

LITURGY AND EMPIRE: Prophetic Historiography and Faith in Exile in 1–2 Chronicles

~ Scott W. Hahn ~

St. Paul Center for Biblical Theology

Reading the books of 1 and 2 Chronicles, we are confronted right away with questions about the meaning and practice of history and prophecy. The Chronicler obviously understands himself to be writing history in some sense. With his first word, “Adam,” he signals his ambition to tell the world’s story from the “beginning,” from the creation of the first man to the “end,” his own time in the late sixth or early fifth century B.C., possibly within a generation of the decree of King Cyrus of Persia that concludes his work.¹

But the reader notices that there is more than history at work here. Chronicles strains the categories and definitions of traditional historiography, secular or biblical. First, there is the matter of tone. It simply does not read like history. It reads more like a series of homilies than a historical narrative. Second, there is the question of why the Chronicler includes so much material omitted from other biblical sources, while excluding so much material that other biblical writers felt essential to Israel’s national story.

There is much evidence to suggest that the Chronicler was self-consciously writing a homiletic and theological commentary on Israel’s history to serve as the summary entry in the Hebrew canon. And it is important to note that Chronicles was positioned as the final book in some of the earliest canons.² Peter Ackroyd is

¹ The original Hebrew title, *dibrê hayyāmim*—“The Book of the Events [literally, “the words”] of the Days,” suggests Chronicles’ provenance as historical writing. So does its fairly straightforward chronological approach to Israel’s story. The basic outline of Chronicles looks like this: The Chronicler begins with a long list of the family of nations and ancestors of Israel (1 Chron. 1:1–9), picking up Israel’s story during the last days of its ill-fated first king (1 Chron. 10). The narrative pivots on the reigns of the great King David (1 Chron. 11–29), and his son and successor, Solomon (2 Chron. 1–9). The break-up of the monarchy in the years after Solomon and the reigns of the post-Solomonic kings are detailed next (2 Chron. 10–36:16). Finally, the Chronicler in short order concludes by depicting the sack of Jerusalem, the destruction of the Temple, the exile of the people and, with King Cyrus of Persia’s decree, the beginnings of their restoration to Judah (2 Chron. 36:17–23).

² That was apparently Chronicles’ position in the Bible as Jesus read it. This is suggested from his sweeping depiction of the history of martyrdom—“from the foundation of the world ... from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah”—that is, from the first martyr in the Bible’s first book, Genesis, to the last martyr in the Bible’s last book, Chronicles. See Luke 11:50–51; compare Gen. 4:8–16; 2 Chron. 24:20–21. See Ralph W. Klein, *1 Chronicles: A Commentary*, Hermenia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2006), 2, n. 15.

surely correct in describing the Chronicler as “the first theologian of the canon.”³ And Martin Selman, who has written one of the best modern commentaries, has noted this unique feature of the work: “Chronicles stands apart in its attempt to interpret the Old Testament from beginning to end.”⁴

If Chronicles demands to be understood in some sense as history, we must acknowledge that it is history told in a “prophetic” key. There are more than a dozen original prophetic speeches in Chronicles that are found nowhere else in the canon. Prophets, seers, and divine emissaries play a prominent role in his recasting of Israel’s history—warning kings, delivering God’s covenant Word, and significantly, “prophesying” in the context of the Temple liturgy.

Scholars have shown how the prophetic discourses in Chronicles reflect fundamental theological concerns of the author.⁵ But to my mind, this dimension of the work raises a set of further questions: to what extent did the Chronicler understand his own writing of Israel’s history to be a prophetic and even liturgical act—receiving the Word of God, interpreting and applying it, and delivering it to God’s people in their concrete historical moment? To what extent is the Chronicler himself “prophesying” in the context of the Temple liturgy?

In this article I want to take up these broad questions—about the relationship between history and prophecy in Chronicles and the relationship between the Chroniclers’ historical testimony and the divine Word in which his work, as sacred Scripture, participates. My contention is that Chronicles can best be understood as a work of *prophetic historiography* characterized by the author’s profound assimilation and interpretation of the covenantal and liturgical worldview of the Hebrew Bible.

Josephus, the Jewish historian who wrote in the first-century A.D., said that the historical records found in the Bible are unique because “only prophets have written the original and earliest accounts of things as they learned them from God himself by inspiration.”⁶ Thus, the rabbis described the historical books, such as Samuel and Kings, as “the former prophets.”

We detect this prophetic sensibility in the Chronicler, who aims to do far more than retell Israel’s national story. He is delivering a word of divine assurance.

3 Peter R. Ackroyd, *The Chronicler in His Age*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 101 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 285; compare 280.

4 Martin J. Selman, *1 Chronicles: An Introduction and Commentary*, 2 vols., Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 10a-10b (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1994), 1:42.

5 See William M. Schniedewind, “Prophets and Prophecy in Chronicles,” in *The Chronicler as Historian*, eds. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 204–224; Pancratius Beentjes, “Prophets in the Book of Chronicles,” in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character, and Anonymous Artist*, ed. Johannes C. de Moor, Oudtestamentische Studiën 45 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 45–53.

6 Josephus, *Against Apion*, Bk. 1, 37, in *The Works of Josephus*, trans. William Whiston (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 776.

He wants his readers to understand that the history he is retelling is not finished; it is ongoing. God's divine purposes are still unfolding in the lives of his people—despite the catastrophe of the exile and the hesitant and anticlimactic beginnings of the people's return from exile and their restoration to Jerusalem. The Chronicler's intent is to recall to the people of Judah God's original intentions—not only for Israel, but for creation, and to help align their hearts and lives more faithfully with that divine plan. A prophetic exhortation attributed to King Jehoshaphat could serve as a summary of his authorial purposes in this book:

Hear me, Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem! Believe in the LORD your God, and you will be established; believe in his prophets and you will succeed. (2 Chron. 20:20)

In this article I want to explore more closely this work of prophetic historiography. I will begin by looking at the “worldview” we find in Chronicles—what does the Chronicler believe about history, how does he come to those beliefs, and how do his beliefs guide his selection of materials to include and exclude in his work? Second, I will look at the literary tools and narrative methods he employs for interpreting his sources and telling his story. The bulk of the article will focus on a close reading of how the Chronicler relates the central moments of his narrative—the establishment of the Davidic kingdom. I will concentrate on three pillars of this establishment—David's founding of Jerusalem as his religious and political capital; the Davidic covenant; and the origins of the Temple. I will conclude with a consideration of purposes of the Chronicler's prophetic historiography. Finally, I will suggest some of the reasons that I believe Chronicles opens fresh interpretive perspectives for our understanding of such key New Testament themes as the Church, the Kingdom, and the liturgy.

Although I will not be able to explore this latter final point fully, my contention is that Chronicles' prophetic historiography offers important perspectives and insights for the Christian interpretation of the New Testament.⁷ We see in the Chronicler what Jean Daniélou has noticed in the Old Testament prophets—a profoundly “typological interpretation of history,” in which the basis of present hope and the vision for the future is based upon a deep reading of God's patterns of dealing with his covenant people in the past.⁸ For the Chronicler, the key to history is the Kingdom of David established by divine covenant and embodied in the Temple at Zion and its liturgy. As the rise of this liturgical empire in the past triggered blessings for God's chosen people and for the world, so its future resto-

7 Nor will I be able to deal in this article with important critical issues regarding Chronicles. All of these issues I take up in my forthcoming theological commentary on 1 and 2 Chronicles, which will be published in the Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible series. The article here is a part of this larger work in progress.

8 See Jean Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1960), 157.

ration will bring to fulfillment God's plan for history. This prophetic hope gives Chronicles its air of expectation and anticipation, especially in his final portraits of the Davidic kings, Jehoshaphat, Josiah, and Hezekiah.

The authors of the New Testament in many ways lived under conditions similar to those in the Chroniclers' audience—trying to keep the faith while living in “exile” as believers in the true God under the domination of a foreign power and its gods. The Chronicler helps us to grasp the meaning of the new Testament, especially the Apocalypse of John, which shows the Church to herself in her essence—as a divine mystery, not just an institution, as a heavenly kingdom and not only an earthly body. The Chronicler's liturgical worldview, which builds to the dedication of the Temple and concludes with a Passover celebration in the renewed Davidic kingdom, also anticipates the New Testament, where the Church, through its participation in the heaven liturgy will be delivered through a succession of earthly empires that persecute her.

“A Chronicle of All Divine History”

The editors of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, grouped Chronicles as the last of the historical writings, following the books of Kings. The Septuagint title, *Paraleipomena*, indicates the editors' apparent belief that it contained mostly supplemental “things omitted or left behind” in those earlier historical accounts.

Yet contrary to the implications of its Septuagint title, Chronicles is far from a gathering of fragments or things left over. It is a coherent and compelling theology of history. There is ample evidence that the Chronicler is working with a relatively stable canon of Scriptures. His first words are drawn from the first pages of the Bible, while his final words are a quotation from the first words of Ezra, a work roughly contemporaneous to his. And he draws extensively from materials in every major division of the Hebrew Bible—the Pentateuch and the writings of the former prophets, definitely, but also from the prophets and the psalms.

But Chronicles is more than a kind of “rewritten Bible,”⁹ as some scholars have surmised, and he is doing more than biblical interpretation. The Chronicler's prophetic historiography is guided by a prayerful and profound biblical worldview—based on an understanding of what he believes the Scriptures reveal about the ways and means of God and his purposes for Israel and the world. The Chronicler's narrative is pervaded by a sense of what St. Paul and later Christian tradition would call the *oikonomia*, the divine economy through which God works out his saving purposes. For the Chronicler history has a *telos*—a definite direction and goal toward which it is driving, a goal established before the foundation of the world through the intention of God. This does not mean that history is reducible to eschatology in Chronicles. Chronicles is not apocalyptic literature but prophetic

9 See Brant Pitre, “Rewritten Bible,” in *The Westminster Dictionary of Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, ed. David E. Aune (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 413–414.

historiography; he looks forward not to the “end” of history, but to the fullness of time and the fulfillment of what is anticipated in Israel’s liturgy, which is always open to what God holds in store for the future.

This recognition about Chronicles was made early in the Christian interpretive tradition. St. Jerome called it “a chronicle of all divine history.”¹⁰ For the Chronicler, human history is *divine history*, which is to say that in human events we see signs of divine purpose; history is salvation history. History in Chronicles is a kind of dialogic and filial encounter between the Creator and his creation, and especially his chosen “firstborn,” the children of Israel.

We see this even in the deceptively routine, even seemingly mundane genealogies that introduce the Chronicler’s work. These genealogies, which run for nine full chapters, root the Chronicler’s narrative in the creation of the world and reflect the author’s familial and covenantal metaphysic. Drawing on the “book of generations” and the listing of the “families of the sons of Noah” found in the primordial history of Genesis 1–11, these opening genealogies connect Israel to the origins of the human family. As in Genesis, the seventy (or seventy-two) sons of Noah that the Chronicler lists are meant to symbolize all the nations of the world and to illustrate their familial relationship to a common father, Adam.¹¹

Chronicles is biblical history as family history; it is the story of the family of humanity. And at the center of the family of nations is the tribal family of Israel. As Ralph Klein observes:

This is a history of all days, a universal history, beginning with Adam and extending to Israel. ... [1 Chronicles 1] implies the diversity *and* the unity of the world and it suggests that Israel understood its role within the family of nations and as a witness to all humanity.¹²

The Chronicler’s prophetic word seeks to remind the people of who they are and where they came from. They are not just another defeated people, moving from captivity in Babylon to subjugation in their homeland under Cyrus. They are the children of God, the people with whom he has made his covenant, his firstborn among the peoples of the world, a holy and priestly people chosen to bring about his divine purposes for creation.¹³

10 St. Jerome, *Prologue to The Books of Samuel and Kings*, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2nd. Series, vol. 6 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 490; compare Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 1.

11 Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 273; Marshall D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies: With Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1969), 232.

12 Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 81.

13 See Exod. 4:22; 19:5–6; Deut. 7:6–7; 10:15; 14:2.

“One Flesh and One Bone”: Covenant and Kinship

This brings us to a pivotal feature of the Chronicler’s prophetic historiography—his sense of the covenant and the covenantal structure of the divine economy. Of crucial significance for interpreting Chronicles is the biblical notion that God’s covenant establishes sacred kinship, setting God, Israel, and humanity in a familial relationship.¹⁴ This relationship is not metaphorical or a sort of legal fiction. The covenant points to a sacramental consanguinity, a “blood” bond, calling Israel to be “one flesh and bone” with God—a nuptial-covenantal image we hear in the Chronicler.¹⁵ At the heart of the covenant is the divine Word, an oath sworn by God himself. The Chronicler will speak of the covenant as “the Word that he commanded for a thousand generations,” that is, as a divine oath that can never be broken.¹⁶ The identity of God himself is defined by his keeping of his covenant oath, as King David sings: “O LORD, God of Israel, there is no God like thee in heaven or on earth, keeping covenant ...”¹⁷

The sequence of biblical covenants is central to the Chronicler’s understanding of the divine economy. This can be traced from the early pages of his work. Beginning with Adam and the covenant of creation, his genealogy follows the path of God’s covenant through Noah, Abraham, Israel, and, finally and cumulatively, to David, with whom God makes a “covenant of salt,” that is, a new and everlasting covenant.¹⁸

His work focuses on David and the Kingdom and Temple liturgy established by the Davidic covenant. The making of this covenant is the climax of the Chronicler’s history, with the covenant presented as the fulfillment of God’s purposes for creation. The Davidic covenant is a *novum*, something unprecedented and radically new. But in the Chronicler’s presentation there is a profound unity in salvation history reflected in the continuity of God’s covenants. This is another way of saying that, for the Chronicler, the Davidic covenant advances the fulfillment of God’s purposes in all the covenants that came before, especially the covenants with Moses and Israel at Sinai and the foundational covenant, the covenant with Abraham.

The Mosaic and Abrahamic covenants illuminate the Chronicler’s understanding of salvation history. Indeed, as we will see, these covenants provide a kind of typological substructure for the history that unfolds in the Chronicler’s work.

14 See generally, Scott W. Hahn, *Kinship By Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God’s Saving Promises*, The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library (New Haven: Yale University, 2009); Scott Hahn, “Covenant in the Old and New Testaments: Some Current Research (1994–2004),” *Currents in Biblical Research* 3:2 (2005): 263–292.

15 1 Chron. 11:1; see also Exod. 24:6.

16 1 Chron. 16:15.

17 2 Chron. 6:14.

18 2 Chron. 13:5; 21:7.

The *telos* of history for the Chronicler is the fulfillment of God's three-fold promise to Abraham—to make Abraham's descendants a great nation, to give him a great name, and to make him the source of blessing for all the nations of the world.¹⁹ And the Chronicler's ideal of Israel is drawn implicitly from the mandate given to Moses and Israel at Sinai—to be God's "firstborn son" and "my own treasured possession among all the nations ... a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."²⁰

In Chronicles, David's kingdom fulfills the "covenant with the people of Israel when they came out Egypt."²¹ The Law of the Kingdom is the Torah given at Mount Sinai, "the book of the covenant,"²² now transformed at Zion into a law for all humanity, as we will see below. Further, as we will see, the Chronicler depicts David as a new Moses figure and describes the Kingdom of David and Solomon in terms that make clear the Kingdom's dependence on the covenant institutions established at Sinai—the "Ark of the Covenant of God," the central role of the Law and the Levitical priesthood, and the liturgical assembly, the *qāhāl* (Greek: *ekklēsia*).

Yet, in contrast to the other historical works in the canon, where the Mosaic covenant is dominant, the Chronicler seems to insist on the priority of the Abrahamic covenant. This again reflects a sound interpretation of the canonical record, where the Abrahamic covenant is foundational and Israel's liberation from Egypt and exodus to Sinai is brought about because "God remembered his covenant with Abraham."²³ The Chronicler may also feel that following the ordeal of the exile, the people need a return to their roots—to understand that long before the Exodus and Sinai there was Moriah, the site of Abraham's binding of Isaac and, in God's plan, the site of the Temple at Zion.²⁴

The Chronicler wants his readers to see the inner unity of salvation history—running from Adam to Abraham, to the covenant with Abraham's descendants at Sinai, and finally to the Kingdom of David at Zion, in which salvation history reaches its zenith.²⁵ The Kingdom of David is the fulfillment of Israel's mission to be a kingdom of priests—but again for the sake of God's original covenant pur-

19 Gen. 12:1–3; 15:7–21; 17:1–8; 22:16–18.

20 Exod. 4:22; 19:5–6. On the three-fold nature of the Abrahamic covenant, see Hahn, *Kinship By Covenant*, 101–135.

21 2 Chron. 5:10; 6:11.

22 2 Chron. 34:30.

23 Exod. 2:24; 6:5.

24 See 2 Chron. 3:1, which I will discuss more below.

25 "The real foundation of God's relationship with his people is rooted ... in the Abrahamic covenant, and this itself in the context of the primeval history. God's purpose for his people begins in creation, not at the Exodus. ... The list of names [in the Chronicler's genealogies], so easily read as a mere catalogue, is in fact an assurance of the ultimate origin of the relationship. 'Adam, Seth, Enoch'—that is where Israel, the true Israel begins." Ackroyd, *Chronicler in his Age*, 265.

poses with Abraham—to bring blessings to all the nations of the world through Abraham’s “seed.”

The Chronicler’s God is a God of the covenant, and the economy of salvation is for the sake of this covenant. When David brings the Ark of the Covenant to rest finally in Jerusalem, the great historical psalm he composes for the occasion includes these lines:

He is mindful of his covenant forever ... the covenant which
he made with Abraham ... an everlasting covenant to Israel. (1
Chron. 16:15–17)²⁶

The Typological Interpretation of History

The Chronicler’s history, as we have suggested, represents a deep reading of the canon of Israel’s scriptures. As many scholars have noted, the Hebrew canon is filled with examples of “inner-biblical” exegesis. Later texts comment upon or interpret earlier ones; new situations and people are understood and characterized by analogy to earlier texts. The large measure of what scholars call the Chronicler’s *Vorlage*, or source material, is drawn from the biblical books of Samuel and Kings. But in his rewriting and reinterpreting of his *Vorlage*, his work is shot through with scriptural references and allusions, in addition to direct quotations and citations. Like any good historian, the Chronicler provides a record of past figures, places, and events; but his accounting is written in such a way that these figures, places, and events often appear as *types*—signs, patterns, and precursors—intended to show his readers not only the past but their present reality from God’s perspective. For instance, David is sketched as both a new Adam and a new Moses; the Temple is a new creation and a new Tabernacle and altar.

Acknowledging this intensely inner-biblical and typological narrative technique is not at all to deny the historical reliability of the Chronicler’s account. Rather, I am suggesting that reporting history simply “as it happened” is not the Chronicler’s primary interest. What happened is crucial for the Chronicler. But only because in the *what* of history he sees revealed the patterns of divine intention and intervention—the *why* of history. The *why* of history is the reason for the Chronicler’s prophetic historiographical work.

The way the Chronicler comes to understand, interpret, and explain the *why* of salvation history is through *typology*. Chronicles is an intensely typological work. Indeed, Chronicles gives us a typological interpretation of history.²⁷ Typology for the Chronicler is a way to shed light on the unity of God’s plan in history, and to show the meaning of people, places, and events in light of God’s covenant promises and redemptive acts.

²⁶ Compare Ps. 105:8–10.

²⁷ See Scott Hahn, *Letter and Spirit: From Written Text to Living Word in the Liturgy* (New York: Doubleday, 2005), 19–25.

G. W. Trompf has suggested that the typological patterns of “recurrence” found in Chronicles and elsewhere in the Bible, are related to the use of these Scriptures in the rhythms of Israel’s cult and worship.²⁸ Indeed, the Chronicler’s extensive use of typology adds to the homiletical feel of his work. What we find in the Chronicler fits the definition of what the Jewish scholar, Michael Fishbane, has termed “aggadic historiography,” a theological and homiletic rereading of Israel’s “received historical *traditum* [“tradition”],” often utilizing various forms of typology. As Fishbane notes, biblical typology is far more than a literary device.

Typological exegesis ... celebrates new historical events in so far as they can be correlated with older ones. By this means it also reveals *unexpected unity in historical experience and providential continuity* in its new patterns and shapes. Accordingly, the perception of typologies is not solely an exegetical activity, it is, at the same time, a religious activity of the first magnitude. ... Typological exegesis is ... a disclosure of the plenitude and mysterious workings of divine activity in history.²⁹

For the Chronicler, the typological key to “the plenitude and mysterious workings of divine activity in history” is the Kingdom of David. Chronicles is the world’s family history written in a Davidic key, beginning in the deceptively simple genealogical lists which are actually careful compositions that progressively narrow the world’s family tree into a single branch—the line of the family of David.

For the remainder of this article we will concentrate on the Chronicler’s description of the rise of the Davidic kingdom, in which we see reflected both his covenantal worldview and his reliance on typology to illuminate the unity of the divine plan and the dynamic movements of history toward its fulfillment.

Salvation History and David, the New Moses

What Jon Levenson has observed about the Davidic ode, Psalm 78, is true for the Chronicler’s work: “It sees David’s divinely commissioned reign as the consummation of Israel’s *Heilsgeschichte* [salvation history], the very *telos* [fulfillment] of their national experience.”³⁰ The Kingdom established by David at Zion, “the city of David,” and the Temple built by David’s son, Solomon, are understood to be the pinnacle of God’s plan for creation. For the Chronicler, all human history since

28 G. W. Trompf, “Notions of Historical Recurrence in Classical Hebrew Historiography,” in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, ed. J. A. Emerton, Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 213–229; also G. E. Wright, “Cult and History: A Study of a Current Problem in Old Testament Interpretation,” *Interpretation* 16 (1962): 3–20.

29 Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (New York: Oxford University, 1985), 352.

30 Jon D. Levenson, “The Davidic Covenant and Its Modern Interpreters,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 205–219, at 218.

Adam has been straining towards its fulfillment in this man of God, David, who with his son after him, will reign upon “the throne of the Kingdom of the LORD over Israel,”³¹ which is the Kingdom of God on earth, a liturgical empire through which the blessings of God are to be bestowed upon all the nations of the earth in fulfillment of God’s covenant plans since creation.

Typology is at work from the moment the Chronicler introduces David in his narrative. The covenant meeting of David at Hebron is cast in Mosaic terms. The people refer to an oracle in which God declares to David: “You shall be shepherd of my people Israel, and you shall be prince over my people Israel.” The use of “my people” evokes the Exodus and the Sinai covenant.³² The shepherd image, which the Chronicler carries over from his sources, looks back to Moses, the archetypal leader of Israel, who was a shepherd in the image of God, who is called “the shepherd of Israel.”³³

This shepherd image will recur in the great covenant and dynastic oracle delivered by the prophet Nathan in 1 Chronicles 17, where again David is identified with God in a way that no other biblical figure is related to God. As Young Chae has observed: “[N]o specific king in Israel is described in shepherd imagery as $\Upsilon\text{H}\text{W}\text{H}$ ’s royal representative, with the exception of David before he assumed the throne. . . . The Old Testament tends to reserve shepherd imagery for $\Upsilon\text{H}\text{W}\text{H}$ and, significantly, extends its use only for $\Upsilon\text{H}\text{W}\text{H}$ ’s Davidic appointee.”³⁴

The Chronicler’s retention of this image may then be an effort to associate David’s kingdom with these prophetic hopes, especially those of Ezekiel, who foretold the reestablishment of David as *king, shepherd, and prince*, by an *everlasting covenant of peace* and the placement of his *dwelling and sanctuary* among the people forever—all core elements emphasized in the Chronicler’s Davidic portrait.³⁵

Throughout, the Chronicler also presents David as a new Moses and the Davidic kingdom as the full realization of the *qāhāl*, the liturgical assembly of Israel as a kingdom of priests and a holy nation in the years after the Exodus. As Dale Allison has noted, while David and Moses are the two dominant figures in the Hebrew Bible, the typological association of the two is not found elsewhere in Scripture and is rare in extrabiblical writings. This suggests that the Chronicler attaches considerable significance to this typological portrait.³⁶

31 1 Chron. 28:5.

32 1 Chron. 11:2; compare Exod. 3:7; 6:7.

33 For Moses as shepherd: Exod. 3:1; Ps. 77:20; Isa. 63:11. For God as shepherd of Israel: Gen. 49:24; Ps. 80:1.

34 Young S. Chae, *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 216 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006). Compare Ps. 78:71; Mic. 5:2–4.

35 Ezek. 34:1–28. See also Jer. 3:15; 23:1–4; Zec. 11:4–17.

36 Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 39.

In addition to the Mosaic shepherd imagery, we might note that in general David, like Moses, is presented as a warrior and cult founder, and as a man who speaks with the words and authority of God. The Chronicler describes both David and Moses as “man of God”³⁷ and “servant of God.”³⁸ The Ark of the Covenant, so important to Moses, is critical as well to David. As Moses interceded for the sins of the people, David intercedes to stop the plague caused by his ill-fated census, in a scene that evokes the angel of death from the Passover in Exodus. As sin kept Moses from entering the promised land, sin prevents David from realizing the fulfillment of his dream of building the Temple.³⁹ Finally, as Moses was given a pattern (*tabnît*) for the Tabernacle, David too is given a *tabnît*, not only for the Temple, but for the liturgical order of worship in the Temple.⁴⁰

Some commentators see in all this the Chronicler’s belief that Moses and Sinai have been eclipsed and replaced by David and Zion.⁴¹ But the evidence does not support any such supercessionist conclusions; to the contrary, the Chronicler portrays a strong continuity between the Mosaic and Davidic covenants. Zion goes beyond but not against Sinai. For the Chronicler, Sinai leads to Zion by way of Moriah, a statement that will become more intelligible as we proceed. David emerges in the Chronicler’s portrait as the “prophet like me from among ... your brethren” that Moses had promised.⁴² As the new Moses, David completes the mission of his forerunner. He leads the final conquest of the land, establishing the capital of his liturgical empire at Jerusalem and laying the foundations for the dwelling of God.

Jerusalem, Zion, Qābāl (Ekklesia), and Kingdom

Jerusalem is central to the Chronicler’s work. The Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Jebus), are introduced very early in the genealogy,⁴³ and the lines of both David and Levi are there rooted in Jerusalem.⁴⁴ Some scholars see a deliberate telescoping in the genealogies to present a *mappa mundi*, a map of the world that makes Israel the center of the nations, and Jerusalem the center of the world.⁴⁵ As

37 1 Chron. 23:14; 2 Chron. 8:14; 30:16.

38 1 Chron. 6:49; 17:4, 7; 2 Chron. 24:9.

39 Num. 20:1–13, 24; 27:12–14; Deut. 3:23–27; 32:48–52; Ps. 106:32–33; compare 1 Chron. 22:7–10; 28:2–3.

40 1 Chron. 28:11–19; compare Exod. 29:9, 40.

41 Allison, *The New Moses*, 39.

42 See Deut. 18:15–19.

43 1 Chron. 1:14; 11:4.

44 1 Chron. 3:4; 6:10, 32.

45 John W. Wright, “Remapping Yehud: The Borders of Yehud and the Genealogies of Chronicles,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, eds. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 67–90, at 74.

the genealogy concludes with a listing of the first exiles to return to Jerusalem,⁴⁶ the entire work ends with Cyrus summoning God's people to come home to Jerusalem.⁴⁷ Indeed, the Chronicler's "Zion-centrism" has the effect of relativizing the exile—God's plans are being advanced, not just in spite of the exile, but in and through the exile.

Jerusalem, also identified as "the city of David, which is Zion," is presented as the true capital of "the Kingdom of the LORD."⁴⁸ By some estimates, nearly one-quarter of all the references to Jerusalem in the entire Hebrew Bible occur in the Chronicler. Isaac Kalimi has noted: "Jerusalem is depicted by the Chronicler ... as an absolutely theocratic city, 'the city of God/the Lord' in the full sense of the word, more than in any other biblical work."⁴⁹

The Chronicler understands Jerusalem in terms of God's promise to Moses—that upon entering the Promised Land he would establish a central sanctuary as a place where his holy name would dwell with his chosen people. For the Chronicler, Jerusalem and the Temple built there fulfill this command, found in Deuteronomy 12. Echoes, allusions, and quotations of this promise are heard throughout Chronicles—the cutting off of enemies and the establishment of peace,⁵⁰ burnt offerings in the house where the Lord's name dwells,⁵¹ eating before the Lord.⁵² Thus God will tell Solomon, "I have chosen Jerusalem that my name may be there and I have chosen David."⁵³

In the Mosaic literature, God's dwelling among his people is integrally related to the Ark of the Covenant.⁵⁴ Thus, after the conquest of Jerusalem, David moves methodically to restore the Ark to the people. David's deep concern for the Ark, documented by earlier biblical historians, is greatly amplified by the Chronicler, who refers to the Ark by names not found elsewhere in the tradition, such as "footstool of our God" and "the holy Ark."⁵⁵ In evoking the Ark, the Chronicler again

46 See 2 Chron. 5:2; 1 Chron. 9:3, 34, 38.

47 2 Chron. 36:28.

48 1 Chron. 28:5.

49 Isaac Kalimi, "Jerusalem—The Divine City: The Representation of Jerusalem in Chronicles Compared with Earlier and Later Jewish Compositions," in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*, eds. M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie and Gary N. Knoppers, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 371 (New York: T & T Clark, 2003), 189–205, at 191.

50 Deut. 12:29; 1 Chron. 17:8.

51 Deut. 12: 5, 11; 2 Chron. 2:4; 6:10.

52 Deut. 12:7, 18; 1 Chron. 29:22.

53 2 Chron. 6:6.

54 See Exod. 25:10–22; Num. 10:33; Josh. 3:3, 6; 6:6–16; 10:35–36; Deut. 10:1–5, 8; 31:9, 24–26; compare Ps. 132:8.

55 1 Chron. 28:2; 2 Chron. 35:3.

summons the historical memory of the Exodus and the people's entry into the land. The Ark becomes the gathering point of God's holy people.

It is striking that, beginning with David's convocation of Israel to embark on the mission of returning the Ark,⁵⁶ the Chronicler repeatedly refers to the liturgical assembly of all Israel as the *qāhāl*. Like the Ark and Jerusalem, the *qāhāl* designates something essential for the Chronicler. Indeed, while the term is found forty-eight times in the Pentateuch, it is used thirty-seven times by the Chronicler.⁵⁷ And again, in its use we see a deep inner-biblical relation with Moses and the Exodus and Sinai tradition. This term (almost always translated *ekklesia* in the Septuagint) first arises canonically in the accounts of the Exodus. The first appearance of *qāhāl* in the canon, in fact, is found on the night of the Exodus, in the divine instructions for how the "whole assembly" (*kōl qāhāl*) is to prepare for the journey.⁵⁸

The Chronicler will use that same expression, *kōl qāhāl*, at pivotal moments in the history of David,⁵⁹ and in general *qāhāl* designates the ideal "form" of Israel for the Chronicler. Israel is fundamentally a *qāhāl*, a kingdom of priests, a liturgical empire. Israel is not primarily a national entity organized for military, political, or economic purposes; all those ordinary rationales for governments are to be ordered in Israel to the singular overriding reason of giving worship to God. This is what Israel exists for—to be the *qāhāl*; and as the *qāhāl*, Israel fulfills its mission as God's first-born among the nations. As *qāhāl*, Israel is a people gathered in the presence of God before the Ark, which, at a climactic moment in the Chronicler's narrative, will be installed by Solomon in the Temple.⁶⁰ The *qāhāl* is a people of sacrifice and praise.

The Royal High Priests: Melchizedek and David

This fundamentally liturgical understanding of Israel is anticipated in the Chronicler's depiction of the joyous procession that marks the return of the Ark.⁶¹ David is portrayed as both Israel's king and its chief priest. He is clad as the Levites are in a fine linen robe and an ephod, garb elsewhere in the Scriptures associated with the vestments of Aaron the High Priest and the Levitical priests.⁶² In another priestly move, David officiates in the sacrificial offering of seven bulls and seven rams. David's portrayal as priest-king is unmistakable. He does things here and

56 1 Chron. 13:2, 4.

57 See William Johnston, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 2 vols., Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 253 (New York: T & T Clark, 1997), 1:168.

58 Exod. 12:6.

59 See 1 Chron. 13:4; 29:10, 20; 2 Chron. 23:3; 30:4, 23.

60 2 Chron. 5.

61 1 Chron. 15:25–16:36.

62 See Exod. 28:4, 31, 34.

elsewhere in Chronicles that only priests are found doing in other books of the Bible, such as making burnt offerings and peace offerings⁶³ and imparting God's blessing upon the people.⁶⁴

Certainly the Chronicler is here continuing the "new Moses" theme. Moses, too, gathered (*qhl*) the *qāhāl*, pitched the tent for the Ark, officiated over the sacrifices, and blessed the children of Israel.⁶⁵ And the installation of the Ark at Zion, the place chosen by God for his name to dwell, marks the summation of the process begun with Moses' completion of the Tabernacle at Sinai. David's blessing of the people echoes Moses' earlier blessing at the close of Exodus because his establishment of the Ark in Jerusalem marks the completion of the conquest of the land promised to Abraham. David's extraordinary ritual feeding of "all Israel, both women and men,"⁶⁶ also associates him with the ritual feasts of Moses and the manna in the wilderness, but also with the promise of Deuteronomy 12—that the people would one day eat in the presence of God in the place where God will choose to dwell.⁶⁷

There also may be a "new Melchizedek" typology at work here, another connection with the Abrahamic covenant. In fact, I believe David's choice of Jerusalem as his capital and his priestly-cultic understanding of his kingship are rooted in the mysterious figure of this King of Salem and priest of God Most High, who brought out bread and wine and blessed Abraham in the name of the maker of heaven and earth.⁶⁸ The identification of Melchizedek's Salem and David's Jerusalem is made in the psalms, and some scholars believe the account of Melchizedek's blessing of Abraham played a central role in the traditions of Jerusalem, helping to establish the continuity of the Kingdom of Israel with the covenant promises made to the patriarch.⁶⁹ Prior to David's procession with the Ark there is only one biblical precedent for a king performing priestly functions—Melchizedek, who is also the first person to be designated as a "priest" in the canon and, according to later Jewish interpreters such as Philo and Josephus, represents the divine ideal for the priesthood.⁷⁰

63 See Num. 3:6–8, 14–38; 4:47; 6:16–17; 8:14–26.

64 See Num. 6:22–27; Deut. 10:8; 21:5.

65 Num. 20:10; Exod. 33:7; Exod. 24:7–8; Exod. 39:42–3; Deut. 33:1; see Johnston, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 1:190.

66 1 Chron. 16:3.

67 See Deut. 12:7, 18.

68 Gen. 14:18–20. On David as a "new Melchizedek," see Hahn, *Kinship By Covenant*, 192–194.

69 See Pss. 76:2; 110:4. Bruce Vawter, *Genesis: A New Reading* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), 198.

70 See Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation*, 3:79, in *The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition*, tran. C. D. Yonge, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 59; Josephus, *The Wars of the Jews*, Bk. 6, Chap. 10, 438, in *Works of Josephus*, 750.

The Chronicler is certainly in contact with these traditions and, more significantly, with the uniquely important tradition in Psalm 110:4 that associates Melchizedek with the divine sonship and perpetual priesthood conferred by divine oath upon the Davidic kings: “The Lord has sworn ... You are a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.”⁷¹ There is considerable scholarly consensus that this psalm, attributed to David, was written before Israel’s exile and it is likely one of the oldest in the Psalter. It may have originated in the liturgical context of an enthronement ceremony for a new Davidic king, possibly even the coronation of Solomon.⁷² For our purposes, we notice important points of contact between the themes and language of the psalm and the Chronicler’s work. For instance, the psalm refers to the universal reign of Zion’s king over the nations, the divine deliverance of the king from his enemies, and the apparent filial relation of the Davidic king to God. We notice, too, that the psalm speaks of a “footstool” (*hadom*) for God—a rare word in the Bible used uniquely in Chronicles and the Psalter to describe the Ark.⁷³

Reading canonically, I suggest that the Chronicler is evoking these ancient Abrahamic and Davidic traditions. With the Ark established at Zion, the God Most High (*’el ’elyon*), the maker of heaven and earth,⁷⁴ sits enthroned above the nations,⁷⁵ ruling through his “first-born, the highest of the kings of the earth,”⁷⁶ who is priest and king. In addition, the Chronicler appears to be evoking prophetic hopes for a Davidic deliverer and ruler. The ideal priest-king of the past foreshadows the one who is to come. Judaism, perhaps even in the time of the Chronicler, read Psalm 110 in messianic terms, and already in the exilic prophecy of Ezekiel, we sense a similar mood. Ezekiel envisioned the restoration of the exiles, the reunification of the divided Kingdom, and the reestablishment of the Temple under God’s “servant David.”⁷⁷ As Jon Levenson has noted, the Davidic figure in Ezekiel is a priest-king and the restored Israel a kingdom of priests.

Ezekiel hoped ... for a community so fundamentally liturgical and sacral in nature that the Davidide ... could only be a liturgical figurehead like the High Priest. ... Ezekiel 40–48 hopes not for a restoration of the monarchy, but for a restoration of the monarch, who is now redefined according to his deepest and

71 Ps. 110:4

72 On the textual issues regarding Ps. 110, see Carroll Stuhlmueller, *Psalms 2 (Psalms 73–150)* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983), 130–131.

73 1 Chron. 28:2; compare Ps. 110:2; see also Pss. 99:5; 132:7; Lam. 2:1; Isa. 66:1.

74 Gen. 14:18–22.

75 1 Chron. 13:6.

76 Ps. 89:26–27.

77 Ezek. 37:20–29.

truest function as the servant of God, or devoted to the divine service, to liturgy.⁷⁸

Prayer and Prophecy in the Davidic Covenant

As we have said, the centerpiece of Chronicles is the covenant that God makes with David in 1 Chronicles 17. In the context of his narrative, the Davidic covenant is a covenant of grant that rewards David's single-minded dedication to restoring Israel as a priestly kingdom and desiring to build a house for the Ark.⁷⁹ And again, we see that the Chronicler's account, divided into two sections—the prophetic oracle of David⁸⁰ and David's prayer of response⁸¹—is redolent with biblical allusion and typology. The term “house” (*bayit*), referring both to the royal dynasty and the Temple, occurs fourteen times, while the term “servant” (*'ebed*) appears twelve times. The use of *bayit*, while a common term, in this context evokes the covenant drama of the house of Israel leading up to their flight from the “house of bondage” in Egypt.

David's prayer in response to Nathan's oracle, with its rhythmic repetitions of the word “servant” also evokes the Exodus. The early chapters of Exodus involve an ironic play on the notion of “service” and “servitude.” The cruel bondage of the Israelites under Pharaoh is described with the same root word as the religious worship and ritual service that God desires of them.⁸² We have a clash of “services”—slavery to worldly empire versus the liturgical service of the living God. The climactic declaration of Israel's divine primogeniture among the nations is made in terms of the “service” that God desires:

And you shall say to Pharaoh, “Thus says the Lord, ‘Israel is my firstborn son, and I say to you, Let my son go that he may serve me.’” (Exod. 4:22)⁸³

78 Jon D. Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48*, Harvard Semitic Monograph 10 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976), 143; compare Hahn, *Kinship By Covenant*, 164–166.

79 1 Chron. 17:1–2; see Moshe Weinfeld, “The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 184–204, at 185.

80 1 Chron. 17:3–15.

81 1 Chron. 17:16–27.

82 Compare Exod. 1:13–14; 5:18; 14:5, 12 (servitude to the Pharaoh) and Exod. 3:12; 4:22; 7:16; 9:1, 13; 10:3, 24–26. Note also the use of *'ebed* to describe the priestly liturgical service in the Tabernacle (Num. 3:7–8; 4:23; 7:5; 16:9).

83 See Scott W. Hahn, “Worship in the Word: Toward a Liturgical Hermeneutic,” *Letter & Spirit* 1 (2005): 101–136, at 110–113.

That the Exodus might not be too far from David's mind is clear from his two references to Israel's "redemption from Egypt" in his response to Nathan's oracle.⁸⁴ Indeed, there is a sense of covenant renewal to David's prayer. He prays while seated "before the LORD" (*lipnê YHWH*), an expression that frequently describes ritual and liturgical prayer, often in the presence of the Ark.⁸⁵ With its liturgical rhythms and repetitions, the prayer suggests that David is not only accepting God's covenant for himself, but also that he is renewing on behalf of all Israel the covenant made at Sinai.

What other nation on earth is like thy people Israel ... whom thou didst redeem from Egypt? And thou didst make thy people Israel to be thy people forever; and thou, O LORD, didst become their God. And now, O LORD ... do as thou hast spoken, and thy name will be established and magnified forever, saying, "The LORD of hosts, the God of Israel, is Israel's God," and the house of thy servant David will be established before thee. (1 Chron. 17:21–24)

The echoes of earlier biblical covenantal language here are unmistakable, as they are in Nathan's oracle. Speaking through Nathan, God employs the vocabulary of the Sinaitic covenant, identifying David as his "servant" and a "shepherd," making repeated references to "my people Israel," and calling Israel's king his "son." The covenant with David, the new Moses, is clearly a kind of renewal of the Sinai covenant, an affirmation of God's election of Israel to be his people and to be their God.⁸⁶ Israel's election is affirmed as "for ever" (*ad 'ôlām*), an expression used seven times in the covenant account, as the son of David becomes the recipient of God's paternal love for Israel.⁸⁷ It is significant, too, that David begins his responsorial prayer with what appears to be a deliberate echo of Moses' response to God's calling at Horeb. As Moses wondered: "Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh?" David in amazement asks: "Who am I ... that thou hast brought me this far?"⁸⁸

Again however, we are invited here to also consider the importance of the Abrahamic covenant for the Chronicler's understanding of salvation history. In fact, we can note close similarities between the dynastic promises to David and the covenant oaths sworn to Abraham. David, too, is promised a great *name*,⁸⁹

84 1 Chron. 17:21.

85 See the section on "before Yahweh" in Ian Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 151 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 131–197.

86 See Exod. 6:7; Lev. 26:12; Hos. 1:8–9; Jer. 31:33.

87 Exod. 4:22.

88 Compare Exod. 3:11; 1 Chron. 17:16; 29:14.

89 1 Chron. 17:8.

and a place, a land in which his people will be “planted.”⁹⁰ The “house” that God promises to build for David is a family, a line of descendants who would reign forever (*ad ‘ôlām*) over Israel.⁹¹

At the heart of the covenant with David, as there was at the heart of the covenant with Abraham, is the promise of “offspring” (*zera’*, literally “seed”).

When your days are fulfilled to go to be with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring after you, one of your own sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for me, and I will establish his throne forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son; I will not take my steadfast love from him as I took it from him who was before you, but I will confirm him in my house and in my Kingdom forever and his throne shall be established forever. (1 Chron. 17: 11–14)⁹²

In David’s prayer celebrating the return of the Ark, he had addressed the people as “offspring [*zera’*] of Abraham.”⁹³ In Nathan’s dynastic oracle, God’s promise to Abraham’s seed is fastened forever to this promise to David’s seed. Thus, the Davidic covenant—the final covenant of the Hebrew Bible—and the Kingdom it establishes, is deeply rooted in the fundamental biblical covenant with Abraham.⁹⁴

The Temple and the Testing of God’s Son

For the Chronicler, the Davidic covenant is ordered to the establishment of the Temple and the liturgy. In the narrative, Nathan’s oracle and David’s response are followed immediately by David’s preparations for the building of the Temple and Solomon’s accession to the throne. The warfare in 1 Chronicles 18–20 is depicted as David’s bringing about the “rest” promised by God as a precondition for building God’s house; again, the promises of Deuteronomy 12 seem central to his understanding of these wars. Even the spoils of war are dedicated to the Temple.⁹⁵

But, at a moment in his narrative when the world could be said to be almost in a state of “sabbath” rest, the Chronicler disrupts his readers’ expectations—depicting a catastrophic pestilence in Israel brought on because of an ill-advised military

90 1 Chron. 17:9; 28:9.

91 1 Chron. 17:11–12; 28:4.

92 Gen. 12:7; 15:5, 18; 17:7–10; 22:17–18.

93 1 Chron. 16:13.

94 “Through his anointed king, Yahweh exercised his dominion over the nations of the earth, communicating his blessing to them through his people of Israel. ... What Yahweh had first promised to Abraham, and reaffirmed to succeeding patriarchs, had been brought to marvelous fruition with the emergence of the Israelite state under David.” R. E. Clements, *Abraham and David: Genesis XV and Its Meaning for Israelite Tradition* (Naperville, IL: A. R. Allenson, 1967), 59.

95 See 1 Chron. 18:8, 10–11.

census ordered by David in 1 Chronicles 21. We see in this another example of the Chronicler's typological interpretation of history. His canonical source in 2 Samuel also records David's illicit census, but without any of the cosmic drama found in the Chronicler, who introduces a supernatural "Satan" and an avenging angel of the Lord as key figures in the narrative. In fact, in 2 Samuel, the story is inserted with little comment as an addendum following David's final speeches to the people and prior to the long account of his final days.⁹⁶

The Chronicler, by contrast, positions the census and plague at a pivotal moment in David's reign and casts it as a turning point in salvation history. The entire episode in 1 Chronicles 21 is a unique literary construct of the Chronicler, and is layered with allusions to earlier Old Testament history. It is one of the most intensely dramatic episodes in all the canon. The Chronicler depicts the census event as a covenant "testing," similar to the testings of Abraham and the children of Israel in the wilderness. That David viewed this as a supreme test is indicated by his great final prayer in Chronicles, where he seems to refer to this episode: "I know, my God, that thou tries (*bhn*) the heart." The word that David uses here, *bhn*, is related semantically and conceptually to *nasah*, the biblical term used elsewhere to describe God's testing of his covenant family.⁹⁷ God "tested" (*nasah*) Abraham in asking for the sacrifice of his only son, and again sought to "prove" (*nasah*) his firstborn Israel in the wilderness.⁹⁸

The Chronicler is describing just such a test, although he does not use the word. Our clues to his intent are not only the inner-biblical allusions in the text but also the appearance of the figure of Satan. Satan is not mentioned in the Chronicler's source and this is one of only three places in the Hebrew canon where the proper name "Satan" is used; the Chronicler is obviously drawing from these other rare portraits in composing his drama. In Job and Zechariah, *Šātān* is a supernatural figure, under the control of God, but granted a quasi-legal authority to "accuse" or to test the bonds of the covenant and the faithfulness of the believer.⁹⁹ The Targum, the Aramaic paraphrase of the Scriptures, gives us an accurate

96 See 2 Sam. 24:1–25; see H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, The New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 142.

97 Birger Gerhardsson has noted that *nsh* is "normally used within the covenant relationship—interpreted in the widest sense to cover all covenants between God and his worshippers whether the latter are a nation, tribe, family, or ... individual (patriarch or king). In these contexts the word seems to imply primarily a testing of the partner in the covenant to see whether he is keeping his side of the agreement." *The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4: 1–11 & par.): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash*, Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 2 (Lund: Gleerup, 1966), 26–27.

98 Gillis Gerleman, "*nsh*, to test," in *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 3 vols., eds. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann (Peabody, MA: Henrickson, 1997): 2:741–742. For *nasah*, see Gen. 22:1; Exod. 16:4; 20:20; Deut. 8:2, 16. For *bhn*, see Pss. 26:2; 17:3; 66:10; 81:7; Job 23:10; 34:36; Jer. 12:3; 20:12; Ezek. 21:13; Zech. 13:9; *bhn* and *nasah* are used as parallels in Pss. 26:2; 95:9.

99 Zech. 3:1. See generally, Peggy L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven: Šātān in the Hebrew Bible*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 43 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1988).

interpretation of what the Chronicler intends, envisioning a scene similar to that in Job—with God permitting Israel’s temptation as he permitted Job’s: “The Lord raised up Satan against Israel, and he incited David to number Israel.”¹⁰⁰

There is nothing intrinsically wrong with taking a military census, which is what David calls for, a numbering of “men who drew the sword.”¹⁰¹ There are other censuses taken in Chronicles,¹⁰² and the Mosaic Law sets out the requirements for the kind of census that David is apparently taking here—although the Law does warn of a deadly penalty if the proper procedures are not followed.¹⁰³ An allusion to the Law may be intended here, as the penalty prescribed by Moses, a “plague” (*negep*) is similar to the “pestilence” (*maggēpâ*) visited upon the people for David’s census.¹⁰⁴

However, God’s displeasure would seem to stem less from David’s failure to pay the half-shekel tax required by the Law than from a deeper violation of the spirit of the covenant. We hear this in the warning of Joab, David’s military chief—“May the LORD add to his people a hundred times as many as they are.”¹⁰⁵ This is an obvious reference to God’s covenant promise to multiply Abraham’s descendants so greatly that they could not be numbered. This reading is confirmed by a later reference to David’s census, in which it is said that “wrath came upon Israel” because “the LORD had promised to make Israel as many as the stars of heaven.”¹⁰⁶ The point is that even though the Lord had given him victory over Israel’s enemies,¹⁰⁷ David still does not trust totally in God’s covenant promises; the failure of his census test proves that—he still wants to “know the number” of battle-ready men available to him.¹⁰⁸

As in the cases of Abraham and Israel under Moses, God permits a testing of David and his fledgling kingdom. But why? The answer is related to the deep biblical theme of primogeniture. The covenant, as we have noted, establishes a father-son kinship between God and Israel.¹⁰⁹ The Davidic covenant for the first time establishes a direct filial tie between God and his chosen ruler for Israel. Indeed, the Davidic covenant marks the first time in the Hebrew canon that an individual

100 Targum Chronicles 21:1. Text in *The Targums of Ruth and Chronicles*, trans. with introd. and notes by J. Stanley McIvor, *The Aramaic Bible*, vol. 19 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994); see also Job 2:3, where God is “incited” by Satan.

101 1 Chron. 21:5.

102 See 1 Chron. 11:1; 23:3; 2 Chron. 2:17; 17:13–19; 25:5; 26:11–13.

103 Exod. 30:11–16.

104 Compare Exod. 30:12; 1 Chron. 21:17, 22.

105 1 Chron. 21:3.

106 1 Chron. 27:23–24; compare Gen. 15:5; 22:17; see also Gen. 13:16.

107 1 Chron. 18:6, 13.

108 1 Chron. 21:2.

109 See generally, F. Charles Fensham, “Father and Son as Terminology for Treaty and Covenant,” in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. Hans Goedicke (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1971), 121–135, at 128–133.

is identified as the son of God. This suggests a previously unimaginable intimacy between God and his chosen king, who can call God *'ābi*, “my Father.”¹¹⁰ The king, then, must truly be a man after the heart of God. And for that he requires a divine pedagogy that includes testing the strength of his faith. As Birger Gerhardsson notes:

The covenant relationship was seen in terms of the father-son relationship, and so it became natural to regard temptation as the paternal act of discipline and a part of the son’s upbringing. The development in this direction began early. ... The verb *nsh* is sometimes placed in parallelism with *bhn* “to test by trial,” or *srp*, “to test by fire,” “purge,” and found with verbs like *ysr*, *hwkyh*, and *'nh*, “to mortify,” “to discipline,” “to bring up.” ... Since the covenant relationship is defined in family terms these aspects are naturally taken up into the picture. In the Book of Proverbs there are many sayings from the ancient patriarchal pedagogic about the hard discipline which a man has to impose on his son.¹¹¹

Through the temptation of the census, the son of God, Israel, and Israel’s king are being trained and disciplined in God’s fatherly ways. Moses had described Israel’s testing in the wilderness in such terms: “Know then in your heart that, as a man disciplines (*ysr*) his son, the LORD your God disciplines (*ysr*) you.”¹¹² In his typological writing of his account, the Chronicler clearly has the wilderness years in view, in addition to the testing of Abraham. David’s sin, like Israel’s in the wilderness, threatens God’s firstborn with extinction. God sends “the angel of the LORD destroying”¹¹³ — the same expression used to describe the angel of death sent to destroy the Egyptians’ firstborn in Exodus;¹¹⁴ the inescapable and deadly irony is that the angel who once destroyed Israel’s enemy is now being sent to destroy Israel.

The Chronicler draws his dramatic picture with allusions to two episodes from the late wilderness era. The first allusion is to the blessing of Israel by Balaam, who had been hired by the Moabite king to curse Israel. In Numbers 22, God places an angel as an “adversary” (*štn*) to stand up against (*'md*) Balaam and block his way, just as he sends *Šātān* against (*'md*) David and Israel.¹¹⁵ Balaam’s eyes are

110 Ps. 89:27.

111 Gerhardsson, *Testing of God’s Son*, 32; see also James A. Sanders, *Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism* (Rochester, NY: Colgate Rochester, 1955).

112 Deut. 8:5.

113 1 Chron. 21:12.

114 See Exod. 12:13, 23.

115 Compare Num. 22:22, 31; 1 Chron. 21:1, 15, 16;

opened to see an angel with a drawn sword in his hand, as David's eyes are opened to see the destroying angel, also with a drawn sword in his hand.¹¹⁶ Balaam falls on his face at the sight, as David and the elders do.¹¹⁷ And as Balaam confesses, "I have sinned," David also uses these exact words.¹¹⁸ The Chronicler also draws from an episode in Joshua.¹¹⁹ Joshua, like David, lifts up his eyes to see a man standing against (*'md*) him with a drawn sword in his hand.¹²⁰ Joshua too falls on his face when the "man" identifies himself as the commander of the Lord's army and tells him that he is standing on holy ground.

More than literary artistry is at work in the Chronicler's use of these allusions. The episodes in both Joshua and Numbers take place when Israel is encamped across the Jordan from Jericho—that is, on the threshold of the Promised Land.¹²¹ As the fragmentary story in Joshua ends with him recognizing that he is in a holy "place" (*māqôm*), Balaam's encounter with the angel in Numbers 22 leads to his erecting altars and offering sacrifices in Numbers 23. And in addition to prophesying a king for Israel, Balaam refers to the very covenant promise that David is guilty of forgetting in 1 Chronicles 21—"Who can count the dust of Jacob, or number the fourth part of Israel?"¹²² Here in Chronicles, what these earlier stories anticipated is being fulfilled. Joshua's conquest of the land has been completed by David, and David's encounter with the sword-bearing angel will now lead to the revealing of the definitive holy place (*māqôm*) and altar.¹²³

Sacrifice at the Threshing Floor of Moriah

The meaning of this place, this altar, and the sacrifices that David will offer depends on still another inner-biblical typology that is played out on the threshing floor of a certain Ornan, a Jebusite, or resident of Jerusalem. The Chronicler places Jerusalem, and this mysterious threshing floor, a cultic site, at the center of the cosmos—at the intersection of heaven and earth. The angel who is to destroy Jerusalem is depicted as standing by the threshing floor and standing between earth and heaven.¹²⁴ At this crossroads the fate of the covenant people is to be decided, not to mention the future of the nations. As the Chronicler describes the threat to Israel with images from the killing of the firstborn in Exodus, he

116 Compare Num. 22:23, 29, 31; 1 Chron. 21:16.

117 Compare Num. 22:31; 1 Chron. 21:16.

118 Compare Num. 22:34; 1 Chron. 21:7, 17.

119 Josh. 5:13–15.

120 Compare Josh. 5:13; 1 Chron. 21:16, 20.

121 Compare Num. 22:1; Josh. 5:13.

122 Num. 23:10.

123 1 Chron. 21:22, 25.

124 1 Chron. 21:15–16.

describes their deliverance from the destroying angel by analogy to Abraham's offering of his firstborn in the *aqedah* in Genesis 22.

The scenes have marked similarities. Both David and Abraham are said to "lift up their eyes to see" visions of divine import. In Chronicles, the angel stands between heaven and earth, his sword unsheathed and raised above Jerusalem, as Abraham put forth his hand and raised his knife above Isaac. By divine command, the hands of both the killer angel and Abraham are stayed. In place of both the firstborn people of Israel and the beloved firstborn Isaac burnt offerings are made instead. Both stories end with an apparent allusion to the Temple: David recognizes that this threshing floor is to be the site of the house of God and Israel's altar of burnt offering; Abraham names the site "the LORD will see" because, as he had hoped, God had seen to it to provide the lamb for the sacrifice instead of Isaac. Thus the account in Genesis concludes with an apparent anticipation of the Temple: "Thus it is said to this day, 'On the Mount of the LORD he shall be seen.'"¹²⁵

The Chronicler sees the establishment of the Temple as the fulfillment of the Abraham story. The Mount of the LORD is now identified with Zion, Jerusalem.¹²⁶ The Chronicler's typological understanding is explained more fully later, when he reports that Solomon began to build the Temple "on Mount Moriah where the LORD had appeared to David his father, at the place that David had appointed, on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite."¹²⁷ Moriah, which according to popular etymology means "the vision of the LORD" (*mōriyyā*) is only mentioned in one other place in Scripture—as the site of the binding of Isaac. And nowhere else in Scripture is it recorded that the Temple was built on the place where Abraham offered Isaac in Genesis 22.¹²⁸

David's cry of recognition, "Here shall be the house of the LORD!"¹²⁹ is the summation of a careful literary effort by the Chronicler. With an intricate series of allusions to every stage of Israel's history of worship—from the patriarchs Abraham and Isaac at Moriah, to the Tabernacle of Moses in the wilderness, to Joshua's conquest of the land and the period of the Judges—the Chronicler illustrates the continuity of the Temple with God's purposes and suggests that his saving plan has reached its pinnacle. We find this interpretation in the Targum. Moriah is there described as the site where "all the generations worship before the

125 Gen. 22:14.

126 Compare Pss. 24:3; 48:1; 99:9; Isa. 2:3; 13:4; 18:7; 30:29; see also Exod. 4:27; Num. 10:33.

127 2 Chron. 3:1.

128 Compare Gen. 22:1; 2 Chron. 3:1. As Levenson points out, in both Genesis 22 and 1 Chronicles 21 "there is a play on [the word] Moriah and the verb *rā'ā*, 'to see,' and its derivative nouns *mar'ā* and *mar'ē*, meaning 'sight, spectacle, vision.' The visionary experiences of Abraham and of David here serve as authorization for the inauguration of the Temple on Mount Zion/Moriah. The theophany authenticates the sanctuary." Jon Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1985), 94–95.

129 1 Chron. 22:1.

Lord”—not only Abraham, Isaac, and David, but also Jacob, whose vision of the heavenly temple is said to have occurred there as well.¹³⁰

The Chronicler wants his readers to see the Temple in profound continuity with this foundational moment in salvation history—when God swore an oath to Abraham to bless all the nations through his seed. In Chronicles, the holy place (*māqôm*) where God provided the sacrifice that spared Abraham’s firstborn and triggered the swearing of his oath of blessing, has now become the holy ground where sacrifice will be offered to spare the lives of the children of Abraham. As God accepted the burnt offerings of Abraham in this place, on this same site, God dwelling in his Temple will accept the praise and offerings of his people and grant them his mercy.

In recasting the census episode as a covenant test, the Chronicler reveals Israel’s God to be a God of surprises, able to bring about his purposes even in the midst of apparent disaster—even in spite of the weaknesses and failures of his appointed covenant mediators. The covenant test leads to repentance and in that repentance we see the origins of the Temple liturgy. The liturgy of the Temple will be a liturgy of reconciliation and atonement, of making a substitutionary offering for sin. But it will also be a liturgy of joyous thanksgiving, for Israel realizes that it is saved by the faithfulness of God to his covenant oath to Abraham. The divine oath, sworn in recognition of Abraham’s fidelity in his covenant test, is what spared Israel in this moment of David’s infidelity. We find this interpretation in the Targum of 1 Chronicles 21:

When he [God] was destroying it [Jerusalem], he observed the ashes of the binding of Isaac which were at the base of the altar, and he remembered his covenant with Abraham which he had set up with him on the mountain of worship; [he observed] the sanctuary-house which was above, where the souls of the righteous are, and the image of Jacob which was engraved on the throne of glory, and he repented in himself of the evil which he had planned.¹³¹

We notice too that David is portrayed in this episode as both a repentant sinner seeking forgiveness and as a royal High Priest interceding on behalf of his people with petitionary prayer, burnt offerings, and peace offerings. The intersection of these two portraits is highly significant for the Chronicler’s theology of liturgy and his understanding of kingship. Through this incident, God teaches his covenant son, the king, an essential lesson about what it means to be the shepherd of God’s people. A true shepherd, David comes to learn, must intercede for and even be

¹³⁰ See Targum 2 Chron. 3:1; compare Gen. 28:16–17.

¹³¹ Targum 1 Chron. 21:15.

willing to lay down his life for his flock. Text criticism has helped us to reconstruct the crucial text in David's conversion:

It is I, the shepherd, who did wrong. But these sheep, what have they done? Let thy hand, I pray thee, O LORD my God, be against me and against my father's house; but let not the plague be upon thy people. (1 Chron. 21:17)¹³²

The shepherd offers his own life for his sheep, recognizing that the people are not his own but God's. This is a dramatic turning point in Chronicles. The king performs public penance so that all can see the subordination of the earthly human realm to the heavenly divine realm, the kingship to the priesthood, the leader of armies to the LORD of hosts. His public repentance, accompanied by sacrifice, triggers the mercy of God, who commands the angel to sheath his sword. We have here in 1 Chronicles 21 a choice specimen of right political theology. David becomes a kind of paradigm for the postexilic people, who must reclaim their vocation as a kingdom of priests and a light to the nations. For this covenant people, David becomes a model for their private prayer and the moral standards to which they must hold themselves and their leaders. As Gary Knoppers has observed:

The image of David as the model of a repentant sinner is a constituent element in the Chronicler's depiction of David. The David of the census story is a person of confession and supplication *par excellence*, a human sinner who repents, seeks forgiveness, intercedes on behalf of his people, and ultimately secures the site of the future Temple. Precisely because David is a pivotal figure in the Chronicler's history of Israel, David's repentance and intercession are paradigmatic. The Chronicler's conviction that errant Israelites have both the opportunity to reform and the potential to make new contributions to their nation is evident in the reigns of Rehoboam (2 Chron. 12:5–12), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 19:1–11), Amaziah (2 Chron. 25:5–13), and even Manasseh (2 Chron. 13:10–17). But this principle is formatively and preeminently at work in the career of David. In the context of a national disaster of his own making, David is able to turn that catastrophe into the occasion for a permanent divine blessing upon Israel.¹³³

132 The Revised Standard Version and most English translations render the first sentence: "It is I who have sinned and done very wickedly." But based on the manuscript evidence, "It is I, the shepherd, who did wrong," is preferred. See the discussions in Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*, Old Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 384; Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 147–148; Selman, *1 Chronicles*, 208.

133 Gary N. Knoppers, "Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in

The Chronicler's account of the founding of the Temple site ends with a final allusion to the Sinai tradition. David's confession leads to the command that he build an altar. In a scene deliberately crafted to evoke the first sacrifices in the Tabernacle in the wilderness, David the king is again shown in the image of a priest. He calls upon the Lord and offers burnt offerings and peace offerings, the same offerings made by Moses and Aaron in the Tabernacle. And as fire descended from heaven and consumed the offerings on the altar of the Tabernacle, so too David's offering is accepted by "fire from heaven."¹³⁴ As this divine fire looks back to the Tabernacle in the wilderness, it looks ahead to the dedication of the Temple, in which King Solomon's priestly offerings will also be consumed by fire from heaven.¹³⁵

The Kingdom of God as Liturgical Empire

In David's covenant testing at Moriah we see the full development of the Chronicler's covenantal and liturgical worldview and his typological interpretation of history. History for the Chronicler is moving inexorably toward the Kingdom of God expressed in the Davidic covenant and the Temple, the dwelling of God on earth. At Moriah, God reveals the meaning of history—the blessing of the family of nations through the liturgy of his firstborn, the royal and priestly people whom he has made a light to the world.

David's last public act in Chronicles is to lead the entire assembly (*kol qāhāl*)¹³⁶ in an extravagant liturgy of sacrifice, offering a thousand bulls, a thousand rams, and a thousand lambs, along with accompanying drink offerings. Dramatically, "the *kol qāhāl* blessed the LORD, the God of their fathers, and bowed and prostrated themselves to the LORD *and to the king*."¹³⁷ This is an extraordinary and unprecedented identification of the king with God.

This is the heart of the Chronicler's theocratic vision—that the Kingdom of Israel under David and Solomon is the Kingdom of God on earth, a kingdom that is fundamentally a *qāhāl*, a liturgical assembly. Chronicles, in fact, is the only place in the Hebrew canon where the expression "Kingdom of God" (*Melek YHWH*) appears:

Ought you not to know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel forever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt? ... And now think you to withstand the Kingdom of

Chronicles," *Biblica* 76 (1995): 449–470, at 469.

¹³⁴ 1 Chron. 21:26; compare Lev. 9:22–24.

¹³⁵ 2 Chron. 7:1.

¹³⁶ 1 Chron. 29:1, 10, 20.

¹³⁷ 1 Chron. 29:20. Emphasis added.

the LORD [*Melek YHWH*] in the hand of the sons of David? (2 Chron. 13:5, 8).

God's kingdom is "in the hands of" David's sons, a grant that is forever (*'ad 'ôlām*) by means of a "covenant of salt" (*bērît melah*).¹³⁸ This latter image has sacrificial and offertory overtones. Salt was added to sacrifices as a sign of permanence and appears to have been an important element in ritual meals celebrated to seal covenants.¹³⁹ To say the Kingdom given to David was given by a *bērît melah* is to say that the Kingdom is to last forever, guaranteed by the oath of God.¹⁴⁰

With the exception of Chronicles, the Book of Daniel, and select psalms, the notion of the Kingdom of God is rare in the canon. While God is sometimes described explicitly as king, his kingdom or rule is assumed but rarely referred to.¹⁴¹ By contrast, in Chronicles, there are a remarkable sixteen references to God's kingdom or his reign—all in relation to the Davidic kingdom.¹⁴² Martin Selman suggests that the idea of the Kingdom is rooted in the Passover and the Sinai covenant, where the word "kingdom" first appears in the canon.¹⁴³ This further emphasizes the intimate connection between the Davidic kingdom and Israel's vocation as a "kingdom of priests." As Selman observes:

It is likely that the later associations of the Kingdom of Yahweh with Zion, the Davidic line, and the son of man, are part of the means by which this ideal [Israel as a kingdom of priests] was being restored, or rather, properly instituted. Indeed, one of the major reasons why the Kingdom of God was spoken of so cautiously in much of the Old Testament may be precisely because of Israel's failure to measure up to its ideals.

The Davidic kingdom for the Chronicler is the ideal kingdom of priests; it is sacramental, making manifest the Kingdom of God. For David, the dynastic promise means that God "has chosen Solomon, my son, to sit upon the throne of

¹³⁸ 2 Chron. 13:5, 8.

¹³⁹ Lev. 2:13; Num. 18:19; Ezek. 6:9; 7:22; 43:24.

¹⁴⁰ Compare 1 Chron. 17:12, 14.

¹⁴¹ God as king: Exod. 15:18; Isa. 6:5; Pss. 47:3; 99:2. God's kingdom or rule: Pss. 22:28; 45:6; 103:19; 145:11–13; Dan. 2:44; 4:3, 31; 6:26; 7:14, 18, 27.

¹⁴² Selman points out that the Chronicler deploys this concept always in relation to the Davidic kingdom and almost always at critical junctures in his narrative. See Martin J. Selman, "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," *Tyndale Bulletin* 40:2 (1989): 161–183, at 167. God "turned the Kingdom over to David" in deposing Saul (1 Chron. 10:14). David's celebration of the Ark's return includes the prayerful exclamation, "The LORD reigns" (1 Chron. 16:31). The promise of the Kingdom is central to the covenant with David (1 Chron. 17:11, 14) and the Temple (2 Chron. 7:18). The Kingdom is the reason for the promise to David and his descendants (2 Chron. 9:8; 13:5, 8).

¹⁴³ Selman, "Kingdom of God," 181–182.

the Kingdom of the LORD over Israel.”¹⁴⁴ In David’s hymn-like prayer at Solomon’s coronation, he associates the Kingdom with God’s purposes in the creation of the world:

Blessed art thou, O Lord, the God of Israel our father, for ever
and ever.
Thine, O LORD, is the greatness and the power, and the glory,
and the victory, and the majesty;
For all that is in the heavens and in the earth is thine; thine is
the Kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted above all.
(1 Chron. 29:10–11)

The Chronicler roots his theocratic vision of the divine economy in creation. The God of Israel is the God of creation and the Lord of history. That explains perhaps a curious feature of David’s response to Nathan’s covenant oracle. In his prayer, David employs a very rare form of divine address—“O LORD God” (*YHWH ’elōhīm*).¹⁴⁵ The Chronicler’s source in 2 Samuel, by contrast, uses *’adōnāy YHWH* (“O Lord God”).¹⁴⁶ The divine title, *YHWH ’elōhīm*, originates, canonically speaking, in the creation narrative, where it is used about twenty times.¹⁴⁷ The only other use of the title in the Pentateuch comes in the confrontation between Moses and Pharaoh.¹⁴⁸ And the title, *YHWH ’elōhīm*, is only found in six other places—five of them in Chronicles, and all of them related to the Davidic covenant or the Temple.¹⁴⁹ This is intriguing if not altogether explicable.

The title is used twice in the Chronicler’s source for David’s prayer.¹⁵⁰ But the Chronicler does not use the title in the places that his source does. Instead he uses *YHWH ’elōhīm* to form a kind of *inclusio* in the introduction of David’s prayer:

144 1 Chron. 28:5; compare 1 Chron. 29:23; 2 Chron. 9:8.

145 1 Chron. 17:16–17.

146 As Japhet has noted, the Chronicler often makes calculated substitutions and changes in the forms of address for God that he finds in his source material. See the discussion in Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*, 2nd rev. ed., Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums 9 (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 20–23; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 337–338.

147 *YHWH ’elōhīm* is “exceedingly rare in the rest of the Bible,” according to Nahum Sarna, who adds: “Admittedly . . . the remarkable concentration of the combination of these divine names in this narrative [Gen. 2:4–3:24] and their virtual absence hereafter have not been satisfactorily explained.” Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation and Commentary* (New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 17.

148 Exod. 9:30; elsewhere *YHWH ’elōhīm* appears only infrequently as part of longer titles, such as “the LORD God of Israel.” See Josh. 7:13, 19, 20; 10:40, 42; 13:14, 33; 1 Sam. 14:41; 1 Kings 8:23, 25; 16:13; Neh. 1:5; Ps. 59:5.

149 1 Chron. 22:1, 19; 26:18; 29:1; 2 Chron. 1:9; 6:41, 42; 32:16.

150 2 Sam. 7:22, 25.

Who am I, *YHWH 'elōhīm* ...
 you are showing me a law for the uplifting of humankind,
YHWH 'elōhīm
 (1 Chron. 17:16, 17)

I suggest that the Chronicler, perhaps inspired by his source, sees *YHWH 'elōhīm* as a way of expressing the special connection between God's purposes in the Davidic covenant and the divine purposes in creation. This may also help explain the meaning of the mysterious passage that I translated above as "you are showing me a law for the uplifting of humankind" (*ūrē'ītānī kētōr hā'ādām hammā'lā*). The Hebrew is obscure both in Chronicles and in his source.¹⁵¹ In light of the creation allusion in the title *YHWH 'elōhīm*, and the Exodus imagery elsewhere in David's prayer, I think the exegete and interpreter must try to "hear" the likely allusions to creation and the Exodus in the references in this obscure phrase to the Law (*kētōr*, literally, "a law") and to humanity (*hā'ādām*, "the man"); a more literal reading also serves better to capture the overall sense of wonder felt in David's prayer. Whatever murkiness there may be in the text, it is clear that David is marveling at this covenant and its implications for the human race. The sense of the text is well explained by Willis Beecher:

What is this "torah of mankind?" ... The most natural understanding is that David recognizes in the promise just made to him a renewal of the ancient promise of blessing for mankind ...

¹⁵¹ Compare 2 Sam. 7:19. Various translations have been proposed based on various proposed emendations of the text. Among the proposals:

"You regard me as man of distinction." (Jewish Publication Society *Tanakh*);

"Thou ... hast shown me future generations, O LORD God!" (Revised Standard Version);

"You have looked on me as henceforth the most notable of men, O LORD God." (New American Bible);

"Thou ... hast regarded me according to the estate of a man of high degree, O LORD God." (King James Version);

"You have let me look upon the generation of humankind to come." (Klein, *1 Chronicles*, 371, 383).

"And you have caused me, someone of human stature, to see into the future." (Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible [New York: Doubleday, 2004], 678.);

"And thou are regarding me according to the upbringing [or uplifting] tôrah of mankind, O Lord God." (Walter C. Kaiser, "The Blessing of David: The Charter for Humanity," in *The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis*, ed. John H. Skilton [Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974]: 298–318, at 315).

a renewal of the promise made of old that all the nations should be blessed in Abraham and his seed.¹⁵²

“Let Them Say among the Nations, ‘The Lord Reigns!’”

The Chronicler indeed presents us with a theocratic and utopian vision, as some of the most provocative of recent scholarship has suggested.¹⁵³ It is not an ideal political economy or military superpower, but a liturgical empire, a worldwide kingdom ordered to a cosmic liturgy, to offering sacrifice and praise to the living God. The liturgy of the Temple is the means by which the children of Abraham are to bestow God’s blessings upon the families of the world.

Chronicles is a fiercely Judeo-centric document. But we cannot forget that it is also a work that reflects a broadly internationalist, even cosmic outlook. From the initial genealogies Israel’s gaze is being directed outward, *ad gentes*, to the nations. Israel is asked to understand itself in light of the world’s beginnings and in light of its prophetic mission to be “a light to the nations.”¹⁵⁴ In his later depiction of Solomon’s Temple, built on the site of Moriah, the Chronicler stresses the “universalism” inherent in the Abrahamic and creation covenants. The Temple for the Chronicler is indeed what the prophets said it would be—“a house of prayer for all peoples.”¹⁵⁵

The Chronicler also seems to share with the prophets a belief in the liturgical consummation of history, an eschatological vision of the nations streaming to Zion to worship Israel’s God. I cannot pursue these points of universalism here, except to note that this liturgical consummation is anticipated in the long priestly psalm of remembrance, thanksgiving, and praise, composed by the priest-king David to celebrate the restoration of the Ark.

This priestly song of redemption combines passages from three psalms¹⁵⁶ and is a profound work of biblical theology in its own right. David interprets Israel’s history as an economy of salvation flowing from the covenant with Abraham to the moment when all the nations and peoples of the world—and indeed all the cosmos, the heavens and the earth—worship Israel’s God: “Let them say among the nations, ‘The LORD reigns!’”¹⁵⁷

152 Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1975 [1905]), 238.

153 See for instance, Steven Schweitzer, *Reading Utopia in Chronicles* (New York: T & T Clark, 2007); Jonathan E. Dyck, *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler* (Leiden: Brill, 1988).

154 See Isa. 42:6; 49:6.

155 Compare Isa. 56:7; 2 Chron. 5:32–33.

156 1 Chron. 16:8–22 = Ps. 105:1–15; 1 Chron. 16:23–33 = Ps. 96:1–13; and 1 Chron. 16:34 = Ps. 106:1; 1 Chron. 16:35–36 = Ps. 106:47–48.

157 1 Chron. 16:23–33.

A Theo-Political Perspective Embedded in the Liturgy

In this article, we have explored the key dimensions of the Chronicler's prophetic historiography. We have identified a distinct biblical worldview and seen how the Chronicler understands history as the unfolding of the divine economy, a plan of salvation that is covenantal and liturgical. And we have seen that his primary framework both for interpreting that history of salvation and for narrating it for his readers is typological. And, through a close reading of the text, we have seen how the Chronicler's covenantal and liturgical worldview, and his typological interpretation of history shapes his narrative of the rise of the Davidic kingdom, which for him is the mountain peak of the salvation history told in the Hebrew Bible.

The questions that remain involve the Chronicler's intentions and purposes—to what “ends” did he write his prophetic historiography? The consensus, even among the most sensitive scholarly readers, seems to be that the Chronicler did not hold out much hope for the Messiah expected by the prophets and later writers in the period after the exile and the building of the Second Temple.

In moving reasonably among the scholarly extremes, Hugh Williamson has concluded with admirable caution: “Although the term ‘messianic’ is perhaps too strong, it must be concluded that the Chronicler still cherished the hope that one day the Davidic dynasty would be reestablished over Israel.”¹⁵⁸ Selman concludes:

The Chronicler's overall aim was to offer an interpretation of the Bible as he knew it. More precisely, his guiding principle was to demonstrate that God's promises revealed in the Davidic covenant were as trustworthy and effective as when they were first given, even though the first readers lived centuries after almost all the events he recorded.¹⁵⁹

However, Selman, like Williamson, sees “no evidence in Chronicles of a strong messianic hope.” Rather than trying to “awaken any explicit hope for the future,” he sees the Chronicler stressing “the continuity between the distant past and the present or recent past ... that God is still building his house and that he invites his people to go on participating in the task.”¹⁶⁰

To my mind, much of the debate over the Chronicler's meaning has needlessly bogged down in overly narrow semantic and reductionist arguments about whether the Chronicler expected a *Messiah* or not. What is often overlooked is that the Messiah is only one star in the constellation of Israel's ancient hope. This larger constellation, as the Chronicler's work reflects, includes Zion, Jerusalem, David,

¹⁵⁸ Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 134.

¹⁵⁹ Selman, *1 Chronicles*, 26.

¹⁶⁰ Selman, *1 Chronicles*, 64–65.

the Temple, the Kingdom, and the covenant. The notion of the Messiah, while certainly not insignificant, must be subordinated to this larger Davidic covenant framework. I would argue that the Chronicler's trust in God's promises to David is, by its very nature, a species of eschatological hope—hope for a Messiah who would bring about the fulfillment of those promises. But the Chronicler's hope is messianic only to the extent that it is Davidic.

To be sure there is no trace of secular political messianism in the work. Nor do we have any overt theology of violent political resistance as we find in 1 Maccabees and some of the extrabiblical apocalypses of the Second Temple period. But it is a mistake to suggest, as many scholars do, that the Chronicler is not interested in the political conditions of the people after the exile or that he has no firm hopes for the future. It is important to remember that Chronicles is not merely a work of nostalgia, a retrospective reading of Israel's history with the vaguely hortatory purpose of inspiring the postexilic community to rebuild the Temple and restore their religious devotions. The Chronicler believes in the God whose story he narrates in his text, a God who is the Lord of history.

What some commentators mistake as political quietism is actually a reflection of the Chronicler's deep faith in God's covenant plan, primarily advanced by liturgical worship. This lends a certain serenity to his account, for sure. He does not preoccupy himself with the wickedness of the Assyrians or the Babylonians; nor does he despair over the divided Kingdom in his account of the monarchy after Solomon. He begins and ends his work with a matter-of-fact diagnosis—the exile was an inevitable result of Israel's "unfaithfulness" (*mā'al*) to the covenant, and their refusal to heed the prophets that "the LORD, the God of their fathers, sent persistently to them."¹⁶¹

We are back to the question we began this article with: In a work in which prophets and prophesy plays such an important role, to what extent does the Chronicler understand himself to be a messenger sent by God to prophesy to the people of his day? As I read it, the many prophetic speeches in Chronicles, in effect, blend together with the narrative to form a single authoritative "Word" spoken to the Chronicler's audience. This has been well explained by Fishbane:

The Chronicler does not merely use his narrative voice—the authoritative voice of impersonal history—but employs the confrontative, exhortative, and instructive voice of prophetic personae as well. In the course of the historical exposition, moreover, both voices—refracted through the stylistic forms of reported speech and reported events—reinforce each other. The prophetic oratories serve to set the course of the narrative reports and to exemplify them, while the narrative reports recip-

¹⁶¹ 1 Chron. 9:1; 2 Chron. 36:15–16.

roically comment upon these speeches and teach through them. ... The continuous oscillation is, in its effect, part of the expository power of the Chronicler. Added to it is his *aggadic* ability to teach *through the traditions*. ... This content confronted [the Chronicler's readers] as a *traditum*, as *the* authoritative version of the ancient *traditio* made present as witness and as challenge. No less than his prophetic personae, then, the Chronicler's narrative addressed his generation, in the twilight of classical prophecy, with a "prophetic" voice.¹⁶²

Chronicles is *aggadic*, that is, homiletic. But more than a long series of historical sermons to the post-exilic community, in Chronicles historical remembrance is transformed into prophetic Word. As prophetic historiography, Chronicles is an act of what the Hebrews called *zakhor*, a remembrance that is covenantal, liturgical, and indeed, sacramental—bringing one into vital contact with the events recalled. Again we can ask whether perhaps the Chronicler saw his work—which may have originated as a series of homilies delivered in the context of the liturgy—as an example of the cultic prophecy established by David as a part of the Temple liturgy.¹⁶³ Whatever its precise origins, Israel's history in Chronicles is being appropriated and transformed into Scripture, a pattern found elsewhere in the Bible. As Stefan Rief has said:

It was not all facts that were to be remembered, but those that specifically documented God's intervention and man's response, since in this way human history could be interpreted as the revelation of God's will. Memory was a central element in ritual and recital, and the festivals manifestly had historical as well as religious and agricultural dimensions. The biblical narrative revolves around the reality of everyday life rather than having its focus on the exclusively spiritual. ... Thus, Israel's history was incorporated—even transformed—into its Scripture. The

162 Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 392.

163 1 Chron. 25:1. Rex Mason has suggested that many of the speeches recorded in Chronicles reflect "the method of preaching and teaching among the Temple community." See Rex Mason, "Some Echoes of the Preaching in the Second Temple Period? Traditional Elements in Zechariah 1–8," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 96:2 (1984), 221–235, at 233; Schniedewind, "Prophets and Prophecy," 212. Rodney Duke concludes that the Chronicler shares a "common hermeneutic" with the authors of the Targum. In both, "Scripture was actualized. The message of the text was contemporary; it spoke to the present; 'revelation' was continuous. ... [T]he Chronicler interpreted his tradition both in light of contemporary cultic praxis and according to the need of the present situation." Rodney K. Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 88 (Sheffield: Almond, 1990), 115.

whole process was maintained and nurtured by transmission, recitation, and education.¹⁶⁴

The Chronicler is doing a kind of reconstructive historical apologetics. In recreating the era of David and the rise of the Kingdom he is not only describing the golden age, the summit of salvation history; he is laying the moral and spiritual groundwork for the restoration of the Kingdom of God, the rebuilding of the Temple, and the return of the son of David. Donna Runnalls has rightly observed: “The interest of the Chronicler in the eternal Davidic kingship at a time when it no longer existed makes emphatic the idea that the promise awaits fulfillment.”¹⁶⁵ Again, it is the Davidic covenant promises that give rise to the Chronicler’s theological perspective, which is prophetic and eschatological and is embedded in the liturgy and not in imperial conquests.

The Priestly Kingdom Before the Exile (2 Chronicles)

In this essay, I have focused on the Chronicler’s portrait of the establishment of the Kingdom. But the patterns I have identified continue and emerge even more clearly in 2 Chronicles, which concentrates on the Davidic royal line in the years after the golden age of David and Solomon, after the Kingdom has been divided. The ideal of the Kingdom continues to be presented in royal and priestly terms—as a liturgical *ekklēsia*.¹⁶⁶ In 2 Chronicles, we see that the power of the Kingdom is the power of God. But it is not expressed in a militaristic program or a political agenda. The Kingdom expresses itself more truly just as it releases the divine power that defines it—in and through worship. For instance, the kings Asa and Jehoshaphat achieve absolutely unexpected victories over their enemies through liturgical prayer and sacrifice.¹⁶⁷ Facing an Ethiopian army a million men strong, King Asa goes to the front lines, armed not with weapons but with a prayer: “Help us, O LORD our God, for we rely on thee!” In the same way, Jehoshaphat responds to an invasion from

164 Stefan C. Reif, “The Function of History in Early Rabbinic Liturgy,” in *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2006: History and Identity: How Israel’s Later Authors Viewed Its Earlier History*, eds. Núria Calduch-Benages and Jan Liesen (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 321–333, at 322.

165 Donna R. Runnalls, “The King as Temple Builder: A Messianic Typology,” in *Spirit Within Structure, Essays in Honor of George Johnston on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. E. J. Furcha (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick), 15–37, at 24–25. See too, William F. Stinespring, “Eschatology in Chronicles,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 209–219, at 211: the Chronicler “was surely thinking eschatologically of the new David and the new Kingdom that would shortly or eventually arise in God’s good time.”

166 For the liturgical assembly of the Kingdom as *qāhāl/ekklēsia*, see 2 Chron. 20:5, 14; 23:3; 28:14; 29:23, 28, 31, 32; 30:22, 4, 13, 17, 23, 24, 25.

167 2 Chron. 14:11–12; 20:1–30.

Edom with a long prayer “in the assembly [*qāhāl*] of Judah and Jerusalem, in the house of the LORD.” The Chronicler’s point is that when the Kingdom looks small in the eyes of God’s people because they face the military might and opposition from superior powers, it is then that the true nature of the Kingdom is manifested and its power unleashed—in and through their covenant worship in the divine liturgy.

The climax of the Chronicler’s narrative of the Kingdom is reached during the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah, in their respective celebrations of the Passover of all Israel.¹⁶⁸ In these dramatic Passover scenes, we see the Davidic king wielding divine power precisely in and through the paschal liturgy in the Jerusalem Temple. We see revealed the deepest meaning of the Kingdom, as the king harnesses all the wealth and political authority at his disposal, subordinating everything to the summoning of the people and the preparations for the feast. The Chronicler writes of Josiah’s Passover as if it were the culmination of Israel’s history and the fulfillment of its destiny: “No Passover like it had been kept in Israel since the days of Samuel the prophet; none of the kings of Israel had kept such a Passover as was kept by Josiah, and the priests and the Levites, and all Judah and Israel who were present, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem.”¹⁶⁹

The prophetic “word” to the Chronicler’s audience is two-fold: First, the Kingdom is not primarily human, but divine; it is not political, but priestly and liturgical. The second and related point is this: the Kingdom is one and the Kingdom is God’s, no matter what earthly appearances might indicate to the contrary. It is important to remember that the Chronicler never really acknowledges the political reality of the divided Kingdom. The historical moment of the split is accounted for,¹⁷⁰ but the remainder of 2 Chronicles focuses on the continuation of the Davidic line reigning in the southern kingdom of Judah. This is the true Israel, as the Davidic king Abijah reminds King Jeroboam, leader of the separatist kingdom in the North: “Hear me, O Jeroboam and all Israel! Ought you not to know that the LORD God of Israel gave the kingship over Israel for ever to David and his sons by a covenant of salt?”¹⁷¹

An Alternative Biblical Theology of Empire

The Chronicler advances a kingdom ecclesiology in which the Kingdom on earth is a sacrament of the Kingdom of God. And this message is intended to speak to his audience in the years after the exile. Although there is no Davidic king seated

168 2 Chron. 30:1–27; 35:1–19.

169 2 Chron. 35:18.

170 2 Chron. 10:16–17.

171 2 Chron. 13:5.

on an earthly throne, the Kingdom is nonetheless real. In the restored liturgy of the Temple, the people have the divine Kingdom made manifest on earth in its sacramental and liturgical expression. Whether there is an earthly ruler who is Jewish and Davidic, or whether the world is governed by a Gentile, such as the Persian King Cyrus, in the rebuilt and rededicated Jerusalem Temple, Israel will glimpse on earth of their true king who reigns in heaven. Living in a land occupied by an external foe, the task is to trust in the promises of God to David and to attend themselves to right worship, to giving glory to the God of Israel, in the new house they are to build in Jerusalem.¹⁷²

In all of this, I suggest, we have the seeds of an alternative biblical theology of empire, one that intends to instruct Israel on how to live in the new post-exilic environment, how to worship the true God while still living under the domination of a foreign power. As William Schniedewind has noted, the prophetic speeches in Chronicles, while ostensibly speaking to the historical events being recounted, are also addressed homiletically to the Chronicler's audience.¹⁷³ Thus, the prophet Shemaiah explains why God permitted Israel's subjugation to Egypt under King Rehoboam in terms that could apply to the entire exilic generation—"so that they may know the difference between serving me and serving the kingdoms of the world."¹⁷⁴

The Chronicler's prophetic historiography teaches a morality of exile and reflects what E. P. Sanders has called "restoration eschatology."¹⁷⁵ The Chronicler's audience is, in a very real sense, still in exile, even though the people have been freed from Babylon and returned to the land. They have to learn how to keep faith in exile, how to serve God while still in captivity to the kingdoms of the world, awaiting the restoration of the Kingdom of David and the Temple.

New Testament Trajectories

Chronicles thus points to its own future fulfillment; the story that the Chronicler tells is not yet complete. This sense of a history awaiting its own fulfillment is what makes Chronicles such fertile ground for New Testament studies. To date, the work has not received the kind of attention from New Testament scholars that it deserves. But I do not think it only coincidence that the Christian canon begins with the genealogy of Matthew, just as the last book of the Hebrew canon, Chronicles, began with a genealogy; what better way for the first editors

172 Compare 2 Chron. 36:28.

173 Schniedewind, "Prophets and Prophecy," 222–223.

174 2 Chron. 12:7–8; the translation is Schniedewind's; "Prophets and Prophecy," 222.

175 E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 77; see also, N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1992), 269–272.

of the Christian canon to emphasize the continuity between the Old and New Testaments and the unity of the economy of salvation from Adam to Jesus. The Chronicler would also seem to be the source for Luke's tracing of Christ's human lineage back to Adam, "the son of God."¹⁷⁶ And it is significant that the renewal of the Davidic kingdom in Chronicles is symbolized by the reconstitution of the *qāhāl* under Kings Hezekiah and Josiah and their celebration of the Passover,¹⁷⁷ as the climax of the new covenant is the institution of the new Passover, the Eucharist.

I am convinced that careful study of the aspects of Chronicles that we have looked at here—the Chronicler's vision of salvation history rooted in creation; his covenantal typology; his treatment of the Kingdom of God as a *qāhāl/ekklēsia* and a liturgical empire—can shed great light on Jesus' own teaching about the Kingdom, the Church, and the Eucharist. To suggest just one implication of reading the New Testament in light of Chronicles, I believe that the Chronicler's vision of the Kingdom as *qāhāl/ekklēsia* is behind Jesus' identification of the Church (*ekklēsia*) with the Temple and the Kingdom in the Gospel of Matthew. While it is beyond my purposes here to demonstrate this, reading Matthew 16:16–20 in light of the Chronicler's vision, causes us to notice a series of terms and concepts that are the unique focus of the Chronicler—Kingdom and Church, divine fatherhood and sonship, Temple and foundation stone.

We can also trace the influence of the Chronicler's kingdom ecclesiology in Luke, especially in the meal scenes and in the establishment of the Eucharist, where Christ, presented in Davidic terms, promises to his Twelve, gathered as a reconstituted Israel: "I covenant to you a Kingdom, as my Father covenanted one to me."¹⁷⁸ Whereas Matthew and Luke use Kingdom vocabulary, John and Paul speak of the Church in terms of the Temple—and again, one can identify how both have tapped into the Davidic traditions that we have explored in the Chronicler.¹⁷⁹ Finally, we see the strands of this tradition braided together in the Apocalypse: Jerusalem, the Kingdom, the Temple, the Church, and the Son of David.¹⁸⁰

176 Luke 3:38. Matt. 1:1–27; Luke 3:23–28. Compare W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 1:167–188; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX*, The Anchor Bible 28 (New York: Doubleday, 1979), 499–504.

177 See 2 Chron. 30, 35.

178 Luke 22:29; for this translation and its implications, see Scott W. Hahn, "Christ, Kingdom, and Creation: Davidic Christology and Ecclesiology in Luke-Acts," *Letter & Spirit* 3 (2007): 113–138, at 131–133.

179 See 1 Cor. 3:16; 2 Cor. 6:16; John 2:13–16; 14:1–3. For this tradition in John, see Scott W. Hahn, "Temple, Sign, and Sacrament: Towards a New Perspective on the Gospel of John," *Letter & Spirit* 4 (2008): 107–143. For Paul, see Raymond Corriveau, "Temple, Holiness, and the Liturgy of Life in Corinthians," *Letter & Spirit* 4 (2008): 145–166.

180 See Yves M.-J. Cardinal Congar, "Church, Kingdom, and the Eschatological Temple," *Letter &*

Indeed, I would suggest that in these and other areas the Chronicler offers us a kind of royal-priestly prototype of the New Testament Church. With his liturgical and sacramental appropriation of history, the Chronicler wants to lead his audience to see the “signs of the times,” the divine purposes being unfolded in everyday reality. He is preparing his readers, those who have returned to Jerusalem and those still in the Diaspora, to recognize these “signs” and to prepare their hearts to live as a royal and priestly people, the agents through whom God will bless all the nations.

Spirit 4 (2008): 289–317. See generally, Scott Hahn, *The Lamb's Supper: The Mass as Heaven on Earth* (New York: Doubleday, 1999).