
A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

citizens of Jesus at Nazareth are taught by an incident in the Old Testament that the rejection of a prophet by his countrymen does not invalidate a prophet's claim (Luke iv. 24 foll.). Other instances are the vision of Jacob (John i. 51), the gift of manna (John vi. 30 foll.), and the serpent lifted up in the wilderness (John iii. 14).

All these examples point to the inference that in the saying under discussion our Lord was also directing the deeper thoughts of His hearers to an Old Testament incident, which would not only indicate His claim to authority, but also open out the significance of the temple itself in the light of prophecy.

More than that, it is one of those words of Christ which help us to understand—and how far are we from fully understanding ?—how "all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man" (Luke xviii. 31). It is a fragment of that lost Gospel according to Christ Himself when, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke xxiv. 27).

ARTHUR CARR.

THE DAVID OF THE BOOK OF SAMUEL AND THE DAVID OF THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES.

IN the book of Chronicles the history proper does not begin until 1 Chronicles x. In that chapter the disastrous battle of Gilboa is narrated (but for a few small changes) in the words of 1 Samuel xxxi., the Chronicler adding his own comment, "So Saul died . . . because of the word of the LORD which he kept not . . . Therefore the LORD slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David the son of Jesse." This is the Chronicler's introduction of David

to his readers; the LORD, he tells us, deposed a disobedient and unfaithful king, and put David in his place.

The whole of the remainder of 1 Chronicles, i.e. chapters xi.–xxix., is devoted to the story of David. As the Chronicler tells it, it begins with a reference to the LORD'S choice of David to be king, and immediately proceeds to describe how David chose Zion to be his city.

The religious motive of this beginning is at once apparent; we are introduced to the chosen king and to the chosen city (1 Chron. xi. 1–8). Three chapters (xiii., xv., xvi.) give an account (much fuller of ritual than that given in Samuel) of the two attempts, the second successful, to bring up the ark into the "city of David." Immediately on this follows the story (repeated from Samuel) of David's consultation with Nathan the prophet, and of the prophet's announcement that David himself was not to be the builder of JEHOVAH'S temple (chap. xvii.). After a section on certain wars of David (borrowed directly from the text of Samuel) the Chronicler narrates the Numbering of the People, an event which immediately led to David's choice of the site of the Temple, a choice providentially guided (chaps. xxi. 18, xxii. 1).

From this point for eight chapters onward the story of the reign of David becomes the story of the preparation for building the Temple and for organizing its worship. The last words and acts of David recorded by the Chronicler deal with the building of the House of the LORD. In the whole account of this king's reign (1 Chron. xi.–xxix.) no fewer than twelve chapters (xiii., xv.–xvii., and xxii.–xxix.) are devoted to the ark, the organization of worship, and the Temple. David is represented as a warrior only when the text of Samuel is followed; when the Chronicler writes independently David is the organizer of the temple psalmody and service, and indeed the true Founder of the Temple.

How much we find missing from Chronicles which occupies an important place in Samuel! How much is missing from Samuel which looms large in Chronicles! If we regard the two accounts as biographies of David, we find the proportions so much altered, that the features of the hero of the one are hardly to be recognized in the other.

Thus in Chronicles the long civil war with the house of Saul (2 Sam. ii. 12–iv. 12) is barely glanced at (1 Chron. xii. 23). The brief account of the two Philistine raids is taken almost unchanged from Samuel. After chapter xvii., however, the Chronicler devotes three chapters (short ones indeed) to David's foreign wars. In these narratives he follows again the text of Samuel, and in these occurs the omission which has given most offence to his critics. This instance needs a somewhat full consideration.

In chapter xx. the Chronicler begins to reproduce from 2 Samuel xi. the story of the Ammonite war. He follows his authority closely and copies down the clause, "But David tarried at Jerusalem." In Samuel these are significant words, for they introduce the story of the king's temptation and fall. But the Chronicler, standing on the brink of the story of Bath-sheba and Uriah, continues his narrative of the Ammonite war without making a single allusion to David's double sin.

This omission leads directly to others. In the story as told in Samuel, a connexion of cause and effect is traced between David's sins against Uriah and the sins of Amnon and Absalom against their father (2 Sam. xii. 11). But these domestic tragedies are passed over by the Chronicler. For him Amnon and Absalom have no history (1 Chron. iii. 1, 2); Bath-sheba (called "Bath-shua") is identified only as "the daughter of Ammiel" (*v.* 5), and Uriah the Hittite is only a name in the long list of David's mighty men (xi. 41).

At this point, before giving a more decisive reason for the omission of the story of Uriah's wife it is only fair to say that the Chronicler may have been moved by a desire to be brief. The story is indeed a very long one, and it is not easy to break it off when once begun. The sequel of "Set ye Uriah in the forefront of the hottest battle that he may die" (2 Sam. xi. 15) is not "I have sinned against the LORD" (xii. 13), but "O my son Absalom, would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" (xviii. 33). The story of Uriah is told in Samuel as if it covered a third of David's life.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that the Chronicler wished to represent David as a sinless character. From his great omission in chapter xx. he passes on in chapter xxi. to tell in full the story of the Numbering of the People. He clearly regards it as a great sin, and he attributes the whole responsibility for the act to David alone. On this last point he emphasizes the verdict of the book of Samuel by adding a few words of his own (1 Chron. xxi. 7). Why does the Chronicler narrate the Numbering? *His reason for recording in chapter xxi. is the counterpart of his reason for silence in chapter xx.* He is silent over Uriah the Hittite because the story has nothing to do with the history of the Temple, but he tells in full the story of the Numbering, because it culminates in the providential choice of a site for the Temple (chap. xxii. 1).

Indeed it was no part of the Chronicler's aim to re-tell the story of David. His interest was not in the Acts of Hebrew kings so much as in the religion of the Hebrew people, that religion which had been handed down from father to son until it became his own. It is true that in treating of the Davidic era he could not shake himself altogether free from the lines of the well-known story of the Hebrew hero. The freebooting life of David is acknowledged in the

list of his early adherents given in 1 Chronicles xii., and the narrative of one group of his wars is copied from the book of Samuel in chapters xviii.–xx. But the Chronicler tells only enough to enable the reader to identify *his* David —the ultimate Founder of the Temple—with the David of the book of Samuel—the warrior king. With this he is content. For the full story of David—shepherd-lad, free-booter, and king—he refers to "the words of Samuel the seer" and "the words of Nathan the prophet" and "the words of Gad the seer" (1 Chron. xxix. 29, Rev. Vers. margin).

Almost similar procedure is followed with regard to Solomon. The story of the Queen of Sheba is taken over in full from the book of Kings as sufficient to enable the reader to identify Solomon the *grand monarque* of Kings with the Solomon of Chronicles, the successor of David in the building of the Temple. The remainder of the account of Solomon's secular glories is omitted.

The Chronicler essayed a task somewhat different from that of the author of Samuel and Kings—the task of writing a history of the religion of his people. The thread of history which he followed was the history of the fortunes of the Temple, for the Temple was in his experience the centre and stay of Hebrew worship, and so ultimately of Hebrew religion.

The Chronicler closes his history with an extract from the memoirs of Nehemiah which tells how the cupbearer of Artaxerxes cleansed the priesthood and took measures for the maintenance of worship at the Temple (Neh. xiii. 29–31). But at what point should this history begin? "With Solomon of course," some would answer, "who built the Temple." But there are two reasons why a starting-point farther back should be selected. In the first place the story of the providences under which the Temple was built and preserved does not in fact begin with Solomon.

The city which was to shelter the Temple had first to be won for Israel ; [1] it was won by David, the man whom the LORD had chosen " according to His own mind " [2] to be the first of a line of kings. The Temple in turn was built to shelter the ark, the symbol of JEHOVAH'S presence, to the care of which David devoted himself early in his reign.[3] Behind the actual building of the Temple are David's choice of a city, David's care for the ark, and the LORD'S choice of David himself.

Secondly, the Chronicler wrote with the direct evidence of 2 Samuel vii. and 1 Kings v. 2–5 before him as to David's interest in Temple-building. This evidence is to be added to the evidence supplied by 2 Samuel vi. that the ark, the sacrifices, and religious music were all objects of David's care. The general action of the Chronicler in carrying back his religious history past Solomon to Solomon's father David is amply justified.

But the Chronicler has gone beyond a general statement and entered with fulness into particulars. On a few hints of the earlier authorities he has reared a superstructure of detail which most modern critics criticize and a few make a mock of. Thus there are definite statements that the organization of the Priests (1 Chron. xxiv. 6 ff.) and of the Levites (xxiii. 2 ff., xxv. 1 ff.) was due to King David. Speeches (xxii. 7 ff., xxviii. 2 ff.) and a prayer (xxix. 10 ff.) are ascribed to him, which are not to be found in Samuel or Kings. David is credited with definite preparations on a large scale for the building of the Temple, and he is said

[1] 2 Samuel v. 6 f.

[2] 1 Samuel xiii. 14, " The LORD hath sought him a man after his own heart." The title " the man after God's own heart " is founded on this passage, but not justified by it. According to Hebrew idiom the phrase " after his heart " qualifies the verb, not the object. " JEHOVAH after His own mind (i.e. uninfluenced by human motives) sought Him a man." Acts xiii. 22 gives a midrashic paraphrase.

[3] 2 Samuel vi. 1 ff. ; vii. 1 ff.

to have given precise instructions to Solomon as to the plan of the work (xxviii. 11–19). As to all this the earlier authorities are silent.

Now it is impossible to prove a negative; we dare not say that this account of the Chronicler is necessarily untrue. Yet weight must be given to the consideration that few, if any, of the Old Testament scholars of to-day suppose that the Chronicler had other good authorities (now lost) for the mass of details not found in Samuel or Kings which fill the last eight chapters of 1 Chronicles. Even the most cautious critics feel that for this superstructure the Chronicler is drawing on his own imagination.

Practically we must allow that the imaginative element predominates in the account of David's activity in relation to the Temple and its worship. On the other hand, as we have seen, the Chronicler follows his authorities somewhat closely in other narratives concerning David.

The Chronicler thus appears in a double character. At times he is a faithful transcriber of the early annals. At other times he makes free additions to the annals, evidently with some purpose not historical in mind. This purpose may have been in part antiquarian, that is, the author may have wished to restore by conjecture a picture of the origins of the Temple worship. But on such a subject the antiquarian interest runs easily into the religious interest, and we cannot doubt that the latter was predominant with the Chronicler. His object is to impress his own generation with his own conviction of the importance of the Temple-worship; in the exhortations which he puts into David's mouth in chapters xxii., xxviii., xxix. he shows himself a great religious teacher, a "scribe" perhaps, and yet a worthy successor of the Prophets. In his teaching he used the kind of historical narrative which was then current, namely, that which passed easily and unconsciously from

fact to the embellishment of fact, unfolding both by fact and by parable great religious lessons.

Undoubtedly such a blending of literal narrative and illustrative narrative, such a mixture of historical fact and "fiction with a purpose," is irritating to the modern logical mind, which asks that the spheres of history and of imaginative literature should always be kept separate. But the Chronicler lived in simpler times, and we have no right to judge and condemn him by purely modern standards. He comes to us as a religious teacher, not as an additional authority for the annals of a Hebrew king.

We have now reached one of the conclusions of this paper. The David of Chronicles is on a different plane from the David of Samuel. From the latter to the former there is a transition which is in the main from history to theology. We cannot combine the two in one historic picture of the man. David is used in Chronicles as an example, an illustration, in a story which the Chronicler tells to recommend to others the piety which he himself cherished. We may not suppose that David actually said and did all that is ascribed to him by the latest of the Biblical annalists.

And what are we to say of the religious teaching which the Chronicler seeks to convey to us through the words and the deeds of *his* David? This is after all a more important question than the question, Is the David of the Chronicler, as distinguished from the David of Samuel, a historical figure? Are we to say that because the Chronicler's interest is so closely bound up with the Temple and its worship, that his religion is for us mere antiquarian formalism, and that it has no message for modern minds? Our first impulse is perhaps to say, Yes, to this question. Some modern scholars have said that the Temple was in Judah just what the sanctuary at Beth-el was in Israel, merely the king's private chapel. Moreover it is a fact that at more than

one period of the history both sanctuaries shrink into insignificance by the side of the activity of the great prophets of the North, Elijah and Elisha, Amos and Hosea. Judging Hebrew religious phenomena with the help of the experience of many Christian centuries we are often led to pronounce the verdict that the ordered worship of the Temple is of small significance beside the Preaching and the Teaching of the Prophets.

But such a verdict has to be modified on further reflection. The Prophet, though great, was only a revivalist, a religious help appearing fitfully from time to time, while the Temple and its services, save for the great break after 586 B.C., were always present. Nor must it be supposed that all religious instruction depended on the Prophets. The Temple itself was a centre of organized religious teaching. This teaching contained, we may believe, moral as well as ritual elements. The Law, the *Torah*, grew up in the Temple. Some long history of an oral tradition growing up among the Priests and embodying itself in a written book must lie behind the great event of the discovery of the Book of the Law in the Temple in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 8). We have the suggestion of one landmark in such a history in the person of Jehoiada the priest, who put down Baal worship with more success than Elijah himself. The "testimony" which he put upon the young king Joash (2 Kings xi. 12) may well have consisted of some passage from the Law of Moses as it then existed—some earlier form perhaps of Deuteronomy xvii. 14–20.[1] It is in any case striking that after this mention of the "Testimony" it is recorded of Amaziah the successor of Joash (2 Kings xiv. 6) that he

[1] I cannot accept Wellhausen's wanton emendation of "bracelets" for "testimony" in 2 Kings xi. 12. The wearing of a document is not alien from Eastern modes of thought. See the note on the passage in the *Cambridge Bible* (1908).

acted in accordance with the Law of Moses in Deuteronomy xxiv. 16. Four reigns later we find Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 4, 22) acting in accordance with a well-known law preserved to us in the book of Deuteronomy,[1] and thus again the suggestion comes to us that the Law of Moses in some form oral or written had its home among the priests in the Temple. Finally it is hardly necessary to record again in black and white the well-known fact that from the recovery in the Temple of the Lawbook—lost or hidden during the days of Manasseh—came the great religious awakening of the reign of Josiah.

I have made much of the Temple as the shelter beneath which the *Torah* grew up, because this aspect of it hardly receives as much notice as it deserves. In another aspect, of course, the Temple was the home of a formal public worship. But there is yet a third aspect which ought not to be overlooked. The Temple was the house, the place of meeting, to which on special occasions of stress the worshipper resorted that he might meet with God. To the Temple Hezekiah went up with Sennacherib's threatening letter to spread it before the LORD (2 Kings xix. 14). The Temple was the outward sign of God's presence with His people; its destruction by the Chaldeans brought about the apostasy of the remnant of the Jews from the service of JEHOVAH to the worship of the Queen of Heaven. All this the Chronicler found written for him in the earlier records.

The Chronicler himself in the opening chapters of the so-called book of Ezra, has recorded the great religious revival which followed the edict of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the Temple. With the Temple for nearly a hundred years from that time (as the succeeding chapters show) the fortunes of the Jewish people and of the Jewish religion were

[1] There is nothing to suggest in the alternative that the impulse came from Isaiah.

inextricably bound up. At a later time, as the prophecies of Joel and (still more) of Malachi show, prophecy itself found the centre of religion in the Temple and its worship. The Chronicler, writing in the third century B.C., could look back upon a long religious history during which the Temple and the Priesthood had exercised an influence as great, if not as deep, as the Prophets had exercised in the best days of prophecy.

In the Chronicler's time there was "no prophet more." Indeed there was, so far as we can judge, little room for prophetical activity. The Temple, with its regular ministrations of priests, was fulfilling its work worthily. There was zeal for worship and for the Law. Thus the Temple-religion (if we may use the phrase) appealed with living force to the Chronicler. It must not be thought that this, as the Chronicler held it, was wanting in life, because in it the forms of worship and the organization of Priests and Levites loomed so large. The ritual in which he delighted enshrined a living faith. The burst of praise gathered with a free hand from the Psalter in 1 Chronicles xvi., the splendid thanksgiving of King David in 1 Chronicles xxix., the prophecy of Azariah, the son of Oded, in 2 Chronicles xv. 2–7, and the utterances of Hezekiah in 2 Chronicles xxx., especially his prayer in verses 18, 19, are enough to show that the Chronicler's religion was inspired by an inward faith. His religion at the heart of it was indeed the religion of David, as it is still the substructure of the religion of all Christian men.

W. Emery Barnes.