifically the manner in which texts are juxtaposed by him with the apparent purpose of creating a specific impression. In the temple-building account in Samuel-Kings there are three records of 'charges' being made to Solomon, which each concern the manner of his (Solomon's) 'walk' before God. In Samuel-Kings the first of these is made by David, while the second and third are by God (1 Kings 2:3-4; 6:12; 9:4). Interestingly, in the Chronicler's version of the charge made by David (there are in fact two records of this in Chronicles, at 1 Chron. 22:11-13 and 28:9-10), after the giving of the charge the focus immediately returns to David by way either of a description of his (David's) preparations for the temple (1 Chron. 2:14-16) or of his bestowal of the temple pattern for the temple to Solomon

(1 Chron. 28:11 onwards). Here then, the Chronicler appears to deliberately deny Solomon the full attention of the reader, choosing instead to draw the reader back towards David.

3.2: The Chronicler's amendments to Samuel-Kings

In the previous section some examples were given of the Chronicler's word changes to the earlier record of the temple-building project; these are changes tending to reduce the perceived role of Solomon but enhance that of David. These are interesting because they appear to be selective, and thus to have been made with a pre-meditated purpose.

The Chronicler's selective editing of the Samuel-Kings account is not, however, limited to changing isolated words or short descriptive phrases, and can be seen in wider sweeps of his work. As in the previous section, the result of these is to focus attention upon David, and some examples of this will now be provided.

Reference has already been made in this study to the two records of Solomon's communication with Hiram, king of Tyre, and two further points can now be noted, related to one another, about this. Firstly, Samuel-Kings introduces the relationship between Solomon and Hiram by noting that the communication between them is instigated by Hiram, – 'Now king Hiram of Tyre sent his servants to Solomon' (1 Kings 5:1), – whereas the Chronicler reverses this and instead records that Hiram 'answered in a letter' a previous communication received from Solomon (2 Chron. 2:11). The purpose of this communication, from Solomon's perspective, was to enable him to secure materials and skilled labour for the temple's construction (1 Kings 5:6; 7:13; and 2 Chron. 2:7-9)

which were not available within Israel.⁴⁴ Each record of the exchange between Solomon and Hiram implies a previous relationship between Hiram and David, but, and this being the second point, by establishing Solomon as the instigator of the exchange, the Chronicler is able to replace the notion of mere knowledge on the part of Hiram of David's desire to build the temple with explicit reference to previous earlier friendly dealings between the two of them. Thus, I Kings 5:3 reads:

You know that my father David could not build a house for the name
of the LORD his God because of the warfare with which his enemies
surrounded him, until the LORD put them under the soles of his feet.

In 2 Chronicles 2:3 this becomes,

Solomon sent word to King Hiram of Tyre: "Once you dealt with my
father David and sent him cedar to build himself a house to live in..."

Samuel-Kings betrays awareness that Hiram had provided the materials for David's own palace was known to the Samuel-Kings author (cf. 2 Sam. 5:11), but this is not mentioned in the interaction between Solomon and Hiram. The Chronicler clearly sees things differently, and while he too has already recorded the provision made by Hiram for David's palace (1 Chron. 14:1) he chooses to include a reminder about it at this juncture. As well as drawing attention once again to the earlier relationship between Hiram and David, the effect of this inclusion by the Chronicler is to replace a potentially negative presentation of David in which only limitations or failings are

⁴⁴The Books of Kings separate the request for materials from the acquisition of the skilled worker in brass.

shown ('my father David could not...') with a positive one in which Solomon aspires for same kind of relationship with Hiram which his father had.⁴⁵

'Nathan's oracle' is the centre-piece of the commissioning of the temple-building project, recording as it does (seen in three sections) David's proposal for the project, God's reply to the idea presented to David through the prophet Nathan, and David's prayerful response to this. The Chronicler's account of these events (1 Chron. 17) is slightly shorter than that in Samuel-Kings (2 Sam. 7), comprising 779 words compared to 858, and similar proportions of each account are dedicated to these three sections.⁴⁶ Two major textual embellishments of this text warrant discussion.

Firstly, the prohibition against David building the proposed temple is implied in Samuel-Kings but made explicit in Chronicles. Thus, the apparently rhetorical question 'Are you the one to build me a house to live in?' (2 Sam. 7:5), becomes the categorical statement, 'You shall not build me a house to live in.' (1 Chron. 17:4). In the absence of such a categorical statement, confirmation of the fact that David is not to be the temple-builder is postponed in Samuel-Kings until God's response, and even then it must be deduced from the fact that another person is referred to in the statement, 'He shall build a house for my name,' (2 Sam. 7:13).⁴⁷ One of the challenges of understanding the question of 2 Sam. 7:5 is that it is not clear where the emphasis is being placed; that is, (with emphasis added) whether is God is using the question to focus on the identity of the temple-builder ('Are **you** the one to build me a house to live in?'), or on the relative capability of David to provide a temple for him ('Are **you** the one to build **me** a house...'), or on the notion of a

⁴⁵See below for additional conclusions from the presentation by the respective authors of the interaction between Solomon and Hiram.

⁴⁶Samuel-Kings: Notion = 8.2% (70 words); God's response = 47.9% (411 words); David's prayer = 43.9% (377 words). Chronicles:Notion = 7.1% (55 words); God's response = 48.5% (378 words); David's prayer = 44.4% (346 words).

⁴⁷ The explanatory text of 2 Samuel 7:5 is closely matched by 1 Chronicles 17:12, where it now acts as confirmation.

house being built for him at all ('Are you the one to build me a **house to live in?**'). Either way, the Chronicler removes any doubt (and perhaps a lack of clarity as the point being made here was the reason for his re-write of the statement) by using a phrase which at once makes it clear that a house would be built for God but that David would not be the one to build it.

Secondly, the book of Chronicles embellishes the Samuel-Kings text in relation to the identity of the temple-builder (given that it was not to be David). The Chronicler follows the previous version in similarly identifying the temple-builder as 'your (that is, belonging to David) offspring', but he then replaces the relatively vague phrase, 'who shall come forth from your body', with the more specific expression, 'one of your own sons' (2 Sam. 7:12; and 1 Chron. 17:11). This modification limits the possible candidates for the role to one of David's direct descendants, and this variation is the focal point of scholarly debate in relation to the attempts to identify the Chronicler's purpose in writing his history from (at least in part) his presentation of Nathan's oracle.⁴⁸ Although Williamson, based upon the usage of the relevant Hebrew words in other Old Testaments texts,⁴⁹ dismisses the difference noted here as inconclusive (a view predicated on the usage of the relevant Hebrew words in other Old Testaments texts,⁵⁰) the fact remains that, for whatever reason, the Chronicler chooses to limit the potential nominees for the role of temple-builder to one of David's sons, and this must be incorporated into our overall view assessment of his presentation of the roles played by of David and Solomon in the temple's construction.

⁴⁸Williamson, *Eschatology In Chronicles*, p. 134. For a lengthy discussion of the salient points see Michael Avioz, Nathan's Prophecy in II Sam 7 and in I Chr 17: Text, Context, and Meaning, <https://www.academia.edu/790971/Nathans_Prophecy_in_II_Sam_7_and_in_I_Chr_17_Text_Context_and_Meaning pp. 548-554>[accessed 18 December 2020].

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Ibid.

A brief mention may be made here of a wider point in relation to the Chronicler's redaction, identified by Adam C. Welch. This is that in his telling of the wars which followed David's proposal for the temple (Chronicles 18-20), while he condenses the equivalent Samuel-Kings record the Chronicler applies selective editing and is careful in particular not to omit anything which concerned the founding and strengthening of Israel's outward religious institutions (which includes the temple). This, he argues, is part of his agenda to present David as builder in all but name of the temple and the religious framework it represented,⁵¹ and the particular relevance here is that these chapters immediately precede those containing the majority of the Chronicler's insertions, which will be discussed below.

3.3: The Chronicler's additions

The material presented so far in this dissertation has comprised textual comparisons, with these presented primarily from the perspective of the Chronicler. Distinctly, this section will focus on passages in Chronicles that have no Samuel-Kings equivalent. The focus of the analysis will not be the source/s of the additional material in Chronicles (about which there is much debate) but the finalised text – irrespective of sources – in comparison to the earlier version in Samuel-Kings.⁵²

By way of introduction, it is interesting to note some of the varying perspectives which have been given to these sections and the value of their study. For example, D. F. Payne notes that amongst other 'charges of inaccuracy' levelled against the Chronicler, 'a number of unsupported stories of the Chronicler fit his philosophy so remarkably that they could well be inventions', while Welch

⁵¹Adam C. Welch, 'The Work of the Chronicler: It's Purpose and It's Date', *The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1938* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939).

⁵²For a brief survey of the use of sources in Chronicles, including verbatim citation and brief summaries, and more generally the unity of the work, see Kleinig, 'Recent Research In Chronicles', pp. 2-4.

argues precisely the opposite, that it is only the records which have no Samuel-Kings parallel which represent his independent thought and thus provide clues as to his presentation of David, and which therefore should be the student's focus.⁵³

As mentioned above (page 19), although the Chronicler's version of the temple-building project is approximately only half the length of the earlier account, it nevertheless includes a number of lengthy passages – mainly in I Chronicles 22-29 - which are unique to his version. At the outset, the juxtaposition of these additional passages within the Chronicler's overall narrative is noteworthy, and several points will be made in relation to this. Firstly, 1 Chronicles 21 concludes with a record of David building an altar and offering a sacrifice on the recently-purchased threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite (21:25-29), closely matching the account in 2 Samuel 24:24-25. However, the account in 2 Samuel 24 concludes this entire narrative section at this point, with the following opening of 1 Kings focusing on the completely separate matter of the tortuous handover of power from David to Solomon. The Chronicler by contrast, having provided an explanation as to why David sacrificed at that particular location and not in Gibeon, the location of Moses' tabernacle, proceeds immediately to provide an account of David's contributions to the project, the charge placed by David on his son Solomon to complete the physical construction and the task of Israel's leadership in the project (1 Chron. 22-23). This is then followed by a lengthy and detailed description of the organisation of the clergy for temple service (chapters 23-27).⁵⁴ De Vries regards this chapter division (which bears some affinities to Samuel-Kings in that it concludes the narrative relating to the threshing floor of Ornan) as masking the textual unity which in fact runs from 1 Chronicles 21:28 to the end of chapter 28.⁵⁵

⁵³D. F. Payne, 'The Purpose and Methods of the Chronicler', *Faith and Thought* 93.2 (1963), pp 64-73, pp. 66-67; Welch p. 11.

⁵⁴De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 178.

⁵⁵Ibid p. 180.

Secondly, notwithstanding the chapter division the Chronicler's arrangement of the narrative allows him to present a number of elements that are absent from Samuel-Kings. For example, the LORD Chronicler makes explicit the selection of Ornan's threshing floor not merely as the temple's chosen location, but rather as the location discerned by David who then provides the (as it were) earthly approval for the selection. In other words, the temple must undoubtedly be built in this location because this is what David agrees: 'Then David said, "Here shall be the house of the LORD God and here the altar of burnt offering for Israel."' (1 Chron. 22:1). Then, the Chronicler takes the opportunity to re-state this observation and include it in a passage which appears to borrow heavily from Samuel-Kings. 1 Kings 6:1 concludes with the words '(Solomon) began to build the house of the LORD', but by the time it appears in the Chronicler's account it takes the form: 'Then Solomon began to build the house of the LORD at Jerusalem in mount Moriah, where the LORD appeared unto David his father, in the place that David had prepared in the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite.' (2 Chron. 3:1). This apparently gratuitous inclusion is followed by an albeit more subtle repetition of this manoeuvre in a passage already noted above; in recording Solomon's temple-dedication speech it is noted that God chose Jerusalem as the site for the temple (which, by implication, presents David as the obedient discernor of God's will), when there is no equivalent of this utterance in Samuel-Kings (cf. 2 Chron. 6:6 and 1 Kings 8:16). The observation of Welch neatly sums up what has been said above, when he notes that the Chronicler 'changed the entire character of the account' of the purchase of the threshing floor from being 'an appendix' in Samuel-Kings to being set by the Chronicler 'in the main stream of his record of (David's) reign', and as being 'in integral relation to the leading purpose of David's life'.⁵⁶

⁵⁶Welch, *The Work of the Chronicler*, p. 23.

Noting the placement of the additional passages (immediately after David's purchase of Ornan's threshing floor) which highlights David as effectively selecting the temple's location, the Chronicler then portrays David as the one presiding over the preparations for it. 1 Chronicles 22:2 begins with the phrase, 'David gave orders...', followed by a brief summary of the materials and workforce put in place by David for the project (vv. 2-4). David's control of the situation is thus emphasised with language characteristic of the Chronicler; as well as noting that David 'gave orders', we are informed that he 'provided' (iron, brass and cedar trees) and 'he set' (stonecutters to tasks). Furthermore, he prepared the items 'in quantities beyond weighing' (vv. 3 and 4). Details about these preparations are added later in the same passage, as 1 Chronicles 22:14-16 refers (in the first person speech of David) to the quantities of gold and silver, and of bronze and iron – 'beyond weighing' – and then to the number of workmen to would work on them – 'an abundance' – that were provided, as well as the timber and stone that he readied.

As with the repeated reference to the threshing floor as the temple's locale, the Chronicler reinforces this message in later sections of this expanded narration. 1 Chronicles 28:14-18 describes, in the third person narrative on this occasion, how David prepared gold for the 'vessels for each service' in the temple, before 29:2 relates, in the first person once more, both the previously mentioned materials and additional information about 'all sorts of precious stones, and marble'; again, the latter items are furnished 'in abundance'. However, on this occasion the Chronicler does not stop at merely repeating information about the materials prepared by David; rather, he now also highlights David's personal commitment to the project, noting that much of what he donated was from his own personal wealth. The Chronicler thus records the words of David as follows:

Moreover, in addition to all that I have provided for the holy house, I have a treasure of my own of gold and silver, and because of my devotion to the house of my God I give it to the house of my God: (1 Chron. 29:3)

Here, David's personal generosity, which is commendable in itself, is presented as a consequence of his 'devotion' for the project (the Hebrew is 'ratsah', which implies pleasure or delight).⁵⁷ This affection then manifests itself in David's exhortation to Solomon to waste no time, but to pursue the project: '...Now begin the work, and the LORD be with you.', and 'Go and build the sanctuary of the LORD God...' (1 Chron. 22:16 and 19). In this context, Troy D. Cudworth has noted the prevalence of the Hebrew word transliterated as 'lebab' in the Chronicler's passages dealing with David, and in particular in those passages which are his additions.⁵⁸ Although in places this word is rendered 'mind' by translators (for example 1 Chronicles 22:7, NRSV), the majority translation is 'heart', and Cudworth's main thesis is that the primary application of the description of David as being 'a man after (God's) own heart' (1 Sam. 13:14) is with reference fundamentally to his desire, described in 1 Chronicles 17:1, to build the temple (i.e. his heart for the project). This is, he argues, in distinction from the Samuel-Kings account of the temple project which never makes definitive the actions which characterised the heart for which David is commended.⁵⁹ If this wider proposition stands scrutiny, then what we have in the passages describing the provision made by David for the temple from his own wealth is an example of the Chronicler making explicit the practical application of David's devotion or heart for the project.

⁵⁷Strong's 7521 transliteration ratsah. <<https://biblehub.com/str/hebrew/7521.htm>> [accessed 9 October 2020].

⁵⁸Troy D. Cudworth, The Davidic "Heart" for the Temple in Chronicles, *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 2019, Vol.81 (2), p. 204-216 .

⁵⁹ Ibid. p.206

The detailed (and repeated) inventory of materials prepared by David, and the explicit acknowledgement that the motivation for his efforts - and indeed generosity - was his delight in the project, is a far cry from the concise manner in which Samuel-Kings discusses the origin of many temple materials. This is limited to two acknowledgements that David 'dedicated' silver, gold and other materials to the Lord that were acquired as spoils of war when he subdued the nations around him (2 Sam. 8:11 and 1 Kings 7:51). The fact that the Chronicler balances these statements (1 Chron. 18:11), recording a summary of the same events, thus renders the passages referred to above (from 1 Chronicles 22, 28 and 29) as clear additions or improvements to the presentation of David's role and of his commitment to the temple project. Furthermore, in the section of text following following Nathan's oracle of 1 Chronicles 17 the Chronicler connects and attributes the later works of Solomon back to David, recording that of the brass won by David from certain cities, 'with it Solomon made the bronze sea and the pillars and the vessels of bronze.' (1 Chron. 18:8). There is no obvious reason for this detail to be included, and the parallel reference in Samuel-Kings (2 Sam. 8:10; also placed in the chapter following the account of Nathan's oracle) makes no mention of the future use of the brass nor indeed to Solomon. In summary, the Samuel-Kings passage, in distinction from that of Chronicles, provides no connection in the narrative between David and the temple.

Finally on the matter of David's provision of materials for the construction of the temple, it is noteworthy that the reference to Solomon's request to Hiram for timber (1 Kings 5:6) is - as regards the timeline of this provision - pre-empted in 1 Chronicles 22:4, where it is noted that after David began his preparations for the temple, and while he was still alive, Hiram (i.e. 'the Tyrians') 'brought great quantities of cedar to David'. Thus, in the same way as the Chronicler's account of the interactions between Solomon and Hiram conveys more intimacy and goodwill than its

counterpart in Samuel-Kings, it also pre-empts the trading arrangements for timber which Solomon establishes with Hiram, presenting David as having already secured at least part of this necessary provision.

In similar fashion as he highlights the temple materials prepared by David, the Chronicler draws repeated attention to David's provision of labourers to work with these materials, and this again contrasts with the comparatively understated manner in which Samuel-Kings deals with the same issue. The single reference in Samuel-Kings to the work carried out in Israel for the temple's construction is found in 1 Kings 5:15: 'Solomon also had seventy thousand laborers and eighty thousand stonecutters in the hill country.' This information is repeated in 2 Chronicles 2:2, but in a similar manner to the way he dealt with the temple's location and building materials: that is, he repeats and at the same time embellishes it by including a reference to David not present in the equivalent Samuel-Kings narrative. The reference is found in the introductory remark to 2 Chronicles 2:18:

Then Solomon took a census of all the aliens who were residing in the
land of Israel, after the census that his father David had taken; and
there were found to be one hundred fifty-three thousand six
hundred. (2 Chron. 2:17)

The remark, 'after the census that his father David had taken', appears to be a citation of the Chronicler's own work, as there is no equivalent event recorded in Samuel-Kings. In line with the narrative development beginning with David's purchase of Ornan's threshing floor, the Chronicler had noted, immediately after highlighting David's assessment of this as the temple's chosen

location, that '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. ' (1 Chron. 22:2). This is followed by yet another reference (22:15) to David's provision of workers, but this time as part of David's own verbal instruction to his son.

Furthermore, and distinct from his inclusion of material detailing David's provision for the temple, the Chronicler chooses to omit the reference found in Samuel-Kings to Solomon's organisation of a workforce (levy) of 30,000 men from within Israel, each of whom would spend one in every three months in Lebanon assisting king Hiram's workers with the preparation and transportation of timber for its construction (1 Kings 5:13-14; cf. verse 6).⁶⁰ As a result of this omission, all his references to the organisation of workers for the temple construction project relate directly to David.⁶¹

Perhaps the Chronicler's most significant inclusion regarding the preparations for the temple is the fact that he provides information about the origin of the temple's design and offers an account of how Solomon knew the description of the building he was to construct. In contrast to Samuel-Kings, which offers no explanation as to the origins of the building design,⁶² the Chronicler describes a formal and presumably splendid occasion taking place before Israel's assembled leaders (1 Chron. 28:1) which included David handing over of the 'plan' of the temple to Solomon.⁶³ Straightforward and unequivocal language is used, noting that 'David gave his son Solomon...' the design of the various elements of the building (1 Chron. 28:11-12). Consistent with

⁶⁰ This levy is later referenced again in 1 Kings 9:15 and forms the basis of the later rebellion by the ten northern tribes of Israel (see 2 Kings 12 and 2 Chronicles 10).

⁶¹ This also bears on the matter of Solomon's capability for the project, on which see further below.

⁶² See, for example, 1 Kings 6:1 or 14.

⁶³ Strong's Hebrew 8403 transliteration *tabnith* - construction, pattern, figure, <<<https://biblehub.com/str/hebrew/8403.htm>> [accessed 9 October 2020].

his rewriting strategy, the Chronicler subsequently notes again, at the beginning of his section detailing the construction work itself, that 'These are Solomon's measurements for building the house of God: ' (2 Chron. 3:3). In summary, David provided and Solomon received instruction.

Without doubt, though, of most significance with regard to the temple pattern or design is not the fact that it was David who gave this to Solomon but that it was God's pattern that he gave. This is noted twice, once in the third-person narrative and once in David's first-person speech (cf. 1 Chron. 28:12 and 19). This aligns with the Chronicler's desire for David to be understood as the conduit for determining God's will in this matter, with David previously presented as accurately interpreting the events at Ornan's threshing floor as representing God's chosen location. It may also be that this is the Chronicler's 'groundwork' for his later use of the word 'asah' ('to make'; discussed above in relation to his description of the building work), as the Hebrew word translated as 'plan' is that used to describe God's instructions to Moses for the building of the tabernacle in the wilderness.⁶⁴ De Vries identifies 1 Chronicles 28:19 ("All this, in writing at the LORD's direction, he made clear to me—the plan of all the works.") as an 'authorization statement', telling Solomon 'by whose authority his father David gives such precise instructions.'⁶⁵ Charles J. Ellicott describes the absence of any introductory formula to the statement such as 'And David said' as 'dramatic',⁶⁶ and it brings to a climax, as the third occasion on which the plan is referenced, the presentation of David as God's conduit in the matter of the design of the building and the service within it.

It is, however, not merely with regard to details about the physical attributes of the building which David passed on to Solomon where we see the Chronicler at work with the text. He notes that

⁶⁴In the next section (Chapter 4: Findings of the Dissertation) the Chronicler's several references back to the wilderness period in his construction terminology will be noted.

⁶⁵De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 220.

⁶⁶Charles J. Ellicott, *A Bible Commentary for English Readers*, (Omaha, NE: Patristic Publishing, 2019).

Solomon also received 'the divisions of the priests and of the Levites, and all the work of the service in the house of the LORD; for all the vessels for the service in the house of the LORD,' (1 Chron. 28:13). This observation once more appears to allude to the Chronicler's earlier work, having previously provided a detailed account of the numbering of the Levites (1 Chron. 23:3-23), and concluding with the observation, 'These were the sons of Levi...who were to do the work for the service of the house of the LORD.' (23:24). Bracketing the construction work with this idea, the Chronicler subsequently draws the reader's attention to David by describing the sacrifices offered after the temple's dedication, noting that 'The priests stood at their posts; the Levites also, with the instruments for music to the LORD that King David had made for giving thanks to the LORD' (2 Chron. 7:6). There is no obvious requirement within this narrative section for the inclusion of this reference to David, and additional emphasis seems to be given in the Chronicler's observation that all of this was done as the result of an instruction issued 'according to the last words of David' (1 Chron. 23:27).

Finally in regard to David's provision for the project, and specifically with regard to the events that are to take place in the completed temple, the Chronicler notes - as he details the temple's completion in terms of its preparations for services - how Solomon was obedient to the David's instructions by appointing 'According to the ordinance of his father David...the divisions of the priests for their service, and the Levites for their offices of praise and ministry alongside the priests as the duty of each day required, and the gatekeepers in their divisions for the several gates; for so David the man of God had commanded.' (2 Chron. 8:14).⁶⁷

⁶⁷A summary statement of his preparations of the priests and Levites for service in the temple, and of the other skilled men he had prepared, is made by David to Solomon at 1 Chronicles 28:21.

Moving to wider issues, it is not only by way of description of David's preparations for the construction of the temple that the Chronicler provides more detail in comparison to Samuel-Kings; he does so also by noting certain aspects of the characterization of David and Solomon. Firstly, he twice records David's observation that Solomon is 'young and inexperienced' (1 Chron. 22:5; 29:1), and he juxtaposes this with the required splendour of the temple. Each time, this observation is placed alongside one referencing the necessary magnificence of the completed building, and it is offered as the reason for David's preparations (of men and materials). In other words, David is represented not only as sufficiently astute to appreciate the scale of the task in hand and Solomon's limitation to complete that task, but as providing the solution to this problem. The Samuel-Kings text provides no similar account of David's concerns about Solomon's capability; indeed in 1 Kings 2:2 he says to Solomon, ' "I am about to go the way of all the earth. Be strong, be courageous"' This not only fails to convey any doubts about Solomon's qualities for the task before him but, on the contrary, implies that his son only needs to utilise the abilities he was born with (his skills and talents) in order to complete the brief as required.

This additional material introduced by the Chronicler is especially interesting given that God informed David that Solomon would build the temple (cf. 2 Sam. 7:12-13; 1 Chron. 17:11-12). There are no doubts or concerns captured in any of the texts recording David's own explanation as to why he could not build the temple which convey any basis for any concern he may have had about the ability of Solomon to complete the project.⁶⁸ Indeed these concerns seem to fly in the face of God's confidence in him. Furthermore, the Chronicler once more matches Samuel-Kings in providing an exhortation for Solomon to 'be strong, and act' (1 Chron. 28:10, 20; cf. 1 Kings 2:2).⁶⁹

⁶⁸1 Chronicles 22:9; 28:6.

⁶⁹1 Chronicles 28:20 includes also "and of good courage".

Between them, these texts also remind Solomon that God has specifically chosen him to be the temple-builder, and that God is with him in the project and will not fail him.

A final point in relation to the Chronicler's additional material of chapters 22-29 is that it contains an explicit reminder of David's original desire with regard to the building, expressed here as being 'to build a house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD' (1 Chron. 28:2). This is certainly a clearer statement than the original pronouncements recorded at either 2 Samuel 7:2 or 1 Chronicles 17:1 in Nathan's oracle, and its significance is that the transfer of the ark to the newly-built temple is recorded in both accounts as the first act of Solomon after the building's completion (cf. 1 Kings 8:1, 3; 2 Chronicles 5:2, 5), and prior to its dedication. Thus, the Chronicler provides a link between the building constructed under Solomon and its firmly Davidic origins which Samuel-Kings does not, and so once more inserts for the reader a message implying Davidic influence and oversight.

Chapter 4:

Findings of the Dissertation

Having now compared the accounts in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles that relate to the building of the first temple, and in particular the additional passages in the latter account and the events common to both accounts which are described in a significantly different way by the Chronicler, some conclusions can be offered about the presentation in both accounts of the roles of David and Solomon in relation to the building project. These conclusions will focus initially on aspects relating to the language of both accounts and then to the events described within those accounts.

To begin with one may make the general observation that Samuel-Kings plainly presents the widespread understanding that David was the instigator of the plan to construct a temple in Jerusalem and that Solomon was the one who carried out that plan. This understanding also goes unchallenged both by the main protagonists and the less prominent characters in the narrative (such as Israel's leaders). Indeed, and as already indicated in this study (above at page 14), this proposition has spawned a number of studies seeking to explain why David was prohibited from carrying out this divinely approved plan. Thus after the record of Nathan's oracle – with God's apparent acceptance of the building plan, his prohibition that David should construct it and his selection instead of David's seed to do so (2 Sam. 7:5, 12-13 in particular) – no progress on the project is reported until 1 Kings 5, when Solomon requests building materials from Hiram, king of Tyre (followed by the commencement of building work in 1 Kings 6). David's charge to Solomon (1 Kings 2:1-9) does note that Solomon's prospering 'in all that you do and wherever you turn' is dependent on his keeping God's statutes, commandments, judgments and testimonies, but any

specific application to the temple-building project has to be read into this passage (cf. 1 Kings 3:14). As seen above, there is no reference in Samuel-Kings to any temple preparations by David, and in Solomon's dedication speech it is reiterated in an entirely matter-of-fact manner that, while David's desire to build a house in God's name was laudable, it was always God's intention that Solomon would complete the project (1 Kings 8:18-20). Thus, in summary, the notion of David as instigator and Solomon as builder of the temple is woven into Samuel-Kings to the extent that no viable alternative view is implied or indeed required while in Chronicles, as the result of various methods which will now be mentioned, these lines are not nearly so clearly drawn.

With regard to the language of the two accounts, differing emphases on David and Solomon are evident between the two accounts. The Chronicler places David 'centre stage' more frequently than Samuel-Kings, and he achieves this by using a variety of literary techniques. First, and at the most basic level, he mentions David's name more frequently during his temple-building account (that is, relative to the scale of the narrative); David's name is the third most prevalent word compared to it being the fourth in the earlier version. Such 'name-dropping' is found in a narrative which is more sharply oriented towards David as king; he is abruptly introduced as the nominated ruler of Israel in 1 Chronicles 11, and the later transfer of power to Solomon is trailed in an entirely positive tone during his reign.

Secondly, the Chronicler raises David's profile by weaving references to him into passages which, at the first level, require no such references and which could simply focus on Solomon. This is done both in anticipation of the building work (cf. 1 Chron. 18:8) and retrospectively after its completion (cf. 2 Chron. 3:1; 7:6). This has a dual effect: as David's profile is raised, so that of Solomon is relatively diminished. The term 'relatively' is important in this respect because the Chronicler does

not remove or dilute his direct references to Solomon in comparison to Samuel-Kings, and thus Braun's assertion that he 'has considered David and Solomon as essentially equal in his treatment of them' is in one sense true.⁷⁰ What he does is perform a subtle shift in emphasis, though not to the extent for it to be supposed that the Chronicler was 'ridiculing' Solomon.⁷¹ Rather, as Cudworth puts it, the Chronicler 'often expands themes that start but never quite develop in Samuel-Kings', and this may be seen as an application of this methodology.⁷²

Thirdly, the Chronicler adjusts some of the direct language of Samuel-Kings in relation to the construction narrative, choosing to replace the repeated proposition of Samuel-Kings that Solomon 'built' the various elements of the building with the notion that he 'made' these things. The Hebrew word used in Samuel-Kings for Solomon's activities is a strong allusion to the biblical record of Israel's patriarchs and spiritual fathers, and to their submission to God as evidenced by their construction of an altar to him. The first occurrence is in relation to Abram, when he 'built an altar to the LORD' in the plain of Mamre (Gen. 13:18).⁷³ By his change of word the Chronicler removes this reference, thereby diluting any representation of Solomon's activities as a replica of those accomplished by Israel's founding fathers in their worship of Yahweh. In contrast, his replacement term, *asah* ('to make') provides a link back to the construction of the tabernacle in the wilderness, where it is that author's preferred verb.⁷⁴ Williamson observes that this language change 'must point to a conscious shaping of the narrative by the Chronicler',⁷⁵ and that certainly seems to be the case. This may be linked to the Chronicler's inclusion of the account concerning

⁷⁰ Braun, *Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles*, p. 515.

⁷¹ The observations of some other scholars are noted in Braun, *Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles*, p. 504, where he offers the spectrum of 'benign neglect' to 'ridicule'. For the latter extreme he quotes R. North, *The Chronicler*, in *JBC* 1, 402-426.

⁷² Cudworth, *The David "Heart" for the Temple in Chronicles*, p. 204.

⁷³ See also Gen. 35:7; Exod. 17:15; 32:5.

⁷⁴ For example, Exod. 38:1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and so forth.

⁷⁵ Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 208.

David's provision of the pattern for the temple and the use of the word 'tabnith' to describe the sum of the information given to David; there are obvious allusions to the tabernacle design in the basic elements of the temple (with its three building sections, and the brazen altar and molten sea in the courtyard) and his choice of the verb *asah*, used in conjunction with the pattern narrative, thus overtly links the temple back through both Solomon and David to the previous place where God met with his people. In distinction to this, according to Samuel-Kings only Solomon may garner acclaim from the similarities of the constructions, and this acclaim is by virtue only of its finished appearance.

Finally, all of this is to be assessed against a backdrop in which the characterization of neither David or Solomon is compromised by reference to the events surrounding Solomon's conception. While it has been noted in this study that the Chronicler does not remove all of David's fallibility with regard to his judgement (for example, in the method used in the first attempt to bring the ark to Jerusalem; cf. 1 Chron. 13) or his sin (for instance, by numbering Israel; cf. 1 Chron. 21),⁷⁶ these weaknesses are not directly related to the temple-building project itself, and it seems to be weaknesses in this regard which the Chronicler wished to remove. Related to this, this dissertation has shown that the transition of power from David to his son is described (or better, accounted for) in terms which provide no hint of the machinations and difficulties of David's final days which are included in Samuel-Kings.

Thus, the straightforward demarcation present in Samuel-Kings between the temple planning phase (with passages focusing on David) and the construction phase (passages focusing on Solomon) is far less apparent in the Chronicler's version. The result of this is that, relatively and

⁷⁶Williamson, *Eschatology in Chronicles*, p. 132, quoting Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicle*, pp. 476-81.

proportionately, Solomon's role in the overall project is diluted while that of David is enhanced. This then creates the possibility for the Chronicler that David may be legitimately presented as involved in both aspects, and his desire to achieve this is then realised by a combination of the changes made to some of the events described by Samuel-Kings and the addition of his own distinctive material. It is noteworthy that much of the Chronicler's additional material is presented in the form of two 'reports' of events taking place before Israel's gathered leadership,⁷⁷ and which focus almost exclusively on David's words and actions. Indeed, even where the rulers of Israel are brought briefly to the fore (1 Chron. 29:6-9) and their generosity in the provision of materials for the temple is recorded, this pericope is bracketed by David's call for this generosity and then his blessing of the rulers, with the result that David's character and reputation is the one enhanced most by the unselfishness of the leaders. By means of this technique (involving Israel's leadership) the Chronicler not only conveys key information for his readers, but he also legitimises the events he is describing in the history of Israel, that is the construction of the temple may be seen as endorsed by the nation 'corporate', and thus be regarded as a matter of unity rather than of division.

The Chronicler's desire to present David as legitimately involved in the building work required other manoeuvres on his part, however, in addition to simply presenting statements which describe his involvement as being acceptable to Israel's leaders of the day. In particular, the reason why David makes preparations had to be accounted for. So, in spite of the clear declaration by God (apparently understood and unequivocally accepted by David in his prayerful response to the message he received from Nathan) that Solomon would – and thus presumably could – build the temple, the Chronicler places into his narrative a 'need' for David to make preparations for its

⁷⁷De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 182 and 224.

construction. Thus the description of Solomon as 'young and tender' (1 Chronicles 22:5; 29:1) is juxtaposed with the requirement for the temple to be 'exceedingly magnificent, famous and glorified throughout all lands' and with the required work to achieve this as being 'great' (1 Chron. 29:1). The clear implication here is that Solomon is not up to the job. Given these requirements and the implied character weakness of Solomon, David is able to say, "'I will **therefore** make preparation for it'" (1 Chron. 22:5; emphasis added). In making Solomon's need of his father's assistance explicit he thus prepares the ground for, and legitimises both spiritually and practically, the preparations David subsequently makes. While at first sight such a move would necessitate a dilution of the prohibition found in Nathan's oracle upon David being the temple-builder (that is on him, as it were, being involved in any way at all with its construction), in fact the Chronicler tackles the problem differently; by amending God's statement as delivered to him by Nathan from 'Are you the one to build me a house to live in?' (2 Sam. 7:5) to the more direct 'You shall not build me a house to live in.' (1 Chron. 17:4), and then by identifying more clearly in relation to David who the temple-builder would be (i.e. of his 'sons' rather than the more general '...offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body' (1 Chron. 17:11 and 2 Sam. 7:12)), he creates the possibility of David legitimately being involved in the construction of the building provided he organised none of the actual building work. In support of this argument, it should be noted that Solomon's statement to God in a dream, 'I am only a little child; I do not know how to go out or come in' is made in the context of, and as a precursor to his request for 'an understanding mind to judge (God's) people' (1 Kings 3:9 and 7), and not in relation to his ability to complete the temple project. This is confirmed by God's response, which acts as an explanation for later descriptive statements about his wisdom (see, for example, 1 Kings 4:30) and the significance of the account of the visit of the Queen of Sheba (1 Kings 10:1-13 and 2 Chron. 9:1-12).

Finally, it is noteworthy that none of David's preparatory work as itemised by the Chronicler affects his portrayal (following that of Samuel-Kings) of Solomon as being entirely satisfied in every way with his role in the project. This is a narrow and carefully-judged path that the Chronicler has trodden, as a careless phrase could have left the door open to perceived resentment from Solomon that while he had been chosen by God to build the temple he was not in fact being allowed to do so. Thus the Chronicler does not introduce any discord between the two main characters in his narrative or between their reigns. One may suppose this was a critical judgement for the Chronicler to make, given (as noted above) the audience for which he was writing and their (then) current circumstances.

Chapter 5:

Conclusions

Some conclusions must now be drawn as a result of the analysis carried out in this study. First, and most generally, it is apparent that the Chronicler, in his version of the history pertaining to the construction of the first temple, highlights David's presence within his narrative and presents for him a much greater level of involvement in the project than is the case in Samuel-Kings. The roles of instigator and implementer are comfortably applied in Samuel-Kings to David and Solomon respectively, and also accepted by them, but these lines are considerably less clearly drawn in the Books of Chronicles. Furthermore, the Chronicler presents this involvement at least in part as a response to Solomon's need for assistance, something not hinted at in Samuel-Kings. While, as noted above (page 30), accusations of fraud on the Chronicler's part have been made against him on the basis that his insertions seem to fit too well his purposes, as has been observed the fact that the evidence for David's greater involvement in the project is found in material not included in the earlier account of the temple-building project cannot lead automatically to the conclusion that the material is invented,⁷⁸

In heightening David's involvement, the Chronicler does not contradict or correct any major aspect of the project's timeline as described in Samuel-Kings, but one of his techniques is to modify some of the emphases in the earlier version. Examples of this are his strengthening of the prohibition of David as temple-builder in Nathan's oracle and the replacement of the verb 'build' with 'made' in the narrative of the construction work itself.

⁷⁸D. F. Payne, 'The Purpose and Methods of the Chronicler', p.67.

The Chronicler is careful to redefine David's role in the project in such a way as not to present him as ignoring or being disobedient to the initial message received by him on this matter, that is, that not he but his seed would be the one to build a temple. Thus, the Chronicler explicitly differentiates between David's 'preparations' (see, e.g., 1 Chron. 22:3, 14; 29:2, 7) and the building work itself (see, e.g., the distinctions in 1 Chron. 28:2 and 6, where David 'had it in (his) heart to build an house' and Solomon 'shall build' it, and his exhortation in 1 Chron. 22:19 to 'all the princes of Israel' that they 'arise, therefore, and build...the sanctuary of the LORD God'). One may assume that this is significant in his overall characterisation of David.

Secondly, the Chronicler uses the public pronouncements made by David, which as we have seen comprise the majority of his additional material, to support the notion that the extent of David's involvement in the project was open and transparent. These pronouncements reflected well upon David and received the approval of his nation, as represented by Israel's leadership.

Finally, in redefining David's role in the building project, the Chronicler provides answers to some of the questions posed by Samuel-Kings to an observant and interested reader. Nevertheless, this should not be regarded as his primary purpose. The question as to the origin of the building's design, for example, would surely have come to mind, even though one may conclude from its absence that this was not a significant matter for the author(s) of Samuel-Kings. The Chronicler provides the answer to this question, as he does to other similarly apparent questions, such as the origin of much of the materials and labour required for the building work, and yet the provision of these answers is a means to an end rather than an end in itself. The Chronicler uses the passages that provide this missing information as offering him an opportunity to develop his presentation of

David as the enthusiastic conduit between God and Solomon – the king approved of by God and, at the same time, approving of what God would have built.

The reason why the Chronicler penned what has been termed his 'revisionist religious history' of this period,⁷⁹ not 'writing history in the sense in which we conceive that history ought to be written',⁸⁰ including (but not limited to) his account of the temple project, is a related but separate matter from the one addressed in this dissertation. It may be observed, however, that the Chronicler's intentions are surely more subtle than the fact, as Williamson suggests, that David is found by the Chronicler to be unsuitable as a temple-builder.⁸¹ In every sense other than the fact that the building was constructed during his reign, David is, as we have seen, purposely presented as contributing as least as much as his son Solomon to the construction of the building. De Vries quotes Von Rad as observing, specifically in relation to 2 Chronicles 3:1, that the Chronicler's overriding intention is to identify David as the real temple builder,⁸² and as this dissertation has demonstrated there is sufficient evidence from his second presentation of the temple-building narrative to support this view.

⁷⁹Reiss and Zucker, 'Chronicles As Revisionist Religious History', p. 120.

⁸⁰Welch, *The Work of the Chronicler*, p. 29

⁸¹Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 134.

⁸²De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 252, quoting Gerhard von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes* (BWANT 3, Stuttgart:Kohlhammer, 1930) p. 129-130.

Bibliography

- Barrick, William D, 'Why Was David's Plan To Build The Temple Prohibited By God?', *Papers*, <https://drbarrick.org/files/papers/other/David_and_the_Temple.pdf> [accessed 9 October 2020].
- Braun, Roddy L., 'Solomonic Apologetic In Chronicles', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, (1973), pp 503-516.
- Braun, Roddy L., 'Solomon, The Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28 and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976), pp. 581-590.
- Braun, Roddy L., *1 Chronicles*, World Biblical Commentary 14 (Waco: Word Books, 1986).
- Campbell, Anthony F., and Mark A. O'Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).
- Cudworth, Roy D., 'The Davidic "Heart" for the Temple in Chronicles', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 2019, Vol.81 (2), pp. 204-216 .
- De Vries, Simon J., *1 and 2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids: Wm B Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989).
- Dirksen, Piet B., 'Why Was David Disqualified as Temple Builder? The Meaning of 1 Chronicles 22:8', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, JSOT 70 (1996), pp. 51-56 <<https://web-b-eb-scohost-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=268efdfd-5a9e-4bba-8b32-4929a78282c3%40pdc-v-sessmgr06>> [accessed 19 December 2020].
- Dumbrell, William J., 'The Purpose of the Books of Chronicles', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (JETS , 27/3 September 1984), pp. 257-266.
- Ellicott, Charles J., *A Bible Commentary for English Readers*, (Omaha, NE: Patristic Publishing, 2019).
- Goswell, Gregory, 'Why Did God Say No To David? (2 Samuel 7)', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 43 (2019), pp. 556-570.

- Japhet, Sara, *The Ideology of the Book Of Chronicles and Its Place In Biblical Thought*, 2nd rev ed. Edition (London: Peter Lang, 1997).
- Kleinig, John W., 'Recent Research In Chronicles', *Currents in Research Biblical Studies* 2 (1994): pp. 43-76.
- Knoppers, Gary N. 'Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63 (2001), pp. 393–415.
- Murphy, Roland E, 'Solomon', in *The Oxford Companion To The Bible*, ed. by Bruce M Metzger and Michael D Coogan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 707-708.
- Murray, Donald F. 'Under Yhwh's Veto: David as Shedder of Blood in Chronicles', *Biblica*, vol. 82, no. 4, 2001, pp. 457–476 <www.jstor.org/stable/42614322> [accessed 6 October 2020].
- Payne, D. F., 'The Purpose and Methods of the Chronicler', *Faith and Thought* 93.2 (1963), pp. 64-73.
- Reiss, Moshe and David J. Zucker, 'Chronicles As Revisionist Religious History', *The Ashbury Journal* 68/2, date and pages.
- Shipp, Mark, 'Why Are David & Solomon Whitewashed In Chronicles?', *Latest News and Articles*. <<https://austingrad.edu/blog/why-are-david-solomon-whitewashed-in-chronicles-part-1/>> [accessed 9 October 2020].
- Strong's Hebrew*, https://biblehub.com/englishmans_hebrew.htm [accessed 9 October 2020].
- Welch, Adam C., 'The Work of the Chronicler: It's Purpose and It's Date', *The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1938* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939).
- Williamson, H. G. M., 'Eschatology in Chronicles: The Tyndale Old Testament Lecture', *Tyndale Bulletin* 28 (1977) pp. 115-54.
- Williamson, H. G. M., 'The Temple in the Book of Chronicles', in William Horbury (ed.), *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp. 15-31.
- Williamson, H. G. M., *1 and 2 Chronicles*, New Century Bible Commentary series (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1982).

Wright, John W, 'The Founding Father: The Structure Of The Chronicler's David Narrative', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1998), pp. 45-59.