

**Images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in 1 Chronicles 21: A
theological and ideological perspective**

By

E C Chukwuka

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements of the Degree

PhD

In

The Faculty of Theology and Religion

Department of Old Testament and Hebrew Scriptures

University of Pretoria

August 2020

Supervisor: Professor AB Geyser-Fouché

Summary

The Chronicler emphasized and underemphasized specific traditions. He also did selective redaction from the source documents. These practices highlight the theology and ideology that the Chronicler wanted to promote. In 1 Chronicles 21 the Chronicler portrayed Yahweh, Satan/satan, and (the ideal) Israel in such a way that both the theology and ideology of the Jerusalem Temple stood out. The Jerusalem Temple represented the Chronicler's theology and his image of God – which was that Yahweh is only to be worshipped in the Jerusalem Temple and that He has chosen the site as the place for worship and dwelling. The Temple also represented the ideology of the Chronicler, because by emphasizing the temple, he succeeded in securing the temple elite's position as the ruling officials. This study aimed to see how these images were portrayed by the Chronicler. The images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel was portrayed in such a way by the Chronicler that God was only in the Jerusalem temple, the true Israel was only the ones who worshipped at the Jerusalem temple and the portrayal of the image of Satan/satan is quite striking in its mundane and rather flat character. He is only a pawn in the Chronicler's narrative, to promote the Chronicler's theology and to create the Chronicler's image of Yahweh. The flat image which the Chronicler has created of Satan/satan links with his belief that God is almighty and that no other creature or symbol can be mightier than God. It became clear that the images of these characters in Chronicles are not only theologically driven but also ideologically loaded to suit the Chronicler's purpose, theology and ideology. To understand the theology and ideology behind the text, it is important to consider the traditions and redactions in the texts. The findings of this research caution against reading and understanding a text outside its unique historical context because the Old Testament does not have a central theme or one theology. Also, in the understanding of a text, we should not focus on the culture or the controversy, rather on the relationship between God and man. That is the core of all Old Testament texts and is still significant. By making use of responsible hermeneutics it is possible to interpret these ideologically loaded images into our contexts and make it relevant for us, today.

Acknowledgement

My acknowledgement goes to my family who has always been supportive to me. Especially to my wife Sandra, who has been with me through it all. She has been my source of strength and support in every way. I will especially acknowledge my supervisor, Professor AB Geysler-Fouché. This would not have been possible without you. Thank you so much, Prof., for being patient with me and kind to me. You provided me with unlimited support, unlimited access to speak with you in search of help. Thank you so much. Finally, I thank God who has been my spiritual strength and allowed me the opportunity to study about you.

Contents

Chapter 1	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Relevance/ Motivation	2
1.3. Problem statement	4
1.3.1. Introduction	4
1.3.2. Existing/ previous research	5
1.3.3. Lacunae that this study will address.....	5
1.3.4. Research problem.....	6
1.4. Preliminary literature review	6
1.5. Methodology.....	9
1.6. Aims/objectives of the study.....	11
1.6.1. Aim	11
1.6.2. Objectives of the study	11
1.7. Hypothesis	11
1.8. Provisional outline of chapters	11
1.9. Orthography and terminology.....	13
1.7.1. Orthography	13
1.7.2. Terminology	13
Chapter 2: Diachronic reading: Socio-Historical.....	15
2.1. Introduction.....	15
2.2. The identity formation of Israel after the exile.....	16
2.2.1. Earlier studies	18
2.2.2. Recent studies	20
2.2.3. Summary	25

2.3. The concept of dualism, which is connected to Zoroastrianism.....	26
2.3.1. Dualism.....	26
2.3.2. Zoroastrianism	28
2.3.3. Summary	29
2.4. The concept of Monolatry	30
2.4.1. Summary	39
2.5. The development of the images of Satan within Israel	39
2.5.1 The Pre-Exilic Period	39
2.5.2. The Post-Exilic Period	42
2.5.3. The New Testament Period	48
2.5.4. Summary	50
2.6. The synthesis of Chapter 2.....	53
Chapter 3: Diachronic reading of the book of Chronicles: Historical Criticism.....	57
3.1. Introduction	57
3.2. Tradition Criticism.....	59
3.2.1. Theoretical Framework	59
3.2.2. Tradition Critical Reading of Chronicles.....	67
3.2.3. Summary	75
3.3. Text Criticism.....	78
3.3.1. Theoretical Framework	78
3.3.2. Text-Critical Reading of Chronicles	80
3.3.3. The internal evidence of content that is the same as known sources	83
3.3.4. Summary	86
3.4. Literary Form Criticism	88
3.4.1. Theoretical Framework	88
3.4.2. Literary Form critical reading of the book of Chronicles.....	90

3.4.3. Literary Form critical reading of 1 Chronicles 21.....	96
3.4.4. Summary	100
3.5. Redaction Criticism	103
3.5.1. Theoretical Framework	103
3.5.2. Redaction Critical Reading of Chronicles	104
3.5.3. Redaction Critical Reading of 1 Chronicles 21.....	107
3.5.4. Summary	111
3.6. Synthesis.....	113
Chapter 4: A synchronic study: Rhetorical and structural analysis.....	125
4.1. Introduction	125
4.2. Translation of 1 Chronicles 21:1-30.....	126
4.2.1. Verse 1	126
4.2.2. Verse 2	131
4.2.3. Verse 3	137
4.2.4. Verse 4	143
4.2.5. Verse 5	147
4.2.6. Verse 6	152
4.2.7. Verse 7	155
4.2.8. Verse 8	157
4.2.9. Verse 9	162
4.2.10. Verse 10	164
4.2.11. Verse 11	168
4.2.12. Verse 12	170
4.2.13. Verse 13	178
4.2.14. Verse 14	182
4.2.15. Verse 15.....	184

4.2.16.	Verse 16	191
4.2.17.	Verse 17	199
4.2.18.	Verse 18	208
4.2.19.	Verse 19	212
4.2.20.	Verse 20	214
4.2.21.	Verse 21	217
4.2.22.	Verse 22	221
4.2.23.	Verse 23	227
4.2.24.	Verse 24	232
4.2.25.	Verse 25	237
4.2.26.	Verse 26	239
4.2.27.	Verse 27	243
4.2.28.	Verse 28	245
4.2.29.	Verse 29	248
4.2.30.	Verse 30	251
4.2.31.	Translation of 1 Chronicles 21:1-30	255
4.3.	Scholars' opinions on 1 Chronicles 21:1-30	257
4.3.1.	Sara Japhet	257
4.3.2.	Louis Jonker	260
4.3.3.	Ralph W Klein	262
4.3.4.	John Jarick.....	265
4.3.5.	Jamieson; Fausset; & Brown	267
4.4.	Synthesis.....	268
Chapter 5:	Hermeneutical Study	276
5.1.	Introduction	276
5.2.	Findings of the study	276

5.2.1. The context of Chronicles	276
5.2.2. Traditions emphasized in 1 & 2 Chronicles, also traditions that were underemphasized	277
5.2.3. Redaction that was done in 1 & 2 Chronicles- source material that was emphasized and underemphasized	278
5.2.4. Theology and ideology of Chronicles as displayed in the specific emphasis	279
5.2.5. Which traditions and redactions are in the text of 1 Chronicles 21?.....	279
5.2.6. Concluding Remarks.....	281
5.3. Remarks regarding the findings of the research; relevance of those findings; and recommendations for further study	282
5.3.1. Remarks regarding the findings of the research	282
5.3.2. The relevance of these findings	282
5.3.3. The contemporary significance of the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel against the theological and ideological background of 1 and 2 Chronicles	282
5.3.4. Recommendation for further study	284
Synthesis.....	285
Chapter 6: Synopsis	288
6.1. Overview of chapter 1	288
6.2. Overview of chapter 2	290
6.3. Overview of chapter 3	293
6.4. Overview of chapter 4	304
6.5. Overview of chapter 5	311
References	a

Chapter 1

1.1. Introduction

This study is a new attempt towards the interpretation and understanding of the Hebrew narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, by the method of biblical exegesis. The overall predisposition on the narrative was focused on David's unfaithfulness to the covenant between God and the nation of Israel. The narrative also brings to light, the so much debated character of Satan or satan, introduced in the first verse, which has puzzled scholars for decades. The narrative chronicled this event from a religious concern, giving particular attention to an incident that happened during the reign of King David and its significance to the location of the Judean Temple.¹

This study is a fresh attempt to understand the reason for and characters of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. This text and the portrayal of the characters in the text will be studied against the theology and ideology of 1 and 2 Chronicles. This study will attempt to explain the images of the characters that we find in 1 Chronicles 21 as well as why the author has changed the source text to include the image of Satan/satan. To study this text against the book's theology and ideology, it will be necessary to scrutinize the book of Chronicles with its background first.

This study shall attempt to add to years of examination of the characters in the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. The narrative will be examined in five phases. First, is a study of the context (socio-historical study) to understand the background of the book. Second, is also a historical study, which includes the Chronicler and has an influence on the ideology and theology that the author emphasizes in the book (whether it is by emphasizing or underemphasizing). When the contexts, ideology, and theology which are portrayed in the book of Chronicles are known it will be possible to have (thirdly) a close reading of the specific chapter (1 Chronicles 21). This chapter will then be read against this background. The fourth step will be an attempt to explain the images of the characters that we find in 1 Chronicles 21 as well as why the author has changed the source text to include the image of

¹ It is important to note that the word temple is only implied, the word is not explicitly mentioned in 1 Chronicles 21, rather references were made in the chapter to the 'alter' and 'tabernacle'.

Satan/satan. The last phase will be a discussion of the contemporary relevance and hermeneutical options of these images.

1.2. Relevance/ Motivation

So many studies have been conducted over the years by scholars towards the understanding of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. However, not much has been done towards the reason for and characters of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. Harmonization of the two passages of 1 Chronicles 21 and 2 Samuel 24 was done by Crockett (1951:138), in the nineteenth century.² Crockett suggests an emendation of the original story by the Chronicler, possibly to suit his theological purpose and the traditions of his day.

Japhet (1993:23-25) in her commentary on I and II Chronicles, presented the study, which seems to sustain the idea that 1 Chronicles 21 was copied from 2 Samuel 24. This is as a result of her general view of the chronology of the biblical literature, as well as her view that the book of Chronicles was a post-exilic genre. Japhet suggests that even though the book of Chronicles displays a peculiar diction of its own, the language places it no earlier than the post-exilic period and most probably into the period, for the reason that the language has common features with late biblical works such as Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, Daniel, as well as non-biblical works of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Much attention has also been given by scholars to the study of two burning issues in the book of Chronicles, according to Japhet (1993:3-5). The first issue, questions the extent of the Chronicler's work, does it cover only the Chronicles, or does it include the books of Ezra and Nehemiah? The second is whether the book of Chronicles was composed by one writer, or whether it contains both primary and secondary elements that should be distinguished and defined.

According to Thompson (1994:22-23), most of the past studies focused on the portions of Chronicles that are paralleled by sections in Samuel, Kings, and the Septuagint. Where Chronicles differ from these passages, it was always assumed that the Chronicler modified these texts, to suit his theological viewpoint.

² Reprinted in 1951

Braun (1994:63) investigates Noth's dealings with the character of Chronicler's work and asserts that it stands out as an independent narration to enliven and develop the details of history. This he supposed contrasts with the Deuteronomistic work that is a systematic presentation of history.

In another study, Japhet (2009:296) investigates the traditions presented in the book of Chronicles and notes that the Exodus tradition was not mentioned in the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. In her view, the narrative does not discuss the exodus from Egypt or the subsequent revelation at Mount Sinai. Japhet (2009:297) states that not only was the historical event omitted from the narrative, but references to it have also been deleted in parallel text. The exodus from Egypt was only in the Deuteronomistic sections of the books of Samuel and Kings.

Knoppers and MacConville (2000:1) conducted a study of the Deuteronomistic history, which covers much of Israel's history from the time before they entered the land to the exiles of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms. This study, however, only presented a comparative study for 1 Chronicles 21, since its source text of 2 Samuel 24 is part of the literary unit of the Deuteronomistic history.

Jonker (2013:136-138) in his commentary on I and II Chronicles, observes that 1 Chronicles 21:1 shows an interesting departure from the source text in 2 Samuel 24:1, which he attributes to theological difficulty. Also, Jonker states that the Chronicler omitted some text from the source text, which shows a reflection of the Chronicler's Southern perspective. Akin to Jonker's interpretation, the Chronicler could be said to have alluded to the Davidic covenant, and the Zion tradition which has the three elements of the city (Jerusalem), the Yahwistic religion (represented by the altar), and the monarchy (represented by David). The concept of building an altar is also a strong reference to cultic practices, which are in the Chronicler's perspective centered at the Jerusalem temple.

Jonker (2013:139) points out an allusion to another Israeli tradition by the Chronicler to reflect his theological intentions. Jonker notes that the Chronicler reworked the source text of 2 Samuel 24:25, in 1 Chronicles 21:26-27. This addition by the Chronicler could be said to be an allusion to the Mosaic tradition and the Sinai tradition. David became in this process a Moses redivivus and the Chronicler attempted to overwrite Moses with David. This overwriting entailed an overwriting of

the Northern tradition with the Southern Tradition, an overwriting of Tabernacle tradition with Jerusalem temple tradition, an overwriting of the Sinai tradition with the Zion tradition, and an overwriting of the exodus tradition with the monarchical tradition.

Jonker (2013:140) also, observes that 1 Chronicles 21:29-30 are without parallel in the source text. Jonker believes that the Chronicler used this addition to achieve a contrast between the sanctuary that was at Gibeon and the newly established altar on the Jebusite threshing floor.

This study shall attempt to add to years of examination of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. However, the focus here will be on the characters in the narrative. The portrayal of the characters in the text will be studied against the theology and ideology of 1 and 2 Chronicles. Past studies have helped in the understanding that different traditions existed in Ancient Israel, and the Chronicler attempted to overwrite some older traditions with new ones. Thus, the reason for the redaction of the source text, to suit his theology and ideology. In this study, therefore, it is necessary to study the portrayal of the characters in the narrative, because the characters in the narrative do not seem to reflect exactly how they were portrayed elsewhere in the source texts. The study considers the background of the author and his audience as well as their socio-historical context.

1.3. Problem statement

1.3.1. Introduction

1 Chronicles 21 has been a much-debated text, primarily because of the presence of Satan/satan, and the fact that this text seems to be an amended version of 2 Samuel 24. The Chronicler in 1 Chronicles 21 redacted the text of 2 Samuel 24. He utilized his sources selectively to retell the story with his emphasis. In some cases, he omitted some information, other times he added some information. He also reversed some information. 2 Samuel 24 states that it was Yahweh who incited David to number the people, which brought calamity upon the people of Israel, but the Chronicler in 1 Chronicles 21 changed the figure to an unknown Satan/ satan. The Chronicler reversed the direction of the census in 2 Samuel 24, which read from North to South (From Dan to Beersheba) to read from South to North (from

Beersheba to Dan). He also added some information not found in the source text that seemed to explain the choice of the siting of the Temple in Jerusalem over the old Temple at Gibeon. All these possible redactions of the source text by the Chronicler cautions against reading and understanding of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 outside its unique historical context. The setting of the narrative was in Jerusalem, under the restoring Israelite state of Yehud, a Persian province. It was a multicultural society with so many religious ideas. The text seems to be written in the post-exilic era when the Jews that returned from exile were trying to rebuild their city. The book of Chronicles seems to have been written with the purpose to convey a certain ideology and theology. The omission, addition, and reversal of some information from the source text could have been purposely done by the Chronicler, to overwrite some traditions with other traditions (Southern tradition over North, Zion tradition over Moses, and Sinai traditions). To discern all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in 1 Chronicles 21, it is, therefore, necessary to search for answers, against the theological and ideological context of the book of Chronicles.

1.3.2. Existing/ previous research

Many studies have been conducted on 1 Chronicles 21, however, most of the previous research focused on the following: A harmonization with the source text; tracing of the source text, studies of the language, the extent of the Chronicler's work, does it cover only the Chronicles, or does it include the books of Ezra and Nehemiah? Also, whether the book of Chronicles was composed by one writer, or not. Some of the past studies focused on the portions of Chronicles that are paralleled by sections in Samuel, Kings, and the Septuagint. Further, we have the study of the character of the Chronicler's work, and the investigation of the traditions presented in Chronicles, as well as the comparative study with the Deuteronomistic history. There is also, the investigation of the possible redactions found in Chronicles compared to the source text. However, none of these works seemed to have examined the portrayal of the characters in the text against the theology and ideology of 1 and 2 Chronicles.

1.3.3. Lacunae that this study will address

This study, therefore, will address the need to understand how the Chronicler portrayed the characters in the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. The characters will be

examined within the unique historical context of the passage. This study will also help to create awareness for exegetes to understand, as they endeavor to interpret and apply the varying principles of any Old Testament texts, that they do not have a central theme or one theology.³

1.3.4. Research problem

Can the portrayal of the images of the characters in 1 Chronicles 21 be explicated when studied against the theology and ideology of 1 & 2 Chronicles? Can these images still have contemporary relevance, when studied from a responsible hermeneutical lens?

1.4. Preliminary literature review

Currently, the book of Chronicles as it is in the Old Testament canon consists of two books, but according to Japhet (1993:2), the book was originally one book. The book was first divided into two parts (1 & 2 Chronicles) by the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament) and has been maintained from then onward by other translations. Japhet (1993:2) observes that “the traditional Masoretic remarks regarding the count of its verses and its middle point are found only at the end of II Chronicles.” For this reason, an exegete should contextually, endeavor to treat the two books as one. Chronicles are one of the books of the Old Testament and are among the few Old Testament books that the name defines a genre. The genre, in this case, equals the events of the day, which is a historical narrative. Nonetheless, there is no clear evidence of its title from within the book itself (Japhet 1993:1).

Jonker (2007:21) presents the different viewpoints that were expressed in past studies about the nature of the book of Chronicles. He writes that “some regard the Chronicler to be an exegete, others see the Chronicler as a theologian, and still others see the Chronicler as a historian.” He is of the understanding that the Chronicler could be characterized as a reforming historian. This characterization, he

³ The lacunae that this study will address seems to only consider the question of “how”. There is need to couple the question of how with the question of “why”. However, the question of why will be considered later in the thesis.

does not mean in the sense of depicting the Chronicler's work as a genre, but rather an attempt to describe the purpose of the work. The purpose he then describes as the reformulation and sanitizing "of the older traditions about the past, as well as an attempt to reformulate the identity of God's people in the changed socio-historical circumstances of the late Persian era" (Jonker 2007:25).

Geyser (2006:5) in her doctoral thesis in Chronicles compares the books of 1 and 2 Chronicles with the source documents the writer(s) used. She showed "that the Chronicler worked extremely selectively when using the source documents and that he retells the history of Israel and Judah through omissions and additions with his particular emphasis."

Japhet (1993:3) states that much attention has been given by scholars to the study of two burning issues in the book of Chronicles. The first, questions the extent of the Chronicler's work, does it cover only the Chronicles, or does it include the books of Ezra and Nehemiah? The second is the many attempts to reconstruct the various literary stages of the books' composition. This is the question of "whether the book of Chronicles was composed by one writer, or whether it contains both 'primary' and 'secondary' elements which should be distinguished and defined" (Japhet 1993:5). The understanding of these two burning issues is critically important in establishing the precise frame of reference and unity of terminology, which in turn, will inform the interpretation and understanding of the message of the book of Chronicles (Japhet 1993:3).

According to Knoppers (2004:72), most commentators in the past assumed that the extent of the Chronicler's work includes the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. He was of the view that this reigning scholarly consensus in the distant past was forcefully challenged between the 1960s and 1980s (Knoppers 2004:73). Following Knoppers' discussion of selected areas of contention, between those who advocate separate authorship and those who assert common authorship, his synopsis led to inconclusive results (2004:89). However, he believes that it is quite unlikely that one author was responsible for the writing of the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Nonetheless, he sees points of connection between Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, based on the cumulative weight of the considerations of matters of style, characteristic language, the doublet in 2 Chronicles 36:22-23, and Ezra 1:1-3a, ideology, and compositional technique (Knoppers 2004:89).

Even though Knoppers (2004:99) acknowledges that there are different views concerning the composition of Chronicles, all the same, he is of the view that each hypothesis will have a similar effect on interpretation. Besides, he understands that every one of the approaches endeavors to distance Chronicles from Ezra and Nehemiah.

Another issue that has posed many problems for scholars over the years is the remarkable similarity and the number of significant differences between the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 and 2 Samuel 24:1-25. In agreement with the similarity of the two narratives, Knoppers (1994:743) is of the view that 1 Chronicles 21:1-27 “is largely taken from the Chronicler’s *Vorlage* of 2 Samuel 24:1-25, while 1 Chr 21:28-22:1 is unique to Chronicles.” Knoppers (1994:751) also notes many differences between the two narratives, among which is the difference in the context of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 and the context of 2 Samuel 24:1-25. In Samuel, the census and plague were induced by Yahweh, whereas in Chronicles, the idea for the census was incited by an adversary.

Jonker (2008:653) underscores the importance of interpreting the book of Chronicles, against the background of the international arena of the time. This is a result of the acknowledgment of a wider sphere of influence during the time of writing of the book of Chronicles. He points out that the traditional scholarship of the book of Chronicles tended to interpret the book exclusively within the cultic-religious conditions of the late-Persian or early Hellenistic period, sometime in the fourth-century B.C.E or later. By so doing the influence of the surrounding cultures was neglected. However, he says a few scholarly voices have started emphasizing the possible influence of Greek historiography.

On the subject of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, the first verse according to Japhet “is the most discussed and interpreted verses in Chronicles, due to the appearance of Satan” (1993:373). Japhet (1993:375) states that the verse depicts a significant theological development in the concept of evil. However, she did not find any further allusions to Satan or even the slightest implication of the independent existence of evil. For which reason, she interpreted that the general attitude of the Chronicler’s view of the origin of evil, like good, is from God.

Stokes (2009:93) responds to some of the noteworthy and more recent arguments regarding the nature and the identity of the ‘Satan or satan’ character in Chronicles. In his response, he attempted to set forth this character’s identity and his presence in the narrative. An explanation he believes has been overlooked previously by scholars. According to Stokes (2009:106), this character, whether Satan or the satan is a superhuman figure, and is not the archenemy of God, referred to in later traditions as the devil. Rather this character is an emissary of God, carrying out God’s punishment on the nation of Israel.

If evil is viewed by the Chronicler to originate from God as Japhet interpreted above, and echoed by Stokes, the question that arises then is, why and for what reason did God punish evil and evil perpetrators in the many narratives in 1 and 2 Chronicles? In search of answers to these questions, one may need to take note of the reminder made by McKenzie (2004:17), in which he points out that “... the history of the academic study of Chronicles cautions against overconfidence in one’s conclusions at any stage, it also illustrates the capacity of biblical scholarship to correct itself and to grow in appreciation of and possibly understanding of its object of study.” Fee and Stuart (2003:99) also explain the importance of how much one can learn from reading between the lines in the study of narratives; to learn not only what is communicated explicitly, but also what is implicitly communicated. The application of this advice in a new attempt to the study of the book of Chronicles may provide supplementary answers to the question of the origin of evil and good, as per the Chronicler’s worldview.

1.5. Methodology

This is both literature and exegetical study. It combines several methods to facilitate a better understanding of the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel as portrayed in 1 Chronicles 21. This will be studied against the theology and ideology of the book of Chronicles.

The literature study will entail a literature review and the exegesis will be based on Gorman’s (2008:8-9) theory on exegesis:

The careful historical, literary and theological analysis of a text ... [and] deliberate, word-by-word and phrase-by-phrase consideration of all the parts

of a text in order to understand it as a whole ... Exegesis is therefore an investigation ... of the many dimensions, or textures, of a particular text.

I shall use a combination of diachronic and synchronic methodologies of biblical exegesis.

To study this text against the book's theology and ideology, it will be necessary to scrutinize the book of Chronicles with its background first. This will entail a socio-historical study. The socio-historical study will focus on the context wherein and wherefore the book of Chronicles was written. A socio-historical approach is a study that involves or relates to society and its organization. It is the study of the origins, historical developments, structure, and functioning of human society, including their social problems. This historical study is usually focused on the aggregate of people living together in a more or less ordered community (Concise Oxford American dictionary 2006:859). In light of this definition, this study will investigate the combination of both social and historical factors, with regards to the book of Chronicles.

The main philosophies of Chronicles were forged and hammered out in a post-exilic background (Mangan 1982:2). The emphasis upon the function of Chronicles' text in establishing Israel's identity, involves, first of all, understanding the text within a certain context. In this picture, the text of the book of Chronicles serves as one part of an unabridged social symbolic system for interpreting the existence of the people of Israel at the time (Childs 2011:23).

After the socio-historical study, a diachronic study will be done. This will comprise a tradition critical study, text-critical study, literary-critical study, and a redaction-critical study. These critical studies will focus (where possible) firstly on the book of Chronicles and then more synchronically on the text (1 Chronicles 21).

This study will be followed by a synchronic study that will be focussed on the text and translation, involving the rhetorical and discourse/structural analysis. Finally, the significance of the findings, regarding the theological, ideological, and practical significance, will be scrutinized.

1.6. Aims/objectives of the study

1.6.1. Aim

This study aims to understand what 1 Chronicles 21 communicate concerning the images of God, Satan/satan, and the nation of Israel. These images will be studied against the ideology and theology of 1 & 2 Chronicles. To determine the portrayal of these three characters, I hope to find answers to the explanation of the images of the characters that we find in 1 Chronicles 21 as well as why the author has changed the source text to include the image of Satan/satan.

1.6.2. Objectives of the study

This research will focus specifically on 1 Chronicles 21 and the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in this text; read against the theology and ideology of 1 & 2 Chronicles. It will therefore be necessary to address the following objectives:

- Discuss the socio-historical background of 1 & 2 Chronicles, including the ideology and theology of the book;
- Present a diachronic study of 1 & 2 Chronicles as well as of 1 Chronicles 21;
- Present a synchronic study of 1 Chronicles 21;
- Discuss the findings of the study of the images portrayed in Chronicles 21; read against the theology and ideology of 1 & 2 Chronicles;
- Discuss the contemporary relevance and hermeneutical options of these images.

1.7. Hypothesis

The images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel as portrayed in 1 Chronicle 21, might be explicable when studied against the theology and ideology of 1 & 2 Chronicles.

1.8. Provisional outline of chapters

This study consists of the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction

- Introduction of the focus of this study, given detailed background; the research problems; the relevance of the research; and the preliminary literature review
- Stating the problem statement; the aim and objectives; the methodology used in the research; the research hypothesis and the orthography and terminology

Chapter 2: Socio-historical

The study of the socio-historical aspects of Chronicles, the experiences of the ordinary Judean people during the period of the writing of the book of Chronicles.

This will require the study of the following objectives:

- a study of the shaping of the of Israel after the exile.
- a study of the concept of dualism, which is connected to Zoroastrianism.
- a study of the concept of monolatry;
- and a study of the development of the images of Satan within Israel.

Chapter 3: Historical Criticism of the Book of Chronicles

- Tradition criticism
This is to examine the different traditions in Israel, understand the traditions that were emphasized, underemphasized, and completely omitted;
- Text criticism
This is to critically study the different texts that exist;
- Literary form criticism
This study will help to understand the type of literature 1 Chronicles 21 is, and to know the various tools to employ in its interpretation.
- Redaction criticism
This study will allow for the discovery of which materials were omitted, added, and/ or reversed by the Chronicler from the source text.

Chapter 4: Text and translation

- Rhetorical
- Discourse/Structural

- This study will help to translate and analyze the different words contained in the passage, to understand their original intended meaning.

Chapter 5: Hermeneutical Study

- Context of 1 & 2 Chronicles, including the traditions and redactions in the text, which highlights the ideology and theology of the book;
- Which of the elements in the book of Chronicles are also in 1 Chronicles 21 and which are not?
- What does the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 communicate concerning the images of God, Satan/satan, and the nation of Israel in light of the theology and ideology of 1 & 2 Chronicles?
- The contemporary significance of the Chronicler's portrayal of these images in the narrative of I Chronicles 21.
- Remarks regarding the findings of the research; relevance of those findings; and critical issues that may require further study.

1.9. Orthography and terminology

1.7.1. Orthography

The following methodology of writing will be applied:

- The adjusted Harvard system of referencing will be used in this study.

1.7.2. Terminology

The following terminologies will apply to the research:

- **Chronicles** refer to the books of 1 and 2 Chronicles of the Old Testament that this study focuses on.
- **Chronicler** is the author(s) of the book of Chronicles;
- **Exegesis** is the historical/literary study of biblical text or group of texts.

- **Ideology** is a system of ideas and ideals, which normally forms the basis of economic or political theory and policy.
- **Theology** is the study of religious belief and the nature of God.
- **Hermeneutics** is the methodology and theory of interpretation of biblical texts.

Chapter 2: Diachronic reading: Socio-Historical

2.1. Introduction

To discern all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in 1 Chronicles 21, it is necessary to search for answers, against the theological and ideological context of the book of Chronicles. However, I believe this cannot be done without the basic understanding of the socio-historical background and historical criticism, of the text of Chronicles. A socio-historical study will be conducted in this chapter, while historical criticism will be the subject matter in the next chapter.

The socio-historical approach has been perceived as effectively undermining the traditional interest in the enterprise of biblical theology. However, the characteristic of the socio-historical approach, in general, is in pain to demonstrate its positive theological contributions to the study of the Old Testament (Childs 2011:22).

A socio-historical approach is a study that involves or relates to society and its organization. It is the study of the origins, historical developments, structure, and functioning of human society, including their social problems. This historical study is usually focused on the aggregate of people living together in a more or less ordered community (Concise Oxford American dictionary 2006:859). In light of this definition, this study will investigate the combination of both social and historical factors, with regards to the book of Chronicles.

The emphasis upon the function of Chronicles' text in establishing Israel's identity, involves, first of all, understanding the text within a certain context. In this picture, the text of the book of Chronicles serves as one part of an unabridged social symbolic system for interpreting the existence of the people of Israel at the time (Childs 2011:23).

In the year 587 B.C., Jerusalem fell to Babylon and the people of Israel were taken off into exile. With the conquest of Babylon, by Cyrus the Persian king, in 539 B.C., some of the descendants of the people of Israel started to return home to Jerusalem. Even though some Israelites returned home, nevertheless Israel was Yehud – only a province of Persia and not an independent state. They set about to rebuild the temple in the year 520 B.C. In this period, the tiny state was in constant threat of extinction from hostile neighbors, and from within by the diminution of its religious

ideals. The multi-cultural environment that was existent at this period brought about the incursion of new, appealing, pious ideas and practices. The main philosophies of Chronicles were supposedly forged and hammered out in such a background (Mangan 1982:2).

It is, therefore, necessary to investigate some of these ideas, since many of them might portray ways of thinking, which are different from the thinking patterns of our day and age. This will require the study of the following objectives: a study of the identity finding of Israel after the exile, a study of the whole concept of dualism, which is connected to Zoroastrianism, a study of the concept of monolatry, and a study of the development of the images of Satan within Israel. The purpose of studying all these aspects is to build together with the historical criticism in chapter 3, the understanding of the Chronicler's theology and ideology. Subsequently, these studies might aid in discerning all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in the book of Chronicles. These images might be explicable against Chronicler's theology and ideology.

2.2. The identity formation of Israel after the exile

From the perspective of the Old Testament and the protestant Bible, the history of Israel is viewed as a theocracy (the kingdom of God) and consists of three periods. The first period, from Moses to Samuel, was under the guidance of the prophets. The second period from King Saul to the Babylonian captivity was under the guidance of the kings. The last period, from Ezra to the birth of Jesus Christ was under the reign of the high priests. The focus of this section, however, is on the transitional period between the second and the third (Edersheim 1975: iv-v).

There has always been a strong belief in the organic unity of Israel, in so much so that the past and the present were always seen to form a unity, which is virtually natural. This can easily be seen in the observation of the twelve tribes historically. The names vary, from text to text in the Old Testament, but the number always remains a constant, as a symbol of completeness. In this light, the Chronicler uses the twelve as a symbol for the unity of the people of Israel. Even though, only the tribe of Judah was effectually operative, during the transition between the second

and the third period, possibly the time of writing of the book of Chronicles (Mangan 1982:2-3).

Yahweh's word spoken in one period, therefore, becomes valid for the next period. Thus, the Chronicler's point, in helping his contemporaries understand Yahweh, by confronting Yahweh's word with the new situation and interpreting the word in that light (Mangan 1982:3).

The Israelites that returned from exile were faced with many challenges. They struggled to rebuild Jerusalem, which they believed Yahweh had given to them. The city was in ruin, from the Babylonian destruction. It was at this time ruled by the Persians and partially dwelt by a multi-cultural population. After rebuilding the city and the temple, the Judean community struggled to understand what their relationship to God would be in this new situation. The book of Chronicles was most probably, written for this troubled restoring community (Barry, et. al. 2014:1).

The book of Chronicles, in this regard, can then be viewed as historiography (history writing). It presents Israel's past that to a certain extent, does not line up with the history of Israel in the books of Samuel and Kings. Its various literary features demonstrate its historiographical concern. Yet its historicity is often debated. The Chronicler, in selecting and arranging his source material displays considerable freedom. This is quite like any historical writing, which anyone who had ever borrowed from a written source may perhaps attest to. History writing generally involves creativity, the selection, omission, and interpretation of historical sources. The Chronicler's selectivity can, therefore, easily be seen in his omission of any narrative that emphasizes or positively portrays the northern kingdom of Israel. He omits most narratives that tell the story of David's sins, like his adultery with Bathsheba and subsequent murder of Uriah, and Solomon's many wives, and his consequent syncretic practices (Barry, et. al. 2014:1).

2.2.1. Earlier studies

Before the nineteenth century, scholars⁴ used Chronicles confidently and accepted its testimony about the pre-exilic period of Israel's history. It was understood to supplement the books of Samuel and Kings (Graham 1990:2-3).

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, a segment of the German Old Testament scholarship⁵ issued the first challenge, which resulted in a rejection of the book of Chronicles for a historical reconstruction of the pre-exilic period of Israel's history. These scholars supposedly saw the enormous conflict between Chronicles and the books of Samuel and Kings. In support of their arguments against the historical trustworthiness of the book of Chronicles, questions were raised, based on the critical study of the language and contents of the book itself. Attempts to answer these questions resulted in conclusions about the general purpose of the work. Their ideas were formulated in the frameworks of date, authorship, and sources (Graham 1990:42).

The response to vindicate the book of Chronicles' historical testimony arose from Protestant and Catholic circles alike.⁶ They used nine arguments⁷ in an attempt to justify the book of Chronicles' historical trustworthiness. Two of the arguments were debated more often and extensively than others. These are the source argument and the harmonization argument. Nonetheless, at a later time, a second challenge was issued, which spun around the history of Israel's religion, and the connections between the book of Chronicles and the Priestly Code (P).⁸ In search of answers to these issues, the external support argument; assumed monumental importance (Graham 1990:55).

⁴ Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* VIII 246, 292, Humphrey Prideaux (1715), Johann J. John (1829), J. G. Eichhorn (1803).

⁵ De Wette (1806), W. Gesenius (1815), C. P. W. Gramberg (1823).

⁶ Bertholdt (1813), Dahler (1819), Herbst (1831), Keil (1833), Hävernack (1839).

⁷ These arguments were issued in defence of Chronicles' historical trustworthiness: 1) The divine inspiration argument. 2) The moral argument. 3) The source argument. 4) The supplementary argument. 5) The textual corruption argument. 6) The modernization argument. 7) The harmonization argument. 8) The external support argument. 9) The general credibility argument (Graham 1990:43-54).

⁸ The Priestly Code, found in Exod. 25–Lev 16, is a large collection of laws (approximately 1/3 of the total) focused primarily on the priests and worship. Major topics covered include: circumcision, the Passover meal, keeping of the Sabbath, inappropriate behaviour for priests, clean and unclean animals, purification and atonement, redeeming property, oaths, cleansing lepers, keeping Yom Kippur and Sukkot, Nazirite vows, consecration of priests, and ritual of the Red Heifer (Johnson 2015).

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, a new period was initiated in the study of the Pentateuch.⁹ This period witnessed the movement in scholarship to re-date the Priestly code. The scholars,¹⁰ who accepted a post-exilic date for P, adopted an extremely skeptical approach, towards the book of Chronicles as a reliable historical source (Graham 1990:150).

This movement, as mentioned above led to the conclusion that just as P was a rewritten history of Israel's pre-exilic period, the book of Chronicles also revised the account in the books of Samuel and Kings. This conclusion they supposed, was to make the book of Chronicles more congruent, with the practices and ideals of the post-exilic period. Consequently, those who accepted a late dating for P took an indistinct view of the book of Chronicles' historical reliability (Graham 1990:150-151).

There were many other scholars,¹¹ who favored the pre-exilic date for P. These scholars, generally accepted information from the book of Chronicles for the reconstruction of Israel's pre-exilic history. The crucial element for this group of scholars, regarding the second challenge to the book of Chronicles' historical reliability, was that if the credibility of P was eroded, then the credibility of Chronicles concerning the pre-exilic history of Israel was eroded as well (Graham: 189-191).

The nineteenth-century also witnessed great archaeological discoveries in the Ancient Near East. Among the discoveries, the epigraphical finds and their translations, made the greatest impact, as they were used by many scholars¹² in defense of the book of Chronicles' historical reliability. Critical responses were issued to the apologetic use of archaeology. Smith (1889), Driver (1895), and Brown (1889),¹³ all saw value in the use of archaeological research to illuminate Israel's pre-exilic history. However, they were not as confident as others, in the vindication of the book of Chronicles' reliability for Israel's pre-exilic history. The consensus, among these later scholars, is that archaeology had only succeeded in providing a

⁹ Pentateuch consists of the first five books of the Old Testament: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

¹⁰ Late dating of P was inaugurated by Graf (1866), approved by Kuenen (1886), Wellhausen (1870), Colenso (1871), Meyer (1884), Stade (1889), Piepinbring (1886), Guther (1899), and Budde (1906).

¹¹ Scholars who favoured pre-exilic date for P: Klostermann (1898), Nöldeke (1868), Kittel (1895), Neteler (1899), Köhler (1875), Zöckler (1877), and Oettli (1889; 1905).

¹² Scholars who used archaeology to defend the historical reliability of Chronicles: Rawlinson (1959:113-123), Schrader (1885), Sayce (1894), Smith (1894), McCurdy (1901).

¹³ Brown's understanding of the book of Chronicles appeared in the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible (1889).

possible set of circumstances for the narratives in the book of Chronicles, not a proof of the story's truthfulness (Graham 1990:222-223).

The debates, over the usefulness of Chronicles in the reconstruction of Israel's pre-exilic history, continued into the twentieth century. It has largely involved the same issues. Many scholars¹⁴ according to Graham (1990:248) refer to the Chronicler's theological ideology to account for the historical depiction in the book of Chronicles.

2.2.2. Recent studies

The emphasis of this study, however, is not on the reconstruction of Israel's pre-exilic history, rather it is to understand the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in 1 Chronicles 21, against the theological and ideological background of the book of Chronicles.

The numerous narratives found in the book of Chronicles are indicative of the theology and ideology the Chronicler sought to depict. The writer of Chronicles gave many details which the writers of Samuel and Kings do not record, in particular, Israel's religious organizations during the monarchy. Special interest was given to the Levites by the Chronicler, by repeatedly mentioning them, to show the special part they played in the nation's affairs. The writers of Samuel and Kings on the other hand scarcely mentioned the Levites (Fleming 2014:150).

Contrariwise, there are many things that the Chronicler did not record, that are found in the books of Samuel and Kings, such as the failures of King David, Solomon, and some of the Davidic Kings (Fleming 2014:150).

Based on the omission and addition of details from the sources, the Chronicler chose and arranged his materials to impress on the returned captives, the importance of rebuilding the nation by emphasizing the importance of the temple. Thus, he portrayed the northern kingdom negatively, because they were not associated with Jerusalem, but with places like Bet-El and Sichem. Simultaneously, he focused mostly on the Davidic line of kings, who reigned in Jerusalem. The deduction then is that according to Fleming, he regarded David's dynasty as the only legitimate dynasty, "Jerusalem the only legitimate capital, the temple the only legitimate

¹⁴ According to Graham (1990:248), these scholars in the twentieth century used the Chronicler's purpose to account for elements in his historical presentation: Thomas Willi (1972), Rudolf Moses (1973), Peter Welten (1973), Peter Ackroyd (1973, 1977), H. G. M. Williamson (1982), Roddy Braun (1979)

sanctuary, and the Levitical priesthood the only legitimate religious order” (Fleming 2014:64).

Geyser-Fouché (2016:2) explains the term exclusive language by looking at the development of thought on language as an instrument. In her view, exclusive language is used in certain circumstances to strengthen a certain group's identity and to empower the group. Geyser-Fouché notes that exclusive language is not always of an emphatic nature but can also lie in what has not been emphatically expressed. She says that it can be seen in what is underplayed or what is left out in the narration.

According to Geyser-Fouché (2016:2), several studies have been conducted concerning the identity finding of Israel that is focused on the post-exilic era, also known as the Second Temple period. She affirms that texts are not simple reflections of well-defined identities but are rather part of ongoing identity negotiation processes. This affirmation she says applies to texts originating in the contexts of transition in Yehud, under the Persian rule in the post-exilic period (Geyser-Fouché 2016:3).

Geyser-Fouché (2016:3), points out that the recent studies in the identity finding of Israel in post-exilic times demonstrate the nation was seeking an identity at a time it has diverse ideologies. Some sought it using exclusive language, while others attempted it using inclusive language. In Geyser-Fouché's (2016:5) view, 1 Chronicles 21 is a discourse of power, which emphasizes the temple, the cult, the sacrifice, and the monarchy. In her view, the new history the Chronicler created is the legitimization of a new ideology, which was achieved by using exclusive language and by selective narration.

Jarick (2007:6) believes that the book of Chronicles is not the work of one author, rather the initiative of a community of analysts. Nonetheless, his view on the message agrees with Fleming's. He sees the traditions the writers gathered, selected, and refined as sacrosanct and part of God's cosmic plan. The cosmic plan was then set up by David, who he regarded as the absolute monarch and only a commitment to a system instituted by the monarch, which can bring about a flawless society.

Zvi (2010:10) understands Chronicles, as a book that presents itself as a secondary and interpretive composition. It is a book that informs and reconfigures the meaning of primary authoritative books like Samuel, Kings, and the prophets. The book of Chronicles separates itself in many ways, from these primary authoritative books, and does not aim to emulate these primary sources.

Jonker (2010:283) explores the different viewpoints regarding the Chronicler's presentation of King Saul's narrative, as it differs significantly from the version in 1 Samuel. Jonker contends that the Chronicler made some changes, by omitting some information in some areas and adding some information in other areas. Jonker however, emphasizes in agreement with Knoppers (2004: 52-56; 1 Chronicles 1-9), that the differences between the book of Chronicles and Samuel or Kings should not always be attributed to the Chronicler's theological intention. Rather, that it could be, the Chronicler's text was from a different version, than the Masoretic Text (MT) of the book of Samuel. The minuses from the Chronicler's text, compared to Samuel, most probably indicate he used a shorter version than the MT Samuel.

On the question of the function of the Saul narrative in Chronicles, Jonker (2010: 292), in agreement with Knoppers (2004:526-531; I Chronicles 10-29), posits four scholarly viewpoints: The first position understands that the Chronicler wanted to contrast Saul and David. The second position sees a unique contribution of the Saul narrative in the Chronicler's theology, and that the Chronicler's version operates independently from Samuel's. The third position emphasized the continuity between Saul and David's reign. While at the same time, downplays the contrast between Saul and David, and also the unique theological contribution of the Saul narrative in Chronicles. The fourth position also argues about the contrast between Saul and David, but this time, from a different angle, based on the text version the Chronicler used.

Knoppers (2004:528-531; 1 Chronicles, 10-29) offers two significant considerations that should be considered when pursuing an understanding of the character and purpose of the Saul narrative in Chronicles. The first has to do with the unique style of the Chronicler's historiography, while the second has to do with the context of the Persian period, in which the Chronicler wrote. The first consideration indicates a unique feature of the Chronicler's treatment of Saul. He shifted focus from the kingship to the conduct of the individual king. The Chronicler's emphasis on Saul's

death ignores his positives, thereby casting a negative light on Saul's legacy and at the same time, not implicating the tribe of Benjamin, but rather Saul himself. The Chronicler's strategy also results in seeing that David became a king, not by lineage, inheritance, or any other means, but by divine choice and human acclamation. By shifting focus from the kingship to the conduct of the individual king, the Chronicler, seem to urge his readers, who include the Benjaminites, to consider David a king for all Israel.

Fleming (2014:391) refers to the Chronicler's characterization of Saul's reign as marked by weakness and conflict, while David's by strength and prosperity. The difference between these two kings is attributed not to the monarchy as an institution, but to David's submission to God and his desire to carry out God's will.

Knoppers (1999:50) interprets what the Chronicler presents, as a stunning alternative to the messages of the books of Samuel and Kings. The alternative results from differing contexts. The Chronicler gives an elaborated picture of David's plans, speeches, and appointments. The books of Samuel and Kings, on the other hand, present David as a man, who in his latter days was made to flee by his son, until his army restored him to power (2 Samuel 15:1-20:22). He was presented as a weak and feeble man in 1 Kgs 1:1-4. Furthermore, 1 Kgs 2:1-10 presents his speech to Solomon, where, instead of a farewell of encouragement to his son, he summons him to use his wisdom to deal with his enemies.

Knoppers (1999:50-54) argues that it is inevitable that the reconstruction of the Chronicler's position, will affect how one construes the pre-exilic, as well as post-exilic periods of the Israelite history. This is because the events that were chronicled in the book were pre-exilic, written in the post-exilic period.

Concerning the loftier debate over the history of the priesthood in Israel, Knoppers (1999:51) believes that the Chronicler was defending the position found in Deuteronomy. He affirms that in principle, any Levite can become a priest. There are two opposing views, with regards to the priests and the Levites. Nonetheless, both views, uphold Chronicles as an important document in outlining the history of the Priesthood in Jerusalem. One of the views affirms Aaron and his lineage as priests while portraying the Levites only as servants and janitors in charge of the physical

equipment of the temple. The other view regards the duties of the priests and the Levites equally.

Knoppers (1999:51-52) correspondingly presents differing views among scholars,¹⁵ concerning redaction activities in the book of Chronicles. One of the views contends that there is evidence of two redactions in the book. The original Chronicler is regarded as pro-Levitical, he promoted the equality of the Levites and the Aaronic priesthood. While a later redactor, separates the duties of the Levites and the Aaronic priesthood, placing the duties of the Levites as subservient to that of the Aaronic priesthood. The later redactor in this view is then regarded as pro-priestly.

The second view holds that the Chronicler specifically advanced a pro-priestly position. This view, however, is held by two groups of scholars. One group¹⁶ argues that the Chronicler's history extensively promotes priestly position, whereby there is a clear distinction between the functions and status of the Levites and the priests. The second group,¹⁷ defend the pro-priestly position of Chronicles differently. Unlike the pro-Levitical scholarly view, which holds that a later redactor promoted the priestly position of Chronicles, this second group speaks of a pro-Levitical redaction or pro-Levitical additions. We, therefore, have two points of view, on the question of the duties of the Levites and the priests. These two positions result in two incongruent constructions of the Chronicler's work. One was influenced by the book of Deuteronomy, while the other by the priestly works (Knoppers 1999:52-54).

The narratives in Chronicles are mostly compared against that of Samuel and Kings. Lasor et. al. (1996:548), refer to the book of Kings, as a historical narrative, with an editor's prophetic comments, resulting in a history book written with a religious and a practical aim. It is the history of a tragic period worth recording as a lesson of God's discipline of his people.

The book of Samuel relates the history of Israel from the perspective of obedience to God, rather than from the perspective of the system of government. The purpose of the book of Samuel was not just a recording of historical events, but rather, to show

¹⁵ The scholars that subscribe to this view are: Welch (1935:172-184), Williamson (1882:28-31), and De Vries (1989:191-196).

¹⁶ The scholars who hold to this view are: Curtis & Madsen (1910: 8-10).

¹⁷ Rothstein & Hanel (1927: xlv); Von Rad (1965:88-115); Noth (1957 110-23); Rudolph (1955:1-5); Mosis (1973 44-45); and Throntveit (1987:6-7).

how God was working in the lives of his people. The purpose of the book of Chronicles, on the other hand, was to show the returning migrants, that they were a continuation of the pre-captivity nation, whose lives were based on the Davidic dynasty and religious lives on the Levitical priesthood (Fleming 2014:64, 391).

The Chronicler takes a leaf out of Ezekiel's book, where the choice of life or death confronts its generation, by constantly invoking the theme of individual responsibility and the consequences of one's actions (Lasor et. al. 1996:548).

The book of 2 Kings, particularly chapter 17:7-18, underscores idolatry as one of the main causes of the exile. On the contrary, the book of Chronicles looks past this surface cursor, to the root of the problem, which is the forsaking of Yahweh. This fundamental problem is demonstrated in many narratives in the book of Chronicles. The Chronicler shows Israel's neglect of their relationship with Yahweh, through their forsaking of proper worship. He then calls their attention to seek Yahweh, and to have a complete response and subsequent transformation in him, through the examples of lives of many of their kings (Barry et. al. 2014:1).

2.2.3. Summary

The focus of this section was on the transitional period in Israel's history. It was a time when the people of Judah that returned from exile were struggling to rebuild their city, inhabited by a multi-cultural population. After rebuilding the city and the temple, the Judean community struggled to understand what their relationship to God would be in the new situation. The book of Chronicles was most probably, written for this troubled restoring community. The Chronicler be a historiographer, who rewrote history, not so much in line with the history of Israel in Samuel and Kings, and his other sources. Relatively, he displayed considerable freedom, in selecting and rearranging narratives from his source materials.

Also, the Chronicler did not write to reconstruct the pre-exilic period of Israel's history. Rather, he sought to portray the theology and ideology, which was necessary to encourage the post-exilic community, who had recently left the other areas of the Persian Empire to return to Jerusalem. This he did, through retelling their history in a new way.

1 Chronicles 21 is a discourse of power, which emphasizes the temple, the cult, the sacrifice, and the monarchy. The new history the Chronicler created is the

legitimation of a new ideology, which was achieved by using exclusive language and also by selective narration.

While the exilic audience of the books of Samuel and Kings needed to hear about Israel's past sins, to understand their current situation; the post-exilic audience of the book of Chronicles needed to be assured that Yahweh was still interested in them. They also needed to look up to David, as a model. The Chronicler looked past the sins of the past, to the root of the problem, which as he portrayed, was the forsaking of proper worship of Yahweh. He then used his writing to call their attention to seek Yahweh and to have a complete response and subsequent transformation in his worship. Therefore, what the Chronicler sought to achieve in his writing, was to encourage the restoring community, his post-exilic audience to find their identity in a multi-cultural environment, as God's people and heirs of the promises of David and to legitimize the temple as the only place of true Yahweh-worship, safeguarding the position of the temple elite.

2.3. The concept of dualism, which is connected to Zoroastrianism

Not only did the post-exilic community experience a multi-cultural environment in the other areas of the Persian Empire where they recently returned from to Jerusalem; they were also at this transitional period, cohabiting with a multi-cultural population in Jerusalem. This multi-cultural population presented different ideas, which posed a lot of challenges to the Judean community. Thus, they struggled to understand what their relationship with God would be in their new situation. It is, therefore, necessary in this section, to examine some of these ideas, which motivated the Chronicler to present the history of Israel from a new perspective. It is presumed that the book of Chronicles was written, to help the Judean community to find their identity in a confusing, difficult, and multi-cultural environment (Moreau et. al. 2000:293).

2.3.1. Dualism

The concept of dualism was one of the prevalent ideas in the post-exilic community. Dualism according to Cairns (2002:140) is the "philosophic system which proposes two original and independent principles in the universe, one good, and the other evil."

Two substances or powers need to exist to have dualism. This can be distinguished from monism, in which there is only one substance of power (Ferguson et. al. 1998:211).

In general, there are distinct senses in which dualism can be understood. In theology, God is set against some spiritual principle of evil or the material world. In Philosophy, the spirit is set over against matter. In psychology, the soul is set against the body (Wood 1996:283).

Possibly, dualism can be affirmed or denied in at least four different contexts. The first context denies dualism, by contrasting God and creation. In this context, God is not identified with his creation. Rather, God is distinct from his creation. He is the ground of his creation, and its sustaining cause. God is understood as both transcendent beyond his creation, and immanent within it (Ferguson et. al. 1998:211).

The second context seems to affirm dualism, by contrasting the mind and the body. This milieu separates the body from the mind or soul. Some form of dualism exists in the face of biblical teaching. According to 2 Corinthians 5:1-10, humans survive the death of the body. However, what survives is non-physical (Ferguson et. al. 1998:211).

Moral and physical evil represents the third context of dualism. The two principles of good and evil allow the account for moral and physical evil, which are locked together in conflict. Biblical theology, however, denies such a dualism, which is characteristic of Zoroastrianism. In biblical theology, evil occurs either by God's permission or by God's messenger. An example of God's permission of evil can be found in the narrative of Job, God gave free rein to Satan, who successively unleashed evil on Job. Similarly, an example of God's messenger of evil is in the narrative of the punishment of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (Ferguson et. al. 1998:211).

The dualism of revelation and reason is the fourth context of dualism. For example, the knowledge of Jesus Christ as being the Saviour,¹⁸ owns its source to divine

¹⁸ The knowledge of Jesus Christ as being the Saviour, I presume is the understanding by Christians that Jesus Christ came to seek and save sinners from the bondage of sin and lead them to spend eternity with God, rather than been eternally separated from God (Gal. 4:4-5; 1 Peter 3:18; 1 Timothy 2:4).

revelation, while the knowledge of the existence of the nation of Israel, is not from revelation but reason (Ferguson et. al. 1998:211).

Dualism finds more philosophical expression, in the making of an absolute distinction between spirit and matter. This is coupled with a great propensity to regard spirit as good and matter as certainly evil. The moral depreciation of matter as contrasted to spirit is contrary to the biblical understanding. According to the Old Testament, the matter is not inherently evil. God saw all that he had made as good (Gn. 1:31). Also, the evil consequences of rebellion against God affect not only the material but also the spirit (Wood 1996:283).

The Persian world pictured God or gods as imposing order on a formless but pre-existent matter. In this view, the matter self is not created by God. This view imposes a limit on the divine operation. In the biblical concept of creation, the Israelites regarded the world as owing not only its form but also its very being to God (Wood 1996:283).

At some point in the Persian religion, there existed a belief in a being evil by his nature, this being does not owe its origin to the creator of good but exists independently. The Israelites certainly came in contact with these influences but did not accept this belief, based on the biblical writings. The biblical writers view Satan and all the powers of evil as subordinate to God, in their present activities, and in their very being as fallen creatures (Wood 1996:283).

2.3.2. Zoroastrianism

Zoroastrianism is a Persian religion, which has evolved through many stages. The modern adherents are found in Bombay, India. Zoroastrianism arguably influenced the Israelites in the post-exilic period, in the area of demonology and eschatology (Ferguson et. al. 1998:735).

Zoroastrianism is a religion, which is arguably dualistic. Its good god is Ahura Mazda, who is opposed by the evil god, Angra Mainyu. The religion teaches the idea that Ahura Mazda created the world as a combat zone, in which it will overcome Angra Mainyu, and subsequently overcome evil. Human beings are at the center of this struggle and have to choose Ahura Mazda who is on the side of truth, instead of Angra Mainyu, who is on the side of the lie. The people must choose sides, and their destinies depended on the side they have chosen. Human beings making the right

choice will result in the eventual triumph of Ahura Mazda (Ferguson et. al. 1998:735).

The focus of the Zoroastrian universe is on three major events, the creation, the revelation, and the final transfiguration. The salvation of the world is their ultimate aim. The last days will be marked by suffering, which will usher in the savior. The savior will come in glory. The later Zoroastrian traditions claim that the savior will be born of a virgin, impregnated by Zoroaster's sperm, which is deposited in the lake and preserved miraculously. The final battle will be a great one between good and evil, ending in victory for the good. The last judgment will then take place, after the resurrection of the dead, whose bodies will be united with the spirit. Thereafter, the kingdom of Ahura Mazda will be ushered in on earth (Moreau 2000:1046).

There are certainly some aspects of these dualistic ideas that could be embraced. However, from the Chronicler's perspective, the post-exilic Judean community must challenge any form of dualism that compromises the understanding of Yahweh as the supreme power and authority over everything that exists (Moreau et. al. 2000:293).

2.3.3. Summary

The post-exilic Judeans experienced a multicultural environment both in the exile communities and in their restoring communities. They were influenced by many cultures and religions, which presented so many ideas that challenged the way Yahweh should be worshipped. Amidst their confused and difficult condition seemingly, the Chronicler wrote to help them understand Yahweh and how to worship him.

Amongst the prevalent ideas is the concept of dualism, of which Zoroastrianism is an archetypal example. Dualism was a system that proposes two original and independent principles in the universe, one good, and the other evil. This is similar to the Judean religion, which upholds God as the supreme creator and the created Satan. The Chronicler probably wrote to the post-exilic Judean community, to challenge any form of dualism that compromises the understanding of Yahweh as the supreme power and authority over everything that exists. It is assumed that Chronicles was written to help the restoring Judaic community understand Yahweh and know their identity in such a confusing, difficult, and multi-cultural environment.

2.4. The concept of Monolatry

The examination of the concept of monolatry might provide the dynamics of idolatry that plagued the Judean nation throughout its history. The current debate, however, gives the impression that Yahweh and monotheism merely resulted from the evolution of religious thought within the culture of Israel. Without question, the worship of other gods existed alongside the worship of Yahweh throughout the Old Testament, reaching its peak in many eras. One cannot also do justice to the examination of the early traditions of Israel if one denies the ancient monotheistic tendencies (Day 2001:46-47).

It is important to express the terminologies used in the discussions that involve the terms monotheism, monolatry, and polytheism. Monotheism is the belief that there is only one God, and all worship should be accorded to him only. Monolatry, on the other hand, is the worship of but one god, with the recognition of the existence of many gods. Polytheism tolerated the worship of many gods since no single god was thought to be in control of all the occurrences that are vital for human life (Tigay 1996:433).

To take a sensible approach to the understanding of ancient Israel's religious development, one may need to recognize that there were many simultaneous strains of religious thought in ancient Israel. The religious thought repeatedly swayed, running the gamut from monolatrous, to monotheistic, and to polytheistic. For example, Yahweh in many eras had Asherah as his consort (Zorn 1999:96).

During the monarchies, specifically in the course of the reign of King Rehoboam, Israel and Judah were separated, the religion of both nations did not differ much from the religious conceptions of their neighbors. Some of their kings may have tried to establish some kind of monolatry, sometimes with success, and other times without much success. In cases where Assyrian cultic symbols were abolished in the Jerusalem temple, Römer (2013:1) argues that it may simply reflect the demonstration of loss of power by the Assyrians on Palestine. He added that "the idea of centralization may simply reflect the situation of a quite truncated state of Judah in which Jerusalem remained the only important city and its temple the only remaining sanctuary."

In agreement with Zorn (1999:96), Römer (2013:1-2) sees clear biblical and extra-biblical evidence before Josianic reform, that Yahweh was associated with a goddess, Asherah. Römer further supposed that the title of the goddess may have been the Queen of Heaven. He, however, admitted that other goddesses like; Ishtar in Mesopotamia, Astarte, Anat, and Hera in Greek mythology, could also use the same title. To sustain his argument, Römer refers to the book of Jeremiah 44:18, where parts of the population of Judah, attributed the collapse of their city to the neglect by the Judeans, of the cult of the Queen of Heaven. According to Jeremiah 44:18, the Judeans that have fled to Egypt were complaining that they have lacked everything and were perishing by the sword and by famine because they were no longer pouring out libations to the Queen of heaven and performing incense offerings to her.

The reconstruction of popular religion in ancient Israel starts with a working definition. These include veneration of Asherah, as the mother goddess and/or consort of Yahweh, rituals connected with fertility, the making, and use of images, mostly female images, rites of passage, offerings for the dead, as part of funerary practices, security of the family patrimony, private prayer, bonding with others, especially among women, various feasts and festivals, veneration of popular saints, occasional child sacrifice and so on. These aspects of commonly accepted ancient Israelite religion were originally a legitimate part of Yahwism. However, these practices became anathema, at later stages of the Israelite religious development, under the prophets, the Deuteronomistic, and the Priestly reform movements. Thus, they have all disappeared in the literary tradition of the Old Testament in its present form (Dever 1995:53). Dever suggests that they may have been deliberately suppressed, except in few passages where redactors feared tampering too much with the scriptures.

Nonetheless, the ever-increasing body of archaeological data has helped to illuminate the Old Testament texts. Also by reading between the lines in the Old Testament, all these vital dimensions of ancient Israelite religion can be recovered (Dever 1995:53).

Archaeology, according to Dever, can supposedly contribute immensely to the discussion of ancient Israelite religion. It is the only source that yields data that are new, external, and seemingly unbiased. It allows us to get back there. Whereas

analysis of texts inevitably, falls back to historical explanations, which usually are attempts at chronological ordering, and most of the time unobtainable. Archaeology is more truly explanatory than the analysis of texts because it comes closer as it is genetic, evolutionary, and social in its orientation. Additionally, archaeology can help to restore a better balanced, proper emphasis on popular religion and the cult (Dever 1995:52-53).

Dever suggested that among critical biblical scholars, there is currently the consensus that ancient Israel was polytheists or at least monolatrous during the monarchy. There is also the consensus that monotheism was a product of the exile. Additionally, scholars agree that the radical reconstruction of Israelite religion was necessitated by the experience, under the Deuteronomistic, Priestly, and other established traditions. However, polytheism, or at best monolatry is the view that prevails as normative in the canonical literature (Dever 1995:49-50).

The only exception to the consensus is by Tigay (1986:41). Tigay adopted an archaeological approach in his study. He studied many Hebrew names of the ninth to the sixth century B.C., on graffiti, Hebrew Bible, and seals. He discovered that only 5.9 percent employ theophoric elements other than Yahweh. This led him to conclude that basically, only this little proportion of the Israelite population was polytheistic. The result, in other words, is that after the monarchy, or perhaps even earlier, many Israelites did not worship gods other than Yahweh. Tigay's interpretation according to Dever (1995:49-50), can be thought to have ignored the popular view by many scholars, which points out that Yahwism in Israel most probably included other deities.

Dever (1995:50) argues that nearly all the works he reviewed challenged older conceptions of Yahwistic monotheism. The argument is based on the acknowledgment of the fact that the recent 'Yahweh and his *asherah*' inscription from Khirbet el-Qôm and Kuntillet Ajrûd are Israelite-Judean shrines of about the eighth century B.C. Tigay's view is that these sites are too far out into the Sinai desert to be tagged Israelite sites. He also contended that Ajrûd was frequented by other nations in addition to Israelites. However, these arguments do not allow one to avoid the clear implications of the inscriptions. Scientists have used neutron activation analysis to show that some of the pottery comes from both the Samaria district and the South, precisely Israel, and Judah. The clear implications of the

extra-biblical inscriptions, where Yahweh and Asherah are mentioned in the same phrase, therefore, attest that the ancient Israelite religion was anything but monotheistic.

Monotheism presumably, arose in Israel as one aspect of its religious development. The two extremes in the study of Israel's religious development are the view that ancient Israel's worship of other gods was rare, and on the other hand, the view that absolute monotheism was only achieved during the middle ages. Day (2001:46), however, argues "instead of that there was a monolatrous party already in the pre-exilic period and that absolute monotheism was first expressed by Deutero-Isaiah in the exile and became fully operative in the post-exilic period." This does not mean, according to Day that the influence of Canaanite deities was extinguished since the effect can still be discerned in the imagery of apocalyptic material (Day 2001:46).

Dever attributes the creation of the Hebrew Bible and monotheism as direct results of the theological crises of the exile and the chauvinistic subjugation of the Asherah cult. Dever argues that only archaeology can redress the bias created by the suppression of folk religion by the book religion. Dever notes that whereas the book religion is biased towards male-dominated authorship and subsequent study, the folk religion, through archaeological discoveries reveals the long-lost goddess, which could give women, back their distinctive long-lost voice. However, Dever seems to have created an unseemly contrast between folk religion and book religion. He attributed all cult-related archaeological data as evidence of normative folk religion, but all ancient texts as revisionists book religion (Baker 2008:71).

The implications are that archaeological and textual data are classified only based on type, without analyzing their reliability and their range of interpretive possibilities. This approach assumes that textual evidence is revisionist propaganda, whereas archaeological evidence and its subsequent interpretations are complete and unbiased. It does seem, therefore, that Dever degrades the importance of primary textual sources, but exaggeratedly emphasized the importance of archaeological evidence (Baker 2008:71-72).

Despite the fact, that archaeology does affirm that at different eras in its history, ancient Israel largely failed to be monolatrous or monotheistic, this is, however, in line with the biblical text. Therefore, Israel had a polytheistic history, but not in the

sense of it embracing polytheism at one stage in its religious evolution. The history of Israel's failures should then not be confused with the history of monotheism (Baker 2008:71-72).

Yahweh does appear in a class of his own in the Pentateuch, yet the texts do not deny the existence of other gods. It can be argued that exclusive Judean monotheism did not develop during the late monarchical period. Rather, in the Old Testament, the Judean religion consistently contrasts Yahweh and other gods (Hardin 2010:449).

In the Second Temple period, the literature of the period reveals the frequent use of the phrase 'the most high God'. This phrase denoted an acknowledgment of monolatry, which is the belief that Yahweh was supreme and transcendent over all other gods. It does not mean that Yahweh was simply the chief of many other gods (Hardin 2010:449).

In Deuteronomy 4:35-39, the Israelites were reminded of the reason that Yahweh was shown to them, and nations were driven out for them. This is so that they will know that Yahweh is God and there is no other God. It appears the Israelites understood this reminder simply as a theological statement that denies the existence of other gods. For the Israelites practically, it is more of a behavioral command ruling out relationships with any other beings and objects that can be seen as gods. This prohibition of the worship of all but one deity was unique in the religious history of Israel. Polytheism tolerated the worship of many gods since no single god was thought to be in control of all the occurrences that are vital for human life. From the perspective of polytheism, the gods themselves were thought to be tolerant of this pluralism and several gods could be worshiped in one sanctuary. The Old Testament demand for monolatry was unswervingly based on the argument that the worship of other gods would be unjustified and pointless. This is because Yahweh alone set Israel free and only he provides all her needs (Tigay 1996:64).

Furthermore, the 'have' in the phrase you shall have no other gods, means to be in a relationship with. This can be understood as the same idiom that is used for establishing marriage relationships. In the Old Testament, it is a fundamental idiom for the establishment of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. As in Exod 6:7 (NKJV): "I will take you as My people, and I will be your God." Also in Leviticus 26:12

“I will walk among you and be your God, and you shall be My people.” In practical terms, the commandment means that Israel may not have any relationship with other gods; including building altars, sanctuaries, making offerings, consult, take oaths in their names, or even mention their names. The transliterations for the Hebrew term for other gods (el and Elohim) can be used for angels, spirits, idols, pagan deities, and Yahweh himself. However, all but the worship of Yahweh is prohibited (Tigay 1996:64).

The question is, why then are these beings referred to as gods? Several Old Testament passages, like Deuteronomy 4:35, 39, have stated that there is no other god but Yahweh. It could be suggested that the passages that refer to them as gods, merely adopted the terminology of those who worshiped them to be understood by them. Moreover, it can also be noted that traditional language is slow to change even after it had become theologically obsolete. For example, Exodus 15:11 asks the question, “who is like You, O Lord, among the gods?” which seems to remain one of the Judean liturgies to this day (Tigay 1996:64).

According to Tigay, many critical scholars believe that the Pentateuch only taught monolatry and not monotheism. Also since historical books such as Judges, Kings, and Chronicles state that the Israelites continued to worship other gods throughout their history. It was simple for scholars to conclude that the requirement of monotheism was not widely accepted in Israel, until after the exile. Therefore, the widely accepted view is that the concept of monotheism originated long after Moses when it was emphasized by the Pentateuch and the prophets (Tigay 1996:433).

The narratives in the book of Exodus accounted for the exit of the Israelites out of Egypt, led by Moses. Soon they settled down in peaceful relationships with their neighbors. They began to have commercial and diplomatic relationships with their neighbors. The mass of the Israelites was attracted by the Baal worship, Ashtoreth, and the cults of these neighboring tribes (Judges 2:13, 3:7, 8:33, 10:10, 1 Samuel 8:8, 12:10, Hosea 2:17).

It was inevitable that the Israelites should render some degree of reverence and worship to the gods of their neighbors. King Ahab was the first king, who tried to set up the worship of Baal, alongside the worship of Yahweh. Elijah’s stance gave a death blow to the worship of Baal and vindicated the sole worship of Yahweh. The

context between the Baal prophets and Elijah (1 Kings 18), transformed what had been a natural monolatry, into a conscious and moral adherence to Yahweh alone by the Israelites (Rees 1915:1255).

This widely accepted view was challenged by the Israeli biblical scholar Yehezkel Kaufmann and the American archaeologist W.F. Albright. These scholars argued respectively, from the Bible and archaeological evidence, that most Israelites were monotheistic ever since the time of Moses. Most of the Israelites accused of worshipping other gods seemed to have worshipped only images, as they did not believe in living powers behind the images as authentic pagans did. In other words, they did not view the images as possessing divine powers, and that the gods were the images and nothing more. They viewed other gods, other than Yahweh as nonentities. This seems clear from the actions of some of their reforming kings. They only purged the land of the images and did not argue against any beings that the images could have represented. Some that worshipped other supernatural beings thought, that Yahweh himself required them to honor his subordinates (Tigay 1996:433).

The number of Israelites who worshipped statues and supernatural beings does not appear to be large from biblical evidence. However, these incidents were regarded to have disastrous consequences for Israel. This is not due to the prevalence of the sin, but the gravity of the sin and the biblical doctrine of collective responsibility, which holds the entire nation responsible for the sin of a small number of its population. Archaeological evidence of polytheism is also scant. No representations of male deities have been found in Israel and most of the female figurines, found in Israeli sites, only represent humans, not goddesses. The Israelite inscriptions with religious content, rarely mention other gods. Most Israelites ignored the gods of other nations, and gods of natural phenomena, which goes to show that they do not consider them to be divine or independently effective. Therefore, so far as evidence goes, most Israelites from the time of Moses seem to have regarded Yahweh as the only independently effective divine power (Tigay 1996:433).

The belief in Yahweh as the only independent divine power is monotheistic. Also, the continued use of the word for gods (Elim and Elohim), by biblical Hebrew to refer to other supernatural beings, reduces all other supernatural beings to the level of angels, spirits, and the like. Since their existence was not denied, monotheism

cannot be used in the etymological sense, but in the practical sense, just described. The Israelite monotheism was, therefore, practical and implicit, rather than intellectual and explicit. They thought, felt, and acted like monotheists (Tigay 1996:433).

Many biblical passages indicate that monotheistic belief made the use of the same generic term for both Yahweh and other lesser beings inappropriate. Some texts which used these terms for idols pointed out that they were not gods, but objects. King Hezekiah in 2 Kings 19:17-18, refers to them as man's handiwork of wood and stone and not gods. The gods of the peoples were called mere idols in Psalm 96:4-5. Some early Israelite poems, as well as Deuteronomy 4:35 and 39, deem it inappropriate to use words meaning gods for beings other than Yahweh. However, the usage was not abandoned, based on the weight of linguistic tradition, not even by the Old Testament. The passages that deny that there are no other gods but Yahweh, simply deny the divinity of lesser supernatural beings. These passages began to multiply in the sixth century B.C. The need for the emphasis on monotheism in this period was due to the increased exposure of the Israelites to the Assyrians and Babylonians. The Israelites were conquered by these nations, who attributed the victories to their gods. Therefore, the formulation of the monotheistic idea in this period received more emphasis on what had been implicit in Israel since the time of Moses (Tigay 1996:434-435).

In polytheistic religions, found around the Persian Empire, different divine figures assume different aspects of life and functions. The exclusivity claim given to Yahweh in Israel during this period gives rise to the question of how the roles that were traditionally attributed to the different goddesses were managed. The solution can be found in Isaiah 40-45, where there is a tendency to transfer all of these aspects and functions to Yahweh alone. Also, the different groups that edited the Pentateuch and the prophetic books during the Persian era were inimical to the idea of a divine couple (Römer 2013:2-3).

Concerning the question of the existence of misfortune and evil, polytheistic systems, do not have a problem, as there are always malevolent gods that are responsible for bad things that affect human beings. The problem is how to explain these misfortunes in a monotheistic system. In the biblical version of the flood story, Yahweh had to play both parts, He is the one that decides to destroy the world, and

at the same time, he is the one who alerts Noah, so that mankind and animals will survive. Isaiah 45:7-8, also affirms Yahweh as the only God, and no other, he is the one that forms a light, as well as darkness, he makes peace and creates evil, he does all things (Römer 2013:3-4).

According to Römer (2013:4-5), “a strategy to maintain chaos or evil outside of Yahweh, is the invention of the figure of Satan.” Römer believes the figure of Satan was inserted in the prologue of the book of Job, and not part of the original story.¹⁹ In this view, the encounter between Yahweh and Satan is considered an insertion into the original context, by a later redactor. Römer further explains that Job 1:16 provides the idea that the calamities that befell Job, were sent by God and not Satan. Also, Job’s answer that one must accept both good and evil from God, affirms the idea that everything comes from Yahweh. The same idea holds for David’s narrative in 2 Samuel 24, rewritten in 1 Chronicles 21.

Römer (2013:4-5) in agreement with Knoppers (2004:751) emphasizes that the Chronicler sees the story presented in Samuel as untenable, for which reason, he changed his version of the story, by introducing Satan as the one who replaces Yahweh in manipulating David to undertake census. Therefore, for the Chronicler, Satan is the one responsible for the evil that happened to David, and not Yahweh. This notion can be directly linked to the theology of the book of Chronicles, which I will elaborate on later when I address the theology in the book.

¹⁹ Scholars seem to take three basic approaches in accounting for this major issue concerning the literary unity of the book of Job. The book’s complexity and diversity give rise to these different approaches. Römer’s view as mentioned above, is that the prologue was the work of a later redactor. According to Hartley (1988:20), Irwin (Peake’s Commentary on the Bible, Black, M. & Rowley, H., 1962, p. 391. 3., Nelson, Lon.) is of the opinion that the book is a collection of independent sections, written by different authors. Also, that other scholars like Fohrer (1963:29), is of the opinion that the prologue in the book of Job is a later addition to the book of Job.

Dell (1991:197) is of the opinion that neither the prologue nor the epilogue can be assigned to the main author of Job.

On the other hand, Snaith (1968:8) and Gordis (1978:100-103) opinion is that the book is primarily the product of a single author, who continued to work on his masterpiece over a lifetime. Pinker (No date:27) is of the opinion that the author of the book of Job appropriated the core story, by making changes in the core story to fit his theological dialogue.

Gray (2010:60) view the book of Job as the product of a poet with original genius and one that is well versed in the Israeli native literature and probably also in the Ancient Near East literature. In addition, he was a philosopher who did not just present preconceived conclusion but experimental and creative thought. Based on these reasons, Gray suggests that one must seriously modify any view of such passages as emanating from a secondary author.

2.4.1. Summary

The investigation of the concept of monolatry reveals the dynamics of idolatry which seemed to have plagued the nation of Israel over her history. Within the early traditions of Israel, there existed monotheistic tendencies. However, based on the canonical literature of the Old Testament and archaeological discoveries, the nation of Israel has been mostly polytheistic.

Over her history, the religious thought of Israel swayed from monolatry to monotheism and polytheism. The promotion of monotheism happened under the Deuteronomistic, and Priestly schools of thought. However, the prevalent view in the Old Testament canonical literature is polytheism. Many of the Jews worshipped Yahweh, as well as other gods. Many other Jews worshipped only Yahweh, while at the same time acknowledged the existence of other gods. The experience of the exilic period necessitated radical reconstruction towards monotheism. The increased exposure of the Israelites to the Assyrians and Babylonians provided the need for the emphasis on monotheism in this period.

2.5. The development of the images of Satan within Israel

The concept of Satan is understood to have transformed across the different epochs in Israel. According to Woods (1996:1064), the Hebrew term Satan is assumed to be the prince of evil. It means adversary, so portrayed in Numbers 22:22. The Hebrew Bible does not seem to have a fully, developed doctrine of Satan, but references to his activities. Satan was seen presenting himself before God, among the sons of God (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) in the first two chapters of Job.

The search in this section, for the development of the images of Satan within Israel, will be conducted according to the different known epochs in the history of Israel, Namely: The pre-exilic, the post-exilic, and New Testament periods.

2.5.1 The Pre-Exilic Period

Hartley (1988:29), suggests that in the prologue to the book of Job, which is considered a pre-exilic book, the term Satan functions as a title, rather than a proper name. The name seems to have supposedly become proper in the post-exilic writings, like the books of Chronicles and Zechariah.

According to Pagels (1991:105-106), the figure of Satan is barely present in the pre-exilic Judean sources and traditional Judaism to this day. These allusions by Pagels, are seemingly in direct contrast to how modern Christianity knew Satan, as the leader of an army of hostile spirits that take pleasure in opposing God and destroying human beings.

Pagels (1991:106) argues that the existence of malevolent supernatural beings was taken for granted by many strands of earlier Hebrew sources. Instead, they depicted the gods or the gods of other nations as hostile to God and his people. These gods and the gods of other nations were later identified in certain rabbinic and Christian sources as belonging to the kingdom of Satan and his fallen angels.

The Hebrew name שָׂטָן, (transliterated as Satan) bears its root 'to obstruct or to oppose.' Some of the biblical passages that describe the activities of Satan characterizes him as acting as an adversary on one hand, and on the other hand, inciting people or even God himself to harmful actions (Pagels 1991:106).

Ferguson, et, al (1998:196), also agree that Satan has its origins in the Hebrew notion of an adversary. He further explains that the adversary could be understood in three different ways. Firstly, the notion as in people opposing each other. This can be understood in the example of David's speech, in 2 Samuel 19:22. The speech was as a result of the encounter David had in the narrative of 2 Samuel 16:5-14. In the narrative, a man, who came out of the family of the house of Saul, whose name was Shimei the son of Gera, cursed David while he was running away from Jerusalem because David's son Absalom revolted against him. Thereafter, in chapter 19, when King David returned to Jerusalem, Shimei asked for his forgiveness, and he decided to show mercy to him. But, Abishai the son of Zeruah requested that Shimei be put to death for cursing David. Therefore, David in his response to Abishai's request portrayed Abishai as an adversary, for inciting him to put another to death on a day that he returned to Jerusalem, as king over Israel.

Secondly, is the notion as can be seen in God using someone to oppose another. An example can be found in 1 Kings 11:14, where God stirred up Hadad the Edomite, as an adversary against King Solomon. Lastly, is the notion as can be seen in Numbers 22:22, where God sent a supernatural agent in his anger against Balaam.

In the narrative, the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against Balaam (Ferguson, et, al. 1998:196).

In the Hebrew language, the term Satan is used as a verb or noun. When used as a verb, it means to act as an adversary, accuser, or to act in a hostile manner (Gen 27:41, 49:23, 50:15). A person may act in such a manner towards Yahweh or other humans, as in 1 Samuel 29:4, 1 Kings 5:4, 11:14,23,25, Psalm 71:13, 109:4, 6, 20 (Cathey 2003:419).

Cathey (2003:419), understands Satan as a finite being, who opposes Yahweh and seeks to lead humans into rebellion. His purpose is to frustrate Yahweh's plans. Seldom, is the name mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, particularly in the pre-exilic books. The most extensive discussion about Satan is found in Job 1:1, where he appears as an agent of God. However, his purpose in that context seems to be the testing of human beings. In Job's story, he comes with the sons of God, as a member of the heavenly council. He questions the faith of the righteous Job. In the narrative, God grants Satan certain powers; in other words, he attacked Job with God's permission.

Most Judean writers imagined such a supernatural emissary as a messenger of God. Job himself pictures Satan as an angelic member of God's council, to whom God assigned the task of afflicting him, to test the limit of his faithfulness to God. In other words, Job pictured Satan as a sort of divine prosecuting attorney. Hence, in the pre-exilic Hebrew sources, Satan never acts independently, but remains one of God's angels, acting as God's agent and serving God's purposes (Pagels 1991:106-107).

Page (2007:449-451) is of the view, that there is abundant evidence that the pre-exilic biblical authors understood that Satan was subject to God and used by God to accomplish His purposes. This is in contrast to the understanding that Satan is simply the archenemy of God, who opposes the will of God and seeks to lead people into sin. Page recognizes that while the pre-exilic biblical authors characterize Satan as God's adversary, they also represent him as God's servant. Using passages of Job (1:6-12; and 2:1-6) as an example, Page demonstrates how Satan is unequivocally in subordination to Yahweh. He is much more than an adversary in these passages, in that he presented himself to Yahweh and made his request, after God, Himself initiated the conversation concerning Job. In Job 1:10, Satan concedes

that Yahweh put a fence around Job and his possessions, and he is unable to breach the protective wall. The implication is that Satan is not able to act independently against Job. It is obvious in these passages that the power Satan exercises is given to him by Yahweh, and Satan was bound to respect the limitations imposed on him by Yahweh. The disasters that befall Job were attributed to both Yahweh and Satan. Job himself believes that his misfortunes proceeded from Yahweh. Thus, in Job 2:5, he speaks of receiving both good and bad from the hand of God.

Nonetheless, there is a clear difference between Yahweh's motive in the narrative and that of Satan concerning their participation in Job's suffering. Yahweh affirms confidence in Job's integrity (Job 1:8; 2:3) and seemingly wants Job to pass the test he undergoes. One would not have expected Yahweh to desire that Job curse Him in the face. Contrariwise, Satan vies that Yahweh's confidence in Job is misplaced and wants Job to fail the tests he subjects him. If Yahweh did not place any limitations on the way Satan can afflict Job, he might go to any lengths to get Job to curse God. Satan's motive can be called into question here. Yahweh insists that Satan incited Him against Job for no reason, not only did he bring accusations against Job, he slandered Job intending to cause him harm (Page 2007:452).

2.5.2. The Post-Exilic Period

It was not until the post-exilic period that the Satanic being is pictured as an evil figure. Satan appears as a tempter in 1 Chronicles 21:1. The story of 1 Chronicles 21:1 seems to reiterate the story of 2 Samuel 24:1. However, in 2 Samuel 24:1, Yahweh was the one that moved David against Israel, while in 1 Chronicles 21:1, Satan moved David against Israel. The name was then used for the first time as a proper name. There is no clear developed doctrine of Satan in the Hebrew Bible, but the origin of the later developments of the concept(s) can be traced back to the Hebrew Bible (Elwell & Beitzel 1988:1907).

Römer (2013:4-5) and Knoppers (2004:751) emphasize that in the post-exilic book of Chronicles and Zachariah, the concept of Satan suddenly changed. The Chronicler changed his version of the story, by introducing Satan as the one who replaces Yahweh in manipulating David to undertake census. As a result, Satan is the one responsible for the evil that happened to David and not Yahweh. In Zechariah, Satan

stands at the right hand of the high priest to accuse him. However, there is nothing in the context to indicate that this being was evil, rather, he is called Satan or the accuser.

Pagels notes two dissimilar arguments concerning the development of the concept of Satan. First, by the German scholar Knut Schäferdiek, who believes that it was the followers of Jesus who suddenly turned this rather unpleasant angel into a far grander and far more malevolent figure. On the other hand, are scholars who in Pagels's view are more familiar than Schäferdiek with Judean literature. Pagels's understanding is that the view of Satan as a malevolent figure, did not suddenly develop with Christians, rather the writings on angelology and demonologies began to proliferate among the various Judean groups during the middle of the second century B.C., though such imagery did not appear in all Judean literature, but specifically in what the Judeans regarded as apocryphal or sectarian literature (Pagels 1991:106-107).

Donnelly (2017:325) describes the apocryphal literature as Judean literature that was of cynical genuineness but widely circulated as being factual. The works of Apocrypha were usually of doubtful origin. These texts are included in the Latin Vulgate and Septuagint, but not in the canon of the Hebrew Bible. The Apocryphal literature not only expresses the popular religiousness of the time in which they were written but also shaped and predisposed the religiousness of later epochs. This is particularly so, with the characterization of Satan, whose appearance is limited in the Hebrew Bible. He makes every effort to tempt human beings so that they end up in Hell. Satan is believed to have possessed all humans, before Christ. But after Christ frees the just, he holds right only to the sinners and infidels (Donnelly 2017:325, 329).

Contrary to Donnelly's understanding of the apocryphal literature, Lim (2013:13) writes that the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran provided a better understanding of the formation of the Hebrew Canon. The Qumran library was diverse in content. These scrolls belonged to the sectarian communities and they are linked by most scholars with the Essenes. One-quarter of the scrolls were biblical texts, while the remaining consists of apocryphal, pseudepigraphic, and other unknown works.

These so called-biblical texts are then what is regarded as the Old Testament canon.²⁰ Lim cites Jerome's notes, which states that the books that are not included in this canon are placed among the apocryphal writings (e.g. the Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Ben-Sira, Judith, Tobit, Shepherd, and 1 and 2 Maccabees). This does not imply that the Qumran community considered the apocryphal and other non-canonical books in their library as extra-biblical. These are only labels used as formal descriptors for these books (Lim 2013:41, 121).²¹

According to Pagels (1991:108), the image of Satan developed at the time it did among a specific group of Jews, who were involved in struggling not only among other nations but also against other Jews, who were the dominant majority. However, she is not in any way suggesting any uniformity among these groups of Jews; rather in her view, they were fractious and diverse, ranging from various groups of Essenes, the apocalyptic groups,²² and Hellenistic Jews. The common

²⁰ The Old Testament canon are the canonical books accepted as authoritative for religious practice and whose authority is binding upon the Jewish people for all generations (Lim 2013:5).

²¹ The long list to Jewish literatures is provided in the appendices of the standard critical edition of the New Testament. This list differentiates between those books belonging to the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament and the Old Testament apocryphal or pseudepigraphic texts (Lim 2013:168).

²² According to Collins (1997:1), apocalypse is a noun, and the related adjective is apocalyptic, which suggest a cataclysm of extra-terrestrial proportions. The core Greek word apocalypses mean uncovering or revelation.

The apocalyptic imagination is usually mistakenly limited by modern scholars to the marginalised groups of Jewish nationalists and Christian triumphalist, who were resident in Israel during the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The imagination actually operates continuously within the broader religious framework within the wider Ancient near East. Historically, the era is identified as marking the transition between late antiquities to early medieval era. During the 7th century and beyond, many of the so-called dissidents: Jewish, Christians and dualist purposefully scripted a series of interconnected things pertaining to "natural disasters, military campaigns, historical crises, and oracular utterances". Their writings are narratives linked together in a series, and the contents display episodes and characters allegedly signalling the triumph of their respective religious and political interests, amidst the final days of the present earthly order. The apocalyptic mode of thought has its grounding and authority beyond the natural world. The notion promotes the unveiling of something that is previously unknown, to the mind of the percipient, that which cannot be generated by normal means of research. Therefore, the verbal expression of such thought is based on revelation. Their communicated knowledge is esoteric. Gnosis is arguably viewed as a category of Near Eastern apocalyptic writing, as it reveals information pertaining to cosmology, uranography, angelology, and eschatology. The critical criterion is the knowledge that permits the evaluation of larger forces at work within the contemporary social order. Therefore, apocalyptic cannot simply be equated to the knowledge of the last days, or the eschaton (Reeves 2005:1-3).

Collins (1997:1) attributes the catastrophic connotation of the word as coming from its use in the last book of the New Testament, the Apocalypse, or Revelation of St John.

It is widely believed that the origin of the Qumran community is of the Essenes, who were regarded as the offshoot of the Hasidim of the Maccabean era. The books of Enoch and Daniel and other related writings, figure conspicuously in the body of the Dead Sea Scrolls. These writings influenced the ideology of the Dead Sea Sect and were among the sources from which the sectarians drew. The apocalypses were believed to have been produced by the sectarian movement (Collins 1997:26).

unification among them is that in their various ways they were regarded by the Jerusalem Temple going Jews as dissidents. The reason they were regarded as dissidents Jews in Pagels's view, is that these first-century Jews sought to develop the principles of authority, the notion of community, sources of revelation, and modes of access to divinity apart from the Jerusalem Temple, the priests, its traditions, and cult.

Hacham (2005:5-6) explains some of the ways of these so-called dissident groups. The Qumran sect viewed the Temple in Jerusalem as a place of sin and pollution, therefore, forbade participation in the various rituals conducted there. On the other hand, the Hellenistic literature according to Hacham perceived the Jerusalem Temple as a holy and eminent place honored even by the Gentile Kings. Hacham understands that both the Scrolls from Qumran and Judean Hellenistic literature has the perspective that seeks to reduce the importance and centrality of the Jerusalem Temple. However, this perspective derives from different reasons for the two groups. For the Qumran sect, they see the council of the community as a house of holiness, a temple, and the Aaronites who are also members of the council as the holy of holies, in addition to their already ill-perceived view of the Jerusalem Temple and the cult. The Qumran sect atones for the land sacrifice a sweet savor just as was done in the Jerusalem Temple. Similarly, about the Hellenistic Jews, Hacham states that in several works by these Jews in the diaspora, there are expressions of concern with their physical distance from the Temple and the advancement of solutions to the problem.

The Qumran dissidents often denounce their Judean opponents and label them apostates, as well as accusing them of been seduced by the power of evil, which they called by many names, among which is Satan and prince of darkness (Pagels 1991:108).

The texts and aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls gave substance to the understanding that the Dead Sea sect was an apocalyptic community. The key element of the fundamental cognitive orientation of the Dead Sea community is that the world is divided between belligerent forces of good and evil. This division is presumed to be

Persian influence was widely assumed among some of the dissident Jews, especially in their literature. It is likely that Zoroastrianism, the Persian dualistic religion stimulated Judean interest in angels, as the religion was full of prominence of arbitrator beings (Collins 1997:132).

described in terms of the Zoroastrian antagonism of light and darkness, with prominence on the doctrine that all events have been predetermined by God, particularly with the eventual fate of the individual soul, as well as the role of the angelic forces (Collins 1997:150).

The first Judean texts to engage in far-reaching conjecture about the heavenly world and the angels were the apocalypses. The priestly character of the Qumran community seems to hypothesize the immediate kind of experience of the angelic world, which possesses cultic character. They believe that after death, those that are righteous would become companions to the angels. The members of the community claim that they already have this experience of companionship with angels in their present life and are not disconcerted about the afterlife (Collins 1997:169).

Collins (1997:30) narrates the mythic account of the origin of evil on earth through the agency of the fallen angels. Collins thinks this understanding is at the root of the apocalyptic tradition and is exemplified in the books of Enoch, principally in one of the oldest books of Enoch, the Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36).

Pagels (1991:105-106) writes that images of such spirits started to develop and proliferate in late antique Judean sources, from 165 B.C to 100 CE. These late antique Judean sources are specifically from the post-exilic and New Testament literature and were from the works of the so-called dissident Jews, which includes the followers of Jesus Christ. As a result, the figure of Satan and his demons became central to the teaching of Christianity.

Pagels (1991:108-109, 112), notes that the figure of Satan was not found in the literature of those who continued to maintain the traditional identification of Israel versus the nations. But for the first time, among the sources in the post-exilic biblical literature, the accounts of 1 Chr 21:1-7 and Zech 3:1-9, respectively depict Satan as deviating from his role as God's agent to become God's enemy, as well as articulate a specific situation of the intra-Judean conflict. This can be illustrated by the narrative of 1 Chr 21:1-7, which differs from the story of Balaam and Job, in the narrative Satan is in effect, in opposition with God. In contrast, the story of Balaam and Job depicts Satan as God's agent. The book of Zachariah (Zech 3:1-9), on the other hand, depicts Satan as a spokesman for the destructive elements among the people. Those that the prophet regarded as destructive were probably descendants

of Jews who remained in Jerusalem or those that returned much earlier than the Jews who were exiled into Babylon. Many of the Jews that returned from Babylon were educated, influential, and also came back under the support of King Cyrus to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem and the Temple. These Jews intended to establish the worship of Yahweh alone and themselves as priests and the ruling class of the people. They were met with bitter resistance by the ones they regarded as destructive. The so-called destructive Jews were adherents to the syncretic cult of Yahweh, that is, they were polytheistic, and saw the Jews that returned from Babylon as agents of a foreign King and a dominant group. Zachariah, who was regarded as a voice to the Jews that returned from Babylon, narrated a story in Zech 3:1-2 that casts Satan as a spokesman for these so-called destructive Jews, who opposed the priests and his group.

The account of Zachariah 3:1-3, further shows the new concept of Satan in the post-exilic period. In the account, Yahweh intended to show mercy to Joshua and restore the priesthood, while on the other hand, Satan was there arguing for his guilt and punishment. Yet again, the will of Yahweh emerges triumphant, demonstrating that even though their will may differ, Satan is at the end subject to Yahweh's control (Page 2007:453-454).

Page suggests that the Chronicler may have thought along similar lines like the pre-exilic writers, viewing Satan as a servant of God. This view, he attributed to the Chronicler's familiarity with Job. Page finds support to this view, in the narrative of 2 Chr. 18:21, where the Chronicler depicts Yahweh permitting the lying spirit to deceive King Ahab. Based on the account of this passage, Page considers that the Chronicler believes that Satan was acting as a servant of God when he enticed David to conduct the census (Page 2007:455-456).

According to Pagels (1991:113-114), during the first and second centuries BCE, some Judean storytellers began to ask the obvious question: 'How could one of God's angels stray?' The search for answers to this question resulted in different stories. One such story departs from the book of Isaiah (14:12-14) and suggests that Satan was one of God's angels, highly placed in the divine hierarchy, but proved insubordinate, rebelled against God, and was cast out of heaven. All the same, what is central to the variant stories is that Satan is an intimate enemy.

2.5.3. The New Testament Period

Based on the understanding from the pre-exilic and post-exilic concept of Satan, he appears in the Hebrew Bible chiefly as opposed to God. He is conceived as opposing God's plan and consequently God's people. He is regarded as a powerful spiritual figure. Nevertheless, he is a created being, who is ultimately subject to God. The Jews seem to have further developed the idea of Satan during the deutero-canonical or intertestamental period. This is the gap of time between the period covered by the Old Testament and the New Testament. Satan was then called Belial, Mastema, and Sammael. The Jews at this stage expressed differing concepts about Satan. The Satan of the Old Testament reappears in the roles of tempting people and accusing them before Yahweh. He was seen as the leader of the evil forces and attacker of Yahweh's people. Satan is identified with stories in the Old Testament which were originally devoid of his name. He caused the fall and he is a fallen creature himself (Elwell & Beitzel 1988:1907-1908).

Most of the information about Satan comes from the New Testament, which refers to the supremely evil being as Satan (Beelzebub) in Mathew 12:24-27. The New Testament uses many other expressions for Satan, such as the ruler of this world (Jn. 14:30) or the prince of the power of the air (Eph. 2:2). The New Testament depicts him as hostile to God and always working against God's purpose (Wood 1996:1064).

Even though Satan's appearance in the Hebrew Bible is limited. He was seen acting under God's authority in Job; he is simply named as the agent of evil acting against humans or through humans and appearing as a dragon. John also mentions that Satan was seen falling from heaven, he was cast unto the earth and his angels were thrown down with him (Donnelly 2017:325).

Urban (2017:91), recounts that Satan disobeyed God's command, which led to his fall. Therefore, Satan is considered a fallen angel. The impending arguments are only positioned around the reasons for the fall, which Urban postulated as both

through his refusal to worship the Son of God²³ and through the angelic rebellion he subsequently leads.

According to Urban (2017:92-93), Satan's disobedience to the Father's command is based on the understanding that the Son was just created. This is in contrast to that which is generally accepted in Christianity, that the Son created the angels. Thus, the Son is worthy of their reverence.

In Page's assessment, the New Testament has a more fully developed concept of Satan. His antagonism to God and his evil personality are more prominent and his role becomes well established as the head of the kingdom of evil (Page 2007:456-457).

After the baptism of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, the Spirit of God drove him into the wilderness to be tempted by Satan (the devil). Satan was, without a doubt, hoping that Jesus will succumb to his temptations. The writers of the Gospels, similar to the author of Job point out that Satan is subject to the will of God and is used by God to accomplish his will. Here again, one can see that God and Satan were involved in the temptation of Jesus, but with different motives. Satan was hoping Jesus will disobey God and swerve from his God-given task. God, on the other hand, desired that his Son will remain faithful. This account elucidates the indication of having both satanic temptation and divine testing in a given solitary experience. It further sustains the perception that God recurrently subjects his people to testing (Page 2007:457).

²³ In the Gospels, Jesus Christ of Nazareth was identified by God as his son, as one he loves, and as one with whom he is well pleased (Mark 1:11; Matt 3:17; Luke 3:22) before he was exposed to devil's temptation in the wilderness (Page 2007:456).

Collins (1997:72) states that the royal Davidic messiah "may also be referred to as the messiah of Israel, the Branch of David, the Prince of the Congregation, or even, although the matter is disputed, the Son of God. Hebrews 1:5 refers to Jesus Christ of Nazareth as the Son of God. The verse says for which of the angels did He say "You are My Son; Today I have begotten you"? Also 1 Corinthians 15:28 refers to Jesus Christ of Nazareth as the Son of God, when it states that all things will be subjected to Him. The Son of God therefore, refers to Jesus Christ of Nazareth, who is believed to have reincarnated as a human being in the New Testament. Urban is of the opinion that, God elicited Satan's rebellion by decreeing that the angels, which includes Satan, worship His Son, whose earlier state of existence has been the subject of important debates. The debate surrounding the earlier state of existence of the Son of God, is centered on the understanding of the word 'begot'. Understanding the word as created, give rise to the justification of Satan's defiance. However, According to Urban, Herbert J. C. Grierson demonstrates in a 1926 review of Saurat's book and then restates in Milton and Wordsworth (1937), that begot does not mean created but rather exalted. With this understanding, Satan's disobedience cannot be justified; rather he was only jealous of the Son of God. Urban 2017:91 contained in the journal (The Falls of Satan, Eve, and Adam in John Milton's Paradise Lost: A Study in Insincerity', Christianity & Literature, 67(1) 89-112.)

In as much as the Bible depicts Satan as a living being, whose schemes on humankind are mischievous and similarly an intimate enemy of God, he is not in any way equal with God nor does he act independently of God's control. The perception of Satan being under divine control seems to appear repeatedly in the biblical literature, regardless of the transformation in the development of the images of Satan across the different epochs in Israel (Page 2007:465).

2.5.4. Summary

The images of Satan seem to have transformed across the different periods in Israel's history. The Old Testament does not seem to have a fully developed doctrine of Satan but made references to his activities. During the pre-exilic period, he was simply understood as an adversary, for example in Numbers 22:22. During this period, the term did not function as a proper name, but only as a title. The name seems to have become proper in Judaic history during the post-exilic period. Many strands of pre-exilic sources took for granted the existence of such a malevolent being. Instead, they depicted the gods of other nations as the ones been hostile to God and his people. These gods were later identified in certain post-exilic and the New Testament sources as belonging to the kingdom of Satan and his fallen angels.

The concept of Satan as an adversary can be understood in three ways during the pre-exilic period of Israel's history. Firstly, the notion as in people opposing each other. Secondly, is the notion as can be seen in God using someone to oppose another. Lastly, is the notion where God sends a supernatural agent to stand in the way as an adversary against someone. A person may act as an adversary or act in a hostile manner towards God or other humans. Satan is understood in the pre-exilic period as a finite being, a messenger of God, who attacks people with God's permission.

The pre-exilic biblical authors understood that Satan was subject to God and used by God to accomplish His purposes. This is in contrast to the understanding that Satan is simply the archenemy of God, who opposes the will of God and seeks to lead people into sin. While the pre-exilic biblical authors characterize Satan as God's adversary, they also represent him as God's servant.

It was not until the post-exilic period that the Satanic being is pictured as an evil figure. Satan appears as a tempter in 1 Chronicles 21:1. In the post-exilic books of Chronicles and Zachariah, the concept of Satan suddenly changed.

The writings on angelology and demonologies began to proliferate among the various Judean groups during the middle of the second century B.C., though such imagery did not appear in all Judean literature, but specifically in what the Jews regarded as apocryphal or sectarian literature.

The image of Satan developed at the time it did among a specific group of Jews, who were involved in struggling not only among other nations but also against other Jews, who were the dominant majority. These groups of Jews were fractious and diverse, ranging from various groups of Essenes, the apocalyptic groups, and Hellenistic Jews. The common unification among them is that in their various ways they were regarded by the Jerusalem Temple going Jews as dissidents. These first-century Jews sought to develop the principles of authority, the notion of community, sources of revelation, and modes of access to divinity apart from the Jerusalem Temple, the priests, its traditions, and cult. The Qumran dissidents often denounce their Judean opponents and label them apostates, as well as accusing them of been seduced by the power of evil, which they called by many names, among which is Satan and prince of darkness.

The images of such spirits as Satan started to develop and proliferate in late antique Judean sources, from 165 B.C to 100 CE. These late antique Judean sources are specifically from the post-exilic and New Testament literature and were from the works of the so-called dissident Judeans, which includes the followers of Jesus Christ. As a result, the figure of Satan and his demons became central to the teaching of Christianity.

The figure of Satan was not found in the literature of those who continued to maintain the traditional identification of Israel versus the nations. But for the first time, among the sources in the post-exilic biblical literature, the accounts of 1 Chr 21:1-7 and Zech 3:1-9, respectively depict Satan as deviating from his role as God's agent to become God's enemy, as well as articulate a specific situation of the intra-Judean conflict.

The Chronicler may have possibly thought along similar lines like the writers in the pre-exilic period, viewing Satan as a servant of God. This view can be attributed to the Chronicler's familiarity with Job. The support of this view can be found in the narrative of 2 Chr. 18:21, where the Chronicler depicts Yahweh permitting the lying spirit to deceive King Ahab. Based on the account of this passage, the Chronicler believes that Satan was acting as a servant of God when he enticed David to conduct the census.

One of the pre-exilic stories, particularly from the book of Isaiah 14:12-14, suggests that Satan was one of God's angels, highly placed in the divine hierarchy, but proved insubordinate, rebelled against God, and was cast out of heaven. However, what is central to the variant stories in the pre-exilic era is that Satan is an intimate enemy.

Based on the understanding from the pre-exilic and post-exilic concept of Satan, he appears in the Hebrew Bible chiefly as opposed to God. He is conceived as opposing God's plan and consequently God's people. He is regarded as a powerful spiritual figure. Nevertheless, he is a created being, who is ultimately subject to God. The Jews seem to have further developed the idea of Satan during the deuterocanonical or intertestamental period. This is the gap of time between the period covered by the Old Testament and the New Testament. Satan was then called Belial, Mastema, and Sammael. The Jews at this stage expressed differing concepts about Satan. The Satan of the Old Testament reappears in the roles of tempting people and accusing them before Yahweh. He was seen as the leader of the evil forces and attacker of Yahweh's people. Satan is identified with stories in the Old Testament which were originally devoid of his name.

Most of the information about Satan comes from the New Testament, which refers to the supremely evil being as Satan (Beelzebub) in Mathew 12:24-27. The New Testament uses many other expressions for Satan, such as the ruler of this world (Jn. 14:30) or the prince of the power of the air (Eph. 2:2). The New Testament depicts him as hostile to God and always working against God's purpose.

The New Testament, particularly the apocalypse of John mentions that Satan was seen falling from heaven, he was cast unto the earth and his angels were thrown down with him. Satan is believed to have disobeyed God's command, which led to his fall. Therefore, Satan is considered a fallen angel. The fall was through his

refusal to worship the Son of God and through the angelic rebellion he subsequently leads. Satan's disobedience to the Father's command is based on the understanding that the Son was just created. This is in contrast to that which is generally accepted in Christianity, that the Son created the angels. Thus, the Son is worthy of their reverence.

The New Testament has a more fully developed concept of Satan. His antagonism to God and his evil personality are more prominent and his role becomes well established as the head of the kingdom of evil. The account of the temptation of Jesus Christ of Nazareth illuminates the indication of having both satanic temptation and divine testing in a given solitary experience.

In as much as the Old Testament depicts Satan as a living being, whose schemes on humankind are mischievous and similarly an intimate enemy of God, he is not in any way equal with God nor does he act independently of God's control. The perception of Satan being under divine control seems to appear repeatedly in the biblical literature, regardless of the transformation in the development of the images of Satan across the different epochs in Israel.

When reading about Satan/satan in 1 Chron 21 it is important to be aware of one's prior knowledge of what is written in the NT about him. One should be careful not to read anachronistic something into the texts that were not meant by the author of Chronicles.

2.6. The synthesis of Chapter 2

It was discovered in section one, that the book of Chronicles was most probably, written for the troubled restoring community during the transitional period in Israel's history. It was a time when the people of Judah that returned from exile were struggling to rebuild their city, inhabited by a multi-cultural population. The Chronicler can be seen as a historiographer, who rewrote history, displaying considerable freedom, in selecting and rearranging narratives from his source materials. The Chronicler sought to portray the theology and ideology, which was necessary to encourage the post-exilic community, who had recently left the other areas of the Persian Empire to return to Jerusalem. This he did, through retelling their history in a new way. While the exilic audience of the books of Samuel and Kings needed to hear about Israel's past sins, to understand their current situation; the post-exilic

audience of the book of Chronicles needed to be assured that Yahweh was still interested in them. They also needed a model to look up to, in David. The Chronicler looked past the sins of the past, to the root of the problem, which as he portrayed, was the forsaking of proper worship of Yahweh. He then used his writing to call their attention to seek Yahweh and to have a complete response and subsequent transformation in his worship. Therefore, what the Chronicler sought to achieve in his writing, was to encourage the restoring community, his post-exilic audience to find their identity in a multi-cultural environment, as God's people and heirs of the promises of David, by worshipping Yahweh in the temple of Jerusalem.

In the second section, it was discovered that the post-exilic Judahites experienced a multicultural environment both in exile and in their restoring communities. They were influenced by many cultures and religions, which presented so many ideas that, challenged the way Yahweh should be worshipped. Amongst the prevalent ideas is the concept of dualism, typified by Zoroastrianism. Dualism was a system that proposes two original and independent principles in the universe, one good and the other evil. Zoroastrianism, which is a form of dualism probably influenced the Israelites in the post-exilic period. The Chronicler seems to have utilized a concept (satan) that was known to them (because of the Persian influence) to alter the theology of Samuel. In Samuel it is Yahweh who is instigating David, which the Chronicler cannot align with his theology and image of God, therefore he falls back to a concept known to the people after exile – satan. The Chronicler probably wrote to the post-exilic Judean community, to challenge any form of dualism that compromises the understanding of Yahweh as the supreme power and authority over everything that exists. It is assumed that Chronicles was written to help the restoring Judean community understand Yahweh and know their identity in such a confusing, difficult, and multi-cultural environment.

In section three, the investigation of the concept of monolatry reveals the dynamics of idolatry that seemed to have plagued the nation of Israel over her history. Within the early traditions of Israel, there existed monotheistic tendencies. However, based on the canonical literature in the Old Testament and archaeological discoveries, the nation of Israel has been mostly polytheistic. Over her history, the religious thought of Israel swayed from monolatry to monotheism, and polytheism. The promotion of monotheism happened under the Deuteronomistic, and Priestly

schools of thought. However, the prevalent view in the canonical literature of the Hebrew Bible is polytheism. Many of the Israelites worshipped Yahweh, as well as other gods. Many other Israelites worshipped only Yahweh, while at the same time acknowledged the existence of other gods. The experience of the exilic period necessitated radical reconstruction towards monotheism. The increased exposure of the Israelites to the Assyrians and Babylonians provided the need for the emphasis on monotheism in this period.

The last section examined the development of the images of Satan in Israel and discovered that there was no well-defined doctrine according to the Hebrew Bible. In other words, the Hebrew Bible does not seem to have a fully developed doctrine of Satan but made references to his activities. Based on these references, Satan is thought to be among the heavenly hosts. Satan has its origins in the Old Testament notion of an adversary, which can be understood in three different ways. The first notion, as in people opposing each other, secondly, as in God using someone to oppose another, and finally, as in God sending a supernatural agent in his anger against humans. It was not until the post-exilic period that Satan is pictured as an evil figure. Satan appears as a tempter in 1 Chronicles 21:1. Satan appears in the Old Testament chiefly as the enemy of Yahweh. He is conceived as opposing Yahweh's plan and consequently His people. He is regarded as a powerful spiritual figure, and a created being, who is ultimately subject to Yahweh. The Jews seem to have further developed the idea of Satan during the deuterocanonical or intertestamental period. This is the gap of time between the period covered by the Old Testament and the New Testament. The New Testament depicts Satan as an evil being, who is hostile to Yahweh and always working against God's purpose. Satan is a finite being, who opposes Yahweh and seeks to lead humans into rebellion. His purpose is to frustrate Yahweh's plans. However, Yahweh grants Satan certain powers and he attacks humans with His permission, his purpose seems to be testing human beings and accusing them before Yahweh.

The purpose of this chapter, however, is to gain insight into the social-historical background of the book of Chronicles. It was, however, discovered that the book of Chronicles, together with the book of Zachariah is post-exilic literature written after the nation of Israel was exposed to and possibly influenced by Zoroastrianism. Also, the study in this chapter simultaneously, build towards the next chapter, so that

together, they will help towards the understanding of the Chronicler's theology and ideology. Subsequently, studying all these aspects I presume will help in discerning all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in the book of Chronicles.

Chapter 3: Diachronic reading of the book of Chronicles: Historical Criticism

3.1. Introduction

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2015:421) explains the term diachronic as a term that seems to be related to the way the book of Chronicles has developed over time. It is a term that is derived from Greek that denotes the study of texts as developed over a while, and it includes the search of the text's multiple editorial sources, the form criticism, and the redaction criticism (Browning, Diachronic, www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com).

Diachronic reading based on the above explanations can then be described as a method of biblical interpretation that is concerned with the relationship of the book of Chronicles' text to history, with a particular focus on 1 Chronicles 21. The purpose of this chapter is an attempt to trace the development of the book of Chronicles' literature through time. Therefore, it is a historical- and literary-critical study. It is a study that involves the investigation into the historical development of the text of Chronicles.

Habib (2005:9) expresses the meaning of the English word criticism as judge. The word derives from the Greek term *Krites*. Based on this expression, Habib suggests that perhaps the first type of criticism in the book of Chronicles was that which occurred in the process of compiling the materials contained in the book. The Chronicler would have made certain judgments about themes, and techniques to be used in his writing, what his audience will accept, and his relationship with his predecessors in the oral and literary tradition. Hence, Habib asserts that the creative act of finding and placing the materials together by the Chronicler is in itself critical.

Habib (2005:760) defines historicism as characterized by several concerns and features. These concerns and features allow the text of Chronicles not to be torn from history and analyzed in isolation, outside the historical development. Habib insists that the texts must be determined in their form and content by their specific historical circumstances, situations of time, and place. Hence, one cannot apply to the book of Chronicles the same assumptions and methods that apply to contemporary literature. It belongs to a different historical period and unrelated political, social, and economic circumstances that will overwhelmingly shape its

notion of truth, art, and society. As a result, Habib instructs that the book of Chronicles must be read within the broader context of culture, aesthetics, politics, religion, as well as economic context.

Geisler's (1999:86) explanation of criticism as applied to the book of Chronicles, allows critics to exercise some judgments. Geisler notes that the two forms of critical study scholars do engage in the book of Chronicles, are lower criticism and higher criticism. Lower criticism deals with the text of Chronicles, while higher criticism treats the source of the text. Whereas lower criticism seeks answers as per what the text says, higher criticism is concerned with the writer, time, place, and purpose of the book.

Black and Dockery (2001:508), in attempting to define historical criticism. They mention that historical criticism can at this point be defined as a means of attempting to draw intellectual conclusions on the many questions. The questions surround the tradition, textual, literary forms, and redaction criticism, of the book of Chronicles. This definition holds to the credibility of the text of the book of Chronicles, that one must recognize that the book has come to be, through the words of men in historical circumstances.

Black and Dockery (2001:509) refer to Harrisville and Sundberg (2001:508), to give quite a different account of historical criticism, as did Ladd. The difference in the definitions is in the credibility of the book of Chronicles. Though the two definitions, do agree that historical criticism is a necessary component of responsible theology. However, the latter one defines the term as a component to subject the putatively factual material and literary structure of the book of Chronicles to an independent investigation to test its truthfulness and to discern its original historical meaning.

According to this latter definition, the investigation is independent, and not to be predetermined by a guarantee of the book of Chronicles' infallibility. Put in another way, this definition assumes that the outcome of the research will not be subjected to any suppositions. The historical-critical method places this study under the imperative of the historical data and must seek the facts no matter where they lead.

In as much as every effort will be made in this section, not to be limited by any form of presuppositions, this historical-critical aspect might still be subjective to my presupposition that the text of the book of Chronicles is credible.

This chapter focuses on the higher criticism, while the focus of the next chapter will be on the lower criticism. The following objectives will be examined here: Tradition criticism; Text criticism; literary form criticism; and Redaction criticism. These examinations aim to critically, understand the history behind the text of the book of Chronicles. Invariably, the understanding of the history of the text will help, as mentioned in the introduction to chapter 2, to discern all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in 1 Chronicles 21, against the theological and ideological context of the book of Chronicles.

3.2. Tradition Criticism

3.2.1. Theoretical Framework

Glassie (1995:395) defines tradition as the creation of the future out of the past, and its understanding begins with the refining of tradition in conjunction with history and culture. Glassie asserts that history is not the past, but an artificial assembly of materials from the past, which is designed for usefulness in the future. Glassie (1995:396) notes that traditions die at some point, and another tradition replaces it, and this is described by the historian as the moment in which a superior replaces an inferior. In Glassie's view, historians need tradition because it would enable them to face the massive fact of continuity. This continuity he reiterates is not only in nonliterate society but also in progressive societies.

Glassie (1995:398-399) states that tradition and culture are alike, and both are understood to be created by human beings going through change. Also, both are created by individuals out of the experience, and the reason for their actions, entail change.

Mroczek (2008:92), advances the question of how second temple scribes allow themselves to rearrange, rework or rewrite the texts of ancient revelatory events, that were attributed to great mediatory figures like Moses and David. In search of an answer to this question, Mroczek proposes making a distinction between what would have been understood as a scriptural Mosaic or Davidic texts, and secondary rewritings and reworkings by later scribes.

Mroczek (2008:93-94) addresses the question of the relationship between the mediatory figures, the second temple scribes, and the developing text. Mroczek points out that the Mosiac legal traditions and tradition-psalm collections linked to David, underwent growth, change, and development. Mroczek inquires, how a text linked to an ancient figure, could remain fluid and tolerant of growth. In search of an answer to this question, Mroczek considers the role Moses and David played as lawgiver and the psalmist. He argued that the production of these texts can be understood by thinking of these ideal figures as ideal, divinely inspired scribes of law and liturgy.

In Mroczek's (2008:94) view, Moses and David were not authors, but scribal channels of tradition, who collected, arranged, and transmitted revelation for new communities. He understood these ancient figures as working scribes who occupy successive links on the chain of revelatory transmission. Mroczek reconsiders the revelatory power of scribal activity found in Sinai and Qumram, as the provider of the framework for thinking about continuous, developing textual traditions, which have room both for the preservation of and the renewal of revealed material. Mroczek clarifies that this model does not only relativize Sinai tradition but at the same time, it elevates the work of ordinary scribes, by explaining how they developed new scriptures long after the mediatory figures were gone.

Mroczek (2008:95), explains further about the scribe and scribal activity in the second temple period. He says that scribal channels like Moses and David, were involved with the textualizing activity, but neither as author or copyist. They were the texturizer, collector, arranger, and transmitter of revealed traditions. However, he maintains that both were exalted divinely inspired figures who update and represent written revelation for their times. Mroczek, adds that the identity of these mediatory figures extended beyond text-related activities, to be a model of piety, whose writing is one aspect of their exemplary life.

Mroczek (2008:95) uses two sets of textual evidence, to illuminate the way second temple Jews understood the scribe. First, is the wisdom tradition, and second is the book of Jubilees. Mroczek (2008:97-98), explains that in the wisdom tradition, the scribe is concerned with the prolific collection and presentation of traditions. This is inextricable from his identity as an ideal figure, who strives to leave a legacy beyond his own life, by exemplifying repentance and piety. Jubilees, on the other hand,

reprojects this ideal onto the patriarchs. The heroes of Jubilees like Abraham and Jacob were recipients of revelation, which they faithfully transmitted from patriarch to patriarch.

According to Boda and McConville (2012:99), so many traditions were expressed in the Old Testament that is part of Israel's history and theological development. They state that the concept of covenant was clearly outlined in the Pentateuch. They further divided the covenants into universal, ancestral, and national. The universal refers to the covenant that God established with creation after the universal flood in Genesis 6-9. The ancestral covenants refer to the covenants that God made with Abraham. The covenants were alluded to by the prophets, who speak directly about specific covenants. God's servants and prophets speak mostly of the Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic, and new covenants.

Boda and McConville (2012:907), notes that another tradition expressed in the Old Testament is the Zion tradition, which is mostly related to the Davidic Monarchy. They state that three elements emerge in any discussion of Zion tradition: the city, Yahwistic religion, and monarchy. The discussion of what is known as the Zion tradition expresses the relationship between these three elements.

According to Knight (2009:97), the various historical-critical methods do not exclude or oppose each other, rather each was developed to complement its predecessor by adding subjects or questions not sufficiently addressed in the previous discussions. Knight highlights that it was assumed that the production of the Hebrew Bible occurred at the written stage. Hence, scholars engaged in the painstaking task of source-critical works, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

However, Knight (2009:97), notes that without disrupting this source-critical work, Gunkel and other scholars introduced a new exegetical method in the early twentieth century known as form criticism. This method in Knight's view sought the conventional genres, known as the forms, which circulated among the people and were rooted in very specific settings of their life. These forms, Knight asserts, were known in many cases in oral contexts and necessitated form critics to begin to move their focus away from the written process as the most creative stage in the production of the Hebrew Bible.

Knight (2009:98), recognizes that “for all the importance of writing, significant literary components could be produced, remembered, and circulated orally.” Based on this understanding, Knight states that the role of the solitary author is retroceded. Instead, specific groups, the community at large, and generations appear in their place as the creators of the Biblical literature.

Nevertheless, the tradition that is under scrutiny here is the tradition of the text of 1 Chronicles 21. This portion of literature in Knight’s (2009:98) view, may have come into being over some time, but now we have it in a finished form as a written passage. The goal here then is to retrace the formation of the literary piece of 1 Chronicles 21, from its initial composition through its later stages of revision and to its final form in the text of the Hebrew Bible.

Knight (2009:103) points out that while scholars like Wellhausen, Gunkel, von Rad, and Noth only acknowledged the presence of oral transmission before the written stage of the literature, it was Engnell who emphasized the role of oral tradition to an extent not previously developed. The scholars mentioned earlier did not make orality a theme of its own. Knight added that the creative stage of composition occurred during the oral stage, not when the materials were recorded in writing and redacted in that form.

Holladay and Hayes (1982:85) understand an attempt to uncover the earlier stages of the book of Chronicles’ text history and development as what this section is theoretically about. They mention that the forms of Laws, creeds, songs, genealogies, poems, stories, and other types of writing, were passed on from one generation to the next orally. These transmissions of information in their view usually happen as a way of preserving history, before the book’s final form.

The tradition history has many facets as noted above, but the tradition that is emphasized in this study is part of the way people retold/delivered the story and most of the time it was orally. This form can be transmitted by word of mouth.

Behind the existing literary sources of the book of Chronicles, there seems to be a separate oral tradition that had long been in existence before they became written sources. According to Mihelic (1951:121), it was to this task that Gunkel and his school of *Gattungsforschung* applied themselves. They desired to search beyond the

written literature to the oral tradition to discover nature, and origin before the literary sources came into existence.

Mihelic (1951:121) observes that the science of the Old Testament Introduction used to focus on many problems, including grammar, lexicography, geography, archaeology, theology, hermeneutics, and other disciplines. But by the end of the nineteenth century, all these problems became separate disciplines, limiting the Old Testament Introduction to three objectives: the origin of books, the canon formation, and the history of the text. The study of the origin of the Old Testament books, including the origin of the book of Chronicles attracted the greatest interest and was largely analytical. The canon formation, and the history of the text, were relegated to the appendage only. However, for Mihelic, the analytical method for the study of the Old Testament books was considered unsatisfactory and so the demand for a synthesis arose. To satisfy the demand for synthesis, he says Gunkel proposed synthetical-creative literary history, instead of analytical-critical introduction.

Mihelic (1951:121) notes that seeing how literary types arose, and the understanding that they are not the creation of individual humans, but a product of the corporation of many generations, we will not likely claim that one human being wrote any portion of the Old Testament books. This knowledge he says further generated greater interest in the study of the influence of oral tradition on Old Testament literature.

According to Farnel and Andrews (2017:35-36), tradition criticism is inherently a philosophical historical-critical methodology, and have prescribed agendas that reach foregone conclusions. They propose that the discipline may not ever hope to perform objective analysis because its design and structure are predicated upon a host of assumptions that are by nature philosophical in origin and expression. The discipline in their opinion seeks to make interpretive decisions that are ultimately driven by philosophical underpinning. To this end, it can be better described as ideology, rather than methodology. Therefore, Farnel and Andrews inscribe that it is assumed not to be a capable neutral tool in handling the biblical text. By its very nature, tradition criticism actively promotes the imposition of subjectivity upon the text.

Farnel and Andrews (2017:67), maintained that tradition criticism is closely related to form criticism in its principles. They were developed in conjunction with each other, yet tradition criticism is now considered a separate discipline

Miller (2011:5) notes that the oral-formulaic theory originated in the second quarter of the twentieth century in the study of epic poetry. The theory in Miller's understanding seeks to explain how oral poets improvise poetry. The "Oral Formulaic Theory" is mostly cited by biblical scholars or used when working with scholarship on oral tradition. This theory Miller states is associated with the work of Parry and his student Lord, as well as Ong, and Goody. Miller understands that Parry and Lord defined the formula as a group of words that are regularly employed under the same metric condition to express a given essential idea. Subsequently, after Parry's death, Lord went on to establish a methodology, which holds that "a percentage of formula could be calculated for a given written text, and then used as an unmistakable indicator of oral composition" (Miller 2011:5).

Miller's (2011:6-7) viewpoint is that the work of Parry and Lord applied to all oral poetries, but their followers went beyond poetry and extended the analysis to every conceivable genre. Miller notes that many researchers, mostly of English speaking wasted no time in setting forth the equation: oral style equals formulaic style. The formula went on to make more impact on the study of form criticism than on the study of oral tradition. The more formula that is contained in a text, the more likely is its oral origin. The formula assumed that oral poets are always illiterate, generating a clear dichotomy between orality and literacy. Miller saw the implication of this giving rise to further development by Ong, and Goody in what became known as the "Literacy Hypotheses." This hypothesis holds that there is a qualitative difference between oral and written language. Particular features usually reveal oral composition, and at the same time reveal thought patterns.

Miller estimates that when most scholars write about theories, they are most of the time referring to Oral Formulaic School. Albright (1950:162) attempted an application of the Oral-Formulaic insights to Ugaritic epics. Cully (1967:1-137) was the first to extensively apply the theory to the study of the Old Testament. He further applied the theory to the study of the Old Testament narratives (Cully 1976:3; 7-10; 17; 20).

Hendel's (1987:35; 37; 137) dissertation²⁴ was entirely dependent on the theory, citing nearly every page (Miller 2011:9).

Person (2010:20) assumed that oral tradition lies behind biblical texts, and it was generally imagined without reference to comparative sources. However, with analogous reference to the work of Parry and Lord, Person saw the interest in various fields in using comparative evidence to understand how oral tradition influenced many great literary works, especially in the ancient and medieval texts.

Miller (2011:28) notes that the comparative approach does not entail any identification of the developments which are being compared. But without the help of a comparative method, reconstruction cannot be achieved. In Miller's view, it could become extremely subjective to do the reconstruction by speculation alone.

Miller (2011:40-41) additionally, explained that oral tradition, and literary worked hand in hand, and that tradition history should be applied to both. He stressed that even after a text is committed to writing, oral transmission remained the normal way of perpetuating, and using a text while writing served as an accessory. As an illustration, Miller states that some parts of the Old Testament were written down early, but to the life situation, the text's application, and actual use was mostly done through remembrance and oral transmission. Therefore, in Miller's view, oral and written transmissions do not exclude each other, exposing the oral-written nature of the biblical text.

Niditch's (1996:1-3) approach expresses the idea that dominant threads in Israelite traditions were oral, and the understanding of literacy in ancient Israel should be in terms of its continuity and interaction with the oral world. Niditch agrees that behind the documentary hypothesis are oral compositions. Niditch's understanding of orality is in a way different from the way Gunkel described it. In her view, Gunkel's description of orality tends to be condescending and include an evolutionary notion that portrays oral means as primitive, unsophisticated, and unbiblical.

Niditch (1996:2-3) argues that the diachronic approach to orality and literacy devalues and misguides oral culture. She further says that it misconstrues the characteristic of oral works and ignores the possibility that written works in a traditional culture will share the characteristics of orally composed works. Rural

²⁴ Harvard dissertation (The Epic of the Patriarchs) published in 1987

works are usually imagined in Israelite social-history as confined to an earlier time. She, however, writes that even during the monarchy, “the vast majority of the people still lived in agrarian life. They work the land, lived in villages led by elders, and continue to tell stories, preserved custom and law, and cited proverbs orally” (Niditch 1996:3). Some of these people Niditch postulates learned from their elders, and had special skills; as such, they were good weavers of narration, preservers of genealogy. She, therefore, suggests that the oral world continues to live in the word of scripture, but not necessarily the oral world as described by Gunkel.

Niditch’s (1996:3) view does not seem to contradict Gunkel’s approach to oral tradition; rather it seems to advance the model by stating explicitly that:

Orally composed and oral-written works can be rural or urban, unsophisticated, rustic, and parochial or sophisticated, aristocratic, and cosmopolitan, concerned with farm or court, village or city, composed by men or women. There is no one oral genre or oral culture in a society but a range of sorts of compositions, styles, contexts, and composers. Orally composed, and oral-style works need not be short and simple, but may like Iliad, and the Odyssey be lengthy, and filled with complex characters and sub-plots.

Scheidewind (2005:1) explored the movement from orality to textuality, the shift from the oral world toward a textual world. Akin to comparative evidence, Schneidewind (2005: 57) suggests that the Ugaritic epic and early biblical poetry had a common literary culture across Syria-Palestine at the end of the Bronze Age, and into the Iron Age. In Schneidewind’s view, the Josianic reform attempted to purge Israel of foreign influences and return Israel to the idealized times when they first entered the land. However, he saw a contrast that shows evidence of continuity from the archaeological record, which reveals “continued Egyptian presence in Canaan from Late Bronze age (1550-1200 B.C.E.) through the early Iron Age I period (1200-1000 B.C.E.)” (Scheidewind 2005:57).

Scheidewind (2005:57) further used the stories in the book of Judges, particularly Judges 1, which he refers to as folktales, to help demonstrate aspects of continuity that existed between the Canaanite, and the Israelite cultures. Also, this evidence testifies to the continuity between the urban culture of the Late Bronze Age, and that of the Early Iron Age. He states that even though some later biblical narratives advocate a cultural break, the stories of Judges and the early monarch accounts

from Samuel, and Kings suggests that early Israelite Kings drew upon the Canaanite administrative system. Only the Josianic religious reform of the Deuteronomic ideology seems to advance the notion of a complete cultural break with Canaanite institutions.

Scheidewind (2005:59) notes that just as Ugaritic writings demonstrate a broader writing tradition in Syria-Palestine, similarly, early Israelite monarchy developed writing tradition and scribal schools that were not independent. He cited David and Solomon's employment of temple herald and scribes. The book of Samuel lists some of David's officials, which includes a royal herald, and scribe. Solomon's list also includes in addition to the two offices, a court scribe, making his list more elaborate than David's.

Based on the above information, and some insight from the Hebrew Bible (Ezr. 7:6, 11; Neh. 8:1-3), it is evident that the oral and written world existed together in ancient Israel. The herald ensures that messages are carried to and from the commanders of opposing armies, possibly orally, and in some cases in writing, as well as keep the armorial history and genealogy. The scribes, on the other hand, are those who learned to read and write and functioned as clerks were responsible to see that they record, and read the royal records and sacred manuscripts. Therefore, based on their separate functions, the herald seemed to have helped to drive the oral world in ancient Israel, while the scribes, may be assumed to be the people that committed the oral history of Israel into a written form.

3.2.2. Tradition Critical Reading of Chronicles

Based on the information garnered under the theoretical framework, tradition critical reading of the book of Chronicles can, therefore, be understood in this study as a method of critical examination of the concepts used to trace the developmental stages of the book of Chronicles from its historical advent to its literary presentation in the Hebrew Bible (Holladay & Hayes 1982:85).

Boda and McConville's (2012:907) explanation about the tradition history, seems to relate the Zion tradition mostly to the text of 1 Chronicles 21. The text focuses mostly on David, whose Monarchy is related to the Zion tradition. The tradition expresses the relationship between the three elements of the city, Yahwistic religion, and the monarchy.

Geyser-Fouché (2016:5) notes that the Chronicler portrayed David as the ideal King, not only in the genealogies but also in the narrative part about the Kings, as the patron of the temple. However, the only unfavorable reference to David was in the census he undertook in 1 Chronicles 21. Nevertheless, Geysers-Fouche states that the reason is the outcome, which is the indication of the site chosen for building the temple.

Appealing to the comparative evidence, there is an enormous amount of evidence, and this is in agreement with the view of many scholars²⁵ that the Chronicler used many biblical, as well as non-biblical sources. He relied heavily on the books of Samuel, Kings, and the Pentateuch. Based on the preceding information, and information garnered under the theoretical framework, it is evident that the Chronicler borrowed from the different traditions and omitted some traditions that existed along with Israel's history.

Geysers-Fouché (2016:6) notes that the Chronicler did not mention the Mosaic covenant, as he is associated with Shechem (Dt 27) and a symbol of the northern kingdom. According to Geysers-Fouché (2016:6), the Abrahamic covenant is also not mentioned either, because he is associated with Mount Gerizim, which is seen as a place of the Samaritans. The traditions that describe Yahweh as the Lord of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are silenced in 1 Chronicles 21, as well as in the whole book.

Geysers-Fouché (2016:6), therefore, states that 1 Chronicles 21 uses exclusive language to emphasize and underemphasize, as well as silence voices, to depict one specific ideology, which is the legitimization of the Yahweh worship and that is in the temple of Jerusalem.

²⁵ Knoppers (1994:743) is of the view that the Chronicler could be characterized as a reforming historian. He asserts that 1 Chronicles 21:1-27 "is largely taken from the Chronicler's Vorlage of 2 Samuel 24:1-25, while 1 Chr 21:28-22:1 is unique to Chronicles."

According to Nahkola (2001:13-14), the Chronicler's redaction of the stories of David, and Solomon, were deliberate and transparent marring of the original narrative as it is found in Samuel. He retouched the old picture, to idealize the history of Judah, in the spirit of post-exilic Judaism.

Based on the content of the book, Kiel and Delitzsch (1976:12) argued that the general sketch apparently show that the author had not the general history of Israel in view, from the time of David to the Exilic period. Rather, the Chronicler's only purpose was to give an outline of the history of David's reign, and his successors, Solomon and the kings of Judah to the fall of Jerusalem. In an attempt to compare the history of Israel in Chronicles, with the representation of the history of Israel in those times in Samuel and Kings, one can easily see that the Chronicler has omitted much of the history.

The non-biblical books are the books of Nathan the prophet, Iddo the seer, Shemaiah the scribe, Gad the seer, and Ahijah the Shilonite. Nonetheless, there is also a possibility that the so-called non-biblical books may be books that are contained in other biblical books or simply evidence of redaction by the writer/s.

Jonker (2013:136-137) notes that 1 Chronicles 21:1 shows an interesting departure from the source text in 2 Samuel 24:1, which he attributes to theological difficulty. Also, Jonker states that the Chronicler omitted 2 Samuel 24:5-8a, which indicates the route that Joab and his commanders took when conducting the census. Instead, the Chronicler abbreviates the description in 1 Chronicles 21:4 and the direction of the route in 2 Samuel 24:2 which has “from Dan to Beersheba”, he reverses from the south (Beersheba) to the north (Dan). According to Jonker, this is not a merely ordinary abbreviation of the source text, but a reflection of the Chronicler’s southern perspective. In other words, the Chronicler’s background is rooted in the southern tradition. By emphasizing the Southern tradition, the Chronicler succeeded in emphasizing the importance of the Jerusalem temple.

Jonker (2013:138) states that the Chronicler presented David’s renewed petition to Yahweh in 1 Chronicles 21:17, as a heavily adapted form of the source text in 2 Samuel 24:17. In Jonker’s view, David took responsibility for the wrongdoing of the census, and therefore, asked Yahweh to punish him and his house, instead of the people. This action by David is interpreted by Jonker, as a realization that this incident has implications for Yahweh’s eternal promise to his house. Akin to Jonker’s interpretation, the Chronicler could be said to have alluded to the Davidic covenant.

Jonker (2013:138) observes an allusion to what can be referred to as the major Israeli tradition in verse 18. He notes a difference from the source text in 2 Samuel 24:18, in which case, the Chronicler involved the angel of the Lord as a representative of Yahweh. In this account, the angel, instead of destroying the city commanded Gad to tell David to go up and build an altar. The three elements of the Zion tradition became prominent in this command by the angel, and they are the city (Jerusalem), the Yahwistic religion (represented by the altar), and the monarchy (represented by David). The concept of building an altar is also a strong reference to cultic practices, which are in the Chronicle’s perspective centered at the Jerusalem temple.

Jonker (2013:139) notices a subtle difference in the actual transaction narrated in 21:21-25 and the source text of 2 Samuel 24:20-24. He states that the huge price difference indicates that the Chronicler wanted to ensure that David's conduct would come across as being without any blemish. Also, the acquiring of the threshing floor that would become a cultic site, had to reflect as noted earlier under the theoretical framework about mediatory figures, David's piety, and reverence. Adapting to the changing tradition, the Chronicler's contemporary audience was made to receive confirmation of the legitimacy of their cultic site.

Jonker (2013:139) points out an allusion to another Israeli tradition by the Chronicler to reflect his theological intentions. Jonker notes that the Chronicler reworked the source text of 2 Samuel 24:25, in 1 Chronicles 21:26-27. Here the Lord answered David with fire from heaven on the altar of burnt offering. The Chronicler added the 'fire from heaven' to his source material according to Jonker. This addition by the Chronicler could be said to be an allusion to the Mosaic tradition and the Sinai tradition. In the two cases, the appearance of Yahweh was often accompanied by fire, for example, Moses at the burning bush, and the revelation of the Torah at Sinai. Therefore, Jonker concludes that the Chronicler recounted the events this way to emphasize the importance of what was happening at the site of the temple. David became in this process a Moses redivivus and the Chronicler attempted to overwrite Moses with David. This overwriting entailed an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern Tradition, an overwriting of Tabernacle tradition with Jerusalem temple tradition, an overwriting of the Sinai tradition with the Zion tradition, and an overwriting of the exodus tradition with the monarchical tradition.

Jonker (2013:140) observes that 1 Chronicles 21:29-30 are without parallel in the source text. Jonker believes that the Chronicler used this addition to achieve a contrast between the sanctuary that was at Gibeon and the newly established altar on the Jebusite threshing floor. I am also convinced that the Chronicler used this addition to drive home his complete dependence on the Zion tradition. The tradition as narrated earlier has the three elements of the city (Jerusalem/Zion), the Yahwistic religion (the temple), and the monarchy represented by David.

The oral history of 1 Chronicles 21 cannot be separated from the oral history of its sources. Thus, to begin to trace the oral history of the narrative, one will at best have

to possibly rely on the previously available studies, to first trace the oral history of its known biblical sources, and also, its non-biblical sources.

The book of 2 Samuel, which is one of the primary sources the Chronicler depended on, belongs to the literary unit of Torah according to Campbell (1994:32-33). Campbell was commissioned to write a paper for a symposium in honor of the German scholar Martin Noth (1902-1968) and to stay as close as possible to Noth's Deuteronomistic history. Campbell understands that the concept of a Pentateuch gives structure to the early traditions of Israel. He notes that Israel constituted a people brought out of Egypt into independence, set on the journey to a promised land. Israel's tradition gave the texts that narrate their journey a recognized unity as Torah, which generally belong to the Sinai tradition. At the important points in the course of history, the texts bring forward leading personages with a speech, either long or short that looks forward and backward to interpret the course of events. Campbell, agreeing with Noth, identifies some of these passages, to demonstrate the literal unity of the Deuteronomistic texts.

Examples of these passages are Joshua 1, 23; Judges 2:11-12; 1 Samuel 12:6; 1 Kings 8:14-16; and 2 Kings 17:7. These passages contain either speeches or summaries by Israeli leaders, to demonstrate the continuation of their tradition history and the link between the books. Thus, they are recognized as a unit. According to Campbell, the structural divisions in the Deuteronomistic text are marked according to Noth, by Joshua 23:1; 1 Samuel 12, and 1 Kings 8:4. The unity of the Deuteronomistic text is very obvious, confirming the understanding of history as a self-contained unit. This unity Campbell stresses is also built on Noth's recognition that the key date from Exodus to 1 Kings 6:1 spanned 480 years; a figure that is explicitly given in the Deuteronomistic history (Campbell 1994:32-33).

Likewise, Braun's (1994:63) assertion about Noth's dealings with the character of Chronicler's work, is that it stands out as an independent narration to enliven and develop the details of history. This he supposed is in contrast to the Deuteronomistic work that is a systematic presentation of history.

Furthermore, the Chronicler's speeches are inserted at opportune moments and, as Braun claims, this is in agreement with Noth's and von Rad's viewpoints, supposing that the speeches are implied like the Levitical sermon current in the Chronicler's

day. Also, the Chronicler's prophets or seer appear as spokesmen for Judah, declaring the doctrine of retribution, an outlook that was conditioned by the conceptions of his day (Braun 1994:63).

According to Knoppers (2000:1), the Deuteronomistic history is a theoretical construct that views the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings as a single literary unit that covers much of Israel's history from the time before they entered the land to the exiles of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms. Knoppers agrees with Noth that the Deuteronomist merged the Law of Moses (Sinai tradition) and Moses' speech (Mosaic tradition), adding other sources, such as tales of conquest, settlement, prophetic narratives, speeches, as well as official annals and records. Knoppers stressed that "the Deuteronomist organized these disparate materials, shaped them, and inserted his retrospective and anticipatory comments (often in the mouths of major characters) at critical junctures in his history" (Knoppers 2000:1).

Campbell (1994:33) describes the already entrenched conclusion that the Deuteronomistic history was not the compilation of an editor, rather historical materials from highly varied traditions (some oral, while others may be written), was brought together by an author and carefully arranged in a conceived plan.

Campbell's (1994:33) description of the Deuteronomistic history, is quite in agreement with the theoretical framework that the oral, and written world existed together in ancient Israel, as well as the surrounding cultures. Employing the comparative evidence at this point, it can be demonstrated that the Hebrew Bible shows enormous evidence that the Israelites and their neighbors made use of the heralds as messengers even before the monarchy and during the monarchical period. The scribes, on the other hand, were there even before the monarchy period, and always employed among the officials by the Israeli Kings, and their neighboring Kings.

The following passages will be referred to as examples of the presence of the heralds in the Hebrew Bible: Exodus 5:10 writes about heralds, who delivered Pharaoh's messages as the taskmasters and officers to the people of Israel who were Pharaoh's servants. Nahum 1:15 points to a herald who stands on the mountain to deliver a message to the people of Judah. Similarly, Isaiah 40:9; 48:20,

and 52:7-8 refers to the work of heralds, and their association with the mountains, as a high point to easily declare messages to reach the people. A herald's work can be seen in the book of Jeremiah 4:5 warning the people of an imminent danger of invasion. Jeremiah 46:14 also demonstrates the oral nature of proclaiming messages, by orally, warning about the impending strike of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon.

In 1 Samuel 11:4-7, the men of Jabesh Gilead used a messenger (a herald) to meet Saul at Gibeah to seek help against the evil proclamation of Nahash the Ammonite, who proposed to make a covenant with them on the condition that he will pull out all their right eyes. On hearing the messengers (heralds), Saul equally sent his messengers (heralds) throughout all the territory of Israel to call them out to go to war with him, and Samuel against Nahash the Ammonite.

1 Kings 21:1-14 demonstrates that the Deuteronomistic history was historical materials from highly varied traditions, some oral, while others were written. In the narrative concerning the murder of Naboth for his vineyard, Jezebel wrote letters (doing the work of a scribe) (verse 8) in King Ahab's name, sealed the letters with Ahab's seal, and sent the letters through messengers to the elders and nobles. These elders and nobles could read and understand written texts, for they received and carried out the instruction Jezebel gave in the letters. In this account, we have evidence of orality and literacy existing together in Israel during the monarchy.

Similarly, Hezekiah wrote letters to Ephraim and Manasseh in 2 Chronicles 30:1-11, to invite them to the house of the Lord in Jerusalem to keep the Passover to the Lord of Israel. However, the messengers who went out to proclaim the words of the King went with the letters from the King and his leaders (possibly included scribes) and spoke throughout all Israel the command of the King. In this account also, we have evidence of orality and literacy existing together in Israel during the monarchy.

The oral and written world did not only exist together in ancient Israel during the monarchy. There is substantial evidence that they also existed together even before the monarchical period. When Joshua gave his farewell address, particularly in Joshua 23:6, he encouraged the people of Israel to keep and do all that is written in the Book of the Law of Moses. The implication of this is that written texts were

already in existence then, long before the Kings, just maybe not as advanced as in the monarchical period.

Furthermore, the names of many scribes were listed during the period of the monarchy: under King David, Seraiah was the scribe in 2 Samuel 8:17; Sheva in 20:25, and Shemaiah the son of Nethanel in 1 Chronicles 24:6. Thereafter under King Solomon, the scribes were Elihoreph, and Ahijah in 1 Kings 4:3, this time two scribes in contradiction with only one in David's era, possibly indicating development or a greater need for writing and recording events. To support this possibility, the same verse in addition to the two scribes, equally listed Jehoshaphat the son of Ahilub as the recorder.

Therefore, founded on the theoretical framework, which proposes the use of comparative evidence, the tradition critical reading of the book of Chronicles, traced the developmental stages of the book of Chronicles from its historical advent to its literary presentation in the Hebrew Bible. It was found that the sources,²⁶ which the writer/s of the book of Chronicles depended on, contain an enormous amount of evidence that shows the existence of the oral world and written world in ancient traditions of Israel before the monarchy. There was also evidence of the interplay between the oral world, and the written world during the monarchy.

According to Walton et. al. (2000:209), comparatively the Ancient Near Eastern material illuminates the historical literature of the Old Testament. Consequently, by implication, it sheds light on the tradition history of 1 Chronicles 21. Among these resources are royal inscriptions, which preserve the account of the achievements of kings. The chronographic texts, which records military annals, and the historical literary texts, that recount the experiences of kings. These texts were usually carved in stones, more often inscribed on clay tablets. Some kept records on small rectangular shaped tablets. Others used large slabs or brick-shaped clay polygons. Records at some point become part of a text if it has to be preserved for future generations.

Japhet (2009:296) notes that the Exodus tradition was not mentioned in the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. In her view, the narrative does not discuss the exodus from Egypt

²⁶ The books of Samuel, Kings, and the Pentateuch. His other biblical sources are the books of Isaiah, Psalm, Jehu the son of Hanani (contained in the book of kings of Israel), and book of Lamentations of Jeremiah. The non-biblical books are the books of Nathan the prophet, Iddo the seer, Shemaiah the scribe, Gad the seer, and Ahijah the Shilonite.

or the subsequent revelation at Mount Sinai. Japhet (2009:297) states that not only was the historical event omitted from the narrative, but references to it have also been deleted in parallel text. The exodus from Egypt was only in the Deuteronomistic sections of the books of Samuel and Kings.

The Chronicler's ideology can be understood by the different traditions he emphasized. In 1 Chronicles 21, he emphasized the Zion tradition, David (who is seen as the founder of the Jerusalem temple), the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – Moses, the Exodus, the Sinai tradition, the Northern traditions, the Northern Kings (referring to the Northern Traditions).

3.2.3. Summary

Tradition is defined as the creation of the future out of the past, and its understanding begins with the refining of tradition in conjunction with history and culture. History is not the past, but an artificial assembly of materials from the past, which is designed for usefulness in the future. Traditions die at some point, and another tradition replaces them.

The Second Temple scribes rearranged, reworked, or rewrote the texts of ancient revelatory events, that were attributed to great mediatory figures like Moses and David. This demonstrates a distinction between what would have been understood as a scriptural Mosaic or Davidic texts, and secondary rewritings and reworkings by later scribes.

Moses and David were not viewed as authors, but scribal channels of tradition, who collected, arranged, and transmitted revelation for new communities. These ancient figures can be understood as working scribes who occupy successive links on the chain of revelatory transmission. The revelatory power of scribal activity found in Sinai and Qumram provides the framework for thinking about continuous, developing textual traditions, which have room both for the preservation of and the renewal of revealed material.

The Second Temple Judeans understood the scribe as concerned with the prolific collection and presentation of traditions. So many traditions were expressed in the Old Testament that is part of Israel's history and theological development. The concept of covenant tradition was clearly outlined in the Pentateuch. It comprises the

universal, which refers to the covenant that God established with creation after the universal flood in Genesis 6-9. The ancestral covenants refer to the covenants that God made with Abraham. God's servants and prophets speak mostly of the Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic, and new covenants.

Another tradition expressed in the Old Testament is the Zion tradition, which is mostly related to the Davidic Monarchy. The three elements emerge in any discussion of Zion tradition: the city of Jerusalem, Yahwistic religion, and monarchy. The discussion of what is known as the Zion tradition expresses the relationship between these three elements.

The various historical-critical methods do not exclude or oppose each other, rather each was developed to complement its predecessor by adding subjects or questions not sufficiently addressed in the previous discussions. Gunkel and other scholars introduced a new exegetical method in the early twentieth century known as form criticism. This method sought the conventional genres, known as the forms, which circulated among the people and were rooted in very specific settings of their life. These forms were known in many cases in oral contexts and necessitated form critics to begin to move their focus away from the written process as the most creative stage in the production of the Hebrew Bible. Significant literary components could be produced, remembered, and circulated orally. Therefore, the role of the solitary author is retroceded. Instead, specific groups, the community at large, and generations appear in their place as the creators of the Biblical literature.

The tradition that is under scrutiny here is the tradition of the text of 1 Chronicles 21. This portion of literature may have come into being over some time, but now we have it in a finished form as a written passage. The goal here then was to retrace the formation of the literary piece of 1 Chronicles 21, from its initial composition through its later stages of revision and to its final form in the text of the Hebrew Bible.

The study of traditional history indicates that the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 was not the creation of an individual but the product of the corporation of many generations, making it more likely that one person could not have written the book.

Comparative evidence is used to understand how oral tradition influenced many great literary works, especially in the ancient, and medieval texts. The dominant threads in Israelite culture were oral, and the understanding of literacy in ancient

Israel should be in terms of its continuity and interaction with the oral world. The oral world continues to live in the word of scripture. Orally composed and oral-written works can be rural or urban and there is thus no one oral genre of oral culture in society, but a range of sorts of compositions, styles, contexts, and composers.

Akin to comparative evidence, the Ugaritic epic, and early biblical poetry has a common literary culture across Syria-Palestine at the end of the Bronze Age, and into the Iron age. The book of Judges, particularly Judges 1, helps demonstrate aspects of continuity that existed between the Canaanite, and the Israelite cultures.

Based on comparative evidence, the Chronicler relied heavily on 2 Samuel 24, other Old Testament books, as well as non-biblical sources.

The oral history of 1 Chronicles 21 cannot be separated from the oral history of its sources. The books of Samuel, and the Pentateuch which are some of the primary sources the Chronicler depended on, belong to the same literary unit recognized as Torah. The texts bring forward leading personages with a speech, either long or short that looks forward and backward to interpret the course of events. These passages contain either speeches or summaries to demonstrate the link between the books contained in the Deuteronomistic texts. The Torah belongs to the Sinai tradition. The various biblical books the Chronicler depended on, belong to the different traditions, the Covenant, and the Zion.

The theoretical framework allowed for the tradition critical reading of 1 Chronicles 21 to critically examine the concepts used to trace the developmental stages of the book of Chronicles from its historical advent to its literary presentation in the Hebrew Bible.

Making use of the comparative evidence, there is enormous evidence that 1 Chronicles 21, has its foundation on the Zion tradition, and the Davidic covenant. But under-emphasized the Sinai and Mosaic traditions respectively. The source text for the chapter, however, belongs to different traditions: The Covenant, the Sinai, Southern, Northern, and so on. The Chronicler, however, omitted the Exodus, Patriarchal, and Northern traditions.

These traditions were preserved and transmitted by mediatory figures from one tradition to another, and either transmitted or recorded by the second temple scribes.

The Chronicler's ideology can be understood by the different traditions he emphasized. In 1 Chronicles 21, he emphasized the Zion tradition, David (who is seen as the founder of the Jerusalem temple), the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – Moses, the Exodus, the Sinai tradition, the Northern traditions, the Northern Kings (referring to the Northern Traditions).

David became in this process a Moses redivivus and the Chronicler attempted to overwrite Moses with David. This overwriting entailed an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern Tradition, an overwriting of Tabernacle tradition with Jerusalem temple tradition, an overwriting of the Sinai tradition with the Zion tradition, and an overwriting of the exodus tradition with the monarchical tradition.

It is believed, therefore, that the oral and written world existed together in ancient Israel that helped to mold and preserve the written text of 1 Chronicles 21, which we currently have in the Hebrew Bible.

3.3. Text Criticism

3.3.1. Theoretical Framework

Draper (2003:1576) writes that textual criticism is sometimes termed lower criticism. It is the study of copies of written work that does not have a surviving original copy or copies. According to Draper's recap, and also in line with this study, it is important to note that textual criticism is not a negative expression, rather it refers to a careful study and analysis of the ancient Chronicles text as thoroughly as possible.

Feldmeth (2008:25) defines text criticism as a study that focuses on the changes that appeared in ancient biblical texts as they were copied and recopied.

According to Tov (1992:1), text criticism deal with the origin and nature of a text. In Tov's view, this involves a discussion of the text's original form(s) and analysis of the various representations of the changes that occur in the text over the years. The analysis usually includes the discussion of the relationships between the different texts, a description of the external condition of the copying of the texts, and the procedure of transmission of the texts. Tov emphasizes that the collection and evaluation of data deriving from differences between the textual witnesses is the

focus of textual criticism. Tov (1992: xxxvi) also, stresses that it is important to note that textual criticism is somewhat dynamic. Many views do change as new studies are carried out, as well as with the discovery of new texts. Nonetheless, for Tov, it is imperative to carry out textual criticism.

Japhet (1993:28-31) contends that text criticism serves two purposes: firstly, establishing the text of a biblical source, and the other is an illustration of the general features of biblical transmission. She postulates that the differences between a biblical text like Chronicles, and its biblical sources result from the intentional editing of linguistic, and theological sources, while a few of the changes in textual variants are caused by the process of transmission. In Japhet's view, the existence of maybe two or more versions of the same text within the MT in some cases serves to illustrate the problems involved in text transmission.

Armerding (1983:97) argues that the original author or authors of the book of Chronicles possibly wrote (or spoke) the message, and there is the possibility that it was disseminated by hand copies until the invention of the moveable printing press in the time of Johannes Gutenberg (1397-1468). According to Armerding, it was inevitable that the earlier process of text transmission gave rise to several variant readings, which subsequently resulted in the science of lower or textual criticism. The field of textual criticism in his view then is to ascertain as nearly as possible what was written in the original text. Armerding further stresses that the research in this field over the years has seen the development of highly sophisticated techniques practiced by Old Testament scholars.

Armerding (1983:98-100) further explicates that the job of a text critic is to work back to the original writings or autographs. He understands that the former practice in the past, only look for alternate text to resolve the difficulty of variant reading. In Armerding's view, scholars developed the idea to use the science of philology to find meaning for an obscure word or phrase, rather than looking for errors of writing or copying. As a result, Armerding (1983:100) states that what used to be referred to as textual problems, is now seen as philological problems. This idea in Armerding's interpretation is a new science to challenge the Old Testament text criticism.

3.3.2. Text-Critical Reading of Chronicles

West (1973:8) describes the primary goal of text-critical reading as an attempt to establish the actual source of a text, so far as possible. For West, the reason for doing this exercise is that the autograph may no longer exist. There might be surviving manuscripts, each of which may be a copy of earlier manuscripts or copies that may have undergone several steps distant from the autograph.

Tov (1992:2) points to evidence from the modern editions, which are available in different languages, to assert that the book of Chronicles has been known to be transmitted in many ancient and medieval sources. As a result, he writes that now we have manuscripts in Hebrew and other languages, from ancient times. There are also fragments of leather and papyrus scrolls that are more than two thousand years old. All these sources in Tov's view, witness to and shed light on the text of the book of Chronicles, hence they are textual witnesses to the book. Also, all these sources differ from each other. Therefore, he saw a need to study the differences between these textual witnesses, and this study holds a central place within text critical reading. Tov understands the modern editions of the traditional text of the book of Chronicles, the *Masoretic Text* (MT) to reflect many differences because it is based on different manuscripts.

According to Thompson (1994:22-23), text-critical reading is the historical study of the text of Chronicles, an attempt to examine the copy or copies of its original manuscript form. Thompson understands the examination of the manuscript copy or copies of the original text of Chronicles as a very critical element. This is especially so, to know the different text traditions that exist and to recognize which source text the Chronicler used. He notes that the usual resources scholars refer to; include parallel passages in Samuel, Kings, Joshua, Genesis, other parts of Pentateuch, and smaller selections from other sources. Also, in recent times, fragments of Chronicles were found among the Qumran scrolls. Thomson's view is that most of the past studies focused on the portions of Chronicles that are paralleled by sections in Samuel, Kings, and the Septuagint. Where Chronicles differ from these passages, it was always assumed that the Chronicler modified these texts, to suit his theological viewpoint.

Japhet (1993:28-31) writes that there are some matches between the deviating text of Samuel and Chronicles, demonstrating that Chronicles reflects a *vorlage* different from MT. Japhet states that all the commentators recognize that Chronicles' text has been preserved in fairly good condition and a few corruptions in it have been amended by the Masoretic apparatus of *Kethib* and *Qere* and *Sebirin*. Further, only a few fragments of Chronicles were found among the documents from Qumran.

Thompson (1994:22-23) notes that, based on recent studies, it could be said that some of the Chronicler's sources are from the Hebrew tradition, from that of the Masoretic Texts (MT). Thompson asserts that the texts of Chronicles are more like the Samaritan Pentateuch and Samuel and Kings, than the MT. The Chronicles is also more like the texts of 4QSam^a, 4QSam^b, and 4QSam^c, and the LXX than the MT version. Concerning the comparison of the parallel passages in Samuel and Kings, Thompson's view is that although the Chronicler might have used different *vorlage*, he also altered his sources to fit his theological and ideological purpose.

Tov (2015:4-5) holds the viewpoint that in the Temple circles, the Rabbis and Pharisees prevalently used the text form of MT. Many other texts such as the LXX, the Torah of the Samaritans, Samaritan Pentateuch, were used in Judaism before the destruction of the Temple, and we learn about them, inter alia, through the Qumran discoveries. Tov emphasizes, however, that various socio-religious and demographic developments changed the nature of the textual evidence. The reason for the change Tov accepts as true, that only the nascent rabbinic Judaism survived after the destruction of the Temple, and it was the text they used. Also, Tov acknowledges that other biblical texts were in circulation at this period. The early Christians used the Greek LXX, which was originally a Judean translation but adopted by the Christians. The Greek-speaking Judeans used the more recent Judean revisions. Another group that had split up from Judaism, the Samaritans turned to their own Torah.

In Tov's (2015:4-5) view, whatever texts that were used before this period, such as those identified from the Qumran, were no longer in circulation because there was no devout group who could have embraced them. Therefore, Tov concluded that the preservation of ancient religions and archaeology helped to irradiate the textual situation in ancient times. The Dead Sea Scrolls discovered at Qumran, the preservation of the LXX, and Vulgate by the Christians, the preservation of the

Pentateuch by the Samaritan community, and MT by the traditional Judaism all contributed to the understanding of the ancient textual situation.

Japhet (1993:28-31) contends that the task of a text-critical reading is not to restore the source reading, but only the text possibly as far back as it came from the author. In Japhet's view, the most significant version among the versions for the textual study of a book like Chronicles is the Septuagint (LXX), which itself has undergone a study of its version as an auxiliary tool for the textual criticism of MT. The Septuagint she believes provides the form of Hebrew text which is a valuable witness to the state of the text of Chronicles in the second century.

However, for Japhet (1993:28-31), the LXX does not help where the text of Chronicles is found faulty, for the reason that its manuscript is identical to the current Hebrew text. Additionally, Japhet notes that the Vulgate, Syriac translation of Peshitta, and the Aramaic Targum all provide only peripheral value for the textual criticism of Chronicles. She asserts that these translations, mainly contribute to the history of exegesis. This view is based on her understanding that the Targum has a relatively ancient core, but did not receive its final form until the eighth or seventh century. The Peshitta on the other hand, is Midrashic and besides, was always harmonized with the text of Samuel and Kings, nevertheless, it was preserved in a very faulty state, which marks it worthless for text-critical resolves.

The Chronicler seems to have relied on many biblical as well as non-biblical sources. He seems to have alluded to many books from the Hebrew Bible. For example, in 1 Chronicles 9:1, the Chronicler refers to the recording by genealogies of all Israel and the captivity of Judah by Babylon (as a result of their unfaithfulness) to the book of the Kings of Israel. Beentjes (2002:73) considers 1 Chron 9:1 as a closure that is theologically loaded. He also emphasizes the fact that it is the first time the concept: "the whole of Israel", is used and will be used after this verse another 40 times. These genealogies can be traced back to MT: The lists derived from Genesis.²⁷

²⁷ 1 Chronicles 1: 1-4 – (From Adam to Noah), Gen 5: 1-32; 1 Chronicles 1: 5-7 – (The descendants of Japheth),- Gen 10: 2-4; 1 Chronicles 1: 8-16 – (Descendants of Gam), Gen 10: 6-8, 13-18; 1 Chronicles 1: 17-23 – (Descendants of Shem), Gen 10: 22-29; 1 Chronicles 1: 24-27 – (Patriarchs from Shem to Abraham), Gen 11: 10-26; 1 Chronicles 1:28 – (Sons of Abraham), Chronicler's own material; 1 Chronicles 1: 29-31 – (Sons of Ishmael), Gen 25: 13-16; 1 Chronicles 1: 32-33 – (Sons of Abraham with Keturah), Gen 25: 1-4; 1 Chronicles 1:34 – (Abraham's grandsons via Isaac: Esau and Israel), Gen 25: 19-26; 1 Chronicles 1: 35-37 – (Descendants of Esau), Gen 36: 4-5, 9-14; 1 Chronicles 1: 38-42 – (Descendants of Esau), Gen 36: 20-28; 1 Chronicles 1: 43-50 – (Kings of

For this study, however, it will not be of great value to text critically read all of the sources the chronicler borrowed from. Therefore, at this point, I will keep the focus on the specific chapter that this study is based on (1 Chronicles 21). I am going to discuss the internal evidence of content that is the same as known sources.

3.3.3. The internal evidence of content that is the same as known sources

It can be adduced from Braun's (1994:63) assertion about the character of the Chronicler's work, that 1 Chronicles 21 stands out as an independent narration to enliven, and develop the details of history from 2 Samuel 24.

The book of 2 Samuel, which is the primary source the Chronicler depended on for the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, belongs to the Deuteronomistic history according to Campbell (1994:33). Campbell states that the Deuteronomistic history was brought together by an author and carefully arranged in a conceived plan. However, the history of 1 Chronicles 21, cannot be separated from the history of its source. Therefore, the text-critical reading of 1 Chronicles 21 will be dependent on the text-critical reading of 2 Samuel 24.

Harmonization of the two passages was done by Crockett (1951:138), in the nineteenth century.²⁸ According to Crockett, the first sections of the two passages presents a similar narrative about David's sin in numbering the people, harmonizing 2 Samuel 24:1-9 with 1 Chronicles 21:1-6. The Chronicles' story seems to have been borrowed from 2 Samuel 24. However, there is a bit of a difference that might suggest an emendation of the original story by the Chronicler, possibly to suit his theological purpose and the traditions of his day.

According to Crockett (1951:139-141), the second section harmonizes 2 Samuel 24:10-14 with 1 Chronicles 21:7-13. Respectively, this section in the two passages writes about the choice of punishments concerning David's sin. The third section in both passages is about the narratives, concerning the pestilence that follows as a result of David's sin. This section harmonizes 2 Samuel 24:15-17 with 1 Chronicles

Edom), Gen 36: 31-39; 1 Chronicles 1: 51-54 – (Princes of Edom after Hadad's death), Gen 36: 4-43; 1 Chronicles 2: 1-2 – (Sons of Israel), Ex 1: 2-4; (to mention but a few).

²⁸ Reprinted in 1951

21:14-17. The fourth and last section harmonizes 2 Samuel 24:18-25 with 1 Chronicles 21:18-30, and both passages write about David's purchase of Araunah's threshing-floor and the erection of an altar for Yahweh.

According to Knoppers (2000:1), the Deuteronomistic history covers much of Israel's history from the time before they entered the land to the exiles of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms. Therefore, since the passage of 2 Samuel 24 is part of the literary unit of the Deuteronomistic history, it is most likely that the Chronicler's work of 1 Chronicles 21, was copied from it. This is because the events of the Deuteronomistic history happened long before the book of Chronicles was written.

Japhet (1993:23-25) seems to sustain the idea that 1 Chronicles 21 was copied from 2 Samuel 24. This is as a result of her general view of the chronology of the biblical literature, as well as her view that the book of Chronicles was a post-exilic genre. Japhet suggests that even though the book of Chronicles displays a peculiar diction of its own, the language places it no earlier than the post-exilic period and most probably into the period, for the reason that the language has common features with late biblical works such as Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, Daniel, as well as non-biblical works of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Samaritan Pentateuch.

In his catalog of Biblical passages, Washburn (2003:80-81), only listed 1 Chronicles 17:9-13; 2 Chronicles 28:27 (4Q Chr.); and 2 Chronicles 29:1-3 (4Q Chr.); as the fragments of Chronicles that were found among the Qumran Scrolls. This finding implies that 1 Chronicles 21 was not found among the Qumran Scrolls. Similarly, 2 Samuel 24 was also not found among the Qumran scrolls (Washburn 2003:79).

Draper and Russell (2003:211) note that the text of the Old Testament, which 1 Chronicles 21 forms part, numbers in tens of thousands of copies. They stress that this is unlike other ancient works that are known in a single manuscript or a few hundred. In Draper and Russell's view, no original document of the Old Testament, which includes 1 Chronicles 21 survive, but the great volume of manuscripts helps to confirm the accuracy of the text. They maintain that the text was carefully copied and transmitted more carefully than any document before the printing press. They ascertain that the manuscripts were written in various materials. Firstly, papyrus was used at the earliest times, secondly the parchment; thirdly, it was contained in scrolls

until A.D. 600, and thereafter, a book form, which was referred to as the codex became popular.

According to Draper & Russell (2003:211-213), the Masoretic text (MT) bears the most important witness to the text of 1 Chronicles 21. The Masoretic scribes preserved the consonantal text between 500-1000 AD. They stated that the basis of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 that is contained in the current Hebrew Bible, and most modern OT translations, was a direct copy of the MT dated 1008 AD. This they referred to as the *Leningrad Codex*. The *Allepo Codex* they suggest is perhaps the best manuscript, and the codex was the basis for a new critical Hebrew OT produced by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Draper & Russell (2003:213) besides, regard some ancient translations as important for establishing as close as possible, the original text of 1 Chronicles 21 because of its antiquity. Some important versions they point to include the Septuagint (LXX), which is the first translation from Hebrew to Greek, and the most important non-Hebrew witness to the passage. The Septuagint in their view generally represents the MT, but for the book of Samuel, from which 1 Chronicles 21 was copied, it preserves a more accurate text than the MT.

In Klein's (1974:1) opinion, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) is currently, the standard critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, which contains the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. The edition is believed to hold a virtually unchanged copy of the medieval manuscript, *Codex Leningradensis*, dated 1009 B CE, by its colophon. Klein concludes that the traditional text of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 is the consonantal *Masoretic Text* (MT), and can be dated to the end of the first century B.C., or early second century B.C.

Tov (2015:21) states that the MT forms the basis for explaining other received texts, even though its background and nature remain a mystery. Unlike the way the Qumran scrolls illuminated the Samaritan Pentateuch, the surviving textual theories have not succeeded in illuminating the background of MT.

Klein (1974:2) further notes that about a millennium separates the earliest completed copy of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21, *Codex Leningradensis*, from its consonantal form of MT. The text seems to have been copied with extreme care during this

millennium, based on the vocalization of the text, which includes instructions on how the text is to be laid out on the page, accent marks, and the *Masorah*.

Tov (1992:373-374) explains that even though the BH/BHS and the HUB are recognized as the two main critical editions of the Hebrew Bible that contain the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, there exist likewise, a large number of other critical editions masked behind modern translations. These editions are included in most critical commentaries, as well as in the several separate translations of the Hebrew Bible.

3.3.4. Summary

Textual criticism in this study is a lower criticism and is a study that deals with the origin and nature of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 as it was copied and recopied. The science of text criticism came as a result of the inevitable process of text transmission and the resultant number of variant readings. The task here was to work back to the original writings or autographs. Scholars presently use the science of philology to find meaning for an obscure word or phrase, rather than looking for errors of writing or copying as far as text-critical reading is concerned.

The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 has been known to be transmitted in many ancient, and medieval sources. The study of the differences between the sources provides the need for the text-critical reading of the passage. Text critical reading is an attempt to examine the copy or copies of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 original manuscript form. There are some matches between the deviating text of Samuel and Chronicles, demonstrating that Chronicles reflects a *vorlage* different from MT. The most significant version among the versions for the textual study of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 is the Septuagint (LXX), which itself has undergone a study of its version as an auxiliary tool for the textual criticism of MT. The Septuagint provides the form of Hebrew text which is a valuable witness to the state of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 in the second century.

The character of the Chronicler's work stands out as an independent narration to enliven, and develop the details of history from 2 Samuel 24. Although the Chronicler was generous to supply the details of the event of 1 Chronicles 21 from his source,

he enlivened the presentation of his *Vorlage* by elaborating it in terms of the conceptions of his day.

The book of 2 Samuel is the primary source the Chronicler depended on for the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, and the book belongs to the Deuteronomistic History. The two passages can be easily harmonized. However, the Chronicler's story seems to have been borrowed from 2 Samuel, and it shows a bit of a difference that might suggest the alteration of the original story by the Chronicler, possibly to suite his theological and/or ideological purpose. Also, 1 Chronicles 21 and 2 Samuel 24 were not found among the Qumran Scrolls.

The text of the Old Testament, which 1 Chronicles 21 forms part, numbers in tens of thousands of copies. The great volume of manuscripts helps to confirm the accuracy of the text. The text was carefully copied and transmitted more carefully than any document before the printing press. The manuscripts were written in various materials, the Papyrus, the parchment, the scrolls, until 600 AD, and thereafter, the codex, which was a book form.

The text of 1 Chronicles 21 is contained in the current Hebrew Bible and most modern OT translations and was a direct copy of the MT dated 1008 CE. It is referred to as the *Leningrad Codex*. The *Allepo Codex* is perhaps the best manuscript and the codex was the basis for a new critical Hebrew OT produced by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Some ancient translations like the Septuagint (LXX) were important for establishing the original text of 1 Chronicles 21 because of its antiquity. The Septuagint generally represents the MT, but for the book of Samuel (from which 1 Chronicles 21 was copied), it preserves a more accurate text than the MT.

The *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) is currently, the standard critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, which contains the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. The edition is believed to hold a virtually unchanged copy of the medieval manuscript, *Codex Leningradensis*, dated 1009 BCE, by its colophon.

The completed *Masoretic Text* has the vocalization of the text, accent marks, and the *Masorah*. The *Masorah* was to ensure that the text will be transmitted with special care, and consists of three parts: the first is the *Masorah parva*, which specifies the occurrences of spellings and vocalization. The second is the *Masora Magna*, which

notes detailed information about the particulars in the *Masorah parva*. The third is the *Masora finalis*, which gives a list of occurrences of the first and the second *Masora*, and also, notes information about the number of letters, words, and verses in the passage of 1 Chronicles 21, as well as in other portions of the Old Testament. Therefore, the traditional text of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 is the consonantal *Masoretic Text* (MT) and can be dated to the end of the first century B.C., or early second century B.C.

The MT forms the basis for explaining other received texts, even though its background and nature remain a mystery. Unlike the way the Qumran scrolls illuminated the Samaritan Pentateuch, the surviving textual theories have not succeeded in illuminating the background of MT.

About a millennium separates the earliest completed copy of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, *Codex Leningradensis*, from its consonantal form of MT. The text seems to have been copied with extreme care during this millennium, based on the vocalization of the text, which includes instructions on how the text is to be laid out on the page, accent marks, and the *Masorah*.

Moreover, even though the BH/BHS and the HUB are recognized as the two main critical editions of the Hebrew Bible that contain the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, there exist likewise, a large number of other critical editions masked behind modern translations. These editions are included in most critical commentaries, as well as in the several separate translations of the Hebrew Bible.

3.4. Literary Form Criticism

3.4.1. Theoretical Framework

Hayes (1982:77) explains the aim of form criticism as a means to determine the genre of a biblical book or section of a biblical book, like 1 Chronicles 21. Hayes claims that the specific features of a text like 1 Chronicles 21, categorizes it into particular literature. He exemplifies his claim, by using parables, which he says usually have certain standard features, such as a repetitive three-fold pattern and also contains contrasts.

Blomberg (2009:81) describes form criticism as a means for identifying the setting that was instrumental in the production, shaping, and employment of a particular style of literature. For example, parables likely were told by popular storytellers in the Ancient world.

According to Buss (1999:15), literary forms, or form criticism is the study of patterns of writing. Buss emphasis Gunkel's view of literary types, as constituting a complex of thoughts, moods, and written symbols, which normally have a connection with life. In agreement with the folklorist Ben-Amos, Buss understands these three aspects as corresponding to the different levels of genres: the cognitive, the expressive, and the behavioral.

In Buss' view, forms can refer to the arrangement of writing with several facets. It can also denote a holistic design of writing, including the physical occurrences, the content, and the role. Understanding any writing in Buss's opinion requires recognizing its forms, and discovering how its aspects relate to one another. He further explains that the consideration of the diverse aspects of any forms of writing helps interpreters not to limit scholarship only to external descriptions, but also to be skeptical of the insight.

Buss (1999:359) states that the form history of the book of Chronicles attempts to reconstruct the history of the book through the examination of its forms. This is achieved theoretically by the conversion of the formal structural observation into diachronic-historical ones. In Buss' view, this is quite different from the history of the forms of the book, which sequentially, examines the literary forms of the book, after determining the times and places based on historical criteria. The historical criteria allude to actual attestations, such as archaeological locations.

Buss (1999:359) suggests that form analysis then further utilizes the diachronic information, such as the time a text was written with the aim of the recognition of the form. Buss insists that the theory of form, in addition to just treating the text, subsequently, moves towards the principles that seek answers to what factors play a role in, behind, or in response to texts.

Brent and Giese (1995:1-4) note that the Hebrew Bible seemingly contains a diversity of forms of writing, which should make readers, if they are aware, consciously adjust their expectations when reading the different content, ways of

expression, and purpose of what is written. In their view, words can have different meanings, depending on the form, content, and function within the context where they appear in a written document. Therefore, they propose that it is imperious for readers of the Hebrew Bible to recognize the differences in forms, content, and miscellany of terms in each book, to avoid misinterpretation. They resolve that the literary forms, in which a text is written, provides the fourth support to the interpretation, in addition to the historical, grammatical, and theological interpretations.

Elwell and Beitzel (1988:328) refer to the literary form criticism as higher criticism and is the study of the literary materials of a text like the book of Chronicles. They state that the focus is usually on three areas. First, is the genre or type of literature. This is an attempt to discover if the original manuscript copy of Chronicles consists of poetry, prose, ancient historical sources, genealogies, letters, or legal matters

Second, is the identification of the sources behind the text of Chronicles. Because the author of Chronicles may seem not to have indicated the underlying sources he used, literary form criticism will attempt to remedy that paucity (1988:328-329).

Last, is the question of authorship and date of the book of Chronicles. This area attempts to discover if the events and persons behind the text of Chronicles were as historical as the author claims (1988:329).

3.4.2. Literary Form critical reading of the book of Chronicles

The literary form critical reading of the book of Chronicles involves presenting a reasoned argument to evaluate and analyze the different scholarly viewpoints to understand the literary form of the book, and for this study, distinct attention will be given to the literary form critical reading of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21.

Cuddon (2013:285) refers to the form of a literary work to its shape, structure, and style. In Cuddon's view, the form is in opposition to the substance of a written work, which implies what the work is all about. Even though forms and substance are inseparable, Cuddon maintains that their analysis and assessment may be done separately. He postulates another meaning of form as the genre.

Roth (1965:1) is of the view that the systematic and in-depth explanation of the literary patterns found in the Old Testament is one of the contemporary

accomplishments of biblical scholarship. Roth ascribed the initiation of the form-critical method to Hermann Gunkel (1862-1932) and emphasizes that it is an exegetical tool that has proven to be effective in the understanding of the Old Testament.

Roth (1965:1) asserts that through the use of the form-critical methods, many new insights have been gained concerning the outline and peculiarity of Biblical texts. As a result, the standard introductions to the Old Testament books offer concisely the results of form-critical research. At the same time, they attest to the accomplishments of the description of the history, as well as setting in life of almost all the literary patterns of the Old Testament texts.

Japhet (1993:1) understands the name of the book of Chronicles as one that seems to define a genre. The genre, in this case, she articulates, equals the events of the day, which is a historical narrative. Nonetheless, she sees no clear evidence of its title from within the book itself.

According to Cuddon (2013:298-299), the genre is a French word for type or class of literature. The classification of genres may coalesce around literary forms and content. Yet these aspects are distinct from the genre. Systems of categorizing genres have developed over time. Cuddon refers to Plato, whose understanding was that there were only three genres: lyric, epic, and drama, which in modern terms correspond to poetry, fiction, and drama. In Cuddon's view, Aristotle further extended Plato's classification to distinguish epic, tragedy, and comedy.

Cuddon (2013:298-299) states that from the Renaissance to the 18th century, genres have been carefully distinguished, and writers are expected to follow the rules prescribed. As a result, many other genres of non-fiction, like autobiography, biography, and essay have emerged. In Cuddon's opinion, genre theory attempts to categorize literature but also draws our attention to the porous nature of generic boundaries. Hence, under the weight of scrutiny, broad genres easily collapse into innumerable sub-genres. For example, when subjected to scrutiny, drama easily collapses into tragedy, comedy, and history, pastoral, and so on.

Additionally, Cuddon (2013:298-299) argues that literary texts may be said not to belong to any particular genre, rather participate in several genres. This assertion, I presume, very well describes the book of Chronicles' text. Cuddon understands this

train of thought to have resulted in increased sensitivity to the role of social and ideological context in the construction of genres. Therefore, he concurs that genre theory is no more confined to literary scholarship, but by implication, relates to the wider debates regarding the role and position of the reader/s.

Brent and Giese (1995:5-6) maintain that the genre falls under the middle level of contexts, and a correct understanding of the context helps in understanding any written text. Conversely, they note that failing to recognize context, deprives written words of their meaning. They point to the three levels of context we should be sensitive to, to properly understand an Old Testament book like the book of Chronicles.

The first level of context is the arrangement of words and phrases to construct well-formed sentences and paragraphs. This first level they also referred to as syntax and is the immediate context, which allows the determination of the meaning of words and phrases within a sentence. The second level of context is literary forms. It is the middle context. This represents the diverse ways in which statements are expressed in the book of Chronicles. This middle context is the context that is in focus in this section of this study. The third level is the distant context or the theological context. This underscores the importance that, every statement in the book of Chronicles, is part of the total context of the canon of the Hebrew Bible.

In contrast to the isolation of the different contexts, Jonker (2011:74) suggests engaging the other levels of communication that are simultaneously present. Using many examples, Jonker shows how these levels occur in an intertwined way and interactively in the book of Chronicles. Using the method of social categorization, he structured these examples according to the distinction between intra-group and inter-group categorization. His discussion moved from the local contexts to the wider international context. In contemplation of Jonker's argument, it becomes apparent that the study of the genre of the book of Chronicles will take into consideration these different levels of communication that are simultaneously present.

Brent and Giese (1995:6-7), identify prose and poetry as usually the most easily distinguished literary form. In their view, many other subdivisions, fall under these two categories. They assert that an exegete must first classify the genre of any work he or she wishes to scrutinize, understand the use or the significance of that

particular genre, and the time the work was written. They note that familiarity with the middle context can open up a window, through which the Chronicler's work can be greatly understood. For Brent and Giese, the immediate context, or the distant context may not usually provide the answers we need, rather, the deciphering of the middle context or the genre is what will allow us to see, not only what the Chronicler wishes to communicate to his audience, but also how he wanted them to respond.

Brent and Giese (1995:8-12) further explain that the literary form critical reading of an Old Testament book, like the book of Chronicles, is not concerned with the other forms before the written stage of the work nor is it concerned with the search of the oral stages of the book of Chronicles for forms. Rather, it is concerned with the canonical form of the text of the book of Chronicles. In their view, vocabulary and grammar may be of great help in determining genre, but neither is a defining mark of the genre in the Hebrew Bible.

Brent and Giese (1995:8-12) suggest that the three defining marks of the genre are: form or structures, content, and function. Forms immediately mark genre, just as prose is marked by verse, and poetry is marked by the system of line lengths. In a lament Psalm, a petition or request immediately follows a description. In the case of narrative, there must be a plot. A read for content, which is the second mark of genre, helps in determining genre. The third and final mark of the genre is the function. They recognize that this is how the text is intended to function and is sometimes referred to as the intentionality of the text.

Sandoval and Mandolfo (2003:30-31) regard the genre of the book of Chronicles as an ancient genre, and its understanding will require the inquiry about its context in the life of the recipients. In their view, genres in ancient Israel were usually associated with specific social group/s, which ensured their purity. They gave two examples, one with the priests and their associate Torah, and secondly the prophets and their associate oracles. The book of Chronicles Sandoval and Mandolfo state consists of collections and could be considered a collection of collections that were made in ancient times. Thus, the task of the literary form critical reading is to take apart these collections and to inquire how their components originated.

According to Japhet (1993:31-34), many generations of scholars regarded the form of the book of Chronicles as history. She states that some scholars related the book

to the Midrash, which can be understood as an ancient commentary on the part of the Hebrew Scriptures. Japhet also notes other scholars, who defined the book as a work of history, while others saw the book as a liturgical composition, to be read along with the Torah. After considering the book of Chronicles' relevant features like the aim, plan, form, and method, Japhet regards the book as history which she refers to as an idiosyncratic expression of biblical historiography.

However, Japhet (1993:31-34) notes that the work seems to be quite different from the modern sense of the definition of history. Nevertheless, She asserts that this does not, in any case, exclude the book from the general genre of history, for the following reasons: firstly, while the modern concept of history regarding human and natural forces as the governing forces of history, Chronicles belong to the realm of super-natural, which is borne out of human-divine interaction, and governed by God; secondly, ancient and modern historians have different ways of evaluating probabilities, based on their different theological suppositions, which usually arises out of the scope and nature of available information, as well as theoretical, and philosophical principles; thirdly, an ancient historian would warmly accept as a legitimate historical source, the genealogical lists, and family trees, while a modern historian would hesitate to accept them; fourthly, historians usually cite archival documents, letters and the like, which they scrutinize for authenticity, to make up the literary format of their work. The Chronicler seems to be well aware of this factor; hence he seemed skeptical of including prophetic stories, unlike his treatment of the Deuteronomistic history; finally, an ancient historian, particularly a biblical one assumes absolute authority in his work, whereas a modern historian relies on natural talent and abilities while recognizing his/ her limitations (Japhet 1993:31-34).

Brent and Giese (1995:14-18) recommend that accurate interpretation of an Old Testament book like the book of Chronicles hinges on the context, especially the middle context (the literary form), thus, recognizing the genre of the work is essential. To go about compiling a working knowledge of the genre of Chronicles comes from internal data and external parallels. The best guide they suggest is to read and note differences in form, content, and function, and what those differences mean. Also, to look at parallel genres that were preserved in writings from the Ancient Near East.

Brent and Giese's (1995:14-15) point of view, agrees with Jonker's (2011:74) understanding that the writer/s of the book of Chronicles felt the direct political impact in Jerusalem, as well as, been part of the ideological discourses on the international scene. Such writings may help to determine aspects of form, content, and function. However, Brent and Giese acclaim that it is important to be cautious in approaching the book of Chronicles, as it appears to have more than one genre. The primary goal of the pursuit of genre criticism here is to gain knowledge of the correct principle of interpretation that is needed for this study.

Buss (2010:116) implicitly, emphasizes that the starting point of form criticism lies within the canon of the Hebrew Bible itself. He notes that the biblical materials were superficially gathered according to the types of discourse, and social location. Buss exemplified his claim, by stating that the realm of wisdom and singers, is almost exclusively contained in the third division of the Hebrew canon. In Buss' understanding, the early post-biblical exegetes commonly analyzed biblical materials based on types. Also, the rabbinic tradition expressed different rules for the exegesis of different genres. For instance, the exegesis of the collective body of Judean laws derived from written and oral Torah differs significantly from the rules for the interpretation of non-legalistic exegetical texts, such as narratives. According to Buss Biblical genres, however, complement one another. They are endowed with persuasive principles that address the individual directly. He argues that this seems to be their central focus; thus, their primary aim is not just to narrate ancient stories, but for correction and usefulness for the individual.

Brent and Giese (1995:14-20) state that the book of Chronicles seems large to contain the genre of narratives. This, in their view, is because it has the form features, which can be seen in the division of the various actions into sequences and the overall developments of plots. They note that the narrator portrays individual characters, through how he relates their words and actions, as well as what he relates to their thoughts and emotions, to display the genre mark of content. The primary functions of the narratives in Chronicles do seem to teach kingship obligations or personal morality.

Brent and Giese (1995:23-24) note that in addition to the narrative, history, and law, other suggestions of biblical genres found in the book of Chronicles are genealogies, oracles, the announcement of judgments, apocalyptic, laments, and praise. In their

view, the understanding that there are various literary forms in the book of Chronicles, is of great importance, as it helps with the understanding of the uniqueness of the book, and how the varying principles can be applied to the interpretation of the different genres found in the book. Furthermore, the understanding here indicates how genres functioned for the author of Chronicles, and his audience.

However, it will not be necessary for this study, to examine all these genres found in the book of Chronicles, thus, emphasis will be limited from this point to the genre of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21.

3.4.3. Literary Form critical reading of 1 Chronicles 21

The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 seems to fall under the genre of narrative. According to Porter (2007:202-203) narratives fall under prose, which resembles the conventions of verbal speech. Porter explains that the Biblical prose narrative is very similar to the conception of a story and it should be approached like any contemporary story, without losing sight of the primary historical and theological nature of the text.

Puckett's (2016:4) definition of a narrative like 1 Chronicles 21, portrays the narrative as the relationship between, on the one hand, a real or imagined series of events, and the representation of that real or imagined series of events. This definition Puckett asserts allows for the possibility to look at the most interesting and vital aspect of critical reading of the narrative. The difference between events and their representation in Puckett's view can be linked to the difference between a story, and how the story is conveyed. Puckett states that the controversial nature of this definition is its reliance on the idea of representation, for which reason critics seem to understand the idea as too limiting.

Nevertheless, Puckett (2016:5) is less interested in supporting a particular definition of narratives, than seeing how competing definitions work within the critical narrative reading. Puckett understands that writers or theorists have made the thinking of the ideological character as well as the historical limits of representation, an important part of narrative theory. However, despite the important reservations in the definitions, Puckett holds that most of the narrative definitions, tend to assume one

or another relation between events and their representations in a narrative like 1 Chronicles 21.

Puckett notes that the “analytically powerful distinction between story and its representation is, arguably, the founding insight of the field of narratology” (2016:5). The narrative theory in Puckett’s view may end up going in many different and sometimes conflicting directions, it, however, always begins with the relationship between the events in a story like 1 Chronicles 21, and how the events are conveyed in the narrative.

In Porter’s (2007:202-203) opinion, for any story to be a story, it must have four basic elements: plot, character, setting, and point of view. Porter explains that the plot deals with events in any given story, and the way the events are arranged, rendered, and connected. Moreover, for Porter, there cannot be a plot without conflict. This could be generated by the opposition of persons, or forces. The plot in his viewpoint will usually have a beginning, middle, and end, which brings an end to the conflict or provides resolution. The plot conflict can only be possible if there is at least one character. This main character is the protagonist, who may be compassionate or indifferent to the character in opposition, who is referred to as the antagonist. The geographical and historical point at which a story occurs is known as the setting. The setting, Porter assumes, may also include other aspects as time, locale, weather condition, and many other physical properties. Finally, the point of view of biblical narratives, according to Porter, except on rare occasions, is typically related from the omniscience, omnipresent, third-party point of view. The narrator displays the freedom to reveal the thought, and motive of any character, as well as be invisibly present in all the places, without the restrictions of time, and space.

Porter (2007:237), summarizes the methodology of reading a narrative like 1 Chronicles 21 in four steps, that are not necessarily sequentially taken by a critic. First, in the form of the text, which is analyzed, and categorized according to literary aspects and genres. Porter includes the categories of fiction, nonfiction, prose, and poetry in the literary aspects. For the literary genres, he includes categories such as history, legend, and myth.

Secondly, Porter (2007:237) mentions the literary structure of the text, which he notes is analyzed in terms of setting, plot, language play, and theme. In Porter’s

view, the set consists of the context of the narrative, in which the plot and characters develop. The context he says usually includes geographical, temporal, social, and historical information. The plot includes the beginning of the story, a sequence of events, and the ending of the story. Porter notes that the plot can be studied at the whole text, or pericope level, and attention is given to narrative time that is regarded as the literary arrangement of the order of events, rather than historical sequence. The language play affords implied commentary, which guides the reader through the story. Language play usually employs devices such as irony, comedy, symbolism, repetition, and omission.

Porter (2007:237) notes that the third aspect of the methodology of reading a narrative is the study of the characters. The characters usually include conventional roles such as the protagonists and the antagonists, which need to be identified, together with the motives and change. The key to the narrative according to Porter, is how the author develops interesting personalities with whom the reader identifies. The identification of the points of view taken by various characters is the fourth aspect of the methodology. Consequently, Porter holds that “the application of the four steps of narrative criticism is directed toward the detection of an overarching or encapsulating theme” (Porter 2007:237).

Porter’s opinion is that among some narrative critics, there is a distinction between the real author, the implied author, and the narrator. The person telling the story says Porter, is the narrator. Porter adds that the perspective from which the text is written defines the implied author/ narrator, and the story is told from the perspective of the author/ narrator.

The real author based on Porter’s contribution, in the case of 1 Chronicles 21, will then refer to the author of the source material in 2 Samuel 24. The author/ narrator, similarly, will refer to the Chronicler, who retold or possibly rewrote the story in a new way, from his perspective, to include the use of the first or third person, the location, and the all-knowing and all presence of “the author/narrator who can interpret events from a future perspective and provide the reader with ‘inside’ information about characters’ thoughts, motivations, reasons, and private conversations” (Porter 2007:237).

Porter similarly, presents the distinction that could be made between the real reader, the narratee, and the implied reader. He explains that:

The implied readers are the group of readers that the text addresses who share certain presuppositions and knowledge of certain information. The real reader is meant to agree to accept the dynamic of the story world created by the author, temporarily adopting the faith commitments and value systems indicated by the text in order to associate with the feelings of the implied readers and determine the effect of the text, which is the intended response ... Narrative criticism is characterized by a remarkable diversity of approach. There is a growing interest in intertextuality, which is interconnection with texts outside of a narrative's immediate contextual boundaries. There is considerable disagreement about narratorial reliability (omniscience), the role of texts, contexts and readers, and the implications of interpretations. Even if all can be brought to agree on the facts, what is made of the facts is entirely different. Therefore, there has been a growing recognition that a uniform system of reading cannot guarantee uniform interpretation. Some narrative critics are combining reader-response criticism with narrative criticism through paying attention to the role of the reader in making meaning and studying how the text interprets the readers by helping them to understand themselves and their experiences. Literary criticism and narrative criticism are also combined with other current literary and sociological trends such as deconstruction, feminist criticism, political criticism, and psychoanalytic criticism.

Porter 2007:237

Wenham (2000:8-9), attempts to explain the difference between the real author, and the implied author, as well as the difference between the implied reader, and the real reader. In Wenham's view, the implied author is usually portrayed as a better person than the real author. Wenham exemplifies this view, by using the idea of a typical politicians' speeches, which usually "are full of high-flown rhetoric presenting themselves as trustworthy and devoted to social justice: sadly, in real life, some politicians do not live up to the image they project" (Wenham 2000:9).

Based on the preceding example, Wenham concludes that if we rely on their speeches and writing to construct a picture of the politicians and their views, we then have the implied author, as opposed to the real author. Therefore, in dealing with the text of 1 Chronicles 21, we can presume that we are dealing with the implied author, not the real author. We have no way of verifying that the real Chronicler matched the Chronicler implied by the text of his narrative.

Nevertheless, Wenham (2000:9) explains that the inaccessibility of the real author is no obstacle to understating the narrative, for it is the values entrenched in the narrative that we trying to illuminate. The views in the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21

are the views of the implied author, which may or may not agree with that of the real author.

Similarly, Wenham (2000:9) supposed that the implied reader is a mirror image of the implied author. This is the reader the author had in mind when writing the text, and probably, guessed the reader's knowledge, experience, and outlook. The writer then grounds his arrangement of materials, to appeal to this implied reader. Wenham identifies the central critical problem in reading a text like Chronicles is to discover the implied author and his worldview. The Chronicler in the case of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, is responsible for recording the words of the characters involved in the story, and his version of their speeches is what we have. He is the one that decides what to include and omit, so in the real sense, all the words are his.

Fokkelman (1999:216) advises readers to revisit the same biblical narrative like 1 Chronicles 21, numerous times to seek out a narrative's hero. In the present context, the hero may refer to God. Fokkelman notes that a narrator like Chronicler uses both narrative and narrated time. The narrator (Chronicler) is omniscient, anonymous, and master over characters, whose truth may or may not be his own. The narrator (Chronicler) was at liberty to manipulate his characters and readers. Fokkelman's emphasis, points to the view, that one can ferret out the story of 1 Chronicles 21 ideology by observing the way the narrator (Chronicler) intervenes in his stories to provide information and portrayal. He adds that through the selection of action, and passion, the narrator (Chronicler) constructed the plot of the story that helps readers detect the story's hero and the hero's quest.

According to Fokkelman (1999:216) a narrator like Chronicler accurately employs time and space, and at the same manipulates the point of view the characters are permitted to disclose. Thus, the narrator (Chronicler) is in control of the flow of knowledge and shapes the menu of perspectives the readers might choose to assume. Fokkelman understands the editor of a narrative like 1 Chronicles 21, to be similarly anonymous as the narrator, as well as intentional about his purpose as the narrator.

3.4.4. Summary

Literary form criticism is a means to determine the genre of any biblical book or a section of a biblical book, like the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. It sometimes helps in

identifying the setting of a particular style of writing. Forms can also refer to the arrangement of writing with several facets. The theory of forms allows the use of principles to seek answers to what factors play a role in, behind, or in response to texts. The Hebrew Bible contains a diversity of forms of writing, which provide the fourth support to the interpretation of the books contained in it, in addition to the historical, grammatical, and theological interpretations.

Literary form criticism can also be referred to as the higher criticism, and the focus is on the genre, the identification of the sources behind the text, and the question of authorship and date.

The literary form critical reading of the book of Chronicles involves presenting a reasoned argument to evaluate and analyze the different scholarly viewpoint to understand the literary form of the book, and for this study, distinct attention will be given to the literary form critical reading of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21.

The literary form critical reading is the systematic and in-depth explanation of the literary patterns found in the book of Chronicles. This is the study of the genres found in the book and is a French word for type or class of literature. The literary text of the book of Chronicles may be said not to belong to any particular genre, rather participate in several genres. The genre falls under the middle level of contexts, and a correct understanding of the context helps in understanding the text of the book of Chronicles. The immediate context is the syntax, which allows the determination of the meaning of words and phrases within a sentence. The middle context represents the diverse ways in which statements are expressed in the book of Chronicles. The distant context or the theological context underscores the importance that, every statement in the book of Chronicles, is part of the total context of the Hebrew Bible.

The immediate context or the distant context may not usually provide the answers we need, rather, the deciphering of the middle context or the genre is what will allow us to see, not only what the Chronicler wishes to communicate to his audience, but also how he wanted them to respond.

The three defining marks of the genre are form or structures, content, and function. Forms immediately mark genre, just as prose is marked by verse, and poetry is marked by the system of line lengths. The genre of the book of Chronicles is ancient, and its understanding will require an inquiry about its context in the life of the

recipients. The book of Chronicles consists of collections and could be considered a collection of collections that were made in ancient times.

The book of Chronicles appears to have more than one genre. The primary goal of the pursuit of genre criticism here is to gain knowledge of the correct principle of interpretation that is needed for this study. The book of Chronicles does seem large to contain the genre of narratives. In addition to the narrative, history, and law, other suggestions of biblical genres found in the book of Chronicles are genealogies, oracles, the announcement of judgments, apocalyptic, laments, and praise. The understanding that there are various literary forms in the book of Chronicles is definitely of great importance, as it helps with the understanding of the uniqueness of the book, and how we can apply varying principles to the interpretation of the different genres found in the book. Furthermore, the understanding here will indicate how genres functioned for the author of Chronicles, and his audience, as well as bring these genres up through time, for present-day application.

However, it will not be necessary for this study, to examine all these genres found in the book of Chronicles, thus, emphasis will be limited from this point to the genre of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 seems to fall under the genre of narrative. Narratives fall under prose, which resembles the conventions of verbal speech. The Biblical prose narrative is very similar to the conception of a story and it should be approached like any contemporary story, without losing sight of the primary historical and theological nature of the text.

The distinction between a story and its representation is, arguably, the founding insight of the field of narratology. The narrative theory goes in many different and sometimes conflicting directions. However, it always begins with the relationship between the events in a story like 1 Chronicles 21, and how the events are conveyed.

For any story to be a story, it must have four basic elements: plot, character, setting, and point of view. The plot deals with events in any given story, and the way the events are arranged, rendered and connected. There cannot be a plot without conflict. This could be generated by the opposition of persons, or forces. The plot usually has a beginning, middle, and end, which brings an end to the conflict or provides a resolution. The plot conflict can only be possible if there is at least one

character. This main character is the protagonist, who may be compassionate or indifferent to the character in opposition, who is referred to as the antagonist. The geographical and historical point at which a story occurs is known as the setting. The setting may also include other aspects such as time, locale, and many other physical properties. The point of view of biblical narratives, except on rare occasions, is typically related from omniscience, an omnipresent third-party point of view. The point of view can rest on different planes, which include ideological, psychological, and theological.

The narrator displays the freedom to reveal the thought, and motive of any character, as well as be invisibly present in all the places, without the restrictions of time, and space. The narrator in his view is the voice that imparts the story to the reader and sometimes may have a very distinct voice from the author.

3.5. Redaction Criticism

3.5.1. Theoretical Framework

Perrin (1969:1) expresses the theoretical framework of this aspect of historical criticism, as a concern with the studying of the theological motivation of an author, as this is revealed in the author's collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and the composition of new material. Perrin suggested that the discipline could equally be called composition criticism because it deals with the composition of new materials and the arrangement of redacted materials into new divisions and forms.

Breytenbach (1997:1166) clarifies what he refers to as intertextuality as a reaction of texts to another text within the context, based on a clear understanding that texts never exist in isolation. Constructed on this concept, Breytenbach observes that different narratives are always found in the Hebrew Bible about the same event, arising out of the need to determine texts socially. Breytenbach termed these narratives counter-narratives, which are generally narratives set up against master narratives, to de-dogmatize them, as well as counter their claim to universal truth.

Breytenbach (1997:1166) assumes that de-dogmatize is usually the aim of the redaction of texts like Chronicles. This is the study as defined by Breytenbach, of how the various units of the book of Chronicles have been assembled into its final

literary structure by the writer. Redaction criticism here, according to Breytenbach's view is that the Chronicler did not merely copy the materials he received; instead, he edited and re-shaped the traditions he collected. Therefore, Breytenbach understands the aim of the redaction criticism as the study of the involvement of the Chronicler in the work he has collected and shaped.

Grenz et. al. (1999:34) describe the redaction criticism as a means that allows a critic to attempt, to identify the ways a writer or editor utilizes sources in composing a biblical book to appreciate the author's theology, and setting.

3.5.2. Redaction Critical Reading of Chronicles

In Japhet's (1993:14) assessment, the Chronicler's major sources among the biblical works are the historical compositions. The Chronicler cited some of them in full and others in a reworked form. He did not take extensive literary excerpts from the prophetic books. He only cited some Psalms literarily. Japhet notes that the Chronicler's tenacities, his historiographical approaches, as well as his theological concepts, usually determines the variation of his technique for the use of the biblical extracts. Sometimes he cites them literary, other times he uses them as a foundation, and further adds materials to produce a more ornate picture. Japhet understands the Chronicler's style, as a display of a skillful balance of omission, additions, and changes that transforms his final work into narratives that are different from the sources, and sometimes conflicting.

Japhet (1993:14-17) indicates that the Chronicler appeared to have surveyed all of the Pentateuch as source materials for his writing, but his picture of Israel's history is emphatically different from that of the Pentateuch. Japhet attributes this difference in the Chronicle's embellishments and omissions as a function of his historiographical and theological plan. In Japhet's view, the Chronicler followed the order of the text of Samuel and Kings, but sometimes introduces a change of order, while adding and omitting texts. The Chronicler's most important biblical source is the book of Kings, which he employed quite differently for the account of Solomon's reign and that of the Kings of Judah.

Japhet (1993:15-17) further explicates that the Chronicler omitted large sections of Solomon's early narratives. Thus, making his version a shortened reformulation of 1 Kings 1-11. Japhet notes that in the case of the Kings of Judah, the Chronicler

follows to the letter, even when they collide with his theological views. His work according to Japhet is a record of the only legitimate kingdom of Judah, instead of being a synchronistic history of the two kingdoms. He only includes in his record the northern kingdom, in passages where the relationship between the two kingdoms is recorded, and he ultimately judges these relationships negatively.

Japhet continues by highlighting that the Chronicler supplements his records with extra-biblical traditions; an example can be found in II Chronicles 28:6-15. Japhet concludes that the Chronicler's record can be said to be presented from the perspective of Judah. He literary elaborated on their existing narratives and also isolated new episodes, as well as introduced new topics²⁹ that were not found in the Deuteronomistic history.

Moreover, Japhet (1993 17-.18) states that the Chronicler also borrowed from Ezra-Nehemiah, the edict of Cyrus, and the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. However, these stories serve a different purpose in Chronicles, showing his view to be critically divergent from Ezra-Nehemiah concerning the history of Israel. He also used extra-biblical sources, which consist of late, post-exilic materials that relate to the "legitimization and organization of the Temple personnel in its fourfold division into priests, Levites, singers and gatekeepers, and in the rotatory structure of twenty-four divisions" (Japhet 1993 17-.18). The Chronicler's general presuppositions in Japhet's view indicate the kind of adherence to sources, which sometimes motivates him to add or elaborate on the historical records.

Nahkola (2001:13) referred to Wellhausen to indicate agreement with his viewpoint and then recounts in the foundations of the method in biblical criticism, the double narrative of the parallels between the book of Chronicles and Samuel or Kings. The principle he could draw from the comparison is the influence of the Priestly Code. This is seen in the difference of the spirit in the way the two histories, represent the same facts and events. The implementation of the principle can be seen in the way the two traditions portrayed the lives of David and Solomon. The difference is the total impression one can see between the two histories. The Chronicler presents David as the founder of the kingdom, as well as the founder of the temple and public worship. Also, David was presented as "the singer and master of ceremonies at the

²⁹ The record of the military organisation of the kingdom; record of their economic achievements; details of the administration; and history of the Temple.

head of a swarm of priests and Levites” (Nahkola 2001:13). On the other hand, the books of Samuel and Kings portrayed David, as the king and hero at the head of his companions in arms.

Furthermore, Nahkola (2001:13-14) reiterates in the Chronicler’s narratives, how God takes the initiative and provides solutions. Nahkola exemplifies this idea by showing how it can be seen in the way God slew Saul and turned the kingdom over to David. However, in the Samuel version of the story, the human aspects of David were more prominent. David obtained the kingdom after a very long period, involving battle, cunning, treachery, and murder. Nahkola therefore, concludes that the Chronicler’s redaction of the stories of David, and Solomon, were deliberate, and transparent marring of the original narrative as it is found in Samuel. He retouched the old picture, to idealize the history of Judah, in the spirit of post-exilic Judaism.

Kiel and Delitzsch (1976:12) in their introduction to the book of Chronicles to analyze the plan, and the aim of the book, which in some way, could contribute to the discussion on the redaction criticism of the book. Based on the content of the book of Chronicles, they argue that the general sketch shows that the author had not the general history of Israel in view, from the time of David to the exilic period. Rather, the Chronicler’s only purpose was to give an outline of the history of David’s reign, and his successors, Solomon, and the kings of Judah to the fall of Jerusalem. In an attempt to compare the history of Israel in Chronicles, with the representation of the history of Israel in those times in Samuel, and Kings, Kiel and Delitzsch (1976:12) postulate that one can easily see that the Chronicler has purposefully omitted much of the history.

Firstly, in the history of David, he omitted his seven years reign at Hebron, over Judah. He generally omitted all the events related to King Saul, events connected to David’s family relationship, the scene between David and Michal (2 Sam. 6:20-23), the infidelity with Bathsheba, with its abrupt and more aloof consequences (2 Sam. 11:2-12), the outrage of Amnon upon Tamar, Amnon’s slaying by Absalom, his rise against David, with its issues (2 Sam. 13-22), and finally, from 2 Sam. 22:1-23:7, he omitted David’s thanksgiving Psalm and last words (Kiel and Delitzsch 1976:12).

Secondly, in the history of Solomon, the Chronicler omitted Adonijah’s attempt to usurp the throne, and the subsequent anointing of Solomon at Gihon, David’s last

command to Joab, and Shimei, the execution of these two men, together with Adonijah, and then Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter (1 Kings 2:13-46). He also omitted the wise judgment of Solomon, the description of his royal magnificence, his glory, his building of the temple, wisdom, and the turning of his heart from the Lord (1 Kings 3-11), Solomon's polygamy and idolatry, with their consequences (1 Kings 11:1-40). Finally, the Chronicler omitted the history of the northern kingdom, founded by Jeroboam, and the prominent prophets of the time, like Elijah and Elisha. He only mentioned the northern tribes, as long as they were in hostility or friendly union with Judah (Kiel and Delitzsch 1976:12).

On the other hand, the Chronicler included many facts and events which were not included in Samuel and Kings. Like the detailed account of the transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem, involving the Levites, and the worship arrangements made by David (1 Ch. 16). He included a whole section, about David's preparations for the building of the temple, and his arrangements for public worship; army regulation, and his last commands (1 Chron. 22-24). He further included in detail, the history of the kings of Judah, more than in the book of kings, as well as the work of the prophets in Judah (Kiel & Delitzsch 1976:13-15).

Based on the kind of information included and excluded by the Chronicler, Kiel and Delitzsch (1976:15-16) note that one can see the point of view, from which the Chronicler regarded, and described the events. He presents the facts religiously, while the author of the books of Samuel, and kings describes events from a political point of view. They assert that the Chronicler tries to draw from the history of the kings of Judah, the bliss, and blessings that come from adherence to the covenant, which the Lord made with Israel, as well as the devastation, and expletive that follows the forsaking of the covenant. The Chronicler's point of view Kiel and Delitzsch concludes, predisposed his selection, omission, and treatment of the material he borrowed from older histories, prophetic writings, and perhaps other writings.

3.5.3. Redaction Critical Reading of 1 Chronicles 21

There appears to be a possible redaction activity in 1 Chronicles 21, relative to the supposed source narrative in 2 Samuel 24. 1 Chronicles 21:1 states that it was Satan who stood up against Israel, and moved David to number the Israelites. While

2 Samuel 24:1, states that it was the anger of the Lord that was aroused against Israel and moved David to number his people.

Römer (2013:4-5) understands that the figure of Satan in 1 Chronicles 21, is not used as a proper name, rather, it designates the function of a secret agent of a sort and he cannot act without Yahweh's permission. In Römer's view, this is an attempt to extract the evil from Yahweh. Römer supposed that the texts from the Persian period demonstrate a tendency to create a figure representing evil that is separated from Yahweh. This tendency in Römer's view, led to the development of a dualistic worldview some centuries later, which he believes was not the case in the Hebrew Bible.

Knoppers (2004:751) similarly, understands that the Chronicler introduced the figure of Satan in 1 Chronicles 21, which alters the source text in 2 Samuel 24 because he wanted to represent the evil that is separated for Yahweh. Knoppers, supposed that the Chronicler altered his source text because the story as presented in the book of Samuel was untenable.

According to Japhet (1993:373), the appearance of Satan in 1 Chronicles 21:1, is an alteration to the text of 2 Samuel. Japhet emphasizes that the Chronicler detached the story from its former context in two ways: first, he omitted the anger of God, and second, the incitement to number the Israelites were not attributed to God, but another agent.

Japhet (1993:373), understands the result of the first alteration to mean that David is responsible for the events that follow. Japhet insists that the second alteration demands a detailed discussion. One of the assumptions and considerations according to Japhet, is based on the events found in a few passages in the Hebrew Bible; Satan is found as a member of the divine entourage in Zech. 3:1, and Job 1-2. In both these cases, Japhet notes that the noun is prefixed by the article, in contrast to 1 Chronicles 21:1, where the noun is indeterminate. In Japhet's view, it is this difference that prompts scholars to regard the noun as a proper name 'Satan.' Thus, 1 Chronicles 21:1, seems to "represent the ultimate stage in the development of the figure of Satan as the embodiment of evil, and the nearest in the Bible to a dualistic concept of the divine" (Japhet 1993:374).

Japhet states that all English translations follow this long exegetical tradition, “according to which satan serves as a proper noun, and read Satan” (Japhet 1993:374). The interpretation of the noun as Satan, by all these translations, is based on several assumptions and considerations according to Japhet. However, she recommends a reconsideration of this generally accepted view.

Japhet (1993:374) points out that from a linguistic point of view, the transition of a common noun to a proper noun is affected in Hebrew by the addition of the article. Additionally, she notes that a common noun can transit to a proper noun without the article if the noun has completely lost its original meaning. Therefore, in Japhet’s view, the absence of the article raises doubts about understanding the noun as a proper noun. This view Japhet notes, is nevertheless, purely from a linguistic point of view.

Japhet (1993:374-375), argues that if such a significant theological development in the concept of evil and its origin were expressed by 1 Chronicles 21:1, we would expect to find it elsewhere in the book as well. The general attitude of Chronicles in Japhet’s view is that evil, like good originates from God. Given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, Japhet concludes that the figure of Satan still serves as a common name, and refers to an adversary.

Mathews (1998:160) also agrees that 1 Chronicles contains a redaction activity. However, he assumes that David took a census of his military troops in 1 Chronicles 21, perhaps because of his pride. In Mathews’ interpretation, 2 Samuel ascribes David’s temptation to God, while the Chronicler ascribes it to Satan. Mathews reasons that the difference is because of the theological purpose of the passages respectively. Mathews further elucidates the need to understand the sovereignty of God and His control over all creation. Based on this understanding, Mathews accept as true that the Chronicler emphasized God’s holiness, and for that reason, attributed the direct cause of David’s sin to Satan. He exemplified his viewpoint by referencing elsewhere in Job 1:6, and Zech. 3:1, where Satan was acting under God’s direction.

Fleming (2005:124) notes that there is a redaction activity in 1 Chronicles 21:1, which reveals a difference in the text, from its source text in 2 Samuel 24:1-4. However, Fleming argues that the difference was theologically motivated. He

suggests in agreement with Mathews (1998:160) that David's sin was as a result of pride. Fleming writes that there was increasing power, and prosperity in Israel under David at the time the source text of 2 Samuel 24 was written. Fleming, attributes a feeling of self-praise to David, based on this growth, as if he, and not God, had been the cause of their growth. In Fleming's view, God allowed Satan to suggest to David to take the census. Therefore, God used the event to reveal David's pride and punish it.

Berger (2007:153) does not argue against the redaction activity in 1 Chronicles 21 either, rather, he proceeded to argue that it was God who did the inciting. Berger insisted that Lord incited David through Satan. He referred to Satan as the angel of the Lord, whom in his view, David saw in the form of the angel of the Lord with a drawn sword in his hand in 1 Chronicles 21:16. Berger understands Satan as the one who leads people to stumble, and the one who puts them to death.

Berger (2007:153) suggests that it cannot be ruled out that the Hebrew word (יָמַת), which can mean the one who puts them to death, is simply a corruption of the Hebrew word (יָסַת), which could mean the one who incites them. In Berger's view, the *samekh* of the *ha-mesit* must have been mistaken for a *mem* by a copyist. Therefore, in Berger's view, the Lord is the one who did the inciting through Satan, and since Satan is the one who did the inciting, it will follow that he is also the one who should be called the angel of the Lord.

Kiel and Delitzsch (1976:234-235) agree that there is the redaction of the source text in 1 Chronicles 21:1 by the Chronicler. Nevertheless, they explained that the mention of Satan, rather than Yahweh, as the seducer in this event, does not mean that everything contrary to Yahweh's will, was traced up to this evil spirit in later times in Israel. Rather, it was the Chronicler's design from the beginning, based on his purpose of writing, to indicate that David's act was ungodly.

According to Stokes (2009:92), in 2 Samuel 24, it was Yahweh who was angry with Israel and incites David against them, but in 1 Chronicles 21, a certain satan was identified as the direct cause of David's error. In Stokes's view, the identification of a certain satan as the instigator of David's census, and the resulting plague, as against the earlier version of the story, point to the fact that a redactor substituted this figure

for the deity. Stoke argues that the answer to the reason why a redactor would substitute the source of the instigator in the Chronicler's story has been given traditionally, and otherwise. However, the different scholarly viewpoints regarding the long exegetical tradition, according to which the term Satan serves either as a proper noun, or a common noun in 1 Chronicles 21:1 will continue to be reconsidered.

3.5.4. Summary

This aspect of historical criticism, theoretically, concerns the studying of the theological motivation of an author, as this is revealed in the author's collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and the composition of new material. The newly redacted materials are usually set up to de-dogmatize the old material, to counter their claim to universal truth. The aim of the redaction criticism is the study of the involvement of the Chronicler in the work he has collected and shaped.

The Chronicler's major sources among the biblical works are the historical compositions. He cited some of them in full and others in a reworked form. He did not take extensive literary excerpts from the prophetic books. He only cited some Psalms literarily. The Chronicler's style is a display of a skillful balance of omission, additions, and changes that transforms his final work into narratives that are different from the sources, and sometimes conflicting.

The Chronicler appeared to have surveyed all of the Pentateuch as source materials for his writing, but his picture of Israel's history is emphatically different from that of the Pentateuch. His work is a record of the only legitimate kingdom of Judah, instead of being a synchronistic history of the two kingdoms. He only includes in his record the Northern kingdom, in passages where the relationship between the two kingdoms is recorded, and ultimately judge these relationships negatively. At the same time, he supplements his records with extra-biblical traditions. The Chronicler also borrowed from Ezra-Nehemiah, the edict of Cyrus, and the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Even though, these stories serve a different purpose in Chronicles, showing his view to be critically divergent from Ezra-Nehemiah concerning the history of Israel. The Chronicler's point of view predisposed his selection, omission,

and treatment of the material he borrowed from older histories, prophetic writings, and perhaps other writings.

There appears to be a possible redaction activity in 1 Chronicles 21, relative to the supposed source narrative in 2 Samuel 24. 1 Chronicles 21:1 states that it was Satan who stood up against Israel, and moved David to number the Israelites. While 2 Samuel 24:1, states that it was the anger of the Lord that was aroused against Israel and moved David to number his people.

The first view considered, is that the figure of Satan is not used as a proper name, rather, it designates the function of a secret agent of some sort and he cannot act without Yahweh's permission. Some scholars believe that the insertion of the figure Satan in the verse is an attempt to extract the evil from Yahweh.

The second view, understand that the Chronicler altered his source text because the story as presented in the book of Samuel was untenable. The Chronicler detached the story from its former context in two ways: first, he omitted the anger of God, and second, the incitement to number the Israelites were not attributed to God, but another agent.

The first alteration means that David is responsible for the events that follow. The second alteration demands a detailed discussion, and one of the assumptions and considerations is based on the events found in a few passages in the Hebrew Bible; Satan is found as a member of the divine entourage in Zech. 3:1, and Job 1-2. In both these cases, the noun is prefixed by the article, in contrast to 1 Chronicles 21:1, where the noun is indeterminate. It is this difference that prompts scholars to regard the noun as a proper name 'Satan.' Thus, 1 Chronicles 21:1, seems to represent the ultimate stage in the development of the figure of Satan as the embodiment of evil. All English translations follow this long exegetical tradition, according to which satan serves as a proper noun, and read Satan.

However, from a linguistic point of view, the transition of a common noun to a proper noun is affected in Hebrew by the addition of the article. Additionally, a common noun can transit to a proper noun without the article, if the noun has completely lost its original meaning. The absence of the article in 1 Chronicles 21:1, raises doubts about understanding the noun as a proper noun.

Nevertheless, if such a significant theological development in the concept of evil and its origin were expressed by 1 Chronicles 21:1, we would expect to find it elsewhere in the book as well. The general attitude of Chronicles is that evil, like good originates from God. Given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, the conclusion is that the figure of Satan still serves as a common name, and refers to an adversary.

A third view assumed that David took a census of his military troops in 1 Chronicles 21, perhaps because of his pride. The reason for his pride is attributed to the increasing power, and prosperity in Israel at the time the source text of 2 Samuel 24 was written. Based on the situation, God allowed Satan to suggest to David to take the census. Therefore, God used the event to reveal David's pride and punish it.

Yet another view, understands Satan as the angel of the Lord, whom David saw in the form of the angel of the Lord with a drawn sword in his hand in 1 Chronicles 21:16. In this view, Satan is the one who leads people to stumble, and the one who puts them to death. In this view, there is believed to be a copyist error, whereby, it is suggested that the one who puts them to death, must have been mistaken as the one who did the inciting through Satan.

In any case, the identification of a certain satan as the instigator of David's census, and the resulting plague, as against the earlier version of the story, point to the fact that a redactor substituted this figure for the deity. The answer to the reason why a redactor would substitute the source of the instigator in the Chronicler's story has been given traditionally, and otherwise. However, the different scholarly viewpoints regarding the long exegetical tradition, according to which the term Satan serves either as a proper noun, or a common noun in 1 Chronicles 21:1 will continue to be reconsidered.

3.6. Synthesis

This synthesis aims to give a summary of the different sections of this chapter, towards a connected whole.

The first section attempts to uncover the tradition history. Traditions die at some point, and another tradition replaces them.

The second temple scribes rearranged, reworked, or rewrote the texts of ancient revelatory events, that were attributed to great mediatory figures like Moses and David. This demonstrates a distinction between what would have been understood as scriptural Mosaic or Davidic texts, and secondary rewritings and reworkings by later scribes.

Moses and David were not viewed as authors, but scribal channels of tradition, who collected, arranged, and transmitted revelation for new communities. These ancient figures can be understood as mediatory figures who occupy successive links on the chain of revelatory transmission.

So many traditions were expressed in the Old Testament that is part of Israel's history and theological development. The tradition expressed in 1 Chronicles 21 is the Zion tradition, which is mostly related to the Davidic Monarchy. The three elements emerge in any discussion of Zion tradition: the city, Yahwistic religion, and kingship. The discussion of what is known as the Zion tradition expresses the relationship between these three elements.

The study of tradition history indicates that the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 was not the creation of an individual but the product of the corporation of many generations, making it more likely that one person could not have written the book. The dominant threads in Israelite culture were oral, and the understanding of literacy in ancient Israel should be in terms of its continuity and interaction with the oral world. The oral world continues to live in the word of scripture.

Based on comparative evidence, the Chronicler relied heavily on 2 Samuel 24, other Old Testament books, as well as non-biblical sources. The books of Samuel, and the Pentateuch which are some of the primary sources the Chronicler depended on, belong to the same literary unit recognized as Torah. The Torah belongs to the Sinai tradition. The various biblical books the Chronicler depended on, belong to the different traditions, the Patriarchal, Covenant, and the Zion.

The Chronicler did not mention the Mosaic covenant, as he is associated with Shechem (Dt 27) and a symbol of the northern kingdom. Abrahamic covenant is also not mentioned either, because he is associated with Mount Gerizim, which is seen as a place of the Samaritans. The traditions that describe Yahweh as the Lord of

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are silenced in 1 Chronicles 21, as well as in the whole book.

The Chronicler shows through the reversing of the census route, a reflection of the Southern perspective. In other words, the Chronicler's background is rooted in the Southern tradition.

The Lord answered David with fire from heaven on the altar of burnt offering. This addition by the Chronicler could be said to be an allusion to the Mosaic tradition and the Sinai tradition and an attempt to replace these traditions. In the two cases, the appearance of Yahweh was often accompanied by fire, for example, Moses at the burning bush, and the revelation of the Torah at Sinai.

These traditions were preserved and transmitted by mediatory figures from one tradition to another, and either transmitted or recorded by the second temple scribes.

The Chronicler's ideology can be understood by the different traditions he emphasized. In 1 Chronicles 21, he emphasized the Zion tradition, David (who is seen as the founder of the Jerusalem temple), the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – Moses, the Exodus, the Sinai tradition, the Northern traditions, the Northern Kings (referring to the Northern Traditions). David became in this process a Moses redivivus and the Chronicler attempted to overwrite Moses with David. This overwriting entailed an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern Tradition, an overwriting of Tabernacle tradition with Jerusalem temple tradition, an overwriting of the Sinai tradition with the Zion tradition, and an overwriting of the exodus tradition with the monarchical tradition.

These traditions were preserved and transmitted by mediatory figures from one tradition to another, and either transmitted or recorded by the second temple scribes.

It is believed, that the oral and written world existed together in ancient Israel that helped to mold and preserve the written text of 1 Chronicles 21, which we currently have in the Hebrew Bible.

The second section is the textual criticism, a lower criticism, and is a study that deals with the origin and nature of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 as it was copied and recopied. The science of text criticism came as a result of the inevitable process of text transmission and the resultant number of variant readings. The task here was to

work back to the original writings or autographs. Scholars presently use the science of philology to find meaning for an obscure word or phrase, rather than looking for errors of writing or copying as far as text-critical reading is concerned.

The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 has been known to be transmitted in many ancient, and medieval sources. The study of the difference between the sources provides the need for the text-critical reading of the passage. Text critical reading is an attempt to examine the copy or copies of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 original manuscript form. There are some matches between the deviating text of Samuel and Chronicles, demonstrating that Chronicles reflects a *vorlage* different from MT. The task here was not to restore the source reading, but only the text as much as possible traced back to the author. The most significant version among the versions for the textual study of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 is the Septuagint (LXX), which itself has undergone a study of its version as an auxiliary tool for the textual criticism of MT. The Septuagint provides the form of Hebrew text which is a valuable witness to the state of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 in the second century.

The character of the Chronicler's work stands out as an independent narration to enliven, and develop the details of history from 2 Samuel 24. The book of 2 Samuel, is the primary source the Chronicler depended on for the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, and the book belongs to the Deuteronomistic History. The Deuteronomistic history was not the compilation of an editor, rather historical materials from highly varied traditions (some oral, while others were written), was brought together by an author and carefully arranged in a conceived plan. However, the history of 1 Chronicles 21, cannot be separated from the history of its source. Therefore, the text-critical reading of 1 Chronicles 21 was dependent on the text-critical reading of 2 Samuel 24.

The two passages can be easily harmonized. However, the Chronicler's story seems to have been borrowed from 2 Samuel, and it shows a bit of a difference that might suggest the alteration of the original story by the Chronicler, possibly to suit his theological and ideological purpose.

The text of the Old Testament, which 1 Chronicles 21 forms part, numbers in tens of thousands of copies. The great volume of manuscripts helps to confirm the accuracy of the text. The text was carefully copied and transmitted more carefully than any

document before the printing press. The manuscripts were written in various materials, the Papyrus, the parchment, the scrolls, until A.D. 600, and thereafter, the codex, which was a book form.

The text of 1 Chronicles 21 is contained in the current Hebrew Bible and most modern Old Testament translations, and was a direct copy of the MT dated AD 1008. It is referred to as the Leningrad Codex. The Aleppo Codex is perhaps the best manuscript and the codex was the basis for a new critical Hebrew Old Testament produced by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Some ancient translations like the Septuagint (LXX) were important for an attempt to establish the original text of 1 Chronicles 21 because of its antiquity. The Septuagint generally represents the MT, but for the book of Samuel, from which 1 Chronicles 21 was copied, it preserves a more accurate text than the MT.

The Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS) is currently, the standard critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, which contains the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. The edition is believed to hold a virtually unchanged copy of the medieval manuscript, Codex Leningradensis, dated 1009 B. C., by its colophon.

The completed Masoretic Text has the vocalization of the text, accent marks, and the Masorah. The traditional text of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 is the consonantal Masoretic Text (MT) and can be dated to the end of the first century B.C., or early second century B.C.

The MT forms the basis for explaining other received texts, even though its background and nature remain a mystery. Unlike the way the Qumran scrolls illuminated the Samaritan Pentateuch, the surviving textual theories have not succeeded in illuminating the background of MT.

About a millennium separates the earliest completed copy of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, Codex Leningradensis, from its consonantal form of MT. The text seems to have been copied with extreme care during this millennium, based on the vocalization of the text, which includes instructions on how the text is to be laid out on the page, accent marks, and the Masorah.

Moreover, even though the BH/BHS and the HUB are recognized as the two main critical editions of the Hebrew Bible that contain the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, there exist likewise, a large number of other critical editions masked behind modern

translations. These editions are included in most critical commentaries, as well as in the several separate translations of the Hebrew Bible.

The third section is the literary form criticism and is a means to determine the genre of any biblical book or a section of a biblical book, like the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. It sometimes helps in identifying the setting of a particular style of writing. Forms can also refer to the arrangement of writing with several facets. The theory of forms allows the use of principles to seek answers to what factors play a role in, behind, or in response to texts. The Hebrew Bible contains a diversity of forms of writing, which provide the fourth support to the interpretation of the books contained in it, in addition to the historical, grammatical, and theological interpretations.

Literary form criticism can also be referred to as the higher criticism, and the focus is on the genre, the identification of the sources behind the text, and the question of authorship and date.

The literary form critical reading of the book of Chronicles involves presenting a reasoned argument to evaluate and analyze the different scholarly viewpoints to understand the literary form of the book, and for this study, distinct attention was given to the literary form critical reading of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21.

The literary form critical reading is the systematic and in-depth explanation of the literary patterns found in the book of Chronicles. This is the study of the genres found in the book and is a French word for type or class of literature. The literary text of the book of Chronicles may be said not to belong to any particular genre, rather participate in several genres. The genre falls under the middle level of contexts, and a correct understanding of the context helps in understanding the text of the book of Chronicles. The immediate context is the syntax, which allows the determination of the meaning of words and phrases within a sentence. The middle context represents the diverse ways in which statements are expressed in the book of Chronicles. The distant context or the theological context underscores the importance that, every statement in the book of Chronicles, is part of the total context of the Hebrew Bible.

The immediate context or the distant context may not usually provide the answers we need, rather, the deciphering of the middle context or the genre is what will allow us to see, not only what the Chronicler wishes to communicate to his audience, but also how he wanted them to respond.

The three defining marks of the genre are form or structures, content, and function. Forms immediately mark genre, just as prose is marked by verse, and poetry is marked by the system of line lengths. The genre of the book of Chronicles is ancient, and its understanding will require an inquiry about its context in the life of the recipients. The book of Chronicles consists of collections and could be considered a collection of collections that were made in ancient times.

The book of Chronicles appears to have more than one genre. The primary goal of the pursuit of genre criticism here is to gain knowledge of the correct principle of interpretation that is needed for this study. The book of Chronicles does seem large to contain the genre of narratives. In addition to the narrative, history, and law, other suggestions of biblical genres found in the book of Chronicles are genealogies, oracles, announcements of judgments, apocalyptic, laments, and praise. The understanding that there are various literary forms in the book of Chronicles is definitely of great importance, as it helps with the understanding of the uniqueness of the book, and how we can apply varying principles to the interpretation of the different genres found in the book. Furthermore, the understanding here will take us back to how genres functioned for the author of Chronicles, and his audience, as well as help with the present-day application.

However, it was not necessary for this study, to examine all these genres found in the book of Chronicles, thus, the emphasis was limited from this point to the genre of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 seems to fall under the genre of narrative. Narratives fall under prose, which resembles the conventions of verbal speech. The Biblical prose narrative is very similar to the conception of a story and it should be approached like any contemporary story, without losing sight of the primary historical and theological nature of the text.

For any story to be a story, it must have four basic elements: plot, characters, setting, and point of view. The plot deals with events in any given story, and the way the events are arranged, rendered and connected. There cannot be a plot without conflict. This could be generated by the opposition of persons, or forces. The plot usually has a beginning, middle, and end, which brings an end to the conflict or provides a resolution. This main character (Yahweh) in 1 Chronicles 21 is the protagonist, who may be compassionate or indifferent to the character in opposition (David), who is referred to as the antagonist. The geographical and historical point

(Jerusalem) at which a story occurs is known as the setting. The setting may also include other aspects as time, locale, and many other physical properties. The point of view of biblical narratives, except on rare occasions, is typically related from omniscience, an omnipresent third-party point of view. The point of view can rest on different planes, which include ideological, psychological, and theological.

The narrator displays the freedom to reveal the thought, and motive of any character, as well as be invisibly present in all the places, without the restrictions of time, and space. The narrator in his view is the voice that imparts the story to the reader and sometimes may have a very distinct voice from the author.

A biblical narrative, like the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, should be evaluated as a unit, alongside the other narratives in the book of Chronicles. Rather than trying to get a special message from its statements, events, and descriptions. In other words, the whole narratives of the book of Chronicles give the message, rather than the separate individual narrative of 1 Chronicles 21.

Narratives can be portrayed as the relationship between, on the one hand, a real or imagined series of events, and the representation of that real or imagined series of events. The difference between events and their representation can be linked to the difference between a story, and how the story is conveyed. Most of the narrative definitions, tend to assume one or another relation between events and their representations in a narrative like 1 Chronicles 21.

The narrative theory goes in many different and sometimes conflicting directions, it, however, always begins with the relationship between the events in a story like 1 Chronicles 21, and how the events are conveyed in the narrative.

The real author of 1 Chronicles 21, is referred to as the author of the source material in 2 Samuel 24. The narrator, similarly, will refer to the Chronicler, who retold or possibly rewrote the story in a new way, from his perspective, to include the use of the first or third person, the location, and the all-knowing and all presence of the narrator who can interpret events from a future perspective and provide the reader with 'inside' information about characters' thoughts, motivations, reasons, and private conversations.

The implied readers (the restoring Judahite community) are the group of readers that the text addresses who share certain presuppositions and knowledge of certain

information. The real reader is meant to agree to accept the dynamic of the story world created by the author, temporarily adopting the faith commitments and value systems indicated by the text to associate with the feelings of the implied readers and determine the effect of the text,

There is a difference between the real author and the implied author. The implied author is assumed to be of better character than the real author, and in real life, the implied author does not live up to the image they project. We have no way of verifying that the real Chronicler matched the Chronicler implied by the text of his narrative. Nevertheless, the inaccessibility of the real author is no obstacle to understating the narrative, for it is the values entrenched in the narrative that we are trying to illuminate.

The implied reader is a mirror image of the implied author. This is the reader the author had in mind when writing the text, and probably, guessed the reader's knowledge, experience, and outlook. The writer then grounds his arrangement of materials, to appeal to this implied reader. The central critical problem in reading a text like Chronicles is to discover the implied author and his worldview. The Chronicler in the case of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, is responsible for recording the words of the characters involved in the story, and his version of their speeches is what we have. He is the one that decides what to include and omit, so in the real sense, all the words are his.

The narrator (Chronicler) is omniscient, anonymous, and master over characters, whose truth may or may not be his own. The narrator (Chronicler) was at liberty to manipulate his characters and readers.

A narrator like Chronicler accurately employs time and space, and at the same manipulates the point of view the characters are permitted to disclose. Thus, the narrator (Chronicler) is in control of the flow of knowledge and shapes the menu of perspectives the readers might choose to assume.

In the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, the Chronicler as already mentioned above under tradition criticism, changed the source material of 2 Samuel 24, to suit his ideological and theological purpose. Ideologically, the Chronicler, emphasized the Zion tradition, David, the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of

temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – Moses, the Exodus, the Sinai tradition, the Northern traditions.

Theologically, the Chronicler seems to have utilized a concept (satan) that was known to them (because of the Persian influence) to alter the theology of Samuel. In Samuel it is Yahweh who is instigating Dawid, which the Chronicler cannot align with his theology and image of God, therefore he falls back to a concept known to the people after exile – satan. This is the main reason why the Chronicler changed the Samuel narrative – because it didn't suit his theology and his image of God.

The last section is the redaction criticism. This aspect of historical criticism, theoretically, concerns the studying of the theological motivation of an author, as this is revealed in the author's collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and the composition of new material. The newly redacted materials are usually set up to de-dogmatize the old material, to counter their claim to universal truth. The redaction criticism aims to study the involvement of the Chronicler in the work he has collected and shaped.

The Chronicler's major source among the biblical works is the historical compositions. He cited some of them in full and others in a reworked form. He did not take extensive literary excerpts from the prophetic books. He only cited some Psalms literarily. The Chronicler's style is a display of a skillful balance of omission, additions, and changes that transforms his final work into narratives that are different from the sources, and sometimes conflicting.

The Chronicler appeared to have surveyed all of the Pentateuch as source materials for his writing, but his picture of Israel's history is emphatically different from that of the Pentateuch. His work is a record of the only legitimate kingdom of Judah, instead of being a synchronistic history of the two kingdoms. He only includes in his record the northern kingdom, in passages where the relationship between the two kingdoms are recorded, and ultimately judge these relationships negatively. At the same time, he supplements his records with extra-biblical traditions. The Chronicler also borrowed from Ezra-Nehemiah, the edict of Cyrus, and the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Even though, these stories serve a different purpose in Chronicles, showing his view to be critically divergent from Ezra-Nehemiah concerning the history of Israel. The Chronicler's point of view, predisposed his selection, omission,

and treatment of the material he borrowed from older histories, prophetic writings, and perhaps other writings.

There appears to be a possible redaction activity in 1 Chronicles 21, relative to the supposed source narrative in 2 Samuel 24. 1 Chronicles 21:1 states that it was Satan who stood up against Israel, and moved David to number the Israelites. While 2 Samuel 24:1, state that it was the anger of the Lord that was aroused against Israel, and moved David to number his people.

The first view considered, is that the figure of Satan is not used as a proper name, rather, it designates the function of a secret agent of some sort and he cannot act without Yahweh's permission. Some scholars believe that the insertion of the figure Satan in the verse is an attempt to extract the evil from Yahweh.

The second view, understand that the Chronicler altered his source text because the story as presented in the book of Samuel was untenable. The Chronicler detached the story from its former context in two ways: first, he omitted the anger of God, and second, the incitement to number the Israelites were not attributed to God, but another agent.

The first alteration means that David is responsible for the events that follow. The second alteration demands a detailed discussion, and one of the assumptions and considerations is based on the events found in a few passages in the Hebrew Bible; Satan is found as a member of the divine entourage in Zech. 3:1, and Job 1-2. In both these cases, the noun is prefixed by the article, in contrast to 1 Chronicles 21:1, where the noun is indeterminate. It is this difference that prompts scholars to regard the noun as a proper name 'Satan.' Thus, 1 Chronicles 21:1, seems to represent the ultimate stage in the development of the figure of Satan as the embodiment of evil. All English translations follow this long exegetical tradition, according to which satan serves as a proper noun, and read Satan.

However, from a linguistic point of view, the transition of a common noun to a proper noun is affected in Hebrew by the addition of the article. Additionally, a common noun can transit to a proper noun without the article, if the noun has completely lost its original meaning. The absence of the article in 1 Chronicles 21:1, raises doubts about understanding the noun as a proper noun.

Nevertheless, if such a significant theological development in the concept of evil and its origin were expressed by 1 Chronicles 21:1, we would expect to find it elsewhere in the book as well. The general attitude of Chronicles is that evil, like good originates from God. Given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, the conclusion is that the figure of Satan still serves as a common name, and refers to an adversary.

A third view assumed that David took a census of his military troops in 1 Chronicles 21, perhaps because of his pride. The reason for his pride is attributed to the increasing power, and prosperity in Israel at the time the source text of 2 Samuel 24 was written. Based on the situation, God allowed Satan to suggest to David to take the census. Therefore, God used the event to reveal David's pride and punish it.

Yet another view, understands Satan as the angel of the Lord, whom David saw in the form of the angel of the Lord with a drawn sword in his hand in 1 Chronicles 21:16. In this view, Satan is the one who leads people to stumble, and the one who puts them to death. In this view, there is believed to be a copyist error, whereby, it is suggested that the one who puts them to death, must have been mistaken as the one who did the inciting through Satan.

In any case, the identification of a certain satan as the instigator of David's census, and the resulting plague, as against the earlier version of the story, point to the fact that a redactor substituted this figure for the deity. The answer to the reason why a redactor would substitute the source of the instigator in the Chronicler's story has been given traditionally, and otherwise. Ideologically, the redaction represents a change in the Chronicler's tradition that is different from the tradition that was in existence during the writing of the source text of 2 Samuel 24. It expresses his perspective of the Zion tradition, the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. Theologically, the redaction was because the perspective of the Samuel narrative did not suit his theology and his image of God.

Chapter 4: A synchronic study: Rhetorical and structural analysis

4.1. Introduction

Whereas chapters 2 and 3, focused on a diachronic reading of the text of Chronicles, the emphasis of this chapter will be on the synchronic study of the text of 1 Chronicles 21. The diachronic reading was concerned with the higher criticism of the text, which sought answers concerning the source of the text. Contrariwise, the synchronic study will be concerned with the lower criticism of the text, which will seek answers as per what the text says.

According to Steck (1998:23), the approaches and stock of methods of Old Testament exegesis, usually reflect the double aspect of their subject matter. From the perspective of the origin of the texts, exegesis is a historical discipline. Conversely, exegesis is a theological discipline, from the perspective of the intention of the statements of the texts.

Steck proposes that to determine the meaning of biblical texts, one should not only consider the literary studies, but also, consider “that these texts are historical entities with historical, linguistic, and structural characteristics” (Steck 1998:22). The caution here is that in the process of understanding biblical texts, their historical origin cannot be disregarded under any circumstance.

The study of the historical origin, however, was completed in chapters 2 and 3, using the stock of methods. The stock of methods according to Steck (1998:21-23), includes but is not limited to the following: First, is the text criticism. The task was to confirm the original text or original wording of 1 Chronicles 21, by critically sorting the Hebrew text transmission as well as the ancient translations. Secondly, is literary criticism. This task investigated the individual text complexes at the stage of the written, fixed formulation of wording. Thirdly, is the transmission-historical approach, which concerns the oral transmission of an individual passage like 1 Chronicles 21. Fourthly, is the redaction-historical approach, which continued the synthetic aspect of transmission history. It traced the history of the text from its first written form through its expansion by additions, and through its incorporation into a larger complex, up to its final setting in the present context. The fifth is the form-historical approach, which worked out the linguistic genre of the text of 1 Chronicles 21. This

approach performed its task to the degree that one recognizes the distinctive character of the linguistic shape, including the choice of genre. It worked out the linguistic genre of the text of 1 Chronicles 21.

This chapter's focus will be on the linguistic, and structural characteristics. In Steck's (1998:22) view, linguistic and structural characteristics, provide insights into the original desire of the statements of the texts. However, they do not have their place alongside but inside the stock of methods, which helped in the attempt to accomplish the tasks in chapters 2 and 3.

The aim of this chapter then is to critically, understand the meaning behind the texts of 1 Chronicles 21 within the surrounding contexts. Invariably, the understanding of the meaning of the text will help, in conjunction with the answers garnered from chapters 2 and 3, to discern all the possible images of God, Satan, and the nation of Israel in 1 Chronicles 21, against the theological, and ideological context of the book of Chronicles.

The objectives of this chapter then will be the translation from Hebrew to English, of all the verses of 1 Chronicles 21, and the detailed analysis of the different words, phrases, and sentences contained in each verse. The aim is to understand the patterns, structure, figures, and methods the author used, in portraying his message.

4.2. Translation of 1 Chronicles 21:1-30³⁰

4.2.1. Verse 1

וַיַּעֲמֵד שָׁטָן עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּסֶּת אֶת־דָּוִד לְמַנּוֹת אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל:

וַיַּעֲמֵד

The root of this Hebrew word is (עָמַד). It is a Qal perfect (simple active verb). This means to take one's stand, or stand (BDB 2010:763). The verb form is referred to as wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect). The waw consecutive is a grammatical

³⁰ I am first giving a translation in 4.2, and the perspectives will be discussed after the translation.

construction in Hebrew that prefixes a verb with the letter waw, to modify its tense. Together with the imperfect inflation hireq-yod (יְ), which is a prefixed vowel for the Qal imperfect third person masculine singular, they both express frequentative use of the imperfect. A habitual action in the past (Kelly 1992:127-128). Resulting in the translation: And (he) stood up.

שָׂטָן

BDB (2010:966) describes this Hebrew term as Satan or Adversary. Also, as a masculine noun, personal or national. According to Anderson-Forbes *Analysed Text* (2008:1 Chr., 21:1), this Hebrew term also means adversary or Satan. But further passes the term as contrary to BDB, as a masculine singular absolute third person common noun. Similarly, the *Lexham Hebrew-English Interlinear Bible* describes the term as Satan, a third-person singular common noun.

The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2015:303) defines a common noun as a word that refers to an object or a thing but is not the name of a person, place, or thing. Based on the definition of a common noun, the Hebrew term (שָׂטָן) is not supposed to refer to a specific person.

There are, however, different views among scholars, garnered from chapters 2 and 3, regarding this figure of Satan. Some regard the figure as a specific person, while others regard the figure as anonymous.

1 Chronicles 21:1 seems to represent the ultimate stage in the development of the figure of Satan as the embodiment of evil. All English translations follow this long exegetical tradition, according to which satan serves as a proper noun, and read Satan (Japhet (1993:373).

The antecedent (וַיִּשְׁטָן) to the term is a third person masculine singular. The antecedent seems to suggest that the term (שָׂטָן) is a proper noun, which then refers to Satan as a specific masculine singular person, in agreement with BDB.

Berger (2007:153) understands the figure of Satan as a specific person. However, Berger's remarks purposely exclude the likelihood that this figure of Satan is a source of evil independent of God. Rather, he believes that it is God who provides the temptation of David, through Satan. Berger cited the discussions of some scholars,³¹ to support the position that Satan is a specific person, and is an embodiment of evil, but is, however, controlled by God.

It is assumed that David took a census of his military troops in 1 Chronicles 21, perhaps because of his pride. The reason for his pride is attributed to the increasing power, and prosperity in Israel at the time the source text of 2 Samuel 24 was written. Based on the situation, God allowed Satan, who is understood in this view as a proper noun, to suggest to David to take the census. Therefore, God used the event to reveal David's pride and punish it.

Japhet (1993:374-375), and Knoppers (2004:751) both do not see the figure of Satan as a definite entity, rather, an anonymous figure, an adversary that is not independent of God, who incited the King to take the wrong action.

In this second scholarly viewpoint concerning the figure of Satan, firstly, the figure of Satan is not used as a proper noun, rather, it designates the function of a secret agent of some sort, who cannot act without Yahweh's permission. Secondly, the Chronicler altered his source text because the story as presented in the book of Samuel was untenable. The incitement to number the Israelites were not attributed to God by the Chronicler, but another agent.

Thirdly, it is believed that scholars regard the noun as a proper name Satan because Satan was found as a member of the divine entourage in Zech. 3:1, and Job 1-2. In both these cases, the noun is prefixed by the article, in contrast to 1 Chronicles 21:1, where the noun is indeterminate.

Fourthly, from a linguistic point of view, the transition of a common noun to a proper noun is affected in Hebrew by the addition of the article. Additionally, a common noun can transit to a proper noun without the article, if the noun has completely lost its original meaning. The absence of the article in the 1 Chronicles 21:1, raises doubts about understanding the noun as a proper noun.

³¹ Williamson (1982:144-145), Johnstone (1997:1-225).

Fifth, it is suggested that if such a significant theological development in the concept of evil and its origin were expressed by 1 Chronicles 21:1, we would expect to find it elsewhere in the book as well. The general attitude of Chronicles is that evil, like good originates from God.

Sixth, the figure of Satan does not refer to a specific person, rather an angel of the Lord, whom David saw in the form of the angel of the Lord with a drawn sword in his hand in 1 Chronicles 21:16. In this view, Satan is the one who leads people to stumble, and the one who puts them to death. In this view, there is believed to be a copyist error, whereby, it is suggested that the one who puts them to death, must have been mistaken as the one who did the inciting through Satan.

In any case, all the views point to redaction activity in this text. The author substituted this figure for the deity as against the source text. The different scholarly viewpoints regarding the long exegetical tradition, according to which the term Satan serves either as a proper noun, or a common noun in 1 Chronicles 21:1 will continue to be reconsidered.

Nevertheless, given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, the conclusion is that the figure of Satan serves as a common name, and refers to an unknown adversary.

עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל

This is a compound Hebrew word, starting with a prepositional prefix (עַל), which can mean “upon, above or about” (Kelly 1992:30). BDB (2010:752), defines the word as a preposition, “upon, above, over or against.” The preposition is joined by a *Maqqef* (-),³² to another word (יִשְׂרָאֵל), which BDB (2010:975), describes as the second name for Jacob (Israel), given to him in Genesis 32:28. By implication, a name for

³² A *Maqqef* is a short horizontal stroke used to join together two or more words within a verse (Kelly 1992:12).

his children, the Hebrew nation, the undivided kingdom. Therefore, the compound word sums up to, “upon Israel or against Israel.”

וַיִּסְתֵּן

The root of this Hebrew word is (סוּת), it is a Hifil (causative active) verb, meaning “to instigate, to incite in a bad sense” (BDB 2010:694). It is a causative active verb that serves as the causative of the Qal (simple active verb) incite (Kelly 1992:111). It is prefixed by the waw conjunction to form a *wayyiqtol* (waw-consecutive + imperfect). The waw consecutive modifies the tense of the verb to imperfect and it is in the third person masculine singular. Imperfect according to the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (2015:787), is the verb tense that expresses an action that is not complete in the past. Therefore, the word means ‘and he incited or and he instigated’.

אֶת־דָּוִד

This word (דָּוִד) means David and is a proper noun in the masculine singular absolute. It is also prefixed by the preposition (אֶת), which is an object marker (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:1). Kelly (1992:71) defines the preposition (אֶת) as a particle, that serves as a sign of the definite direct object. This is generally not translated in English but preceding and indicating the accusative.

A particle is a preposition as defined by the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (2015:1121) and combines with a verb to form a phrasal verb. Therefore, the word David can be assumed to be combined by the particle with the preceding imperfect verb to form the phrasal verb, ‘and he incited David’.

לְמַנּוֹת

The root of this word is the verb (מָנָה), which means “count, number or reckon” (BDB:584). The word is prefixed with the preposition (לְ) that can mean “to, for or at (plus other meanings),” according to Kelly (1992:28). This preposition is most frequently used to prefix infinitives construct, to introduce a purpose clause or a result clause. The infinitive, in this case, is infinite in the sense that it is used to express the basic idea of the verb root without the limitations of a person, gender, and number. This is unlike the other verb forms; perfects, imperfects, and imperatives that are limited to a specific person, gender, and number. In this case, it expresses the basic idea of the verb root “to count, or to number” (Kelly 1992:179-183).

אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל

The root word here like above means Israel. But this time, it is prefixed by the preposition (אֶת), which is an object marker (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:1). Therefore, making the word the object of the preceding infinitive verb. And as stated above, the preposition serves as a sign of the direct object and combines with the preceding verb to form a phrasal verb. Therefore, the term Israel here can be assumed to be combined by the particle with the preceding infinitive verb to form the phrasal verb, “to number or to count Israel.”

Verse 1 therefore, reads as follows: And Satan stood up against Israel and incited David to count Israel.

4.2.2. Verse 2

וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל־יוֹאָב וְאֶל־שָׂרֵי הָעָם לֵכּוּ סַפְּרוּ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִבְּאֵר שֶׁבַע וְעַבְבֹן וְהִבִּיאוּ אֵלַי וְאִדְעָה אֶת־מִסְפָּרָם:

וַיֹּאמֶר

The root of this word is a verb (אָמַר) that means “utter, speak or say” (BDB 2010:55).

The word is a Qal verb (simple active verb), a *wayyiqtol* (waw consecutive + imperfect) and in the third person masculine singular (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:2). The resulting translation is then “and he said.”

דָּוִד

This word as already described above is a proper masculine singular absolute noun, which is the name of a person. BDB (2010:187) describes the name as “David”, meaning beloved, the son of Jesse, the second King of Israel.

אֶל-יוֹאָב

The preposition (אֶל) is defined by Anderson-Forbes Analysed Text (2008: 1 Chr. 21:2) as unto. Kelly (1992:29) defines it as; “to, into, toward” and refers to it as an unattached or independent preposition that functions much like prepositions in English. It prefixes and joined with a *Maqqef*, to the word (יוֹאָב), a proper noun in the masculine singular absolute, which BDB (2010:222) describes as Joab, David’s sister’s son, and captain of his host. The word can be translated as “to Joab.”

וְאֶל-שָׂרֵי

This Hebrew word is prefixed by the waw conjunction (וְ) “and,” plus the preposition (אֶל), “to” (as described in the previous word). They are joined together by a *Maqqef* in a construct relationship to the root word (שָׂרִים), a masculine common plural noun that means “commanders” (BDB 2010:978). This expresses a genitival relationship and other meaning associated with the preposition “of”, which is lacking in Hebrew. Thus, the construct relationship helps to fill the gap and the construct state represents the shortening of the absolute state. When a masculine plural noun is

placed in the construct state, its ending is changed from **יָוֹד** (hireq-yod, plus final mem) to **יָוֹדִי** (sere-yod). The construct relationship here serves as a further description of a person of Joab, as well as it is used to show possession. A noun usually in a construct state does not take a definite article; hence it is a common noun. However, because this noun is joined to an absolute noun with a definite article, it will be translated as definite. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and to the commanders of” (Kelly 1992:58-63).

הָעָם

This word comprises the definite article that is usually written (**הַ**) before the Hebrew guttural letter (**ע**) and the word (**עַם**) that means nation, or people, a common singular absolute noun (BDB 2010:769). There is the compulsory lengthening of the vowel of the article from (patah to qames), because the guttural rejects the dagesh forte, without which the short vowel will be left in an unaccented syllable (Kelly 1992:25). It is joined to the preceding construct noun and has forced the preceding construct noun to also have the definite article. The word is translated as ‘the people.’

לָכוּ

This word is from the root Qal verb (**לָכָה**), a simple active verb that means ‘to go’ (BDB 2010:229). According to Van der Merwe (2004: 1 Chr. 21:2), it is a Qal imperative second person masculine plural verb. The Qal imperative verb is a shortened form of the Qal imperfect verb. The shortening involves the dropping of the performatives from the second person form of the masculine plural imperfect verb. However, this is an example of a Qal imperative representation class of the weak verb, from (**לָכָה**) he walked, went (Pe guttural), results to (**לָכוּ**) “go” (Kelly 1992:167).

סָפַרְוּ

This is also an active verb in the imperative second person masculine plural form that means “count or number” (Anderson-Forbes Analysed Text 2008: 1 Chr. 21:2). It is a weak verb similar to the preceding word, and from the root word (סָפַר), which is a masculine noun that means enumeration (BDB 2010:708). Therefore, the word can be translated as “number.”

אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל

As stated earlier, (אֶת) is used to mark the accusative, therefore, it is the object maker of the sentence and it is prefixed to (יִשְׂרָאֵל) which as stated above is Israel, the object of the sentence.

מִבְּאֵר שֶׁבַע

This is a compound Hebrew word, prefixed by the preposition (מִן), which can mean “from, away from or more than,” according to Kelly (1992:70). It is prefixed to the proper, singular absolute noun (בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע), which BDB (2010:92) describes as a place, called Beersheba, meaning well of seven, and explained as a place of an oath that is South of Hebron in Israel. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “from Beersheba.”

וְעַבְדֶּנּוּ

This is also a compound Hebrew word that comprises the waw conjunction “and”, which Kelly (1992:31) states, does not stand alone in Hebrew but is prefixed to other words. In this case, it is prefixed to the preposition (עַבַּד) that BDB (2010:723) defines

as “as far as, even to, up to, until.” The word can then possibly mean “and as far as, or and up to.”

The word is then joined by the short horizontal line *maqṣef* to a noun, which BDB (2010:192) proposes three meanings for firstly, it could mean the masculine plural noun that refers to the fifth son of Jacob. Secondly, it could also mean the tribe that descended from the son of Jacob. Finally, it could mean a proper locative noun that refers to a city on the northern frontier of Israel. BDB however, prefers the city of Dan as the right choice of translation, based on context. Therefore, the compound word can then mean “and as far as the city of Dan or and up to the city of Dan.”

וְהָבִיאֵי

This Hebrew word is made up of the waw conjunction “and” that is prefixed to a verb. The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:97) is a Qal perfect verb (בֹּאֵ) that means “come in, go, go in, go.” Van der Merwe (2004: 1 Chr. 21:2) passes the word as a Hif'il imperative second person masculine plural verb.

According to Kelly (1992:171), the Hif'il imperative verb is formed by changing the (ת) of the prefix of the second person imperfect forms to (ה). BDB further defines the Hif'il of the verb form as follows “bring in, cause to come in, gather, cause to come, bring near, bring against, bring upon.” Therefore, the word can be defined as “and bring in” or “and gather, and so on.”

אֶל־

This word is made up of the prefix, the independent or unattached preposition (אֶל), which Kelly (1992:29) defines as “to, into or towards.” BDB (2010:39) also defines the word as a preposition, denoting motion to or direction towards. Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:2), passes the word as a preposition in agreement with Kelly and BDB, but explains the contraction as a combination of the prefix, suffixed by the first-

person singular pronoun (אֲנִי), that means “me or I.” Therefore, the word can mean “to me,” or “towards me.”

וְאֵדָעָה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:2) describes the above word as a compound word, made up of the waw-conjunction (ו) that means “and” plus the imperfect verb that has its root as (יָדַע), which BDB (2010:393) defines as “know.” The verb in the present form is in the imperfect form, which can mean “to know,” and according to Van der Merwe, it is a cohortative first-person singular verb. Kelly (1992:132) defines cohortative as a verb that is used to express the speaker’s desire, intention, or determination to perform a certain action. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and I will know.”

אֶת־מִסְפָּרָם

This Hebrew word is prefixed by the object marker (אֶת), which as described earlier, is a sign of the direct object. According to Van der Merwe, it is joined by the *maqfef* to the common singular noun (מִסְפָּר) that means “number.” Van der Merwe explains the word to be in a construct state, with the third-person pronoun suffix (הֶם) that means “their”. Therefore, the word can mean “Their number.”

Verse 2 therefore, reads as follows: And David said to Joab and the commanders of the people, go number Israel from Beersheba and as far as the city of Dan and bring in to me and I will know their number.

4.2.3. Verse 3

וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹאָב יוֹסֵף יְהוָה עַל־עַמָּר | כִּהֵם מֵאָה פְּעָמִים הֲלֹא אֲדַנִּי הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּלֶם לֵאדֹנִי לְעַבְדִּים
לְמָה יִבְקֹשׁ זֹאת אֲדַנִּי לְמָה יְהִי לְאַשְׁמָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל:

וַיֹּאמֶר

The root of this word is a verb (אָמַר) that means “utter, speak or say” (BDB 2010:55).

The word is a Qal verb (simple active verb), a *wayyiqtol* (waw consecutive + imperfect), and in the third person masculine singular (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:2). The resulting translation is then “and he said.”

יוֹאָב

A proper noun in the masculine singular absolute, which BDB (2010:222) describes as Joab, David’s sister’s son, and captain of his host. The word can be translated as “Joab.”

יוֹסֵף

The root of this verb according to BDB (2010:414) is (יָסַף) that means “add.” In the present inflation, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3) passes the word as a jussive Hif’il yiqtol (imperfect verb), in the third-person masculine singular. Kelly (1992:131) explains the jussive verb as a verb that only involves imperfect forms of the verb, and most commonly used in the third person, even though it can sometimes be used in the second person. Accordingly, as Kelly stated about weak verbs, the jussive appears as a shortened form of the imperfect. Kelly, further explained that the jussive is used to express the speaker’s desire or wish, and frequently translated as the modal auxiliaries “may” and “let.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “may he add.”

יְהוָה

BDB (2010:217) describes the above word as “Yahweh,” a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which the proper name for the God of Israel. The word presumably has the previous word as its antecedent, which together will result in “Yahweh.”

עַל-עַמּוֹ

This compound word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3), is made up of three words in a construct relationship. The first is the preposition (עַל), which BDB (2010:252) defines as “upon, in addition to, on to, towards or to.” The second is the common masculine singular construct noun (עַם), meaning “nation, or people” (BDB 2010:768). Lastly, is the third-person masculine singular pronoun suffix (הוּא) that contracts to (ו) in a construct relationship, denoted by Kelly (1992:74) as “his.” Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “upon his people, or to his people.”

כְּהֵם

The above word is made up of the preposition (כְּ), which in Kelly’s (1992:28) definition, can mean “as, like, according to,” and the third-person masculine pronoun suffix (הֵם) that denotes “they,” according to Kelly (52). The word can then be translated as “like they or as they.”

מֵאֵה

Kelly (1992:99) describes the word above as a feminine singular absolute numerical cardinal that denotes the number “hundred.” BDB (2010:547) similarly defines the word as a feminine noun that denotes “a hundred.”

פְּעָמִים

The root of the above Hebrew word is (פָּעַם) that can mean “beat, foot, anvil or occurrence.” In the present form (פְּעָמִים), according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3), it is in the common, masculine absolute plural noun, that can then denote “occurrences.”

הֲלֹא

The prefix of this word is the interrogative (הֲ), Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3), defines as the question mark (?), which denotes a yes/ no question in Hebrew.

Kelly (1992:94) similarly defines the prefix as “a simple yes-or-no question normally introduced by the interrogative (הֲ) and is prefixed to the first word in the sentence.

Hence, the prefixed is asserted by Kelly to start a sentence, it will indicate that the previous sentence has ended, and here begins a new sentence.

The prefix is attached to the negation (לֹא), which can mean “no, not,” and expresses absolute prohibitions (Kelly 173). Therefore, the word can be written as “? + no, or not,” and thus, can be translated as “Are not.”

אֲדֹנָי

The above word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3), is a construct noun that comprises the root word (אֲדֹנָי) that means “Lord” (BDB (2010:10), and the first-person singular pronoun suffix (אֲנִי) that means “my” (Kelly 1992:71). The function of

the construct relationship as Kelly (1992:58) explained is to express a genitival relationship. The construct word, contracts to become “my Lord.”

הַמֶּלֶךְ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3) passes the above word as a common singular absolute noun that is prefixed by the definite article. The definite article (הַ) is defined as “the,” and never stands alone in Hebrew according to Kelly (1992:24), but is prefixed to the noun whose definiteness it determines. In this case, it determines the definiteness of the word (מֶלֶךְ) that means “King.” Therefore, together they can mean “the King.”

כָּלָם

This is also another construct word, with the root (כָּל), a common singular noun, that means “the whole, or all” (BDB 2010:481). It is joined in a construct relationship with the pronominal suffix third-person masculine plural (הֶם), which BDB (241) defines as “they or them.” Kelly (1992:58) notes that the construct relationship here, explains about the various nuances associated with the preposition “of.” In Kelly’s view, the construct relationship helped to fill the gap, since Hebrew lacked such an all-purpose preposition. Therefore, the word can mean “all of them”

לְאֲדֹנָי

This word as already explained earlier is a construct noun that comprises the root word (אֲדֹנָי) that means “Lord” (BDB (2010:10), and the first-person singular pronoun suffix (אֲנִי). The function of the construct relationship as Kelly (1992:58) explained is to express a genitival relationship. The construct word then contracts to become “my Lord.” However, this time, the word is prefixed by the preposition (לְ), that Kelly

(1992:28) defines as “to, for, at”. Therefore, the word this time becomes “to my Lord or for my Lord.”

לְעֲבָדִים

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3) passes the above word as a compound word that comprises the (לְ) preposition that means as in the previous word “to, for, at,” prefixed to the noun with the root (עָבַד) that means “slave, or servant.” In the present form, the noun is in the masculine common absolute plural noun, thus it can be translated as “slaves or servants.” Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “to servants, or for servants.”

לְמָה

Similarly, the above what is prefixed by the (לְ) preposition that means as in the previous word “to, for, at,” prefixed to the interrogative (מָה), that can mean “what or how” (BDB 2010:552). Hence, the word can be translated as “to what or for what.”

However, Kelly (1992:96) explains that the above word, is an example of a typical question that is usually introduced in Hebrew using interrogative adverbs, and can, therefore, mean “why?” or “to what purpose?”

יִבְקֹשׁ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3) passes the above word as Piel, yiqtol (imperfect) third-person, a masculine singular verb that has its root as (בָּקַשׁ), which BDB (2010:134), defines as “seek.” In the present form, the verb is prefixed by the yiqtol (יִ) to denote the Pi’el imperfect stem (Kelly 1992:141). Kelly describes the Pi’el stem, as sometimes intensive in meaning, but often rendered as a simple active verb much

like the Qal perfect or as a causative verb, much like the Hif'il imperfect. Thus, the verb can be translated as “to seek to find, to seek to secure, to desire, or demand.”

זאת

Kelly (1992:53) describes the above word as a demonstrative feminine singular pronoun “this.” Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3) in agreement with Kelly, also describes the word as the demonstrative feminine singular pronoun “this.”

אֲדֹנָי

This word as described earlier, according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3), is a construct noun that comprises the root word (אֲדֹנָי) that means “Lord” (BDB (2010:10), and the first-person singular pronominal suffix “my” (אֲנִי). The function of the construct relationship as Kelly (1992:58) explained is to express a genitival relationship. The construct word, contracts to become “my Lord.”

לְמַה

Similarly, as described earlier, the (לְ) preposition means “to, for, at,” prefixed to the interrogative (מַה), which can mean “what or how” (BDB 2010:552). Hence, the word can in a simple sense be translated as “to what or for what.”

However, as already clarified above, Kelly (1992:96) explains that the above word, is an example of a typical question that is usually introduced in Hebrew using interrogative adverbs, and can, therefore, mean “why?” or “to what purpose?”

יְהִי

The root of this verb according to BDB (2010:224) is (הָיָה), means “fall out, come to pass, become or be.” In the present context, the word is passed by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3), as an imperfect third-person masculine singular verb. Therefore, it can be translated as “to fall out, to come to pass, or to be.”

לְאִשָּׁמָה

The above word is described by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:3), as a compound word, consisting of the (לְ) preposition “to, for, at,” and the common feminine singular absolute noun (אִשָּׁמָה). BDB (2010:80) defines the noun as “wrong-doing, guilt or guiltiness.” In the context, BDB describes the word as “becoming guilty.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “for guilt.”

לְיִשְׂרָאֵל

Again this is the (לְ) preposition that means “to, for, at,” prefixed to the singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:975), describes as the second name for Jacob (Israel), given to him in Genesis 32:28. By implication, the name for his children, the Hebrew nation, the undivided kingdom. Therefore, the word can be translated as “to Israel, or for Israel.”

Verse 3 therefore, reads as follows: And Joab said, may Yahweh add to his people as they a hundred occurrences. Are not all of them My Lord for servants to my Lord the King? Why demand this, my Lord? To what purpose, to be for guilt to Israel?

4.2.4. Verse 4

וּדְבַר־הַמֶּלֶךְ חָזַק עַל־יּוֹאָב וַיֵּצֵא יוֹאָב וַיִּתְּהַלֵּךְ בְּכַד־יִשְׂרָאֵל רַיְבָא יְרוּשָׁלַם:

וּדְבַר־הַמֶּלֶךְ

The above word is prefixed by the waw conjunction (ו) that means “and” (Kelly 1992:31). Kelly explains that the waw conjunction is written as (sureq= ו), before all consonants pointed with a simple sheva, except when this consonant is a yod.

Here, it is prefixed to the word (דְּבַר), which BDB (2010:182) describes as “speech, word,” a common masculine singular noun in a construct state. The function of the construct relationship in the context as Kelly (1992:58) explains is to express a genitival relationship and the nuances of meaning associated with the preposition “of,” which is lacked in Hebrew. Thus, we have “speech of or word of.”

Now, the compound word is joined by a *maqfef* to the definite article (ה), which is defined as “the,” and never stands alone in Hebrew according to Kelly (1992:24), but is prefixed to the noun whose definiteness it determines. In this case, it determines the definiteness of the word (מֶלֶךְ) that means “King.” Together they can mean “the King.” Therefore, the two words joined together can mean “and word of the King.”

חִזַּק

The above word according to BDB (2010:304) is a Qal perfect (simple active) third-person masculine singular verb, that can mean “prevail, harden, be strong, become strong, be courageous, be firm, grow firm, or be resolute.”

Kelly (1992:223) describes this verb as a Pe Guttural verb, because of the initial consonant of (ח). However, in the simple active form, the verb can mean “he prevailed, or it prevailed, or he was strong, and other meanings.”

עַל-יוֹאֵב

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:4), passes the above word as a compound word, prefixed by the preposition (עַל), which Kelly (1992:28) defines as “upon, above or about.” The prefix is then joined by a *maqfef* to a proper noun in the masculine

singular absolute state, which BDB (2010:222) describes as Joab, David’s sister’s son, and captain of his host. The word can be translated as ‘Joab’. Therefore, together they become “upon Joab, or above Joab.”

וַיֵּצֵא

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:4), the above word is a wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect), which comprises the waw conjunction (וַ) “and,” plus the verb root (יֵצֵא) that means “go, or come out,” according to BDB (2010:422).

The imperfect verb here can be understood as Kelly (1992:130) explains, to express repeated, habitual or customary action, whether in the past, present, or the future. Thus, the verb can be expressed as “he went, or he went out,” as it is prefixed by the imperfect prefix of the third-person masculine singular. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he went out.”

יוֹאָב

This word again is a proper noun in the masculine singular absolute state, which BDB (2010:222) describes as Joab, David’s sister’s son, and captain of his host. The word can be translated as ‘Joab’.

וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:4), passes the above word as a hitpael wayyiqtol verb (waw consecutive + imperfect). The word hence is a combination of the waw conjunction “and,” plus the third-person masculine singular imperfect hitpael verb that has its root as (הִלָּךְ) that means “go, come, walk.”

The hitpael according to Kelly (1992:108) is a reflexive verb, which in the present context can mean “he went, or he worked.” Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he went out.”

בְּכָד־יִשְׂרָאֵל

This compound word is made up of the preposition (ב) that can mean “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28). The preposition is prefixed to the word (כָּל), which BDB (2010:481) describes as “the whole, or all.” Hence, we can have “in the whole, or in all”.

The word is joined by a *maqfef* to the word that is previously defined by the BDB (2010:975), as the second name for Jacob (Israel), given to him in Genesis 32:28. By implication, the name for his children, the Hebrew nation, the undivided kingdom. Therefore, the word can be translated as “in the whole of Israel or in all Israel.”

וַיֵּבֵא

This word is a wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:4). It comprises the waw conjunction “and” plus the Qal imperfect third-person masculine singular verb, with the root (בָּוֵא) that means “to enter, come in, come, go in or go.”

Again, the imperfect as expressed by Kelly (1992:130), can be understood as a verb to express repeated, habitual or customary action, whether in the past, present, or the future, in this case “he entered, he went, or he came in or he went in.”

Thus, the word can be translated as “and he went in, and he went, or and he came in”.

יְרוּשָׁלַם

This word is defined by the BDB (2010:436), as a proper locative noun that means “Jerusalem.” BDB further explains that the name signifies “teaching of peace,” and that it is “the chief city of Palestine and capital of the united kingdom and the nation of Judah after the split.”

Verse 4 therefore, reads as follows: And (the) word of the King prevailed upon Joab, and Joab went out and he went out in the whole of Israel and he entered Jerusalem.

4.2.5. Verse 5

וַיִּתֵּן יוֹאָב אֶת־מִסְפָּר מִפְּקֻד־הָעָם אֶל־דָּוִד וַיְהִי כֹל־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶלְף אֲלָפִים וּמֵאָה אֶלְף אִישׁ שְׁלֹף
חָרַב רִיהוּדָה אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת וְשִׁבְעִים אֶלְף אִישׁ שְׁלֹף חָרַב:

וַיִּתֵּן

The above word is a wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:5). It comprises the waw conjunction “and,” plus the Qal imperfect third-person masculine singular verb, with the root (נָתַן) that means “give, put, or set.” According to BDB (2010:678), in the present inflation, the word can then mean “he gave.” Therefore, the wayyiqtol can be translated as “and he gave.”

יוֹאָב

This word is a proper noun in the masculine singular absolute state, which BDB (2010:222) describes as Joab, David’s sister’s son, and captain of his host. The word can be translated as “Joab.”

אֶת־מִסְפָּר

The above Hebrew word is prefixed by (אֶת), which has already been translated above as a prepositional particle, the sign of the definite direct object, not translated in English but generally preceding and indicating the accusative. It prefixes the common singular construct noun (מִסְפָּר) that means “number, or tale,” (BDB 2010:708). Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “number of,” and is the object of the sentence.

מִפְקֵד־הָעָם

This is a compound Hebrew word, made up according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:5), of the common singular construct noun (מִפְקֵד) that means “muster, appointment, appointed place,” (BDB 2010:824), joined by a *maqfef* in a construct relationship to the common singular absolute noun (עָם) that means “people,” BDB (766) and prefixed by the definite article (הַ) “the,” that defines the definiteness of people, making it “the people.” Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “the muster of the people.”

אֶל־דָּוִד

This word is a combination of the prepositional prefix (אֶל) that can mean “to, into, or toward,” (Kelly 1992:29), and joined by the *maqfef* to the masculine absolute singular proper noun (דָּוִד), that BDB (2010:187) describes as David the son of Jesse, the second King of Israel, whose dynasty remained on the throne of Jerusalem till the Babylonian exile. Therefore, the word can best be translated based on the context as “to David.”

וַיְהִי

The above word is passed by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:5), as a wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect). It comprises of the waw conjunction (וַ) “and,” added to the imperfect masculine singular third-person imperfect verb, which has its root as (הָיָה) that can mean “fall out, come to pass, become, or be,” (BDB 2010:224). The imperfect verb can be translated then as “and he was, or and he became.”

כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל

This word is a compound word, made up of the common singular construct noun (כל) which means “all, the whole,” (BDB 2010:481). Been in the construct state, the word becomes “all of or the whole of.” The word is joined by the *maqfef* in a construct relationship to the proper singular absolute noun (יִשְׂרָאֵל) that as already described above, means “Israel.” Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “the whole of Israel, or all Israel.”

אַלֶּף

This is a singular absolute numerical cardinal, that BDB (2010:48), defines as “thousand.” Kell (1992:100), also defines the numeral as a “thousand.”

אַלְפִים

According to Kelly (ibid), this is just the plural form of the preceding word, that results in “thousands.” In agreement with Kelly, BDB (2010:48) also defines the word as a plural of the preceding word. Therefore, the translation is “thousands.”

וּמֵאָה

According to Kelly (1992:31), the waw conjunction “and,” is written as (ו) sureq, because it stands before a labial like (מ). Therefore, the prefix is a waw conjunction “and,” prefixing the feminine absolute plural numerical cardinal “hundred” (Kelly 97). The word can then be translated as “and hundred.”

אַלֶּף

As already described above, this is a singular absolute numerical cardinal, that BDB (2010:48), defines as “thousand.” Kelly (1992:100), also defines the numeral as a “thousand.”

אִישׁ

The above Hebrew word is a common singular absolute noun that means “man,” according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:5).

BDB (2010:33) however, defines it as a masculine noun “man,” in opposition to a woman. Kelly (1992:24) in agreement with BDB, defines the word as a masculine singular noun “man,” in opposition to a daughter that is written like (בַּת). Therefore, I will go with the masculine singular noun, instead of a common noun.

שָׁלַף

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:5) passes the above word as a masculine singular absolute Qal participle verb, that has its root as (שָׁלַף). BDB (2010:1025), defines the root word as “to draw out.”

Kelly (1992:193) explains that the participle as used here, describes participation in the action or state of the verb, and unlike the English participle, agrees with the gender, number, and definiteness. Kelly (199) further explains that the participle is used as a participial adjective, used attributively, and can be translated as relative clauses, with such relative pronouns as “who, which, or that,”

Therefore, the word can be translated as “who draw out, or, that draw out.”

חֶרֶב

BDB (2010:352) describes the above word as a feminine singular absolute noun that means “sword or knife.”

וְיְהוּדָה

The above word is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to a masculine proper singular absolute noun, described by BDB (2010:397), as the nation of the southern kingdom of Israel under the dynasty of David. Hence, the word can be translated as “and Judah.”

אַרְבַּע

Kelly (1992:97) defines the above word as a feminine singular absolute numerical cardinal that denotes the number four (4).

מֵאוֹת

This is a feminine absolute plural numeral “hundred” (Kelly 1992:97).

וְשִׁבְעִים

The above word is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” plus the masculine absolute numerical cardinal “seventy” (Kelly 1992:99). The translation of the word is “and seventy.”

אַלֶּף

As already described earlier, this is a singular absolute numerical cardinal, that BDB (2010:48), defines as “thousand.” Kelly (1992:100), also defines the numeral as a “thousand.”

אִישׁ

The above Hebrew word as defined earlier is a common singular absolute noun that means “man,” according to BDB (2010:33).

שָׁלַף

As already described above, this word can be translated as “who/ that draw out.”

חָרַב

BDB (2010:352) describes the above word as a feminine singular absolute noun that means “sword or knife.”

Verse 5 reads as follows: And Joab gave number of the muster of the people to David and the whole of Israel was a million (thousand thousands) and hundred thousand man that draw out sword and Judah four hundred and seventy thousand man that draw out sword.

4.2.6. Verse 6

וְלֵוִי וּבְנֵימִן לֹא פָקְדוּ בְּתוֹכָם כִּי־נִתְעַב דְּבַר־הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־יֹאָב:

וְלֵוִי

This is a singular absolute proper noun described by BDB (2010:532), as the third son of Jacob by Leah, and progenitor of tribe of Levites. It is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and.” Therefore, it can be translated as “and Levi.”

וּבְנֵימִן

This is also a singular absolute proper noun described by BDB (2010:122), as the name of the tribe of Benjamin, the tribe descended from Benjamin, the son of Jacob. It is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and,” as described earlier, it is written as a sureq (וּ), because it is prefixing a labial (ב) (Kelly 1992:31). Therefore, the translation of the word will be “and Benjamin.”

לֹא

BDB (2010:530) describes this word as “not, or no.” BDB further describes the word as “not,” an absolute prohibition with a verb, as “not,” a negation with a modifier, and as “nothing,” as a substantive. However, it seems to precede a verb, for which reason I will choose the “not” as an absolute prohibition.

פָּקַד

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:6) passes the above word as a Qal (Simple active) third-person masculine singular verb. According to Kelly (1992:82), the verb can be translated as a simple action completed in the past time, and it can mean “he visited, or he appointed.” BDB (2010:823) similarly defines the verb as “he visited, or he appointed,” but added other nuances of meaning like “he attended, he numbered, he cared for, and so on.” Based on the context, I will go with “he numbered.”

בְּתוֹכָם

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:6) passes the above word as a compound word that comprises, the prepositional prefix (בְּ) that can mean according to Kelly (1992:28) “in, by or with.” The preposition prefixes the common singular noun (תּוֹךְ), that can mean according to BDB (2010:1063) “mist or middle or among (of a number of persons).” The noun is joined in a construct relationship to the third-person masculine plural pronominal suffix (הֶם) that means “them,” (Kelly 1992:68). Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “among them.”

כִּי־גַם

This word is made up of the conjunction (כִּי) that BDB (2010:475) defines as “that, for, because, when, as though,” and is joined by the *maqef* to a nif'al (simple

passive or reflexive), qatal (perfect) third-person masculine singular verb, that can mean “to be abhorred, or to be detested.” The word can then be translated as “Because he was detested, or for he was detested.”

דְּבַר-הַמֶּלֶךְ

The word (דְּבַר), is described by BDB (2010:182) as “speech, word,” a common masculine singular noun in a construct state. The function of the construct relationship in the context as Kelly (1992:58) explains is to express genitival relationship and the nuances of meaning associated with the preposition “of,” which is lacked in Hebrew. Thus, we have “speech of, or word of.”

Now, the compound word is joined by the *maqgef* to the definite article (הַ), which is defined as “the,” and never stands alone in Hebrew according to Kelly (1992:24), but is prefixed to the noun whose definiteness it determines. In this case, it determines the definiteness of the word (מֶלֶךְ) that means “King.” Together they can mean “the King.” Therefore, the two words joined together can mean “word of the King.”

אֶת־יֹאבֵב

This word is a proper noun in the masculine singular absolute state, which BDB (2010:222) describes as Joab, David’s sister’s son, and captain of his host. It is prefixed by the particle (אֶת), which Kelly (1992:12) describes as merely a sign of the direct object, and is therefore not to be translated. The article is joined by the *maqgef* to the noun. Therefore, the word can be translated as ‘Joab,’ which is the direct object of the sentence.

Verse 6 reads as follows: And Levi and Benjamin he numbered not among them because the word of the king detested Joab.

4.2.7. Verse 7

וַיֵּרַע בְּעֵינָיו הָאֱלֹהִים עַל־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה וַיֹּד אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל:

וַיֵּרַע

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:7), this word is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the verb root (רַעַע), which BDB (2010:949), describes as “be evil, wicked, ethically. In the current form, the verb is in the imperfect inflation, third-person masculine singular. According to Kelly (2010:145) the prefixing of the waw consecutive to the imperfect expresses the narrated past. Kelly, further explained that “a passage narrating consecutive events in past time will often begin with a perfect, and then be continued by a series of imperfects with waw consecutive.” So, the word can be translated as “and he/it was evil, or and he/it was wicked.”

בְּעֵינָיו

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:7), explains this word as a dual construct common noun, prefixed by the preposition prefix (בְּ) that can mean according to Kelly (1992:28) “in, by or with.” The meaning of the noun to which it is prefixed according to Kelly (1992:63), is “eyes,” because it is in the dual form. Kelly explains that the noun in a construct state never takes the definite article, but the absolute noun to which it is joined determines the definiteness of the construct noun. In this case, the succeeding noun is joined to has a definite article, therefore, the construct noun will also have a definite article. The translation will then be “in the eyes of.”

הָאֱלֹהִים

BDB (2010:43) defines this word as “God,” and goes further to explain that God is Yahweh. In agreement with BDB, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:7) translates the word as a common masculine plural absolute noun that he referred to also as “God.”

The noun is prefixed by the definite article (הַ) “the.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “the God” or “the Lord”.

עַל־הַדָּבָר

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:7) passes the above word as the preposition (עַל) plus the definite article, (הַ) plus the absolute common singular noun (דָּבָר). The preposition according to BDB (2010:752) can mean “upon, on the ground of, according to, on account of, on behalf of, concerning”. The article is “the.” And the noun can mean “speech, word, speaking, thing.” Based on the context, I will go with the translation “concerning the thing.”

הַזֶּה

This word is made up of the definite article (הַ) “the,” prefixed to the demonstrative masculine singular pronoun (זֶה), which Kelly (1992:53) defines as “this.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “the this.”

וַיִּ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:7) describes the above word a wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect), a hif'il verb in the third person masculine singular form. The waw conjunction can be translated as previously as “and.” The verb root of the hif'il verb is (נָכַח) that means “to strike, smite, hit, beat, slay, kill” BDB (2010:645).

Kelly (1992:108) defines the hif'il as a causative active verb, so the verb can be translated as “he struck, or he smite.” The compound word can therefore, be translated as “and he struck or and he smote.”

אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל

This word is prefixed by the particle (אֶת), which Kelly (1992:12) describes as merely a sign of the direct object, and is therefore not to be translated. The article is joined by the *maqṣef* to the noun as described earlier, it is a singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:975), describes as the second name for Jacob (Israel), given to him in Genesis 32:28. By implication, the name for his children, the Hebrew nation, the undivided kingdom. Therefore, the above word can be translated as “Israel.”

Verse 7 reads as follows: And it was evil in the eyes of God concerning this thing, and he struck Israel.

4.2.8. Verse 8

וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים חָטָאתִי מְאֹד אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי אֶת־הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה וְעַתָּה הֶעֱבַר־נָא אֶת־
עֲרוֹן עֲבֹדֶיךָ כִּי נִסְכַּלְתִּי מְאֹד:

וַיֹּאמֶר

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:8) passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The waw conjunction means “and”. The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say”. The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular, and can be translated as “he uttered, or, he said”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

דָּוִד

This is a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel.

אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים

This is a compound word, prefixed by the preposition (לְ) that can mean “to, into or towards” (Kelly 1992:29). It is prefixed to the word that BDB (2010:43) previously defined as “God,” and goes further to explain that God is Yahweh. In agreement with BDB, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:8) also translates the word as a common masculine plural absolute noun that he referred to also as “God.” The noun is prefixed by the definite article (הַ) “the.” Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “to the God.”

הִטָּאתִי

The root of the above Hebrew word is (אָטָה) that BDB (2010:306-307) defines as “miss (a goal or way), go wrong, or sin.” In the present form, BDB, further explains that the pronominal suffix makes the word result to “I have sinned.” Thus, the pronominal suffix is a first-person singular pronominal suffix “I”.

מְאֹד

According to BDB (2010:547), this is a common singular absolute noun, that can mean “muchness, force, abundance or exceedingly.” Anderson & Forbes (2008: 1 Chr. 21:8) explains the word to have the idea of adverbial “very,” sort of lamentation to Divinity.

BDB further defines the word based on the substantive sense. However, in agreement with Anderson & Forbes, BDB, also defines the word as “exceedingly, or much.” Therefore, I will translate the word in the adverbial sense as “exceedingly”.

אֲשֶׁר

According to BDB (2010:81), this is a relative particle that can mean (which, who, that which), or it can also mean a conjunction “that,” in an object clause. Based on

the context, I will go with the conjunction “that,” as it is in an object clause, as regards its relationship with the word (אֶת־הַדָּבָר).

עָשִׂיתִי

Anderson & Forbes (2008: 1 Chr. 21:8) describes this word as a Qal active verb (עָשָׂה) that can mean “to do, work, make, or produce.” It is suffixed by the perfect singular common first person. Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:8) also defines the verb as a Qal perfect verb. In the present context, the word is in the perfect and therefore, can be translated as “I did, or I made”.

אֶת־הַדָּבָר

This word as explained already above is prefixed by the sign of the direct object, signifying that the word it is joined to by the *maqfef*, is the object here. It is joined to the definite article, (הַ) prefixed to the absolute common singular noun (דָּבָר). The article is “the.” And the noun can mean “speech, word, speaking, thing.” Based on the context, I will go with the translation “the thing”.

הַזֶּה

This word as already described earlier is made up of the definite article (הַ) “the,” plus the demonstrative masculine singular pronoun (זֶה), which Kelly (1992:53) defines as “this.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “the this”.

וְעַתָּה

This word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:8) is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the adverb of time that BDB (2010:773) defines as “now.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “and now”.

הַעֲבֹר־נָא

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:8) passes the above word as the verb root (עֲבֹר), presently in the Hif'il imperative second-person masculine singular, plus the interjection (נָא). BDB (2010:716) describes the verb as any of “to pass over, or, by, alienate, bring, carry, do away, take, take away, transgress.” In the present context, it can be translated as “cause to pass over I pray, or cause to take away I pray”.

The function of the interjection or particle according to Kelly (1992:173), is to make the imperative more emphatic or more urgent. Nevertheless, Kelly notes that the particle is not always possible to be translated into English. Therefore, the imperative can be translated as “cause to pass over I pray, or, cause to take away I pray”.

אֶת־עֲוֹן

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:8), the prefix of the above word again is the object marker, joined by the *maqfef* to the construct noun that has its root as (עֲוֹן), which BDB (2010:730) defines as “perversity, depravity, iniquity, guilt or punishment of iniquity”.

The construct noun here is used to show possession or ownership according to Kelly (1992:64). Therefore, the word can be translated as “my guilt, or my iniquity”.

עֲבַדְךָ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:8) passes the above word as a common singular construct noun, suffixed by a second-person masculine singular pronoun.

The noun is the word (עֶבֶד) that can mean “slave, or servant”. It is suffixed by the second-person masculine singular pronoun (ךָ) that Kelly (1992:68) defines as “you.” The word is in a construct state, and therefore, can be translated as “of servant you or your servant”.

כִּי

BDB (2010:471) defines the above word as the conjunction “because, since,” and explains that it demonstrates a causal connection.

נִסְבַּלְתִּי

The above Hebrew word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:8), is a nif'al (perfect) first person singular verb. The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:698) is (סָבַל) that means “to be foolish, or be a fool.” In the nif'al inflation (simple passive or reflexive), the word can mean “to act or do foolishly”.

The verb is suffixed by the pronominal suffix (תִּי), which Kelly (1992:156) explains can represent the perfect second-person feminine singular or the perfect first-person common singular, and that only the context can distinguish between the two forms. Based on the context here, I will go with first-person common singular. The resultant translation will then be, “I acted foolishly”.

מְאֹד

Again, this word as already explained above by BDB (2010:547), is a common singular absolute noun, that can mean “muchness, force, abundance or exceedingly.” Anderson & Forbes (2008: 1 Chr. 21:8) explains the word to have the idea of adverbial “very,” sort of lamentation to Divinity. BDB defines the word based on the substantive sense. However, in agreement with Anderson & Forbes, BDB,

also defines the word as “exceedingly, or much.” Therefore, I will translate the word in the adverbial sense as “exceedingly or very”.

Verse 8 reads as follows: And David said to God, I have sinned exceedingly that I did this thing, and now, I pray cause guilt of your servant to pass over because I acted very foolishly

4.2.9. Verse 9

וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־גָּד חֲזָה דָּוִד לְאָמַר:

וַיְדַבֵּר

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:9), passes the above word as a Piel wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb.

The root of the verb is (דַּבַּר), which BDB (2010:180) defines as “speak.” In the context, the verb is in the Piel imperfect inflation, and Kelly (1992:108) defines it as an intensive active or causative verb. It can then be translated as “he spoke.” However, the verb is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”, which together with the verb, they become “and he spoke”.

יְהוָה

BDB (2010:217) describes the above word as “Yahweh.” Meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

אֶל־גָּד

The above word is made up of the (אֶל) preposition that can mean “to, into or toward” (Kelly 1992:29). It is prefixed by the *maqṣef* to the noun (גָּד) which BDB (2010:151) describes as the name of a prophet during the time of David who appears to have

joined David when in the hold, and re-appears in connection with the punishment for taking a census. So then, the word can be translated as “to Gad”.

חֹזֶה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:9), explains this word as a common singular construct noun. BDB (2010:302), then defines the noun as “seer.”

According to Kelly (1992:62), bi-syllabic nouns with both syllables closed will form the singular construct by shortening the long vowel of the second syllable. This he says is because long vowels cannot stand in closed, unaccented syllables. In this case, the (וֹ) changes to (וּ). In the construct state, the word can then be translated as “seer of”.

דָּוִד

This again is a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel.

לְאָמַר

This word is made up of the preposition (לְ) “to, for or at,” (Kelly 1992:28). The preposition is prefixed to the verb root (אָמַר) that can mean according to BDB (2010:55) “to say, speak, or utter.” Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:9), notes that the form of the verb in the present context is the Qal infinitive, construct verb.

Kelly (1992:182) warns that special attention should be given to the preposition (לְ) when it is prefixed to the Qal infinitive construct (אָמַר) “to say”. He notes that normally, the preposition was supposed to take the compound sheva of the alef, but the weak nature of the alef, forces the preposition to take sere, and the alef becomes quiescent. He further explains that the resultant infinitive is used to mark direct

discourse, somewhat as quotation marks (speech marks) are used in modern languages. Therefore, the infinitive can be translated as “to speak, or, to say”.

Verse 9 reads as follows: And God spoke to Gad seer of David to say.

4.2.10. Verse 10

לְךָ וּדְבַרְתָּ אֶל־דָּוִד לֵאמֹר כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה שְׁלוֹשׁ אַנְי נֹטָה עָלֶיךָ בְּחַר־לְךָ אַחַת מֵהֵנָּה
וְאַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ: לְךָ

This word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), is a Qal imperative second-person masculine singular verb, from the verb root (הִלַךְ) that can mean “go, come or walk” (BDB 2010:229).

Kelly (1992:176) also explains that the present form of the verb is a second-person Qal imperative verb, used to express positive commands and never to express any prohibitions. Further, that it is the shortened forms of the Qal imperfect, which involves the dropping of the pre-formatives from the imperfect second person forms of the masculine singular. Therefore, the word can be translated as “go, or, come, or, walk”.

וּדְבַרְתָּ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), passes the above word as a piel (waw + perfect) second-person masculine singular verb, with verb root (דָּבַר) that means “to speak, to promise.”

The verb is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and,” as well as suffixed by the second person masculine singular pronominal suffix. The piel verb, gives the idea of intensive active (Kelly 1992:108). Therefore, the word can be translated as “and you should speak.”

אֶל־דָּוִד

This word is as explained before, is prefixed by the preposition that means “to, into, or toward.” The preposition is prefixed to the noun by a *maqgef*, and the noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “to David.”

לְאִמֹּר

As already explained earlier in verse 9, this word is made up of the preposition (לְ) “to, for or at,” (Kelly 1992:28), and the verb root (אָמַר) that can mean according to BDB (2010:55) “to say, speak, or utter”. Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), notes that the form of the verb in the present context is the Qal infinitive, construct verb. Therefore, the infinitive can be translated as “to speak, or to say”.

כֵּן

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), describes the above word as an adverb, which means “thus”. BDB (2010:462) in agreement also describes the word as an adverb, but further, describe it as a demonstrative adverb. The word can be translated as “thus”.

אָמַר

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), defines the above word as a Qal perfect third-person masculine singular verb, that means “he says”. BDB (2010:55) similarly, defines the word as “he utters, he says.” Therefore, I will translate the word as “he says”.

יְהוֹה

BDB (2010:217) describes the above word as “Yahweh.” Meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

שְׁלוֹשׁ

Kelly (1992:97) defines the above word as an absolute feminine cardinal numeral that means “three”. Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), agrees that this can mean three, but adds that by the implication of the context, that it can mean “three things”.

אֲנִי

Kelly (1992:52) defines the above word as an independent personal common singular pronoun that means “I”, and adds that it is a subject pronoun.

נֹטֶה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), passes the above word as a Qal participle masculine singular absolute verb that he defines as “offer”. The root of the verb is defined by BDB (2010:639) as “to stretch out, extend, spread out, pitch, turn, pervert, incline, bend, bow”. Being active participle, can be translated as “stretching out, or, extending, or, spreading out, or, offer”.

עֲלֶיךָ

The above word is made up of the preposition (עַל) “upon, above or about,” (Kelly 1992:30). BDB (2010:752) defines the preposition as “upon, on the ground of, according to, on account of, on behalf of, concerning, besides, in addition to, together with, beyond, above, over, by, on to, towards, to, against”. The word is suffixed by the second-person masculine singular pronominal suffix. So then, the word can be translated as “to you”.

בְּחַרְלֶךָ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), passes the above word as a Qal imperative second-person masculine singular verb, that is joined by the *maqfef* to the preposition (לְ), suffixed by the second-person pronominal suffix.

The root of the verb is (בָּחַר), that can mean “to choose, elect, or decide for” (BDB 2010:103). The imperative can be understood to express positive command, and as such can be translated as “choose”. The preposition means “to, for or at” (Kelly 1992:28). The second-person pronominal suffix can mean “you”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “choose for you, or elect for you”.

אַחַת

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), defines this Hebrew word as a feminine, cardinal singular absolute numeral, that means “one”.

מִהֵנָּה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), passes the above word as the preposition (מִן), prefixed to the third-person feminine plural pronoun (הֵנָּה).

The preposition according to Kelly (1992:30) can mean “from, or, out of.” The pronoun on the other hand can mean “they, these, the same, who” (BDB 2020:244). The compound word can then be translated as “from these, or out of these”.

וְאֶעֱשֶׂה לְךָ

The above Hebrew word can be passed as follows, according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), It comprises the waw conjunction “and”, added to the Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) first-person singular verb, joined to the

preposition (לְ) “to, for, or at), and suffixed by the second-person masculine singular pronoun “you”.

The root of the verb is (עָשָׂה) that can mean “to do, fashion, accomplish, make” (BDB 2010:793). In the present form, the verb is in the imperfect form prefixed by the waw consecutive, and as such can be translated as “I do”.

Kelly (1992:145) explains that the waw consecutive represent consecutive actions that took place in past times, from the reader’s viewpoint. In Kelly’s view, they may be understood as either sequential “and then”, or consequential “and so”. In the present context, I will go with “and then”.

Therefore, the word can be translated as “and then I do to you”.

Verse 10 reads as follows: Go and you should speak to David to say, thus says God, three things I offer to you choose for you one out of these and then I do to you.

4.2.11. Verse 11

וַיָּבֵא גִדְדֵי אֶל־דָּוִד וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה קִבְּלֵנִי־לָךְ:

וַיָּבֵא

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:11), explains the above word as a Qal (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb, prefixed by the waw conjunction “and.” The verb root is the word (בֹּא), which BDB (2010:97) describes as “come in, come, go in or go”. In the imperfect third person masculine singular inflation, the verb will be “he came”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and he came”.

גִּדְדֵי

This word is again the noun (גִּדְדֵי) which BDB (2010:151), describes as the name of a prophet during the time of David who appears to have joined David when in the hold,

and re-appears in connection with the punishment for taking a census. So then, the word can be translated as “Gad”.

אֶל־דָּוִד

This word as already explained before is prefixed by the preposition that means “to, into, or toward.” The preposition is prefixed to the noun by the *maqṣef*, and the noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here, “to David”.

וַיֹּאמֶר

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:11) passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The waw conjunction means “and.” The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say.” The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular and can be translated as “he uttered, or he said”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

לֹו

This is made up of the preposition (לְ), which can mean “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28), and the pronominal suffix (ו), which Kelly (68) defines as the third-person masculine singular pronominal suffix, that can mean “him”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “to him, or for him”.

כֹּה־אָמַר

This is a compound Hebrew word, made up of the demonstrative adverb (כֹּה), which BDB (2010:462) describes as “thus,” and is joined by the *maqef* to the Qal (perfect) third-person masculine singular verb (אָמַר), which can mean “he utters, or he says”. Therefore, the word can mean “thus he utters, or thus he says”.

יְהוָה

BDB (2010:217) describes the above word as “Yahweh.” Meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

קַבֵּל-לָךְ

As previously explained, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:10), passes the above word as a Qal imperative second-person masculine singular verb, that is joined by the *maqef* to the preposition (לְ), suffixed by the second-person pronominal suffix.

The root of the verb is (בָּחַר), that can mean “to choose, elect, or decide for” BDB (2010:103). The imperative expresses a positive command, and as such can be translated as “choose.” The preposition means “to, for or at” (Kelly 1992:28). The second-person pronominal suffix can mean “you”.

Therefore, the word can be translated as “choose for you, or elect for you”.

Verse 11 reads as follows: And Gad came to David, and he said to him, thus says God, choose for you.

4.2.12. Verse 12

אִם-שְׁלוֹשׁ שָׁנִים רָעַב וְאִם-שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים נִטְפָה מִפְּנֵי-צָרֶיךָ וְחָרַב אוֹיְבֶיךָ | לְמִשְׁגַּת וְאִם-
שְׁלֹשׁתָּ מִיָּמִים חָרַב יְהוָה | וְדָבַר בְּאָרְץ וּמִלְאָךְ יְהוָה מִשְׁחִית בְּכָל-גְּבוּל וְשָׂרָא לְעַתָּה רְאֵה
מִה-אָשִׁיב אֶת-שְׁלֹחֵי דְבָר:

אם-שלוש

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12) explains the above word as a combination of the conjunction (אם), and the cardinal singular absolute numeral “three”. According to BDB (2010:49), the conjunction is used here, as the term “if, or, whether,” specifying a conditional clause, of a possible situation. Therefore, the word can be translated as “if three, or, whether three”.

שָׁנִים

According to BDB (2010:1040), this is from the root feminine singular noun (שָׁנָה) that means “year.” In the present context, it is in the common masculine plural absolute form, therefore, it can be translated as “years”.

רָעָב

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12) defines the above word as a common singular absolute noun that means “famine”. BDB (2010:944) similarly, defines the word as the “famine, as in land, nation or city, or it can mean hunger, of individual”. Based on context, I will go with the “famine”.

ואם-שלושה

The above word is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” plus the compound word, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12) already explained as a combination of the conjunction (אם), and the cardinal singular absolute numeral “three.” According to BDB (2010:49), the conjunction is used here as the term “if, or, whether” specifying a conditional clause, of a possible situation. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and if three, or, and whether three”.

חֳדָשִׁים

The root of this word is the masculine noun (חֳדָשׁ) that can mean “new month, or month” (BDB 2010:294). In the present form, BDB specifies that it is the term month, and is in the common plural absolute form. Therefore, it can be translated as “months”.

נִטְפָּה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12) passes the above word as the Nif'al participle masculine singular absolute verb, with the root (נִטַּף).

The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:705), can be defined as “to sweep or snatch away, catch up, destroy, consume”. Kelly (1992:108) explains the Nif'al verb as a simple passive or reflexive verb. The verb, however, is in the participle tense, and therefore, can be translated as “to be swept away, or, be destroyed”.

מִפְּנֵי-צָרִים

The above compound word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), is made up of the preposition (מִן), prefixed to the common masculine plural construct noun (פְּנֵה), joined by the *maqef*, to the common masculine plural construct noun (צָר), and prefixed by the second-person masculine singular pronoun.

The preposition as previously explained, means “from, out of” (Kelly 1992:30). The noun (פְּנֵה) can mean “face,” and is in the plural construct form in the context, can then mean “faces of”.

The second noun is the plural construct noun (צָר) according to BDB (2010:865), which means “adversaries, foes, enemies, or oppressors.” This is finally suffixed by

the second-person masculine singular pronoun (אָיִךְ), that Kelly (1992:71) defines as “your.”

Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “from faces of your enemies, or from faces of your adversaries.”

וְחֶרֶב

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), describes the above Hebrew construct noun, as comprising of the root (חֶרֶב), that (BDB 2010:352), describes as “sword, knife.” The noun is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and.” The word can then be translated as “and sword of”.

אוֹיְבֶיךָ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), passes the above word as a common masculine plural construct noun, suffixed by the second person, masculine singular pronoun as described earlier by Kelly (1992:71), as “your”, (אָיִךְ).

The noun can mean “enemy,” according to BDB (2010:33). The construct state of the noun, makes it translate to “enemy of you.” Therefore, the word can be presented as “your enemy”.

לְמַשְׁגָּחַת

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), the above word is made up of the (לְ) preposition, that means as previously explained “to, for, or at,” and the common absolute feminine singular noun (מַשְׁגָּחַת) that is described by BDB (2010:673) as “reach, or overtake”.

BDB explains further that it’s meaning is figurative of battle, and only found in the hif’il inflation (causative active verb form). Anderson & Forbes (2008: 2004:1 Chr.

21:12) in difference to Van der Merwe, who pass the word as a hif'il active, pure noun participle singular feminine normal verb. It does look like Van der Merwe's passing of the root of this word as a noun, disagrees with BDB's, and Anderson & Forbes.

However, as Kelly (1992:201-203) explained, participles can sometimes function as nouns, and it indicates the "one who" or the "ones who" are performing a certain action. Kelly then referred to this type of word as participle nouns and can be used in various ways nouns can be used, including subjects, objects, predicate, and so on. Kelly, further indicates that the form of the feminine singular participle noun end with the (ת), thus, that explains the suffix ending of the word in its present form.

Therefore, I will translate the word as "to overtake you".

וְאִם-שְׁלֹשָׁת

This word as already explained earlier is made up of the waw conjunction "and," plus the compound word, which Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12) already explained as a combination of the conjunction (אם), and the cardinal singular absolute numeral "three." According to BDB (2010:49), the conjunction is used here as the term "if, or, whether" specifying a conditional clause, of a possible situation. Therefore, the word can be translated as any of "and if three, and or three, and whether three".

יָמִים

This is a common masculine plural absolute noun that means (days) according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12). Kelly (1992:38) also defines the word as a plural noun that means "days".

חֶרֶב

As already explained earlier by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), who describes the above Hebrew construct noun, as "sword of, or knife of".

BDB (2010:352), also agrees with the definition of the word as “sword of, or knife of”.

יְהוָה

BDB (2010:217) describes the above word as “Yahweh.” Meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

וְדָבָר

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), describes the above compound word as the common singular absolute noun (וְדָבָר) “plague”. The noun is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”.

The noun is also defined by BDB (2010:184) as “pestilence, or plague”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and pestilence, or and plague”.

בְּאֶרֶץ

The prefix of this word is the preposition (בְּ), which can mean “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28). The preposition is prefixed to the noun, which according to BDB (2010:75) is a feminine noun, that can mean “earth, or land”. BDB explains that the word can sometimes be masculine, but very seldom.

According to Kelly (1992:26), the noun is among the few nouns that their singular form undergoes internal changes when the definite article is prefixed to them. He notes that there is the compensatory lengthening of the vowel from *segol* to *qames*, because the guttural rejects the dagesh forte. In this case, both the vowels of the preposition and the initial *alef* of the noun undergo internal changes to indicate the presence of the article. Therefore, the word can be translated as “in the earth, or, in the land”.

וּמִלְאָה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), describes the above word as the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the common singular construct noun (מַלְאֲכָיִם), which means “messenger”. BDB (2010:521) defines the noun as a construct noun, that can mean “an angel of God, or as a messenger of God”. BDB, further describes this messenger, as one destroying by the judgment of Yahweh. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and an angel of, or a messenger of”

יְהוָה

This word as described already described above is “Yahweh.” Meaning the proper name of the God of Israel (BDB 2010:217).

מַשְׁחִית

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), passes the above word as the Hif'il participle masculine singular absolute verb, which means “destroying”. The root of the verb is the word (שָׁחַת), that BDB (2010:1008) defines as a participle, an adjective, “destroyer.” As a participle, the word can then be translated as “destroying”.

בְּכָל-גְּבוּל

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), describes the above word as comprising the preposition (בְּ), previously described as “in, by, or with”, and the common singular construct noun (כָּל) that can mean “the whole, or all” (BDB 2010:481). The word is joined to the common singular construct noun (גְּבוּל) by a *maqgef*. The noun according to BDB (2010:147) can mean “border of, boundary of or territory of”. The compound word can then be translated as “in the whole territory of, or in all territory of”.

יִשְׂרָאֵל

This word as described earlier is “Israel,” according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12).

וְעַתָּה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), describes the above word as a combination of the waw conjunction “and,” plus the adverb, that means “so then”.

BDB (2010:773) describes the adverb as an adverb of time “and now,” concluding, a practical one from what has been stated. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and now”.

רְאֵה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), describes the above word as a Qal imperative second-person masculine singular verb, that can mean “see, or consider.” BDB (2010:7200) similarly describes the word as “to see, look at, inspect, perceive, consider”. Being in the imperative form, the word can then be translated as “see, or consider”.

מִה־אָשִׁיב

This word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), is made up of the interrogative pronoun (מִה), that means “what,” joined by the *maqfef* to the Hifil *yiqtol* (imperfect) first-person singular verb, with the root (שׁוּב), which BDB (2010:996) defines as “turn back, or return”. Presently the verb is in the imperfect first person singular form, and can therefore be translated as “what I will return”.

אֶת־שְׁלֹחֵי

The above word is explained by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:12), as the prepositional prefix (אֶת), the object marker that is not translated in English, joined by the *maqfef* to the Qal (simple active) participle masculine construct verb (שֶׁלַח), and suffixed by the first-person singular pronoun (אֲנִי) “I, or my”.

The verb root can mean “send,” according to BDB (2010:1018). The verb, however, is in the participle form, and can therefore be translated as “my sender”.

דְּבַר

This is a common singular absolute noun, that means “word” (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:12), BDB (2010:182) similarly defines the term as “speech, or word”.

Verse 12 reads as follows: Whether three years famine, and or three months to be swept away from faces of your enemies, and sword of your enemy to overtake you, and or three days sword of God, and pestilence in the land, and an angel of God destroying in the whole territory of Israel. And now, consider what word I will return my sender.

4.2.13. Verse 13

וַיֹּאמֶר דְּוִיד אֶל-נָדָב צֶרְלִי מֵאֵד אֶפְלָה-נָגַא בְּיַד-יְהוָה כִּי-רַבִּים רַחֲמָיו מֵאֵד וּבְיַד-אָדָם אֶל-
אֶפְלָ:

וַיֹּאמֶר

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:13) passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The waw conjunction means “and”.

The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say.” The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular and can be

translated as “he uttered, or he said”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

אֶל-גָּד

The above word is made up of the prepositional prefix (אֶל), which can mean “to, into, or toward” (Kelly 1992:29). The prefix is joined by the *maqfef* to the noun (גָּד) which BDB (2010:151) describes as the name of a prophet during the time of David who appears to have joined David when in the hold, and re-appears in connection with the punishment for taking a census. So then, the word can be translated as “to Gad”.

עָרַף-לִי

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:13), the above word is the Qal (perfect) third-person masculine singular verb, joined by the *maqfef* to the preposition (לִי), “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28), and suffixed by the first-person singular pronoun.

The verb can mean “straits, or distress,” (BDB 2010:865). The pronoun according to Kelly (1992:52) means “I”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “distressed to I, or distressed to me”.

מְאֹד

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:13) defines the above word as a common singular absolute noun, which means “very, or great”. BDB (2010:) on the other hand, defines

the word as an adverb “exceedingly, much”, or a substantive “might, force, abundance”, or a noun “exceedingly, greatly, very (idioms showing magnitude or degree)”. in the context, I will go with the adverbial meaning “exceedingly” because it seems to modify the preceding verb *distress*.

אֶפְלֶה־נָא

This word can be passed as the Qal (imperfect) first-person singular cohortative verb (אֶפְלֶה), joined by *maqfef* to the interjection (נָא), (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:13).

The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:656), can mean “fall, or lie”. The verb, however, is a cohortative, which Kelly (1992:131-132), explained is used by a speaker, to express his/her desire, or intention to perform a certain action, and is frequently translated as the modal auxiliaries “may, or let”. Kelly further explained that the interjection (particle), is simply added to a cohortative to make them more emphatic, and can be classified as a particle of entreaty “I pray!” Therefore, the word can then be expressed as “let me fall I pray”.

בְּיַד־יְהוָה

The above compound word is passed by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:13), as the prepositional prefix (בְּ) that can mean “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28), prefixed to the common singular construct noun (יָד), that means “hand of”.

Therefore, the word can be translated as “in hand of.” The word is joined by the *maqfef* to the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” Meaning the proper name of the God of Israel. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “in hand of Yahweh, or in hand of God”.

כִּי־רַבִּים

This word is prefixed by the conjunction (כִּי), which BDB (2010:471) defines as “that, for, or when”. It is prefixed to the masculine plural absolute adjective, which BDB (912), describes as “much, many, or great”.

Kelly (1992:46) explains that this adjective is of a predicative usage, which usually stands before its subject noun, and agrees in gender and number with its subject noun. Kelly further refers to this type of sentence that consists of a noun, which functions as a subject, and an adjective, which functions as a predicate, as a verbless sentence. This type of sentence helps to supply the verb “to be,” which are not written but implied. The translation Kelly notes must be supplied in the translation. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “for great is”.

רַחֲמָיו

BDB (2010:933) describes the above word as a masculine plural noun that means “compassion: usually of God”. In the present form, it is in a construct state, suffixed by the third-person masculine singular pronoun (י) which means “his” (Kelly 1992:71). The word can then be translated as “his compassion”.

מְאֹד

This is a masculine noun explained by BDB (2010:547) as used to express the idea of “exceedingly, greatly, or very”.

וּבְיַד־אֲדָם

This compound word is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” added to the preposition (ב) “in, by, with” (Kelly 1992:28), and the common singular construct noun (יָד) that means “hand of” (Kelly 1992:61).

Kelly, explains that the noun, like other monosyllabic nouns with changeably long vowels in the singular absolute, will usually shorten the long vowel to form the

singular construct. The construct noun is joined by the *maqgef* to the singular absolute noun (אָדָם), that means “man, human being” (BDB 2010:9). Therefore, the word can be translated as “and in hand of human being”.

אֶל-אֲפֹל

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:13), passes the above word as the negation (אֶל) joined by the *maqgef* to the Qal (imperfect) first-person singular jussive verb (נִפֹּל). The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:656) can mean “fall, or lie”.

The verb, however, is a jussive, which Kelly (1992:131-132), explains is used to express the speaker’s desire, wish or command, and translated as “may, or wish.” However, the word is prefixed by the negation, the BDB (2010:39) defines as the adverb of negation, with a verb, which is then always an imperfect “do not, let not”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “do not let me fall”.

Verse 13 reads as follows: And David said to Gad exceedingly distressed to me let me fall, I pray, in hand of God for exceedingly great is his compassion, and in hand of human being do not let me fall.

4.2.14. Verse 14

וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה דָּבָר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּפֹּל מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל שִׁבְעִים אָלֶיךָ אִישׁ:

וַיִּתֵּן

The above word is made up of the waw-conjunction “and,” added to the Qal (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:14).

The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:678) is (נָתַן) “give, put, or set.” In the current inflation, the waw-consecutive, plus the imperfect verb can be translated as “and he gave”.

יהוה

The above word is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” Meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

דָּבָר

This is a common singular absolute noun that means “plague” (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:14). BDB (2010:184) similarly defines the word as “pestilence, or plague, in general”. In the context, I will choose “pestilence”.

בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל

The above Hebrew word is made up of the prepositional prefix (בְּ) that can mean “in, by or with” (Kelly 1992:28). It is prefixed to the word as described earlier as “Israel,” according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:14). So, the word can be translated as “in Israel”.

וַיִּפֹּל

This word is the Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect), third-person masculine singular verb. This is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the Qal (imperfect) third-person masculine verb (וַיִּפֹּל).

The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:656), can mean “fall, or lie.” In the present form, it can mean “he fell”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and he fell”.

מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:14), explains the above word as the preposition (מִן) that means “from”, prefixed to the word as earlier described as “Israel”. Kelly (1992:30) similarly defines the preposition as “from, out of”. So, the word can be translated as “from Israel or out of Israel”.

שִׁבְעִים

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:14), defines the above word as the masculine plural absolute cardinal numeral “seventy”. Kelly (1992:99) likewise, defines the word as the number “seventy”.

אַלֶּף

This is the singular absolute cardinal numeral “thousand” (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:14). Kelly (1992:100) also, defines the word as a singular absolute cardinal numeral “thousand.”

אִישׁ

This is the common singular absolute noun “human being, person or human being (in contrast to God)” (BDB 2010:35).

Verse 14 reads as follows: And God gave pestilence in Israel and he fell out of Israel seventy thousand person.

4.2.15. Verse 15

וַיִּשְׁלַח הָאֱלֹהִים | מִלֶּאֱדָ | לִירוּשָׁלַם לְהַשְׁחִיתָהּ וּבְהַשְׁחִית רָאָה יְהוָה וַיִּנָּחַם עַל-הָרֶעֱוָה וַיֹּאמֶר
לְמִלְאָךְ הַמִּשְׁחִית רֹב עֲתָה הֲרֹף יָדְךָ וּמִלֶּדָּה וְהוּוּ עֹמֵד עַם-גִּרְןִי אֲרִגְנִי הַיְבוּסִי:

וַיִּשְׁלַח

The root of this verb according to BDB, is (שָׁלַח), that can mean “send, or, stretch out,” and is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”. In the present form, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), passes the verb as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and he sent”.

הָאֱלֹהִים

This is the common masculine absolute plural noun, which BDB (2010::43) defines as “rulers, judges,” and it can also a plural intensive - singular meaning “god, goddess, the (true) God, or God.” The noun is prefixed by the article (הַ), which Kelly (1992:25), explains is usually written with the *qames*, because the initial guttural rejects the dagesh forte that causes the short vowel to be lengthened from “*pata* to *qames*.” Therefore, the noun can be translated as “the God” or “the Lord”.

מֵלָאֵךְ

The above word according to BDB (2010:521) is a masculine singular absolute noun, that can mean “messenger, representative, angel.”

לְיְרוּשָׁלַם

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), describes the above word the combination of the preposition (לְ) that can mean “to, for, or at,” prefixed to the proper singular absolute noun, which BDB (2010:436) describes as “Jerusalem,” the chief city of Palestine and capital of the United Kingdom and the nation of Judah after the split. The word can, therefore, be translated as “to Jerusalem, or for Jerusalem”.

לְהִשְׁחִיתָהּ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), passes the above word as comprising the (לְ) “to, or for,” added to the Hif’il infinitive verb construct, with root (שָׁחַת), and suffixed by the third-person feminine singular pronoun (הִיא). The Hif’il verb according to BDB (2010:1008) can mean “to spoil, ruin, destroy”.

Kelly (1992:182) explains that the preposition prefixed to the infinitive “may be used to introduce a purpose clause, a result clause or a temporal clause.” In the context here, the preposition is used I presume, as a purpose clause “to destroy”. Besides, Kelly (183) notes that the pronominal “suffix may function either as the subject or as the object of the infinitive.” In the context, the pronominal suffix functions as the subject of the destroying.

Therefore, the word can be translated as “to destroy her/ it, or to ruin her/ it”.

וּבְהַשְׁחִיתָ

This is a compound Hebrew word, that comprises the waw conjunction “and,” added the preposition (כִּי), which Kelly (1992:28) defines as either, “as, like, or according to”. The conjunction and the preposition, are both prefixed to the Hif’il (causative active) infinitive verb construct, with root (שָׁחַת), that can mean, according to BDB (2010:1008) “to spoil, ruin, destroy”.

Kelly (1992:182), explains that infinitive constructs prefixed with the preposition (כִּי), can be translated as a temporal clause, and should be understood as any of the following “when, as, just as, or as soon as”.

The compound word can then be translated as “and as soon as to destroy or and just as to destroy”.

וּרְאָה

BDB (2010:906) defines this word as a Qal (perfect) third-person masculine singular verb that the root means “see, perceive.” In the simple active inflation, it can be translated as “he saw”.

יְהוָה

The above word as already described earlier is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” Meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

וַיִּנָּחֵם

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the nif'al (simple passive or reflexive), wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb, with the root (נחם).

BDB (2010:636) defines the root of the verb as “be sorry, be moved to pity, have compassion, or console oneself.” In the present inflation, the verb can be translated as “and he was sorry” or “and he was moved to pity”.

עַל־הָרָעָה

This compound Hebrew word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), is made up of the prepositional prefix (עַל) that can mean “upon, above or about” (Kelly 1992:30). The preposition is joined by the *maqef* to the article (ה) “the”, prefixed to the common feminine singular absolute noun (רָעָה), which BDB (2010:949), defines as “evil, misery, distress, or injury”. The compound word can then be translated as “about the evil”.

וַיֹּאמֶר

As already noted earlier, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15) passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The waw conjunction means “and”.

The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say”. The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular and can be translated as “he uttered, or he said”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

לְמַלְאָךְ

The above word is the prepositional prefix (לְ) “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28). The preposition is prefixed to the word, which according to BDB (2010:521) is a masculine singular absolute noun, that can mean “messenger, representative, angel”.

Ander-Forbes (2008: Chr. 21:15), suggested that the noun is a masculine normal, definite without (הַ). Therefore, the word can be translated as “to the angel or, to the messenger”.

הַמְשַׁחֵת

As already translated earlier, but this time, with the addition of the article (הַ), Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), passes the above word as the Hif'il participle masculine singular absolute verb, that means “destroying”. The root of the verb is the word (שָׁחַת), that BDB (2010:1008), defines as a participial adjective, “destroyer”. As a participle, the word can then be translated as “the destroying”.

רַב

This is an adjective that can mean “much, many, or great” BDB (2010:912).

עַתָּה

This is an adverb that means “now” according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15).

הִרְרָה

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), this is a hif'il imperative second-person masculine singular verb that can mean “to let drop, abandon, relax, refrain, forsake”. BDB (2010:951) defines the verb as “let drop”. Therefore, the verb can mean “let drop or refrain”.

יָדְךָ

Kelly (1992:75) defines the above word as the feminine singular construct noun, which means “hand”. It is suffixed by the second person pronominal suffix that appears to have the second person masculine singular ending. Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), on the other hand, describes the word as a common singular construct noun. BDB (2010:388) agrees with Kelly, that it is a feminine noun. Therefore, I will translate the word as “your hand”.

וּמְלָאֵךְ

This is the waw conjunction “and,” which Kelly (1992:31) explains, is written as sureq before a labial like (מ), it is prefixed to the word, which according to BDB (2010:521) is a masculine singular absolute noun, that can mean “messenger, representative, angel.”

In the present context, the noun is in the construct state according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15).

Therefore, the word can be translated as “and messenger of, or, and angel of”.

יְהוָה

This word again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

עֹמֵד

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15) passes the above word as the Qal participle masculine singular absolute verb that is from the root verb (עָמַד), which BDB (2010:763) defines as “take one’s stand, or stand”. In the present form, the verb is in the participle stem, and Kelly (1992:200), explains that this type of participle normally preceded by an expressed subject, is used as a verb, and it describes continuous action either, past, present, or future. In this case, it is assumed to have been used in the past, therefore, it can be translated as “he was standing”.

עִם־גֶּרֶן

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:15), the above word comprises of the preposition (עִם), prefixing, and joined by the maqqef to the common singular construct noun (גֶּרֶן).

The preposition according to Kelly (1992:30) means “with.” BDB (2010:767) similarly defines the preposition as “with,” but added other nuances of meaning like “against, toward, as long as, besides, except, in spite of”.

The construct noun, on the other hand, means “threshing floor of” (BDB 2010:175). The word can then, be translated as “beside threshing floor of”.

אֶרְבֵּן

BDB (2010:75) describes the above word as a proper masculine singular absolute noun that refers to a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan”.

הַיְבוּסִי

This word is made up of the article (הַ) “the”, prefixed to the singular absolute adjective (יְבוּסִי) that means “Jebusite” (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:15).

BDB (2010:384) defines the word as the Jebusite, the descendants of Jebus. The descendants of the 3rd son of Canaan, who lived in or around the site of Jebus, the early name for Jerusalem. Therefore, the word can be translated as “the Jebusite”.

Verse 15 reads as follows: And God sent (an) angel to Jerusalem to destroy it, and just as to destroy, God saw he was moved to pity about the evil. And he said to the angel destroying, much now, refrain your hand and angel of God was standing beside (the) threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite.

4.2.16. Verse 16

וַיִּשָּׂא דָוִד אֶת-עֵינָיו וַיֵּרָא אֶת-מִלְאָךְ יְהוָה עֹמֵד בֵּין הָאָרֶץ וּבֵין הַשָּׁמַיִם וַחֲרָבוֹ שְׁלוֹפָה בְּיָדוֹ
נֹטְוִיהָ עַל-יְרוּשָׁלַם וַיִּפֹּל דָוִד וְהַזְקֵנִים מִכִּסֵּי בַשָּׁקִים עַל-פְּנֵיהֶם:

וַיִּשָּׂא

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16) passes the above word, as the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb.

The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:669) is נָשָׂא, which can mean “to lift, lift up, carry, or, take”. In the present context, the word can be translated as “and he lifted up”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

אֶת־עֵינָיו

This Hebrew word is a combination of the preposition (אֶת), which serves as the object marker, joined by the *maqfef* to the supposed object of the sentence. The object is defined by Kelly (1992:63), as a common dual noun (עֵינַיִם), that means “eyes”.

The noun is in a construct relationship with the third-person masculine singular pronominal suffix (י) “his” according to Kelly (71). Therefore, the word can be translated as “his eyes”.

וַיִּרְאֵ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16) passes the above word, as the *waw* conjunction “and,” prefixed to the Qal wayyiqtol (*waw*-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb רָאָה. The verb is defined by BDB (2010:906), as “see”. Based on the form of the verb in the present context, the verb can be translated as “and he saw”.

אֶת־מַלְאָךְ

This word is the masculine singular construct noun, which can mean “messenger, representative, angel” BDB (2010:521). It is prefixed by the particle (אֶת), which is

the sign of the direct object, and is not translated in English, but denotes that the word is the object of the sentence (Kelly 1992:12).

Kelly further explains that the particle preceding the object indicates that the object is definite. Therefore, the word can be translated as “the messenger of, or, the angel of”.

יהוה

This word again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

עמד

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16), as previously noted, passes the above word as the Qal participle masculine singular absolute verb, that is from the root verb עמד, which BDB (2010:763) defines as “take one’s stand, or stand.”

In the present form, the verb is in the participle stem, and Kelly (1992:200) explains that this participle that is normally preceded by an expressed subject, is used as a verb, and it describes continuous action either, past, present, or future. In this case, it is assumed to have been used in the past, therefore, it can be translated as “he was standing”.

בין

This is a preposition that can mean “between, among, in the midst of (with other preps), from between” (BDB 2010:108). BDB suggests that the word can be used as part of speech, as a substantive masculine that is always used as a preposition. Therefore, the word can be translated as “between”.

הָאָרֶץ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16), defines the above word as a make-up of the article (הַ) “the”. Kelly (1992:24), explains that the article is usually written with a *qames* (◌ִ), but because the guttural rejects the dagesh forte, the preceding vowel is forced to lengthen from *patah* (◌ַ) to *qames* (◌ִ). The conjunction is prefixed to the common singular absolute noun (אָרֶץ), that means “earth”.

BDB (2010:75) similarly defines the noun as “earth, or land”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “the earth, or, the land”.

וּבֵין

This is again the preposition that can mean “between, among, in the midst of (with other preps), from between” (BDB 2010:108). BDB suggests that the word can be used as part of speech, as a substantive masculine that is always used as a preposition. Therefore, the word can be translated as “between”.

This time, the word is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and,” which Kelly (1992:31), explains that the conjunction is written like a sureq, because it is prefixed to a word that starts with the labial (בּ). Therefore, the word can be translated as “and between”.

הַשָּׁמַיִם

This word according to BDB (2010:1029) is the masculine plural absolute noun, that can mean “heavens or sky.” It is prefixed by the definite article (הַ) “the” (Kelly 1992:24). Therefore, the word can be translated as “the heavens, or the sky”.

וְחִרְבוֹ

This word is comprised of the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the word, which is already explained earlier by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16), who described the Hebrew noun, as “sword, or knife”.

BDB (2010:352), also agrees with the definition of the word as “sword, or knife.” The noun is in a construct relationship with the third-person masculine singular pronominal suffix (י) “his” according to Kelly (1992:71).

The word can, therefore, be translated as “and his sword”.

שְׁלֹפָה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16), describes the above word as the Qal passive participle absolute feminine singular verb “draw.” BDB (2010:1025) describes the verb in the present context as “draw out, or draw off”.

According to Kelly’s (1992:200), explanation, this participle, can be classified as a past participle, which describes continuous action in the time of the context, expressed in another way, what was going on in the past. Also being in the passive stem. The action can be assumed to be performed on the sword, therefore, the word can be translated as “it was drawn out”.

בְּיָדוֹ

This word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16), is a combination of the preposition (ב), plus the common singular noun (יָד), in a suffixed construct relationship with the third-person masculine singular pronoun (י).

Kelly (1992:28) defines the preposition as “in, by, or with.” The noun according to BDB (2010:388) can mean “hand”.

The noun is in a construct relationship with the third-person masculine singular pronominal suffix (י) “his” according to Kelly (1992:71). Therefore, the word can be translated as “in his hand, or by his hand”.

נְטוּיָה

This word is a verb, in the Qal passive participle feminine absolute singular stem according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16). The root of the verb is the word (נָטָה), which BDB (2010:639), defines as “stretch out, spread out, extend, incline or bend”, also being in the passive stem. The action can be assumed to be performed like previously as on the sword, therefore, the word can be translated as “she/ it was stretched out, or, she/ it was spread out.”

עַל-יְרוּשָׁלַם

The above word is a compound word, made up of the preposition (עַל), and the proper singular absolute noun (יְרוּשָׁלַם) (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:16).

The preposition can be defined as “upon, on the ground of, according to, on account of, on behalf of, concerning, above, over, against” (Kelly 1992:30).

BDB (2010:436) describes the proper singular absolute noun, as “Jerusalem,” the chief city of Palestine and capital of the United Kingdom and the nation of Judah after the split. The word can, therefore, be translated as “upon Jerusalem, or, over Jerusalem”.

וַיִּפֹּל

The above word is comprised of the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the verb root (נָפַל), which BDB (2010:656) defines as “to fall, lie, be cast down, fail.” The prefixing of the conjunction to the verb forms the wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb.

According to Kelly (1992:145), grammarians refer to the waw consecutive as waw conversive and explain that it is because it converts imperfect forms into perfects. As

such, from the reader's point of view, the (waw-consecutive + imperfect) represents consecutive actions that took place in the past time. Therefore, the verb can be translated as "and he fell".

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as "David," the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here "David".

וְהַזְקֵנִים

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16) passes the above word as the waw conjunction "and," prefixed to the article (הַ) "the". Both the conjunction and the article, are joined to the masculine plural absolute adjective (זְקֵנִים), which means "elders".

BDB (2010:278) defines the adjective as "old, of human beings, old man (or woman), elder". Therefore, the word can be translated as "and the elders".

מִבְּטָה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16), defines the above word as a Pu'al passive participle masculine absolute plural verb. The verb root according to BDB (2010:491) is the word בָּטָה, that means "cover, conceal shame, cloth, spread over".

However, in the present context, the verb is in the Pu'al participle inflation, which Kelly (1992:196) explains, is distinguished by the (בְּ) prefix, the qibbus (ֻ) under the initial root consonant, and the doubling of the middle root consonant. The Pu'al verb also represents the intensive passive verb mode (Kelly 1992:108).

Therefore, the verb can be defined as "they were clothed, or they were covered".

בְּשָׂקִים

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16), passes the above Hebrew word, as comprising of the (בְּ) preposition, plus the article (הַ), both prefixed to the masculine plural absolute noun (שָׂקִים).

The noun according to BDB (2010:974) means “sack, sackcloth”. BDB, further explained that it was “worn in mourning and humiliation, either loose garment like a sack, or a piece of similar material (or rough, dark hair), fastened round body.” The preposition is defined by Kelly (1992:28) as “in, by, or with”.

Therefore, the word can be translated as either “in the sackcloth, by the sackcloth, or, with the sackcloth”.

עַל-פְּנֵיהֶם

The above Hebrew word is passed by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:16), as the prepositional prefix (עַל), prefixed to the common masculine plural noun (פְּנֵיהֶם), in a construct relationship with the third-person masculine plural pronominal suffix (הֶם).

The preposition can be defined as “upon, on the ground of, according to, on account of, on behalf of, concerning, above, over, against” (Kelly 1992:30). The plural noun is defined by BDB (2010:815), as “faces”.

Kelly, further explained that the pronominal suffix, when attached to nouns, functions as a possessive pronoun, hence, it is assumed to be in construct relationship with the noun. Kelly (68) then defines the pronominal suffix as “their.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “upon, above, or, over their faces”.

Verse 16 reads as follows: And David lifted up his eyes, and he saw the angel of God he was standing between the earth and between the heavens, and his sword was drawn out in his hand, it was stretched out over Jerusalem, and David and the elders they (who) were clothed with the sackcloth fell upon their faces.

4.2.17. Verse 17

וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים הֲלֹא אֲנִי אֶמְרָתִי לְמַנּוֹת בָּעַם וַאֲנִי־הוּא אֲשֶׁר־חָטְאֵתִי וְהִרְעֵה הִרְעוֹתִי
וְאֵלֶּה הַצָּאן מֶה עָשׂוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי תְהִי נָא יְדָדְךָ בִּי וּבְבַיִת אָבִי וּבְעַמֶּךָ לֹא לְמַגִּפָּה

וַיֹּאמֶר

As already noted earlier, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17) passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The waw conjunction means “and”. The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say”. The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular and can be translated as “he uttered, or he said”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים

This is a compound word, prefixed by the preposition (אֶל) that can mean “to, into or towards” (Kelly 1992:29). It is prefixed to the word that BDB (2010:43) previously defined as “God,” and goes further to explain that God is Yahweh.

In agreement with BDB, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17) also translates the word as a common masculine plural absolute noun that he referred to also as “God”. The noun is prefixed by the definite article (הַ) “the”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “to the God” or “to the Lord”.

הֲלֹא

The first letter of this Hebrew word is the interrogative (הֲ), which as Kelly (1992:94), explains, introduces a simple yes-or-no question “is it?” In the context here, it is prefixed to the negation (לֹא), which can mean “not, or no” (BDB 2010:518). Therefore, the word can be translated as a negative question “is it not?”

אֲנִי

Kelly (1992:52) defines the above word as the common singular independent personal pronoun, or subject pronoun translated as “I”.

אָמַרְתִּי

BDB (2010:55) defines the above word as a verb, with the root אָמַר that means “utter, or speak”. In the present form, it is a Qal perfect (simple active) first-person common singular verb, which can mean “I uttered, or I said”.

Kelly (1992:156) ascertained that the suffix is the perfect first-person common singular. Nevertheless, he cautioned translators to be aware, that the perfect second-person feminine singular does have the same form as the perfect first-person common singular, and only the context can be relied upon to distinguish between the two forms. In this context, however, the preceding word is a first-person singular independent pronoun, which can help to be sure that this is also, perfect first-person common singular, rather than the perfect second-person feminine singular.

Anderson & Forbes (2008: 1 Chr. 21:17), also pass the word as Qal active, suffixed (perfect), singular common, first-person, which implies a supplication to Divinity, “say,” therefore, what we have here is “I said”.

לִּמְנוֹת

Anderson & Forbes (2008: 1 Chr. 21:17), defines the above word as a combination of the preposition (לְ) “to, for, or at,” prefixed to the Qal active, infinitive construct, a transitive verb that can mean “to count”.

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17) similarly, defined the word as the verb, Qal. Infinitive construct.

The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:584) is the word (מָנָה), that can mean “count, number, reckon, or assign.” In the present form, it is Qal active, infinitive construct form and prefixed by the preposition, which Kelly (1992:182) suggests, introduces a temporal clause. Therefore, the word can be translated as “to count”.

בְּעַם

This is the (בְּ) preposition that means “in, by, or, with” (Kelly 1992:28). It is prefixed to the article (הַ), “the” and the word (עַם), which is a singular absolute common noun that BDB (2010:766), defines as “people, mankind”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “in the people”.

וְאִנִּי־הוּא

This word is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”, plus again as Kelly (1992:52), defines, the common singular independent personal pronoun, or subject pronoun, translated as “I”. They are joined by the *maqef* to the suffixed third-person masculine singular pronoun (הוּא), which BDB (2010:214) defines as a pronoun of the third-person singular, “he or she”, and sometimes used also for the neuter “it”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and it is I (who)”.

אֲשֶׁר־חָטָאתִי

The above word is made up of the relative conjunction (אֲשֶׁר), plus the Qal qatal (perfect) first-person singular verb (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:17).

The relative conjunction can mean according to BDB (2010:81), “that which, that, or who,” and is a sign of relation, bringing the clause introduced by it into a relationship with an antecedent clause. BDB suggests that sometimes, the relation expressed by it is specifically temporal, local, or causal. But more particularly, it includes its pronominal antecedent.

The Qal (perfect) first-person singular verb, on the other hand, has its root as (חָטָא), which BDB (2010:306), defines as “miss, sin, miss the goal or path of right and duty.” In the present context, it can be translated as “I sinned, or I missed the path.”

Therefore, the compound Hebrew word can be translated as “that I sinned or I that sinned, or that I missed the path, or I that missed the path”.

וְהָרַע

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17) passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and,” plus the Hif'il, infinitive absolute verb (רָעַע), that means “do evil.”

The BDB (2010:949) defines the root of the verb as “be evil, bad.” In the present form, the verb is in the Hif'il form, which according to Kelly (1992:108), is a causative active verb. Kelly (185), further explains that the infinitive absolute often as in this case, stands immediately after its cognate verb, serving to emphasize the duration or continuation of the verbal idea. Therefore, it can be translated as “and to do evil”.

הָרַעוֹתִי

This word like above is a Hif'il, a verb with the root (רָעַע), that means “do evil.” The BDB (2010:949) defines the root of the verb as “be evil, bad.” In the present form,

the verb is in the Hif'il (perfect) first singular form, which according to Kelly (1992:108), is a causative active verb. The verb seems to be repeated to strengthen the force of the verb, which could have prompted most English translations, to add the word indeed. This repetition, in a way, gives the idea the David was certainly aware that he committed evil against his God.

The verb is suffixed by the first person common singular pronominal suffix. Therefore, the verb can be translated as “I caused evil, or I did evil indeed”.

וְאֵלֶּה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17) passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and”, plus the demonstrative plural pronoun (אֵלֶּה), which BDB (2010:41), defines as the demonstrative plural pronoun, used before the antecedent “these”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and these”.

הַצֹּאֵן

This word is made up of the article (הַ) “the,” prefixed to the common collective feminine absolute noun (צֹאֵן), which BDB (2010:838) defines as “small cattle, sheep, sheep and goats, flock, flocks”. The word can, therefore, be translated as “the sheep and goats, or the flock”.

מָה

This is an interrogative pronoun, that can mean “what”, according to Kelly (1992:95). Kelly explains that questions are introduced by the interrogative pronouns, in this case, it refers to things, rather than to people, and it is not inflated for gender or number. The translation here then is “what”.

עָשׂוּ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17) passes the above word as the Qal qatal (perfect) third person plural verb, with the root (עָשָׂה), which BDB (2010:793), defines as “to do, work, make, produce”. This is prefixed by the third-person pronominal suffix (וּ) “they” (Kelly 1992:113).

In the present context, the verb is in the Qal (perfect) third person plural inflation, and can thus, be translated as “they did”.

יְהוָה

This word again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

אֱלֹהֵי

The above word is passed by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17), as the common plural construct noun, with the root (אֱלֹהִים), the word was previously defined as “God,” by BDB (2010:43), and BDB, goes further to explain that the God is Yahweh. In agreement with BDB, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17) also translates the word as a common masculine plural absolute noun that he referred to also, as “God.” In the present context, the word is in a construct state, with the suffixed first-person singular pronoun (אֲנִי) “I, or me.” The function of the construct relationship, in this case, is to express genitival relationships, thus, the word can be translated as “my God”.

תְּהִי

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17), the above word is a Qal yiqtol (imperfect) third-person feminine singular jussive verb, with the root (הָיָה), which BDB (2010:224), defines as “fall out, come to pass, become, or be”.

Kelly (1992:131) explains that in the present context, the weak verb appears as a shortened form of the imperfect, and is used to express the speaker’s desire, wish, or command. According to Kelly, the translation is frequently accompanied by the modal auxiliaries “may, or let,” and as is the case here, it is preceding the particle (אֲנִי), that makes the word more emphatic. Therefore, the word can be translated as either “may it come to pass, or let it come to pass”.

אָנֹכִי

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17), expresses the above word as an interjection. Anderson & Forbes (2008:1 Chr. 21:17) expresses the word as adverbial, emphatic, a supplication to Divinity. BDB (2010:609) defined the word as a part of entreaty, or exhortation, “I (we) pray, now”.

יָדְךָ

The above word is the common singular noun construct (יָדְךָ), in a construct relationship with the pronoun suffixed second person masculine singular (יָדְךָ) (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:17).

The noun according to Kelly (1992:75) means “hand,” and the pronominal suffix, is “the second-person masculine singular pronoun, in a construct relationship with the noun. Therefore, the construct noun can be translated as “your hand”.

בִּי

This is the preposition (בְּ), which Kelly (1992:28) defines as “in, by, or with”, prefixed to the first-person singular pronoun (אֲנִי), which Kelly (68) defines as the common first-person pronominal suffix for the inseparable preposition “me”. Therefore, the word can be translated as either “in me, by me, or with me”.

וּבְבַיִת

The above Hebrew word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17), is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” written as previously discussed, as sureq, because it is attached to a labial. It is prefixed to the inseparable preposition (בְּ), which Kelly (1992:28) defines as “in, by, or with”; the preposition is attached to the masculine singular noun (בַּיִת), also defined by Kelly (74), as “house of me or my house”. Therefore, the compound Hebrew word can be translated as either “and in my house” or “and by my house”.

אָבִי

The above word is the masculine singular absolute noun (אָב), that Kelly (1992:73) defines as “father”. The noun in the context is in a construct relationship, with the first-person singular pronoun (אֲנִי), which Kelly (68) defines as the common first-person pronominal suffix “my.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “my father”.

וּבְעַמִּי

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17), passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and,” which is written as previously discussed, as sureq, because it is attached to a labial. The waw conjunction is attached as previously discussed as well, to the inseparable preposition (בְּ), which Kelly (1992:28) defines as “in, by, or with”.

The prefix is attached to the masculine noun (עַם) which means “people” (BDB 2010:766). The noun in the context here is in a construct relationship with the suffixed second-person masculine singular pronoun (אַתָּה). The pronominal suffix is the second-person masculine singular pronoun, in a construct relationship with the noun. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and by your people” or “and with your people”.

לֹא

As explained by Kelly (1992:173), the above word is a negation, used to express negative commands or prohibition, since the imperative is not used in Hebrew to express negative commands or prohibition. In the present context, the negation is used with the imperfect (תִּהְיֶה), and Kelly asserts that it expresses an absolute prohibition. The word can therefore be translated as “you shall not”.

לְמַגֵּפָה

The above word is a compound Hebrew word, made up of the preposition (לְ) that can mean “to, for, or at,” Kelly (1992:28). The preposition is prefixed to the common feminine singular absolute noun (מַגֵּפָה), which BDB (2010:620) defines as a feminine noun, that can mean “plague or pestilence (divine judgment).” Therefore, the word can be translated as “to plague, to pestilence, or for plague or for pestilence”.

Verse 17 reads as follows: And David said to God, is it not I (who) said to count in the people? And I the one that sinned and to do evil (did evil), I did evil certainly. And these, the sheep, what they did Yahweh, my God? Let your hand come to pass I pray now by me and by my house, my father, and with your people, you shall not to pestilence.

4.2.18. Verse 18

וּמְלָאֲךָ יְהוָה אָמַר אֶל־גָּד לְאֹמֵר לְדָוִד כִּי | יַעֲלֶה דָוִד לְהַקִּים מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה בְּגֵרֹן אֲרָגָן

הַיְבֹסִי:

וּמְלָאֲךָ

This word is the masculine singular absolute noun, that can mean “messenger, representative, angel” BDB (2010:521). It is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and.” The waw conjunction is written as previously discussed, as sureq, because it is attached to a labial (מ) (Kelly 1992:31).

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:18), asserts that the word is in a construct state, which expresses genitival relationships, and so, the word can be translated as “and messenger of, or, and angel of”.

יְהוָה

This word again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

אָמַר

The above word is a Qal (perfect) third-person masculine singular verb, defined by BDB (2010:55), as “he said, or he uttered.” Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:18) also, agrees with BDB’s definition of the word as meaning “he said”.

אֶל־גָּד

This word is prefixed by the preposition (אֶל), which Kelly (1992:29) defines as “to, into, or toward.” The prefix is joined to the proper singular absolute noun (גָּד), which

as previously defined by BDB (2010:151) is “a prophet during the time of David; appears to have joined David when in the hold; reappears in connection with the punishment for taking a census; also assisted in the arrangements for the musical service of the house of God.”

The word can, therefore, be translated as “to Gad”.

לְאמֹר

This Hebrew word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:18), is a combination of the (לְ) preposition, and the infinitive construct verb, with the root (אָמַר).

Kelly (1992:182) explains that when the preposition is prefixed to the Qal infinitive construct, it means “to say,” and is used to mark a direct discourse, similar to the usage of quotation marks in modern English. Kelly, further explains that the change in the vowel of the preposition, is because of the weak nature of the alef, and the alef becomes quiescent. Therefore, the word can be translated as “to say”.

לְדָוִד

This word is again the masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187), describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David.” It is prefixed by the inseparable preposition (לְ), defined by Kelly (1992:28), as “to, for, or at.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “to David, or for David”.

כִּי

BDB (2010:471), defines the above word as the conjunction “that, for or when”.

יְעֹלָה

This Hebrew word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:18), is the Qal, yiqtol (imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The root of the verb is (עָלָה), which BDB (2010:748), defines as “go up, ascend, or climb”. The verb is in the imperfect form in the context, and thus can be translated as “he should go up”

דָּוִד

This word is again the masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”

לְהִקְיִם

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:18), passes the above word as the preposition (לְ), prefixed to the Hif'il infinitive construct verb. The root of the verb is (קָוַם), that BDB (2010:877), defines as “arise, stand up, or stand”.

The verb, however, is in the Hif'il inflation, and according to Kelly (1992:108), it is a causative active verb.

Based on the earlier explanation by Kelly (1992:182), that when the preposition is prefixed to the Qal infinitive construct, it means “to arise, to stand up, or to stand”, in the context, as a causative active verb, it can then be translated as “make to arise, make to stand up, or make to stand”.

מִזְבֵּחַ

BDB (2010:258) defines the following word as the masculine singular absolute noun, which can mean “altar”.

לִיהוָה

This word again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel. It is prefixed by the preposition that can mean “to, for, or at,” (Kelly 1992:28). Therefore, the word can be translated as “to God, or for God”.

בָּגֶרֶן

The root of the above word is a noun, which means “threshing floor” (BDB 2010:175). The word is prefixed by the inseparable preposition (בְּ), which Kelly (1992:28), defines as “in, by, or with”.

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:18), the noun is presently in a construct state, therefore, it can be translated as “in threshing floor of, or by threshing floor of”.

אֲרָנָן

BDB (2010:75) describes the above word as a proper masculine singular absolute noun, that refers to a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan”.

הַיְבוּסִי

This word is as earlier described, made up of the article (הַ) “the,” prefixed to the singular patrial masculine noun (יְבוּסִי) that means “Jebusite” (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:18).

BDB (2010:384) defines the word as the Jebusite, the descendants of Jebus. The descendants of the 3rd son of Canaan who lived in or around the site of Jebus, the early name for Jerusalem. Therefore, the word can be translated as “the Jebusite”.

Verse 18 reads as follows: And (the) angel of God said to Gad, to say to David that David should go up (to) make to stand (an) altar for God by (the) threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite.

4.2.19. Verse 19

וַיַּעַל דָּוִד בְּדָבָר־גָּד אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה

וַיַּעַל

This is the same root word as previously discussed, however, in the former instance, the verb according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:19), was the Qal, *yiqtol* (imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The root of the verb is (עָלָה), which BDB (2010:748), defines as “go up, ascend, or climb”.

In this instance, the verb is the Qal *wayyiqtol* (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and he went up”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

בְּדָבָר־גָּד

This compound word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:19), is made up of the preposition (בְּ), plus the common singular construct noun, with the root דָּבַר, joined by the *maqgef* to the proper absolute noun (גָּד).

The preposition according to Kelly (1992:28) can mean “in, by, or with.” The construct noun is masculine singular, that can mean according to BDB (2010:182)

“speech of, or word of”. And the proper noun, which as previously defined by BDB (2010:151) is “Gad”, a prophet during the time of David.

The compound word can then be translated as “by word of Gad”.

אֲשֶׁר

The above word according to BDB (2010:81), is a relative participle, that can mean “which, who, or that which”. BDB notes that it can also mean conjunction, “that (in object clause), when, since, as, and this is a part of speech”. In the context, BDB accepts the word as a conjunction. Therefore, the word can be translated as “that”.

דִּבֶּר

BDB (2010:181) defines this word as a verb that the root implies “speak”. In the present context, BDB explains that it can denote “speak in the name of”.

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:19), it is a Pi’el qatal (perfect) third-person masculine singular verb. Kelly (1992:108) defines the Pi’el verb as an intensive active or causative verb. Therefore, the verb can be translated as “he spoke”.

בְּשֵׁם

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:19), the above word can be passed as follows: It comprises the preposition (בְּ) “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28).

The preposition is prefixed to the common singular construct noun (שֵׁם), that the root can mean “name” (BDB 2010:1027). The noun, however, is in the construct state, and therefore, can be translated as “in name of”.

יְהוָה

This word again as previously defined is the word that BDB (2010:43) means “God.” BDB goes further to explain that God is Yahweh. In agreement with BDB, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17), also translates the word as a common masculine plural absolute noun that he referred to also as “God”.

Verse 19 reads as follows: And David went up by word of Gad which he spoke in name of God

4.2.20. Verse 20

וַיֵּשֶׁב אֲרֶנָּן וַיְרֵא אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאַרְבַּעַת בָּנָיו עִמּוֹ מִתְחַבְּאִים וְאַרְנָן דִּישׁ חֲטָיִים:

וַיֵּשֶׁב

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:20), passes the above word as comprising of the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb.

The root of the verb is the word שׁוּב, defined by BDB (2010:996), as “turn back, or return”. In the present form, the imperfect can be translated as “and he turned back”, or “and he returned”.

אֲרֶנָּן

BDB (2010:75) describes the above word as a proper masculine singular absolute noun, that refers to a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan”.

וַיְרֵא

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:20), defined this word as the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the root verb (רָאָה), to form the Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive +

imperfect) masculine singular verb. The verb root means “see” (BDB 2010:906). In the current form, the verb can be translated as “and he saw”.

אֶת־הַמַּלְאָךְ

This compound word is prefixed by the preposition (אֶת), which serves as the object marker, and as Kelly (1992:12), explains, is not to be translated in English. The object marker is joined by the *maqfef*, to the direct object (מַלְאָךְ), prefixed by the article (הַ) “the”

Kelly notes that the object is representing a person or thing, upon which the action of a verb is performed. In this case, the direct object is the masculine singular absolute noun, which can mean “messenger, representative, angel” (BDB 2010:521). Therefore, the word can be translated as “the messenger, or, the angel”.

וְאַרְבַּעַת

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:20), this word is comprised of the waw conjunction “and,” plus the feminine, singular, numeral cardinal construct (אַרְבַּעַת), with the absolute root form as (אַרְבַּע).

Kelly (1992:97) identifies the cardinal as the number “four”. Being in the construct state, the numeral plus the prefix can be translated as “and four”.

בָּנָיו

Kelly (1992:61) defines the above word as the masculine plural construct noun (בָּנָיו), suffixed by the third-person masculine singular pronoun (י) “his.” The construct noun can then, be translated as “his sons”.

עִמּוֹ

The above Hebrew word is made up of the preposition (עִם), suffixed by the third-person masculine singular pronoun (וֹ) (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:20).

Kelly (1992:30), defines the preposition as “with”, and he (68), also, defined the pronoun as “him”.

Therefore, the word can be translated as “with him”.

מִתְחַבְּאִים

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:20), the above Hebrew word can be passed as follows: It is a Hitpa’el, participle, plural absolute verb, with the root חֲבָא.

BDB (2010:285) defines the root verb as “withdraw, hide”, and goes further to define the word in its current form as “drawback, or hide oneself”. Kelly (1992:108) notes that the Hitpa’el verb is reflexive. Kelly (200) further notes that the Hitpa’el, participle, in this context is used to represent what was going on in the past.

The Hitpa’el, a participle is also, in the plural form, therefore, the verb can be translated as “they drew back”, or “they hid themselves”.

וְאֹרְנָן

The above word is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the word BDB (2010:75), describes as a proper masculine singular absolute noun, that refers to a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. The noun can be translated as “Ornan” Therefore, the word can be translated as “and Ornan”.

שׁוֹ

The above word can be passed as the Qal participle, masculine singular absolute verb (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:20). The root of the verb is the Hebrew word (דוּשׁ), defined by BDB (2010:190), as “tread, thresh”. Participles generally are used to describe participation in the action or state of the verb (1992:193). This form of the participle, can be understood, as Kelly (200) notes, is used to function as a participial verb. Kelly explained that the participial verb is used to describe continuous action in the time of the context, and could be said to represent what was going on in the past. The word can, therefore, be translated as “was threshing”.

חֻטִּים

BDB (2010:334) defined the root of the above word as the feminine noun (חֻטָּה), which means “wheat”. In the present context, it is in the plural absolute form, and translated by BDB also, similar to the singular as “wheat”.

Verse 20 reads as follows: And Ornan turned back and he saw the angel, and his four sons with him, they hid themselves, and Ornan was threshing wheat.

4.2.21. Verse 21

וַיָּבֵא דָוִד עֵד-אֲרָנָו וַיִּבֶט אֲרָנָו וַיֵּרָא אֶת-דָּוִד וַיֵּצֵא מִן-הַגֶּרָן וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ לְדָוִד אַפַּיִם אֲרָצָה

וַיָּבֵא

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:21) passes the above word as the Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular. The verb is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”.

The root of the verb is (בּוֹא), defined by BDB (2010:97) as “come in, come, go in, or, go”. According to Kelly (1992:130), this type of imperfect is referred to as the frequentative use of the imperfect, and can thus be translated as any of “and he came in, and he went in, and he went, or, and he went”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

עַד־אֲרָנָן

The above word is comprised of the preposition (עַד), joined by the *maqgef* to the word described BDB (2010:75), as a proper masculine singular absolute noun, that refers to a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan”.

The preposition is defined by BDB (2010:723), as “even to, until, up to, while, or as far as.” Therefore, the word based on context can be translated as “up to Ornan”, or “as far as Ornan”.

וַיִּבֶט

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:21) passes the above word as the Hif'il wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) masculine singular verb.

The root of the verb is וַיִּבֶט, which BDB (2010:613), defines as “to look, or regard”. In the present context, it is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”, to form the imperfect verb, which Kelly (1992:144) explained is sometimes used to express repeated or habitual actions. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and he looked”.

אֲרָנָן

BDB (2010:75) describes the above word as a proper masculine singular absolute noun, that refers to a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect

an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan”.

וַיִּרְאֵ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:21), defined this word as the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the root verb (וַיִּרְאֵה), to form the Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) masculine singular verb. The verb root means “see” (BDB 2010:906). In the current form, the verb can be translated as “and he saw”.

אֶת־דָּוִד

As discussed earlier, (אֶת), is a sign of the direct object that is not translated in English. However, it helps to identify the object of a sentence (Kelly 1992:12). This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here the object of the sentence as “David”.

וַיֵּצֵא

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:21), the above Hebrew word can be passed as follows: It is a Qal verb, wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + Imperfect) third-person masculine singular. It is made up of the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the root verb וַיֵּצֵא, which BDB (2010:422) defines as “go”, or “come out”.

Kelly (1992:145) suggested that this type of imperfect from the reader’s viewpoint, represent consecutive actions in past time, and maybe understood as sequential “and then.” Therefore, the verb can be translated as “and then he went, or and then he came out”.

מִן־הַגֶּרֶן

This word is made up of the (מִן) preposition “from, or out of” (Kelly 1992:30), joined by the *maqṣef* to the definite absolute noun, which means “threshing floor” (BDB 2010:175). Therefore, the word can be translated as “from the threshing floor”.

וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:21), passes the above word, as the verb *Estaf’el*, *wayyiqtol* (waw-consecutive + Imperfect) third-person masculine singular.

Anderson & Forbes (2008: 1 Chr. 21:21), on the other hand, passed the compound word as the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the verb, *hitpa’el*, middle, prefixed (imperfect) sequential third-person masculine singular verb, a verb of movement, The sequential verb as already discussed above, can be understood as “and then”.

The verb root is the word (שָׁחָה), which means “bow down” (BDB 2010:1005). The inflation of the verb in the context, is *hitpa’el*, which is a reflexive verb, and therefore can be translated as “and then he bowed himself”.

לְדָוִד

This word is comprised of the preposition (לְ) that can mean according to Kelly (1992:28), “to, for, or at.” The preposition is prefixed to the noun, which again is a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David,” the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. So, we have here “David.”

Therefore, the word can be translated as “to David”, or “for David”.

אֶפְיָם

This according to BDB (2010:60), is a masculine dual absolute noun that means “face”.

אַרְצָה

The root of this word according to Kelly (1992:146-147), is a common noun (אַרְצָה), that can mean “ground or earth.” Kelly explains that the suffix He-Directive (הַ) is used to indicate the direction towards or motion towards something or someone, and it may appear either with or without the article. In the present context, the compensatory lengthening of the vowel of the alef, from (patah to qames), indicates that the word is definite (Kelly 1992:25).

Therefore, the word can be translated as “to the ground” or “to the earth”.

Verse 21 reads as follows: And David went up to Ornan, and Ornan looked, and he saw David and then he came out from the threshing floor, and then he bowed himself to David, face to the ground.

4.2.22. Verse 22

וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל-אַרְנֹן תְּנֵה-לִי מְקוֹם הַגֶּרֶן וְאַבְנֵה-בּוֹ מִזֶּבֶחַ לַיהוָה בְּכֶסֶף מְלֵא תְנֵהוּ לִי וְתִעָצֵר
הַמִּגְפָּה מֵעַל הָעַם:

וַיֹּאמֶר

As already noted earlier, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:22) passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb.

The waw conjunction means “and”. The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say.” The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular and can be translated as “he uttered, or he said”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

אֶל-אֲרִנָן

This compound word is made up of the preposition (אֶל), that can mean “to, into or toward” (Kelly 1992:29), joined by the *maqef* to the proper masculine singular absolute noun, which BDB (2010:75), describes as a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan”.

Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “to Ornan”.

תְּנֵה-לִּי

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:22), passes the above compound word as comprising of the Qal imperative second-person masculine singular verb, with the root תָּנָה, plus the paragogic (הֵּ), plus the preposition (לְ), plus the first-person singular suffixed pronoun (לִּי).

Anderson & Forbes (2008:1 Chr. 21:22), refers to this imperative verb, as an insistent imperative.

The verb according to BDB (2010:678), can mean “give, put, or set”. Kelly (1992:172), explains that the paragogic (הֵּ), is a suffix often added to the second person masculine singular form of the imperative, simply to make it more emphatic, and does not have an influence upon the meaning of the form. Kelly (28), also,

defines the preposition as “to, for, or at.” Besides, Kelly (52) defines the suffixed pronoun as “I”.

Therefore, the insistent imperative verb can be translated as “you give to I (me) please”.

מְקוֹם

BDB (2010:879-880) defines the above word as the masculine construct noun, which the root that means “standing-place or place”. In the present context, BDB describes the noun as “plot”, or “parcel of ground”.

הַגֶּרֶן

This is the definite masculine singular absolute noun, which can mean “threshing floor” (BDB 2010:175). It is prefixed by the article “the”, and can be translated as “the threshing floor”.

וְאֵבְנָה-בּוֹ

The above word is a compound Hebrew word, passed by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:22), as the waw conjunction “and,” plus the Qal wiyyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) first-person singular verb, plus the preposition (בְּ), and the suffixed third-person masculine singular pronoun (וֹ).

The root of the verb is the word בָּנָה, which BDB (2010:124), defines as “build”. The preposition can mean “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28). The suffixed third-person masculine singular pronoun can mean “him or it” (Kelly 155).

The waw-consecutive prefixed to the imperfect in the present context, according to Kelly’s (145), explanation, can be understood as sequential, and as such can be translated as “and then”.

Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and then I will build in it”.

מִזְבֵּחַ

This is a common singular absolute noun, which means “altar” BDB (2010:258).

לִיהוָה

This is a compound word, prefixed by the preposition (לְ), that can mean either “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28), prefixed to the word, that again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “to Yahweh”, or “for Yahweh”.

בְּכֶסֶף

The above word is a common, singular absolute noun, that can mean “silver, or money” (BDB 2010:494). It is prefixed by the preposition (בְּ) that Kelly (1992:28) defines as “in, by, or with”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “with silver”, or “with money”.

מְלֵא

BDB (2010:570) defines the above word as an adjective that can mean “full,” and particularly in the present context, as “of value, or price.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “full value” or “full price”.

תְּנִהוּ

The above word is a verb, with the root **נָתַן**, that BDB (2010:678) defines as “give, put or set”. In the present form, the verb is in the Qal imperative second-person masculine singular inflation and prefixed by the third-person masculine singular suffixed pronoun. The word can then be translated as “you give him/it”.

לִּי

The above word is made up of the preposition, which Kelly (1992:28), defines as “to, for, or at”. The preposition is attached to the first-person singular suffixed pronoun, which Kelly (52), as well, defines as “I”, therefore, the word can be translated as “to I (me)”.

וְתִעָצֵר

The above word is passed by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:22), as the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the nif'al wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person feminine singular verb.

The root of the verb is the word **עָצַר**, which can be defined as “restrain, or retain”.

The nif'al is a simple passive verb (Kelly 1992:108), and can be translated as “be restrained, or be retained”.

As Kelly (145), explained above, the waw-consecutive prefixed to the imperfect in the present context, can be understood as consequential, and as such can be translated as “and so”. Therefore, the verb can be translated as “and so him/ it will be restrained”.

הַמְגִּפָּה

The above Hebrew word is a common, feminine singular absolute noun (מַגִּפָּה), which is defined by BDB (2010:620), as “blow, slaughter, plague, or pestilence”. The noun is prefixed by the definite article (הַ) “the”.

The noun can then be translated as “the slaughter or the pestilence”. However, if the word is translated as “the slaughter,” it might give the impression that death is only caused by the angel alone. On the other hand, if translated as “the pestilence,” it might give the idea that another force was busy destroying the people, outside the sword of the angel.

מֵעַל

This word is made up of the preposition (מִן), which Kelly (1992:30) defines as “from, or out of,” it is prefixed to another preposition (אֶל), which Kelly also, defines as “upon, above or about”.

BDB (2010:752) similarly, defines the preposition (אֶל), as “on the ground of, according to, on account of, on behalf of, concerning, besides, in addition to, together with, beyond, above, over, by, on to, towards, to, against. Therefore, the word can then be translated as “from upon” or “from against”.

הָעָם

The above word is a common singular absolute noun, defined by BDB (2010:769) as “nation, people.” It is prefixed by the article (הַ), “the”. Kelly (1992:25) explains that the vowel of the article is lengthened from “patah to qames”, because the guttural rejects the dagesh forte. The patah would have been left as a short vowel, in an open unaccented syllable, without the lengthening. Therefore, the word can be translated as “the people”.

Verse 22 reads as follows: And David said to Ornan, you give to me please, the site of the threshing floor and then I will build on it, an altar for God. Give it to me for the full price and so the pestilence will be restrained from upon the people.

4.2.23. Verse 23

וַיֹּאמֶר אֲרֶנָּה אֶל־דָּוִד קַח־לָךְ וַיַּעַשׂ אֲדֹנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ הַטּוֹב בְּעֵינָיו רֵאָה נְתַתִּי הַבְּקָר לְעֹלוֹת
וְהַמְזֻרְגִים לְעֵצִים וְהַחֲטִים לַמִּנְחָה הַכֹּל נְתַתִּי:

וַיֹּאמֶר

As already noted earlier, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:23) passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The waw conjunction means “and”. The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say.” The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular and can be translated as “he uttered, or he said”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

אֲרֶנָּה

BDB (2010:75) describes the above word as a proper masculine singular absolute noun, that refers to a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan”.

אֶל־דָּוִד

This is a compound word, comprising of the preposition (אֶל), which Kelly (1992:29), defines as “to, into, or toward.” The preposition is joined by the *maqfef* to the noun, which again is a masculine singular absolute proper noun, described by BDB (2010:187) as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel.

Therefore, we have here “David”. The compound word can then be translated as “to David”.

קח-לך

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:23), passes the above word as the Qal imperative second-person masculine singular verb **קח**, joined by the *maqafef* to the preposition (**לך**), suffixed by the second-person masculine singular pronoun (**אתה**).

Anderson & Forbes (2008: 1 Chr. 21:23) similarly, passes the verb as the Qal, imperative, masculine singular second person transitive verb.

The root of the verb according to BDB (2010:542) can mean any of “to take, get, fetch, lay hold of, seize, receive, acquire, buy, bring.” In the context, the verb is no more in the simple active Qal perfect form. So, then the verb can be translated as “take, acquire, or receive”.

The preposition can mean “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28). Lastly, the suffixed pronoun can mean “you”.

The compound word can, therefore, be translated as “take for you”.

ויעש

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:23), passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular jussive verb.

The root of the verb is **עשה**, which BDB (2010:793) defines as “do or make”. In the context, the verb is in the imperfect jussive form, which Kelly (1992:131), explained is used to express the speaker’s command, and is frequently accompanied in translation by the modal auxiliary “may or let”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and let do”.

אֲדֹנָי

The above word is comprised of the singular construct noun, suffixed by the first-singular pronoun (אֲנִי) “my” (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:23). The root of the noun is the masculine noun (אָדוֹן), which BDB (2010:10) defines as “lord”. In the present context, the word is in the construct state, expressing ownership, and therefore be translated as “my lord”.

הַמֶּלֶךְ

This word is a noun, prefixed by the definite article (הַ) “the”. The noun is a masculine definite noun, defined by BDB (2010:572) as “the king”.

הַטוֹב

According to Kelly (1992:46), this word is made up of the article (הַ) “the.” And the adjective (טוֹב) “good”. Kelly explains that the adjective is predicative, and it functions as a verbless sentence, it consists of a noun that functions as a subject and an adjective. Therefore, the adjective can be translated as “the good”.

בְּעֵינָיו

The above Hebrew word is comprised of the preposition (בְּ), which can mean “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28). Kelly (63) also defines the preposition that is prefixed to the common dual masculine singular construct noun (עֵינַיִם) “eyes of”, and suffixed by the third-person masculine singular pronoun (וֹ), that can mean “his”.

Therefore, the word can be translated as “in eyes of his”, or, “in his eyes”.

רֹאֵה

This is a verb with the root that means “see” (BDB 2010:906). In the present context, it is in the Qal imperative second-person masculine singular form, and therefore can be translated as “you see”.

נָתַתִּי

The word is the Qal active verb נָתַן, and is defined by BDB (2010:678), as “give, put or set”. In the current form, it is suffixed by the first singular pronominal suffix “I.” Therefore, the word can be translated as “I give”.

הַבָּקָר

This is the article (הַ), “the”, prefixed to the common singular absolute noun בָּקָר, defined by BDB (2010:133) as “cattle, herd, oxen, ox”. Therefore, the above word can be translated as “the cattle, or, the oxen”.

לְעֹלֹת

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:23), passes the above Hebrew word as comprising of the following: The preposition (לְ) “to, for, or at,” (Kelly 1992:28), prefixed to the article (הַ), “the” and the common feminine plural absolute noun (עֹלֹת), defined by BDB (2010:750), as “whole burnt-offering”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “for the whole burnt-offering”.

וְהַמִּזְבֵּחַ

The above compound word is made up of the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the article “the”, and both joined to the common masculine plural absolute noun (מֹרֶגֶת), defined by BDB (2010:558), as “threshing-sledge”.

The compound word can, therefore, be translated as “and the threshing-sledge”.

לְעֵצִים

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:23), the above word is comprised of the preposition (לְ) “to, for, or at,” and the article “the”, prefixed to the common masculine absolute noun (עֵץ). The noun can be defined as “tree, or wood”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “for the wood”.

וְהַחִטִּים

The above word is made up of the waw conjunction “and”, plus the article (הַ) “the”, prefixed to the common, masculine plural absolute noun (חִטָּה), which can be defined as “wheat” BDB (2010:310). Therefore, the above word can be translated as “and the wheat”.

לְמִנְחָה

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:23), the above word is comprised of the preposition (לְ) “to, for, or at,” and the article “the,” prefixed to the common masculine absolute noun (מִנְחָה). BDB (2010:585) defines the noun as “grain offering” Therefore, the above word is “for the grain offering”.

הַפֶּל

The above word is defined by BDB (2010:481), as “the whole, or the all”. It is made up of the masculine noun (בָּל), and the article (הַ) “the”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “the whole”.

נָתַתִּי

The word has its root as the Qal active verb נָתַן, and is defined by BDB (2010:678), as “give, put or set”. In the current form, it is suffixed by the first singular pronominal suffix “I”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “I give”.

Verse 23 reads as follows: And Ornan said to David, take for you, and let my lord the king do the good you see in his eyes, I give the oxen for the whole burnt-offering and the threshing-sledge for the wood and the wheat for the grain offering, I give all.

4.2.24. Verse 24

וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד לְאַרְנֹן לֹא בִי־קִנְיָה אֶקְנֶה בְּכֶסֶף מֵלֶא כִּי לֹא־אֶשָּׂא אֶשְׂר־לְךָ לִיהוָה וְהַעֲלֹת
עֹלָה חֲנָם:

וַיֹּאמֶר

As already noted earlier, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:24), passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The waw conjunction means “and”.

The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say.” The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular and can be translated as “he uttered, or he said.” Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

הַמֶּלֶךְ

This word is a noun, prefixed by the definite article (הַ) “the”. The noun is a masculine definite noun, defined by BDB (2010:572) as “the king”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

לְאֹרְנָן

This is the preposition (לְ), prefixed to the proper masculine singular absolute noun, which BDB (2010:75), describes as a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan.” Therefore, the above word is translated as “to Ornan”.

לֹא

The above word can mean “not, no,” according to BDB (2010:518) with a modifier, a negation.

כִּי־קָנָה

The prefix here is the word defined by BDB (2010:475), as “that, for, because, when, as though, as, because that, but, then, certainly, except, surely, since”. In the context, after a negation, it can be translated as “but”. It is joined by the *maqgef* to the Qal infinitive absolute verb קָנָה, defined also, by BDB (2010:888), as “get, acquire, buy, or possess”

Kelly (1992:185) explains that the infinitive absolute form of the verb here stands immediately before its cognate verb, and serves to strengthen, reinforce, as well as

intensify the verbal idea. Therefore, the verb can be translated as “but shall surely acquire”.

אֶקְנֶה

The verb is also of the root as the Qal infinitive absolute verb above אֶקְנֶה, and defined also, by BDB (2010:888), as “get, acquire, buy, or possess”. In the present form, it is in the Qal yiqtol (imperfect) first person singular verb. Therefore, it can be translated as “I will acquire, or I will buy”.

בְּכֶסֶף

The above word is made up of the prepositional prefix (בְּ) that can mean “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28). The preposition is prefixed to a common singular absolute noun (כֶּסֶף), which means “silver or money” (BDB 2010:494). The word can be translated as “with money”.

מֵלֵא

BDB (2010:570) defines the above word as an adjective, which means “full”.

כִּי

The above word as already explained previously is the word defined by BDB (2010:475), as “that, for, because, when, as though, as, because that, but, then, certainly, except, surely, since.” In the previous context, after a negation, it was translated as “but.” In the present context, BDB suggested that it is serving as a causal connection, and therefore, can be translated as “because, since”.

לֹא-אֶשָׂא

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:24), passes the above word as the negation (לֹא), joined by the *maqfep* to the Qal, yiqtol (imperfect) first-person singular verb, with the root אֶשָׂא. Anderson & Forbes (2008: 1 Chr. 21:24), defines the negation as an adverbial negative “not”.

The negation according to Kelly (1992:173) is used with the imperfect to express an absolute prohibition, since imperative is not used in Hebrew to express negative commands or prohibition. The verb root that the negation modifies is described by BDB (2010:669) as “lift, carry, or take”. As an imperfect first-person singular verb, it can be written as “I will take, or I will lift”. However, because of the negation, the resultant translation will then, be “I will not take”, or “I will not lift”.

אֲשֶׁר-לְךָ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:24), passes the above compound word as the conjunction (אֲשֶׁר), joined by the *maqfep* to the preposition (לְ), that is suffixed by the second-person, masculine singular pronoun (אֲתָהּ).

According to BDB (2010:81), the conjunction can be translated as a relative particle “which, who, or that which”. The preposition, on the other hand, can be translated as “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28), and the suffixed pronoun can be the second-person, masculine singular subject pronoun “you” (Kelly 1992:52).

Therefore, the word can be translated as “that which for you”.

לִיהוֹה

This word is comprised of the preposition (לְ), defined by Kelly (1992:28) as “to, for, or at”. The preposition is prefixed to the word that is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh”, meaning the proper name of the God of Israel. Therefore, the word can be translated as “for Yahweh”, or, “for God”.

וְהַעֲלוֹת

The above word can be passed as the (וְ) conjunction, “and”, prefixed to the Hif'il infinitive construct verb, with the verb root עָלָה. BDB (2010:748) defines the verb as “go up, ascend, or climb”. The Hif'il according to Kelly (1992:108) is a causative active, and if the Qal infinitive of the weak verb can be translated as “to go up, to ascend”. Therefore, the Hif'il form will then, be translated as “to cause to go up”, or “to cause to ascend”.

The compound word can, therefore, be translated as “and to cause to go up”, or “and to cause to ascend”.

עֹלָה

The above word is the common feminine plural absolute noun (עֹלָה), defined by BDB (2010:750), as “whole burnt-offerings”.

חִנָּם

BDB (2010:336) defines the above word as an adverb, that is more particularly used with substantives, and means out of favor, “gratis, gratuitously, for nothing”.

Verse 24 reads as follows: And King David said to Ornan, no, but I shall surely buy it from you for the full value because I will not take that which (is) for you for God and to cause to ascend whole burnt-offerings for nothing.

4.2.25. Verse 25

וַיִּתֵּן דָּוִד לְאֹרְנָן בַּמָּקוֹם שֶׁקָּלִי זָהָב מִשְׁקָל שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת:

וַיִּתֵּן

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:25), passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb.

The root of the verb is נָתַן, “give, put, or set” (BDB 2010:678). In the present form, the verb can be written as “he gave, or he put”. It is however prefixed by the waw conjunction, and thus can be translated as “and he gave”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

לְאֹרְנָן

The above word is comprised of the preposition (לְ), “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28).

The preposition is prefixed to the proper masculine singular absolute noun, which BDB (2010:75) describes as a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan.” The word can then be translated as “to Ornan” or “for Ornan”.

בַּמָּקוֹם

The above word can be passed according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:25), as the preposition (בְּ) “in, by, or with,” plus the definite article (הַ) “the,” prefixed to the common singular absolute noun (מְקוֹם). BDB (2010:879) describes the noun as the word “standing place, or place”. BDB (2010:90) explains about the preposition, that it is used in this context of cost or price, the price given, being treated as the instrumental means by which the act is accomplished, “with or for”.

Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “for the place”

שְׁקָלִי

This is a common plural masculine construct noun, with the root as (שָׁקַל), that BDB (2010:1053) defines as “Shekel, the chief unit of weight or measure.” Being in the construct form, the word can be translated as “Shekel of”.

זָהָב

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:25), defines the above word as the common singular absolute noun “gold”. In agreement, BDB (2010:262) similarly defines the noun as “gold”.

מִשְׁקָל

This is a masculine noun, which means “heaviness, or weight” (BDB 2010:1054).

שֵׁשׁ

The above word according to Kelly (1992:97) can mean either the absolute cardinal feminine numeral “six” or the construct cardinal numeral “six.” In the context, the absolute cardinal numeral will be preferred.

מֵאוֹת

Kelly (1992:99) defines the above as the feminine, plural cardinal numerals “hundreds.” The singular form of the cardinal numeral is (מֵאָה), “meaning”.

Therefore, the numeral here can be written as “hundreds”.

Verse 25 reads as follows: And David gave to Ornan for the place six hundred Shekels of gold weight.

4.2.26. Verse 26

וַיִּבֶן שָׁם דָּוִד מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה וַיַּעַל עֹלוֹת וּשְׁלָמִים וַיִּקְרָא אֶל־יְהוָה וַיַּעֲנֵהוּ בְּאֵשׁ מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם עַל
מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה

וַיִּבֶן

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:26), passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The verb is prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the root verb בָּנָה, which BDB (2010:124), defines as “build”. The imperfect form will then be translated as “he built”. Therefore, the verb can be translated as “and he built”.

שָׁם

The above word is an adverb, defined by BDB (2010:1027) as “there, or thither”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

מִזְבֵּחַ

This word is a masculine noun that means “altar” (BDB 2010:258).

לִיהוָה

This is a compound word, prefixed by the independent preposition (לְ), defined by Kelly (1992:28), as “to, for, or at.” The preposition is prefixed to the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means, according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “to Yahweh”, or “for Yahweh”.

וַיַּעַל

The above word in its previous occurrence was the Hif'il infinitive construct verb, with the verb root עָלָה. BDB (2010:748) defines the verb as “go up, ascend, or climb”. In the present form, the verb is in the Hif'il, wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb form, and can then be translated as “and he caused to ascend or climb, and he caused to go up”.

עֹלֹת

The above word is the common feminine plural absolute noun (עֹלֹת), defined by BDB (2010:750), as “whole burnt-offerings”.

וּשְׁלָמִים

The above word is a common masculine plural absolute noun, with the root (שָׁלַם), defined by BDB (2010:1023), as “peace offering, requital, sacrifice for alliance or friendship”. The noun in the present context is prefixed by the waw conjunction

“and”, and in the plural absolute form. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “and peace offerings”.

וִיקְרָא

The above word is passed by Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:26), as the Qal, wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The root of the verb is the word קָרָא, defined by BDB (2010:894), as “call, proclaim, or read”.

In the imperfect form, the verb can be translated as “and he called, or and will proclaim”.

אֶל־יְהוָה

This is a compound word, prefixed by the preposition (אֶל), defined by Kelly (1992:28), as “to, into, or toward.” The preposition is joined by the *maqfef*, to the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means, according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “to Yahweh”.

וַיַּעֲנֶהוּ

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:26), the above compound word can be passed as the waw conjunction, prefixed to the verb עָנָה, wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect), third-person masculine singular, suffixed by the third-person masculine singular pronoun (הוּא).

The waw conjunction means “and”. The verb can mean “answer, or respond,” (BDB 2010:772). In the present form, the verb is a wayyiqtol, and thus, can be translated as “and he answered”.

The third-person masculine singular pronoun, is a typical pronominal suffix with imperfect, according to Kelly (1992:157), and can be translated as “him”.

Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he answered him”.

בְּאֵשׁ

The above word is made up of the preposition (בְּ), defined by Kelly (1992:28), as “in, by, or with.” The preposition is prefixed to the article (הַ) “the”. Both the preposition and the article are joined to the feminine singular absolute noun (אֵשׁ), defined by BDB (2010:77) as “fire”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “with the fire”, or “by the fire”.

מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם

This is the preposition (מִן) “from, out of,” (Kelly 1992:30). The preposition is joined by the *maqṣef* to the definite masculine plural absolute noun (שָׁמַיִם), defined by BDB (2010:1029), as “heavens or sky”.

The compound word can, therefore, be translated as “from the heavens/ sky, or out of the heavens/ sky”.

עַל

Kelly (1992:30), defines the above word as a preposition that can mean “upon, above, or about”.

מִזְבַּח

The above word as described earlier is a masculine noun that means “altar” (BDB 2010:258). In this context, the noun is in the construct form, and thus can be translated as “altar of”.

הַעֲלָה

The above word as before is the common feminine plural absolute noun (עֲלָה), defined by BDB (2010:750), as “whole burnt-offerings”. In the present context, however, it is a definite noun, and thus, can be translated as “the whole burnt-offerings”.

Verse 26 reads as follows: And David built (an) altar for God there. And he caused to ascend whole burnt-offerings and peace offerings and he called to God and he answered him with the fire from the heavens upon (the) altar of the whole burnt-offerings.

4.2.27. Verse 27

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לְמֹלְאָד וַיֵּשֶׁב הַרְבֹּב אֶל־נְדָנָה:

וַיֹּאמֶר

As already noted earlier, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:27), passes the above word as a Qal wayyiqtol (waw consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb. The waw conjunction means “and”. The verb root is the word that BDB (2010:55) defines as “utter, say”. The verb, however, is in the imperfect inflation third-person masculine singular and can be translated as “he uttered, or he said”. Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he said”.

יְהוָה

This word again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “YAHWEH,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

לַמַּלְאָךְ

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:27), passes the above word as the prepositional prefix (לְ), that means “to, for, at” (Kelly 1992:28), and the definite article (הַ) “the”.

The preposition and the article are prefixed to the masculine singular absolute noun, which can mean “messenger, representative, angel” BDB (2010:521).

Therefore, the word can be translated as “to the angel”.

וַיָּשׁוּב

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:27), passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the verb, wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular.

According to BDB (2010:996), the root of the verb (שׁוּב), means “turn back, return”.

As Kelly (1992:145) explained earlier, the waw consecutive converts imperfect form into perfect, and maybe understood as sequential “and”. Therefore, the verb can be translated as “and then he turned back”, or, “and then he returned”.

הַרְבֵּוֹ

The above word is described as the Hebrew noun “sword, or knife”. BDB (2010:352), also agrees with the definition of the word as “sword, or knife”. The noun is in a construct relationship with the third-person masculine singular pronominal suffix (וֹ) “his” according to Kelly (1992:71). The word can, therefore, be translated as “his sword”.

אֶל-נִדְנָה

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:27), passes the above word, as comprising the preposition (אֶל), joined by the *maqfef* to the common, singular construct noun (נִדְנָה), suffixed by the third-person feminine singular pronoun (הָ).

The preposition according to Kelly (1992:29) can mean “to, into or toward”. BDB (2010:623) defines the noun as the masculine singular noun “sheath”. Finally, the pronoun can mean either “her, or it”.

However, because the noun is in a construct state, it denotes ownership, for which reason, it can be translated as “into its sheath”.

Verse 27 reads as follows: And God said to the angel and then he returned his sword into its sheath.

4.2.28. Verse 28

בַּעַת הַהִיא בְּרֵאוֹת דָּוִד כִּי־עָנָהּ יְהוָה בְּגֶרֶן אֶרְגָן הַיְבוּסִי וַיִּזְבַּח שָׁם:

בַּעַת

The above word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:28), is the common singular absolute noun (עַת), prefixed by the preposition (בְּ), plus the definite article (הַ).

BDB (2010:773) defines the noun as the definite feminine singular absolute noun that means “time (of an event)”. The preposition can mean “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28). Therefore, the word can be translated as “by the time”.

הַהִיא

Kelly (1992:52) defines the above word as the third-person independent personal pronoun “she/it,” prefixed by the definite article “the”. Thus, it can be translated as “the she/it.”

בְּרֵאִוֹת

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:28), passes the above word as the Qal infinitive construct verb רָאָה, prefixed by the preposition (בְּ).

The preposition according to Kelly (1992:28) can mean “in, by, or with.” The verb means “to see, look at, inspect, perceive, consider” (BDB 2010:906). However, the verb is in the infinitive construct form. Kelly (1992:182) explains that when an infinitive construct follows the preposition (בְּ), that it can be translated as a temporal clause, and it expresses when an action took place. Therefore, it can be translated as “when he saw”, or “when he perceived”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

כִּי־עָנָהּ

According to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:28), the above word is made up of the conjunction (כִּי), joined by the *maqfef* to the Qal, qatal (perfect) third-person masculine singular verb עָנָה, and suffixed by the third-person masculine singular pronoun (הוּ).

The conjunction according to BDB (2010:471) can mean “that, for, or when,” and can specifically mean “that”, when prefixed to sentences depending on the active verb, and occupying to it the place of an accusative.

The verb also according to BDB (עָנָה) means “to answer, respond, testify, speak, shout”. The verb in the present inflation, is in the Qal, qatal (perfect) third-person masculine singular, and can, therefore, be translated as “he answered”.

The pronominal suffix means “him” (Kelly 1992:153).

So, the compound word can be translated as “that he answered him”.

יְהוָה

The above word as previously defined by BDB (2010:43), means “God,” and goes further to explain that God is YAHWEH. In agreement with BDB, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:17) also translates the word as a common masculine plural absolute noun that he referred to also as “God”.

בְּגֵרָה

The above word is a construct noun, which means “threshing floor of” (BDB 2010:175). The noun is prefixed by the preposition (בְּ) “in, by, or, with” (Kelly 1992:28). Therefore, the word can be translated as “in threshing floor of”, or “by threshing floor of”.

אֲרָנָה

BDB (2010:75) describes the above word as a proper masculine singular absolute noun, that refers to a Jebusite, whose threshing floor was bought by David to erect an altar, which became the site of the temple. Therefore, the noun can be translated as “Ornan”.

הַיְבוּסִי

This word is as earlier described, made up of the article (הַ) “the,” prefixed to the singular absolute adjective (יְבוּסִי) that means “Jebusite” (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:28).

BDB (2010:384) defines the word as the Jebusite, the descendants of Jebus. The descendants of the 3rd son of Canaan, who lived in or around the site of Jebus, the early name for Jerusalem. Therefore, the word can be translated as “the Jebusite.”

וַיִּזְבַּח

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:28) passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and,” prefixed to the Qal, wayyiqtol (waw-consecutive + imperfect) third-person masculine singular verb, with the verb root (זָבַח). The verb according to BDB (2010:256) means “to slaughter, kill, sacrifice, slaughter for sacrifice”. However, in the present inflation, the verb can be translated as “and he slaughtered”, or, “and he sacrificed”.

שָׁם

The above word is an adverb that means “there” (Van der Merwe 2004:1 Chr. 21:28). BDB (2010:1027) similarly defines the word as an adverb, that can mean “there, or thither.” So then, it can be translated as “there”.

Verse 28 reads as follows: At that time when David saw it that God answered him at the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite, (and) he sacrificed there.

4.2.29. Verse 29

וּמִשְׁכַּן יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר-עָשָׂה מֹשֶׁה בַּמִּדְבָּר וּמִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה בָּעֵת הַהִיא בְּבַמָּה בְּגִבְעוֹן:

וּמִשְׁכָּן

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:29) passes the above word as the construct noun (מִשְׁכָּן), prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”. The noun can be defined according to BDB (2010:1015), as a “dwelling-place, or tabernacle.” Therefore, the construct noun can be translated as “and dwelling-place of”, or, “and tabernacle of”.

יְהוָה

This word again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

אֲשֶׁר-עָשָׂה

The above compound word according to Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:29), is made up of the relative conjunction (אֲשֶׁר), joined by the *maqef* to the Qal qatal (perfect) third-person masculine singular verb (עָשָׂה).

As relative conjunction, BDB (2010:81), defines (אֲשֶׁר), as “that (in object clause), when, since, or as”. The verb root, on the other hand, can mean “do, or make” (BDB 2010:793), and being in the Qal perfect third-person masculine singular form, it can be translated as “he did, or he made”.

Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “that he made”, or, “that he did”.

מֹשֶׁה

According to BDB (2010:602), this word is the masculine proper noun that means “Moses, the prophet and lawgiver, leader of the exodus”.

בַּמִּדְבָּר

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:29), passes the above word as the preposition (בְּ), plus the article (הַ), both prefixed to the common singular absolute noun (מִדְבָּר).

The preposition can be defined as “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28). The article means “the”. Finally, the noun is defined by BDB (2010:184), as the “wilderness”.

Therefore, the word can be translated as “in the wilderness, or, in the desert”.

וּמִזְבֵּחַ

The above word as described earlier is a masculine noun that means “altar” (BDB 2010:258). In the present context, the noun is in the construct form, and prefixed by the waw conjunction “and”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “and altar of”.

הָעֹלָה

The above word as before is the common feminine singular absolute noun (עֹלָה), defined by BDB (2010:750), as “whole burnt-offerings”. In the present context, however, it is a definite noun, and thus, can be translated as “the whole burnt-offering”.

בְּעֵת

The above word is made up of the preposition (בְּ), that means “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28), and the article “the”, both prefixed to the feminine singular absolute noun (עֵת), defined by BDB (2010:773), as “time”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “by the time”, or “in the time”.

הָיָא

The above word is made up of the article “the”, and the independent personal pronoun (subject pronoun), defined by Kelly (1992:52) as “she/ it”. Therefore, we have here “the she/ it”.

בַּבְּמָה

The above Hebrew word is made up of the preposition (בְּ) “in, by, or with” (Kelly 1992:28), and the article “the”, both prefixed to the feminine singular absolute noun (בַּמָּה), defined by BDB (2010:119), as “high place (as places of worship), mountain”.

The word, therefore, can be translated as “in the high place”, or, “by the mountain”.

בְּגִבְעוֹן

The above word is the proper singular absolute noun (גִּבְעוֹן), defined by BDB (2010:149), as “a Levitical city of Benjamin, which lies 8 kilometers from Jerusalem. It is the hill city named Gideon”. BDB further describes the city as “where was the tabernacle of Yahweh in the high places”. The noun is prefixed by the preposition that can mean according to Kelly (1992:28) “in, by, or with”. Therefore, the word can be translated as “in Gideon”, or “by Gibeon”.

Verse 29 reads as follows: For the tabernacle of God that Moses made in the desert and the altar of the whole burnt-offering was in that time in the high place at Gibeon.

4.2.30. Verse 30

וְלֹא־יָכַל דָּוִד לְלַכֵּת לְפָנָיו לְדָרֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים כִּי נִבְעַת מִפְּנֵי חָרֵב מִלְאֲדָה יְהוָה:

וְלֹא־יָכַל

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:30), passes the above word as the waw conjunction “and”, prefixed to the negation (אֵל), and both joined by the *maqfef* to the Qal qatal (perfect), (יָבֵל). According to Kelly (1992:173), the negation can mean “not”.

BDB (2010:407), defines the verb as “to be able, be able to gain or accomplish, be able to endure, be able to reach”. Being in the Qal (perfect), the verb can be translated as “he was able to”.

Therefore, the compound word can be translated as “and he was not able to”.

דָּוִד

This noun is again a masculine singular absolute proper noun, which BDB (2010:187) describes as “David”, the youngest son of Jesse, and second king of Israel. Therefore, we have here “David”.

לְלֶכֶת

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:30), passes the above word as the preposition (לְ), prefixed to the Qal infinitive construct verb, with the root (לָכַד). The preposition can mean “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28).

The verb root is defined by BDB (2010:229), as “go, come, or walk”. In the present context, the verb is in the infinitive form, and when prefixed by the preposition (לְ), Kelly (1992:182), explains that it is used to introduce a purpose clause. Therefore, the infinitive verb can be translated as “to go”, or “to walk”.

לְפָנָיו

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:30), passes the above word as comprising of the preposition (לְ), prefixed to the masculine plural construct noun (פְּנֵה), and suffixed by the third-person masculine singular pronoun (וֹ).

The preposition means “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28). The plural construct noun is defined by BDB (2010:815) “face of, or faces of”. Kelly (1992:70) explains that even though this construct noun is plural in form, it is translated simply as “face of”. Kelly further defines the suffixed third-person masculine singular pronoun (וֹ), as “his”.

Therefore, the word can be translated as “to his face”, or as translated by Kelly, “before him”.

לְדַרֵּשׁ

The preposition can mean “to, for, or at” (Kelly 1992:28). The verb root (דָּרַשׁ), is defined by BDB (2010:205), as “to resort to, seek, seek with care, enquire, require”. In the present context, the verb is in the infinitive form, and when prefixed by the preposition (לְ), Kelly (1992:182), explains that it is used to introduce a purpose clause.

Therefore, the infinitive verb can be translated as “to seek, or, to inquire”.

אֱלֹהִים

This word was previously defined by BDB (2010:43) as “God,” and BDB goes further to explain that God is Yahweh. In agreement with BDB, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:30) also translates the word as a common masculine plural absolute noun that he referred to also as “God”.

כִּי

BDB (2010:471-473), defines the above Hebrew word as a conjunction that can mean “that, for, because, when, as though, as, because that, but, then, certainly, except, surely, since”. Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:30) favors “because”.

BDB favors the translation as a causal connection “because, or since,” asserting that it enunciates the condition under which future action is conceived as possible.

נִבְּעַת

BDB (2010:130) defines the above word as a verb, Nif'al, qatal (perfect) third-person masculine singular, which can mean “to be terrified”.

Kelly (1992:108), states that the Nif'al stem can be transliterated as a “simple passive or reflexive.” Being a passive verb, it can then, be translated as “he was terrified”.

מִפְּנֵי

The above word is the plural construct noun defined by BDB (2010:815) as “face of, or faces of”. Kelly (1992:70) explains that even though this construct noun is plural in form, it is translated simply as “face of”. BDB explains that with preposition, which is the case here, the construct noun can be translated as “in front of, before, in the presence of, in the face of”.

The noun is prefixed by the preposition (מִן), which means “from, out of” (Kelly 1992:30).

Therefore, the word can be translated as “from before”, or, “from the presence of”.

חֶרֶב

Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:30) passes the above word as the common singular construct noun. BDB (2010:352) defines the root of the noun as “sword”. Therefore, it can be translated as “sword of”.

מַלְאָךְ

The above word as previously discussed is the masculine singular absolute noun, that can mean “messenger, representative, angel” BDB (2010:521). However, Van der Merwe (2004:1 Chr. 21:30) passes the noun as a construct noun, and therefore, can be translated as “angel of”.

יְהוָה

This word again is the proper masculine singular absolute noun that means according to BDB (2010:217), “Yahweh,” meaning the proper name of the God of Israel.

Verse 30 reads as follows: And David was not able to go before him to seek God, because he was terrified from the presence of sword of angel of God.

4.2.31. Translation of 1 Chronicles 21:1-30

1. And Satan stood up against Israel and incited David to count Israel.
2. And David said to Joab and to the commanders of the people, go number Israel from Beersheba and as far as the city of Dan and bring in to me and I will know their number.
3. And Joab said, may Yahweh add to his people as they a hundred occurrences. Are not all of them My Lord for servants to my Lord the King? Why demand this, my Lord? To what purpose, to be for guilt to Israel?
4. And word of the King prevailed upon Joab, and Joab went out and he went out in the whole of Israel and he entered Jerusalem.
5. And Joab gave number of the muster of the people to David and the whole of Israel was a million (thousand thousands) and hundred thousand man that draw out sword and Judah four hundred and seventy thousand man that draw out sword.

6. And Levi and Benjamin he numbered not among them, because the word of the king detested Joab.
7. And it was evil in the eyes of God concerning this thing, and he struck Israel.
8. And David said to God, I have sinned exceedingly that I did this thing, and now, I pray cause guilt of your servant to pass over, because I acted very foolishly
9. And God spoke to Gad seer of David to say.
10. Go and you should speak to David to say, thus says God, three things I offer to you choose for you one out of these and then I do to you.
11. And Gad came to David, and he said to him, thus says God, choose for you.
12. Whether three years famine, and or three months to be swept away from faces of your enemies, and sword of your enemy to overtake you, and or three days sword of God, and pestilence in the land, and an angel of God destroying in the whole territory of Israel. And now, consider what word I will return my sender.
13. And David said to Gad exceedingly distressed to me let me fall, I pray, in hand of God for exceedingly great is his compassion, and in hand of human being do not let me fall.
14. And God gave pestilence in Israel and he fell out of Israel seventy thousand person.
15. And God sent angel to Jerusalem to destroy it, and just as to destroy, God saw he was moved to pity about the evil. And he said to the angel destroying, much now, refrain your hand and angel of God was standing beside threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite.
16. And David lifted up his eyes, and he saw the angel of God he was standing between the earth and between the heavens, and his sword was drawn out in his hand, it was stretched out over Jerusalem, and David and the elders they (who) were clothed with the sackcloth fell upon their faces.
17. And David said to God, is it not I (who) said to count in the people? And I the one that sinned and to do evil (did evil), I did evil certainly. And these, the sheep, what they did Yahweh, my God? Let your hand come to pass I pray now by me and by my house, my father, and with your people, you shall not to pestilence.
18. And angel of God said to Gad, to say to David that David should go up make to stand (an) altar for God by threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite.
19. And David went up by word of Gad which he spoke in name of God

20. And Ornan turned back and he saw the angel, and his four sons with him, they hid themselves, and Ornan was threshing wheat.
21. And David went up to Ornan, and Ornan looked, and he saw David and then he came out from the threshing floor, and then he bowed himself to David, face to the ground.
22. And David said to Ornan, you give to me please, the site of the threshing floor and then I will build on it, an altar for God. Give it to me for the full price and so the pestilence will be restrained from upon the people.
23. And Ornan said to David, take for you, and let my lord the king do the good you see in his eyes, I give the oxen for the whole burnt-offering and the threshing-sledge for the wood and the wheat for the grain offering, I give all.
24. And King David said to Ornan, no, but I shall surely buy it from you for the full value because I will not take that which (is) for you for God and to cause to ascend whole burnt-offerings for nothing.
25. And David gave to Ornan for the place six hundred Shekels of gold weight.
26. And David built (an) altar for God there. And he caused to ascend whole burnt-offerings and peace offerings and he called to God and he answered him with the fire from the heavens upon (an) altar of the whole burnt-offerings.
27. And God said to the angel and then he returned his sword into its sheath.
28. At that time when David saw it that God answered him at the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite, (and) he sacrificed there.
29. For the tabernacle of God that Moses made in the desert and the altar of the whole burnt-offering was in that time in the high place at Gibeon.
30. And David was not able to go before him to seek God, because he was terrified from the presence of sword of angel of God.

4.3. Scholars' opinions on 1 Chronicles 21:1-30

4.3.1. Sara Japhet

Japhet (1993:373), is of the view that the Chronicler in 1 Chronicles 21, altered the source text from 2 Samuel 24. The alteration in Japhet's view means that firstly, David is responsible for the events that follow. Secondly, a new figure was introduced, as a source of incitement for David to sin, rather than God, as stated in II

Samuel 24. I am also convinced that the Chronicler changed this to suit his theology which entails his image of God. This figure demanded a detailed discussion. All the English translations assumed the figure to be a proper noun and refers to Satan. However, Japhet is of the view that the figure is a common name, because of the absence of the article, and therefore, concludes that the figure of Satan serves as a common noun, and refers to an adversary. This opinion stated by Japhet is purely from a linguistic point of view.

Japhet (1993:374-375), argues that if such a significant theological development in the concept of evil and its origin were expressed by 1 Chronicles 21:1, we would expect to find it elsewhere in the book of Chronicles as well. However, the general attitude of the book of Chronicles in Japhet's view is that evil, like good originates from God. Given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, Japhet concludes that the figure of Satan still serves as a common noun, and refers to an adversary.

Japhet (1993:376) observed that the Chronicler follows a certain inclination, whereby, he uses shorter phrases. This is exemplified in 1 Chronicles 21:2, the Chronicler used Israel, contrary to II Samuel 24:2, which used the people of Israel. In Japhet's view, this is probably motivated by the wish to emphasize the unity of the people.

Japhet (1993:378) points out that immediately after the census, David repented of his sin, and turned to God for forgiveness. This act in Japhet's view, adds color to David's image. However, God did not forgive him, and it shows that God has the power to forgive humans of sin or not to forgive. Also, David's sin attracted punishment for the whole of Israel, demonstrating the kind of relationship that existed between the nation of Israel and God.

Japhet (1993:380) observed that Gad was referred to as "the prophet Gad", in II Sam. 24:11. This was replaced by the Chronicler with the title "Gad the seer". Japhet states that this does not just amount to abbreviation, but the title seer is more common in Chronicles than in all other biblical books together.

Japhet (1993:381) attempted to reconstruct several stages in the development of the concept of the plague as 'the sword of the Lord', which further developed as the 'sword of the angel'. Japhet notes that at the basic layer, the plague is simply

presented as God's blow, coming from the hand of the Lord. Japhet understands the concept to reveal an implicit struggle between a demonic divine autonomous figure, as against a lesser being, operating as God's messenger. Nevertheless, she understands the pestilence as a destroying angel, or God's sword, or a combination of the two, an angel with a sword.

Japhet (1993:383) regards the event of 1 Chronicles 21:15 as the central episode of the narrative. The central episode in Japhet's view is in the averting of the plague from Jerusalem and the events that led to the choice and dedication of the Jerusalem Temple.

Japhet (1993:387) states that there is a double significance of the place in question, the site David purchased from Ornan. She says that it was the site for the future Temple, but also, a holy place. Besides, I am persuaded that the site for the building of the temple was the only motivation for portraying David's mistake. It is striking that the only unfavorable reference to David mentioned in the book pertains to the census he undertook. The reason for mentioning the census is the outcome, namely to indicate the site for building the temple.

Japhet (1993:387-388) is of the view that 1 Chronicles 21, demonstrates an example of God's wrath and forgiveness. Japhet adds that a call to the Lord and an answer by fire were obligatory elements in the legitimization of the divinely-ordained cultic site.

Japhet (1993:387-389) understands 1 Chronicles 21:28-30, as a priestly redaction of Chronicles. The passage in Japhet's view is to answer an implicit question: How did David offer sacrifice on the threshing floor when the tabernacle of God is at Gibeon? The answer to this question Japhet says is in the concept of the centralization of the cult, which is not inherent in the story but comes from outside. There cannot be two places of worship in Israel. David's failure to worship at Gibeon is explained in this passage about his terror of the angel. Therefore, this passage which is opposed to that of the story itself was to show that the assignment of the threshing floor as the site of the future Temple, was a divine decision. "It was God, through his prophet Gad, who instructed the building of an altar on the site and offering sacrifices there. It was God who confirmed the choice by answering David with fire" (Japhet 1993:389).

4.3.2. Louis Jonker

Jonker (2013:136) states that 1 Chronicles 21 made extreme use of 2 Samuel 24, but omitted some information and added other information. In other instances Jonker reiterates, the Chronicler worked from another Hebrew text than the one preserved in the MT of 2 Samuel 24.

According to Jonker (2013:136), because of the theological difficulty in the source text, the Chronicler made Satan the instigator of David, while Yahweh remains the one exercising the punishment. Jonker notes that the difficulty is that if Yahweh instigated the census, it remains theologically problematic that Yahweh would then punish the transgression.

Jonker (2013:141), argues that the occurrence of Satan in this verse may indicate that personification of evil had already started during Chronicler's time, a trend that was also visible in late literature such as Job 1. In Jonker's view, supernatural dualism was not customary in Israeli's earlier belief systems, with good and bad being attributed to Yahweh. This tendency according to Jonker, started to develop in the late post-exilic period, probably under the influence of Persian Zoroastrian dualism. Jonker adds that this tendency was adopted in Christianity and was well established during the time the New Testament writings developed.

Jonker (2013:136-137), observes that the Chronicler abbreviates the route that Joab and the military leaders took when conducting the census. In Jonker's view, this should not be seen as just a mere abbreviation of the Deuteronomistic version, rather a reflection of the self-definition the Chronicler wanted to attribute to the returned community in Yehud after the exile. Jonker points out that the area described in 2 Samuel 24 is indicated by the Chronicler to be all Israel, and even though the Chronicler omitted the detailed itinerary, he specified the direction in reverse order, from the South to the North, reflecting the Chronicler's Southern perspective.

Similarly, Jonker (2013:137) points out that the omission of Levi in the census may be due to the priestly regulation in Numbers 1:47-49 and 2:33 that the Levites were not to be counted with other Israelites. Jonker considers that neither the omission of Levi and Benjamin from the census nor the census itself is sinful, rather the sinful act of David is an example of human hubris. According to Jonker, David wanted to give

an account of his sphere of influence, after Yahweh had given him and his men military successes.

In the choice of punishment that follows, Jonker (2013:137-138) notes that David observed that Yahweh is a God of mercy, and this is confirmed when Yahweh withholds the destruction at the last moment. Similarly, Jonker emphasizes the compassion of God for the city of Jerusalem, as the scene zooms in on Jerusalem because God sent an angel to destroy the city. Jonker also, notes that Yahweh stopping the angel from destroying the city precisely at the location of the threshing floor signifies the important role the threshing floor will play later.

When David pleaded that the punishment should fall on his head and his house, Jonker (2013:138) understands David's renewed petition, to mean that first, David takes responsibility for the wrongdoing of the census. Secondly, David realizes that the incident has implications for Yahweh's eternal promise to his house.

Jonker (2013:138-139) states that the action of the angel in verse 18, ordering David to go up and build an altar is different from the source text in 2 Samuel 24:18. Also, the angel here is showed to represent Yahweh himself, and the significance of the threshing floor becomes apparent. Jonker points out another difference with the source text in verse 20, which includes a short interlude, and explains Ornan's gracious act later in the narrative when he offers the threshing floor for free. Jonker believes that Ornan knew that David's request to have the threshing floor was related to divine activity.

Jonker (2013:139) observes there is a subtle difference between 1 Chronicles 21:21-25 and 2 Samuel 24:20-24. Ornan's question to David, why he came to his servant is omitted, even though he already knew about divine intention. Instead, David makes his intention clear immediately and offered to buy it at full price, which is again the Chronicler's addition to the text. Jonker interprets the huge difference in price between the source text and the Chronicler's version, as a way for the Chronicler to ensure that David's conduct would come across as being without a blemish. In Jonker's view, David's piety and reverence had to be reflected in the transaction that entailed acquiring what would become a cultic site.

Jonker (2013:139) again points out the reworking of the source text in 2 Samuel 24:25 to reflect the Chronicler's theological intention. He observes that the Chronicler

adds fire from heaven in answer to David's prayer, to emphasize the importance of what was happening here. Jonker compares this to other Old Testament passages like Moses at the burning bush, and the revelation of the Torah at Sinai to demonstrate that the appearance of Yahweh was often accompanied by fire in some form.

Finally, Jonker (2013:140) notes that verses 28-30, are without parallel in the source text. Jonker states that the Chronicler used these verses to achieve a contrast between the sanctuary that was at Gibeon and the newly established altar at the Jebusite threshing floor. Jonker is of the view that the Chronicler's modification of the census and cultic narrative, was done to achieve three purposes. First, to make the story an all-Israel narrative, by tying the narrative to the genealogical construction in 1 Chronicles 1-9.

Secondly, he tried to protect Jerusalem as a common denominator between the tribes, to ensure the moral high ground as a cultic center, by excluding Levi and Benjamin from the census. Thirdly, the Chronicler wanted to claim a special position for Jerusalem in contrast to the Benjamite sphere of influence, emphasizing that this is the right place to bring a sacrifice. According to Jonker (2013:141), the Chronicler used Jebu as a trump card against any Benjamite claim of authority.

In Jonker's view, these all-too-human ideologies were the motivation behind the Chronicler's reconstruction of the past. Jonker (2013:141), also, notes that one of the prominent ideological features in 1 Chronicles 21 is that "Yahweh's presence among and guidance of his people is acted out in the realm of human history".

4.3.3. Ralph W Klein

Klein (2006:418), is of the view that the Chronicler replaces the problematic idea of Yahweh's anger leading to the temptation of David to number the Israelites, and instead attributed the temptation to Satan. Klein seems to suggest that Satan played a similar role in two other Old Testament passages, Job 1-2, and Zach. 3:1-2. However, he referred to Japhet, to note that the Hebrew word that is translated as Satan, lacks the definite article only in Chronicles and for that reason, does not function as a personal name. Besides, that the figure does not appear elsewhere in Chronicles, it does not appear in the divine realm and his incitement is against David

rather than against God. Klein claims that Japhet's proposal based on the above reasons is that the figure is a human adversary.

Nevertheless, Klein (2006:418), points out that the verb "stand" עמד, is used in a legal sense, and was also used of the adversary in Zech. 3:1. Similarly, the word "incited" סוּת, was also used with the adversary in Job 2:3. Therefore, Klein suggests that a supernatural tempter/accuser was intended by the passage. Klein points out that similar use of the word Satan to lessen problematic actions by Yahweh can be found in the later books of Jubilees, where it was Mastema, which Klein equals to Satan, was the one who suggested to God that he test Abraham by having him sacrifice Isaac (Gen. 22:1; *Jub.* 17:15-18). Yet again, Klein points to Exod. 4:24; *Jub* 48:2, to further state that Satan replaces Yahweh as the agent who tried to kill Moses on his way to Egypt.

Klein (2006:419) points out that censuses were ordinarily taken for purposes of taxation or military conscription. In the present context, Klein is of the view that the latter was intended, since it is conducted by Joab, David's chief army officer and the commander of the troops, and he listed the results according to those who drew the sword.

Klein (2006:419) understands that the phrase "go number Israel from Beer-sheba to Dan", can be interpreted as a way of the Chronicler giving the ideal limit of the land in reverse order, from Beer-Sheba to Dan. Klein, therefore, suggested that perhaps the Chronicler gave a preference for the South (Judah) over the North.

Concerning the plague, Klein (2006:420), references Deut. 23:10-15 to explain how people that were enrolled in a census were subjected to military rules of purity, and from the onset, the plague in the passage of 1 Chronicles 21, seems to suggest that taboos may have been violated. However, in Klein's view, the context suggests a different interpretation. Yahweh had given David victory wherever he went, as stated in 1 Chr. 18-20. Also, census implies that numbers count. Therefore, the census is an indication of a lack of trust in Yahweh's role in bringing about victory. Further, the Chronicler uniformly criticizes any reliance on alliances as if they were the source of strength (2 Chr. 18:1; 20:35-37).

Klein (2006:423), explains that for David to acknowledge that he acted foolishly, and also, asked Yahweh to forgive his iniquity, shows that he admitted full responsibility for taking the census. Nevertheless, Yahweh still punished him, by sending an adversary in the form of an angel (God's messenger).

Klein (2006:425), detects a tension between the angel standing by the threshing floor (v.15) and the angel standing between earth and heaven. He notes that there are two pauses in the cessation of the pestilence when Yahweh repented, He told the angel to drop his hand; and when David had built the altar and offered a sacrifice, the angel was commanded to put the sword into its sheath. Klein sees it as awesome, the posture of the angel with a drawn sword in his hand. Also, it is not only a threat to Jerusalem but makes puny by comparison the hundreds of thousands of men who Joab had counted, with the sword.

Klein (2006:426), observes that the Chronicler rewords his *Vorlage*, concerning the angel of Yahweh's command to Gad to tell David to build an altar for Yahweh. The reason Klein notes is to make it clear that Gad was speaking on divine authority and not just on his own. This authority, therefore, in Klein's view, gives divine and prophetic warrant to the altar site.

Klein (2006:428), suggested that the addition by the Chronicler, concerning Yahweh's answer to David by fire from heaven on the altar of burnt offering, indicates divine approval for the sacrifice and the altar. He says it could also, indicate that this altar replaces the tabernacle which received similar divine approval when the sacrifice was offered at it (Lev. 9:24). This observation of Klein links with the tradition criticism in the previous chapter, which revealed that the Chronicler replaced the Tabernacle tradition with the Temple tradition.

Klein (2006:429), finally notes that in addition to the discussion of sin and forgiveness, the Chronicler used the account to indicate that David had purchased the site for the future temple, and had initiated sacrificial worship at the altar at the site. Further, the Chronicler made allusions to mediatory figures in Israelite history: Abraham, Jacob, Balaam, Joshua, and Gideon to lend significance to this account as well as give credit to David's actions.

4.3.4. John Jarick

Jarick (2007:133) argues that it is most unlikely that the Satan of an apocalyptic kind is imagined in 1 Chronicles 21. According to Jarick, there has been no sign of such satanic presence in the narrative up to this point, and there will be no further appearance of such an entity as the narrative unfolds. Jarick's view is that this 'Satan' does not appear to be Satan in the sense of later Judean and Christian theological developments concerning a grand opponent of God, rather a 'satan' in the sense of an adversary. Jarick used the passages of Numbers 22:22 and Psalm 109:6, as examples to suggest that this 'satan' was simply an angel of Yahweh. Therefore, he cautions that the English rendering would best avoid the loaded term 'Satan' and simply translate the term as a 'satan', an adversary.

Jarick (2007:133-135) states that this brief mention of 'a satan' leading King David astray, seems far removed from the heavenly courtroom scenes depicted in Job and Zechariah. Jarick points to different pages of 1 Chronicles where figures were enumerated, like 7:2, 7:40, 12:23-28, and chapter 27, to suggest that the royal decree was condemned, because David did not consult either the deity directly or an intermediary acting on the deity's behalf.

Jarick supports the preceding idea, by alluding to 2 Chronicles 16:7-9, where a descendant of David (King Asa) was quoted as having done foolishly, because he relied on the king of Aram, and did not rely on Yahweh. From then on, he was punished by Yahweh, to always have wars. Previously, it was said about King Asa, that the Ethiopians and the Libyans had a huge army with exceedingly very many chariots and cavalry, yet because King Asa relied on Yahweh, he gave them into his hand. Again, in 2 Chronicles 16, the prophet implies that the Israelite army is immaterial if the people of Israel rely on their deity rather than their human strength.

The implication in 1 Chronicles 21 in Jarick's view, therefore, is that David was not relying on Yahweh, that he was trying to assess how many troops he has to plan his future strategy. Jarick's conclusion then is that "if the people of Israel rely on their deity rather than their human strength, then they will be successful, but if they do not rely on Yahweh, then, no matter how many troops they have, they will not be successful" (Jarick 2007:135).

Jarick (2007:138) states that God struck Israel because he was displeased about David's sin. Also, that God previously confined himself to striking Israel's enemies, implying that the Philistines, for example, could not have been subdued if God of Israel had not been doing the striking. In other words, Israel without divine aid was not strong enough to defeat Philistia. Jarick notes that even though David quickly confesses his sin, God did not forgive him, nor did God give a direct answer to him. Instead, God punished the whole of Israel, which is per the traditional view that the national God brought bad things upon the people whenever their King acted badly.

Jarick (2007:140-141) suggests that the punishment God gave to Israel fits the crime, saying that while the King was busy counting how many people could draw the sword, the deity responds by drawing the sword of his own against those people. In Jarick's view, this is an indication that the sword in their human hands was nothing compared to the sword in the divine hand, or in the hand of the divine agent sent to do the destroying. Nevertheless, the destroying was stopped at the threshing-floor of Ornan, which will later become the site for the Temple.

Jarick (2007:143-144) observed that in response to David's contrition, God did not answer him directly, nor communicate directly with the seer. Instead, on this occasion, God communicated to David's seer through the mediation of the destroying angel and David through the instructions of the seer. However, Jarick believes that irrespective of the complexity of the communication channels, the message is clear. Yahweh wants an altar to himself on the threshing floor of Ornan.

Furthermore, Jarick (2007:145) understands that by David paying an enormous amount to Ornan for the Temple site, it signals that nothing is to be cheap about the house of Yahweh. Jarick likewise, understands that when David offered the sacrifice of animals to the deity at the site, and the deity answered with fire from heaven, it acts as an endorsement of the site. Additionally, Jarick notes that a deity who rains fire from the skies is a God to be held in awe and fear. In Jarick's view, he can consume humans by such means, and indeed his character can be summarized in such an image.

According to Jarick (2007:145-146), the special divine approval of having sacrifices made to Yahweh on this particular site will be underlined when Solomon completes the dedication of the temple, and fire similarly came from heaven and consumed the

burnt-offering and the sacrifices. Jarick states that nothing less than the fire will do for the establishment of the Davidic-Solomonic temple. In support of this assertion, Jarick refers to the Exodus traditions of Israel, whereby, it was said that “the appearance of the glory of Yahweh was like a devouring fire on the top of the mountain in the sight of the people of Israel” (Exodus 24.17).

In conclusion, Jarick (2007:149) affirms about 1 Chronicles 21, that the passage is very instructive because it shows that any of Yahweh’s angels can function as a satan, not as an adversary against the deity, but as a loyal agent, sent to perform a certain adversarial task for the divine purpose.

4.3.5. Jamieson; Fausset; & Brown

Jamieson et. al. (1997:260) did not discuss much the figure of Satan linguistically, rather, they only looked at the figure from a theological point of view. They referred to the figure as a tempter, and their view is that the tempter prevailed over David, because God withdrew his grace at the time from him.

Jamieson et. al. (1997:260) understand the numbering of the people of Israel as a distrust of the divine promise and it was a sin. They note that even though numbering had been done with impunity in the time of Moses, however, according to the Exodus tradition, each time numbering was done, each of the people had to contribute half a shekel towards the building of the tabernacle, and that appeased Yahweh. This was done so that there might be no plague among the people when they were numbered (Ex. 30:12). Jamieson et. al. asserted that based on the Exodus tradition, it was understood that the anger of the Lord could be easily aroused, during the numbering of the people. Therefore, in itself, it was regarded as an undertaking.

Jamieson et. al. (1997:260) concluded, therefore, that everything depended on the purpose of the census. They proposed that the sin of David numbering the people could be either to gratify his pride to know the number of warriors he had or to institute a regular and permanent system of taxation.

Jamieson et. al. (1997:261) is of the view that when David pleaded to fall into the hand of the Lord, it is because experience had taught him that human passion and vengeance had no bounds, whereas, Yahweh is wise and gracious. Concerning the

punishment, Jamieson et. al. (1997:261), observed that only the infliction of the pestilence is noticed. The visible appearance and menacing of the destroying angel were only given a minute description. Also, they noted that Ornan was probably the Hebrew or Judean name of the owner of the threshing-floor, Araunah his Jebusite name.

Jamieson et. al. (1997:261) states that the haste and the value of the present offered by Ornan were to terminate the pestilence without a moment's delay. Jamieson et. al., understands about the site of the temple, that although David had plenty of space on his property, he was commanded to go a considerable distance from his home, to build an altar for Yahweh. Jamieson et. al., referenced 2 Chronicles 3:1, to point to the position of the altar David built, which was situated up Mount Moriah, close to the spot where Abraham had offered Isaac.

4.4. Synthesis

This synthesis aims to give a summary of the different sections of this chapter, towards a connected whole.

The first section attempts to do a synchronic study of the text of 1 Chronicles 21. The synchronic study was concerned with the lower criticism of the text, which sought answers as per what the text says. This section focused on linguistic, and structural characteristics. The linguistic and structural characteristics provided insights into the original desire of the statements of the texts. However, they have their place alongside the stock of methods, which helped in the attempt to accomplish the tasks in chapters 2 and 3.

The section aimed to critically, understand the meaning behind the texts of 1 Chronicles 21 within the surrounding contexts. Invariably, the understanding of the meaning of the text helped, in conjunction with the answers garnered from chapters 2 and 3, to discern all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and the nation of Israel in 1 Chronicles 21, against the theological, and ideological context of the book of Chronicles.

The objectives accomplished in the first section was the translation from Hebrew to English, of 1 Chronicles 21:1-30, and the detailed analysis of the different words,

phrases, and sentences contained in each verse. The aim was to understand the patterns, structure, figures, and methods the author used, in portraying his message.

From the text and translation of 1 Chronicles 21, I discovered that it was a certain satan, an unknown adversary who stood up against Israel and incited David to number Israel. This is purely based on linguistic evidence, with the absence of an article to the name. This is conflicting with the source text of 2 Samuel 24:1, which attributes the inciting to Yahweh. This change seems to be of theological importance, and I agree with scholars who hold that the redaction was because the perspective of the Samuel narrative did not suit the Chronicler's theology and his image of God.

David was reported by the Chronicler to have given the command to number the people from Beersheba to Dan, as against the source text in 2 Samuel 24:2 that reads from Dan to Beersheba. This change in direction seems to demonstrate the overwriting of the Northern tradition by the Chronicler with the Southern tradition.

Joab's response to David, questions the purpose of the action, and Joab also demonstrates his awareness that the action could bring guilt to Israel. However, for Joab to be sent for this task, and his subsequent report, which mentions men that draw out the sword, indicates that the census was carried out for a military purpose. I will therefore agree with the view, which holds that David conducted the census to show pride in his army, even though God had led him through military successes.

God responded by striking Israel, rather than only David, who accepted that he sinned and acted foolishly. Instead, God sent his seer to David to offer three choices of punishment. David accepted to be punished by God, rather than fall into the hands of human beings because he understood God to be compassionate.

Nevertheless, God killed in Israel seventy thousand persons through pestilence and his angel. The source text of 2 Samuel 24:15, notes the direction of the killing, from Dan to Beersheba, from North to South. This was omitted by the Chronicler, which could suggest an attempt to overwrite the Northern tradition with the Southern tradition.

The angel had to be stopped by God as he was standing beside the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite. The location of this site is believed to be the purpose of the narrative, as the site would be confirmed by the angel's command to David through

Gad, to erect an altar for God on the threshing floor. The threshing floor would become the site of the new altar and the future temple. The three elements of the Zion tradition, therefore, suffixes in this narrative, the site (the threshing floor at Jerusalem), the Yahwistic worship (the altar), and the monarchy (represented by David).

There is a huge difference in price for the purchase of the site, between the source text of 2 Samuel and the Chronicler's account. 2 Samuel reported fifty shekels of silver, while the Chronicler reported six hundred shekels. The reason for this difference has bewildered scholars, but I will consider seeking the answer in a separate future study.

David built an altar at the site as he was commanded, and offered a burnt offering there. Then God answered him with fire from the heavens. The Chronicler added the fire here, which does not appear in the source text. As indicated in chapter 3, this could mean an allusion to the Mosaic and Sinai traditions respectively. Moses at the burning bush, and the fire at Mount Sinai. This redaction activity may suggest the overwriting of the Mosaic and the Sinai tradition with the Davidic tradition by the Chronicler.

The source text of 2 Samuel 24 stopped at this point where God answered David after he offered sacrifice at the new altar. However, the Chronicler further added other pieces of information: the fire, the angel returning his sword into its sheath, David's offering of another sacrifice, explanation about the position of the former altar at Gibeon, and the reason why David could not go to Gibeon to seek God.

The Chronicler could be said to have attempted with all these additions, to overwrite Moses with David. This overwriting as already garnered in chapter 3, entailed an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern Tradition, an overwriting of Tabernacle tradition with Jerusalem temple tradition, an overwriting of the Sinai tradition with the Zion tradition, and an overwriting of the exodus tradition with the monarchical tradition.

The Chronicler's ideology, therefore, can be understood by the different traditions he emphasized. He emphasized the Zion tradition, David (who is seen as the founder of the Jerusalem temple), the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and

the concepts of temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – Moses, the Exodus, the Sinai tradition, the Northern traditions, the Northern Kings (referring to the Northern Traditions).

Section 2 was a summary of scholars'³³ opinions on 1 Chronicles 21:1-30.

The analysis of the chapter was done by different scholars, based on linguistic as well as theological insights. It is a common understanding among all the scholars that the author/s of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, modified the source text of 2 Samuel 24, to suit his theological and ideological purpose. 1 Chronicles 21 made extreme use of 2 Samuel 24, but omitted some information and added other information. The Chronicler may have worked from another Hebrew text than the one preserved in the MT of 2 Samuel 24.

Based on the redaction of the text in verse 1 according to the different scholars' viewpoint, David is held responsible for the events that follow. Also, a new figure was introduced, as a source of incitement for David to sin, rather than God, as stated in 2 Samuel 24. This figure demanded a detailed discussion. All the English translations assumed the figure to be a proper noun and refers to Satan that appeared in Job and Zachariah. The passages of Numbers 22:22 and Psalm 109:6 can be used as examples to suggest that this 'satan' was simply an angel of Yahweh. Some suggest that a supernatural tempter/accuser was intended by the passage.

However, purely from a linguistic point of view, the figure of Satan is written in Hebrew without an article, and therefore, serves as a common noun, and refers to an adversary.

It is argued that if such a significant theological development in the concept of evil and its origin were expressed by 1 Chronicles 21:1, we would expect to find it elsewhere in the book of Chronicles as well. However, the general attitude of the book of Chronicles is that evil, like good originates from God.

Because of the theological difficulty in the source text, the Chronicler made Satan the instigator of David, while Yahweh remains the one exercising the punishment. If

³³ Japhet (1993:373-389), Jonker (2013:136-141), Klein (2006:418-429), Jarick (2007:133-149), and Jamieson et. al. (1997:260-261).

Yahweh instigated the census, it remains theologically problematic that Yahweh would then punish the transgression. The occurrence of Satan in this verse may indicate that personification of evil had already started during Chronicler's time, a trend that was also visible in late literature such as Job 1.

Supernatural dualism was not customary in Israel's earlier belief systems, with good and bad being attributed to Yahweh. This tendency started to develop in the late post-exilic period, probably under the influence of Persian Zoroastrian dualism. However, given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, the conclusion is that the figure of Satan serves as a common noun, and refers to an adversary.

Immediately after the census, David repented of his sin and turned to God for forgiveness. Also, David's sin attracted punishment for the whole of Israel, demonstrating the kind of relationship that existed between the nation of Israel and God.

The Chronicler abbreviates the route that Joab and the military leaders took when conducting the census. The area described in 2 Samuel 24 is indicated by the Chronicler to be all Israel, and even though the Chronicler omitted the detailed itinerary, he specified the direction in reverse order, from the South to the North, reflecting the Chronicler's Southern perspective.

The omission of Levi in the census may be due to the priestly regulation in Numbers 1:47-49 and 2:33 that the Levites were not to be counted with other Israelites. This is an allusion to Mosaic tradition, nevertheless, neither the omission of Levi and Benjamin from the census nor the census itself is sinful, rather the sinful act is that David wanted to give an account of his sphere of influence after Yahweh had given him and his men military successes.

Censuses were ordinarily taken for purposes of taxation or military conscription. In the present context, since it is conducted by Joab, David's chief army officer and the commander of the troops, it can be assumed that the census was conducted for military purposes. This idea is supported by the listing of the results according to those who drew the sword. In the Mosaic tradition, people that were enrolled in a census were subjected to military rules of purity, and from the onset, the plague in

the passage of 1 Chronicles 21, seems to suggest that taboos may have been violated.

Numbering had been done with impunity in the time of Moses. However, according to the Mosaic tradition, each time numbering was done, each of the people had to contribute half a shekel towards the building of the tabernacle, and that appeased Yahweh. This was done so that there might be no plague among the people when they were numbered (Ex. 30:12). Therefore, based on the Mosaic tradition, it was understood that the anger of the Lord could be easily aroused, during the numbering of the people. Therefore, in itself, it was regarded as an undertaking.

Yahweh had given David victory wherever he went, as stated in 1 Chr. 18-20. Also, census implies that numbers count. Therefore, the census is an indication of a lack of trust in Yahweh's role in bringing about victory. Figures were enumerated, in 1 Chr. 7:2, 7:40, 12:23-28, and chapter 27, to suggest that the royal decree was condemned because David did not consult either the deity directly or an intermediary acting on the deity's behalf.

The Chronicler also uniformly criticizes any reliance on alliances as if they were the sources of strength (2 Chr. 18:1; 20:35-37). In 2 Chronicles 16:7-9, a descendant of David (King Asa) was quoted as having done foolishly, because he relied on the king of Aram, and did not rely on Yahweh. From then on, he was punished by Yahweh, to always have wars. Previously, it was said about King Asa, that the Ethiopians and the Libyans had a huge army with exceedingly very many chariots and cavalry, yet because King Asa relied on Yahweh, he gave them into his hand. Again, in 2 Chronicles 16, Hanani the seer implies that the Israelite army is immaterial if the people of Israel rely on their deity rather than their human strength.

Several stages in the development of the concept of the plague as 'the sword of the Lord', which further developed as the 'sword of the angel' is simply presented as God's blow, coming from the hand of the Lord. The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 shows that any of Yahweh's angels can function as a satan, not as an adversary against the deity, but as a loyal agent, sent to perform a certain adversarial task for the divine purpose.

Yahweh is a God of mercy, and this is confirmed when Yahweh withholds the destruction at the last moment. God has compassion for the city of Jerusalem. The

angel here is showed to represent Yahweh himself, and the significance of the threshing floor becomes apparent.

David renewed the petition to Yahweh to mean that first, David takes responsibility for the wrongdoing of the census. Secondly, David realizes that the incident has implications for Yahweh's eternal promise to his house.

The central episode of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 is the averting of the plague from Jerusalem and the events that led to the choice and dedication of the Jerusalem Temple. There is a double significance of the place in question, the site David purchased from Ornan. It was the site for the future Temple, but also, a holy place.

The huge difference in price for the place, between the source text and the Chronicler's version, is assumed to be a way for the Chronicler to ensure that David's conduct would come across as being without a blemish. Also, David's piety and reverence had to be reflected in the transaction that entailed acquiring what would become a cultic site.

There is a reworking of the source text in 2 Samuel 24:25 to reflect the Chronicler's theological intention. The Chronicler adds fire from heaven in answer to David's prayer, to emphasize the importance of what was happening here. This can be compared to other Old Testament passages like Moses at the burning bush, and the revelation of the Torah at Sinai to demonstrate that the appearance of Yahweh was often accompanied by fire in some form. These two preceding examples demonstrate allusion to the Mosaic, as well as the Sinai traditions respectively.

1 Chronicles 21, demonstrates an example of God's wrath and forgiveness. The call to the Lord and an answer by fire were obligatory elements in the legitimization of the divinely-ordained cultic site. It is worth noting that a deity who rains fire from the skies is a God to be held in awe and fear. He can consume humans by such means, and indeed his character can be summarized in such an image.

The concept of the centralization of the cult can also be adduced from this story. The Chronicler redacted 1 Chronicles 21:28-30, which are without parallel in the source text. These verses are presumed to answer an implicit question of why David offered a sacrifice on the threshing floor when the tabernacle of God is at Gibeon. In other

words, they were used to achieve a contrast between the sanctuary that was at Gibeon and the newly established altar at the Jebusite threshing floor.

Traditionally, there cannot be two places of worship in Israel. Yahweh's answer to David by fire from heaven on the altar of burnt offering indicates divine approval for the sacrifice and the altar. It could also, indicate that this altar replaces the tabernacle which received similar divine approval when the sacrifice was offered at it (Lev. 9:24). This links with the tradition criticism in the previous chapter, which revealed that the Chronicler replaced the Tabernacle tradition with the Temple tradition.

The Chronicler may have used this account to indicate that David had purchased the site for the future temple, and had initiated sacrificial worship at the altar at the site. Further, the Chronicler made allusions to the different historical traditions of Israel, to lend significance to this account as well as give credit to David's actions.

The special divine approval of having sacrifices made to Yahweh on this particular site will be underlined when Solomon completes the dedication of the temple, and fire similarly came from heaven and consumed the burnt-offering and the sacrifices. Therefore, nothing less than the fire will do for the establishment of the Davidic-Solomonic temple.

The Chronicler's modification of the census and the cultic narrative was done to achieve three purposes. First, to make the story an all-Israel narrative, by tying the narrative to the genealogical construction in 1 Chronicles 1-9. Secondly, he tried to protect Jerusalem as a common denominator between the tribes, to ensure the moral high ground as a cultic center, by excluding Levi and Benjamin from the census. Thirdly, the Chronicler wanted to claim a special position for Jerusalem in contrast to the Benjamite sphere of influence, emphasizing that this is the right place to bring a sacrifice.

These all-too-human ideologies were the motivation behind the Chronicler's reconstruction of the past. It is striking that the only unfavorable reference to David mentioned in the book of Chronicles pertains to the census he undertook. The reason for mentioning the census is the outcome, namely to indicate the site for building the temple. It seems that the Chronicler changed the source text from 2 Samuel 24 to suite both his ideology and theology which includes his image of God.

Chapter 5: Hermeneutical Study

Images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in 1 Chronicles 21: a theological and ideological perspective

5.1. Introduction

Chapters two and three, were about the historical aspect of this study, and chapter 4, concerns the grammatical issues (text and translation). The present chapter will be concerned with two objectives: first, what the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 communicates concerning images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel when they are interpreted against the theology and ideology of the book of Chronicles; secondly it will address the findings and the relevance of the findings.

I will seek to discern these images from the historical studies, and the understanding from the grammatical study (text and translation) on the text of 1 Chronicles 21, in chapter 4. The purpose here is not to describe these images, but the way the images are portrayed by the Chronicler. The objectives in this chapter will be to summarise the findings under the following headings: 1) Context of Chronicles, 2) Traditions emphasized in 1 & 2 Chronicles, also traditions that were underemphasized, 3) Redaction that was done in 1 & 2 Chronicles- source material that was emphasized and underemphasized, 4) Theology and ideology of Chronicles as displayed in the specific emphasis, 5) Which traditions and redactions are in the text of 1 Chronicles 21. 6). The second part of the chapter will address the findings, the relevance of the findings, the contemporary significance of the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel according to the theology and ideology of 1 Chronicles 21, as well as recommendations for further research opportunities.

5.2. Findings of the study

5.2.1. The context of Chronicles

The book of Chronicles seems to be a theological and ideological reflection, rather than a retelling of the history of Israel. The Chronicler begins with the genealogies in chapters 1-9 of 1 Chronicles, narrowing the focus from all mankind down to the

nation of Israel, and the true adherents of the Yahwistic religion at the temple in Jerusalem. With the result of the specific focus of the narrative, the history of the historical kingdom of the whole of Israel is almost completely ignored.

The narrative focuses on King David and his monarchy as the chosen of God to carry out God's will. The narrative puts special emphasis on the reign of David (1 Chronicles 11-29) marked by three great events during David's reign. First, the bringing of the Ark of the Covenant. Second, is David's founding of the eternal royal dynasty. Third, is the preparation for the construction of the temple.

The next section (2 Chronicles 1-9) focuses on David's son Solomon, and the last section (2 Chronicles 10-36) is concerned with the Kingdom of Judah, with occasional reference to the Northern Kingdom. The final chapter is concerned with the last four kings of Judah until Judah went into exile in Babylon.

The Chronicler presented David as an ideal figure, by omitting his shortfalls. The only time David's sin was mentioned, resulted in the confirmation of the temple site. The site of the temple where God should be worshiped was chosen by God through his angel. Special interest was given to the Levites by the Chronicler, by repeatedly mentioning them, to show the special part they played in the nation's affairs. The purpose of the book of Chronicles, therefore, was to show the returning migrants, that they were a continuation of the pre-captivity nation, whose lives were based on the Davidic dynasty and religious lives on the Levitical priesthood/ the Jerusalem temple.

5.2.2. Traditions emphasized in 1 & 2 Chronicles, also traditions that were underemphasized

Many traditions were emphasized by the Chronicler, the Temple, Zion, and Southern traditions. The Chronicler underemphasized the patriarchal, Northern, Mosaic, and Sinai traditions. However, the Southern and the three elements of the Zion tradition, the site, the Yahwistic religion, and the monarchy were his main emphasis.

The traditions emphasized by the Chronicler in the chapter under focus in this study, are the Zion, and Southern traditions respectively.

The Chronicler's ideology can be understood by the different traditions he emphasized. He emphasized the Zion tradition, David (who is seen as the founder of

the Jerusalem temple), the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – the patriarchal tradition (portraying Yahweh as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), the exodus tradition (Moses), the Sinai tradition (Moses), the Northern traditions, the Northern Kings (referring to the Northern Traditions).

Therefore, what the Chronicler sought to achieve in his writing, was to encourage the restoring community, his post-exilic audience to find their identity in a multi-cultural environment, as God's people and heirs of the promises of David and to legitimize the temple as the only place of true Yahweh-worship, safeguarding the position of the temple elite.

5.2.3. Redaction that was done in 1 & 2 Chronicles- source material that was emphasized and underemphasized

The redaction activity found in the book of Chronicles was motivated by the Chronicler's theological and ideological purposes. The Chronicler collected, arranged, edited, and modified traditional material, and turned the composition into new material that is theologically loaded. The Chronicler's major sources among the biblical works are the historical compositions. He emphasized some of them in full and others in a reworked form. He did not take extensive literary excerpts from the prophetic books. He underemphasized some Psalms. The Chronicler's style is a display of a skillful balance of omission, additions, and changes that transforms his final work into narratives that are different from the sources, and sometimes conflicting.

The Chronicler appeared to have surveyed all of the Pentateuch as source materials for his writing, but his picture of Israel's history is emphatically different from that of the Pentateuch. His work is a record of the only legitimate kingdom of Judah, instead of being a synchronistic history of the two kingdoms. He used exclusive language to include the Southern kingdom, and exclude the Northern kingdom. He only includes in his record the Northern kingdom, in passages where the relationship between the two kingdoms is recorded, and ultimately judge these relationships negatively. At the same time, he supplements his records with extra-biblical traditions. The Chronicler also borrowed from Ezra-Nehemiah, the edict of Cyrus, and the list of the inhabitants

of Jerusalem. Even though, these stories serve a different purpose in Chronicles, showing his view to be critically divergent from Ezra-Nehemiah concerning the history of Israel. The Chronicler's theology and ideology predisposed his selection, omission, and treatment of the material he borrowed from older histories, prophetic writings, and perhaps other writings.

5.2.4. Theology and ideology of Chronicles as displayed in the specific emphasis

Theologically the Chronicler could not accept that evil as well as good come from God, therefore, he changed Yahweh as the instigator of David to number the Israelites. The Chronicler sees the story presented in Samuel as untenable, for which reason, he changed his version of the story, by introducing Satan/satan as the one who replaces Yahweh in manipulating David to undertake the census. Therefore, for the Chronicler, Satan/satan is the one responsible for the evil that happened to David, and not Yahweh. This notion can be directly linked to the theology of the book of Chronicles. This is the main reason why the Chronicler changed the Samuel narrative –because it did not suit his theology and his image of God.

The Chronicler seems to have utilized a concept (satan) that was known to him (because of the Persian influence) to alter the theology of Samuel. In Samuel it is Yahweh who is instigating David, which the Chronicler cannot align with his theology and image of God, therefore he falls back to a concept known to the people after exile – satan.

Ideologically, he changed many things from the source text to promote his Southern tradition, to legitimize the Davidic monarchy, the temple site in Jerusalem, and the temple elites. By emphasizing the temple and the cultic practices, he ideologically secured the position of the temple elite and empowered them as the ruling officials.

5.2.5. Which traditions and redactions are in the text of 1 Chronicles 21?

There is redaction activity in 1 Chronicles 21, relative to the supposed source narrative in 2 Samuel 24. 1 Chronicles 21:1 states that it was Satan who stood up against Israel, and moved David to number the Israelites. While 2 Samuel 24:1, states that it was the anger of the Lord that was aroused against Israel and moved

David to number his people. Some scholars believe that the insertion of the figure Satan in the verse is an attempt to extract the evil from Yahweh.

The Chronicler detached the story from its former context in two ways: first, he omitted the anger of God, and second, the incitement to number the Israelites were not attributed to God, but another agent. All English translations follow a long exegetical tradition, according to which *satan* serves as a proper noun, and read Satan.

The general attitude of Chronicles, however, is that evil like good originates from God. Given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, the conclusion is that the figure of Satan still serves as a common name, and refers to an adversary.

Satan in some view, can be understood as the angel of the Lord, whom David saw in the form of the angel of the Lord with a drawn sword in his hand in 1 Chronicles 21:16. In this view, Satan is the one who leads people to stumble, and the one who puts them to death. In this view, there is believed to be a copyist error rather than redaction activity, whereby, it is suggested that the one who puts them to death, must have been mistaken as the one who did the inciting through Satan.

The Chronicler changed the direction of the census taking to read from Beersheba to Dan (from South to North), instead of from Dan to Beersheba (from North to South). This is an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern tradition.

The answer to David's prayer was met with fire from heaven according to the Chronicler. This is an addition to the source text. It is suggested to be an allusion by the Chronicler to the Mosaic tradition (Moses met by fire at the burning bush), and the Sinai tradition (fire at Mount Sinai during the receiving of the Law). The Chronicler did not emphasize both the Mosaic and the Sinai traditions, therefore, this could be termed overwriting of these traditions by the Davidic tradition.

Finally, the Chronicler added the last portion of the text in 1 Chronicles 21:28-30, which is without parallel in 2 Samuel 24. These verses try to explain the reason why David could not go to the altar at Gibeon. The Chronicler may have used this to achieve a contrast between the sanctuary that was at Gibeon and the newly established altar at the Jebusite threshing floor. This links with the tradition criticism

in chapter 3, which revealed that the Chronicler replaced the Tabernacle tradition with the Temple tradition.

5.2.6. Concluding Remarks

It became clear that the Chronicler has manipulated and emphasized specific traditions to underemphasize the ones that he did not want to give attention to. The same was done by selective redaction from the Chronicler.

The theology and ideology that the Chronicler wanted to promote were highlighted by the above-mentioned practices. The same practices that are evident in the book of Chronicles are also to be seen in 1 Chronicles 21. The Chronicler portrayed Yahweh, Satan/satan, and (the ideal) Israel in such a way that both the theology and ideology of the Jerusalem Temple stood out. The Jerusalem Temple represented the Chronicler's theology and his image of God – which was that Yahweh is only to be worshipped in the Jerusalem Temple and that He has chosen the site as the place for worship and dwelling. The Temple also represented the ideology of the Chronicler, because by emphasizing the temple, he succeeded in securing the temple elite's position as the ruling officials.

The aim was not to describe these images, but the way the images were portrayed by the Chronicler. The images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel was portrayed in such a way by the Chronicler that God was only in the Jerusalem temple, the true Israel was only the ones who worshipped at the Jerusalem temple and the portrayal of the image of Satan/satan is quite striking in its mundane and rather empty portrayal. Not much is said about him, he is portrayed as a flat character, almost an empty image. He is only a pawn in the Chronicler's attempt narrative. His purpose was to promote the Chronicler's theology. He was the pawn that he used to get to his image of Yahweh.

It became clear that the images of these characters in Chronicles are not only theologically driven but also ideologically loaded to suit the Chronicler's purpose. It became clear that these images are related and linked to the 1 & 2 Chronicle's theology and ideology.

5.3. Remarks regarding the findings of the research; relevance of those findings; and recommendations for further study

5.3.1. Remarks regarding the findings of the research

The findings of this research caution against reading and understanding a text outside its unique historical context. This is because the Old Testament does not have a central theme or one theology. Also, in the application of the varying principles garnered from the study of a text, we should not focus on the culture or the controversy, rather on the relationship between God and man.

The flat image, which the Chronicler has created of Satan/satan links with his belief that God is almighty and that no other creature or symbol can be mightier than God.

5.3.2. The relevance of these findings

An exegetical study of any portion of the Old Testament should always consider the different traditions the author/s considered, to understand the theology and ideology behind the text.

God is the creator of all, both good and evil come from Him. Dependence on God will bring success, whereas a lack of dependence on him may lead to all kinds of problems.

God can punish human sin in many different ways, which may include death.

5.3.3. The contemporary significance of the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel against the theological and ideological background of 1 and 2 Chronicles

In finding out that the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel are theologically driven and ideologically loaded the question rises – what impact does it have on our understanding of these images, and can they still be relevant today?

It seems that the real question here should be hermeneutical. A question of how to interpret the images that are ideologically loaded and still make them relevant for us today? In addressing this issue a few key concepts relating to a person's hermeneutical options should be considered.³⁴

In reading Old Testament texts it is important to keep in mind that some Old Testament texts can be polemic against the cultural relativism of the older traditions or other texts. One should be aware that texts are written for their specific contexts and that certain groups used texts to empower themselves. By making use of exclusive language, certain groups can empower themselves, while excluding other groups. Old Testament texts are relational. The core of all Old Testament texts is centred around the relationship between Yahweh and the nation. The fact that Old Testament texts deal with God concerning human beings includes a human aspect and it is precisely this that makes people think and decide differently in and about the texts and the interpretation thereof at different times and in different contexts. It, therefore, remains essential for the texts to be read within context, as well as interpreted, and then translated into the current context. Reading Old Testament texts stems from our understanding of Scripture and hermeneutics.

The Bible, and especially the Old Testament, does not contain a central theme or one theology. This makes it essential that each section of text be understood and read within its unique historical framework. The diversity of the Old Testament reflects the reality of life as expressed by people in different times and contexts, but also their testimony of the relationship between God and humans. The diversity of the Old Testament is a mirror image of the society in which we live. Old Testament texts function side by side and not opposite each other. It requires flexibility in thinking to interpret texts as having different purposes and therefore being relevant in different contexts.

In the Old Testament hermeneutics, the reader should be brave enough to throw off cultural ties and focus only on what matters. It requires reading the controversy, and polemic in the text and not being influenced by it. The controversy and polemics in the text are directed against a particular text or culture at a particular time and can therefore not be taken as law or gospel. That is why it is important to read and

³⁴ Most of these concepts are described in detail by Geysers-Fouché (2016; 2017) and will only be shortly mentioned.

understand a text within context. What matters in any text is the relationship between God and humans, and this is what the interpreter should translate into today's context, not the culture or the controversy.

In an attempt to create a personal interpretation of how the ideologically loaded images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel can still be relevant for us today, the following options can be taken into consideration.

Israel was a confused nation, seeking identity after the exile. An author like Chronicler wanted to give them direction by telling them that they can find identity in their relationship with God. Although he has used the ideologically loaded symbol of the temple, it can be translated into today's context to a relationship with God. This entails that people who are feeling confused about their circumstances and identity, today, can find certainty in their relationship with God, regardless of how and where they worship.

The flat image, which the Chronicler has created of Satan/satan links with his belief that God is almighty and that no other creature or symbol can be mightier than God.

The image that the Chronicler has created of the whole Israel to be only the people worshipping in Jerusalem can also be linked to how the Chronicler tried to give security to a confused nation and can also be translated in our contexts to our relationship with God, regardless of where and how we worship.

5.3.4. Recommendation for further study.

This study opened up new research options that might be of interest for further studies.

The different scholarly viewpoints regarding the long exegetical tradition, according to which the term Satan serves either as a proper noun, or a common noun in 1 Chronicles 21:1 will continue to be reconsidered.

More consideration can be given to the study of the Old Testament traditions, as it bears on the understanding of the different texts of the Hebrew Bible.

Second Temple Scribes and how they were able to collect, preserve, rework, and retransmit the traditions they received from the mediatory figures, can also open up new possibilities.

There is a huge difference in price for the purchase of the site, between the accounts in the source text of 2 Samuel 24:24 and the 1 Chronicler 21:25. 2 Samuel 24:24 reported fifty shekels of silver, while the Chronicler in 1 Chronicles 21:25 reported six hundred shekels. The reason for this difference has puzzled scholars. It might only be the Chronicler's way of overemphasizing the importance of the cultic site, but another study might lead to interesting results.

The early Judaic reception of these texts in something like the Targum can also be an interesting study.

Synthesis

Chapter 5 was concerned with two objectives: firstly, what the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 communicates concerning images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel when they are interpreted against the theology and ideology of the book of Chronicles; secondly it addressed the findings and the relevance of the findings.

Section one was about the context of Chronicles. The narrative of Chronicles is a theological and ideological reflection, rather than a retelling of the history of Israel. The Chronicler narrows the narrative from all mankind down to the nation of Israel, and the true adherents of the Yahwistic religion at the temple in Jerusalem. As a result, the historical kingdom of the whole of Israel is almost completely ignored. The purpose of the book of Chronicles, therefore, was to show the returning migrants, that they were a continuation of the pre-captivity nation, whose lives were based on the Davidic dynasty and religious lives on the Levitical priesthood/ the Jerusalem temple.

Section two was about the traditions emphasized in 1 & 2 Chronicles, also traditions that were underemphasized. Many traditions were emphasized by the Chronicler, the ancestral tradition, patriarchal (Abrahamic, Davidic), Temple, Zion, and the Southern

traditions. The Chronicler underemphasized the Northern, Mosaic, and Sinai traditions. However, the Southern and the three elements of the Zion tradition, the site, the Yahwistic religion, and the monarchy were his main emphasis.

The traditions emphasized by the Chronicler in the chapter under focus in this study, are the Zion, and Southern traditions, respectively.

Section three was about the redaction that was done in 1 & 2 Chronicles- source material that was emphasized and underemphasized. The Chronicler collected, arranged, edited, and modified traditional material, and turned the composition into new material that is theologically loaded. The Chronicler's major sources among the biblical works were the historical compositions. He emphasized some of them in full and others in a reworked form. He did not take extensive literary excerpts from the prophetic books. He underemphasized some Psalms.

The Chronicler appeared to have surveyed all the Pentateuch as source materials for his writing, but his picture of Israel's history is emphatically different from that of the Pentateuch. His work is a record of the only legitimate kingdom of Judah, instead of being a synchronistic history of the two kingdoms. He used exclusive language to include the Southern kingdom and exclude the Northern kingdom.

Section four was about the theology and ideology of Chronicles as displayed in the specific emphasis. Theologically the Chronicler could not accept that evil as well as good comes from God, therefore, he changed Yahweh as the instigator of David to number the Israelites. The Chronicler sees the story presented in Samuel as untenable, for which reason, he changed his version of the story, by introducing Satan/satan as the one who replaces Yahweh in manipulating David to undertake the census. This is the main reason why the Chronicler changed the Samuel narrative –because it did not suit his theology and his image of God.

Ideologically, he changed many things from the source text to promote his Southern tradition, to legitimize the Davidic monarchy, the temple site in Jerusalem, and the temple elites.

Section five was about which traditions and redactions are in the text of 1 Chronicles 21. The Chronicler detached the story from its former context in two ways: first, he omitted the anger of God, and second, the incitement to number the Israelites were not attributed to God, but another agent.

The Chronicler changed the direction of the census taking to read from Beersheba to Dan (from South to North), instead of from Dan to Beersheba (from North to South). This is an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern tradition.

The answer to David's prayer was met with fire from heaven according to the Chronicler. This is an addition to the source text. It is suggested to be an allusion by the Chronicler to the Mosaic tradition (Moses met by fire at the burning bush), and the Sinai tradition (fire at Mount Sinai during the receiving of the Law). The Chronicler

Finally, the Chronicler added the last portion of the text in 1 Chronicles 21:28-30, which is without parallel in 2 Samuel 24. These verses try to explain the reason why David could not go to the altar at Gibeon. This links with the tradition criticism in chapter 3, which revealed that the Chronicler replaced the Tabernacle tradition with the Temple tradition. The Jerusalem Temple represented the Chronicler's theology and his image of God – which was that Yahweh is only to be worshipped in the Jerusalem Temple and that He has chosen the site as the place for worship and dwelling.

In the second part of this chapter, the findings and relevance of this study were discussed. Section six was about the contemporary significance of the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel according to the theology and ideology of 1 Chronicles 21.

We must read and understand a text within its unique historical context. This is because the Old Testament does not have a central theme or one theology. Also, in the application of the varying principles garnered from the study of a text, we should not focus on the culture or the controversy, rather on the relationship between God and man. The flat image, which the Chronicler has created of Satan/satan links with his belief that God is almighty and that no other creature or symbol can be mightier than God.

Chapter 6: Synopsis

6.1. Overview of chapter 1

This study was a new attempt towards the interpretation and understanding of the Hebrew narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, by the method of biblical exegesis.

The study was a fresh attempt to understand the reason for and characters of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. This text and the portrayal of the characters in the text was studied against the theology and ideology of 1 and 2 Chronicles. The study attempted to explain the images of the characters that we find in 1 Chronicles 21 as well as why the author has changed the source text to include the image of Satan/satan. To study this text against the book's theology and ideology, it was necessary to scrutinize the book of Chronicles with its background first.

The narrative was examined in five phases. First, was a study of the context (socio-historical study) to understand the background of the book. Second, was also a historical study, which included the Chronicler and has an influence on the ideology and theology that the author emphasizes in the book (whether it is by emphasizing or underemphasizing). When the contexts, ideology, and theology which are portrayed in the book of Chronicles were known it became possible to have (thirdly) a close reading of the specific chapter (1 Chronicles 21). This chapter was then read against this background. The fourth step was an attempt to explain the images of the characters that we find in 1 Chronicles 21 as well as why the author has changed the source text to include the image of Satan/satan. The last phase was a discussion of the contemporary relevance and hermeneutical options of these images.

So many studies have been conducted over the years by scholars towards the understanding of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. However, not much has been done towards the reason for and characters of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21.

This study attempted to add to years of examination of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. However, the focus here was on the characters in the narrative. The portrayal of the characters in the text was studied against the theology and ideology of 1 and 2 Chronicles. Past studies have helped in the understanding that different traditions

existed in Ancient Israel, and the Chronicler attempted to overwrite some older traditions with new ones. Thus, the reason for the redaction of the source text, to suit his theology and ideology. Therefore, in this study, it was imperative to study the portrayal of the characters in the narrative, considering the background of the author and his audience as well as their socio-historical context.

1 Chronicles 21 has been a much-debated text, primarily because of the presence of Satan/satan, and the fact that this text seems to be an amended version of 2 Samuel 24. All these possible redactions of the source text by the Chronicler cautions against reading and understanding of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 outside its unique historical context. The book of Chronicles seems to have been written with the purpose to convey a certain ideology and theology. The omission, addition, and reversal of some information from the source text was purposely done by the Chronicler, to overwrite some traditions with other traditions (Southern tradition over North, Zion tradition over Moses, and Sinai traditions). To discern all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in 1 Chronicles 21, it was, therefore, necessary to search for answers, against the theological and ideological context of the book of Chronicles.

Many studies have been conducted on 1 Chronicles 21, however, none of these works seemed to have examined the portrayal of the characters in the text against the theology and ideology of 1 and 2 Chronicles.

The works of literature reviewed, discussed many issues surrounding the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21. There was a harmonization with the source text; tracing of the source text, studies of the language, the extent of the Chronicler's work, does it cover only the Chronicles, or does it include the books of Ezra and Nehemiah? Also, whether the book of Chronicles was composed by one writer, or not. Some of the past studies focused on the portions of Chronicles that are paralleled by sections in Samuel, Kings, and the Septuagint. Further, we have the study of the character of the Chronicler's work, and the investigation of the traditions presented in Chronicles, as well as the comparative study with the Deuteronomistic history. There is also, the investigation of the possible redactions found in Chronicles compared to the source text. However, none of these works seemed to have examined the portrayal of the characters in the text against the theology and ideology of 1 and 2 Chronicles. Therefore, the examination of the portrayal of the characters in the text against the

theology and ideology of 1 and 2 Chronicles, provided a gap that necessitated this study.

This was both literature and exegetical study. It combined several methods to facilitate a better understanding of the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel as portrayed in 1 Chronicles 21. This was studied against the theology and ideology of the book of Chronicles.

The literature study entailed a literature review, and the exegesis was based on Gorman's (2008:8-9) theory on exegesis:

I used a combination of diachronic and synchronic methodologies of biblical exegesis.

This study aimed to understand what 1 Chronicles 21 communicate concerning the images of God, Satan/satan, and the nation of Israel.

6.2. Overview of chapter 2

It was discovered in section one, that the book of Chronicles was most probably, written for the troubled restoring community during the transitional period in Israel's history. It was a time when the people of Judah that returned from exile were struggling to rebuild their city, inhabited by a multi-cultural population. The Chronicler can be seen as a historiographer, who rewrote history, displaying considerable freedom, in selecting and rearranging narratives from his source materials. The Chronicler sought to portray the theology and ideology, which was necessary to encourage the post-exilic community, who had recently left the other areas of the Persian Empire to return to Jerusalem. This he did, through retelling their history in a new way. While the exilic audience of the books of Samuel and Kings needed to hear about Israel's past sins, to understand their current situation; the post-exilic audience of the book of Chronicles needed to be assured that Yahweh was still interested in them. They also needed a model to look up to, in David. The Chronicler looked past the sins of the past, to the root of the problem, which as he portrayed, was the forsaking of proper worship of Yahweh. He then used his writing to call their attention to seek Yahweh and to have a complete response and subsequent transformation in his worship. Therefore, what the Chronicler sought to achieve in his

writing, was to encourage the restoring community, his post-exilic audience to find their identity in a multi-cultural environment, as God's people and heirs of the promises of David, by worshipping Yahweh in the temple at Jerusalem.

In the second section, it was discovered that the post-exilic Jews experienced a multicultural environment both in exile and in their restoring communities. They were influenced by many cultures and religions, which presented so many ideas that, challenged the way Yahweh should be worshipped. Amongst the prevalent ideas is the concept of dualism, typified by Zoroastrianism. Dualism was a system that proposes two original and independent principles in the universe, one good, and the other evil. Zoroastrianism, which is a form of dualism probably influenced the Israelites in the post-exilic period. The Chronicler seems to have utilized a concept (satan) that was known to them (because of the Persian influence) to alter the theology of Samuel. In Samuel it is Yahweh who is instigating David, which the Chronicler cannot align with his theology and image of God, therefore he falls back to a concept known to the people after exile – satan. The Chronicler probably wrote to the post-exilic Judean community, to challenge any form of dualism that compromises the understanding of Yahweh as the supreme power and authority over everything that exists. It is assumed that Chronicles was written to help the restoring Judean community understand Yahweh and know their identity in such a confusing, difficult, and multi-cultural environment.

In section three, the investigation of the concept of monolatry reveals the dynamics of idolatry which seemed to have plagued the nation of Israel over her history. Within the early traditions of Israel, there existed monotheistic tendencies. However, based on the canonical literature in the Old Testament and archaeological discoveries, the nation of Israel has been mostly polytheistic. Over her history, the religious thought of Israel swayed from monolatry to monotheism and polytheism. The promotion of monotheism happened under the Deuteronomistic, and Priestly schools of thought. However, the prevalent view in the canonical literature of the Hebrew Bible is polytheism. Many of the Jews worshipped Yahweh, as well as other gods. Many other Jews worshipped only Yahweh, while at the same time acknowledged the existence of other gods. The experience of the exilic period necessitated radical reconstruction towards monotheism. The increased exposure of

the Jews to the Assyrians and Babylonians provided the need for the emphasis on monotheism in this period.

The last section examined the development of the images of Satan in Israel and discovered that there was no well-defined doctrine according to the Hebrew Bible. In other words, the Hebrew Bible does not seem to have a fully developed doctrine of Satan but made references to his activities. Based on these references, Satan is thought to be among the heavenly hosts. Satan has its origins in the Old Testament notion of an adversary, which can be understood in three different ways. The first notion, as in people opposing each other, secondly, as in God using someone to oppose another, and finally, as in God sending a supernatural agent in his anger against humans. It was not until the post-exilic period that Satan is pictured as an evil figure. Satan appears as a tempter in 1 Chronicles 21:1. Satan appears in the Old Testament chiefly as the enemy of Yahweh. He is conceived as opposing Yahweh's plan and consequently His people. He is regarded as a powerful spiritual figure, and a created being, who is ultimately subject to Yahweh. The Jews seem to have further developed the idea of Satan during the deuterocanonical or intertestamental period. This is the gap of time between the period covered by the Old Testament and the New Testament. The New Testament depicts Satan as an evil being, who is hostile to Yahweh and always working against God's purpose. Satan is a finite being, who opposes Yahweh and seeks to lead humans into rebellion. His purpose is to frustrate Yahweh's plans. However, Yahweh grants Satan certain powers and he attacks humans with His permission, his purpose seems to be to test human beings and accusing them before Yahweh.

The purpose of this chapter, however, is to gain insight into the social-historical background of the book of Chronicles. It was, however, discovered that the book of Chronicles, together with the book of Zachariah is post-exilic literature written after the nation of Israel was exposed to and possibly influenced by Zoroastrianism. Also, the study in this chapter simultaneously, build towards the next chapter, so that together, they helped towards the understanding of the Chronicler's theology and ideology. Subsequently, studying all these aspects I presume helped in discerning the portrayal of all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel in the book of Chronicles.

6.3. Overview of chapter 3

This overview aims to give a summary of the different sections of this chapter, towards a connected whole.

The first section attempts to uncover the tradition history. Traditions die at some point, and another tradition replaces them.

The Second Temple scribes were assumed to have rearranged, reworked, or rewrote the texts of ancient revelatory events, that were attributed to great mediatory figures like Moses and David. This demonstrates a distinction between what would have been understood as scriptural Mosaic or Davidic texts, and secondary rewritings and reworkings by later scribes.

Moses and David were not viewed as authors, but scribal channels of tradition, who collected, arranged, and transmitted revelation for new communities. These ancient figures can be understood as mediatory figures who occupy successive links on the chain of revelatory transmission.

So many traditions were expressed in the Old Testament that is part of Israel's history and theological development. The tradition expressed in 1 Chronicles 21 is the Zion tradition, which is mostly related to the Davidic Monarchy. The three elements emerge in any discussion of Zion tradition: the city, Yahwistic religion, and kingship. The discussion of what is known as the Zion tradition expresses the relationship between these three elements.

The study of tradition history indicates that the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 was not the creation of an individual but the product of the corporation of many generations, making it more likely that one person could not have written the book.

Based on comparative evidence, the Chronicler relied heavily on 2 Samuel 24, other Old Testament books, as well as non-biblical sources. The books of Samuel, and the Pentateuch which are some of the primary sources the Chronicler depended on, belong to the same literary unit recognized as Torah. The Torah belongs to the Sinai tradition. The various biblical books the Chronicler depended on, belong to the different traditions, the Patriarchal, Covenant, and the Zion.

The Chronicler did not mention the Mosaic covenant, as he is associated with Shechem (Dt 27) and a symbol of the northern kingdom. Abrahamic covenant is also

not mentioned either, because he is associated with Mount Gerizim, which is seen as a place of the Samaritans. The traditions that describe Yahweh as the Lord of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are silenced in 1 Chronicles 21, as well as in the whole book.

The Chronicler shows through the reversing of the census route, a reflection of the Southern perspective. In other words, the Chronicler's background is rooted in the Southern tradition.

The Lord answered David with fire from heaven on the altar of burnt offering. This addition by the Chronicler could be said to be an allusion to the Mosaic tradition and the Sinai tradition and an attempt to replace these traditions. In the two cases, the appearance of Yahweh was often accompanied by fire, for example, Moses at the burning bush, and the revelation of the Torah at Sinai.

These traditions were preserved and transmitted by mediatory figures from one tradition to another, and either transmitted or recorded by the second temple scribes.

The Chronicler's ideology can be understood by the different traditions he emphasized. In 1 Chronicles 21, he emphasized the Zion tradition, David (who is seen as the founder of the Jerusalem temple), the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – Moses, the Exodus, the Sinai tradition, the Northern traditions, the Northern Kings (referring to the Northern Traditions). David became in this process a Moses redivivus and the Chronicler attempted to overwrite Moses with David. This overwriting entailed an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern Tradition, an overwriting of Tabernacle tradition with Jerusalem temple tradition, an overwriting of the Sinai tradition with the Zion tradition, and an overwriting of the exodus tradition with the monarchical tradition.

These traditions were preserved and transmitted by mediatory figures from one tradition to another, and either transmitted or recorded by the second temple scribes.

It is believed, that the oral and written world existed together in ancient Israel that helped to mold and preserve the written text of 1 Chronicles 21, which we currently have in the Hebrew Bible.

The second section is the textual criticism, a lower criticism, and is a study that deals with the origin and nature of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 as it was copied and

recopied. The science of text criticism came as a result of the inevitable process of text transmission and the resultant number of variant readings. The task here was to work back to the original writings or autographs. Scholars presently use the science of philology to find meaning for an obscure word or phrase, rather than looking for errors of writing or copying as far as text-critical reading is concerned.

The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 has been known to be transmitted in many ancient, and medieval sources. The study of the difference between the sources provides the need for the text-critical reading of the passage. Text critical reading is an attempt to examine the copy or copies of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 original manuscript form. There are some matches between the deviating text of Samuel and Chronicles, demonstrating that Chronicles reflects a *vorlage* different from MT. The task here was not to restore the source reading, but only the text as much as possible traced back to the author. The most significant version among the versions for the textual study of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 is the Septuagint (LXX), which itself has undergone a study of its version as an auxiliary tool for the textual criticism of MT. The Septuagint provides the form of Hebrew text which is a valuable witness to the state of the text of 1 Chronicles 21 in the second century.

The character of the Chronicler's work stands out as an independent narration to enliven, and develop the details of history from 2 Samuel 24. The book of 2 Samuel, is the primary source the Chronicler depended on for the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, and the book belongs to the Deuteronomistic History. The Deuteronomistic history was not the compilation of an editor, rather historical materials from highly varied traditions (some oral, while others were written), was brought together by an author and carefully arranged in a conceived plan. However, the history of 1 Chronicles 21, cannot be separated from the history of its source. Therefore, the text-critical reading of 1 Chronicles 21 was dependent on the text-critical reading of 2 Samuel 24.

The two passages can be easily harmonized. However, the Chronicler's story seems to have been borrowed from 2 Samuel, and it shows a bit of a difference that might suggest the alteration of the original story by the Chronicler, possibly to suit his theological and ideological purpose.

The text of the Old Testament, which 1 Chronicles 21 forms part, numbers in tens of thousands of copies. The great volume of manuscripts helps to confirm the accuracy of the text. The text was carefully copied and transmitted more carefully than any document before the printing press. The manuscripts were written in various materials, the Papyrus, the parchment, the scrolls, until A.D. 600, and thereafter, the codex, which was a book form.

The text of 1 Chronicles 21 is contained in the current Hebrew Bible and most modern Old Testament translations, and was a direct copy of the MT dated AD 1008. It is referred to as the Leningrad Codex. The Aleppo Codex is perhaps the best manuscript and the codex was the basis for a new critical Hebrew Old Testament produced by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Some ancient translations like the Septuagint (LXX) were important for an attempt to establish the original text of 1 Chronicles 21 because of its antiquity. The Septuagint generally represents the MT, but for the book of Samuel, from which 1 Chronicles 21 was copied, it preserves a more accurate text than the MT.

The Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS) is currently, the standard critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, which contains the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. The edition is believed to hold a virtually unchanged copy of the medieval manuscript, Codex Leningradensis, dated 1009 B. C., by its colophon.

The completed Masoretic Text has the vocalization of the text, accent marks, and the Masorah. The traditional text of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21 is the consonantal Masoretic Text (MT) and can be dated to the end of the first century B.C., or early second century B.C.

The MT forms the basis for explaining other received texts, even though its background and nature remain a mystery. Unlike the way the Qumran scrolls illuminated the Samaritan Pentateuch, the surviving textual theories have not succeeded in illuminating the background of MT.

About a millennium separates the earliest completed copy of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, Codex Leningradensis, from its consonantal form of MT. The text seems to have been copied with extreme care during this millennium, based on the vocalization of the text, which includes instructions on how the text is to be laid out on the page, accent marks, and the Masorah.

Moreover, even though the BH/BHS and the HUB are recognized as the two main critical editions of the Hebrew Bible that contain the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, there exist likewise, a large number of other critical editions masked behind modern translations. These editions are included in most critical commentaries, as well as in the several separate translations of the Hebrew Bible.

The third section is the literary form criticism and is a means to determine the genre of any biblical book or a section of a biblical book, like the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. It sometimes helps in identifying the setting of a particular style of writing. Forms can also refer to the arrangement of writing with several facets. The theory of forms allows the use of principles to seek answers to what factors play a role in, behind, or in response to texts. The Hebrew Bible contains a diversity of forms of writing, which provide the fourth support to the interpretation of the books contained in it, in addition to the historical, grammatical, and theological interpretations.

Literary form criticism can also be referred to as the higher criticism, and the focus is on the genre, the identification of the sources behind the text, and the question of authorship and date.

The literary form critical reading of the book of Chronicles involves presenting a reasoned argument to evaluate and analyze the different scholarly viewpoints to understand the literary form of the book, and for this study, distinct attention was given to the literary form critical reading of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21.

The literary form critical reading is the systematic and in-depth explanation of the literary patterns found in the book of Chronicles. This is the study of the genres found in the book and is a French word for type or class of literature. The literary text of the book of Chronicles may be said not to belong to any particular genre, rather participate in several genres. The genre falls under the middle level of contexts, and a correct understanding of the context helps in understanding the text of the book of Chronicles. The immediate context is the syntax, which allows the determination of the meaning of words and phrases within a sentence. The middle context represents the diverse ways in which statements are expressed in the book of Chronicles. The distant context or the theological context underscores the importance that, every statement in the book of Chronicles, is part of the total context of the Hebrew Bible.

The immediate context or the distant context may not usually provide the answers we need, rather, the deciphering of the middle context or the genre is what will allow us to see, not only what the Chronicler wishes to communicate to his audience, but also how he wanted them to respond.

The three defining marks of the genre are form or structures, content, and function. Forms immediately mark genre, just as prose is marked by verse, and poetry is marked by the system of line lengths. The genre of the book of Chronicles is ancient, and its understanding will require an inquiry about its context in the life of the recipients. The book of Chronicles consists of collections and could be considered a collection of collections that were made in ancient times.

The book of Chronicles appears to have more than one genre. The primary goal of the pursuit of genre criticism here is to gain knowledge of the correct principle of interpretation that is needed for this study. The book of Chronicles does seem large to contain the genre of narratives. In addition to the narrative, history, and law, other suggestions of biblical genres found in the book of Chronicles are genealogies, oracles, announcements of judgments, apocalyptic, laments, and praise. The understanding that there are various literary forms in the book of Chronicles is definitely of great importance, as it helps with the understanding of the uniqueness of the book, and how we can apply varying principles to the interpretation of the different genres found in the book. Furthermore, the understanding here will take us back to how genres functioned for the author of Chronicles, and his audience, as well as help with the present-day application.

However, it was not necessary for this study, to examine all these genres found in the book of Chronicles, thus, the emphasis was limited from this point to the genre of the passage of 1 Chronicles 21. The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 seems to fall under the genre of narrative. Narratives fall under prose, which resembles the conventions of verbal speech. The Biblical prose narrative is very similar to the conception of a story and it should be approached like any contemporary story, without losing sight of the primary historical and theological nature of the text.

For any story to be a story, it must have four basic elements: plot, characters, setting, and point of view. The plot deals with events in any given story, and the way the events are arranged, rendered, and connected. There cannot be a plot without

conflict. This could be generated by the opposition of persons, or forces. The plot usually has a beginning, middle, and end, which brings an end to the conflict or provides a resolution. This main character (Yahweh) in 1 Chronicles 21 is the protagonist, who may be compassionate or indifferent to the character in opposition (David), who is referred to as the antagonist. The geographical and historical point (Jerusalem) at which a story occurs is known as the setting. The setting may also include other aspects as time, locale, and many other physical properties. The point of view of biblical narratives, except on rare occasions, is typically related to omniscience, an omnipresent third-party point of view. The point of view can rest on different planes, which include ideological, psychological, and theological.

The narrator displays the freedom to reveal the thought, and motive of any character, as well as be invisibly present in all the places, without the restrictions of time, and space. The narrator in his view is the voice that imparts the story to the reader and sometimes may have a very distinct voice from the author.

A biblical narrative, like the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, should be evaluated as a unit, alongside the other narratives in the book of Chronicles. Rather than trying to get a special message from its statements, events, and descriptions. In other words, the whole narratives of the book of Chronicles give the message, rather than the separate individual narrative of 1 Chronicles 21.

Narratives can be portrayed as the relationship between, on the one hand, a real or imagined series of events, and the representation of that real or imagined series of events. The difference between events and their representation can be linked to the difference between a story, and how the story is conveyed. Most of the narrative definitions, tend to assume one or another relation between events and their representations in a narrative like 1 Chronicles 21.

The narrative theory goes in many different and sometimes conflicting directions, it, however, always begins with the relationship between the events in a story like 1 Chronicles 21, and how the events are conveyed in the narrative.

The real author of 1 Chronicles 21, is referred to as the author of the source material in 2 Samuel 24. The narrator, similarly, will refer to the Chronicler, who retold or possibly rewrote the story in a new way, from his perspective, to include the use of the first or third person, the location, and the all-knowing and all presence of the

narrator who can interpret events from a future perspective and provide the reader with 'inside' information about characters' thoughts, motivations, reasons, and private conversations.

The implied readers (the restoring Judean community) are the group of readers that the text addresses who share certain presuppositions and knowledge of certain information. The real reader is meant to agree to accept the dynamic of the story world created by the author, temporarily adopting the faith commitments and value systems indicated by the text to associate with the feelings of the implied readers and determine the effect of the text,

There is a difference between the real author and the implied author. The implied author is assumed to be of better character than the real author, and in real life, the implied author does not live up to the image they project. We have no way of verifying that the real Chronicler matched the Chronicler implied by the text of his narrative. Nevertheless, the inaccessibility of the real author is no obstacle to understating the narrative, for it is the values entrenched in the narrative that we are trying to illuminate.

The implied reader is a mirror image of the implied author. This is the reader the author had in mind when writing the text, and probably, guessed the reader's knowledge, experience, and outlook. The writer then grounds his arrangement of materials, to appeal to this implied reader. The central critical problem in reading a text like Chronicles is to discover the implied author and his worldview. The Chronicler in the case of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, is responsible for recording the words of the characters involved in the story, and his version of their speeches is what we have. He is the one that decides what to include and omit, so in the real sense, all the words are his.

The narrator (Chronicler) is omniscient, anonymous, and master over characters, whose truth may or may not be his own. The narrator (Chronicler) was at liberty to manipulate his characters and readers.

A narrator like a Chronicler accurately employs time and space, and at the same manipulates the point of view the characters are permitted to disclose. Thus, the narrator (Chronicler) is in control of the flow of knowledge and shapes the menu of perspectives the readers might choose to assume.

In the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, the Chronicler as already mentioned above under tradition criticism, changed the source material of 2 Samuel 24, to suit his ideological and theological purpose. Ideologically, the Chronicler, emphasized the Zion tradition, David, the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – Moses, the Exodus, the Sinai tradition, the Northern traditions.

Theologically, the Chronicler seems to have utilized a concept (satan) that was known to them (because of the Persian influence) to alter the theology of Samuel. In Samuel it is Yahweh who is instigating Dawid, which the Chronicler cannot align with his theology and image of God, therefore he falls back to a concept known to the people after exile – satan. This is the main reason why the Chronicler changed the Samuel narrative – because it didn't suit his theology and his image of God.

The last section is the redaction criticism. This aspect of historical criticism, theoretically, concerns the studying of the theological motivation of an author, as this is revealed in the author's collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and the composition of new material. The newly redacted materials are usually set up to de-dogmatize the old material, to counter their claim to universal truth. The redaction criticism aims to study the involvement of the Chronicler in the work he has collected and shaped.

The Chronicler's major source among the biblical works is the historical compositions. He cited some of them in full and others in a reworked form. He did not take extensive literary excerpts from the prophetic books. He only cited some Psalms literarily. The Chronicler's style is a display of a skillful balance of omission, additions, and changes that transforms his final work into narratives that are different from the sources, and sometimes conflicting.

The Chronicler appeared to have surveyed all of the Pentateuch as source materials for his writing, but his picture of Israel's history is emphatically different from that of the Pentateuch. His work is a record of the only legitimate kingdom of Judah, instead of being a synchronistic history of the two kingdoms. He only includes in his record the northern kingdom, in passages where the relationship between the two kingdoms are recorded, and ultimately judge these relationships negatively. At the same time, he supplements his records with extra-biblical traditions. The Chronicler also

borrowed from Ezra-Nehemiah, the edict of Cyrus, and the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Even though, these stories serve a different purpose in Chronicles, showing his view to be critically divergent from Ezra-Nehemiah concerning the history of Israel. The Chronicler's point of view, predisposed his selection, omission, and treatment of the material he borrowed from older histories, prophetic writings, and perhaps other writings.

There appears to be a possible redaction activity in 1 Chronicles 21, relative to the supposed source narrative in 2 Samuel 24. 1 Chronicles 21:1 states that it was Satan who stood up against Israel, and moved David to number the Israelites. While 2 Samuel 24:1, states that it was the anger of the Lord that was aroused against Israel and moved David to number his people.

The first view considered, is that the figure of Satan is not used as a proper name, rather, it designates the function of a secret agent of some sort and he cannot act without Yahweh's permission. Some scholars believe that the insertion of the figure Satan in the verse is an attempt to extract the evil from Yahweh.

The second view, understand that the Chronicler altered his source text because the story as presented in the book of Samuel was untenable. The Chronicler detached the story from its former context in two ways: first, he omitted the anger of God, and second, the incitement to number the Israelites were not attributed to God, but another agent.

The first alteration means that David is responsible for the events that follow. The second alteration demands a detailed discussion, and one of the assumptions and considerations is based on the events found in a few passages in the Hebrew Bible; Satan is found as a member of the divine entourage in Zech. 3:1, and Job 1-2. In both these cases, the noun is prefixed by the article, in contrast to 1 Chronicles 21:1, where the noun is indeterminate. It is this difference that prompts scholars to regard the noun as a proper name 'Satan.' Thus, 1 Chronicles 21:1, seems to represent the ultimate stage in the development of the figure of Satan as the embodiment of evil. All English translations follow this long exegetical tradition, according to which satan serves as a proper noun, and read Satan.

However, from a linguistic point of view, the transition of a common noun to a proper noun is affected in Hebrew by the addition of the article. Additionally, a common

noun can transit to a proper noun without the article, if the noun has completely lost its original meaning. The absence of the article in 1 Chronicles 21:1, raises doubts about understanding the noun as a proper noun.

Nevertheless, if such a significant theological development in the concept of evil and its origin were expressed by 1 Chronicles 21:1, we would expect to find it elsewhere in the book as well. The general attitude of Chronicles is that evil, like good originates from God. Given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, the conclusion is that the figure of Satan still serves as a common name, and refers to an adversary.

A third view assumed that David took a census of his military troops in 1 Chronicles 21, perhaps because of his pride. The reason for his pride is attributed to the increasing power, and prosperity in Israel at the time the source text of 2 Samuel 24 was written. Based on the situation, God allowed Satan to suggest to David to take the census. Therefore, God used the event to reveal David's pride and punish it.

Yet another view, understands Satan as the angel of the Lord, whom David saw in the form of the angel of the Lord with a drawn sword in his hand in 1 Chronicles 21:16. In this view, Satan is the one who leads people to stumble, and the one who puts them to death. In this view, there is believed to be a copyist error, whereby, it is suggested that the one who puts them to death, must have been mistaken as the one who did the inciting through Satan.

In any case, the identification of a certain satan as the instigator of David's census, and the resulting plague, as against the earlier version of the story, point to the fact that a redactor substituted this figure for the deity. The answer to the reason why a redactor would substitute the source of the instigator in the Chronicler's story has been given traditionally, and otherwise. Ideologically, the redaction represents a change in the Chronicler's tradition that is different from the tradition that was in existence during the writing of the source text of 2 Samuel 24. It expresses his perspective of the Zion tradition, the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. Theologically, the redaction was because the perspective of the Samuel narrative did not suit his theology and his image of God.

6.4. Overview of chapter 4

This synthesis aims to give a summary of the different sections of chapter 4, towards a connected whole.

The first section was an attempt to do a synchronic study of the text of 1 Chronicles 21. The synchronic study was concerned with the lower criticism of the text, which sought answers as per what the text says. This section focused on linguistic, and structural characteristics. The linguistic and structural characteristics provided insights into the original desire of the statements of the texts. However, they have their place alongside the stock of methods, which helped in the attempt to accomplish the tasks in chapters 2 and 3.

The section aimed to critically, understand the meaning behind the texts of 1 Chronicles 21 within the surrounding contexts. Invariably, the understanding of the meaning of the text helped, in conjunction with the answers garnered from chapters 2 and 3, to discern all the possible images of God, Satan/satan, and the nation of Israel in 1 Chronicles 21, against the theological, and ideological context of the book of Chronicles.

The objectives accomplished in the first section was the translation from Hebrew to English, of 1 Chronicles 21:1-30, and the detailed analysis of the different words, phrases, and sentences contained in each verse. The aim was to understand the patterns, structure, figures, and methods the author used, in portraying his message.

From the text and translation of 1 Chronicles 21, I discovered that it was a certain satan, an unknown adversary who stood up against Israel and incited David to number Israel. This is purely based on linguistic evidence, with the absence of an article to the name. This is conflicting with the source text of 2 Samuel 24:1, which attributes the inciting to Yahweh. This change seems to be of theological importance, and I agree with scholars who hold that the redaction was because the perspective of the Samuel narrative did not suit the Chronicler's theology and his image of God.

David was reported by the Chronicler to have given the command to number the people from Beersheba to Dan, as against the source text in 2 Samuel 24:2 that reads from Dan to Beersheba. This change in direction seems to demonstrate the overwriting of the Northern tradition by the Chronicler with the Southern tradition.

Joab's response to David, questions the purpose of the action, and Joab also demonstrates his awareness that the action could bring guilt to Israel. However, for Joab to be sent for this task, and his subsequent report, which mentions men that draw out the sword, indicates that the census was carried out for a military purpose. I will therefore agree with the view, which holds that David conducted the census to show pride in his army, even though God had led him through military successes.

God responded by striking Israel, rather than only David, who accepted that he sinned and acted foolishly. Instead, God sent his seer to David to offer three choices of punishment. David accepted to be punished by God, rather than fall into the hands of human beings because he understood God to be compassionate.

Nevertheless, God killed in Israel seventy thousand persons through pestilence and his angel. The source text of 2 Samuel 24:15, notes the direction of the killing, from Dan to Beersheba, from North to South. This was omitted by the Chronicler, which could again suggest an attempt to overwrite the Northern tradition with the Southern tradition.

The angel had to be stopped by God as he was standing beside the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite. The location of this site is believed to be the purpose of the narrative, as the site would be confirmed by the angel's command to David through Gad, to erect an altar for God by the threshing floor. The threshing floor would become the site of the new altar and the future temple. The three elements of the Zion tradition, therefore, suffixes in this narrative, the site (the threshing floor at Jerusalem), the Yahwistic worship (the altar), and the monarchy (represented by David).

There is a huge difference in price for the purchase of the site, between the source text of 2 Samuel and the Chronicler's account. 2 Samuel reported fifty shekels of silver, while the Chronicler reported six hundred shekels. The reason for this difference has bewildered scholars, but I will consider seeking the answer in a separate future study.

David built an altar at the site as he was commanded, and offered a burnt offering there. Then God answered him with fire from the heavens. The Chronicler added the fire here, which does not appear in the source text. As indicated in chapter 3, this

could mean an allusion to the Mosaic and Sinai traditions respectively. Moses at the burning bush, and the fire at Mount Sinai. This redaction activity may suggest the overwriting of the Mosaic and the Sinai tradition with the Davidic tradition by the Chronicler.

The source text of 2 Samuel 24 stopped at the point where God answered David after he offered sacrifice at the new altar. However, the Chronicler further added other pieces of information: the fire, the angel returning his sword into its sheath, David's offering of another sacrifice, explanation about the position of the former altar at Gibeon, and the reason why David could not go to Gibeon to seek God.

The Chronicler could be said to have attempted with all these additions, to overwrite Moses with David. This overwriting as already garnered in chapter 3, entailed an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern Tradition, an overwriting of Tabernacle tradition with Jerusalem temple tradition, an overwriting of the Sinai tradition with the Zion tradition, and an overwriting of the exodus tradition with the monarchical tradition.

The Chronicler's ideology, therefore, can be understood by the different traditions he emphasized. He emphasized the Zion tradition, David (who is seen as the founder of the Jerusalem temple), the Jerusalem temple tradition, the Southern traditions, and the concepts of temple rituals. However, he omitted or under-emphasized the following traditions – Moses, the Exodus, the Sinai tradition, the Northern traditions, the Northern Kings (referring to the Northern Traditions).

Section 2 was a summary of scholars' opinions on 1 Chronicles 21:1-30.

The analysis of the chapter was done by different scholars, based on linguistic as well as theological insights. It is a common understanding among all the scholars that the author/s of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21, modified the source text of 2 Samuel 24, to suit his theological and ideological purpose. 1 Chronicles 21 made extreme use of 2 Samuel 24, but omitted some information and added other information. The Chronicler may have worked from another Hebrew text than the one preserved in the MT of 2 Samuel 24.

Based on the redaction of the text in verse 1 according to the different scholars' viewpoint, David is held responsible for the events that follow. Also, a new figure was

introduced, as a source of incitement for David to sin, rather than God, as stated in 2 Samuel 24. This figure demanded a detailed discussion. All the English translations assumed the figure to be a proper noun and refers to Satan that appeared in Job and Zachariah. The passages of Numbers 22:22 and Psalm 109:6 can be used as examples to suggest that this 'satan' was simply an angel of Yahweh. Some suggest that a supernatural tempter/accuser was intended by the passage.

However, purely from a linguistic point of view, the figure of Satan is written in Hebrew without an article, and therefore, serves as a common noun, and refers to an adversary.

It is argued that if such a significant theological development in the concept of evil and its origin were expressed by 1 Chronicles 21:1, we would expect to find it elsewhere in the book of Chronicles as well. However, the general attitude of the book of Chronicles is that evil, like good originates from God.

Because of the theological difficulty in the source text, the Chronicler made Satan the instigator of David, while Yahweh remains the one exercising the punishment. If Yahweh instigated the census, it remains theologically problematic that Yahweh would then punish the transgression. The occurrence of Satan in this verse may indicate that personification of evil had already started during Chronicler's time, a trend that was also visible in late literature such as Job 1.

Supernatural dualism was not customary in Israel's earlier belief systems, with good and bad being attributed to Yahweh. This tendency started to develop in the late post-exilic period, probably under the influence of Persian Zoroastrian dualism. However, given the different considerations, theological as well as linguistic, the conclusion is that the figure of Satan serves as a common noun, and refers to an adversary.

Immediately after the census, David repented of his sin and turned to God for forgiveness. Also, David's sin attracted punishment for the whole of Israel, demonstrating the kind of relationship that existed between the nation of Israel and God.

The Chronicler abbreviates the route that Joab and the military leaders took when conducting the census. The area described in 2 Samuel 24 is indicated by the Chronicler to be all Israel, and even though the Chronicler omitted the detailed

itinerary, he specified the direction in reverse order, from the South to the North, reflecting the Chronicler's Southern perspective.

The omission of Levi in the census may be due to the priestly regulation in Numbers 1:47-49 and 2:33 that the Levites were not to be counted with other Israelites. This is an allusion to Mosaic tradition, nevertheless, neither the omission of Levi and Benjamin from the census nor the census itself is sinful, rather the sinful act is that David wanted to give an account of his sphere of influence after Yahweh had given him and his men military successes.

Censuses were ordinarily taken for purposes of taxation or military conscription. In the present context, since it is conducted by Joab, David's chief army officer and the commander of the troops, it can be assumed that the census was conducted for military purposes. This idea is supported by the listing of the results according to those who drew the sword. In the Mosaic tradition, people that were enrolled in a census were subjected to military rules of purity, and from the onset, the plague in the passage of 1 Chronicles 21, seems to suggest that taboos may have been violated.

Numbering had been done with impunity in the time of Moses. However, according to the Mosaic tradition, each time numbering was done, each of the people had to contribute half a shekel towards the building of the tabernacle, and that appeased Yahweh. This was done so that there might be no plague among the people when they were numbered (Ex. 30:12). Therefore, based on the Mosaic tradition, it was understood that the anger of the Lord could be easily aroused, during the numbering of the people. Therefore, in itself, it was regarded as an undertaking.

Yahweh had given David victory wherever he went, as stated in 1 Chr. 18-20. Also, census implies that numbers count. Therefore, the census is an indication of a lack of trust in Yahweh's role in bringing about victory. Figures were enumerated, in 1 Chr. 7:2, 7:40, 12:23-28, and chapter 27, to suggest that the royal decree was condemned because David did not consult either the deity directly or an intermediary acting on the deity's behalf.

The Chronicler also uniformly criticizes any reliance on alliances as if they were the sources of strength (2 Chr. 18:1; 20:35-37). In 2 Chronicles 16:7-9, a descendant of David (King Asa) was quoted as having done foolishly, because he relied on the king

of Aram, and did not rely on Yahweh. From then on, he was punished by Yahweh, to always have wars. Previously, it was said about King Asa, that the Ethiopians and the Libyans had a huge army with exceedingly very many chariots and cavalry, yet because King Asa relied on Yahweh, he gave them into his hand. Again, in 2 Chronicles 16, Hanani the seer implies that the Israelite army is immaterial if the people of Israel rely on their deity rather than their human strength.

Several stages in the development of the concept of the plague as 'the sword of the Lord', which further developed as the 'sword of the angel' is simply presented as God's blow, coming from the hand of the Lord. The passage of 1 Chronicles 21 shows that any of Yahweh's angels can function as a satan, not as an adversary against the deity, but as a loyal agent, sent to perform a certain adversarial task for the divine purpose.

Yahweh is a God of mercy, and this is confirmed when Yahweh withholds the destruction at the last moment. God has compassion for the city of Jerusalem. The angel here is showed to represent Yahweh himself, and the significance of the threshing floor becomes apparent.

David renewed the petition to Yahweh to mean that first, David takes responsibility for the wrongdoing of the census. Secondly, David realizes that the incident has implications for Yahweh's eternal promise to his house.

The central episode of the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 is the averting of the plague from Jerusalem and the events that led to the choice and dedication of the Jerusalem Temple. There is a double significance of the place in question, the site David purchased from Ornan. It was the site for the future Temple, but also, a holy place.

The huge difference in price for the place, between the source text and the Chronicler's version, is assumed to be a way for the Chronicler to ensure that David's conduct would come across as being without a blemish. Also, David's piety and reverence had to be reflected in the transaction that entailed acquiring what would become a cultic site.

There is a reworking of the source text in 2 Samuel 24:25 to reflect the Chronicler's theological intention. The Chronicler adds fire from heaven in answer to David's prayer, to emphasize the importance of what was happening here. This can be

compared to other Old Testament passages like Moses at the burning bush, and the revelation of the Torah at Sinai to demonstrate that the appearance of Yahweh was often accompanied by fire in some form. These two preceding examples demonstrate allusion to the Mosaic, as well as the Sinai traditions respectively.

1 Chronicles 21, demonstrates an example of God's wrath and forgiveness. The call to the Lord and an answer by fire were obligatory elements in the legitimization of the divinely-ordained cultic site. It is worth noting that a deity who rains fire from the skies is a God to be held in awe and fear. He can consume humans by such means, and indeed his character can be summarized in such an image.

The concept of the centralization of the cult can also be adduced from this story. The Chronicler redacted 1 Chronicles 21:28-30, which are without parallel in the source text. These verses are presumed to answer an implicit question of why David offered a sacrifice on the threshing floor when the tabernacle of God is at Gibeon. In other words, they were used to achieve a contrast between the sanctuary that was at Gibeon and the newly established altar at the Jebusite threshing floor.

Traditionally, there cannot be two places of worship in Israel. Yahweh's answer to David by fire from heaven on the altar of burnt offering indicates divine approval for the sacrifice and the altar. It could also, indicate that this altar replaces the tabernacle which received similar divine approval when the sacrifice was offered at it (Lev. 9:24). This links with the tradition criticism in the previous chapter, which revealed that the Chronicler replaced the Tabernacle tradition with the Temple tradition.

The Chronicler may have used this account to indicate that David had purchased the site for the future temple, and had initiated sacrificial worship at the altar at the site.

The special divine approval of having sacrifices made to Yahweh on this particular site will be underlined when Solomon completes the dedication of the temple, and fire similarly came from heaven and consumed the burnt-offering and the sacrifices. Therefore, nothing less than the fire will do for the establishment of the Davidic-Solomonic temple.

The Chronicler's modification of the census and the cultic narrative was done to achieve three purposes. First, to make the story an all-Israel narrative. Secondly, he tried to protect Jerusalem as a common denominator between the tribes, to ensure

the moral high ground as a cultic center, by excluding Levi and Benjamin from the census. Thirdly, the Chronicler wanted to claim a special position for Jerusalem in contrast to the Benjamite sphere of influence, emphasizing that this is the right place to bring a sacrifice.

These all-too-human ideologies were the motivation behind the Chronicler's reconstruction of the past. It is striking that the only unfavorable reference to David mentioned in the book of Chronicles pertains to the census he undertook. The reason for mentioning the census is the outcome, namely to indicate the site for building the temple. It seems that the Chronicler changed the source text from 2 Samuel 24 to suit both his ideology and theology which includes his image of God.

6.5. Overview of chapter 5

Chapter 5 was concerned with two objectives: firstly, what the narrative of 1 Chronicles 21 communicates concerning images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel when they are interpreted against the theology and ideology of the book of Chronicles; secondly it addressed the findings and the relevance of the findings.

Section one was about the context of Chronicles. The narrative of Chronicles is a theological and ideological reflection, rather than a retelling of the history of Israel. The Chronicler narrows the narrative from all mankind down to the nation of Israel, and the true adherents of the Yahwistic religion at the temple in Jerusalem. As a result, the historical kingdom of the whole of Israel is almost completely ignored. The purpose of the book of Chronicles, therefore, was to show the returning migrants, that they were a continuation of the pre-captivity nation, whose lives were based on the Davidic dynasty and religious lives on the Levitical priesthood/ the Jerusalem temple.

Section two was about the traditions emphasized in 1 & 2 Chronicles, also traditions that were underemphasized. Many traditions were emphasized by the Chronicler, the ancestral tradition, patriarchal (Abrahamic, Davidic), Temple, Zion, and the Southern traditions. The Chronicler underemphasized the Northern, Mosaic, and the Sinai traditions. However, the Southern and the three elements of the Zion tradition, the site, the Yahwistic religion, and the monarchy were his main emphasis.

The traditions emphasized by the Chronicler in the chapter under focus in this study, are the Zion, and Southern traditions, respectively.

Section three was about the redaction that was done in 1 & 2 Chronicles- source material that was emphasized and underemphasized. The Chronicler collected, arranged, edited, and modified traditional material, and turned the composition into new material that is theologically loaded. The Chronicler's major sources among the biblical works were the historical compositions. He emphasized some of them in full and others in a reworked form. He did not take extensive literary excerpts from the prophetic books. He underemphasized some Psalms.

The Chronicler appeared to have surveyed all the Pentateuch as source materials for his writing, but his picture of Israel's history is emphatically different from that of the Pentateuch. His work is a record of the only legitimate kingdom of Judah, instead of being a synchronistic history of the two kingdoms. He used exclusive language to include the Southern kingdom and exclude the Northern kingdom.

Section four was about the theology and ideology of Chronicles as displayed in the specific emphasis. Theologically the Chronicler could not accept that evil as well as good comes from God, therefore, he changed Yahweh as the instigator of David to number the Israelites. The Chronicler sees the story presented in Samuel as untenable, for which reason, he changed his version of the story, by introducing Satan/satan as the one who replaces Yahweh in manipulating David to undertake the census. This is the main reason why the Chronicler changed the Samuel narrative –because it did not suit his theology and his image of God.

Ideologically, he changed many things from the source text to promote his Southern tradition, to legitimize the Davidic monarchy, the temple site in Jerusalem, and the temple elites.

Section five was about which traditions and redactions are in the text of 1 Chronicles 21. The Chronicler detached the story from its former context in two ways: first, he omitted the anger of God, and second, the incitement to number the Israelites were not attributed to God, but another agent.

The Chronicler changed the direction of the census taking to read from Beersheba to Dan (from South to North), instead of from Dan to Beersheba (from North to South). This is an overwriting of the Northern tradition with the Southern tradition.

The answer to David's prayer was met with fire from heaven according to the Chronicler. This is an addition to the source text. It is suggested to be an allusion by the Chronicler to the Mosaic tradition (Moses met by fire at the burning bush), and the Sinai tradition (fire at Mount Sinai during the receiving of the Law). The Chronicler

Finally, the Chronicler added the last portion of the text in 1 Chronicles 21:28-30, which is without parallel in 2 Samuel 24. These verses try to explain the reason why David could not go to the altar at Gibeon. This links with the tradition criticism in chapter 3, which revealed that the Chronicler replaced the Tabernacle tradition with the Temple tradition. The Jerusalem Temple represented the Chronicler's theology and his image of God – which was that Yahweh is only to be worshipped in the Jerusalem Temple and that He has chosen the site as the place for worship and dwelling.

In the second part of this chapter, the findings and relevance of this study were discussed. Section six was about the contemporary significance of the images of God, Satan/satan, and Israel according to the theology and ideology of 1 Chronicles 21.

We must read and understand a text within its unique historical context. This is because the Old Testament does not have a central theme or one theology. Also, in the application of the varying principles garnered from the study of a text, we should not focus on the culture or the controversy, rather on the relationship between God and man. The flat image, which the Chronicler has created of Satan/satan links with his belief that God is almighty and that no other creature or symbol can be mightier than God.

References

- Aldus, V., Brookes, I., Dexter, G., & Pickering, A., (eds.), 2007, *Chambers Family Dictionary*, Chambers Harrap Publishers, Edinburgh.
- Alastair, M., & Johnson, I., (ed.), 2005, *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism Vol. II, The Middle Ages*, Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Albright, W., 1950, *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 54 (3), pp. 162-176.
- Anderson, F., & Forbes, A., 2008, *The Hebrew Bible: Anderson-Forbes Analyzed Text*, Logos.com.
- Armerding, C., 1983, *The Old Testament and Criticism*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Arnold, B., 2009, *Genesis*. Cambridge University Press, London.
- Aune, D., 2010, *The Blackwell companion to the New Testament: Historical Criticism*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, West Sussex.
- Baker, W., & Carpenter, E., 2003, *The complete word study dictionary, Old Testament*, AMG Publishers, Chattanooga, TN.
- Barker, W., 2008, Review of Did God Have a Wife? William G. Dever. *Themelios*, 33(1), 71–72.
- Bandstra, B., 2009, *Reading the Old Testament: Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, Wadsworth, Belmont.
- Barr, J., 2000, *History and Ideology in the Old Testament*. Oxford University Press, Madison, NY.
- Barry, J., Mailhot, J., Bomar, D., Ritzema, E., & Sinclair-Wolcott, C., (eds.), 2014, *DIY Bible Study*, Lexham Press, Bellingham, WA.
- Barstad, H., 2010, *A brief guide to the Hebrew Bible*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.

- Berger, Y., 2007, *The commentary of Rabbi David Kimh|l to Chronicles: A translation with Introduction and Super-commentary*, Brown Judaic Studies, Rhodes Island.
- Black, D., & Dockery, D., 2001, *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues* pp. 508–509, Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN.
- Black, M., & Rowley, H., 1962, 'Peake's Commentary on the Bible', *Job*, Nelson, London.
- Blomberg, C., 2009, *Jesus and the Gospels: An Introduction and Survey, 2nd ed.*, B & H Publishing Group, Nashville, TN.
- Boda, M., 2005, 'Prayer', in B. Arnold, & H. Williamson (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books*, Intervarsity Press, Westmont, IL.
- Boda, M., 2001, 'Review of Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan by John Day', *Themelios*, 27(1), 46-47.
- Boda, M., & McConville, J., 2012, *Dictionary of the Old Testament Prophets*, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, IL.
- Brand, C., Draper, C., England, A., Bond, S., Clendenen, E., & Butler, T., (eds.), 2003, *Satan. In Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary (p. 1448)*, Holman Bible Publishers, Nashville, TN.
- Braun, R., 1986, *1 Chronicles, Word Biblical Commentary (Vol. 14)*, Word Books Publisher, Waco, TX.
- Brent, S, & Giese, R, 1995, *Cracking Old Testament Codes: A Guide to Interpreting the Literary Genres of the Old Testament*, Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN.
- Brettler, M., 2005, *How to read the Bible*, The Jewish Publishing Society, Philadelphia, PA.

- Breytenbach, A. P. B., 1997, 'Meesternarratiewe, kontranarratiewe en kanoniserings – 'n Perspektief op sommige profetiese geskrifte', *HTS* 53/4, 1161-1186.
- Browning, W., No. date, Diachronic "In A Dictionary of the Bible" Oxford Biblical Studies Online, <http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/opr/t94/e526>, Date of access 14 May 2020.
- Buss, M., 1999, 'Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (274)', *Biblical Form Criticism in its Context*, Sheffield Academic Press, UK.
- Buss, M., 2010, *The Changing Shape of Form Criticism A Relational Approach*, Sheffield Phoenix Press, UK.
- Buttrick, G., (ed.), 1991, *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia*, (4 Volumes), Abington Press, Nashville, TN.
- Bible, 2012, *The Holy Bible: Hebrew Old Testament*, E-Sword, version 10.1.0: www.e-sword.net.
- Bible, 1982, *The Holy Bible: New King James Version*, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, TN.
- Bible, 1998, *The Holy Bible: New Living Translation*, Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., Wheaton, IL.
- Bible, 1999, *The New International Version*, Bible Society of South Africa, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Braun, R., 1994, in McKenzie, S., & Graham, M., (eds.), 'The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth,' *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 182*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, UK.
- Brown, F., 1907, *A Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK.
- Brown, F., & Driver, S., & Briggs, C., 2010, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., Peabody, MA.

- Cairns, A., 2002, *Dictionary of Theological Terms*, Ambassador Emerald International, Belfast; Greenville, SC.
- Campbell, A., 1994, in S. Mckenzie, & M. Graham, (eds.), 'The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth,' *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 182*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, UK.
- Cathey, J., 2003, 'Devil, Satan, Evil, Demonic', in C. Brand, C. Draper, A. England, S. Bond, E. R. Clendenen, & T. C. Butler (eds.), *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary (p. 419)*, Holman Bible Publishers, Nashville, TN.
- Childs, B., 2011, 'Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments', *Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* pp. 23, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Coggins, R., 1976, *The first and second books of the Chronicles*, Cambridge University Press, London, UK.
- Concise Oxford American Dictionary, 2006, *Oxford University Press Inc.*, Madison Avenue, NY.
- Corduan, W., 2015, 'Zoroastrianism', in J. D. Barry, D. Bomar, D. R. Brown, R. Klippenstein, D. Mangum, C. Sinclair Wolcott, W. Widder (eds.), *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, Lexham Press, Bellingham, WA.
- Crockett, W., 1951, *A Harmony of the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles: The Books of the Kings of Judah and Israel*, Baker book house, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Cuddon, J., 2013, *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory, 5th ed.* Wiley-Blackwell, UK.
- Culley, R., 1967, *Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms*, University of Toronto press, CA.
- Culley, R., 1967, *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Narratives*, Scholar press, Philadelphia, PA.

- Curtis, E., & Madsen, A., 1965, *The international critical commentary. A critical and exegetical commentary on the books of Chronicles*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, UK.
- Dell, K., 1991, *The Book of Job As Sceptical Literature*, Walter DE Gruyter, Berlin, NY.
- Dever, W., 1995, 'Will the Real Israel Please Stand up?' *Part II: Archaeology and the Religions of Ancient Israel*, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (May), (298), 49–50.
- De Vries, S., 1989, *1 & 2 Chronicles*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Dirksen, P., 2003, *1 Kronieken, Commentaar op het Oude Testament*, Kok, Kampen.
- Donnelly, C., 2017, 'Apocryphal Literature, the Characterization of Satan, and the Descensus ad Inferos Tradition in England in the Middle Ages', *Religion & Theology* 24, 321–349.
- Draper, C., 2003, 'Textual Criticism, Old Testament. In C. Brand, C. Draper, A. England, S. Bond, E. R. Clendenen, & T. C. Butler (eds.)', *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, Holman Bible Publishers, Nashville, TN.
- Draper, C., & Russell, F., 2003, 'Bible Texts and Versions, in C. Brand, C. Draper, A. England, S. Bond, E. R. Clendenen, & T. C. Butler (eds.)', *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, Holman Bible Publishers, Nashville, TN.
- Easton, B., 1915, 'Zoroastrianism', in J. Orr, J. L. Nuelsen, E. Y. Mullins, & M. O. Evans (eds.), *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (Vol. 1–5, p. 3158)*, The Howard-Severance Company, Chicago, IL.
- Edersheim, A., 1975, *Bible History: Old Testament (Vol. 4)*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Elwell, W., & Elwell, W., 1996, *Evangelical dictionary of biblical theology (electronic ed.)*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI.

- Elwell, W., & Beitzel, B., 1988, *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Endries, J., 2011, *New Colledgeville Bible Commentary: First And Second Chronicles*, Liturgical Press, Colledgeville, MN.
- Estes, D., 2016, Biblical Narrative, in J. D. Barry, D. Bomar, D. R. Brown, R. Klippenstein, D. Mangum, C. Sinclair Wolcott, ... W. Widder (eds.), *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, Lexham Press, Bellingham, WA.
- Farnel, F., & Andrews, E., 2017, *Biblical Criticism: What Are Some Outstanding Weaknesses of Modern Historical Criticism?* Christian Publishing House, Cambridge, OH.
- Feldmeth, N., 2008, 'IN Pocket Dictionary of Church History:' *Over 300 Terms Clearly and Concisely Defined*, IVP Academic, Downers Grove, IL.
- Fensham, F., 1982, *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament: The Books of Ezra And Nehemiah*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Ferguson, S., Wright, D., & Packer, J., (eds), 1998, *New Dictionary of Theology*, Inter-Varsity Press, Downers Grove, IL.
- Fleming, D., 2004, *Bridgeway Bible Dictionary*, McPherson's Printing group, Brisbane, Australia.
- Fleming, D., 2014, *Bridgeway Bible Commentary*, McPherson's Printing group, Brisbane, Australia.
- Fohrer, G., 1963, *Das BuchHiob, KAT 16*, Giitersloh, Gerd Mohn.
- Fohrer, G., 1968, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, SPCK, London.
- Fokkelman, J., 1999, *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.

- Freedman, D., Myers, A., & Beck, A. (eds.), 2000, *Eerdmans dictionary of the Bible*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Geyser, A.B., 2005, *1 & 2 Kronieke as magstekes*, PhD Thesis, Fakulteit van Teologie, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
- Geyser, A.B., & Breytenbach, A.P.B., 2006, '1 & 2 Kronieke as magstekes', *HTS Teologiese studies/ Theological Studies*, 473-500.
- Geyser-Fouche, A.B., 2016, 'Exclusive language: The tool to empower and create identity', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 37(1), 1-9. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v37i1.1495>.
- Geyser-Fouche, A., 2017, 'Die kerk vanaf die Ou Testament en die Nuwe Testament tot vandag I: "Voortsetting, vervanging of transformasie?"' *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 73(1), a4570. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v73i1.4570>.
- Glassie, H., 1995, Tradition, *Journal of American Folklore*, 108(430), 395-419.
- Gordis, R., 1978, *The Book of God and Man*, University of Chicago Press, IL.
- Gorman, M.J., 2001, *Elements of Biblical Exegesis*, Peabody, Hendrickson.
- Graham, M., 1990, *The Utilization of 1 and 2 Chronicles in the reconstruction of Israelite History in the Nineteenth Century*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, GA.
- Graham, M., & McKenzie, S., 1999, *The Chronicler as Author*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, UK.
- Gray, J., 2010, *The Book of Job*, Phoenix Press, Sheffield, UK.
- Grayson, A., 1980, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, Indiana
- Groves, J., 2005, *Zion Traditions. In Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books (pp. 1019-1025)*, Inter-Varsity Press, Westmont, IL.

- Grenz, S., Guretzki, D., & Nordling, C., 1999, *Pocket dictionary of theological terms*, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, IL.
- Habib, M., 2005, *A History of Literary Criticism From Plato to The Present Day*, Blackwell-Publishing, Oxford, UK.
- Hacham, N., 2005, 'Exile and Self-Identity in the Qumran Sect and in Hellenistic Judaism', in E.G. Chazon & B. Halpern-Amaru, (eds.), *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium of the Orion Center for the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 9-11 January 2005, pp 3-21, Brill, Leiden.
- Hagedorn, A., 2005, Honor and Shame. in B. Arnold, & H. Williamson (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books (pp. 497-501)*, Inter-Varsity Press, Westmont, IL.
- Hardin, J., 2010, 'Review of Jesus and the God of Israel: "God Crucified" and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity by Richard Bauckham', *Themelios*, 35(3), 449.
- Hartley, J., 1988, 'The New International Commentary on the Old Testament', *The Book of Job*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Hastings, J., Selbie, J., Davidson, A., Driver, S., & Swete, H., (eds.), 1911–1912, *A Dictionary of the Bible: Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology (Vol. I–V)*, Charles Scribner's Sons, Manhattan, NY.
- Hendel, R., 1987, *The Epic of The Patriarch*, Scholar Press, MI.
- Hobbs, R., 2005, War and peace In B. Arnold, & H. Williamson (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical books*, Inter-Varsity Press, Westmont, IL.
- Holladay, W., 1988, *A concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.

- Holladay, C., & Hayes, J., 1982, *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook*, John Knox Press, Atlanta, GA.
- Hooker, P., 2001, *First and Second Chronicles*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.
- Jamieson, R., Fausset, A., & Brown, D., 1997, *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible, Vol. 1*, Logos Research Systems, Inc., Oak Harbour, WA.
- Japhet, S., 1968, 'The supposed common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah investigated anew', *Vetus Testamentum*, 18(3), 330-371.
- Japhet, S., 1979, 'Conquest and settlement in Chronicles', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 98, 205-218.
- Japhet, S., 1993, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.
- Japhet, S., 2009, *The Ideology of the book of Chronicles and its place in Biblical thought*. Eisenbrauns, Warsaw, IN.
- Jarick, J., 2007, *1 Chronicles*, Sheffield Phoenix Press, Sheffield, UK.
- Jobling, D., 2001, 'Methods of modern Literary Criticism', in L. Perdue, *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible* (pp. 19-35), Blackwell Publishers, Malden, MA.
- Johnson, B., 2015, *Law in the Hebrew Bible*, in J. D. Barry, et al (eds.), *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, Lexham Press, Bellingham, WA.
- Jones, G., 1993, *1 & 2 Chronicles*, JSOT Press, Sheffield, UK.
- Jonker, L., 2003, 'The Rhetoric of finding a new identity in a multi-religious and multi-ethnic society: The case of the book of Chronicles', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 24(2) 396-416.
- Jonker, L., 2010, 'Saul Narrative in Chronicles, Revisiting the Saul Narrative in Chronicles: *Interacting with the Persian Imperial Context?*' 23(2), 283-305.

- Jonker, L., 2011, 'Texts, Contents and Readings in Postexilic Literature': Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.
- Jonker, L. 2012, 'Reading the Pentateuch's genealogies after the Exile: The Chronicler's usage of Genesis 1–11 in negotiating an all-Israelite identity', *Old Testament Essays*, 25(2), 316-333.
- Jonker, L., 2013, *1 & 2 Chronicles, Understanding the Bible commentary series*, Baker Books, Bellingham, WA.
- Jonker, L., 2007, 'Reforming History: The Hermeneutical Significance of the Books of Chronicles', *Vetus Testamentum* 57, 21-44.
- Jonker, L., 2008, 'The Chronicler's portrayal of Solomon', *OTE* 21/3, 653-669.
- Kalimi, I., 2005. *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN.
- Keel, O., & Uehlinger, C., 1992, *Gods, goddesses and images of God, in ancient Israel*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Keil, C., & Delitzsch, F., 1950, *Biblical commentary on the Old Testament*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Keil, C., & Delitzsch, F., 1976, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Kelly, P., 1992, *Biblical Hebrew: An Introductory Grammar*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Klein, R., 1974, 'Textual Criticism of the Old Testament', *Fontes.lstc.edu*, 1:1-23.
- Klein, R., 2001, 'Narrative Texts: Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah', in L. Perdue, *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible*, pp. 385-401, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

- Klein, R., 2006, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Kleinig, J., 1994, 'Recent Research in Chronicles', *Currents in Research Biblical Studies* 2, 43-76.
- Knight, D., 2009, *Traditio-Historical Criticism: The Development of the Covenant Code*, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA.
- Knoppers, G., 1999, 'Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1): 49-72.
- Knoppers, G., 2003, *The Anchor Bible. 1 Chronicles, A new translation with introduction and commentary*, Doubleday, Broadway, NY.
- Knoppers, G., 2004, *1 Chronicles 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Doubleday, Broadway, NY.
- Knoppers, G., 2004, *1 Chronicles 10-29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Doubleday, Broadway, NY.
- Knoppers, G., & MacConville, J., 2000, *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN.
- Lasor, W., Hubbard, D., & Bush, F., 1996, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Levin, Y., 2004, 'From lists to history: Chronological Aspects of the Chronicler's genealogies', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123(4), 601-636.
- Lim, T., 2013, "The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library": *The Formation of The Jewish Canon*, Yale University Press, New heaven, London.
- Lipschits, O., 2011, 'Shedding new light on the dark years of the "Exile period": New studies, further elucidation, and some questions regarding the archaeology of Judah as an "empty land"', in B. Kelle, F. Ames, & J. Wright (eds.), *Interpreting*

Exile: Displacement and deportation in Biblical and modern contexts, pp. 57-86,
Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA.

Longman Active Study Dictionary, 2010, Pearson Education Limited, Essex, Eng.

Mangan, C., 1982, *Old Testament Message: A Biblical-Theological Commentary, Volume 13*, Michael Glazier, Inc., Wilmington, DE.

Mathews, K, 1998, 'The Historical Books', in D. S. Dockery (Ed.),' *Holman Concise Bible Commentary*, Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN.

Merriam-Webster, I., 2003, *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary, (Eleventh ed.)*, Merriam-Webster, Inc., Springfield, MA.

McKenzie, S., 2004, *Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries: 1-2 Chronicles*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, TN.

McKenzie, S., 2012, *Introduction to the Historical books*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.

McNutt, P., 1999, *Reconstructing the Society of Ancient Israel*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.

Mihelic, J., 1951, 'The Influence of Form Criticism on the Study of the Old Testament,' *Journal of Bible and Religion*, 19 (3), pp. 120-129.

Miller, R., 2011, *Biblical Performance Criticism: Oral Tradition in Ancient Israel*, Cascade Books, Eugene, OR.

Moreau, A., Netland, H., & Engen, C., 2000, *Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions*, Baker Books, Grand Rapids, MI.

Mosis, R., 1973, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des christlichen Geschichtswerkes*, Herder Freiburg.

Mroczek, E., 2008, *Moses, David, and Scribal Revelation: Preservation and Renewal in Second Temple Jewish Textual Traditions*, Brill, Leiden, MA.

- Murphy, F., 2002, *Early Judaism: The Exile to the Time of Jesus*, Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., Peabody, MA.
- Myers, J., 1986, *1 Chronicles, The Anchor Bible*, Doubleday, Broadway, NY.
- Nahkola, A., 2001, *Double Narratives in the Old Testament: The Foundations of Method in Biblical Criticism*, Walter de Gruyter, NY.
- Neyrey, J. (1998). 'Limited Good, Group Orientation', in J. Pilch, & B. Malina (eds.), *Handbook of Biblical social values*, pp. 122-127, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, MA.
- Neyrey, J., 2010, 'Social-scientific criticism', in D. Aune, *The Blackwell companion to the New Testament*, pp. 177-191, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, West Sussex.
- Niditch, S., 1996, *Oral World and Written World: Ancient Israelite Literature*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.
- Noth, M., 1943, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Noth, M., 1957, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*, 2d ed., Max Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- North, R., 1963, *Theology of the Chronicler*, The Society of Biblical Literature, 82, 369-381.
- Odor, J., 2015, *Light, and Darkness*, in J. D. Barry, D. Bomar, D. R. Brown, R. Klippenstein, D. Mangum, C. Sinclair Wolcott, ... W. Widder (eds.), *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, Lexham Press, Bellingham, WA.
- Orr, J., Nuelsen, J., Mullins, E., & Evans, M., (Eds.), *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (Vol. 1–5)*, The Howard-Severance Company, Chicago, IL.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2015, 9th ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

- Page, S., 2007, 'Satan: God's Servant, *JETS* 50 (3), 449-465.
- Pagels, E., 1991, 'The Social History of Satan, The "Intimate Enemy": A Preliminary Sketch', *HTR* 84(2), 105-128.
- Perrin, N., 1969, *What is Redaction Criticism?*, Fortress Press, PA.
- Person, R., 2010, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World*, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA.
- Pilch, J., & Malina, B., 1998, *Handbook of Biblical Social Values*, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.
- Pinker, A., 2006, 'The Core Story in the Prologue-Epilogue of the book of Job', *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*, Vol.6 (1) 1-27.
- Plevnik, J., 1998, Honor & Shame, in J. Pilch, & B., Malina (eds.), *Handbook of Biblical social values* (pp. 106-115).
- Porter, S (ed.), 2007, *Dictionary of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation*, Routledge, Madison, NY.
- Puckett, K., 2016, *Narrative Theory: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Rees, T., 1915, 'God'. in J. Orr, J. L. Nuelsen, E. Y. Mullins, & M. O. Evans (eds.), *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* Vol. 1-5, p. 1255, The Howard-Severance Company, Chicago, IL.
- Reeves, J., 2005, 'Trajectories in Near Eastern Apocalyptic', *A Postrabbinic Jewish Apocalypse Reader*, Society of Biblical Literature Vol. 45, p. 1-3, Atlanta, GA.
- Rogerson, J., 2006, 'Historical Criticism and the Authority of the Bible', in J., Rogerson, & J. Lieu (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies* pp. 841-859, Oxford University Press, Madison, NY.

- Römer, T., 2013, *The Dark God: Cruelty Sex and Violence in the Old Testament*, Paulist, Manhattan, NY.
- Römer, T.C., 2013, 'Yhwh, the Goddess, and Evil: Is "monotheism" an adequate concept to describe the Hebrew Bible's discourses about the God of Israel?', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34(2), Art. #841, 5 pages, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v34i2.841>.
- Roth, W., 1965, *Numerical Sayings in the Old Testament: A form-critical Study*, Brill, Leiden, NL.
- Rothstein, J., & Hanel, J., 1927. *Das erste Buch der Chronik*, KAT 18/2; Deichert, Leipzig.
- Rowlands, C., 2010, 'Social, political and ideological criticism'. In J. Rogerson, & J. Lieu (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical studies* pp. 655-671, Oxford University Press, Madison, NY.
- Rudolf, W., 1954, Problems with the book of Chronicles, *Vetus Testamentum*, 4, 401-40.
- Rudolph, W., 1955, *Chronikbücher*, HAT 21; Mohr, Tübingen.
- Schneidewind, W., 2005, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textuality of Ancient Israel*, Cambridge University Press, NY.
- Schweitzer, S., 2007, *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*, T & T Clark, London.
- Sandoval, T., & Mandolfo, C., (ed.), 2003, *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form Critical Insight on The Bible*, T & T Clark International, NY.
- Seal, D., & Barry, J., 2016, 'Biblical Criticism', in Barry, J., Bomar, D., Brown, D., Klippenstein, R., Mangum, D., Sinclair Wolcott, C., Widder, W., (eds.), *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, Lexham Press, Bellingham, WA.
- Selman, M., 1994, *1 Chronicles: An introduction and commentary*, Inter-varsity Press, Leicester.

- Selman, M., 2005, 'Chronicler's history', in B. Arnold, & H. Williamson (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical books* pp. 157-161, Inter-Varsity Press, Westmont, IL.
- Shipp, R., (n.d.), Return, restoration, and renewal in Chronicles and today, *Christian Studies Journal*, 55-63.
- Smith, G., 2010, *Cornerstone Biblical Commentary: Ezra-Nehemiah Esther*, Tyndale House Publishers Inc., Carol Stream, IL.
- Snaith, N., 1968, *The Book of Job: Its Origin and Purpose*, SBT 2/11, Naperville, Allenson, London.
- Steck, O., 1998, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology 2nd ed.*, Society of Biblical Literature, Scholars Press, Atalanta, GA.
- Stokes, R., 2009, 'The Devil Made David Do It... or "Did" He? The Nature, Identity, and Literary Origins of the Satan' in 1 Chronicles 21:1, Vol. 128, pp. 91-106, *Society of Biblical Literature*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25610168>, Accessed: 27-01-2016.
- Strong, J., 1890, *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*, E-Sword version 10.1.0, [Online Computer Software], Available at www.e-sword.net [Accessed 28 December 2014].
- Swatson, H., 1972, *Scripture discussion commentary 5: Histories II*, Sheed, and Ward, London.
- Thompson, M., 2003, 'What happens when we pray? A contribution from the Old Testament', *The Expository Times*, 367-372.
- Thompson, J., 1994, *1, 2 Chronicles*, Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN.
- Tigay, J., 1986, *You shall have no other Gods, Israelite Religion in the light of Hebrew Inscriptions*, Scholars Press, Harvard Semitic Studies.

- Tigay, J., 1996, *Deuteronomy*, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, PA.
- Tov, E., 1992, *Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Tov, E., 2015, *Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, Collected Essays Vol. 3, Brill, Boston, MA.
- Throntveit, M., 1987, *When Kings Speak*, Scholars Press, Decatur, GA.
- Tuell, S., 2001, 'Interpretation: A Bible commentary for preaching and teaching', *First and Second Chronicles*, John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.
- Urban, D., 2017, 'The Falls of Satan, Eve, and Adam in John Milton's Paradise Lost: A Study in Insincerity', *Christianity & Literature*, 67(1) 89-112.
- Van Aarde, A., 2009, 'Narrative criticism', in A. Du Toit, *Focussing on the Message* pp. 381-418, Protea, Pretoria.
- Van der Merwe, C., 2004. *The Lexham Hebrew-English Interlinear Bible*, Lexham Press, Bellingham, WA.
- Von Rad, G., 1965, *Das Geschichtsbild Des Chronistischen Werkes*, W. Kohlhamme, Stuttgart.
- Walls, J., 2005, 'Evil', in B. Arnold, & H. Williamson (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books* pp. 272-274, Inter-Varsity Press, Westmont, IL.
- Walton, J., 1990, 'Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context', *A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Walton, J., 2005, 'Genealogies', in B. Arnold, & H. Williamson (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books*, pp. 309-315, Intervarsity Press, Westmont, IL.

- Walton, J., 2006, 'Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament', *Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, Baker Academic, Ada, MI.
- Walton, J., Mathews, V., & Chavalas, M., 2000, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament*, Intervarsity Press, Downers Grove, IL.
- Washburn, D., 2003, *A Catalogue of Biblical Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Brill, Leiden, MA.
- Welch, A., 1935, *Post-Exilic Judaism*, Blackwood and Sons, London.
- Wenham, G., 2000, *Story of Torah: Reading Old Testament Narrative Ethically*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI.
- West, M., 1973, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, EB B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart.
- Whitehouse, O., 1911–1912, 'Satan', in J. Hastings, J. A. Selbie, A. B. Davidson, S. R. Driver, & H. B. Swete (eds.), *A Dictionary of the Bible: Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology* 4, p. 407, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.
- Williamson, H., 1977, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Williamson, H., 1982, *1 and 2 Chronicles: New Century Bible Commentary*: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Williamson, H., 2004, *Studies in Persian period history and historiography*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.
- Williamson, P., 2005, 'Land', in Arnold, B., & Williamson, H. (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical books*, pp. 638-643, Inter-Varsity Press. Westmont, IL.

- Wisley, L., 2016, 'Benaiah, Son of Jehoiada' in J. D. Barry, et al (eds.), *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, Lexham Press, Bellingham, WA.
- Witte, M., 2012, 'The book of Chronicles', in J. Gertz, A. Berlejung, K. Schmid, & M. Witte, *Handbook of the Old Testament: An introduction to the literature, religion, and history of the Old Testament*, pp. 683-694, T & T Clark, Broadway, NY.
- Wood, D., (ed.) 1996, *New Bible Dictionary, third edition*, Inter-varsity Press, Downers Grove, IL.
- Wood, W., 2016, 'Anselm of Canterbury on the fall of the devil: the hard problem, the harder problem, and a new formal model of the first sin', *Religious Studies* 52, 223–245.
- Wright, J., 2003, 'Genealogies', in T. Alexander, & D. Baker (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, pp. 345-349, Intervarsity Press, Westmont, IL.
- Zorn, J., 1999, 'Review From the Ancient Sites of Israel': *Essays on Archaeology, History, and Theology*, in Memory of Aapeli Saarisalo (1896–1986) edited by Timo Eskola and Eero Junkkaala, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* May, 314, 96.
- Zvi, E., 2010, 'Reconstructing the intellectual Discourse of Ancient Yehud', *Studies in Religion/ Sciences Religieuses*, 39 (1), 7-23.