Chiasm and Meaning in 1 Chronicles

YITZHAK BERGER

CHIASM AND MEANING IN 1 CHRONICLES

YITZHAK BERGER
HUNTER COLLEGE

In recent decades, it has become increasingly clear that late biblical writers made extensive use of chiasm.[1] In the case of Chronicles, numerous proposed chiastic patterns have gained substantial support, including some that govern notably large expanses of text. Structures of this kind have been observed to encompass, inter alia, the genealogical material in 1 Chr 1–9; the lists of supporters of David in 1 Chr 11–12; the song of praise and its narrative frame in 1 Chr 16; and the account of Solomon's activities in 2 Chr 1–9.[2]

---

[1] A generation ago, Y.T. Radday concluded that the presence of chiasm declines markedly in late biblical literature, to the point where its incidence provides a means of "roughly dating a book as pre- or post-exilic" ("Chiasmus in Biblical Hebrew Narrative," in J.W. Welch [ed.], *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structure, Analyses, Exegesis* [Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981], 50–112 [51]). However, the evidence that has accumulated since that time renders this position untenable. See, e.g., the remarks by I. Kalimi and the material he cites in *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 218. The sources mentioned in the next note provide a sense of the increasing discernment of chiasm in Chronicles specifically.

[2] F. Michaeli first observed that the prominent tribes of Judah and Benjamin frame the Israelite genealogies, and that the Levites occupy the center (*Les livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie* [Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament, 16; Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1967], 71). H.G.M. Williamson later expanded on this, providing fuller articulation to the structure generated by the placement of multiple, less distinctive tribes both before and after Levi (*1 and 2 Chronicles* [NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982], 46–47). A chiastic reading of 1 Chr 11–12 appeared first in H.G.M. Williamson, " 'We are Yours, O David': The Setting and Purpose of 1 Chronicles xii 1–23," *OtSt* 21 (1981), 164–76. A.E. Hill identified a chiastic design to the song in 1 Chr 16 ("Patchwork Poetry or Reasoned Verse: Connective Structure in 1 Chronicles xvi," *VT* 33 [1983], 97–101); and two commentators independently observed a symmetrical correspondence between the narrative material before this poem and after it (S. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* [OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1993], 312; M.J. Selman, *1 Chronicles: An Introduction and Commentary* [Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, 10a; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1994], 166). Finally, a chiastic pattern comprising 2 Chr 1–9 was first noted by R.B. Dillard, "The Literary Structure of the

According to one recent analysis, the ark narrative in 1 Chr 13–15 takes the form of still another chiastic pattern.[3]

It will immediately be noted, especially if this last proposal is correct, that there emerges one striking gap in an otherwise uninterrupted, lengthy sequence of material believed to be chiastically arranged. I refer to 1 Chr 10, a chapter that recounts Saul's death in battle, whose very role in the book has long presented a problem.[4] Another concern involves both the purpose and positioning of 1 Chr 9, which provides names of individuals who inhabited Jerusalem and Gibeon.[5] While commentators typically link this chapter to

---

Chronicler's Solomon Narrative," *JSOT* 30 (1984), 85–93. Apart from this last example, additional citations in support of all these structures, as well as discussion of their precise parameters, appear in the appropriate sections below.

Scholars have proposed a variety of other chiastic patterns in Chronicles, typically encompassing smaller stretches of text. See, e.g., Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite History*, ch. 11; M.K.Y.H. Hom, "Chiasmus in Chronicles: Investigating the Structures of 2 Chronicles 28:16–21; 33:1–20; and 31:20–32:33," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 47 (2009), 163–79; and the patterns mentioned below in the latter part of n. 18. In many instances, relatively confined chiasms may be present within broader ones. We shall be considering only the putative structures that are relevant to the thesis of this study.

From 2 Chr 10 to the end of the book, the text more closely follows the royal history of Judah as it appears in Kings, so that instances of chiasm resulting from revision and rearrangement of material, as in the case of the structures proposed by Hom, appear to govern only relatively brief passages.

[3] S. Zalewski, *"Now rise up, O Lord, and go to your resting-place": A Literary Study of the Ark Narrative in the Book of Chronicles* (Beersheba: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, 2007), 74–75 (Hebrew).

[4] For an overview and discussion of efforts to account for the presence of this story see G.N. Knoppers, "Israel's First King and 'the Kingdom of [the Lord] in the hands of the sons of David': The Place of the Saulide Monarchy in the Chronicler's Historiography," in C.S. Ehrlich and M.C. White (eds.), *Saul in Story and Tradition* (FAT, 47; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 187–213. An earlier, less expansive version appears in Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 12a; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 526–31.

[5] As will be seen, the list of residents of Gibeon presents a particular problem, for it duplicates an account that appears shortly beforehand, near the end of 1 Chr 8. As for the list of residents of Jerusalem, which is dominated by Levites, most commentators explain this to be an account of postexilic settlers, in keeping with a substantially parallel list that appears in Neh 11. According to this view, after the genealogies in the preceding chapters underscore the selection of Israel, this account emphasizes the continued centrality of Israel and its cult in the Chronicler's own day (see, e.g., G.N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB, 12; New York: Doubleday, 2004], 264, and the literature cited there). But if, indeed, the very purpose of the list here is to describe the settlement of postexilic Yehud, it is especially problematic

the genealogies that precede it, and some have attempted to justify this from a structural standpoint, the matter remains decidedly problematic.[6] Still another difficulty arises in connection with 1 Chr 11:4–9, a description of David's conquest and settlement of Jerusalem. Again, despite efforts to account for the placement of this passage, its inclusion near the beginning of a chiastic presentation of David's supporters has resisted satisfactory explanation.[7]

This essay makes the following primary claims:

1. 1 Chr 9 does not belong with the genealogical material in chs. 1–8. Rather, it marks the beginning of a new chiasm, one that continues through ch. 10 and ends with David's conquest and settlement of Jerusalem in 11:4–9. This independent pattern underscores the displacement of Saul and his cult city of Gibeon by David and his own cult city of Jerusalem, in line with several recent studies which, in evaluating the Chronicler's attitude toward Saul and the tribe of Benjamin, consider the broader question of the postexilic status of Gibeon and the Saulides.[8] It will be argued that

---

that the text of Chronicles offers no clear indication that it is in fact referring to that time period (cf., e.g., Japhet, *Chronicles*, 207–8). Moreover, the Gibeonites in the subsequent list are pre-exilic; and, as I shall argue, the two lists strongly appear to parallel one another, under the rubric "the early inhabitants of their land" provided in 1 Chr 9:2.

[6] Knoppers, after endorsing the chiastic structure of the genealogies, considers what purpose ch. 9 might serve within the unit; but despite linking ch. 9 to ch. 1 in his outline, he draws no sharp structural correspondence between them that I can detect (*I Chronicles 1–9*, 260–61, 264). J.T. Sparks's proposal that the lively, varied description of a cultic community in 9:2–34 generates a contrast—and, in turn, a structural link—to the "barren" list of names in ch. 1 seems decidedly speculative (*The Chronicler's Genealogies: Towards an Understanding of 1 Chronicles 1–9* [Atlanta: SBL, 2008], 326–31). In the schemes of both of these scholars, moreover, the structural unit concludes before the list of inhabitants of Gibeon which, as will be seen, is best considered together with the account of residents of Jerusalem that appears before it.

I recognize that if, indeed, 1 Chr 9 has not been convincingly shown to be part of the pattern that comprises the genealogical section, then the apparent gap in chiastically-arranged material may be considered less of a concern—for the more this gap widens, the less clear it becomes that the Chronicler sought to construct sustained chiastic units. I am nonetheless convinced that the thesis to be presented shortly, which provides that another such pattern encompasses 1 Chr 9–10, offers a strong case that the text exhibits a lengthy, uninterrupted sequence of chiastic structures. Moreover, it will be argued that the proposed chiastic reading of the ark narrative in 1 Chr 13–16 has considerable merit, making it that much more likely that patterns of this kind dominate at least the first half of 1 Chronicles.

[7] Discussion and citations appear in the relevant section below.

[8] A relatively early and important discussion of the evidence suggesting a historical link between Saul and Gibeon appears in J. Blenkinsopp, "Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital?" *VT* 24 (1974), 1–7. The relevance of this matter to Chronistic ideology is the primary subject of S.D. Wal-

this proposal resolves all the difficulties mentioned, and helps explain the movement from the genealogical introduction to the account of David's rise.

2. A Saul-related frame surrounds the recently noted chiastic arrangement of the ark narrative. This pattern culminates in the last scene of 1 Chr 15, where the Chronicler, as is widely observed, revises his source material so that Michal's reaction as the ark reaches its destination highlights the failure of Saul in the cultic realm.[9] It emerges, in turn, that the structural units composing the first half of 1 Chronicles play an important role in presenting David's cultic initiatives in favorable contrast to those of his Benjaminite predecessor.

What is more, **this** analysis gives rise to an important and suggestive hypothesis regarding the Chronicler's method: in con-

---

ters, "Saul of Gibeon," *JSOT* 52 (1991), 61–76. The foundational arguments, based on textual and archeological evidence, that Benjaminites in the postexilic period sought primacy for themselves and the city of Gibeon—and a consideration of the relevance of this to the interpretation of Chronicles—appear in D. Edelman, "Did Saulide-Davidic Rivalry Resurface in Early Persian Yehud?" in J.A. Dearman and M.P. Graham (eds.), *The Land that I Will Show You: Essays on the History and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honor of J. Maxwell Miller* (JSOTSup, 343; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 69–91; see also D. Edelman, "Gibeon and Gibeonites Revisited," in O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 153–67. Edelman's position finds further support and elaboration in Knoppers, "Israel's First King," esp. 206–10; Y. Amit, "The Saul Polemic in the Persian Period," in O. Lipschits and M. Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 647–61, but more extensively in Y. Amit, *In Praise of Editing in the Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays in Retrospect* (Hebrew Bible Monographs, 39; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012), 233–47; and L.C. Jonker, "Revisiting the Saul Narrative in Chronicles: Interacting with the Persian Imperial Context," *OTE 23* (2010), 283–305. For citations of other studies suggesting that a pro-Saulide ideology persisted after the exile, and may even be present in some Rabbinic sources, see R. Rezetko, *Source and Revision in the Narratives of David's Transfer of the Ark: Text, Language, and Story in 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16* (New York/London: T&T Clark, 2007), 52; and note especially the argument of M.Z. Brettler, who concludes that the Chronicler shows pointed resistance to such an ideology (*The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* [London: Routledge, 1995], 109–11).

With many scholars (e.g., Williamson, *Chronicles*, 16), I favor dating Chronicles around the middle of the fourth century B.C.E., in the late Persian period. An early Hellenistic date would not, however, undermine my argument, even as a number of the sources cited here address the Persian period specifically; for it stands to reason that the relevant ideological tensions and concerns would not have ceased with the emergence of a new power.

[9] See, e.g., Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29*, 626. Regarding the assumption that the Chronicler was working off a text similar to that of Samuel, see below, n. 37.

structing a work primarily by means of judicious, often near-verbatim deployment of material that was already in circulation—even, at least in some instances, recognized as canonical—the Chronicler depended heavily upon structural design in order to produce new meaning and convey the book's novel ideological message.[10] For the chiastic patterns chiefly to be discussed do not generate mere convenience or aesthetic quality, but rather underscore contrasts and inversions that contribute substantially to the development of theme.[11] Should this hypothesis prove correct, any effort to understand the book's content and purpose would properly consider the literary design produced by the Chronicler's selection, adaptation, and sequencing of expansive blocks of earlier material.

In the concluding section, accordingly, in a provisional effort to apply such a methodology, I propose a broad symmetrical reading of 1 Chr 17–29 which, if judged to be persuasive, bears important thematic implications. Furthermore, in conjunction with the other structures to be presented, this proposal shall offer a tentative means of evaluating the entirety of 1 Chr 1–2 Chr 9 as a series of chiastic units.

1. "EXTENDED CHIASMUS":
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON METHOD

While the wide use of chiasm in ancient texts is hardly disputed, several scholars have attempted to formulate methodological principles to govern the search for such patterns.[12] Of particular relevance here is a relatively extensive set of criteria offered by Blomberg for assessing the persuasiveness of a perceived

---

[10] It remains a fairly standard assumption that the principal sources utilized by the Chronicler were, at the time, already considered authoritative. For a recent articulation of this, see R.W. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 44. Furthermore, even according to those who express skepticism that Chronicles is secondary to Samuel–Kings (see below, n. 37), it remains highly plausible that the source-material in question was familiar to the Chronicler's audience.

[11] On the importance of purposefulness in proposed chiastic structures, see, inter alia, J.W. Welch, "Criteria for Identifying and Evaluating the Presence of Chiasmus," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 4 (1995), 1–15 (5–6); M.J. Boda, "Chiasmus in Ubiquity: Symmetrical Mirages in Nehemiah 9," *JSOT* 71 (1996), 55–70 (58); and D.P. Wright, "The Fallacies of Chiasmus. A Critique of Structures Proposed for the Covenant Collection (Exodus 20:23–23:19)," *ZAR* 10 (2004), 143–68 (168). Concerning ways in which a chiastic arrangement of material might contribute to meaning, see also the important study by E. Assis, "Chiasmus in Biblical Narrative: Rhetoric of Characterization," *Prooftexts* 22 (2003), 273–304; but note the critical remarks by Wright, "Fallacies of Chiasmus," 143 n. 2.

[12] For detailed lists of criteria see, e.g., C. Blomberg, "The Structure of 2 Corinthians 1–7," *Criswell Theological Review* 4 (1989), 3–20; Welch, "Criteria"; Boda, "Chiasmus in Ubiquity," 56–58; and Wright, "Fallacies of Chiasmus," 166–68.

"extended chiasmus," criteria which, to be sure, he rightly acknowledges cannot be applied rigidly and "are seldom fulfilled *in toto* even by well-established chiastic structures."[13] Significantly, the patterns to be discussed score quite well when evaluated based on the constraints that Blomberg sets forth, for as a general matter we may affirm the following:

1.   The proposed structures are at least as straightforward as other apparent structural options, and indeed resolve difficulties that others do not.

2.   At least some connections between the two halves of each pattern have tended to be noticed irrespective of the question of design.

3.   Whereas content-based correspondences dominate the structures to be presented, some distinctive lexical connections play an important role.

4.   Corresponding terms, where present, give expression to ideas of some genuine importance.

5.   Corresponding themes and terminology tend to be limited to the appropriate sections within each structure.

6.   The proposed patterns divide the text at points that are decidedly reasonable.

7.   In most instances, the thematic center—generally also a pivot-point—occupies the middle of the structure.

8.   No pattern depends upon the shifting of components from their place in the textual sequence, notwithstanding one carefully-considered alternative that features an imperfection of this sort.

Among the criteria on the list in question, only one remains unaddressed: the "desirable" presence of a substantial number of components (e.g., ABCC'B'A') rather than just one or two corresponding sets (ABA' or ABB'A'). The new patterns to be proposed in fact contain only two sets each, a disadvantage that, even if seen to carry some force, would likely not prove decisive where the vast majority of criteria are indeed met.

Beyond this, two matters noted earlier must inform the evaluation of any observed deficiency in the patterns to be considered. First, there is wide recognition of multiple expansive chiasms in 1 Chronicles. Accordingly, additional perceived structures of this sort

---

[13] Blomberg, "Structure," 5–7. Most of Blomberg's criteria, as well as the qualification that I cite here, appear in one form or another in other treatments also.

may be said, in methodological terminology set forth by Welch, to exhibit appropriate "compatibility" with the author's literary preferences.[14] Especially in a case like the present one, where the suggested patterns fill gaps in a sequence of material otherwise characterized by the same kind of design, evidence in their favor becomes substantially more likely to tip the balance in a positive direction.

Second, and crucially, in keeping with other, more established chiasms in the book, my argument provides that the Chronicler designed new structures by adapting and rearranging large blocks of prior material. This doubtless posed a significant challenge, and we shall witness some notable ingenuity in the pattern comprising 1 Chr 13–15 which, among other considerations in its favor, contains an impressive quantity of corresponding elements. More typically, however, given the constraints of the Chronicler's task, the quest for symmetry would understandably have yielded some imperfection, including structures that contain a relatively limited number of components despite the expansiveness of the material covered by them.

This latter consideration, in fact, carries substantial force in connection with two other methodological concerns. First, I have acknowledged that thematic correlations are essential to the argument of this essay, even though criterion 3 above affirms that lexical correspondences provide a sounder basis for identifying chiasm than do thematic ones. Indeed, in support of this methodological criterion, recent scholars warn against excessive reliance on theme-based "sectional summary statements" in connection with proposed macro-chiastic patterns. Thus, highlighting the earlier work of Thomson, de Silva underscores the greater reliability of shared vocabulary and syntax—of the kind generally found in micro-chiastic structures—and calls attention to the dangers of "headings" that offer a putative synopsis of material said to compose a section of a chiasm.[15]

Nevertheless, it bears emphasis that, if texts employ macro-chiasms at all, thematic correlations must invariably play a central role in them. In our case in particular, moreover, if the Chronicler sought to generate symmetrical structures by means of adaptation and organization of existing blocks of material, it would have proved especially difficult to produce consistent lexical correspondences. Rather, the desired chiastic relationships would inevitably have been constructed out of passages exhibiting similar content. Indeed, if the thesis advanced here is correct, the careful arrangement of such fundamentally analogous passages is precisely

---

[14] Welch, "Criteria," 9.

[15] D.A. deSilva, "X Marks the Spot? A Critique of the Use of Chiasmus in Macro-Structural Analyses of Revelation," *JSNT* 30 (2008), 343–71 (347–48); I.H. Thomson, *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters* (JSNTSup, 111; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 30–33.

what facilitates the expression of our book's unique theological message. Accordingly, the added measure of subjectivity that characterizes this thematic variety of chiastic analysis ought not to prevent us from evaluating the evidence with an open mind, however important it might be to maintain an awareness of this indisputably genuine concern.

Second, consider the crucial methodological preference for balance of length between corresponding elements within a chiastic pattern.[16] In the case of "extended chiasmus," where a relatively large span of text may comprise just a single structural component, some measure of variability might be expected between elements that correspond to one another; and Blomberg's omission of this oft-mentioned principle from his list, if not exploited beyond reason, would appear to be defensible. What is more, though, in our case, the Chronicler's undertaking would likely have made it especially difficult to achieve consistent balance between components. A variety of concerns, after all, would have informed the decision of what sections of text to incorporate, what their boundaries should be, and how and to what extent to alter their content, so that the quest to deploy them in chiastic arrangements—however important to the Chronicler's effort to generate structure and meaning—would probably, at least in some instances, have yielded some nontrivial imbalance of length. Additionally, in cases where the boundaries of the selected texts are discernible with little difficulty, particularly to the reader familiar with their source, these texts could have remained identifiable as distinct, corresponding segments of a broad structure even in the presence of some such imbalance.

Accordingly, I have given careful consideration to relevant methodological concerns when evaluating each hypothesis, taking into account the implications of the distinctive compositional nature of the book of Chronicles. In the analysis that follows, the persuasiveness of each argument shall depend on the soundness of my judgments.

2. CHIASTIC PATTERNS IN 1 CHR 1–12

THE GENEALOGICAL PROLOGUE

In the presentation of tribal genealogies in the early chapters of Chronicles, geographical considerations play an undeniable role.[17] Nevertheless, a majority of scholars have, at a minimum,

---

[16] See, e.g., Welch, "Criteria," 11. Both Boda ("Chiasmus in Ubiquity," 56) and Wright ("Fallacies of Chiasmus," 166), moreover, place this criterion at the top of their respective lists.

[17] Beyond what appears in the outline immediately below, note that the genealogy of the southern tribe of Simeon appears between those of Judah and the Transjordanian tribes—for the Simeonites, we are told, lost substantial territory to the neighboring tribe of Judah, after which a group

seen thematic significance in the placement of the royal tribes of Judah and Benjamin, respectively, at the beginning and at the end, and the tribe of Levi—including mention of its cultic role—in the middle.[18] A skeletal outline of this section of the book, following the basic arrangement endorsed by commentators, looks as follows:

A   Royal tribe of Judah
    B   Transjordanian tribes
        X   Tribe of Levi
    B'   Tribes west of the Jordan
A'   Royal tribe of Benjamin

---

of them moved east of the Jordan where they conquered and settled an area that had been populated by Amalekites (1 Chr 4:41–43). For a recent discussion that incorporates geographical considerations as well as the basic chiastic framework emerging from the observations of Michaeli and Williamson (above, n. 2), see T. Willi, *Chronik*, vol. 1, *1. Chronik 1,1–10,14* (BKAT, 24; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 54–62.

[18] Since Williamson, a number of scholars have outlined one variation or another of this chiastic arrangement. These include L.C. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units in 1 & 2 Chronicles," *JSOT* 41 (1988), 21–36 (22), and in his commentary on Chronicles in *NIB* III (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1999), 320; W. Johnstone, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, vol. 1, *1 Chronicles 1–2 Chronicles 9: Israel's Place Among the Nations* (JSOTSup, 253; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 37–40; M.A. Throntveit, "Was the Chronicler a Spin Doctor? David in the Books of Chronicles," *Word & World* 23 (2003), 374–81 (376). Cited 2/26/14. Online: http://www.luthersem.edu/ word&world/Archives/23-4_David/23-4_Throntveit.pdf; and Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 260–61. An especially elaborate, more controversial version of the pattern forms the basis of the recent study by Sparks, *Chronicler's Genealogies*.

The only critic who poses a challenge to the fundamental validity of this chiasm is G. Galil in his online review of Sparks's work, *RBL*, 7 (2009). Cited 2/26/14. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/ 6682_7246.pdf. Galil rejects even the more basic version of the pattern (as it is presented by Knoppers), on the grounds that descendants of Benjamin appear not only at the end but also in 1 Chr 7:6–12, among other tribes west of the Jordan. Rather, Galil proposes that these two sets of Benjaminite lines frame a more limited chiastic unit, one that is confined to chs. 7–8 and comprises the non-Leahide genealogies: A) lines of Benjamin; B) descendants of Bilhah; C) lines of Manasseh; D) lines of Ephraim; D') settlements of Ephraim; C') settlements of Manasseh; B') descendants of Zilpah; A') lines of Benjamin. Yet however persuasive this pattern might be, it in no way precludes the presence of the more encompassing one under discussion. By way of analogy, consider that scholars endorsing the broader structure generally acknowledge that its first component, the genealogy of Judah, follows one or another chiastic arrangement of its own. See, e.g., the widely-cited proposal by H.G.M. Williamson, "Sources and Redaction in the Chronicler's Genealogy of Judah," *JBL* 98 (1979), 351–59. Note also Welch's methodological assertion that "longer passages are more defensibly chiastic where the same text also contains a fair amount of short chiasmus" (J.W. Welch, "Introduction," in idem, *Chiasmus in Antiquity*, 13).

Taken straightforwardly, however, this pattern spans only from 1 Chr 2:3 to the end of 1 Chr 8, leaving out the world ancestry and Patriarchal lines in 1:1–2:2 as well as the lists of inhabitants of Jerusalem and Gibeon in ch. 9. As noted, efforts to present ch. 9 as part of the pattern have proved unconvincing, including the argument that, in one way or another, it corresponds to 1:1–2:2.[19] Accordingly, we shall shortly consider the possibility that ch. 9 initiates a new, structurally independent sequence.

As for 1:1–2:2, it might in principle be suggested that:

1. This introductory passage plays no role in any notable structural pattern; or alternatively,

2. It belongs with the lines of Judah, thereby commencing a process of election that extends from the beginning of human history up to the emergence of King David.

A different proposal, however, favored by Braun, Klein, and Willi, would appear to merit serious consideration. These scholars, noting the Chronicler's inversion of the birth order of Ishmael and Isaac, present the following dual chiastic outline of this material:[20]

    I   Ten generations from Adam to Noah
    A   Shem
        B   Ham
            C   Japheth
            C'   Progeny of Japheth
        B'   Progeny of Ham
    A'   Progeny of Shem
    II   Ten generations from Shem to Abraham
    A   Isaac
        B   Ishmael
        B'   Progeny of Ishmael (and Keturah)
    A'   Progeny of Isaac

It is, of course, rather unconventional for the corresponding elements of a chiasm to differ in size so dramatically. In this instance, however, the correspondences remain easily discernible notwithstanding this shortcoming. Accordingly, a chiastically-inclined author, after lifting the first of these two structural arrangements from Genesis intact (Gen 10), would have needed only to present Isaac's name before that of his brother in order to complete this dual chiastic adaptation of the pre-Israelite genealogical records.[21]

---

[19] See above, n. 6.

[20] R.L. Braun, *1 Chronicles* (WBC; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1986), 13; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 57; Willi, *Chronik*, 20.

[21] In addition to the imperfection regarding the progeny of Keturah, for which, if this suggestion is correct, the Chronicler found no attractive solution, we must also acknowledge, among the progeny of Isaac, the presence of the descendants of Seir within those of Esau (1 Chr 1:38–42) in accordance with the text in Genesis upon which the lines are based (Gen 36). It also bears mention—although this would by no means un-

SAUL AND GIBEON VS. DAVID AND JERUSALEM

Let us now direct our attention to 1 Chr 9, where the opening verse provides a stark conclusion to the genealogical chapters: "And all Israel was registered by genealogical lines, and these are recorded in the Book of the Kings of Israel. And Judah was exiled to Babylonia because of its unfaithfulness."[22] When the text then introduces an account of "the early inhabitants of their land" (v. 2), this would appear to mark something fundamentally new. The account itself consists of two sections with parallel introductions, the first of which reads "In Jerusalem there lived . . . " (ובירושלם ישבו; v. 3), and the second "In Gibeon there lived . . . " (ובגבעון ישבו; v. 35). The list of residents of Jerusalem (vv. 3–34) includes members of numerous tribes, but is dominated by several groups of Levites who are presented along with the cultic roles assigned to them by David and Samuel. The list of residents of Gibeon (vv. 35–44) begins with the city's initial settler, "the father of Gibeon," and follows with a selective record of his progeny, which is said to include the line of King Saul: "And Ner begat Kish, and Kish begat Saul, and Saul begat Jonathan and Malki-shua and Abinadab and Eshbaal" (v. 39). To be sure, the presence of Saul's line here generates inconsistencies with other biblical records, and this has prompted a variety of speculations regarding the textual history of the segment. Nonetheless, as scholars have affirmed, it remains highly probable that the Chronicler consciously presented the Benjaminite royal house as part of the Gibeonite genealogy—either in an original effort "to graft the Saulide genealogy onto that of Gibeon," or by employing a text that, whatever its prior history, already approximated the present stage of development.[23]

Problematically, however, this entire list of inhabitants of Gibeon is nearly identical to one that appears in 1 Chr 8:29–38, near the end of the presentation of the lines of Benjamin. Accordingly, some have proposed that one of the two lists is not authentic

---

dermine the structure—that the reference to Isaac before Ishmael might show the influence of Gen 25:9, where Abraham is buried by "his sons Isaac and Ishmael." (The nineteenth-century commentary of M.L. Malbim, printed in many Rabbinic Bibles, at 1 Chr 1:28, appears to be the first to acknowledge the similarity to this verse in Genesis.)

[22] The role of this verse as some kind of transition finds recognition in numerous studies, including some that, in spite of it, do not hesitate to assign ch. 9 to the same structural unit as the genealogical material in chs. 1–8 (e.g., Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 486). Of particular note, on the other hand, is Walters' more definitive assertion that the "genealogical material comes to an end" and "the rest of the book begins" at this point ("Saul of Gibeon," 63). Not coincidentally, Walters, rightly in my opinion, evaluates the role of the duplicate Saulide genealogy in 1 Chr 9 in light of the prior material in that chapter specifically ("Saul of Gibeon," 73–74). His conclusions, to be sure, differ substantially from my own.

[23] The quoted line appears in Edelman, "Saulide-Davidic Rivalry," 78. For additional discussion see Japhet, *Chronicles*, 196–98.

to the Chronicler. Recent commentators, on the other hand, have generally explained the second account as a kind of resumptive repetition, if a rather long and tedious one, that prepares the reader for the ensuing story of the deaths of Saul and his sons in battle.[24] Indeed, in favor of the alternative that the list here is authentic and serves a Saul-related purpose, it bears emphasis that the version in ch. 8 adds two verses that provide non-Saulide lines (vv. 39–40) and that in ch. 9 these are conspicuously omitted.[25]

While endorsing the view that the account in 1 Chr 9 is linked to the battle narrative that follows it, I see a more essential connection to the account of inhabitants of Jerusalem that precedes it.[26] The most straightforward structural clue in the text is undoubtedly the parallelism exhibited by the introductory phrases "In Jerusalem there lived" (1 Chr 9:3), on the one hand, and "In Gibeon there lived" (1 Chr 9:35), on the other; and it would appear likely that the juxtaposition of material concerning these two cult cities serves an intended purpose. The royal lines of Judah and Benjamin, after all, which frame the genealogical chapters, stand in competition with one another; and it is the Judean line that will prevail, producing kings who—in keeping with the Chronicler's presentation from here through 2 Chr 9—preside over the successful integration of royal city, ark, and temple, recognized by a unified Israel, toward the establishment of an eternal, divinely sanctioned cultic center. As a first step, then, 1 Chr 9 presents the Judean and Benjaminite cult cities side by side: after the book's genealogical introduction, in which the Levites and their cultic activities already occupy a central place, the Chronicler provides an account of the multiple tribes that inhabited Jerusalem—where the Levites, we are told, maintained cultic positions designated by David and Samuel—followed by the line of Saul which inhabited the cult city of Gibeon.

Which of these cities, then, becomes the preferred one? The text proceeds to relate the story (1 Chr 10:1–12) of the demise of Saul and his sons "Jonathan and Abinadab and Malki-shua" (v. 2), the same ones specified in ch. 9 (with the omission of the surviving son Eshbaal/Ish-bosheth); and it adds mention of Saul's unfaithfulness to the Lord and of the divinely ordained transfer of kingship to David (10:13–14). Immediately, then, in parallel to 2 Sam 5:1–10, we learn that "all Israel" joined David in Hebron. There, they affirmed their loyalty to him, acknowledged the leadership he displayed during Saul's reign, and pronounced him king, whereupon he led them in the conquest of Jerusalem, settled there, and

---

[24] See the extensive discussion by Japhet (*Chronicles*, 205), which provides sources representing the former view, and a detailed argument in favor of the now-regnant position that the Chronicler had reason to include both lists.

[25] Cf. Japhet, *Chronicles*, 205.

[26] As noted above (n. 22), on this particular point see already Walters, "Saul of Gibeon," 73–74.

grew in stature with the help of God (1 Chr 11:1–9). The Chronicler omits the content of 2 Sam 5:4–5, which relates that David reigned in Hebron for seven years before his conquest of Jerusalem, lest this indicate a break—chronological and structural—between the coronation and the conquest.[27]

After a chiastic presentation of the genealogies, then, the text, it would appear, underscores the rejection of Saul and the Benjaminite city of Gibeon in favor of David and the Judean city of Jerusalem by means of another chiastically-arranged unit. Even though Gibeon itself does not appear in ch. 10, the Chronicler makes use of the passage recounting the death of Saul and his sons to impart the fall of Saulide kingship and, by extension, the cult city associated with it. The pattern may be outlined as follows:

> A   Cult city of Jerusalem inhabited by multiple tribes (9:2–34)
> > B   Cult city of Gibeon inhabited by line of Saul (sons "Jonathan and Malki-shua and Abinadab and Eshbaal") (9:35–44)
> > B'   Demise of Saul and sons "Jonathan and Abinadab and Malki-shua" (10:1–14)
> A'   Cult city of Jerusalem captured, settled, and built up by David, supported by all Israel (11:1–9)[28]

In this connection, one final point bears mentioning. The list of inhabitants of Jerusalem in 1 Chr 9:3–34 substantially parallels an account, appearing in Neh 11, of the city's first settlers upon the return from exile. Our text, however, despite referencing the exile of Judah in 9:1, provides no overt indication that these individuals lived in this late period. Indeed, by referring to the appointment of Levites to gatekeeping roles by David and Samuel (1 Chr 9:22), and to oversight provided by Phinehas (v. 20), the Chronicler appears to obscure the sense that this is an account of postexilic settlers. Japhet, accordingly, affirms that the text, by means of such

---

[27] Scholars have recognized that, by omitting David's years in Hebron in this passage—acknowledging them only in the account of his death in 1 Chr 29:27—the Chronicler generates the impression that David ascribed primary and immediate importance to the capture and settlement of Jerusalem; see, e.g., Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite History*, 20. This ideological emphasis on the new cult city underlies the structural objective proposed here. A thematic link between the conquest of Jerusalem in 1 Chr 11 and the list of residents of the city in ch. 9 was already observed by Allen, *NIB*, 377.

[28] It bears mention that, whereas some other chiasms, such as the one proposed below for the ark narrative, underscore a direct contrast between what is presented before the midpoint and after it, the present pattern aids in the development of theme by means of a different strategy: the cult cities of the two royal houses—by means of lists of their inhabitants—are placed in parallel to one another in the first half, while the second half employs narrative passages to highlight the fall of one and the rise of the other. This stands as an example of the Chronicler's creativity in generating meaningful patterns utilizing available source material, in this case consisting of two disparate genres.

references, generates temporal ambiguities that serve "to legitimize the gatekeepers' status" at the time the book was composed.[29]

According to the thesis proposed here, however, the Chronicler gained another advantage by invoking the pre-exilic period. For the account of residents of Jerusalem, in this view, stands in parallel to the ensuing presentation of *early* inhabitants of the rival cult city of Gibeon, including the line of Saul. The Chronicler had good reason indeed, then, to obfuscate the temporal incompatibility between the two lists.[30] Thus, by mentioning Phinehas, Samuel, and David, the text calls to mind the nation's early history, including, prominently, the period of the rise of the monarchy and the conflict, ultimately an enduring one, between the adherents of first king of Israel and those of his Judean successor.[31]

THE SUPPORTERS OF DAVID

The account of David's rise to the throne concludes with still another chiasm, which contains lists of his military supporters among all Israel, including many Benjaminites.[32] This unit, which

---

[29] Japhet, *Chronicles*, 216; cf. 208. Already among medieval commentators, there appears a view that ascribes these residents of Jerusalem to the pre-exilic period; see the references to Pseudo-Rashi and the anonymous commentary in manuscript Munich 5, both of the twelfth century, in Y. Berger, *The Commentary of Rabbi David Kimḥi to Chronicles: A Translation with Introduction and Supercommentary* (Brown Judaic Studies, 345; Providence: Brown University, 2007), 107–8. For a summary of scholarship on this question—and on the associated issue of the relationship between the accounts in Chronicles and Nehemiah—see recently Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 262–65. With respect to Pseudo-Rashi's commentary more generally, note the recent exhaustive study by E. Viezel, *The Commentary on Chronicles Attributed to Rashi* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2010) (Hebrew).

In connection with chiasm in Chronicles, it bears mention that the twelfth-century exegete Rabbi Abraham Ibn Ezra, one of the first medieval figures to recognize this device, offers a creative chiastic reading of 1 Chr 29:11–12, recently published and elucidated by A. Mondschein, "The Philosophical Commentary of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra to 1 Chronicles 29:11–13—A Critical Edition" in S. Vargon *et al.* (eds.), *Studies in Bible and Exegesis IX: Presented to Moshe Garsiel* (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University, 2009), 509–44 (Hebrew). Regarding Ibn Ezra's recognition of chiasm more generally, see the material cited by Kalimi, *Ancient Israelite History*, 216 n. 6.

[30] Regarding temporal imprecision and other issues related to time in the Chronicler's work, see the important discussions by E. Ben Zvi, *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles* (London/Oakville, Conn.: Equinox, 2006), 53–57, 144–57.

[31] I speak of enduring tension between the two royal houses in keeping with the premise of this study and those on which it is based. It is precisely such tension which impels the Chronicler to insist that the tribe of Benjamin is, in fact, prominent among those who eventually do recognize the primacy of David and Jerusalem; see immediately below.

[32] Discussion of these references to David's Benjaminite supporters—

extends until the end of 1 Chr 12, might be perceived to begin at 11:10 ("These are David's chief warriors who supported him in his kingship, coronating him together with all Israel in accordance with the Lord's word concerning Israel"), and to take the following form:[33]

    A   Supporters at coronation (together with "all Israel") (11:10–45)[34]
        B   Supporters at Ziklag (12:1–8)
            C   Supporters at stronghold (12:9–16)
            C'   Supporters at stronghold (12:17–19)
        B'   Supporters at Ziklag (12:20–23)
    A'   Supporters at coronation (together with "all Israel") (12:24–41)

Now it is true that all Israel comes to coronate David already in 1 Chr 11:1, and, accordingly, in line with the initial presentation of this structure by Williamson, scholars have typically affirmed that it begins at the start of the chapter, notwithstanding the incongruous passage in vv. 4–9 which describes David's conquest of Jerusalem.[35] In this view, the final two verses of 1 Chr 12, which speak of a general celebration of David's ascent to the throne, correspond to the coronation scene by all Israel in 11:1–3. Indeed, the attractiveness of this correlation must be acknowledged; yet the problem of 11:4–9 has required proponents of this version of the pattern either to force these verses into the same structural component as vv. 1–3, or merely to skip vv. 4–9 in their presentation of the chiasm.[36]

---

and of the ideological significance of their endorsement of his leadership—appears in Knoppers, "Israel's First King," 195–99; and Amit, "Saul Polemic," 651–52. For additional, related remarks concerning passages in 1 Chr 8–9 that call attention to Benjaminites who settled in Jerusalem, see Chapter 18 of Amit, *In Praise of Editing.*

[33] As it is presented by J.A. Thompson, the chiasm indeed begins at this point (*1, 2 Chronicles* [NAC, 9; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1994], 123).

[34] This passage also refers to followers of David from earlier years, but the Chronicler implies that these individuals came to Hebron now for the specific purpose of crowning him king, as noted, for example, by Williamson, " 'We are yours, O David,' " 165.

[35] Commentators who present the pattern in this fashion include, inter alia, Williamson, " 'We are yours, O David,' " 169; Allen, *NIB*, 376; Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29*, 574–75; Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 298; and P.B. Dirksen, *1 Chronicles* (trans. A.P. Runia; HCOT; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 160.

[36] Of those mentioned in the previous note, only Williamson (169 n. 17) affirms that vv. 4–9 remain in the pattern as an extension of vv. 1–3. Allen, Knoppers, and Klein, by contrast, leave this passage out of their outlines without further comment. Dirksen cites Williamson's position, but argues that "it is perhaps better to recognize this irregularity, and to assume that the Chronicler was forced by the great significance of this capture directly after the coronation to disrupt his own chiastic structure

If, on the other hand, the pattern is seen to begin at v. 10, whereas vv. 1–9 close out the preceding unit and underscore the rise of David and Jerusalem, vv. 4–9 become essential, while vv. 1–3 serve to recount the emergence of the Judean king before his conquest of the new cult city. The only drawbacks to this alternative involve the aforementioned celebratory coronation scene at Hebron at the end of ch. 12, which would need:

1. To be viewed as an extension of the preceding account of military personnel who came to support David in that city, rather than as a structural component of its own; and,

2. To bear no structural relationship to the opening scene of ch. 11 despite the similarity that scholars have noted.

These concerns, to be sure, should not be dismissed; and, in order to account for them, one moderately ambitious solution merits serious consideration: the Chronicler deployed the passage contained in 11:1–9 as a point of overlap, servicing two distinct structural units. Especially for those who have chosen to disregard 11:4–9 when presenting the chiasm that comprises chs. 11–12, such an option offers particular appeal: the incongruous verses, which the Chronicler had little choice but to place only after the coronation of David in vv. 1–3, indeed belong not with the present structural unit but with the preceding one. The overlapping units, then, would look as follows, the components of the first one signified here by uppercase alphabetic markings, the latter one by lowercase:

A   Cult city of Jerusalem inhabited by multiple tribes (9:2–34)
  B   Cult city of Gibeon inhabited by line of Saul
    (sons "Jonathan and Malki-shua and Abinadab and Eshbaal") (9:35–44)
  B'   Demise of Saul and sons "Jonathan and Abinadab and Malki-shua" (10:1–14)
a   Coronation of David by all Israel (11:1–3)
A'   Cult city of Jerusalem captured, settled, and built up by David, supported by all Israel (11:4–9)
  b   Supporters at coronation (11:10–45)
    c   Supporters at Ziklag (12:1–8)
      d   Supporters at stronghold (12:9–16)
      d'   Supporters at stronghold (12:17–19)
    c'   Supporters at Ziklag (12:20–23)
  b'   Supporters at coronation (12:24–39a)
a'   Coronation of David by all Israel (12:39b–41)

here and to confine the structure to the recognition of and support of David" (*1 Chronicles*, 160). Similar articulations appear in S.L. McKenzie, *1–2 Chronicles* (Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 2004), 124–25; and in Japhet, *Chronicles*, 234.

If an option of this sort is to be pursued, some will doubtless prefer to present 11:1–9 as a single component, even as it services two patterns. To those, on the other hand, who would resist the suggestion of any kind of structural overlap, I submit—in keeping with the initial argument provided above—that the more persuasive remaining alternative is to identify v. 10 as the beginning of the latter chiasm, leaving 11:1–9 as the culmination of a pattern that includes chs. 9–10. For by acknowledging the two Israelite cult cities and then recounting the demise of Saul and his sons, those preceding chapters thereby serve a clear-cut purpose that accounts for their inclusion and position in the book—underscoring the firm rejection of the Benjaminite royal house *and cultic center*, which leads, in turn, to the uncontested recognition of the kingship of David and of the newly established cult city of Jerusalem.

3. CHIASTIC PATTERNS IN 1 CHR 13–16

THE ARK NARRATIVE

We now proceed to 1 Chr 13:1–16:1, where the Chronicler resumes the story of David's royal activities by means of an adaptation of material appearing in 2 Sam 5:11–6:20.[37] The most striking difference in the account in Chronicles involves the structural position of one substantial segment: the story of the celebratory transport of the ark by carriage, a transgression that leads to the death of Uzza. In Samuel, this event appears after David's defeat of the Philistines, and it is immediately followed by the successful transport of the ark to Jerusalem by Levites. In Chronicles, however, the initial, failed transport is the first event recounted in the unit.

According to a recent, astute proposal by Zalewski, the Chronicler, by means of this single change in arrangement, generates a chiasm that underscores a crucial reversal of fortune for King David.[38] First, the transport of the ark by Levites, which appears at the end of the unit, presents a contrast to the opening, fateful attempt to haul it by carriage. What is more, the defeat of the Philistines now occupies a structural position that places it in oppo-

---

[37] I speak of the Chronicler working off a text resembling that of Samuel in keeping with the majority opinion among scholars. It must be emphasized, however, that the alternative position, which maintains that Chronicles and Samuel–Kings contain fundamentally independent adaptations of a common core of material, remains consistent with the proposals advanced here. This minority view finds its most important expression in the studies of A.G. Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994); and Rezetko, *Source and Revision*. Note further the sources cited by Rezetko, *Source and Revision*, 6–7 n. 11; and the variation of this approach in R.F. Person, Jr., *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature, 6; Atlanta: SBL, 2010).

[38] Zalewski, *Ark Narrative*, 74–75.

sition to the death of Uzza—these two events being unmistakably linked by David's respective reactions to them. In the wake of Uzza's demise, we are told that "David became dejected because the Lord made a breach (*pāraṣ . . . pereṣ*) by way of Uzza, and he called that place *pereṣ ʿuzzâ . . .* " (1 Chr 13:11). By contrast, after the king's men defeat the Philistines in battle, we learn that "David said, 'God breached my enemies . . . like a breach made by water (*pāraṣ . . . kĕpereṣ . . .*)'; so they named that place *baʿal pĕrāṣîm*" (14:11).[39]

Now one might, at this point, identify the passage appearing between these two events, which recounts the favorable personal fortunes of David, as a turning point that stands by itself at the center of the pattern. Zalewski, however, offers a clever alternative, positing that David's good fortune stands in parallel to the blessings that God bestows upon Obed-edom when the chastened king diverts the ark to this Levite's house.[40] For after "the Lord blessed the house of Obed-edom and all that was his" (1 Chr 13:14), the text relates that Hiram sent to David workers along with materials to build *him* a "house," a development that persuaded the Judean monarch of the Lord's endorsement of his kingship (14:1–2). Furthermore, in the midst of an otherwise rather unadorned enumeration of members of various Levite families, 1 Chr 26:4–5 tells us that Obed-edom fathered eight sons *because God blessed him*. Accordingly, commentators note that the Lord's blessing of "the house of Obed-edom and all that was his" in our passage was pointedly taken by the Chronicler to convey, if inexplicitly, the granting of sons.[41] In turn, much as the building of David's

---

[39] Several interpreters note the repeated play on this term; see, e.g., T.C. Eskenazi, "A Literary Approach to Chronicles' Ark Narrative in 1 Chronicles 13–16," in A. Beck (ed.), *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Honor of His Seventieth Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 258–74 (264–67).

I strongly endorse these connections, and, in turn, their potential to contribute to a chiastic pattern, even though the components in the first half of the sequence are notably shorter than the corresponding ones in the second half. This is an instance where, by means of one ingenious move—i.e., the repositioning of the account of the failed transport of the ark—the Chronicler managed to generate the correlations necessary for a chiasm; and in light of the thematic and lexical parallels highlighted by Zalewski that are cited here, it could well have been decided that the structure was best left alone at that point, presumed to be discernible to the ancient reader sensitive to the presence of this kind of literary device. The alternative, which would have involved reworking passages familiar from the book of Samuel merely for the sake of creating balance of length, might also have run the risk of awkwardness and artificiality.

[40] Zalewski, *Ark Narrative*, 75. Regarding the Chronicler's identification of Obed-edom as a Levite, see recently N. Tan, "The Chronicler's 'Obed-edom': A Foreigner and/or a Levite?" *JSOT* 32 (2007), 217–30.

[41] The observation is made by, among others, Japhet, *Chronicles* 455–56; Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29*, 867; and Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 490.

"house" recalls the blessing granted to Obed-edom's "house," the king's fathering of children may likewise correspond to the implicit expansion of this fortunate Levite's family.

In the chiastic pattern soon to be outlined, I have incorporated this more ambitious, if nonessential, alternative. Before presenting the chiasm, however, I wish to suggest, in light of the broader thesis of this study, that it contains still another set of corresponding elements.

Observe that, at the very beginning of 1 Chr 13, the Chronicler adds an introduction (vv. 1–5), which contains David's proposal that the community of Israel should "transfer the ark of God to us because we did not seek it out in the days of Saul" (v. 3). Consider further that, in the pattern under discussion, the transport of the ark by carriage is structurally distinct from its tragic conclusion; for the account of Uzza's death—standing independently—corresponds to the defeat of the Philistines. It seems reasonable to suggest, therefore, that the celebratory transport by Levites, too, stands apart from its conclusion, the successful placement of the ark in its proper location. The culmination of that transfer, celebrated by all Israel, corresponds rather to the aforementioned proposal by David to the entire community at the start of ch. 13. Of central importance, in the final scene the text retains an anomalous reference to Michal "daughter of Saul" peering down disdainfully upon David (15:29), in a way that, as commentators have suggested, underscores the problematic attitude of the house of Saul toward the ark of God.[42] This allusion to the fallen Benjaminite king thereby correlates with the pointed comment by David in the Chronicler's introductory scene, "because we did not seek it out in the days of Saul."

The pattern, then, may be presented as follows:

---

[42] See, among many others, Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29*, 626, departing from an earlier affirmation by E.L. Curtis and A.A. Madsen that the inclusion of this line reflects the "unskilful art of the Chronicler" (ICC, 24; *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910], 219). Even though the Chronicler was working off the text of Samuel here, the inclusion of the line about Michal is noted to be especially striking for several reasons: 1) the Chronicler omits the subsequent material in Samuel that clarifies the reason for her scorning David; 2) much of the account leading up to the reference to Michal is substantially different from what appears in Samuel, which suggests that this line too would not have been included just to leave the source material intact; and, 3) the Chronicler deftly neutralizes any hint that David was dancing immodestly, the reason for Michal's discontent in Samuel.

A   David and Israelites resolve to transfer ark to Jerusalem "because we did not seek it out in the days of Saul" (13:1–5)

    B   Celebratory procession: ark transported by carriage (13:6–8)

        C   Death of Uzza: the Lord *pāraṣ pereṣ*; place named *pereṣ ʿuzzâ* (13:9–11)

            D   God blesses "Obed-edom's house and all that was his" (sons? cf. 1 Chr 26:4–5) (13:12–14)

            D'   God favors David: king receives materials to build "house," begets sons (14:1–7)

        C'   Defeat of Philistines: God *pāraṣ . . . kĕpereṣ . . .*; place named *baʿal pĕrāṣîm* (14:8–17)

    B'   Celebratory procession: ark transported by Levites (15:1–24)

A'   David and Israelites transfer ark to Jerusalem; "daughter of Saul" disdains David's celebration (15:25–16:1)

Note, furthermore, that back in ch. 10 the Chronicler attributes Saul's fall to his having neglected to "seek out the Lord" (v. 14), a phrase widely observed to resemble David's assertion, in the first component of our chiasm, that Israel did not "seek out" the ark of God "in the days of Saul."[43] Fittingly, then, in the proposed corresponding element of the pattern, "the daughter of Saul," by scorning David's conduct, shows bitter resentment toward what she sees as an excessive expression of joy at the expense of her displaced, fallen father, whose inadequacy in the very matter of "seeking out" the ark—and the God whose name it bears—brought the Benjaminite royal house to its end.

In the eyes of Michal, then, David's transfer of the ark and attendant celebration amount to a stinging blow to the legacy of Saul's kingship. For the reader, on the other hand, the scene simultaneously marks the culmination of an elegant literary pattern conveying one of the many successes of David, as he continues the incremental process of unifying Israel around a perpetual cultic center in Jerusalem.

THE AFTERMATH AND THE SONG OF PRAISE

In the narrative in Samuel, after the ark is placed in its proper location and offerings are brought, David blesses the nation and distributes food, after which the people disperse and the king returns

---

[43] Klein, in our context, calls attention to the earlier references to Saul's neglect to "seek out" both God and the ark, seeing the line about Michal as underscoring "a moral contrast between the first two kings" (*1 Chronicles*, 357). To be sure, he does not, as in my formulation, understand her reaction as a pained expression that David's transfer of the ark punctuates her father's loss of the throne. To Klein's remarks, cf. Japhet, *Chronicles*, 308, and Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29*, 626.

home to bless his household (2 Sam 6:18–20). The Chronicler, however, places a substantial separation between these two blessings (1 Chr 16:2–3, 43), thereby deploying them as a frame for the next chiastic unit.[44]

As first observed by Hill, the song in 1 Chr 16:8–36 follows a chiastic arrangement that is artfully constructed out of three different psalms.[45] But as Japhet and Selman have noted, a structure of this kind in fact extends to the narrative that precedes and follows the poem.[46] According to both of these scholars, the pattern begins at the very start of the chapter; and more recently, Klein, building upon Japhet's argument, has included the account of the ark's transfer to Jerusalem (1 Chr 15:25–29) within the first component of the chiasm.[47]

As already seen, however, there is reason to ascribe the transfer of the ark, including its placement in a newly prepared location in 16:1, to a prior chiastic pattern. Accordingly, I propose that the new structure begins at 16:2, where, appropriately, we encounter the first of the two blessings that serve as its frame. We may allow the remaining components of the chiasm, a version of which appears below, to speak for themselves:

---

[44] The correlation between the two blessings is noted by Selman in his presentation of the chiasm (*Chronicles*, 166).

[45] Hill, "Connective Structure." Regarding the song's artistry, see the collection of sources in Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 362, including some early treatments, since discredited, denying that it is secondary to the parallel material in Psalms.

[46] Japhet, *Chronicles*, 312; Selman, *Chronicles*, 166. Neither Japhet nor Selman cites Hill's study, and it is notable that their presentations of the chiasm merely place the poem at the center, without assigning to it any internal correspondences. Hill's position is in fact pointedly rejected by J.W. Kleinig, *The Lord's Song: The Basis, Function and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles* (JSOTSup, 156; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 142 n. 2; and J.M. Street, *The Significance of the Ark Narrative: Literary Formation and Artistry in the Book of Chronicles* (Studies in Biblical Literature, 129; New York: Peter Lang, 2009). Neither Kleinig nor Street, however, was working with the broad chiasm suggested by Japhet and Selman. In my opinion, the persuasiveness of the broader correlations suggests that the Chronicler was actively seeking to generate a chiastic arrangement, and quite probably intended for the correspondences noted by Hill to be part of the structure. It emerges, in any event, that the outline I provide below is the first one to present all this material together.

[47] Klein, *Chronicles*, 351. Klein, too, despite an awareness of Hill's study (162), leaves out any correspondences within the song itself in his presentation of the chiasm.

A David blesses and feeds the people (16:2)
  B David appoints Levites to service of the ark (16:3–6)
   C Role of Asaph and his sons is highlighted (16:7)
    D "Praise the Lord . . ." (16:8)
     E "Sing to the Lord . . ." (16:9–22)
     E' "Sing to the Lord . . ." (16:23–33)
    D' "Praise the Lord . . ." (16:34–36)
   C' Role of Asaph and his sons is highlighted (16:37)
  B' David appoints Levites to service of the ark, and of the cultic center in Gibeon (16:38–42)
A' People disperse; David turns to bless his household (16:43)

With the ark now in its proper location in Jerusalem, the king is now in position to move to the next step: preparing for the construction of a temple in the city, which will house the ark and become the new, permanent cultic center of Israel. Indeed, when David identifies the precise location for this temple, he pointedly affirms that it will function to replace the shrine at Gibeon (1 Chr 21:29–22:1). Only after these preparations are complete does the newly appointed King Solomon—having just been granted the wisdom to guide the nation—turn away from Gibeon in the direction of Jerusalem, where his erection of a permanent sanctuary will endow the city with its ultimate stature (2 Chr 1:13). For it is upon that sanctuary's completion that the Lord, in the wake of the efforts of both David and Solomon, will unequivocally affirm that he has "chosen and consecrated this House for [his] name to be there forever" (7:16).

4. SUMMARY, METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS, AND A PROPOSAL FOR 1 CHR 17–29

SYNOPSIS OF CONCLUSIONS

Recent studies have proposed that, as late as the Persian period, Benjaminites identifying with the legacy of Saul vied for political prominence while advocating for the centrality of the cultic location associated with their tribe.[48] In this view, the book of Chronicles, by pointedly rejecting Gibeon and the Saulides and underscoring the unified recognition of David by all Israel, reaffirms the exclusive standing of Judean rule and of the sanctuary in Jerusalem. According to the argument presented here, structural considerations, too, suggest that this was among the Chronicler's objectives. For by making extensive use of chiasm, our author craftily adapts and arranges blocks of source material in a way that gives expression to the displacement of Saul and his cult city by David and his own.

---

[48] See above, n. 8.

It will be helpful to provide a detailed summary of my conclusions before considering some of their further implications for the interpretation of Chronicles:

1. 1 Chr 9 serves primarily to set up an opposition between Jerusalem, the cult city of David, and Gibeon, the cult city of Saul. To make the two parts of the chapter correspond better to one another, the text gives the impression that the individuals specified as inhabitants of Jerusalem lived well before the exile, as did the residents of Gibeon named subsequently. The demise of Saul recounted in ch. 10 signifies a rejection of not only his kingship but the cultic location associated with it. David's conquest and settlement of Jerusalem in the early part of ch. 11 then underscores the rise of the new cult city. Together, all this material forms a chiasm, much like the preceding genealogies where the royal tribes of Judah and Benjamin serve as a frame and the Levites occupy the center. The list of Gibeonites in ch. 9, although a duplication of what appears a chapter earlier, not only is authentic but makes an essential contribution to the structure and ideological force of the sequence. In 11:1–9, to maintain focus on the rise of David and his conquest of Jerusalem—and thereby keep the structural unit intact—the text omits reference to his seven-year reign in Hebron despite its presence in the parallel text in Samuel. Significantly, the chiastic arrangement of the sequence highlights a thematic turn, involving the rejection of one cultic location in favor of another.

2. As the starting point of a new unit, 1 Chr 9 bears no structural connection to the preceding material, even as it picks up on the matter of the Benjaminite–Judean rivalry in relation to the cult. Accordingly, it exhibits no correspondence to 1:1–2:2. Rather, the world ancestry and Patriarchal genealogies at the beginning of the book are best seen to form an independent unit that itself consists of two successive chiastic patterns.

3. The chiastic presentation of supporters of David in 1 Chr 11–12 may be seen to commence at the transitional statement in 11:10, which immediately follows the account of the Judean king's conquest of Jerusalem. Alternatively, this new chiasm begins at the start of the chapter and overlaps the pattern that precedes it, so that the material in 11:1–9 services both structures. If this is the case, there is reason to divide these nine verses into two sections, so that vv. 1–3 correspond to the final scene in ch. 12 where all Israel celebrates David's coronation, and vv. 4–9 conclude the earlier pattern which underscores the rejection of the old cult city in favor of the new.

4. The ensuing sequence recounting the transfer of the ark of God to Jerusalem, which begins at 1 Chr 13:1, exhibits a chiastic arrangement that culminates in 1 Chr 16:1 with the placement of the ark in its designated location. This structure gives expression to a reversal, whereby David, recognizing the favor that God has shown him, corrects the error in cultic procedure that caused his original effort at moving the ark to end in tragedy. Framing this

pattern are allusions to Saul's failure to transfer the ark to the central cultic location, which signifies his neglect to "seek out" the Lord. In this way, David's cultic achievements, signifying his own religious triumph, once again stand in contrast to the fateful inadequacies of Saul. The Chronicler's effort to construct this frame accounts for the reference, near the end of the unit, to the "daughter of Saul" scorning David's celebration; for this reaction highlights Michal's pained recognition that David has scored a historic success in precisely the matter that doomed her father's kingship.

5. The chiasm that encompasses the song and its narrative frame in 1 Chr 16 begins at v. 2, after the transfer of the ark is complete. Fittingly, this verse contains a reference to the blessing that David bestowed upon the people, which corresponds to the blessing that he directs toward his household at the end of the chapter.

RAMIFICATIONS FOR INTERPRETING CHRONICLES

From all of the above, it follows not only that the Chronicler produced a series of expansive chiastic patterns out of sizable blocks of source material, but that these structures make a key contribution toward the development of the book's theological message. If the conclusions drawn here are judged to be largely correct, considerations of broad design must, accordingly, occupy a prominent place in the exegesis of Chronicles. For example, questions that have been raised concerning the authenticity of any particular passage—for example, the material in 1 Chr 23–27 describing David's organization of the cult—would properly be assessed with reference to the role that the passage in question might play within a larger structure.[49]

Moreover, if the book's message is indeed communicated substantially by way of chiastic deployment of earlier texts, then a new approach must emerge toward questions about the motive for the incorporation or exclusion of material. For according to this conception of the Chronicler's work, not only does the book chiefly serve a theological purpose rather than a historical one, but it would be misleading, even if technically accurate, to describe Chronicles as a theologically-driven retelling of history. Rather, toward the goal of affirming certain specific points of theology, the book selects, adapts, and arranges familiar historical narratives and various types of lists, presuming that, as appropriate, its audience will:

---

[49] Regarding the authenticity of 1 Chr 23–27, see, e.g., the helpful summary and discussion in W.M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 165–70.

1. Apply a vertical reading strategy rather than linear one; and, accordingly,

2. See the detailed accounts—historical and otherwise—that form the basis of the work as fundamentally subordinate to the wider message conveyed by the patterns that these accounts help to generate.[50]

With an eye toward this broad conception of the book, then, I conclude with some thoughts regarding the account of David's activities in 1 Chr 17–29, which immediately follows the patterns already discussed and precedes the widely-recognized chiastic presentation of the Solomon material in 2 Chr 1–9. Notably, Williamson sees these thirteen chapters as a unified segment, one that relates to David's initiative to build a house for God.[51] Following this understanding, in turn, we shall evaluate this material as a single unit when considering its design.

It will be observed that the beginning, middle, and end of this selection exhibit a close relationship. In 1 Chr 17, in a speech transmitted by the prophet Nathan, God insists that the temple be built not by David but by an heir to his throne; and the king responds with a deferential, acquiescent prayer. In ch. 22, in a speech to Solomon that cites this prophecy, David charges his son to build God's house in a newly identified location; and he instructs the people to support Solomon's efforts. Finally, in chs. 28–29—before relinquishing power and meeting his death (29:21–30)—David strikes similar themes in a series of speeches to Solomon and the people, again citing Nathan's prophecy; and he adds another prayer, offering praise to the Lord and petitioning him to grant success to the next king.[52]

Observe also that 1 Chr 22, the middle passage, is flanked by initiatives taken by David to perform a census of his subjects. In ch. 21, over Joab's own objection (v. 3), the general follows, if incompletely (v. 6), the king's ill-conceived orders to count the people; and this leads to an especially deadly plague, one that ends when David brings an offering at the location subsequently designated for the temple. By contrast, in chs. 23–27, a properly circumscribed census is performed under the king's direction in the context of his assigning cultic roles for this prospective sanctuary; and the text associates the prior, tragic effort to count the people exclusively with Joab (27:23–24).

---

[50] In this connection, see, inter alia, Knoppers' discussion of the relationship between Chronicles and the genre of the rewritten Bible, and his citations of earlier scholarship on the question of how to classify the work (*I Chronicles 1–9*, 129–34).

[51] Williamson, *Chronicles*, 132, 185–86. Cf. Allen, "Kerygmatic Units," 22–23.

[52] The sources mentioned in the previous note point to fundamental similarities between the prayers in chs. 17 and 29.

Could it be, then, that another chiasm is emerging? This would seem, at first glance, to be rather improbable. 1 Chr 21, after all, differs dramatically in length from chs. 23–27, an imbalance that would militate against any suggestion that the two selections correspond to one another. More important, the remaining material in the sequence under discussion consists of an account of David's military victories (chs. 18–20), which bears no apparent correspondence to any content in the latter half of the unit.

The picture changes substantially, however, when we consider the role of chs. 18–20 in the book, and, more specifically, within this particular sequence. The inclusion of David's victories has long presented a problem, for these battles appear, at least initially, to be entirely unrelated to the cult. However, as noted by Williamson and others, this material in fact gives detailed expression to the unrest that plagued David's kingship, which, as the prophet implied back in ch. 17, disqualified the first Judean king from building the temple.[53] Indeed, it is only after acquainting the reader with these military exploits that the text, by way of David's speech in ch. 22 (v. 8; cf. 28:3), can explain his disqualification in a clear and specific way: this is, emphatically, a king who has "spilled much blood and waged many wars."

With this in mind, then, and with appropriate caution, I suggest that 1 Chr 17–29 in fact follows a broad chiastic arrangement, containing an evenly-balanced opposition between, on the one hand, the fatalities that prevented David from building a temple, and, on the other, his initiatives that extended to all but the actual process of construction. First, in ch. 17, God denies David the right to build such a temple, referring in a general way to the unrest that dogged his reign. Chs. 18–21, then, specify the activities of the king that engendered loss of life—his military ventures, and his illicit census. In what marks the beginning of a transition, however, the plague that resulted from the census gives way to an identification of the proper site for the house of God.[54] Thus, after multiple royal initiatives that lead to much death, David, at the center and turning point of the unit (ch. 22), redirects his attention to the matter of a temple and orders Solomon to build one, explaining

---

[53] Williamson, *Chronicles*, 137–38; see also the sources collected by Dirksen, who himself rejects this position (*1 Chronicles*, 241). Williamson, too, adds other reasons for the inclusion of this material; but I favor the present explanation because of the structural and exegetical advantages it will be shown to provide.

[54] For our purposes, it is especially worth noting a recent argument by Y. Amit that, by means of several techniques, the Chronicler's account of the acquisition of the temple site serves to affirm "the status of Jerusalem vis-à-vis its rivals," Gibeon prominently among them ("Araunah's Threshing Floor: A Lesson in Shaping Historical Memory," in E. Ben Zvi and D. Edelman [eds.], *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles?* [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011], 133–44).

that God would not allow a house for his name to be constructed by someone involved in so much spilling of blood.

Next, the king proceeds with another census—this time within proper limits—which guides him in assigning cultic roles in the sanctuary (chs. 23–27). It is only when all these preparations are complete that David cedes power to Solomon, leaving the scene with a series of speeches that mark a culmination of his efforts to bring Jerusalem to the brink of its destiny as the center of Israel's cult (chs. 28–29). If the fatalities described in 1 Chr 18–21 stood in the way of David's construction of a house for God, his organization of the cult in chs. 23–27 allows him to approach death after celebrating, together with the entire community of Israel, the fulfillment of all the prerequisites for his successor to bring the matter to its completion.

I propose, therefore, the following pattern:

A   Divine speech: David's successor must build temple; David's prayer (ch. 17)

   B   Bloodshed disqualifying David from building temple: Wars
      Fatal census (conducted over Joab's objection) (chs. 18–21)

      X   Citation of divine speech: Solomon must build temple, for David "spilled much blood and waged many wars" (ch. 22)

   B'   David's preparations for building of temple: Organization of cult
      Proper census (fatal census now attributed to Joab) (chs. 23–27)

A'   Citation of divine speech: Solomon must build temple; David's speeches and prayer (chs. 28–29)

For one who is inclined to accept this pattern in principle, it will inevitably lend itself to varying nuances of presentation.[55] Nevertheless, beyond closing a gap in an otherwise extensive sequence of chiastically-arranged material, the suggestion offers considerable

---

[55] 1 Chr 28:11–19 and 29:6–9 contain narrative material that is fundamentally connected to the speeches: the first passage lists materials that David provided to Solomon for the temple after instructing him to build it, and the second one mentions donations made by the people that were inspired by David's words. I have omitted these from the outline, seeing the rather general nature of the components of the structure to allow for the placement of these narrative passages under the same rubric as the speeches to which they are linked. Of course, any evaluation of the chiasm must take into account the presence of this material.

It was obviously necessary for the Chronicler, in a transitional passage at the end of ch. 29, to recount David's death and Solomon's attendant rise to power, and the inclusion of that material before the chiastic unit that recounts Solomon's activities (2 Chr 1–9) strikes me as a minimal structural concern.

exegetical value. For in this way, the literary structure of 1 Chr 17–29 generates a thematic framework for the account of David's connection to the house of the Lord, spanning the entirety of the sequence. First, after seeking to erect a temple, he is disqualified from undertaking its construction because of the casualties that he spawned. In the end, however, the founder of the Judean dynasty manages to put all the necessities for building a new sanctuary firmly into place, in what amounts to his final contribution to the establishment of an eternal cultic center at God's chosen site.

APPENDIX: 1 CHR 1–2 CHR 9 ACCORDING TO ITS PROPOSED DESIGN

PRE-ISRAELITE GENEALOGIES (1 CHR 1:1–2:2)

(Braun, Klein, and Willi)

- I   Ten generations from Adam to Noah
  - A   Shem
    - B   Ham
      - C   Japheth
      - C'   Progeny of Japheth
    - B'   Progeny of Ham
  - A'   Progeny of Shem
- II   Ten generations from Shem to Abraham
  - A   Isaac
    - B   Ishmael
    - B'   Progeny of Ishmael (and Keturah)
  - A'   Progeny of Isaac

THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL AND THE LEVITICAL CULT: JUDAH VS. BENJAMIN (1 CHR 2:3–8:40)

(Williamson, followed by others)

- A   Royal tribe of Judah
  - B   Transjordanian tribes
    - X   Tribe of Levi
  - B'   Tribes west of the Jordan
- A'   Royal tribe of Benjamin

SELECTION OF JUDEANS, DAVID, AND JERUSALEM OVER BENJAMINITES, SAUL, AND GIBEON (1 CHR 9:3–11:9)

- A   Cult city of Jerusalem inhabited by multiple tribes (9:2–34)
  - B   Cult city of Gibeon inhabited by line of Saul (sons "Jonathan and Malki-shua and Abinadab and Eshbaal") (9:35–44)
  - B'   Demise of Saul and sons "Jonathan and Abinadab and Malki-shua" (10:1–14)
- A'   Cult city of Jerusalem captured, settled, and built up by David, supported by all Israel (11:1–9)

SUPPORT FOR DAVID BY ALL ISRAEL (1 CHR 11:10–12:41)

(Williamson, followed by others)

- A   Supporters at coronation (together with "all Israel") (11:10–45)
  - B   Supporters at Ziklag (12:1–8)
    - C   Supporters at stronghold (12:9–16)
    - C'   Supporters at stronghold (12:17–19)
  - B'   Supporters at Ziklag (12:20–23)
- A'   Supporters at coronation (together with "all Israel") (12:24–41)

SELECTION OF JERUSALEM OVER GIBEON
AND SUPPORT FOR DAVID BY ALL ISRAEL:
ALTERNATIVE FOR 1 CHR 9–12

(chs. 11–12 following Williamson, apart from 11:4–9)

A   Cult city of Jerusalem inhabited by multiple tribes (9:2–34)
    B   Cult city of Gibeon inhabited by line of Saul
         (sons "Jonathan and Malki-shua and Abinadab
         and Eshbaal") (9:35–44)
    B'   Death of Saul and sons "Jonathan and Abinadab and
         Malki-shua" (10:1–14)
a   Coronation of David by all Israel (11:1–3)
A'   Cult city of Jerusalem captured, settled, and built up by
         David, supported by all Israel (11:4–9)
    b   Supporters at coronation (11:10–45)
        c   Supporters at Ziklag (12:1–8)
            d   Supporters at stronghold (12:9–16)
            d'   Supporters at stronghold (12:17–19)
        c'   Supporters at Ziklag (12:20–23)
    b'   Supporters at coronation (12:24–39a)
a'   Coronation of David by all Israel (12:39b–41)

TRANSFER OF ARK TO JERUSALEM (1 CHR 13:1–16:1)

(Zalewski, with addition of A–A')

A   David and Israelites resolve to transfer ark to Jerusalem
         "because we did not seek it out in the days of Saul"
         (13:1–5)
    B   Celebratory procession: ark transported by carriage
         (13:6–8)
        C   Death of Uzza: the Lord *pāraṣ pereṣ*, place
            named *pereṣ ʿuzzâ* (13:9–11)
            D   God blesses "Obed-edom's house and all
                that was his" (sons? cf. 1 Chr 26:4–5)
                (13:12–14)
            D'   God favors David: king receives materials
                to build "house," begets sons (14:1–7)
        C'   Defeat of Philistines: God *pāraṣ . . . kĕpereṣ . . .* ;
            place named *baʿal pĕrāṣîm* (14:8–17)
    B'   Celebratory procession: ark transported by Levites
         (15:1–24)
A'   David and Israelites transfer ark to Jerusalem; "daughter of
         Saul" disdains David's celebration (15:25–16:1)

ESTABLISHMENT OF CULT IN JERUSALEM AND SONG OF PRAISE (1 CHR 16:2–43)

(adaptation of Japhet and Selman, combined with Hill)

A   David blesses and feeds the people (16:2)
    B   David appoints Levites to service of the ark (16:3–6)
       C   Role of Asaph and his sons is highlighted (16:7)
          D   "Praise the Lord . . . " (16:8)
             E   "Sing to the Lord . . . " (16:9–22)
             E'   "Sing to the Lord . . . " (16:10–33)
          D'   "Praise the Lord . . . " (16:34–36)
       C'   Role of Asaph and his sons is highlighted (16:37)
    B'   David appoints Levites to service of the ark, and of the cultic center in Gibeon (16:38–42)
A'   People disperse; David turns to bless his house (16:43)

TOWARD A PERMANENT TEMPLE: ROLE OF DAVID (1 CHR 17–29)

A   Divine speech: David's successor must build temple; David's prayer (ch. 17)
    B   Bloodshed disqualifying David from building temple:
       Wars
       Fatal census (conducted over Joab's objection) (chs. 18–21)
       X   Citation of divine speech: Solomon must build temple, for David "spilled much blood and waged many wars" (ch. 22)
    B'   David's preparations for building of temple:
       Organization of cult
       Proper census (fatal census now attributed to Joab) (chs. 23–27)
A'   Citation of divine speech: Solomon must build temple; David's speeches and prayer (chs. 28–29)

RISE OF SOLOMON AND CONSTRUCTION OF TEMPLE (2 CHR 1–9)

(Dillard, followed by others)

A   Solomon's wealth and wisdom, trade in horses (1:1–17)
    B   Recognition by gentiles, dealings with Hiram (2:1–16)
       C   Temple construction, gentile labor (2:17–5:1)
          D   Dedication of temple, Solomon's speeches to God and people (5:2–7:10)
          D'   Divine response: God's speeches to Solomon and people (7:11–22)
       C'   Other construction, gentile labor (8:1–16)
    B'   Recognition by gentiles, dealings with Hiram (8:17–9:12)
A'   Solomon's wealth and wisdom, trade in horses (9:13–28)