

# The Priestly Tent of Meeting in Chronicles: Pro-Priestly or Anti-Priestly?

JAEYOUNG JEON



# THE PRIESTLY TENT OF MEETING IN CHRONICLES: PRO- PRIESTLY OR ANTI- PRIESTLY?

JAEYOUNG JEON

UNIVERSITY OF LAUSANNE/UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the horizon of the Pentateuch and DtrH, the priestly tradition of the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary and the Dtr tradition of the Ark are loosely connected by the place of Shiloh. Josh 18:1 states that the Priestly wilderness sanctuary, the Mosaic Tent of Meeting, was eventually located at Shiloh by Joshua during the conquest.<sup>1</sup> At the entrance of the Tent of Meeting at Shiloh, the land has been distributed to the tribes by Joshua, Eliezer the priest, and the elders of the tribes, as Moses had commanded (Josh 19:51; Num 34:16). The report of the settling of the Tent of Meeting in Shiloh anticipates and justifies the appearance of the Ark at Shiloh in 1 Sam 4, the battle account with the Philistines, after an interval of hundreds of years. One may argue that, since the Ark is the most important component of the Mosaic Tent of Meeting, a literary or historical connection between the two accounts may be assumed in a certain degree. Nevertheless, the present battle account and the following so-called “Ark narrative” do not mention at all the Tent of Meeting or Tabernacle. After Joshua, the historical books in the Hebrew Bible are totally silent about the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary, except for the succinct note that the Tent of Meeting was brought into the Temple in Jerusalem after its construction (1 Kgs 8:4, cf. 2 Sam 7:6).

In the history of the monarchy of the Books of Chronicles, however, the tradition of the Mosaic (priestly) Tent of Meeting is far more apparent. The Mosaic Tent is located in the high place of Gibeon at the time of David and often mentioned along with other Davidic and Solomonic cultic institutions (1 Chr 16:39, 21:29, etc.). The Chronicler refuses the tradition of the Tent of Meeting at Shiloh and creates an entirely new story of the fate of the Mosaic Tent. Setting aside the discussion of the historicity of the latter, one may say that the Mosaic Tent at

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Pentateuch, there appear two different kinds of Tent of Meeting (מועד אהל): the Priestly Tent (Exod 25–31, 35–40) designed for the priestly sacrificial rituals; and the prophetic Tent that Moses himself erected outside of the camp (Exod 33:7–11; Num 11:24, etc.). The Mosaic Tent of Meeting, which is the focus of this essay, is the priestly Tent imagined by the priestly scribes.

Gibeon is one of the most inventive receptions of the pentateuchal Priestly tradition in Chronicles.

The major purpose of this inventive reception is usually thought to be a justification for Solomon's sacrifice at the great high place of Gibeon (2 Chr 1).<sup>2</sup> The mention of the Mosaic Tent of Meeting is, nevertheless, not limited to this passage, but appears consistently in connection with the establishment of the temple cult in Jerusalem. Critics generally understand the passages as the Chronicler's deliberate synthesis of the traditions of the Deuteronomistic Ark and the priestly wilderness sanctuary, with a favorable and sympathetic attitude toward the latter. Sarah Japhet, for instance, finds here an harmonization of the Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic traditions focusing on a theological role of the Tent of Meeting regarding the continuation of the centralized worship.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, Gary Knoppers sees the Chronicler's attempt to reconcile and mediate traditional points of view, rather than seeing the Chronicler as either pro-Levitical or pro-Priestly in orientation.<sup>4</sup>

To be sure, the Chronicler obviously endeavors to bring together the two traditions on the surface literary level. Nevertheless, a close analysis of the way the passages mention the Mosaic Tent suggests that the broadly accepted notion of its priestly nature, or a simple harmonization of different traditions, should not be taken for granted. Rather, the unique status and authority of the Mosaic Tent are often denied to the degree that is incompatible with the priestly ideology and theology appearing in the Pentateuch. In this essay, I will examine these passages closely and endeavor to prove that the Chronicler introduced the Mosaic Tent for his own purpose that is not necessarily loyal to the priestly tradition.

## II. THE AMBIGUOUS FATE OF THE MOSAIC TENT OF MEETING IN CHRONICLES

As mentioned above, 1 Kgs 8:4 reports that, when Solomon finished the construction of the Temple, he brought the Ark, the Tent of Meeting, and its holy vessels into the Temple. This verse has been, since Martin Noth, regarded as a late priestly addition due to its priestly language and concern.<sup>5</sup> In the present form of

---

<sup>2</sup> See, already, J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (2nd ed.; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1883), 183; E.L. Curtis and A.A. Medsen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910), 315; R.W. Klein, *2 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 21–22; S. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1993), 525–28.

<sup>3</sup> See Japhet, *Chronicles*, 527–529.

<sup>4</sup> G.N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 12A; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 656. For an elaboration of the scholarly views on the pro-Levitical or pro-Priestly nature of Chronicles, see idem, "Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood," *JBL* 118 (1999), 49–72.

<sup>5</sup> See, M. Noth, *Könige. Teilbd. 1, I Könige 1–16* (Neukirchen-Vluyn:

the text, nevertheless, this editorial verse plays the significant role of bridging between the priestly tradition of the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary and the new temple cult in Jerusalem. On the literary horizon of the Enneateuch, as a result, the premonarchic, wilderness cultic tradition continues through the Temple in Jerusalem. The present verse is closely followed by 2 Chr 5:5, giving an impression that the Chronicler also fully respected the priestly, that is, Mosaic cultic tradition. However, one needs to be cautious in interpreting the Tent of Meeting in Chronicles as the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary.

The lexemes such as *miškan* (משכן), “Tent” (אהל), or “Tent of Meeting” (אהל מועד), are not always clear in their meanings in Chronicles. The lexeme משכן, above all, does not consistently mean the Tabernacle, the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary. For instance, 2 Chr 29:6b states, “they turned away their face from YHWH’s *miškan* (ה’ ויסבו פניהם ממשכן ה’).” This half verse is located in the narrative of Hezekiah’s purification of the Temple, and critics generally agree that משכן here indicates the temple. In this verse, משכן is used as a common noun designating the dwelling of YHWH.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, 1 Chr 6:17 (ET v. 32) and 1 Chr 6:33 (ET v. 48) mention משכן אהל מועד and משכן בית ה’, respectively, yet משכן in these verses are better understood in their literary contexts as the tent David erected for the Ark in Jerusalem (1 Chr 16:1).<sup>7</sup> Whereas the term משכן, or its plural form משכנות, is often used as a common noun rendered as “dwelling(s)” for either humans or the deity (e.g. Jer 51:30; Ezek 25:4, 37:27; Hab 1:6; Ps 46:5, 26:8), the fusion of house (or temple) and משכן is a phenomenon found particularly in Psalms and Chronicles (e.g. Ps 26:8, 74:7, 84:2–5).<sup>8</sup>

Use of the lexeme “Tent” (אהל) in Chronicles is also confusing. In particular, in 1 Chr 9, the so-called gatekeepers’ creed, the Tent is guarded by a group of Korahite Levites. The Tent here is again described with the terms applicable for the temple, such as הספים (“thresholds,” v. 19), שער (“gate,” v. 21), and בית (v. 23).<sup>9</sup> While commentators allow various possible interpretations,<sup>10</sup> the literary context is more likely about Jerusalem rather

---

Neukirchener Verlag, 1983), 177; S.J. de Vries, *1 Kings* (WBC, 12; Waco: Word Books, 1985), 124. See also M. Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 10; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 278; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.101. But some critics claim that the Tent of Meeting in this verse indicates the Davidic Tent in Jerusalem. See, e.g., J. Gray, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1964), 194; I. Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 146.

<sup>6</sup> See, R.B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles* (WBC, 15; Waco: Word Books, 1987), 231; Japhet, *Chronicles*, 918; Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 416.

<sup>7</sup> See, Japhet, *Chronicles*, 156; T. J. Sparks, *The Chronicler’s Genealogies: Towards an Understanding of 1 Chronicles 1–9* (Academia Biblica, 28; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 43–44.

<sup>8</sup> Sparks, *Genealogies*, 44.

<sup>9</sup> Especially v. 21 mentions שער פתח האהל מועד, but LXX renders the Tent as τῆς ἀνακῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου, which presupposes a term like אהל העדות.

<sup>10</sup> For the tent in v. 19, for instance, Rudolph and Klein regard it as

than Gibeon, namely, the Tent here indicates the Tent of David that is often equated with the Temple in Chronicles. This view is supported by the fact that the gatekeepers are mainly positioned around the Davidic Tent. For instance, 1 Chr 16:38 reports that David appointed the gatekeepers for the Tent he erected, such as Obed Edom and his brothers, totaling 68 members. For the Mosaic Tent in Gibeon, however, the gatekeepers are only succinctly mentioned in the same chapter as “and the sons of Jeduthun for the gate” (ובני ידותון לשער) (1 Chr 16:42b). This brief report is irreconcilable with the description of the gatekeepers’ order in 1 Chr 9:17–27, so that critics often doubt the originality of this half verse.<sup>11</sup>

In Chronicles, the Mosaic Tent is similarly called מִשְׁכַּן ה' (1 Chr 16:39, 21:29), אהל מועד האלהים, or simply אהל מועד (2 Chr 1:3, 13; also אהל העדות in 2 Chr 24:6). In these cases, the terms are safely identifiable as the Mosaic Tent, for they are explicitly associated with Moses or the high place of Gibeon. In other words, when those terms are not explicitly connected to Gibeon or Moses, one should not automatically interpret them as the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary.

The confusion is caused by the fact that the Chronicler recognizes at least two sacred Tents, one Mosaic and the other Davidic. The idea of multiple sacred Tents or מִשְׁכַּן is explicitly emphasized in 1 Chr 17:5b, which is an alteration of its *Vorlage* 2 Sam 7:6b. Compare the two texts:<sup>12</sup>

2 Sam 7:6b

ואהיה מתהלך באהל ובמשכן

“I have been moving about in a tent and a tabernacle”

1 Chr 17:5b

ואהיה מאהל אל אהל וממשכן

“I have gone from one tent to another and from one *miškan* (to another).”

The Chronicler intentionally changes the single Tent and מִשְׁכַּן in 2 Sam 7:6b to multiple Tents and Tabernacles, most likely in view of the Ark’s move from the old Mosaic Tent to the Davidic

---

the Davidic Tent in Jerusalem, while Allen interprets it as the priestly Tent of Meeting. Curtis and Madsen claim that it can be both the priestly Tent and the Temple. Japhet maintains that the passage deliberately equates the Temple and the priestly Tent. See W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia, Samt 3 Esra* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1949), 89; R.W. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A commentary* (Hermeneia Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 276; C.L. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text* (VTSup; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 363; Curtis and Medsen, *Chronicles*, 174–75; Japhet, *Chronicles*, 216.

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., Curtis and Madsen, *Chronicles*, 225; Knoppers, *Chronicles 10–29*, 653. Cf. Japhet, *Chronicles*, 324.

<sup>12</sup> But the *Vorlage* of LXX (καὶ ἤμην ἐν σκηνῇ καὶ ἐν καταλύματι) follows more closely 2 Samuel 7 (v. 6b).

Tent in Jerusalem. James Spark, therefore, rightly points out, “the Chronicler believed that any location that housed the Ark is house of YHWH”.<sup>13</sup> Also, Sarah Japhet clarifies that both Mosaic and Davidic tents are designated by Tabernacle (משכן) and Tent of Meeting (אהל מועד) in Chronicles.<sup>14</sup>

This observation has special significance for the interpretation of the aforementioned 2 Chr 5:5a, the brief mention of bringing a certain Tent of Meeting to the Temple of Jerusalem. The Tent of Meeting in its *Vorlage* (1 Kgs 8:4) most likely indicates the Mosaic Tent of Meeting, considering the priestly nature of the verse, although some critics argue that the Tent is already the Davidic Tent.<sup>15</sup> For the Tent of Meeting in 2 Chr 5:5a, too, the majority of critics argue for the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary.<sup>16</sup> Against the major view, however, there are several reasons to understand it as the Davidic Tent in Jerusalem in the literary context of Chronicles.

First of all, the account to which our passage belongs (2 Chr 5:2–14) is a careful revision of 1 Kgs 8:1–11 in favor of the Levites (e.g. 2 Chr 5:4, 12–13). One can, therefore, reasonably conjecture that the present verse (2 Chr 5:5) was also under Chronicler’s scrutiny rather than being copied inattentively from its *Vorlage*. Reading the present passage as a careful literary work, one can see that the main focus of the passage is moving the Ark from the Davidic Tent in Jerusalem and placing it in the holy of holies (דביר הבית, v. 7) of the new Temple. The move of the Ark, the Tent of Meeting, and the holy vessels are described as a single action by the group of elders, priests, and the Levites (v. 5); it is unimaginable from the present form of the passage that the elders, priests, and the Levites were somehow separated into two groups, and one group brought the Ark from Jerusalem and the other brought the Mosaic Tent of Meeting and its vessels from Gibeon. The more smooth and reasonable reading is that the group of people brought the Ark to the Temple together with the Davidic Tent and the vessels at the same time.

Second, the term Tent of Meeting, as we saw, may refer to both Mosaic and Davidic Tents in Chronicles; yet more often the term indicates the Davidic Tent in fusion with the Temple. The Chronicler often specifies the Mosaic Tent with explicit associations with the Gibeon or Moses; in the present verse, the Chronicler simply follows the wording of its *Vorlage* without identifying the Tent as Mosaic. Further, the Tent is mentioned in a close connection with the Ark, which is hosted at the Davidic Tent in Chronicles.

---

<sup>13</sup> See Spark, *Genealogies*, 44 n. 38.

<sup>14</sup> Japhet, *Chronicles*, 576.

<sup>15</sup> See above, n. 10.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 75; Curtis and Madsen, *Chronicles*, 337; Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 41; Kalimi, *Reshaping*, 146 n. 65; Japhet, *Chronicles*, 576. But Japhet still recognizes that both Mosaic and Davidic tents are designated by “tabernacle” and “Tent of Meeting” in Chronicles.

Third, the holy vessels (כלי קדש) in the Tent in our passage do not necessarily denote those of the Mosaic Tent. Although the holy vessels in the priestly addition (1 Kgs 8:4) more likely designate those in the priestly Mosaic Tent (e.g. Num 3:31, 4:15, 18:3), the Davidic Tent of Meeting may also have had some vessels for ritual activities in the Chronicler's mind. The Davidic Tent has its own altar on which sacrifices were offered (e.g. 1 Chr 16:2; 1 Kgs 1:50, 2:28). Also, 1 Kgs 1:39 mentions a horn of oil from the Tent (האהל), that is the Davidic Tent in Jerusalem, which presupposes some sorts of ritual activities. In addition, in 1 Chr 16:37 David assigns Asaph and his brother Levites the "daily service" (דבר יום ויומו) at his Tent in Jerusalem. Although it is not clear what kind of service the term means, in the context of sanctuary, the term normally indicates daily rituals or sacrificial services (Lev 23:37; Ezra 3:4; 2 Chr 8:13, 14; 1 Kgs 8:59; Dan 1:5).

The holy vessels may also be those prepared by David especially for the future temple, as, for instance, 2 Chr 5:1 states that David dedicated gold, silver, and vessels<sup>17</sup> for the Temple. David commands Solomon before his succession of the throne to bring the Ark and the holy vessels (כלי קדש) into the Temple (1 Chr 22:19), without any connection to the Tent or Tabernacle.<sup>18</sup> Considering that David's command in 1 Chr 22:19 anticipates the present 1 Chr 5:5, the vessels in the latter is also likely connected to the former in Chronicler's mind. There is no compelling reason to associate the holy vessels here to those of the Mosaic Tent at Gibeon. The vessels may indicate either those in the Davidic Tent with the Ark or those prepared by David for the future Temple.

The observation so far suggests that, although the present passage (1 Chr 5:5) follows its *Vorlage* closely, the Tent of Meeting here may rather be understood as the Davidic Tent in the literary context of Chronicles. It is hard to say with certainty, however, whether the Chronicler already understood the Tent in its *Vorlage* as the Davidic Tent or intended to alter its meaning from the Mosaic tent to the Davidic tent by putting it in the verse without identifying it as Mosaic. Whichever was the case, the Tent brought into the Temple is more likely Davidic; as a result, the final fate of the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary is left unmentioned in Chronicles. The Chronicler's indifference about the fate of the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary is quite understandable from its treatment in an inverse relationship with the Davidic Ark-Temple cult in Jerusalem.

<sup>17</sup> Although it is הכלים in 2 Chr 5:1 rather than כלי, which is used in other relevant passages, the former may be interpreted inclusively.

<sup>18</sup> In Numbers, the Ark is still one of the holy vessels in the Tabernacle, yet here it is separated from other vessels; in other words, the concept of the holy vessels is not identical with that of the priestly texts in Numbers. See A.C. Welch, *The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Its Date* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), 36 n. 2.

### III. AN INVERSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAVIDIC AND MOSAIC CULTIC INSTITUTIONS

In Chronicles, the Mosaic Tent of Meeting at Gibeon is explicitly mentioned in the major stages of the development of the new cultic system of the Ark and the Temple in Jerusalem. In the accounts of (1) the placement of the Ark in Jerusalem (1 Chr 16:39), (2) the legitimization of the altar in Ornan's threshing field (1 Chr 21:29), and (3) Solomon's sacrifice at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:3), the Mosaic Tent of Meeting is explicitly mentioned and juxtaposed with the new cultic systems. Apparently, on a surface level, these passages seem to strike a balance between the Priestly wilderness sanctuary and the Deuteronomistic Ark and Temple traditions. Nevertheless, if we examine closely the way the Priestly tradition is treated, the Chronicler's ambivalent attitude toward the priestly tradition becomes obvious.

1. The first case to examine is the account of settling the Ark in Jerusalem (1 Chr 16). The main theme of this account is to place the Ark in the Tent sanctuary that David has erected in Jerusalem. David makes sacrifices before the tent (v. 1b)<sup>19</sup> and appoints priests, Levite singers, and the gatekeepers for the service of this new sanctuary (vv. 4–6, 37–38).<sup>20</sup> The Davidic sanctuary, which is often designated as Tent of Meeting or Tabernacle in Chronicles, is inaugurated as the most important, new cultic center in Jerusalem in this chapter.

In parallel with the Davidic Tent of Meeting, the Mosaic Tent at Gibeon and the priestly and Levitical services are mentioned at the end of the narrative (1 Chr 16:39–42). As a result, the two different legitimate cultic places are juxtaposed: one with the Ark and the other with the priestly sacrificial service. This strange situation, to be sure, may be understood as an inevitable consequence of the artificial combination of the two different traditions. Nevertheless, according to the Chronicler's theology, it is the Ark that symbolizes YHWH's presence. In the description of the Levitical order in 1 Chr 23:25–26, for instance, David explicitly states that YHWH now dwells (וישכן) in Jerusalem,

<sup>19</sup> 1 Kings 2:28 mentions an altar with horns at the Tent of YHWH (אהל ה') that is the tent sanctuary David erected. Probably the Chronicler presupposed the existence of an altar before the tent sanctuary in Jerusalem.

<sup>20</sup> The priestly service of the Davidic tent sanctuary is limited to blowing trumpets (חצצרות) before the ark (v. 6), while the priestly sacrificial service is not mentioned. The Chronicler assigns the sacrificial service to Zadok's family at the Mosaic Tent of Meeting in Gibeon (v. 39). The two priests Benaiah and Jahaziel for the trumpets allude to the two priestly trumpets made in the wilderness (Num 10:8), although the latter was for the move of the whole camp (implicitly including the Ark) and not specifically for the Ark. For the move of the Ark, seven priests serve with trumpets (1 Chr 15:24), which reflects the late priestly redaction of Joshua's battle of Jericho (esp. Josh 6:4, 6, 8, 13) in which seven priests blow trumpets before the Ark (though they blow שופרים instead of חצצרות). The two different motifs of the priestly trumpets in 1 Chr 15–16 exhibit the Chronicler's detailed knowledge of the priestly edition of the Hexateuch.



meaning, in the Tent of David, and that the Levites no longer need to carry **משכן** and its vessels. Through a word-play involving **שכן**, the Chronicler makes a sharp contrast between the new sanctuary in Jerusalem and the old Mosaic sanctuary, while greater significance of the former is greatly emphasized.

2. Similarly, the implicit downplay of the Mosaic Tent is found in the story of David's census in 1 Chr 21. At the conclusion of the narrative, David builds an altar in Ornan's threshing field and makes an expiatory and intercessory sacrifice there. The Mosaic Tent and its altar are mentioned at the end of the chapter (vv. 29–30), apparently providing an excuse for David for building another altar while the one from Moses is still functional. The excuse, David's fear of the sword of the angel, is neither clear in its meaning nor logically connected to the main narrative plot.<sup>21</sup> The ambiguous link between the angel of destruction and the Mosaic sanctuary in Gibeon seems to be the result of the Chronicler's attempt to insert the latter motif into the existing story of David's census (2 Sam 24).

Nevertheless, regardless of the literary coherence of the story, the juxtaposition of the two altars, Davidic and Mosaic, produces an antithesis between them.<sup>22</sup> While David could not approach the Mosaic altar at Gibeon, the new altar is fully legitimized by the fire from heaven (v. 26). The fire that consumes the offerings is not only reminiscent of Elijah's sacrifice at Mt. Carmel (1 Kgs 18:37–38),<sup>23</sup> but also, even with a further relevance, alludes to the legitimation of the Mosaic Tent of Meeting and its altar in Lev 9:24. Through this allusion, the Chronicler emphasizes that now the newly authorized altar is the one that David built, as David explicitly states, "Here shall be the temple of YHWH and this is *the altar* for Israel" (1 Chr 22:1).<sup>24</sup> Now David has given up the old Mosaic altar at Gibeon and continues to make sacrifice at his new altar.<sup>25</sup> Zadok and his brothers, who were ordered by David to serve the Mosaic altar, are later commissioned to the service of the future Jerusalem Temple by David himself (1 Chr 24:3). In this way, the priestly service at the altar at Gibeon is soon given up as well. In a deeper structure of the story, therefore, the Mosaic altar is deprived of its unique status when the new altar is legitimized.

3. The account of Solomon's sacrifice at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:2–13) is often thought to be the major cause for the Chronicler's inventive reception of the Priestly tradition of Mosaic wilderness sanctuary.<sup>26</sup> The Mosaic sanctuary and the bronze altar

<sup>21</sup> See also Curtis and Madsen, *Chronicles*, 254.

<sup>22</sup> See Japhet, *Chronicles*, 389.

<sup>23</sup> See *ibid.*, 388.

<sup>24</sup> The italics are mine.

<sup>25</sup> "[A]nd he made sacrifice there" (**וַיִּזְבַּח שָׁם**, v. 28b) should be interpreted as David continuing to make sacrifice in the new altar after this incident. See also Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 429.

<sup>26</sup> See above, n 2. Japhet regards this account as a prolonged mid-rashic process (Japhet, *Chronicles*, 323). Some critics, however, argued for an authentic historical source behind the account. See, e.g., H.W. Hertzberg, "Mizpah," *ZAW* 47 (1929), 176–177; M. Görg, *Das Zelt der*

made by Bezalel at Gibeon are introduced with a relatively lengthy description (2 Chr 1:3b–5), through which the Chronicler successfully defends Solomon from the possible blame for his making sacrifice at high places (e.g., 1 Kgs 3:3). In 1 Kgs 3:3–4, the root זבח is repeatedly used, and the altar at Gibeon is especially emphasized as “that altar” (הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַהוּא, v. 4b). The Chronicler alters the altar at Gibeon to the bronze altar made by Bezalel in the wilderness of Sinai (2 Chr 1:5). The Mosaic origin of the altar is emphasized in the verse (2 Chr 1:5) by Bezalel’s genealogy, which legitimizes “that altar” in 1 Kgs 3:4 as the altar from the Mosaic period.

Notably, the Mosaic Tent of Meeting and the Davidic Tent are juxtaposed in vv. 3b–4, revealing the present state of the co-existence of the two cultic centers, Gibeon and Jerusalem. The focus of this juxtaposition is, however, the absence of the Ark in the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary in Gibeon, as it is obvious in v. 4 starting with the adversative אַבֵּל. The absence of the Ark represents the diminished authority of Mosaic sanctuary as the unique cultic center. Read in continuation of these verses, the introduction of the altar (v. 5) is an apology for the validity of the altar as a still legitimate one, even without the Ark in the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary.

In spite of the apology, the bronze altar made by Bezalel, the only authoritative element left in the Mosaic Tent, is immediately replaced by another bronze altar made by Solomon himself in the following account of the building of the Temple (2 Chr 2–4, esp. 4:1). The Chronicler lays considerable emphasis on the Solomonic altar at the Temple, which is comparable to the emphasis on the Mosaic altar in 2 Chr 1:5. The Chronicler changes the seven-day festival for the dedication of the Temple in the Vorlage (1 Kgs 8:64–66) into an eight-day festival, especially for the dedication of the altar (2 Chr 7:9); and the Chronicler omits the negative description that the altar was too small for all the offerings (2 Chr 7:7; 1 Kgs 8:64). Furthermore, the dedication is highlighted by Solomon’s prayer being answered by the divine fire from heaven and the presence of the glory of YHWH (2 Chr 7:1). This verse is the Chronicler’s own addition missing in its Vorlage. The motif of fire and glory at once alludes to the dedication of the Mosaic Tent of Meeting and altar legitimized by the divine fire and the glory of YHWH after Aaron’s blessing (Lev 9:22–24). According to the Chronicler’s account, therefore, the Solomonic altar and temple completely replace the old wilderness sanctuary and its altar. There is no continuation from the Mosaic altar to the Solomonic altar. Paradoxically, the Mosaic altar is deprived of its special status by Solomon himself, who respected the former in Gibeon.

The accounts of Solomon’s sacrifice at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:1–13) and the building of the Temple (2 Chr 1:18–7:22) are

---

*Begegnung. Untersuchung zur Gestalt der sakralen Zeltraditionen Altisraels* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1967), 122–123, 131–137; H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 130–131. Welch, however, regards 2 Chronicles 1 (vv. 3b–5) as a later addition (Welch, *Work of Chronicler*, 30–41).

closely connected to each other in Chronicles, which is not the case in its *Vorlage*. In 1 Kgs 3–8, the sacrifice at Gibeon (1 Kgs 3:4–15) is followed by an episode and reports about the fulfillment of the divine promise of wisdom, wealth, and glory (1 Kgs 3:12–13) that was given at Gibeon. The episode of Solomon’s wise judgment between the two women (1 Kgs 3:16–28, esp. v. 28) and the direct description of his wisdom (1 Kgs 5:9–14) are the realization of the promise of wisdom; the list of his retainers (1 Kgs 4:1–19) and the description of the prosperity of his kingdom (vv. 20–34) testify to his glory and wealth that can be also understood as the result of the divine blessing from Gibeon. The lengthy account of building the Temple (1 Kgs 5:15–8:66) begins only after the completion of this cycle of promise-and-fulfillment started from Gibeon.

In Chronicles, however, the divine promise of wisdom, wealth, and wealth directly anticipates the building of the temple. Only after the brief description of his wealth (1 Chr 1:14–17), Solomon immediately starts building the Temple so that the following account of Solomon’s Temple building is read as a continuation of the episode at Gibeon. The detailed description of his well-organized preparation for the huge construction project is, therefore, seen as the result of the divine promise of wisdom at Gibeon. The literary connection between the episode at Gibeon and the following account of building the Temple is clearly revealed in the words of Hiram of Tyre. In his answer to Solomon’s request, Hiram praises Solomon (2 Chr 2:11b) for being a wise (חכם) son of David who is endowed (literarily “knows” [יודע]) with discretion (שכל) and understanding (בינה). This expression refers back to the divine promise at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:11–12) of giving him wisdom (חכמה) and knowledge (מדע) with the identical roots ח.כ.ם and י.ד.ע. Also, the root for “understanding” (בינה) comes from the divine promise to Solomon in the original Gibeon story (הבין לשמע משפט: 1 Kgs 3:11b). Hiram’s praise here has been expanded by the Chronicler from its *Vorlage* (1 Kgs 5:21) that simply designates Solomon as a wise son (בן חכם), in consideration of the Gibeon accounts in both 2 Chr 1 and 1 Kgs 3. Such literary connections must have been made by the Chronicler’s purposeful literary activity to connect the two accounts, rather than by a mere coincidence. Once the literary connection between the two accounts is understood as intentional, the paradoxical relationship between the Mosaic altar at Gibeon and Solomon’s new altar at Jerusalem becomes far more obvious. In Chronicles, the sacrifice at the altar at Gibeon results in the building of the new legitimate altar in Jerusalem that completely replaces the former. And it was the Chronicler’s intention to transform the originally independent Gibeon episode to a transitive one that introduces the new altar in Jerusalem.

4. The Chronicler’s history of the reign of David and Solomon focuses on the establishment of the new cultic system in Jerusalem that is highlighted by the building of the Temple.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>27</sup> From 1 Chr 13 to 2 Chr 7, except for the description of David’s

The new system is gradually established through several major stages, as we saw, such as (1) David's bringing and settling the Ark in Jerusalem (1 Chr 13, 15–16), (2) David's census that results in finding the place for the future Temple (1 Chr 21), and (3) Solomon's building of the Temple (2 Chr 2–7) that is closely related to his sacrifice at Gibeon (2 Chr 1). Considering that it is David who prepared everything for the Temple, including the basic blueprint, materials, and even its clerical system (1 Chr 22–26, 28–29), he is actually the founder of this new cultic system. David is a new Moses for the Chronicler. The new system is also centered on the Ark. Therefore, its development starts from moving the Ark to Jerusalem and, through the intermediate stage of the Davidic Tent of Meeting, is completed by eventual placement of the Ark at the holy of holies of the Temple.

As we saw above, in every major stage of the development of the Davidic Ark-Temple cult in Jerusalem, the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary is mentioned. Interestingly, the relationship between the two cultic systems, Davidic and Mosaic, appears to be inverted. By David's settling the Ark in Jerusalem in his own Tent of Meeting, the Mosaic Tent of Meeting appears without the Ark in its holy of holies. As the Ark signifies the presence of YHWH in Chronicles, the Tent of David is now the more significant cultic center. David appoints Zadok and his brothers and some Levites for the service of the Mosaic sanctuary (1 Chr 16:39–42), yet it only shows that even the Mosaic sanctuary is now fully under David's control. As we saw, the priestly and Levitical services for the Mosaic sanctuary and altar are eventually withdrawn by David himself. In the second stage, David successfully makes the expiatory sacrifice at Ornan's threshing field, while the Mosaic sanctuary and altar do not play any positive role during the national disaster. David continues to make sacrifice at the new altar; the Mosaic sanctuary is neither a unique cultic institute nor used by David anymore. Solomon again makes a large amount of sacrifice at the Mosaic altar at Gibeon at the last stage; yet, with his wisdom and wealth given there by God, Solomon builds the Temple and the altar that will ultimately replace the former. Since the Tent of Meeting finally brought into the Temple (2 Chr 5:5) is more likely the Davidic Tent in the literary context of Chronicles, as we saw, the Mosaic Tent of Meeting disappears from the history of Israel with the construction of the Temple.

What might be the final destiny of the Mosaic sanctuary and the altar? One gets an impression in the last part of Chronicles that they were eventually destroyed by the people. During the cultic reform of Hezekiah, the people of Israel destroyed all the high places and their altars in the territories of Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, and Menashe (2 Chr 31:1). The description of the reform has been extended from the brief report in its *Vorlage* (2

---

military achievement in 1 Chr 14:18–20, the Chronicler provides a lengthy but focused account of the development of the Davidic Ark-Temple cult. Out of nine chapters of the history of Solomon's reign (2 Chr 1–9), only the last two chapters (chs. 8–9) are devoted to his achievements other than the building of the Temple.

Kgs 18:4) and, therefore, reflects the Chronicler's own purpose. Notably, the destruction of the altars and high places in the territory of Benjamin should include the Mosaic sanctuary and its altar at the high place of Gibeon. The Chronicler provides no clue that Gibeon was an exception to this destruction. Although it is uncertain if the Chronicler intended an implicit report of the destruction of the Mosaic sanctuary and Altar, the destruction is anyhow a logical conclusion in present form of the text.

The observation so far shows that, as the Davidic Ark-Temple cult system develops, the Mosaic Tabernacle cult loses its unique authority stage by stage. The contrasting interrelation between the two cultic systems is recognizable in a further distinctive manner from the problems with the priestly theology and ideology caused by the Chronicler's description of the Mosaic sanctuary.

#### IV. AGAINST THE PRIESTLY THEOLOGY

The Chronicler explicitly mentions the Mosaic Tent of Meeting in three places, as we saw. The descriptions of the Mosaic Tent in those passages are, however, problematic in the priestly theology and ideology found in the priestly texts in the Pentateuch. First, the absence of the Ark in the wilderness sanctuary is significantly problematic in the Priestly ideology and worldview. According to the hierarchal order of holiness envisioned in the Priestly texts, the Mosaic sanctuary is the center of the whole creation. In spite of the recent disagreement in details concerning the end of P, most critics agree that P is concluded with the building the Tent of Meeting and/or establishment of its sacrificial system at the wilderness of Sinai.<sup>28</sup> According to this dominant view, P envisages that the creation of the world (Gen 1:1–2:4a) is completed with the building of YHWH's sanctuary.<sup>29</sup> The special and unique sanctity of this Priestly wilderness sanctuary is guaranteed by the permanent presence of YHWH in the holy of holies that holds the highest position in the strict spatial hierarchy of the Priestly world. And, again, the core of the holy of holies is the Ark, for YHWH will appear and speak on the “mercy seat” (כַּפֶּרֶת) between the two cherubim on the Ark (Exod 25:16–22; Num 17:19). In P, YHWH's presence moves from the Mount Sinai to the holy of holies, which is the highlight of the Priestly Sinai pericope.<sup>30</sup> According to Thomas Römer, Christophe Nihan, and others, P reaches its conclusion

<sup>28</sup> For the detailed exposition of the recent discussions of the end of P, see, e.g., C. Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung Erinnern: Zum Ende der Priestergrundschrift* (Herders Biblische Studien, 23; Freiburg: Herder, 2000); C. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (FAT II, 25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 20–58; J. Jeon, “The Promise of the Land and the Extent of P,” *ZAW* 130 (2018), 513–28.

<sup>29</sup> See, e.g., T. Pola, *Die Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von Pg* (WMANT, 70; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995), 29–50; Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 20–58.

<sup>30</sup> See, e.g., Nihan, *ibid.*

at Leviticus 16, with the high-priest's yearly expiatory ritual before the mercy seat in Yom Kippur.<sup>31</sup> It is, therefore, obvious that the Priestly sanctuary without the Ark, with the empty holy of holies, is unimaginable in the Priestly theology and worldview. Without the Ark and the mercy seat on it, i.e. without the symbol and the medium of YHWH's presence, the major priestly services in the inner sanctuary such as incense offering (Exod 30:1–10), lightening the Menorah (Exod 27:20–21), service of the daily bread (Exod 25:30), and the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16) become either impossible or pointless.

Furthermore, the Ark in Chronicles is not the Priestly Ark. The Ark and the cherubim that are placed in the temple (2 Chr 5:7–8.) are described closely following its *Vorlage* (1 Kgs 8:7–8). Unlike the Priestly text, the Ark here has neither cherubim nor mercy seat on its cover (cf. Exod 22:10–22) and is placed under the wings of the cherubim that are separated from it.

In addition, the existence of the Davidic Tent of Meeting with the Ark in parallel with the Mosaic Tent creates a situation incompatible with the Priestly ideology. According to the priestly worldview, the Mosaic sanctuary is the unique cultic center, surrounded, served, and guarded by the specially separated personnel such as the Levites (e.g. Num 3–4, 8). In Chronicles, however, the Davidic Tent is served and guarded by the Levites and the Levitical service there is described far more in detail than that of the Mosaic tent in Gibeon.

The gradual loss of the unique status of the Mosaic sanctuary proceeds further by building the altars in Jerusalem, twice by David (1 Chr 16:1, 21:26) and finally by Solomon. In the Priestly notion of the wilderness sanctuary, there are two places in it where YHWH himself is present in his glory: on the mercy seat on the cover of the Ark and the outer sacrificial altar at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting (פתח אהל מועד: Exod 29:42–43; Num 16:18–19, 20:6). On the former YHWH appears and speaks only to the high priest; on the latter he does so to the entire people. Especially the outer altar is sanctified by His glory (e.g., Exod 29:43).<sup>32</sup> Besides the mercy seat on the Ark, therefore, the outer sacrificial altar is the most important cultic object that guarantees the distinguished sanctity of the Tent of Meeting. In Chronicles, nevertheless, the new altars in Jerusalem are authorized by the divine fire from heaven (1 Chr 21:26; 2 Chr 7:1), and the Solomonic altar is eventually sanctified by the presence of YHWH's glory on the Temple (2 Chr 7:2). The old Mosaic altar

<sup>31</sup> See H.-P. Mathys et al., *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Neuausg. Theologische Wissenschaft: Sammelwerk für Studium und Beruf 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014), 90–93; Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 340–394. See also M. Köckert, "Leben in Gottes Gegenwart. Zum Verständnis des Gesetzes in der priesterschriftlichen Literatur," *JBTh* 4 (1989), 29–61.

<sup>32</sup> The subject of ונקדש is rather obscure in its context. Although LXX renders the subject as YHWH himself (ἀγιασθήσομαι), the subject is most reasonably understood as the place where He reveals himself (שמה: v. 43a), i.e. the altar at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting.

no longer bears such signs of divine legitimation or sanctification. Solomon's new altar replaces the old Mosaic altar that is the only significant and highly sanctified object left in the wilderness sanctuary. This is an irrevocable damage to the unique status of the Mosaic Tent of Meeting in the Priestly theology and ideology. The single instance of Solomon's sacrifice at the Mosaic altar does little to alter the general direction of decreasing the authority of the Mosaic institution.

## V. CONCLUSION

The observation so far suggests that it is doubtful whether the Chronicler really intended to express his respect to or favor of the Priestly tradition of the wilderness sanctuary. The Chronicler consistently mentions the Priestly sanctuary, i.e. the Mosaic Tent of Meeting, at every stage of the Davidic Ark-Temple cult's development; yet, by doing so, the authority and function of the Mosaic sanctuary is gradually replaced by the Davidic institutions. Notably, the authority of the Mosaic sanctuary is not transferred to the new cultic centers. The latter gain their own legitimation and authority directly from God with the fire and glory of YHWH. The tendency is obvious: in every stage the new Davidic Ark-Temple cult rises, the Mosaic Tabernacle cult falls inversely. This situation directly contradicts the theological and ideological core of the Priestly literature.

As Knoppers rightly points out, the Chronicler often quotes the earlier biblical law to validate his position, creating the impression of continuity in orthopraxis from the time of Moses, so that "the citation of older precedent authorizes later innovations."<sup>33</sup> In our case, too, apparently a certain continuity of cultic tradition is found in that the old Mosaic sanctuary still survived and was served until the time of David. The observation above, however, indicates that the juxtaposition of the old and new cultic institutions serves for the legitimation of the new at the demise of the old, rather than a smooth continuation of the authority. The Chronicler is manipulating the Priestly tradition in a sophisticated way in order to emphasize relative superiority of the new Davidic cult over the old Mosaic cult.

The purpose of this sophisticated manipulation of the Priestly tradition is closely related to the question of the authorship of Chronicles and its socio-historical context, into which I cannot delve in this limited space. Nevertheless, a clue can be found in the possible conflict between the priests and Levites during the Persian period. As I discuss in detail elsewhere, some of the late priestly redactional passages, e.g. the Korah redaction in Num 16 and Ezek 44:9–14, we find the Zadokite priests' struggle to degrade and oppress the Levites for their exclusive priestly prerogatives.<sup>34</sup> Critics usually assume that behind these

<sup>33</sup> Knoppers, "Hierodules," 69.

<sup>34</sup> See further J. Jeon, "The Zadokites in the Wilderness: The Rebellion of Korach (Num 16) and the Zadokite Redaction," *ZAW* 127 (2015), 381–411; idem, "Levites (Hebrew Bible/Old Testament)," in C. Helmer et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception* (Vol.

texts lies a power struggle between the Zadokite priestly group and the rest of the Levites around the Temple of Jerusalem during the Persian period. Presupposing that Chronicles is a Levitical scribal work, it may contain the Levites' response to the Zadokites and their ideological oppression through the priestly literature.<sup>35</sup> The manipulation of the priestly tradition of the Mosaic wilderness sanctuary may, therefore, reflect the Levites' ideological struggle against the Priestly oppression to improve their status in the temple and community.

---

16; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), 336–44.

<sup>35</sup> For further discussions, see J. Jeon, "The Zadokite and Levite Scribal Conflicts and Hegemonic Struggles," in T. Klutz et al. (eds.), *Scripture as Social Discourse: Social-Scientific Perspectives on Early Jewish and Christian Writings* (New York: T&T Clark, 2018), 97–110.