Chapter 1: Chronicles

1.1 INTRODUCTION

TODO: Write me.

1.2 SITES OF MEMORY IN THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES

We have plenty of language to describe the various processes of individual memory, but one of the main problems we have when talking about social memory and cultural memory is that we lack good language describe the structures and functions of those mnemonic systems at the level of society. As such, memory theorists have adopted a number of analogies and terms to describe how societies remember and how individuals and groups interact with memory at the social level.

It is important to remember that because social memory is a social construct we must not equate the remembered past with the events, experiences, and individuals which informed it. Where one might refer to an individual person having "a memory" of a particular event, there is no central repository—be it material or biological—of social memory.[1] As has been

1. See especially Jens Brockmeier, "After the Archive: Remapping Memory," *CP* 16.1 (2010): 5–35 and James V. Wertsch, "Beyond the Archival Model of Memory and the Affordances and Constraints of Narratives," *CP* 17.1 (2011): 21–29.

noted by numerous memory theorists, "there is no such 'thing' and social or collective memory."[2] In other words, when we talk about social or cultural "memory" we are talking about a complex network of social processes and discourses which make up a society's understanding of the past.

These social processes and discourses tend to center around particular events, places, people, and ideas which the society has imbued with special mnemonic significance. These clusters of discourse are commonly referred to by memory theorists as "sites" of memory. The term "site of memory" is a translation of the French *lieu de mémoire* was coined by Pierre Nora in the 1970's and has been adopted and adapted by numerous theorists since then.[3] Although Nora did not clearly define the term, a "site of memory," as used by Nora, might better be translated as a "place of remembrance," or a "place where people remember." For Nora, modern-day "sites" of memory existed "because there are no longer *milieux de mémoire*, real

2. Ian D. Wilson, *Kingship and Memory in Ancient Judah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 14 citing Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices," *ARS* 24 (1998): 105–40 and James V. Wertsch, "Collective Memory," in *Memory in Mind and Culture,* ed. Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 117–37.

3. The term was originally coined by Nora in the work "Mémoire collective," in *La Nouvelle histoire,* ed. Roger Chartier Jacques Le Goff and Jacques Revel (Paris: Retz, 1978), 398–401, and used subsequently in *Les Lieux de mémoire,* 7 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1984–1992) and "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," in "Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory," *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–24. For a discussion of Nora's use of the term and its reception, see Andrzej Szpociński, "Sites and Non-Sites of Memory," in "Special Issue English Edition: Place and Memory," *TD* 9 (2016): 245–54.

environments of memory."[4] In other words, because modern historical consciousness, by Nora's reckoning, has all but eradicated "memory," the preservation of memory in the modern era has been relegated to particular "sites" of memory—monuments, structures, and practices whose purpose is to perpetuate memory. He writes:

> *Lieux de mémoire* are simple and ambiguous, natural and artificial, at once immediately available in concrete sensual experience and susceptible to the most abstract elaboration. Indeed they are *lieux* in three senses of the word—material, symbolic, and functional. Even an apparently purely material site, like an archive, becomes a *lieu de mémoire* only if the imagination invests it with a symbolic aura. A purely functional site, like a classroom manual, a testament, or a veterans' reunion belong only inasmuch as it is also the object of a ritual. And the observation of a commemorative minute of silence, an extreme example of a strictly symbolic action, serves as a concentrated appeal to memory by literally breaking the temporal continuity.[5]

Sites of memory, therefore, are not entirely abstract and intellectual, but bear on the practice and materiality of a society in addition to having symbolic significance.

Although Nora's original use of the term tended to focus especially on sites of memory which bear on so-called "great traditions"[6] of political and ideological importance such as national monuments and archives, the modern use of the term tends to be more abstract and to refer to any "place" where memory discourses occur within a society for the purpose of remembering. Such sites of memory may operate within any number of social/cultural spheres

4. Nora, "Between Memory and History," 7.

5. Ibid., 18–19.

6. As coined by Redfield in *Peasant Society and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), 41–42.

such as national memory (war memorials, national holidays, etc.), religious memory (religious holidays, symbolic ritual acts, etc.), or family memory (traditional foods, birthdays, anniversaries) and may be thought of as distinct, but connected "nodes" of symbolic meaning within a complex network of cultural symbols—what Halbwachs called the "social frameworks of memory."[7]

Every edge and node within the graph of a society's collective memory is the product of memory construction. It is an abstraction. In much the same way that historiography offers a schematic narrative of past events which is necessarily selective and intentional about what specific events, people, and ideas are germane to the purpose of the historian, so too social and cultural memory is selective of the particulars which it preserves and constructive in how it presents people, events, and ideas within particular symbolic systems. Thus, sites of memory are social spaces where memory is constructed. For our purposes, and following a number of modern practitioners of memory studies, I will use the term "site" of memory to describe any discrete person, place, practice or idea where such discourses of memory occur.[8]

The Hebrew Bible is replete with sites of memory—ideas, people, places, and practices which have been imbued with significance by numerous societies since antiquity and which form a central component to the identities and self-understanding of (especially) Jews and

7. Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* trans. Lewis A. Coser, HS (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 38.

8. Within Hebrew Bible studies, see especially the work of Ehud Ben Zvi as well as his student Ian Wilson, esp. Ehud Ben Zvi, "Chronicles and Social Memory," *ST* 71.1 (2017): 69–90 and Wilson, *Kingship and Memory*, 25–26.

Christians throughout the world. Take, for example, the Exodus from Egypt. Regardless of the historical reality of such an event, the story of the Exodus as recounted in the Hebrew Bible is the central narrative undergirding the biblical rationale for Israel's possession of the Land. Likewise, the Israelites are told to be kind to strangers and sojourners within their community based on the memory of Israel's enslavement in Egypt. Similarly, the Torah could be understood as a distinct (and particularly potent) site of memory found in the Hebrew Bible; the same goes for the figure of Moses. Each of these sites of memory (the Exodus, Torah, and Moses) are distinct but they also exhibit clear relationships within the network of discourses which are found in the Hebrew Bible. And moreover, each site of memory also relates to and bears distinct significance for the various religious communities which hold the Hebrew Bible as a part of their tradition within their distinct systems of symbolic meaning. Remembering these connections and their culturally defined significance is what cultural memory is all about.

1.3 KING DAVID AS A SITE OF MEMORY

It is important to note that although the book of Chronicles is a work of cultural memory, it is unquestionably the case that the figure David was a prominent site of memory for ancient Israel long before the book of Chronicles was written. Chronicles, more so than Samuel–Kings, is characterized in terms of "memory" because it is clear that the Chronicler[9] used

9. My use of the term "Chronicler" is meant only to reference the author(s) of the book of Chronicles. Although the term is sometimes associated with a particular theory about the composition of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, I am not using it as such.

Samuel–Kings as a primary source and the differences between the sources and the end-product are demonstrable. In other words, because we know that Chronicles is secondary to Samuel–Kings and we can see where the Chronicler departed from Samuel–Kings, it is easy to characterize those changes as the result of changes in cultural memory. But it is important to remember that even Samuel–Kings is the product of mnemonic construction and the David presented there already functioned as a special site of memory for ancient Israel. In other words, despite the fact that Samuel–Kings functions as a foundational source *for Chronicles*, it should not be treated as if it was the origin of all Davidic traditions.[10]

Even setting aside the biblical material (e.g., Samuel–Kings, Psalms, et al.), it is demonstrably the case that the Davidic *dynasty*—whatever one might think about David as an historical figure—had symbolic meaning in the ancient world which extended beyond the borders of Israel. For example, we know from the Old Aramaic inscription from Tel Dan that the term בת דוד "house of David" was used as a dynastic name for the monarchy of the kingdom of Judah in the late ninth or early eighth centuries BCE.[11] Likewise, it has been suggested that the Mesha Stele, too, refers to the "house of David," although this reading is not

10. Ida Fröhlich, "The Changing Faces of David in Biblical Historiography. Narrative Patterns in Historiography, Positive and Negative," in *David in Cultural Memory,* ed. Ida Fröhlich, CBET 93 (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 65–88.

11. The *editio princeps* were published in two articles: the first find as Avraham Biran and Joseph Naveh, "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan," *IEJ* 43 (1993): 81–93, and the subsequent fragments as Avraham Biran and Joseph Naveh, "The Tel Dan Inscription: A New Fragment," *IEJ* 45 (1995): 1–18.

secure.[12] Although such references have traditionally been used to bolster claims of an historical David, for our purposes it suffices to say that around the turn of the eight century BCE, "David" existed as a meaningful eponymous symbol and site of memory with respect to the monarchy of Judah. Thus, when we turn to the biblical portrayals of the figure David (which, by most accounts were products of later periods of Israelite history than Tel Dan and Mesha), it is important to keep in mind that those portrayals are participating in established discourses about David. This is all the more important when we consider the book of Chronicles which represents some of the latest strata of memory preserved in the Hebrew Bible. Thus when we discuss the figure of David as a site of memory which the book of Chronicles engages with extensively, I want to emphasize that the processes of constructing the remembered figure of David did not begin with the Chronicler just as it did it end with the Chronicler.[13]

Although the particular relationship between the book of Chronicles and the books of Samuel and Kings is a matter of scholarly debate, it is generally agreed that Samuel–Kings forms the basis for much of the Chronicler's depiction of Israel's history.[14] A great deal of work

12. The reading בת דוד was proposed by Lemaire, but his reading is not universally accepted. See André Lemaire, "La dynastie davidique (BYT DWD) dans deux inscriptions ouestsémitiques du IXe s. av. J.-C.," *SEL* 11 (1994): 17–19 and André Lemaire, "'House of David' Restored in Moabite Inscription," *BAR* 20 (1994): 30–37. The Mesha inscription is typically dated to the mid-ninth century BCE and thus would be slightly earlier than the reference in the Tel Dan inscription, if Lemaire is correct.

13. Fröhlich, "Changing Faces of David," 65–88.

14. The observation was made as early as de Wette in the early nineteenth century in his

has been done analyzing the particular literary relationship between Samuel–Kings and Chronicles and the textual processes involved—e.g., what version(s) of Samuel–Kings the Chronicler may have used, etc.—but thinking in terms of social memory requires us to consider the relationship between the texts in *social* terms. In other words, not just to ask *what* the received traditions about David said, but to consider the *role* and *status* of those traditions and to consider why they were (or were not) significant within a particular social context.

Thus the process of "remembering" David in Chronicles can be viewed from two different angles which map onto the dual valences of the term "remember": to "recall" and to "commemorate." On the one hand, the Chronicler "recalls" stories about David which are

---

Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 2 vols. (Halle: Schimmelpfennig, 1806–1807). More recently, see especially the work of McKenzie *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History,* HSM 3 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985); Steven L. McKenzie, "The Chronicler as Redactor," in *The Chronicler As Author: Studies in Text and Texture,* ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 70–90; Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* AB 12 (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 66–71; and Ralph W. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary,* Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2006), 30–42 as well as that of David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Construction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 74–74. Notable exceptions, however, do exist. See especially the work of A. Graeme Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (London: T & T Clark, 1994); A. Graeme Auld, "What was the Main Source of the Book of Chronicles?" In *The Chronicler As Author: Studies in Text and Texture,* ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 263 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 91–99 and Raymond F. Person, *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World,* AIL 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010).

adapted to the frameworks of the Chronicler's social situation. the Chronicler is a product of his time and society and as such inherited sets of traditions about David, the past, and the world more broadly, which color how he understands the history of Israel and David in particular. On the other hand, the composition of the book of Chronicles is itself an act of commemoration which (as we've noted) is a conscious, constructive process. It represents the process of memory encoding and the construction of cultural memory from which future rememberers would draw. As a work literature, it also bears the idiosyncrasies of its author(s), however constrained by their social milieu they may have been. In fact, determining which of these processes best accounts for any particular "innovation" of Chronicles is quite difficult. Was the Chronicler consciously "reshaping" the memory of David? Or was the Chronicler more passively reproducing a composite picture of David that he inherited from his culture? Traditional approaches to the book of Chronicles have tended to attribute a great deal of agency to the Chronicler as an innovator of tradition. But thinking in terms of cultural memory pushes us to consider a fuller picture of how cultural memory is created and calls into question whether every theological or ideological augmentation of the Chronicler should be attributed to his novel understanding of the Israelite past. Such an approach takes into account that textual "sources" are not merely copied and "altered," but are read, internalized, believed, understood, and reasoned about, which is to say, *remembered*.

1.3.1 The David of Chronicles

How then was David remembered in Chronicles? This question carries with it the assumption that the author of Chronicles was not simply copying-and-changing Samuel–Kings (or other

traditions), but rather was a product of a *remembering community* and participated in memory discourses at various sites within the cultural memory of Second Temple Judaism. Answering this question requires that we not only consider what sources the Chronicler may have used and how he altered those sources, but also to consider the social frameworks which shaped how those sources were received by the Chronicler and how they affected how the Chronicler presented (or commemorated) his work.

Although the David of Chronicles largely resembles that of the DH (he is recognizably the same figure), his function within the narrative of the book of Chronicles is different than that of the DH and that difference can be seen in how the Chronicler portrays and uses him. In both works David is beloved, but he is noticeably less-flawed in the book fo Chronicles. This is not to say that David is treated as entirely faultless in the book of Chronicles, but I think it is fair to say that the overall portrait presented by the Chronicler is more willing to overlook (and literally to omit) some of David's more egregious acts, and to highlight his role as a model King. This positive portrayal of David in Chronicles is well documented and oft-repeated, so it will suffice for me to focus on two of the most significant features of the Chronicler's portrayal of David, specifically, his portrayal as a divinely elected king, and his role in the establishment of the Israelite cult in Jerusalem.[15]

15. See John Jarick, "Seven Things that the Chronicler Wants You to Remember about King David," in *David in Cultural Memory,* ed. Ida Fröhlich, CBET 93 (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 115–30; Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009; repr., Sara Japhet; *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought;* trans. Anna Barber; BEATAJ 9 [Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989]), 347–83 Gary N. Knoppers, "Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in Chroni-

David the Divinely Elected King

First, as I have just alluded to, in the book of Chronicles, David is portrayed as the quintessential, rightful Israelite ruler, elected by Yahweh (1 Chr 10:14) and anointed by the elders of Israel to lead the people (1 Chr 11:1–3). By comparison to the account in Samuel–Kings, the process by which David becomes the ruler of Israel is somewhat less contentious. The apologetic tone of the HDR narratives is nowhere to be found. The rationale for Saul's demise is, like in the DH, predicated on his supposed infidelity to Yahweh, with special reference to his consultation with a medium (although, the story is not told in Chronicles), however, the election of David as Saul's "successor," as described by the Chronicler, does not include Saul aside from a passing reference to his death and infidelities. David himself offers his version of events in 1 Chr 28:4:

(1 Chr 28:4) וַיִּבְחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּי מִכֹּל בֵּית־אָבִי לִהְיוֹת לְמֶלֶךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל
לְעוֹלָם כִּי בִיהוּדָה בָּחַר לְנָגִיד וּבְבֵית יְהוּדָה בֵּית אָבִי וּבִבְנֵי אָבִי בִּי רָצָה לְהַמְלִיךְ
עַל־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

(1 Chr 28:4) Yahweh, the God of Israel chose me from among my father's whole house to be king over Israel forever. He chose Judah to be a leader and (from) the house of Judah, the house of my father and (from) the house of my father, he took delight in me to make (me) king over all Israel.

Conspicuously absent from the Chronicler's narrative and David's summary, are the major conflicts with Saul during David's rise to power. In fact, if one did not know better, simply removing all references to Saul in Chronicles would not meaningfully change how

---

cles," *Bib* 76.4 (1995): 449–70; Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary,* OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 47–48; Klein, *1 Chronicles,* 44–48; Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9,* 80–85.

David's election is described.[16]

Similarly, the tumult within David's court at the end of his life and the succession of Solomon are omitted by the Chronicler, where 1 Kgs begins with a feeble, impotent David and his messy succession by Solomon, 1 Chr 23:1 is content simply to report that:

(1 Chr 23:1) וְדָוִיד זָקֵן וְשָׂבַע יָמִים וַיַּמְלֵךְ אֶת־שְׁלֹמֹה בְנוֹ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

> When David was old and full of days, he made Solomon, his son, king over Israel.

It went *so* well, in fact, that David saw fit to do it a second time, according to 1 Chr 29:22b–23:

(1 Chr 29:22b) וַיַּמְלִיכוּ שֵׁנִית לִשְׁלֹמֹה בֶּן־דָּוִיד וַיִּמְשְׁחוּ לַיהוָה לְנָגִיד וּלְצָדוֹק לְכֹהֵן׃
(23) וַיֵּשֶׁב שְׁלֹמֹה עַל־כִּסֵּא יְהוָה לְמֶלֶךְ תַּחַת־דָּוִיד אָבִיו וַיַּצְלַח וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֵלָיו כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

> (1 Chr 29:22b) Then they made Solomon, son of David, king a second time and they anointed him by Yahweh as a prince as well as Zadok as a priest. (23) And Solomon sat on the throne of Yahweh as king in place of David, his father. And he prospered and all Israel obeyed him.

These matter-of-fact descriptions contrast sharply with the events depicted in 1 Kgs: Adonijah's self-exaltation (1 Kgs 1:5–53), David's deathbed speech to Solomon (1 Kgs 2:1–9), Solomon's subsequent conflict with Adonijah over Abishag (1 Kgs 2:13–25), with Joab (1 Kgs 2:28–35), and with Shimei (1 Kgs 2:36–46); all of which culminates with the ominous pronouncement of 1 Kgs 2:46b:

וְהַמַּמְלָכָה נָכוֹנָה בְּיַד־שְׁלֹמֹה׃

16. This fact raises the question of why the Chronicler *did not* simply omit Saul. I suspect that, although not favored Saul was a useful foil narratively and was a well-enough known figure that omitting him entirely simply did not make sense. Saul was, doubtless, a major figure in the traditions of early Israel.

So the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon.

The contrast between the violent establishment of the kingdom "in the hand of Solomon" and the popular assent of the people to both the reigns of David and Solomon in Chronicles could not be more clear. On the one hand, the accounts of 1 Kgs offer narratives which provide *rationale* for the events that take place—everything that David and Solomon do is framed as a sensible response to wrongdoing. The descriptions of Chronicles, on the other hand, are not at all interested in providing such rationales, but rather *assume* the premise of 1 Kgs. Instead, Chronicles offers plain, black-and-white, narratives which—by virtue of their declarative rhetoric—help to reinforce the idea that David and his successors were not only elect by Yahweh, but were "good" kings whose reigns were not contested, but were supported by the population at large.

David the Temple-builder (Almost)

While the portrayal of David as the unquestioned founder of the Israelite monarchy in Chronicles is accomplished primarily through omitting details of David's faults, the book of Chronicles makes its most significant *positive* contribution to its picture of David by crediting him as the founder of the Jerusalem temple. David did not build the temple in Jerusalem, of course, but the picture that the Chronicler paints of how the Jerusalem temple came about leaves little doubt about whose idea it *really* was, namely, David's. In the mind of the Chronicler, although Solomon may have been the one to *build* the temple, David wrote, directed, funded, and produced the project.

In both 2 Sam 7 and 1 Chr 17, David expresses a desire to build a temple for Yahweh and

in both cases is rebuffed by Yahweh through the prophet Nathan. Instead, Nathan tells David that Yahweh would establish David's line through his son, Solomon. Although neither account gives a reason for Yahweh's preference toward Solomon, later in Chronicles, David states that the reason Yahweh passed over him was that David was a man of war, while Solomon would be a man of peace:

> (1 Chr 22:7) וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִיד לִשְׁלֹמֹה בְּנוֹ [בְּנִי] אֲנִי הָיָה עִם־לְבָבִי לִבְנוֹת בַּיִת לְשֵׁם יְהוָה
> אֱלֹהָי: (8) וַיְהִי עָלַי דְּבַר־יְהוָה לֵאמֹר דָּם לָרֹב שָׁפַכְתָּ וּמִלְחָמוֹת גְּדֹלוֹת עָשִׂיתָ
> לֹא־תִבְנֶה בַיִת לִשְׁמִי כִּי דָמִים רַבִּים שָׁפַכְתָּ אַרְצָה לְפָנָי: (9) הִנֵּה־בֵן נוֹלָד לָךְ הוּא
> יִהְיֶה אִישׁ מְנוּחָה וַהֲנִחוֹתִי לוֹ מִכָּל־אוֹיְבָיו מִסָּבִיב כִּי שְׁלֹמֹה יִהְיֶה שְׁמוֹ וְשָׁלוֹם
> וָשֶׁקֶט אֶתֵּן עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיָמָיו:
>
> (1 Chr 22:7) And David said to Solomon, "My son, my heart desired to build a temple for the name of Yahweh, my God (8) but the word of Yahweh came to me saying, 'You have spilled much blood and fought in great battles. You shall not build a temple for my name because you have spilled so much blood on the earth before me. (9) Rather, a son will be born to you. He will be a man of rest. And I will give him rest from all his enemies who surround him. Thus, Solomon will be his name and I will give peace and quiet to Israel during his days."'

Here, the point is made particularly explicit through the word-play of "Solomon" (Heb. שְׁלֹמֹה) and "peace" (Heb. שָׁלוֹם) in v. 9.[17]

Despite David's assertion that Solomon be the one who builds the temple, the Chronicler credits David with making all the preparations and providing the bulk of the necessary building supplies for its construction. While Solomon would provide the labor, not

17. The same logic is echoed in 1 Chr 28:3: וְהָאֱלֹהִים אָמַר לִי לֹא־תִבְנֶה בַיִת לִשְׁמִי כִּי אִישׁ מִלְחָמוֹת אַתָּה וְדָמִים שָׁפָכְתָּ: "But God said to me, 'You shall not built a house for my name because you are a man of war and had spilled blood."'

only was the *idea* of building the temple David's, but he financed the operation בְּעָנְיִי "with great pains" (lit. "in my oppression"; 1 Chr 22:14). This may be contrasted with Samuel–Kings which does not contain any of this material.

1.3.2 Historicizing the Chronicler's Memory of David

Historicizing the Chronicler's memory of David's roles as King and cult-founder asks us to account for the similarities and differences between the portrayal of David in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles based on an historical understanding of the social frameworks from which each text emerged. In other words it asks us to utilize what we know historically about the societies which produced these texts to help to explain the similarities and differences between them using the language and theoretical models of social and cultural memory theory.

As I alluded to above, the portrayal of David as the unquestionably elect ruler of Israel and his succession by Solomon in Chronicles is a conspicuously tidy treatment of the very messy account of the so-called History of David's Rise (HDR) narrative and the dramatic family disputes that preoccupied the latter years of David's reign and those of his son Solomon (the so-called "Succession Narrative" [SN]). While these stories form a core set of narratives for Samuel–Kings, they are almost completely absent from the book fo Chronicles.[18]

18. Although the compositional and redactional history of the Deuteronomistic History is hotly debated—with wildly divergent scholarly opinions—I will take as my point of departure the centrist view of McCarter, Halpern, and specifically Knapp which view the HDR and SN (collectively, the "Court Narrative" [CN] or "Traditions of David's Rise and Reign" [TDRR] *per* Knapp) as royal apologia. I follow Knapp in his view that these traditions do not represent "the residue of a single apologetic composition" (161), but rather a diverse set of traditions. How-

It is widely held that that the HDR and SN should be understood as forms of ancient royal apologia—an effort by the author(s) to legitimize David's actions which might otherwise have been construed as a usurpation of the divinely elected king, Saul. Andrew Knapp, for example, observes that "[i]n some ways, [the Traditions of David's Rise and Reign] is the paradigmatic ancient Near Eastern apology."[19] He elaborates:

> The apologist employs nearly every apologetic motif in his effort to legitimize David, including passivity, transcendent non-retaliation, the unworthy predecessor, military prowess, and the entire triad of establishing legitimacy.[20]

Clearly the apologist sought to make a forceful and potent argument in favor of David's legitimacy. The apologist operated within his social context—using literary devices and forms which were meaningful in his society—and engaged in discourses about David's legitimacy in an attempt to define David's rise and reign in a particular (positive) way. As such, it has been argued that this apologetic form suggests that the HDR narratives functioned as a *contemporary* form of apologia,

---

ever, because the sources cannot meaningfully be parsed, I will also follow him in "[dealing] with the early narrative traditions in their entirety" (161). See Andrew Knapp, *Royal Apologetic in the Ancient Near East,* WAWSup 4 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015); P. Kyle McCarter, "'Plots, True or False': The Succession Narrative as Court Apologetic," *Int* 35.4 (1981): 355–67; P. Kyle McCarter, "The Apology of David," *JBL* 99.4 (1980): 489–504; P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation with Translation, Notes, and Commentary,* AB 8 (New York: Doubleday, 1980); Baruch Halpern, *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001).

19. Knapp, *Royal Apologetic,* 218.

20. Ibid.

implying that these narratives originated at-or-around the time of the presumed historical figure.[21] By this reasoning, such an apologia would have arisen in response to accusations of usurpation. Thus, we would imagine that the HDR was representative of the "last word" on the matter or an attempt to suppress alternative voices that questioned the legitimacy of David's rule, the means by which he gained the throne, and the manner of his succession. These discourses were not entirely suppressed from the Hebrew Bible, as evidenced by the figure Shimei and his condemnation of David as a usurper in 2 Sam 16:7b-8:

> (2 Sam 16:7b) וְכֹה־אָמַר שִׁמְעִי בְּקַלְלוֹ צֵא צֵא אִישׁ הַדָּמִים וְאִישׁ הַבְּלִיָּעַל׃ (8) הֵשִׁיב עָלֶיךָ יְהוָה כֹּל דְּמֵי בֵית־שָׁאוּל אֲשֶׁר מָלַכְתָּ תַּחְתָּו [תַּחְתָּיו] וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת־הַמְּלוּכָה בְּיַד אַבְשָׁלוֹם בְּנֶךָ וְהִנְּךָ בְרָעָתֶךָ כִּי אִישׁ דָּמִים אָתָּה׃
>
> (2 Sam 16:7b) Thus Shimei spoke cursing him, "Go out! Go out! Oh man of blood; Oh worthless man! Yahweh has repaid you all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose place you reign. May Yahweh give your kingdom into the hand of Absalom, your son. Look at your evil! Because you are a man of blood."

Although I am not entirely convinced by this line of reasoning, from the perspective of social memory it is safe to say that at the time of the narrative's composition, the question of whether David should be remembered as a the leader of a victorious *coup d'état* over Saul, or a reluctant leader divinely chosen by Yahweh was a matter of debate. The complex redactional history of

21. See especially McCarter, "Plots True or False," 355–67; McCarter, "The Apology of David," 489–504; and to a lesser degree Halpern, *David's Secret Demons,* 75–76. Some clarification is in order here. McCarter et al. are generally talking about where these stories *originated.* They are engaging primarily with minimalist scholars who discount reality of the historical figure of David.

the Deuteronomistic History makes saying anything more specific than this difficult and I am open to the possibility that there could have been other social contexts in which such apologia would be potent, either as the original context of their composition or as a new context for an old set of stories.[22] Whatever the case, we know that for ancient Israel David *did* become known as the legitimate king of Israel and Judah *par excellence* and a figure against whom subsequent kings would be measured. In this way, the construction of the apologist's David was ultimately successful.

For all the potency of these stories, one may wonder why they were not included in the Chronicler's history. That is to say, why omit such persuasive, and effective material? The answer, I think, is quite simple: the Chronicler was operating within a social milieu which not only accepted the legitimacy of David and his heirs, but celebrated them as foundational figures. In other words in the symbolic world of the Chronicler, David was significant *because* he was king and—his legitimacy was assumed and celebrated. In other words, for the Chronicler, remembering David into his social context found particular parts of the received tradition more useful for the set of discourses that he was participating in. The discourses that HDR participated in had been resolved and the Da-

22. For example, Diana Edelman has suggested that a Saulide–Davidic rivalry could have resurfaced during the early Persian period. See Diana Edelman, "Did Saulide–Davidic Rivaly Resurface in Early Persian Yehud?" In *The Land That I Will Show You: Essays on the History and Archaeology of the Ancient near East in Honor of J. Maxwell Miller,* ed. J. Andrew Dearman and M. Patrick Graham, JSOTSup 343 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 69–91. Or perhaps the Saul/David struggle could hint at a Benjaminite/Judahite conflict even after the the fall of Israel. This is all idle speculation, of course, but I want to allow for the fact that *other* social situations could make these apologetic discourses potent.

vidic dynasty was thoroughly legitimate in the mind of the Chronicler. As such, it was sufficient for the Chronicler to simply recount the death of Saul—which David had no part in—and the subsequent anointing of David. From the perspective of the Chronicler it was a thoroughly unremarkable transfer of power. Similarly, the Chronicler makes no mention of the difficult power struggles that occurred near the end of David's life between him and his sons. Instead, it sufficed for the Chronicler to state:

(1 Chr 23:1) וְדָוִיד זָקֵן וְשָׂבַע יָמִים וַיַּמְלֵךְ אֶת־שְׁלֹמֹה בְנוֹ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

> When David was old and full of days, he made Solomon, his son, king over Israel

The struggle between Solomon and Adonijah following David's death is likewise omitted. Instead, opening verse of 2 Chronicles reads simply:

(2 Chr 1:1) וַיִּתְחַזֵּק שְׁלֹמֹה בֶּן־דָּוִיד עַל־מַלְכוּתוֹ וַיהוָה אֱלֹהָיו עִמּוֹ וַיְגַדְּלֵהוּ לְמָעְלָה׃

> Solomon, the son of David, established himself in his kingdom, and Yahweh his God was with him and made him exceedingly great.

It seems, therefore, that the DH was so successful in its apologetic that the memory constructed by its rhetoric precluded the need for continued apologia in the work of the Chronicler. The Chronicler had no need to "legitimize" the *fact of* the Davidic dynasty, but instead would focus his attention on defining the *significance of* that dynasty for his own readers in a dramatically different social setting.

Instead of these questions of legitimacy, what seems more important to the Chronicler are questions revolving around David's role in cultic activity before Solomon's temple. Despite the fact that David is viewed by the Chronicler as a central figure in the establishment of the cult, it is con-

spicuous that David is not the one to build the temple to Yahweh. In particular we can see how the rationale for explaining why David *did not* build a temple for Yahweh may have developed through the influence of other traditions. As early as 1 Kgs 5:15 Solomon explains that the reason his father, David, was unable to build the temple was due to the persistence of David's many enemies:

> אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ אֶת־דָּוִד אָבִי כִּי לֹא יָכֹל לִבְנוֹת בַּיִת לְשֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו מִפְּנֵי הַמִּלְחָמָה אֲשֶׁר סְבָבֻהוּ עַד תֵּת־יְהוָה אֹתָם תַּחַת כַּפּוֹת רַגְלָו [רַגְלָי:]
>
> You knew David, my father; that he was not able to build a house for the name of Yahweh, his God, on account of the war which surrounded him until Yahweh put them beneath the soles of his feet.

It is important to note that the rationale here is not that David divinely prohibited from building the temple, but that the presence of his enemies *prevented* him from building the temple. In fact, this statement is inconsistent with the description of David in 2 Sam 7:1, which explicitly states that it was after Yahweh had given David rest from his enemies that David first considered building a temple for the deity:

> (2 Sam 7:1) וַיְהִי כִּי־יָשַׁב הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּבֵיתוֹ וַיהוָה הֵנִיחַ־לוֹ מִסָּבִיב מִכָּל־אֹיְבָיו: (2) וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל־נָתָן הַנָּבִיא רְאֵה נָא אָנֹכִי יוֹשֵׁב בְּבֵית אֲרָזִים וַאֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים יֹשֵׁב בְּתוֹךְ הַיְרִיעָה:
>
> (2 Sam 7:1) It came about that when the king was sitting in his house—Yahweh having given him rest all around from all his enemies— (2) the king said to Nathan the prophet, "Look! I am sitting in a house of cedar but the ark of God is sitting in the midst of curtains!"

Rather conspicuously, however, the parallel account in 1 Chr 17:1 omits that David had been given rest:

> (1 Chr 17:1) וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר יָשַׁב דָּוִיד בְּבֵיתוֹ וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִיד אֶל־נָתָן הַנָּבִיא הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי יוֹשֵׁב בְּבֵית הָאֲרָזִים וַאֲרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה תַּחַת יְרִיעוֹת:

> (1 Chr 17:1) Now, when David was sitting in his house, David spoke to Nathan the prophet, "I am sitting in a house of cedar but the ark of the covenant of Yahweh is under curtains!"

One obvious way to explain this difference is to attribute the omission to the Chronicler's desire for narrative consistency and to assert that it was not until the reign of Solomon that "peace and quiet" would be achieved in Israel. Indeed, this ultimately is the position of the Chronicler, which he makes explicit in 1 Chr 22:7 (above).

While Japhet and others finds this omission consistent with the Chronicler's broader methodology and ideological project,.[23] there is some debate about whether the reference to Yahweh giving rest to David was original to 2 Samuel or whether it was a late Deuteronomistic addition.[24] As a result, there is also some question whether it was a part of the *Vorlage*of the Chronicler at all and therefore whether the minus in 1 Chr 17 should be attributed to the Chronicler. McKenzie in particular goes so far as to say that this was a late Deuteronomistic addition to 2 Samuel and argues that the phrase simply was not a part of the *Vorlage*from which the Chronicler drew.[25] Even allowing for the possibility that this aside was not a part of the Chronicler's *Vorlage*, however, there remain at least two related questions to be answered:

23. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles,* 328.

24. McCarter states confidently that this is an addition to the MT, despite the fact that all known witnesses include the phrase. See P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel: A New Translation with Translation, Notes, and Commentary,* AB 9 (New York: Doubleday, 1984), 191.

25. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History,* 63. Knoppers does not make a strong recommendation either way, but makes it a point to include haplography as a possible explanation of the omission. See Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* AB 13 (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 666.

1) What prompted the supposed insertion into 2 Sam 7, and 2) how did David's *preoccupation* with his enemies turn into a divine *disqualifier*, as described in 1 Chr 22 and 28.

To answer the first question, numerous scholars have observed the clear connection between this reference to finding "rest" with Deuteronomy 12:10–11, which establishes a timeline for the construction of a permanent cultic site in Yahweh's chosen locale:

(Deut 12:10) וַעֲבַרְתֶּם אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן וישַׁבְתֶּם בָּאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם מַנְחִיל אֶתְכֶם
וְהֵנִיחַ לָכֶם מִכָּל־אֹיְבֵיכֶם מִסָּבִיב וישַׁבְתֶּם־בֶּטַח׃ (11) וְהָיָה הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יִבְחַר יְהוָה
אֱלֹהֵיכֶם בּוֹ לְשַׁכֵּן שְׁמוֹ שָׁם תָּבִיאוּ אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה אֶתְכֶם עוֹלֹתֵיכֶם
וְזִבְחֵיכֶם מַעְשְׂרֹתֵיכֶם וּתְרֻמַת יֶדְכֶם וְכֹל מִבְחַר נִדְרֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר תִּדְּרוּ לַיהוָה׃

> (Deut 12:10) And you will cross over the Jordan and settle in the land that Yahweh your God is giving to you. And he will give you rest from all your enemies around (you) and you will live safely. (11) Then the place at which Yahweh your God will establish his name will be (the place) that you will bring everything that I command you—your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, tithes, the contributions of your hand, and all your finest votive offerings that you might vow to Yahweh.

According to this passage, it is only after the Israelites completely conquer the land and find "rest" will the central cultic site be established. As a matter of inner-biblical interpretation, it makes sense that some late redactor of 2 Sam 7 might note that David sought to build the temple only after "rest" had been established and simply did not take into account the rationale given by Solomon in 1 Kgs 5:15.

Such editorial or redactional changes may be subsumed under the rubric of memory insofar as such changes come about in order to align some idea (or mnemonic node) within a the broader framework of the editor's social memory. In other words, we can account for this textual change by positing that the redactor's understanding of *when* the temple could be built

was informed by the tradition of Deut 12:10–11 (or one like it). Thus, when the redactor read about David's attempt to build a temple, he interpreted David's actions based on this other knowledge. Although it would be easy enough to circumvent the issue by noting that David is *rebuffed* by Yahweh and that the temple is ultimately built by Solomon, doing so leaves David somewhat vulnerable to critique. If the redactor thought David to have access to the "Torah" one must suppose that David either did not know Deut 12, did not care about Deut 12, or (as the redactor concluded) that "rest" *had in fact* come about in Israel. As a way to rationalize the apparent contradiction with the fact that David engages in battle in the very next chapter, one might imagine that the Chronicler speculated that David only *thought* that he had vanquished all his enemies or that there was "rest," but that it was short-lived. If instead we locate the change at the pen of the Chronicler, the argument may be, in effect, reversed. By prioritizing the idea that "rest" would not be established in Israel until the reign of Solomon, the Chronicler is able to categorically dismiss the notion that David had already accomplished the task in 1 Chr 17. In fact, the two ideas are not mutually exclusive. The inclusion of 2 Sam 7:1b may have been both a late editorial addition *and* a part of the Chronicler's *Vorlage*. In either case we can see the received tradition being adapted and fitted into a related, but distinct system of knowledge—social memory. The redactional process is—like rewriting—a process of memory.

The second question—how David's *preoccupation* with his enemies turned into a divine *disqualifier*—is a more difficult question to address. The transition from the practical exigency of "not having time to build the temple" to the ideological position that David was disqualified from building the temple based on his bloody past cannot be attributed to the same kinds of

simple redactional processes as above. Accounting for such a fundamental reimagining of circumstances under which the temple would be built requires us to consider not simply *what* was remembered but *how* and *why* it was remembered.

Knoppers notes that there are essentially three explanations for the Chronicler's disqualification of David. First, it could be that the Chronicler viewed David as ritually unclean from his bloodshed. This position, supported by Rudolph,[26] presumes that warfare disqualifies David from participating in cultic activities. As Knoppers points out, however, there is no indication with in the Hebrew Bible that this was the case, and moreover, David *does* participate in other forms of cultic activity.[27] Second, David's bloodshed could be understood as an "ethical lapse," i.e., that David bore guilt because for some wrong act, such as murder.[28] Yet, within chronicles, David is never described as incurring blood-guilt. The accusations of being a "man of blood" are made by Shimei in 2 Sam 16:8. The great faults of David known from Samuel–Kings (such as the death of Uriah) are not present in Chronicles.[29] Finally, a number of

26. Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher,* HAT 21 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1955), 151.

27. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10–29,* 772.

28. This position is advocated by Piet B. Dirksen, "Why Was David Disqualified as Temple Builder? The Meaning of 1 Chronicles 22:8," *JSOT* 70 (1996): 51–56 and Brian E. Kelly, "David's Disqualification in 1 Chronicles 22:8: A Response to Piet B. Dirksen," *JSOT* 80 (1998): 51–56. See also Roddy Braun, "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles," *JBL* 95.4 (1976): 581–90.

29. The one possible exception is when David takes a census and many people die as a result (1 Chr 21:1–13; see below). However, as Knoppers notes, we would more likely expect some kind of "*national* consequence" (as we see with the census) if this were the case. For the Chronicler, David's prohibition from building the temple is "personal in nature." See Knoppers, *1*

scholars have suggested that it was David's martial activities that made him unfit—the temple is place of peace, while David is a man of war.[30] This interpretation has the advantage of taking the Chronicler's explanation in the most plain sense possible. But, here again, there is insufficient textual support in the rest of the Hebrew Bible, which does not associate warfare with the shedding of innocent blood, and nowhere in Chronicles is David accused of such. At the very least, this interpretation aligns most closely with the explicit connection between David and his military campaigns (i.e., not a ceremonial or ethical, shortcoming), and indeed, it is the rationale given in antiquity by Josephus (Jewish Antiquities 7.337).[31] Knoppers adopts a modified version of this last position and implies that it was the shear volume of blood that David spilled which ultimately disqualified him, drawing on Pentateuchal notions that "blood belongs to God."[32] From my perspective, none of these explanations are particularly satisfying.

The assumption of all these approaches has been that the Chronicler—with his distinct theological *Tendenz*—sought to rationalize the fact that Solomon, and not David, built the temple—to explain why it was that David *did not* build the temple. As Japhet writes:

> The portrayal of David as *the* greatest of Israel's kings and the object of future hopes, the establishment of the Temple as the centre of Israel's re-

Chronicles 10–29, 772–73.

30. See especially Japhet, *I & II Chronicles,* 396–97 and Steven L. McKenzie, "Why Didn't David Build the Temple? The History of a Biblical Tradition," in *Worship and the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of John T. Willis,* ed. M. Patrick Graham, R. R. Marrs, and Steven L. McKenzie, JSOTSup 284 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 204–24.

31. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10–29,* 773.

32. Ibid., 774.

> ligious experience, and the inalienable bond between the house of David and the city of Jerusalem with its temple—all these had become theological cornerstones. The irrefutable fact that the Temple was built by Solomon rather than David did not cease to challenge theological thinking and demand explanation.[33]

I would like to suggest, however, that the question the Chronicler sought to answer was not why David *did not* build the temple, but why David *could not* build the temple. The difference is subtle, but important. To be sure the rhetoric of Samuel–Kings assumes that David *could have* built the temple, and attempts to provide reasons for why he did not. The narrative of Samuel–Kings argues that David *wanted* to build the temple but ultimately was unable to do so because "rest" had not been established in Israel. The Chronicler, on the other hand, assumes that the David *did not* and *should not have* built the temple and sought to explain the reason why. The answer is simple: David could not build the temple because Yahweh had appointed Solomon to do it.

Implicit in this shift is the assumption that what *did* happen *should* or *must have* happened. God must have planned for Solomon to build the temple because Solomon *did* build the temple. This shift marks an ideological transformation which almost certainly would have affected the way that the Chronicler interpreted the relevant material in his *Vorlagen*. What Dirksen calls Chronicles' "*ad hoc*" reinterpretation of 1 Kgs 5:15 in fact reflects an ideology which is built on the Chronicler's belief that Solomon was *supposed* to build the temple. Operating within such an ideology, Deut 12:10 becomes a *prediction of future events* rather than a description of the conditions under which Yahweh would establish a place for his name.

33. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles,* 396.

Yahweh's decision to choose Solomon to build the temple in 1 Chr 17 (and, by extension 2 Sam 7) is merely an elaboration on this plan set in place in Deut 12:10. That Israel had to wait for "rest" before Yahweh would established a place for his name, therefore, was tantamount to waiting for the reign of Solomon.

This reading is supported by the way that the book of Chronicles ultimately portrays David's involvement in the temple's construction. In particular, the argument made by the Chronicler asserts that David did everything within his power to prepare the way for his son to successfully complete construction. Within an intellectual framework wherein David knew that he was disqualified from building the temple, David shows his piety through restraint and deference toward his son's chosen status. In other words, the Chronicler has turned the whole discourse on its head. The implication that David was *ineffectual* in his efforts to build a temple (or, establish peace so the temple could be build) is reinterpreted as an act of piety. Not only did David have good reasons for not building the temple, but he was right *not* to build it. The truth that the temple could not be built until the the reign of the divinely appointed monarch is so fundamental that it is even encoded within the name of the king who would rule the kingdom during the requisite time of "rest" and "peace" (שָׁלוֹם, namely, Solomon (Heb. שְׁלֹמֹה). Where the narrative of Samuel–Kings can be read as an apology for David, the work of the Chronicler is a teleological interpretation of the fact that it was Solomon who ultimately built the temple in Jerusalem.

Both the (putative) redactional insertion in 2 Sam 7:2b and the reformulation of David as disqualified from building the temple, both are examples of how received traditions are

adapted and retrofitted into a broader contemporary system of knowledge—social memory. Important for our purposes, these social mnemonic processes can be reasoned about *historically*. The differences between ways that Chronicles and Samuel–Kings portray David should not primarily be explained as novel inventions of an idiosyncratic author, but instead analyzed as reflecting the social and theological discourses of the society that produced each. Thinking more broadly about the role of Chronicles, as a whole, it is imperative that we consider the fact that insofar as Chronicles is a rewriting of Samuel–Kings, it is a product of a distinctly different time, place, and social location.

1.4 THE TEMPLE AS A SITE OF MEMORY

The temple in Jerusalem was already an important site of memory for ancient Israel long before the book of Chronicles was written. Already in the book of Deuteronomy the mythology surrounding the divine selection of Jerusalem and the uniquely ordained site of the Solomonic temple had been well-established. This development is easily seen by contrasting the ways that the Covenant Code of Exod 20 in which Yahweh seems to command (or, at the very least not *prohibit*) the Israelites to establish cult sites בְּכָל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַזְכִּיר אֶת־שְׁמִי "in every place that I commemorate my name" (Exod 20:24) with that of Deuteronomy, in which Yahweh commands the Israelites to destroy all cult sites within the land and furthermore that:

> (Deut 12:5) כִּי אִם־אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יִבְחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם מִכָּל־שִׁבְטֵיכֶם לָשׂוּם אֶת־
> שְׁמוֹ שָׁם לְשִׁכְנוֹ תִדְרְשׁוּ וּבָאתָ שָׁמָּה׃ (6) וְהֲבֵאתֶם שָׁמָּה עֹלֹתֵיכֶם וְזִבְחֵיכֶם וְאֵת
> מַעְשְׂרֹתֵיכֶם וְאֵת תְּרוּמַת יֶדְכֶם וְנִדְרֵיכֶם וְנִדְבֹתֵיכֶם וּבְכֹרֹת בְּקַרְכֶם וְצֹאנְכֶם׃

> (Deut 12:5) But you shall seek the place that Yahweh your God will choose from among all your tribes as his dwelling to put his name there. You shall go there (6) and you will bring your burnt offerings there as well as your sacrifices, your tithes and the offerings of your hands, your votive gifts, your freewill offerings, and the firstborn of your cattle and flocks.

It is hard not to speculate that the textual variants in Exod 20:10 are due to the implication that Yahweh could be commemorate his name in multiple places, compared to its counterpart in Deut 12:5. This discomfort is illustrated in Samaritan Pentateuch's omission of כל with the result that מָקוֹם is conceptually singular (in *the* place), while LXX, Syriac, and the Targums all support the reading "in every place."[34] Such a reading implies that the author had in mind an *itinerant* cult site. The Niqqudim make it a point to separate the ideas, emphasizing that the clause בְּכָל־הַמָּקוֹם "in every place" modifies the following clause אָבוֹא אֵלֶיךָ וּבֵרַכְתִּיךָ "I will come to you and bless you" and not completing the action of the preceding מִזְבַּח אֲדָמָה תַּעֲשֶׂה־לִּי וְזָבַחְתָּ עָלָיו "you will make an earthen altar for me and make sacrifices upon it." Indeed, the first person form אַזְכִּיר favors the former reading. Even so, Exod 20 seems to presuppose that Yahweh could or would cause his name to be commemorated in more than one place. On the other hand, the book of Deuteronomy states clearly that the the Israelite were only to bring their offerings to the *the* place that Yahweh would choose from among the tribes. The historical reality of Israelite shrines and cult sites outside of Jerusalem during the monarchic period such as those from Dan, Arad, Beer-Sheeba, and others is well documented.[35]

34. In the case of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the editor may have had in mind "Samaria" rather than "Jerusalem," but the impulse is the same.

35. For a concise overview of the archaeological evidence, see Philip J. King and Lawrence E.

While these sites were condemned as idolatrous by the deuteronomistic editor(s), there is no evidence to suggest that contemporaries of the seventh century BCE (or earlier) saw them as such.

The increased importance of the Jerusalem temple brought about by the cult centralization efforts of Hezekiah and Josiah after the destruction of the Northern Kingdom similarly consolidated the religious memory of ancient Israel around Jerusalem and temple of Solomon. Insofar as the real religious practices of Israel (putatively) became increasingly focused on the city of Jerusalem and Solomon's temple leading up to its destruction at the beginning of the sixth century BCE, ancient Israel's memory about other "marginal" religious practices was quite literally demolished through the intentional destruction of bāmôt and other sacred sites through the religious reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah.[36]

Thus it was the socio-political *reality* of the Jerusalem temple's significance at the end of the sixth century BCE—brought about by the intentional religious reforms of Josiah—which informed the deuteronomistic editor's memory of earlier yahwistic cult practices and which would form the basis for the Chronicler's perception of religious practice during the early monarchic period. Regardless of how centrally significant the Jerusalem temple actually had (or

---

Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 319–52. See also Diana Edelman, "Cultic Sites and Complexes beyond the Jerusalem Temple," in *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah,* ed. John Barton and Francesca Stavrakopoulou (London: T & T Clark, 2010), 82–103 and Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and Other Deities in Ancient Israel,* 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 160–81.

36. ibid., 182–99; Thomas Römer, *The Invention of God,* trans. Raymond Geuss (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015), 191–209.

had not) been during the early monarchic period, or how successful the practical aspects of Hezekiah and Josiah's reforms had been, between the end of the seventh century BCE and the time of the Chronicler the memory of the temple had accrued meaning as a site of memory for the Golah community of Persian Yehud.[37] In other words, what is important for our purposes is not what the historical function of the temple had been during the monarchic period, but the function the Jerusalem temple played in the memory of the Chronicler and what kinds of social factors contributed to that function.

Consider, for example, the foundational role that the temple played in the reestablishment of the Golah community, as presented in the closing verses of 2 Chronicles (2 Chr 36:22–23|| Ezra 1:1–4). According to these texts, the first task of the returnees was to construct the *temple*. The construction project (as presented here) comes as a result of Cyrus' desire to build a temple for Yahweh. This emphasis on the importance of the temple's reconstruction aligns with sentiments from the other accounts of the temple's construction in Haggai and Zechariah. The account in Haggai 1:1–4, in particular, evokes the same rhetorical question asked by David in 2 Sam 7 and 1 Chr 17 and asserts that the struggles that the Golah community was facing were tied to the fact that they had yet to reconstruct the temple:

(Haggai 1:1) בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם לְדָרְיָוֶשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשִּׁשִּׁי בְּיוֹם אֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ הָיָה
דְבַר־יְהוָה בְּיַד־חַגַּי הַנָּבִיא אֶל־זְרֻבָּבֶל בֶּן־שְׁאַלְתִּיאֵל פַּחַת יְהוּדָה וְאֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ
בֶּן־יְהוֹצָדָק הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל לֵאמֹר׃ (2) כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לֵאמֹר הָעָם הַזֶּה אָמְרוּ

37. I restrict my discussion here to the memory of Persian *Yehud*, meaning the Golah community. The Samaritans, ʕam hāʔāreṣ, and the Jewish garrison at Elephantine, presumably, had their own systems of memory which, while historically related, would have been distinct in this period.

לֹא עֶת־בֹּא עֶת־בֵּית יְהוָה לְהִבָּנוֹת׃ (3) וַיְהִי דְּבַר־יְהוָה בְּיַד־חַגַּי הַנָּבִיא לֵאמֹר׃ (4) הַעֵת לָכֶם אַתֶּם לָשֶׁבֶת בְּבָתֵּיכֶם סְפוּנִים וְהַבַּיִת הַזֶּה חָרֵב׃

(Haggai 1:1) In the second year of Darius the King, in the sixth month, on the first day of the month, the word of Yahweh came by the hand of Haggai the prophet to Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel, the governor of Judah and to Joshua, son of Jehozadak, the high priest, saying: (2) "Thus says Yahweh of Hosts: 'This people says "The time has not come (yet) to build a temple for Yahweh"'" (3) And the word of Yahweh came by the hand of Haggai the prophet, saying: (4) "Is it time for you to live in your (own) paneled houses while this temple is in ruins?"

In all of these cases, the construction of the temple is of central concern to the authors of the biblical text. In the case of 2 Chronicles and Ezra, as the impetus for the returnees to go back to the land, and for Haggai and Zechariah as a way to complete the establishment of the Golah community. These text show considerable diversity, however, in a number of particulars.

It is conspicuous to me, for example, that although all the accounts operate within the Persian administrative context, the effort to reconstruct the temple in Chronicles and Ezra is instigated by Cyrus as a part of his benevolent edict. Because temple-construction was thought to be one of the central responsibilities of kings in the ancient world, it is understandable that it is *Cyrus* who gives the command to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem.[38] These accounts lack any hint of nation-

38. On temple construction as a royal activity, see Arvid S. Kapelrud, "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings," *Or* 32.1 (1963): 56–62; David L. Petersen, "Zerubbabel and Jerusalem Temple Reconstruction," *CBQ* 36.3 (1974): 366–72; Antti Laato, "Zachariah 4,6b-10a and the Akkadian Royal Building Inscriptions," *ZAW* 106.1 (1994): 53–69.

It is also worth noting that the Persian Empire *did* in fact commission the reconstruction of religious and cultural apparatuses, as evidenced by the Egyptian Udjahorresnet. See Alan B. Lloyd, "The Inscription of Udjahorresnet: a Collaborator's Testament," *JEA* 68 (1982): 166–80.

alistic aspirations for the return—the returnees are Persian subjects working at the behest of the benevolent and pious Persian king (2 Chr 36:22–23|| Ezra 1:1–4). Note further Zerubbabel's response in Ezra 4:3 to the ʕam hāʔāreṣ who wished to assist in the temple's reconstruction:

> (Ezra 4:3) וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם זְרֻבָּבֶל וְיֵשׁוּעַ וּשְׁאָר רָאשֵׁי הָאָבוֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא־לָכֶם וָלָנוּ לִבְנוֹת בַּיִת לֵאלֹהֵינוּ כִּי אֲנַחְנוּ יַחַד נִבְנֶה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּנוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ כּוֹרֶשׁ מֶלֶךְ־פָּרָס
>
> (Ezra 4:3) And Zerubbabel and Joshua and the remaining heads of the families of Israel said to them, "It is not your place, but ours, to build a temple for our God. But we alone will build (it) for Yahweh, the God of Israel, *as Cyrus the king of Persia commanded us*." (Emphasis added)

On the other hand, the accounts of Haggai and Zechariah, although not overtly nationalistic or anti-imperial, focus on the figure of Zerubbabel as a semi-royal, Davidic figure charged with the rebuilding of the temple (along with the high priest, Joshua) *by Yahweh.* In other words, this royal responsibility was taken on by Zerubbabel and Joshua (the high priest) and *not* by the Persian king, which has lead some scholars to suggest that Zerubbabel was viewed as a royal-messianic figure. More-

---

On the relationship of Udjahorresnet to Ezra and Nehemiah, see Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Mission of Udjahorresnet and Those of Ezra and Nehemiah," *JBL* 106.3 (1987): 409–21. Whether or not this was a part of a broader practice of so-called imperial authorization of local customs remains a matter of debate. See especially Peter Frei, "Zentralgewalt und Lokalautonomie im Achämenidenreich," in *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich,* ed. Peter Frei and Klaus Koch, OBO 55 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1984), 8–131; Peter Frei, "The Imperial Authorization of the Torah: A Summary," in *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch,* ed. James W. Watts, trans. James W. Watts, SBLSymS 17 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 5–40; trans. of "Die persiche Reichsautorisation: Ein Überblick," *ZABR* 1 (1995): 1–35.

over, both Haggai and Zechariah betray certain images that point toward some kind of semi-royal or messianic hope associated with him, most notably in Haggai's reference to Yahweh making Zerubbabel "like a signet ring" (Hag 2:23). Although the text does not make it explicit that Zerubbabel was viewed as a semi-royal figure, it is difficult to read Haggai's use of the term "signet ring" as anything but an allusion to Jer 22:24 which describes "Coniah" as a signet ring on Yahweh's hand which would be removed and cast into exile:

> (Jer 22:24) חַי־אָנִי נְאֻם־יְהוָה כִּי אִם־יִהְיֶה כָּנְיָהוּ בֶן־יְהוֹיָקִים מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה חוֹתָם עַל־יַד
> יְמִינִי כִּי מִשָּׁם אֶתְּקָנֶךָּ׃ (25) וּנְתַתִּיךָ בְּיַד מְבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשֶׁךָ וּבְיַד אֲשֶׁר־אַתָּה יָגוֹר
> מִפְּנֵיהֶם וּבְיַד נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל וּבְיַד הַכַּשְׂדִּים׃
>
> (Jer 22:24) As I live—an utterance of Yahweh—even if Coniah, son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, were a signet ring upon my right hand, even from there I would tear you off (25) and I would give you into the the hand of those who seek your life and into the hand of those you dread and into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon and into the hand of the Chaldeans.

In Haggai, this negative image of Yahweh removing and discarding the "signet ring" is used positively, ostensibly, to mark Zerubbabel as Yahweh's agent on earth and, probably, as a royal messianic figure.[39] The fact that Zerubbabel is referred to as the "servant" (Heb. עֶבֶד) evokes the way that David was characterized as Yahweh's servant and supports this general conclusion.

All of this is to say that during the Second Temple period the temple itself was

39. See Joseph Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 71–103; Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology,* trans. D. M. G. Stalker, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Row), 2:281–284; Paul Redditt, "Themes in Haggai–Zechariah–Malachi," *Int* 61.2 (2007): 184–97.

overloaded with significance. The historical reality of Zerubbabel's failure to come into his kingship (if indeed this was what Haggai and Zechariah allude to), meant that it was the temple and not the kingship that provided continuity between the present and the remembered past. The significance of the Solomonic temple in the memory of Second Temple Judaism, is a reflection of the significance of the second temple in the lived experience of the Golah community. This is not to suggest that the Solomonic temple would not have been significant had the second temple not been built, only that the *presence* of the second temple augmented and affected the memory of the former temple in the memory of Second Temple Judaism.

1.5 MAGNETISM AND MNEMONIC NETWORKS

The questions that the book of Chronicles seeks to answer and the assumptions which it carries are different than that of Samuel–Kings or even Haggai and Zechariah and affect the way that the Chronicler not only read and interpreted his sources, but also the way that he situated various sites of memory with respect to one another. Thus David's role in the construction of the temple is not isolated to the question of why he could not build it, but extends to the way that David, as site of memory, relates to the temple *as a site of memory*.

Although both David and the temple may be thought of as discrete sites of memory, it is important to remember that they participate in a *network* of symbolic social meaning. Thus, "discrete" here does not mean "isolated." For example, as I have already demonstrated, the figure of Zerubbabel is connected both to the construction of the second temple as well as to the figure of David, who himself is related to the construction of the first temple, albeit not as

its builder. Moreover, not all sites of memory carry the same weight of significance within a particular symbolic system. In other words, not all sites of memory are created equal; David is a much more prominent and potent node within the social memory of ancient Israel than was Shimei, his critic. Though they participate within the same discursive space—even in the Bible—David is a more significant symbol. Likewise the temple's symbolic significance far outweighs that of the bāmôt, despite the fact that—functionally—their social function was similar.

But, what do we mean by "significance?" I would like to suggest that a particularly useful model for thinking about mnemonic significance is to consider social memory as a complex *network* of meaning—as a graph with nodes and edges.[40] In such a system each node represents a site of memory and the size or weight of that node is determined by the kinds of details, ideas, and themes that are remembered about that mnemonic site. In the case of the temple, one might argue that the detail with which the it is described in the Pentateuch as well as the themes of atonement and covenant provide considerable "weight" to the node within Israel's memory. But what make networks interesting, of course, are the connections that

40. Graphs and graph theory are a part of discrete mathematics and have a long and distinguished history going back to Euler. Although more recent applications of graph theory within sociology have focused on, for example, social networks on the internet, so-called social network analysis has been in use within sociology back to the early 19th century. See Linton C. Freeman, *The Development of Social Network Analysis: A Study in the Sociology of Science* (Vancouver, BC: Empirical, 2004), 10–16. Scale-free networks, in particular, are of interest to us. See Albert-László Barabási, "Scale-Free Networks: A Decade and Beyond," *Science* 325.5939 (2009): 412–13.

nodes make to one another. Those nodes which are more highly "connected" (those that have more edges linking them to other sites of memory) are more entangled with the entire symbolic system. Entangled nodes are more stable within the network and are less likely to be forgotten by virtue of the fact that they are defined with reference to more sites of memory. Severing one or two connections will not completely isolate the node from the rest of the graph. The inverse, then, is also true. Those sites which are less clearly situated within the graph are more susceptible to being forgotten.

One way to think about a symbol's significance within a social space, therefore, is to consider the size of the node and how "connected" the node is within the social network. Larger, more highly-connected sites of memory—those which for one reason or another have been connected to many other such sites within the social memory—may be viewed as more "significant," while smaller sites with fewer connections are comparatively less significant with respect to social and cultural memory.[41] Larger, more highly connected nodes of meaning are not only more difficult to forget, but have the tendency to extend their connectedness to other highly significant nodes and furthermore to absorb lesser nodes and integrate their meaning.[42] This process by which sites of memory

41. Of course, when I say that a king is more "significant" than, say, a peasant, I am making an assessment of the social impact of the individual on the society broadly and not making a judgment of the intrinsic value or importance of the individual. Moreover, I am not saying that such significance ought to guide the historian. This is merely meant as a description of this particular social phenomenon.

42. This is a property of scale-free networks more generally. When new new nodes make connections within the graph, they are not connected at random, but tend to connect to more highly connected nodes (so-called "preferential attachment"). See Barabási, "Scale-Free Net-

attract one another is what Ehud Ben Zvi refers to as "magnetism" in memory. He writes:

> Of course, not all sites of memory draw the same attention in a group. the most prominent sites of memory are "magnets" for core meaning, ideas, and concepts and tend to evoke and deeply intertwine several of the groups's main metanarratives. Conversely , the more a site of memory can embody, intertwine and communicate several of these metanarratives, the more central the site of memory will become for the group.[43]

The processes by which these major "hubs" of meaning continue to attract more and more connections and creates a kind of feedback loop wherein the "rich get richer" and the more significant sites of memory get more significant.[44]

One likely example of magnetism observable within the biblical text is the story of David and Goliath. Although the story of David and Goliath is very well known, is surprising to find that in 2 Sam 21:19b, someone else is credited with slaying Goliath:

> וַתְּהִי־עוֹד הַמִּלְחָמָה בְּגֹב עִם־פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיַּךְ אֶלְחָנָן בֶּן־יַעְרֵי אֹרְגִים בֵּית הַלַּחְמִי אֵת גָּלְיָת הַגִּתִּי וְעֵץ חֲנִיתוֹ כִּמְנוֹר אֹרְגִים׃ (2 Sam 21:19)

> (2 Sam 21:19) Then another battle came about in Gob with the Philistines and *Elhanan son of Jaare-oregim the Bethlehemite struck down Goliath* the Gittite the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

Of course, Elhanan is not remembered as the one who killed Goliath. The book of Chronicles, notably, explains this discrepancy by emending the text to say that Elhanan killed *Lahmi* the *brother* of Goliath.

---

works," 412.

43. Ben Zvi, "Chronicles and Social Memory," 73.

44. Barabási, "Scale-Free Networks," 412.

(1 Chr 20:5b) וַתְּהִי־עוֹד מִלְחָמָה אֶת־פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיַּךְ אֶלְחָנָן בֶּן־יָעִוּר [יָעִיר] אֶת־לַחְמִי
אֲחִי גָּלְיָת הַגִּתִּי וְעֵץ חֲנִיתוֹ כִּמְנוֹר אֹרְגִים׃

(1 Chr 20:5b) Then another battle came about with the Philistines and Elhanan, son of Jair struck down Lahmi, the brother of Goliath, the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

Thinking in terms of magnetism, we may suppose that the more significant and highly-connected mnemonic node (David) absorbed the comparatively poorly-connected node of Elhanan, who was relegated to the footnotes of Israelite history.

In this particular case, it is also important to note that the extended narrative of David and Goliath from 1 Sam 17 likewise bears the signs of magnetism. In fact, the name "Goliath" only occurs twice in the extended narrative, in vv. 4 and 23; in every other instance throughout the narrative, the man is referred to simply as "the Philistine." This fact has caused some scholars to question whether the identification of the "the Philistine" with Goliath was, like David, a secondary addition. Thus, it is supposed that both major characters in the story originally may have been anonymous, and only later were these figures identified with David and Goliath.[45] It is not difficult to speculate about why this convergence of character might have happened. David was remembered as a warrior (1 Sam 18:7; 29:5) who fought with and against Philistines (with: 1 Sam 27:1–28:2; against: 2 Sam5:17–25). Narratively, his character arc—even without the Goliath story—is one of humble beginnings and a meteoric rise by God's favor. All of these connections and narrative patterns lend themselves to attachment to the

45. For a fuller account of the textual issues surrounding the main narrative about David and Goliath, see McCarter, *I Samuel,* 280–309 and Steven L. McKenzie, *King David: A Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 69–77.

story of the humble Israelite boy (Elhanan?) who successfully slew the Philistine "the shaft of whose spear was as like a weaver's beam." The identification of Goliath with "the Philistine," too, is quite easy. Although the Philistine's stature is exaggerated in the Masoretic Text,[46] presumably a man who could weird a spear whose size was remarkable would also be a large man.[47] Moreover, since Gath was a Philistine city and, so far as anyone can tell "Goliath" is an authentically Philistine name,[48] it is not so difficult to identify the tall "Philistine" with Goliath.

The idea that the David "absorbed" the deeds of Elhanan into his own legacy is not new. Indeed, McCarter notes this in his commentary, writing: "Deeds of obscure heroes tend to attach themselves to famous heroes."[49] Although I am in agreement with McCarter, it is noteworthy that he makes this statement without providing any supporting rationale for *why* this may have been the case or *how* it came about. The ability to articulate social processes such as magnetism is one of the major contributions that memory studies offer to these kinds of discussions.

---

46. The Masoretic text lists Goliath's height to be "six cubits and a span" (Heb. שֵׁשׁ אַמּוֹת וָזָרֶת), or about three meters. This number is contested by both Josephus (Jewish Antiquities 6.171) at least two major Greek versions (Codex Vaticanus and the Lucianic texts), as well as 4QSam^{a}, which all read "*four* cubits and a span," or about two meters. Still quite large, but hardly a "giant." See McCarter, *I Samuel,* 286.

47. The reference to Goliath's spear shaft being the size of a weaver's beam in 1 Samuel 17:7 is commonly read as an insertion *based on* 2 Sam 21:19. As such, it is a further example of how the more central mnemonic site is able incorporate lesser sites. It does not, however, help to explain the connection *initially*.

48. Ibid., 291.

49. McCarter, *II Samuel,* 450.

Thus when we consider the relationship between David and the temple in the book of Chronicles, it should come as no surprise that these two large, highly connected nodes within the cultural memory of Persian Yehud have continued to entangle themselves with the major metanarratives and ideas of the Chronicler's society. Indeed, we have already discussed at length the way that David's role in the construction of the temple expanded in the memory of the Chronicler vis-à-vis Samuel–Kings. This expansion can be understood as a process of mnemonic magnetism whereby the most typologically significant and highly-connected node of memory about the remembered political kingdom of Israel (David) converges with the highly-connected and typologically significant center of Judahite identity during the Second Temple period (the temple).

As a final example of the mnemonic processes at work in the book of Chronicles, I will discuss the account of David's Census and the Threshing Floor of Araunah/Ornan found in 1 Chr 21:1–22:1 as a product of cultural memory. When compared to the parallel account in 2 Sam 24:1–24, the story as told in Chronicles is not simply a modified or "cleaned up" version of the story, but offers a narrative which functions in a distinct fashion compared to that of 2 Sam 24. This recontextualized narrative not only operates on different sets of ideological and theological presuppositions, but re-situates the narrative within the social memory by making magnetic connections to the major themes and ideas of the Chronicler's society.

The story of David's census in 2 Sam 24:1–24 begins with Yahweh inciting David to take a census of his army because Yahweh was angry with him. He dispatches his general, Joab, to take the census. Joab is successful and, after nine months, reports back to David the results of

the census. Upon hearing the results, "David's heart was stricken because he had numbered the people" (Heb. וַיַּךְ לֵב־דָּוִד אֹתוֹ אַחֲרֵי־כֵן סָפַר אֶת־הָעָם). David asks for forgiveness from Yahweh, who gives him three options for punishment. After the punishment of pestilence is executed against several thousand Israelites, Yahweh relents before striking Jerusalem and instructs his angel (Heb. מַלְאָךְ)—who at that moment was at the threshing floor of a man named Araunah (a Jebusite)—to cease destroying the people. Later, the prophet Gad instructs David to build an altar to Yahweh at the site of Araunah's threshing floor. David purchases the threshing floor, offers sacrifices to Yahweh, and "the plague was averted from upon Israel" (וַתֵּעָצַר הַמַּגֵּפָה מֵעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל).

With the exception of a few key details and additions, the version presented in 1 Chr 21:1–22:1 follows the version in 2 Samuel very closely.[50] The description of the census itself is mostly the same as the MT of 1 Samuel, though differences (such as the specific numbers reported) do occur. The most significant change to the first part of the story, however, is the attribution of David's incitement to take the census to an entity referred to as "(a) Satan" (Heb. שָׂטָן):

וַיַּעֲמֹד שָׂטָן עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּסֶת אֶת־דָּוִיד לִמְנוֹת אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ (1 Chr 21:1)

50. In smaller textual matters one must be careful to remember that the *Vorlage*of the Chronicler was not identical to the Masoretic text. Indeed the textual plurality of the LXX, 4QSam[a], and references in Josephus's Jewish Antiquities caution against assuming every difference between the Chronicler's account and that of 2 Samuel (MT) are the result of some change made by the Chronicler. See Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10–29,* 761–62.

(1 Chr 21:1) (A) Satan arose against Israel and incited David to number Israel.

Scholars remain divided over whether שָׂטָן should be understood as a simple indefinite noun "an adversary,"[51] or whether the absence of the definite article indicates that by the time of the Chronicler, Satan referred to a malevolent spirit which prefigured the more developed, personified "Satan" found in the New Testament.[52] The most common usage of the term שָׂטָן in the Hebrew Bible refers to human adversaries and accusers (Num 22:22, 32; 1 Sam 29:4, 2 Sam 19:23; 1 Kgs 5:18, 11:14, 23, 25; Ps 38:21, 71:13, 109:4, 6, 20, 29). However, the figure הַשָּׂטָן (with definite article) in both the prologue to Job (Job 1–2) and Zech 3:1–2 appears as a celestial figure to whom Yahweh speaks directly. [53] Proponents of reading שָׂטָן as the personal name of a malevolent spirit argue that the absence of the definite article indicates that the idea of *the*

51. Ryan E. Stokes, "The Devil Made David Do It…Or Did He? The Nature, Identity, and Literary Origins of the Satan in 1 Chronicles 21:1," *JBL* 128 (2009): 91–106; Japhet, *Ideology of the Book of Chronicles,* 114–17; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles,* 370–90.

52. Christopher A. Rollston, "An Ur-History of the New Testament Devil: The Celestial שׂטן (śaṭan) in Zechariah and Job," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity,* ed. Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, WUNT II (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 1–16.

53. This notion is more clear in Job, where הַשָּׂטָן is described in the heavenly courts and is described as having supernatural powers over the health and prosperity of those on the Earth. On the other hand, the reference in Zechariah is somewhat ambiguous. Zech 3:1 reads: וַיַּרְאֵנִי אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל עֹמֵד לִפְנֵי מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה וְהַשָּׂטָן עֹמֵד עַל־יְמִינוֹ לְשִׂטְנוֹ, "And he showed me Joshua, the high priest standing before the angel of Yahweh, and haśśāṭān was standing on his right (side) to accuse him." The antecedent of "his" in "his right(side)" is unclear. If "his" refers to the מַלְאַךְ Yahweh, then הַשָּׂטָן likely refers to some kind of spiritual being. However, it is possible that "his" refers to Joshua, and that הַשָּׂטָן should be understood as a human adversary.

שָׂטָן of Job and Zechariah had evolved into a fully personified Satan by the time of the Chronicler.[54] Additionally, while the LXX hails from a later chronological horizon than Chronicles, it is worth noting that the translator used the indefinite substantive διάβολος to translate שָׂטָן—the same term used in Job and Zechariah (also, Ps 108:6) *with* a definite article—which gives some indication that, in the mind of the translator, these passages likely referred to the same entity.[55]

Critics of this view, however, have pointed to the fact that in other cases in the Hebrew Bible, generic nouns that are treated as personal names or titles often *do* retain the definite article.[56] In such a case, שָׂטָן should simply be understood as an indefinite noun, "an accuser" and may be understood as a human antagonist of David.[57] For our purposes, it is not essential that we know for

54. Roddy Braun, *1 Chronicles,* WBC 14 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986), 216–17; R. J. Coggins, *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles,* CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 107. Rollston also finds this reading compelling, though, not without difficulties. See Rollston, "Ur-History of the New Testament Devil," 4–5.

55. Elsewhere the LXX renders the nominal forms of שָׂטָן with the feminine διαβολή or, in the case of 1 Kgs 11:14, simply in transliteration as σαταν. It should be noted, however, that Est 7:4 and 8:1 render the Hebrew √ṣrr as the masculine διάβολος as well.

56. Japhet, *Ideology of the Book of Chronicles,* 114–17; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles,* 370–90. Japhet, for example, notes that direct references to the Canaanite deity Baʿal are always accompanied by the definite article. In every instance, the name/title בַּעַל is made grammatically definite whether by adding the definite article, pronominal suffixes, or being in construct with an explicitly definite noun. Japhet, *Ideology of the Book of Chronicles,* 115 citing GKC §126d.

57. See Stokes, "Devil Made David Do It…Or Did He?" 91–106; Japhet, *Ideology of the Book of Chronicles,* 114–17; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles,* 370–90.

certain how שָׂטָן was intended to be understood by the Chronicler. What *is* important, however, is that the author of Chronicles plainly understood the mechanisms at work differently than the author of 2 Sam 24. Chief among these differences is the fact that the Chronicler shifts the incitement of the census away from Yahweh and onto a third party. One of the more perplexing aspects of the 2 Sam 24 narrative is that Yahweh seems function as an antagonist to David. It is Yahweh's anger which prompts Yahweh to "incite" David to take the census, for which he is punished. At least to modern readers, the resulting narrative appears to be one of a sort of divine "entrapment" of David that makes Yahweh seem rather "mercurial."[58] That Yahweh would incite David to sin then punish him for it was understandably confusing for the Chronicler, and equally confusing is why Yahweh would punish Israel for taking the census to begin with. But within the narrative discourse, there is no hint of confusion. All the characters operate as if Yahweh's response is perfectly reasonable and seem to know the proper actions to take to avert the disaster. Joab, for example, seems reticent about David's request to take the census:

> (2 Sam 24:3) וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹאָב אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ וְיוֹסֵף יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶל־הָעָם כָּהֵם וְכָהֵם מֵאָה פְּעָמִים וְעֵינֵי אֲדֹנִי־הַמֶּלֶךְ רֹאוֹת וַאדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ לָמָּה חָפֵץ בַּדָּבָר הַזֶּה׃
>
> (2 Sam 24:3) And Joab said to the king, "May Yahweh your God increase the people a hundred times while the eyes of my lord the king may see (them). But why does my lord the king desire this thing?"

He seems to know that taking the census could be risky.

What these two insertions reveal is that for the Chronicler, the narrative logic of 2 Samuel did not work within his own set of social frameworks. Instead of reading the Chronicler's attribu-

58. Rollston, "Ur-History of the New Testament Devil," 4.

tion of incitement to שָׂטָן as an attempt at "absolving" or explaining away Yahweh's actions because they were offensive to the Chronicler, perhaps it is better to think about the Chronicler attempting to fit the story of 2 Sam 24 into a different theological framework and into a different system of narrative logic. From this perspective, it was not that the Chronicler was scandalized by Yahweh's incitement of David but rather a reflection on the fact those actions lacked a sort of "theological verisimilitude" (my term) within the worldview of the Chronicler.[59] Likewise where the narrative in 2 Sam 24 assumes that the reader understands why Joab would question David about taking the census, the Chronicler supplies the details for Joab's reservations:

(1 Chr 21:3) וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹאָב יוֹסֵף יְהוָה עַל־עַמּוֹ כָּהֵם מֵאָה פְּעָמִים הֲלֹא אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ כֻּלָּם לַאדֹנִי לַעֲבָדִים לָמָּה יְבַקֵּשׁ זֹאת אֲדֹנִי לָמָּה יִהְיֶה לְאַשְׁמָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל׃

(1 Chr 21:3) And Joab said, "May Yahweh increase his people a hundred times. Are they not all, my lord the king, servants of my lord? Why does my lord seek this? Why shall he bring guilt on Israel?"

Here the Chronicler makes explicit what is implicit in 2 Sam 24—that census taking carries a risk. Although a number of scholars have speculated about what the rationale had been for the original author(s) of 2 Sam 24, the Chronicler infers a plausible rationale from his own theological and ideological frameworks.[60] The same basic tendency to clarify the narrative logic of several apparently inconsistent portions of 2 Sam 24 can be seen throughout the narrative.[61]

59. I suspect that most religious laypeople for whom 2 Sam 24 is scripture, too, would find Yahweh's portrayal in this text out-of-character with the way that God is portrayed elsewhere in their Bibles (not least, in Chronicles!).

60. See, especially the discussion in McCarter, *II Samuel,* 512–14.

61. For example, the angel of Yahweh appears suddenly in the Samuel narrative and seems to

Perhaps the most significant addition to the Chronicler's account, however, comes at the very end of the story with the identification of Araunah/Ornan's threshing floor with the future site of the Jerusalem temple. In both accounts David is instructed to build an altar to Yahweh and offer sacrifices in an effort to atone for his sin.

1.6 CONCLUSIONS

---

be carrying out some violence against the land. The Chronicler introduces the angel as explicitly sent by Yahweh. More than likely there is some kind of textual corruption in the Samuel account, so it is not certain that every additional detail that the Chronicler supplies is original to the Chronicler.

Bibliography

Auld, A. Graeme. *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings.* London: T & T Clark, 1994.

———. "What was the Main Source of the Book of Chronicles?" Pages 91–99 in *The Chronicler As Author: Studies in Text and Texture.* Edited by M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. JSOTSup 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Barabási, Albert-László. "Scale-Free Networks: A Decade and Beyond." *Science* 325.5939 (2009): 412–13.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Chronicles and Social Memory." *ST* 71.1 (2017): 69–90.

Biran, Avraham, and Joseph Naveh. "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan." *IEJ* 43 (1993): 81–93.

———. "The Tel Dan Inscription: A New Fragment." *IEJ* 45 (1995): 1–18.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.

———. "The Mission of Udjahorresnet and Those of Ezra and Nehemiah." *JBL* 106.3 (1987): 409–21.

Braun, Roddy. *1 Chronicles.* WBC 14. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986.

———. "Solomon, the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles." *JBL* 95.4 (1976): 581–90.

Brockmeier, Jens. "After the Archive: Remapping Memory." *CP* 16.1 (2010): 5–35.

Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Construction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Coggins, R. J. *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles.* CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Dirksen, Piet B. "Why Was David Disqualified as Temple Builder? The Meaning of 1 Chronicles 22:8." *JSOT* 70 (1996): 51–56.

Edelman, Diana. "Cultic Sites and Complexes beyond the Jerusalem Temple." Pages 82–103 in *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah.* Edited by John Barton and Francesca Stavrakopoulou. London: T & T Clark, 2010.

Edelman, Diana. "Did Saulide–Davidic Rivaly Resurface in Early Persian Yehud?" Pages 69–91 in *The Land That I Will Show You: Essays on the History and Archaeology of the Ancient near East in Honor of J. Maxwell Miller.* Edited by J. Andrew Dearman and M. Patrick Graham. JSOTSup 343. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002.

Freeman, Linton C. *The Development of Social Network Analysis: A Study in the Sociology of Science.* Vancouver, BC: Empirical, 2004.

Frei, Peter. "The Imperial Authorization of the Torah: A Summary." Pages 5–40 in *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch.* Edited by James W. Watts. Translated by James W. Watts. SBLSymS 17. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. Translation of "Die persiche Reichsautorisation: Ein Überblick." *ZABR* 1 (1995): 1–35.

———. "Zentralgewalt und Lokalautonomie im Achämenidenreich." Pages 8–131 in *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich.* Edited by Peter Frei and Klaus Koch. OBO 55. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1984.

Fröhlich, Ida. "The Changing Faces of David in Biblical Historiography. Narrative Patterns in Historiography, Positive and Negative." Pages 65–88 in *David in Cultural Memory.* Edited by Ida Fröhlich. CBET 93. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory.* Translated by Lewis A. Coser. HS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Halpern, Baruch. *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.

Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary.* OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

———. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009. Repr., Japhet, Sara. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought.* Translated by Anna Barber. BEATAJ 9. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989.

Jarick, John. "Seven Things that the Chronicler Wants You to Remember about King David." Pages 115–30 in *David in Cultural Memory.* Edited by Ida Fröhlich. CBET 93. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings." *Or* 32.1 (1963): 56–62.

Kelly, Brian E. "David's Disqualification in 1 Chronicles 22:8: A Response to Piet B. Dirksen." *JSOT* 80 (1998): 51–56.

King, Philip J., and Lawrence E. Stager. *Life in Biblical Israel.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Klein, Ralph W. *1 Chronicles: A Commentary.* Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2006.

Knapp, Andrew. *Royal Apologetic in the Ancient Near East.* WAWSup 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.

Knoppers, Gary N. *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB 12. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

Knoppers, Gary N. *1 Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB 13. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

———. "Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in Chronicles." *Bib* 76.4 (1995): 449–70.

Laato, Antti. "Zachariah 4,6b-10a and the Akkadian Royal Building Inscriptions." *ZAW* 106.1 (1994): 53–69.

Lemaire, André. "'House of David' Restored in Moabite Inscription." *BAR* 20 (1994): 30–37.

———. "La dynastie davidique (BYT DWD) dans deux inscriptions ouestsémitiques du IXe s. av. J.-C." *SEL* 11 (1994): 17–19.

Lloyd, Alan B. "The Inscription of Udjahorresnet: a Collaborator's Testament." *JEA* 68 (1982): 166–80.

McCarter, P. Kyle. "'Plots, True or False': The Succession Narrative as Court Apologetic." *Int* 35.4 (1981): 355–67.

———. *I Samuel: A New Translation with Translation, Notes, and Commentary.* AB 8. New York: Doubleday, 1980.

———. *II Samuel: A New Translation with Translation, Notes, and Commentary.* AB 9. New York: Doubleday, 1984.

———. "The Apology of David." *JBL* 99.4 (1980): 489–504.

McKenzie, Steven. *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History.* HSM 3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

McKenzie, Steven L. *King David: A Biography.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "The Chronicler as Redactor." Pages 70–90 in *The Chronicler As Author: Studies in Text and Texture.* Edited by M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. JSOTSup 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

———. "Why Didn't David Build the Temple? The History of a Biblical Tradition." Pages 204–24 in *Worship and the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of John T. Willis.* Edited by M. Patrick Graham, R. R. Marrs, and Steven L. McKenzie. JSOTSup 284. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." In "Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–24.

———, ed. *Les Lieux de mémoire.* 7 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1984–1992.

———. "Mémoire collective." Pages 398–401 in *La Nouvelle histoire.* Edited by Roger Chartier Jacques Le Goff and Jacques Revel. Paris: Retz, 1978.

Olick, Jeffrey K., and Joyce Robbins. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *ARS* 24 (1998): 105–40.

Person, Raymond F. *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World.* AIL 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Petersen, David L. “Zerubbabel and Jerusalem Temple Reconstruction.” *CBQ* 36.3 (1974): 366–72.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Old Testament Theology.* Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Row.

Redditt, Paul. “Themes in Haggai–Zechariah–Malachi.” *Int* 61.2 (2007): 184–97.

Redfield, Robert. *Peasant Society and Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Rollston, Christopher A. “An Ur-History of the New Testament Devil: The Celestial שטן (śaṭan) in Zechariah and Job.” Pages 1–16 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity.* Edited by Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. WUNT II. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Römer, Thomas. *The Invention of God.* Translated by Raymond Geuss. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Chronikbücher.* HAT 21. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1955.

Smith, Mark S. *The Early History of God: Yahweh and Other Deities in Ancient Israel.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Stokes, Ryan E. “The Devil Made David Do It…Or Did He? The Nature, Identity, and Literary Origins of the Satan in 1 Chronicles 21:1.” *JBL* 128 (2009): 91–106.

Szpociński, Andrzej. “Sites and Non-Sites of Memory.” In “Special Issue English Edition: Place and Memory.” *TD* 9 (2016): 245–54.

Wertsch, James V. “Beyond the Archival Model of Memory and the Affordances and Constraints of Narratives.” *CP* 17.1 (2011): 21–29.

———. “Collective Memory.” Pages 117–37 in *Memory in Mind and Culture.* Edited by Pascal Boyer and James V. Wertsch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament.* 2 vols. Halle: Schimmelpfennig, 1806–1807.

Wilson, Ian D. *Kingship and Memory in Ancient Judah.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.