

The Ark of Yahweh in the Old Testament: An Exegetical-Theological Study

D.I. Shin Drs.

Thesis submitted for the degree Philosophiae Doctor
in Theology at the North West University

Promoter: Prof. F.N. Lion-Cachet

2004

Potchefstroom

Abstract

The aim of this dissertation is to unravel the meaning of the ark of Yahweh in the Old Testament primarily from the perspective of redemptive history. This central theme of the Scriptures encompasses the totality of history and forms a unity in Christ while providing a progressive realization of God's eternal counsel in time.

The first chapter is an introduction which demonstrates that the variety of conclusions of earlier studies about the significance of the ark in the Old Testament is due to the application of different modern critical studies to the exegesis of Biblical texts: each study has problems. In order to overcome the flaws, there is a need to examine the biblical text acknowledging the intention of the divine author and his use of subordinates.

The second chapter offers discussions on exegetical methodology. The method of interpretation, a three dimensional approach, namely philological-historical-theological approach, applied to this thesis, is in contrast to the historical-literary and the traditio-historical approaches which most prior studies about the ark have used. The redemptive-historical theological method has validity since much of the Bible itself reflects redemptive history.

The third chapter attempts to exegesis all biblical texts referring to the ark. The text of Exodus demonstrates that the ark was made to serve as a comfortable assurance that Yahweh would indeed accompany the Israelites on their journey to the promised land and as a tool of God's revelation. The Numbers' text shows that Yahweh led and protected his people in the presence of the ark in the wilderness, even though it is not a throne-chariot. The ark passages in Deuteronomy emphasize Yahweh's law and tell us that the ark still has the symbolic meaning of the glorious presence of Yahweh. Yahweh used the ark when he wanted to retrieve his corrupt people and redeem them with the covenantal law. In the book of Joshua we find that occupancy of the promised land as a phase of redemptive history was accomplished by the guidance of the ark using it as a vanguard, as a physical representation of divine presence. The narrative pertaining to the ark in the book of 1 Samuel explains that the ark is not permitted to be mobilized into the battle as a war-palladium. Nor is it a throne. Rather, the ark is closely

linked with Yahweh's advanced redemptive work in conformity to his sovereign and eternal design for salvation, despite the Israelite's abuse. The historical event of the transporting of the ark in 2 Samuel 6 suggests Yahweh's sovereign choice of Zion and the climax of a long series of events which began when Moses promised the people 'rest' from all their enemies (Deut. 12:10). The occasion of bringing up the ark into the temple in 1 Kings 8 explains that Yahweh's resting place was embodied by the ark's position in the inner sanctuary of the temple, the Most Holy Place. The allusion to the stone tablets on which the law of the covenant had been engraved accentuates the importance of the observance of the law in maintenance of the people's relationship with Yahweh. In Psalm 132, the ark as the emblem of God's presence is propounded as a literary work linking the oaths of David and Yahweh and as a foundation of prosperity for the kingdom of Israel. This psalm newly accentuates the redemptive - historical significance of the transportation of the ark to Jerusalem. In Jeremiah 3:16, which obviously hints at the disappearance of the original ark, the function and meaning of the ark vanishes around the time of the new covenant era in the progressive course of redemptive history.

The fourth chapter provides theological concepts of the ark. The appellations for the ark are not used as a norm to classify sources. The ark with Kapporet and the cherubim as a holy object the designed on Sinai was given by Yahweh himself has Mosaic origin. The ark was a kind of cultic article used for revelation of his attributes, but it was not to be worshipped. It is not a throne, nor footstool, nor a war-palladium but a symbol of Yahweh's presence in a sacramental and covenantal sense. Notwithstanding, the 'whole unit of the ark' has the concept of footstool, implying his sovereignty. The glorious epiphany of Yahweh occurs around the ark in a tangible and sublime manner. Thus, the significance of the ark is related to a core biblical thought: God is *with* us; Yahweh fulfils his promise concerning the redemption of human beings in the period of the Old Covenant. Although the ark stood at the center of Israelite culture throughout history, it was a dispensable object in the process of the redemptive historical progression of God. God wants to reside among his people in a different way in the era of the new covenant: through his Holy Spirit. In this regard, the disappearance of the ark may have been a part of God's sovereign plan.

Opsomming

Die doel van hierdie proefskrif is om die betekenis van die ark van Jahwe in die Ou Testament veral vanuit 'n heilshistoriese perspektief te ondersoek. Die heilsgeskiedenis is 'n sentrale lyn wat dwarsdeur die Skrif loop en saamtrek in Christus om so God se ewige raadsplan in die tyd tot 'n werklikheid bring.

Die eerste hoofstuk is 'n inleiding wat aantoon dat die menigvuldige resultate ten opsigte van die betekenis van die ark in die Ou Testament grootliks die gevolg is van verskillende moderne kritiese metodes van Skrifeksegese. Elke navorsing het probleme. Om die gebreke te probeer oorkom, is die Bybelse tekste weer intensief ondersoek om die bedoeling van die Goddelike Outeur in die werk van die sekondere auteurs in hulle historiese konteks te verstaan.

In hoofstuk twee word eksegetiese metodes bespreek. 'n Filologies-historiese metode word in die eksegetiese gebruik terwyl die teologie heilshistoriese benadering word. So het die navorsing 'n drie-dimensionele benaderingsmetode. Dit vorm 'n teenstelling met 'n literer-historiese en tradisioneel-historiese benaderings wat in meeste navorsings oor die ark gebruik is. Die heilshistoriese benadering is besonder geskik in die teologiese aspek van die Bybelse verklaring omdat die Bybel self die aandag op die heilsgeskiedenis plaas.

In die derde hoofstuk is al die Bybelse tekste met betrekking tot die ark geëksegetiseer. Die tekste uit Eksodus het aangetoon dat die ark gemaak moes word om as 'n versekering te dien dat Yahweh die Israeliete sal vergesel op hulle pad na die beloofde land. Dit was ook 'n plek van openbaring. In Numeri word aangetoon dat Yahweh soos met die teenwoordigheid van die ark sy volk gelei en beskerm het. Die ark was nie 'n troonwa is nie. Die ark-gedeeltes in Deuteronomium beklemtoon steeds die simboliese betekenis van die heerlike teenwoordigheid van Yahweh. Yahweh het die ark gebruik om aan te toon dat Hy sy sondige volk in sy verbondsliefde wil verlos. In die boek Josua vind ons die inbesitname van die beloofde land as 'n fase in die heilsgeskiedenis. Die ark is vooruit gedra en dit is as die sigbare teenwoordigheid van Yahweh beskou. Die geskiedenis van die ark in I Samuel toon aan dat

die ark nie as 'n oorlogsverskansing gebruik mag word nie. Dit is ook nie 'n troon nie. Die ark word steeds nou verbind met die voortgesette verlossingswerk van Yahweh in die uitvoering van sy soewereine en ewige verlossingsraadsplan. Die vervoer van die ark na Sion in 2 Samuel beklemtoon Yahweh se soewereine keuse van Sion. Dit vorm die klimaks van 'n lang reeks gebeurtenisse wat by Moses begin het toe hy die volk “rus” van al hulle vyande belowe het (Deut. 12:10). Die plasing van die ark in die Allerheiligste van die tempel (I Kon. 8) wys na Yahweh se rusplek te midde van sy volk. Die kliptafels waarop die verbondswet geografeer was, dien om die belangrikheid van wetsonderhouding in die volk se verhouding met Yahweh te beklemtoon. Die ark dien in Psalm 132 as simbool van God se teenwoordigheid. In hierdie gedig word daar 'n verband gele tussen die eedswering van Yahweh aan Dawid met die belofte van voorspoed vir die koninkryk van Israel. Die psalm beklemtoon ook die heishistoriese betekenis van die vervoer van die ark na Jerusalem. Jeremia 3:16 verwys baie duidelik na die verdwyning van die ark. So verdwyn die funksie en betekenis van die ark in die progressiewe gang van die heilsgeskiedenis.

Die vierde hoofstuk bied die teologiese besinning met betrekking tot die ark aan. Eerstens gee die omskrywings van die ark geen norm om die bronne aan te dui nie. Vervolgens is die ontwerp van die heilige artikels, naamlik die ark met sy Kapporet en gerubs, deur Yahweh self gegee. So is dit deur Moses beskrywe. Die ark was 'n kultiese artikel om die deugde van Yahweh te openbaar maar mag nie aanbid word nie. Dit is nie 'n troon, 'n oorlogsverskansing of 'n voetstoel nie maar 'n sakramentele en verbondsimbool van Yahweh se teenwoordigheid. Die “ark in sy geheel” het egter wel 'n sekere ooreenkoms met die gedagte van “voetstoel” wat na sy soewereiniteit heenwys. Die heerlike verskyning van Yahweh by die ark geskied in 'n aanvoelbare, maar delikate wyse. So word die betekenis van die ark te nouste verbind met die hart van die Bybelse gedagte: God is by ons. Yahweh wil so sy beloftes om die mensheid te verlos in die Ou Testamentiese tydperk begin vervul. Alhoewel die ark in die sentrum van die Israelitiese religie en lewe gedurende hulle geskiedenis tydperk gestaan het, was dit in die voortgang van die verlossingsgeskiedenis vervangbaar. God wil in die nuwe verbondsbedeling op 'n ander manier by sy volk inwoon, naamlik deur sy Heilige Gees. So gesien, is die verdwyning van die ark deel van God se soewereine raadsplan.

Acknowledgments

It was a long journey to complete my dissertation while working for Kosin University in Korea. During the writing of this thesis, I realized just how difficult it is to practice the old Korean saying 'farm by day and study by night.'

I am greatly indebted to many people and I wish to thank them all.

I would like to express my gratitude to the faculty of Potchefstroom Theological Seminary who offered me the opportunity to improve my academic ability in this doctoral program. I am grateful to my students at Kosin University and Theological Seminary who ploughed through the draft of this thesis, and whose questions, and suggestions, helped me to clarify some points. Likewise, my gratitude goes out to my colleagues of the Theological Department at Kosin University for their spiritual support and endurance. During every vacation, they were willing to help me concentrate on my research in the libraries of foreign universities such as Potchefstroom University, Geneva College in the United States, Leuven Catholic University in Belgium, and Tyndale House in Cambridge.

I wish to express special gratitude to my thesis supervisor, F.N. Lion-Cachet for his patient support, constructive criticism and endless encouragement. Whatever contributions this study may provide are largely due to his impetus. He made substantial contributions to this work.

Above all, I owe an incalculable debt of thanks to my wife, Jessica (Jeong Sook) for her unflinching love and untiring assistance at every point during last 10 years of doctoral study. Finally, I want to express my thanks and love to my two sons, Paul (Sang Doo) and Daniel (Sang Hwa) for their many prayers and sacrifices for my thesis.

I hope that this small thesis which is established on the Reformed perspective will contribute to Old Testament study.

I praise the Lord, my Shepherd, who has led me until now.

D.I. Shin

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Abstract: English | 2 |
| Afrikaans | 4 |
| Acknowledgment | 6 |
| Contents | 7 |
| 1. Introduction | 13 |
| 1.1. Problems and relevance | 13 |
| 1.2. The aims of this study and its hypothesis | 23 |
| 1.3. Scope and limitations | 26 |
| 1.4. Study methods | 27 |
| 2. Main methods applied to the study on the ark of Yahweh | 30 |
| 2.1. Historico-literary criticism | 30 |
| 2.1.1. Its application to studies on the ark | 30 |
| 2.1.2. The evaluation | 32 |
| 2.1.3. Summary | 38 |
| 2.2. Traditio-historical criticism | 39 |
| 2.2.1. Its application to studies on the ark | 39 |
| 2.2.2. The evaluation | 41 |
| 2.2.3. Summary | 46 |
| 2.3. Narrative Criticism | 47 |
| 2.4. The redemptive-historical approach as a theological interpretation | 52 |
| 2.4.1. Redemptive history as a central theme of the Scriptures | 52 |
| 2.4.2. The concept of redemptive history | 57 |
| 2.4.3. The necessity of redemptive history in exegesis | 61 |
| 2.4.4. Summary | 63 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3. Exegesis | 64 |
| 3.1. The ark in the Pentateuch | 64 |
| 3.1.1. Exodus 25:10-22; 37:1-9: Yahweh's instruction and Bezalel's construction of the ark | 64 |
| 3.1.1.1. The canonical status | 64 |
| 3.1.1.2. Textual and grammatical problems | 67 |
| 3.1.1.3. Form and Structure | 69 |
| 3.1.1.4. Explanation | 70 |
| 3.1.1.4.1. The instruction and construction of the ark (Ex. 25:10-15; 37:1-5) | 71 |
| 3.1.1.4.2. The Testimony (Ex. 25:16) | 76 |
| 3.1.1.4.3. The atonement place (Ex. 25:17; 37:6) | 86 |
| 3.1.1.4.4. The cherubim (Ex. 25:18-20; 37:7-9) | 98 |
| 3.1.1.4.5. The location of the atonement place and the Testimony and Yahweh's promise (Ex. 25:21, 22) | 93 |
| 3.1.1.5. Summary | 94 |
| 3.1.2. The ark in Numbers (Num. 10:33-36) | 96 |
| 3.1.2.1. Text and form | 96 |
| 3.1.2.2. The context | 98 |
| 3.1.2.3. Explanation | 98 |
| 3.1.2.4. Summary | 103 |
| 3.1.3. The ark of Deuteronomy (10:1-5, 8 and 31:26) | 105 |
| 3.1.3.1. Canonical status and form | 105 |
| 3.1.3.2. Explanation | 106 |
| 3.1.3.3. Summary | 109 |
| 3.2. The ark in historical texts | 111 |
| 3.2.1. The ark in Joshua | 111 |
| 3.2.1.1. The ark in Jordan (Jos. 3:1-4:24) | 111 |
| 3.2.1.1.1. Canonical status | 111 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3.2.1.1.2. The text | 113 |
| 3.2.1.1.3. Explanation | 117 |
| 3.2.1.1.4. Summary | 127 |
| | |
| 3.2.1.2. The ark in Jericho (Jos. 6:1-21) | 129 |
| 3.2.1.2.1. Canonical status | 129 |
| 3.2.1.2.2. The text | 131 |
| 3.2.1.2.3. Explanation | 133 |
| 3.2.1.2.4. Summary | 138 |
| | |
| 3.2.1.3. The ark near Shechem (Jos. 8:33) | 139 |
| 3.2.1.3.1. Exegetical explanation | 139 |
| 3.2.1.3.2. Summary | 141 |
| | |
| 3.2.2. The ark in the first book of Samuel | 143 |
| 3.2.2.1. Views on the criticism | 144 |
| 3.2.2.2. The text of 1 Sam. 4:1b-7:1 | 148 |
| 3.2.2.3. The background of the text in redemptive history | 155 |
| 3.2.2.4. Explanation | 157 |
| 3.2.2.4.1. The ark captured (4:1b-22) | 157 |
| 3.2.2.4.2. The ark in Philistia (5:1-6:1) | 166 |
| 3.2.2.4.3. The ark's return to Israel (6:2-7:1) | 169 |
| 3.2.2.5. Summary | 173 |
| | |
| 3.2.3. The ark of Yahweh in 2 Samuel 6 | 175 |
| 3.2.3.1. The context | 175 |
| 3.2.3.2. Text criticism and grammatical analysis | 176 |
| 3.2.3.3. The form and structure (cf. 1 Chr. 13 and 15-16) | 179 |
| 3.2.3.4. Explanation | 183 |
| 3.2.3.4.1. The first attempt to carry the ark (vv. 1 - 11) | 183 |
| 3.2.3.4.1.1. The preparation to carry the ark (vv. 1 - 2a) | 183 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 3.2.3.4.1.2. The ark (v. 2b) ----- | 186 |
| 3.2.3.4.1.3. Attempt to transfer the ark (vv. 3-5) ----- | 187 |
| 3.2.3.4.1.4. Peres-Uzza (vv. 6-8) ----- | 190 |
| 3.2.3.4.1.5. The ark in the house of Obed-Edom (vv. 9 - 11) ----- | 193 |
| 3.2.3.4.2. Festive entry of the ark into David's city (vv. 12-19) ----- | 195 |
| 3.2.3.4.2.1. The procession around the ark (vv.12-15) ----- | 195 |
| 3.2.3.4.2.2. The contempt of Michal (v.16) ----- | 197 |
| 3.2.3.4.2.3. The first worship on Zion (vv.17-19) ----- | 200 |
| 3.2.3.4.3. The tension between David and Michal (20-23) ----- | 203 |
| 3.2.3.4.3.1. The mockery of Michal (v. 20) ----- | 203 |
| 3.2.3.4.3.2. David's answer (vv. 21, 22) ----- | 204 |
| 3.2.3.4.3.3. The judgment of God (v. 23) ----- | 205 |
| 3.2.3.5. Summary ----- | 206 |
| | |
| 3.2.4. The ark of Yahweh in 1 Kings 8:1-11 ----- | 209 |
| 3.2.4.1. The context ----- | 209 |
| 3.2.4.2. Canonical status ----- | 210 |
| 3.2.4.3. The text criticism and the grammatical analysis ----- | 211 |
| 3.2.4.4. Form and structure ----- | 212 |
| 3.2.4.5. Explanation ----- | 213 |
| 3.2.4.5.1. Solomon's summons to assemble people (1-3a) ----- | 213 |
| 3.2.4.5.2. Transfer of the ark and sacrifices (3b-5) ----- | 215 |
| 3.2.4.5.3. The installation of the ark (6-11) ----- | 217 |
| 3.2.4.6. Summary ----- | 220 |
| | |
| 3.3. The ark in the Psalms and in prophecy ----- | 221 |
| 3.3.1. The ark in Psalm 132 ----- | 222 |
| 3.3.1.1. Canonical status and the form ----- | 222 |
| 3.3.1.2. The text ----- | 226 |
| 3.3.1.3. Explanation ----- | 226 |
| 3.3.1.4. Summary ----- | 232 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 3.3.2. The ark in Jeremiah 3:16 | 234 |
| 4. Theological concepts of the ark | 238 |
| 4.1. The appellations for the ark | 238 |
| 4.1.1. Ark | 238 |
| 4.1.2. The ark of Yahweh/God | 239 |
| 4.1.3. The ark of the Covenant/ The Testimony | 240 |
| 4.2. The ark, Kapporet and Cherubim | 242 |
| 4.2.1. The ark | 242 |
| 4.2.2. Kapporet (cf. 3.1.1.4.3) | 247 |
| 4.2.3. Cherubim (cf. 3.1.1.4.4) | 248 |
| 4.3. The contents of the ark | 250 |
| 4.4. The ark, tabernacle and temple | 253 |
| 4.5. The ark and worship of Yahweh | 257 |
| 4.6. The localization of the ark | 260 |
| 4.6.1. The ark near Shechem (cf. 3.2.1.3.) | 260 |
| 4.6.2. The ark at Shiloh | 261 |
| 4.6.3. The ark at Bethel | 262 |
| 4.6.4. The ark in Kiriath-Jearim | 263 |
| 4.6.5. The ark in Zion | 264 |
| 4.7. The ark and Israel | 266 |
| 4.8. Disappearance of the ark | 268 |

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| 5. Summary and conclusion | 270 |
| Abbreviations | 278 |
| Bibliography | 283 |

1. Introduction

1.1. Problems and Relevance

Israelite religion regarded the imageless worship of Yahweh as one of its most striking characteristics, differing from the idol-worship of the surrounding nations. The ark of Yahweh seems to have functioned as the unique symbol of God's presence and was the center of the Israelite cult. It was located in the most holy place of the temple around the Israelites in the promised land centred their faith. Thus, the ark appears as the center piece of Israelite existence in Old Testament times. A biblical theme deemed of such importance can usually expect to attract much attention from biblical scholars, but only a few studies about the significance of the ark in the Old Testament have been undertaken. In general, the meaning of the ark has been understood in a variety of ways due to the application of the different conclusions of modern critical studies to the exegesis of biblical texts.

In the twentieth century five monographs have been published: *Die Lade Jahves* (1906), by M. Dibelius; *De ark Gods* (dissertation, 1908), by T. P. Sevensma; *De ark* (1955), by Brouwer; *Altisraelitisch Heiligtum* (1965), by Johann Maier; *The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship* (1965), by M.H. Woudstra. During the 1970's three monographs about the ark were issued. However, the writers only cover the ark texts found in 1 Samuel and 2 Samuel because they regarded these texts as "the Ark Narrative." These monographs bore the following titles: *Die Ladeerzählung des ersten Samuel-Buches. Eine literaturwissenschaftliche und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung* (1973), by F. Schicklberger; *The Ark Narrative (1 Samuel 4-6; 2 Samuel 6): A Form-Critical and Traditio-Historical Study*, by A. F. Campbell; *The hand of the Lord: A Reassessment of the "Ark Narrative" of 1 Samuel* (1977), by P. D. Miller, Jr. and J. J. M. Roberts. In addition, there is Arnold's work, "*Ephod and Ark*" (1917) which is a monograph of research about the ark based on the relationship between Ephod and the ark in the Massoretic text and LXX, particularly in the historical books. In addition, there were a huge number of articles that contributed further studies on the ark. These will be explored in the following chapters.

The above mentioned scholarly works appear to have attempted to meticulously expound the meaning and function of the ark in Old Testament times. However, the results of these studies

hardly reach a consensus, since the presuppositions and methodologies of these studies are quite diverse. In many cases, such postulates originated under the influence of the philosophies of the day. As a result, these works fail to render satisfactory answers to numerous questions raised about the ark of Yahweh in the Old Testament.

Dibelius' *Die Lade Jahves* appears to be a typical opus in which the *religionsgeschichtliche* approach was fully implemented (1906:6). At the first stage of his explanation, he (1906:8-44) splits all texts pertaining to the ark into two groups on the basis of historical-literary criticism: "Die ältesten Berichte über die Lade," which contain the texts of Numbers, 1, 2 Samuel and Jeremiah and "Die späteren Vorstellungen von der Lade," corresponding to the rest of the 'ark passages' in the Old Testament and Apocrypha. The general feature of his book is an attempt to explain most selections, referring to the ark from the standpoint of "die Lade ist ein Thron" (1906:27, 102-110). To be sure, he (1906:55) suggests prooftexts on the notion as if it were a syllogism: "Nach Ez. 1 ist die Lade ein Abbild des Himmels, ... Denn auch der Himmel ist ein Thron Gottes" but it seems debatable, since the picture of Ezekiel 1 has nothing to do with the ark. Undoubtedly, his idea of the throne emanated not so much from the biblical perspective as from the *religionsgeschichtliche* view. Referring to the writings of Herodotus, Xenophon and Curtius, he (1906:60-63) clarified the meaning of the ark through analogy to the *ledige Thronwagen* of Ahura Mazdâ, the Persian god, which was drawn by eight white horses. Yet whether the meaning of God's revelation can properly be explained by the view of comparative religion requires much discussion. Dibelius (1906:31f. 111f.) accepts neither the origin of the ark in Exodus 25 nor in Deuteronomy 10 because "so hat das nach dem soeben Gesagten keinen historischen Wert." He discounts the events associated with the prominent role of the ark in crossing the Jordan river and in the fall of Jericho in Joshua 3-6 because he believes that they merely reflect the then-contemporary view. At best, he (1906:118) assumes that the ark was fabricated either inside or outside Palestine under the Babylonian influence, completely independent of Yahweh at the outset. For him (1906:56, 110), the ark also functions as *Kriegspanier* and *Feldzeichen*, since Yahweh is not *der über die ganze Erde herrschende Universalgott* but *der Himmelsgott* who is tied only to his people and his land. His people should carry the ark to the battlefield in a foreign country as a sign of God's intervention during the war. Dibelius may well assume so from his own point of view, but such a conception

about the ark is hardly supported on biblical grounds. In fact, in consideration of the whole disposition of this book, this question may have to be answered prior to assessment of Dibelius' writing: Is it valid to provide biblical meaning of the ark from direct inference of such pagan practice and mythological images, neglecting the trustworthiness of biblical documents and the distinctiveness of God's revelation?

Sevensma's dissertation (1908:101ff.) which strongly reflects contemporary historico-literary criticism ("Wellhausen school"), as a whole, argues that the ark is not mere symbol but a portable sanctuary in which the deity is actually present. In many places, he (1908:58, 75) identifies the ark with deity by appealing to the reference of the texts in 1 Sam 4:3; 4:7; 6:3 and the events connected with the ark. Moreover, he (1908:7) supposes that Moses manufactured God's images and the ark with the collected ornaments (Ex. 33:7). Yet his contention appears to require more meticulous exegesis of the passages in question. Sevensma (1908:90, 99f.), following the likes of Budde, classifies the literary sources according to the designations of the ark. As it were, the oldest name is אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהִים, the sequent one, אֲרוֹן יְהוָה, the next one, אֲרוֹן בְּרִית and the last, אֲרוֹן עֵדוּת. Particularly, for him (1908:27, 116), D devaluates the ark compared to P, which supplemented D's tradition, although both have consensus in that the ark is a box. For D, the ark is just a subordinate object on account of the importance of its contents, while for P, the ark is a valuable receptacle for the עֵדוּת. In other words, D conceives that the function of the ark depends on the importance of the authority of the law (Sevensma, 1908:28).

However, Sevensma (1908:29f.) does not give credit to the data which the much later description of P informs about the ark: "eene door de fantasie ingegeven anachronistische beschrijving"; "De historische waarde van dit onderdeel der door P.C. gegeven beschrijving kan in elk geval niet groot zijn. De betrouwbaarheid neemt af, naarmate de onduidelijkheid toeneemt." As a result, he (1908:32f.) supposes that the Israelites had not the least idea of the cherubim, which P allegedly offered, until they entered the land of Canaan. In fact, this solution seems to mirror a view of *Religionsgeschichte*. Furthermore, there are some indications that he (1908:69) also applied the method of traditio-historical criticism to exegete some texts of the Books of Samuel: "De verschillende trekken der verhalen hangen samen met volksetymologieën en losse anecdoten..." In a word, he (1908:37) regards the narrative about

the ark in the Book of Samuel as a legend. It may be inappropriate for him to do research on the ark described in the biblical passages without historical reliability of the biblical materials.

Brouwer (1955) commences with summary and critique of the historical stream of the historico-literary criticism in relation to four sources and he criticises it. His position (1955: 15, 16) regarding historico-literary criticism is as follows: "Er is geen enkel bezwaar tegen, om ruiterlijk te erkennen, dat in de Pentateuch allerlei verschillende stemmen meespreken. ... Zo horen de verhalen van the Oude Testament voor ons daar, waar zij nu staan." He (1955:19-21) also declines the use of traditio-historical criticism: "Zij zien in deze opdracht aan Mozes een z.g. aetiologische sage uit de tijd van de tweede tempel. ... We moeten niet vergeten, dat in de tweede tempel geen ark meer aanwezig was." Nevertheless, he (1955:30, 111; cf. 116) still aligns himself with this method, to some extent, in that he takes the book of Joshua as "het zuiver deuteronomistische" or "de deuteronomistische geschiedschrijving." Such a disposition is implied in his explanation of the concept of *heilshistorie* which he employs as a point of departure for his research. He (1955:16) specifies the term as *exclusief-heilshistorisch*, that is different from historical facts as such, and from *een inclusief heilshistorische* which is said to contain actual historical facts. Moreover, even if it is fully understandable for him to underline the *heilshistorische* nature of the Bible, the ambiguous expression in the first clause of this sentence is liable to lead to misunderstanding: "Wij hebben in de bijbel nooit te maken met zuiver historische gegevens, maar altijd met historische gegevens plus die eigenaardige interpretatie vanuit het zichzelf openbarende heil Gods" (1955:17). However, it may have to be said that the biblical documents have to do with *bare* facts in history as well as historical events which are characterized by God's intention for redemption because the Bible does not allow a distinction between bare facts and meaningful facts: it is impossible to recognize *heilshistorische* meaning without recognizing that something has happened which signifies this meaning.

As a whole, his exposition on the ark looks simply like a theological description rather than an exegesis, without the elaborate work of textual criticism and careful consideration of the literary character of the biblical texts. His comprehension of the ark in Deuteronomy, which brings up the image of Von Rad's *entmythologie* of the ark, may debase the innate value of the ark: "Hier ontbreekt volkomen het sacrale karakter van de ark en is zij alleen geworden tot een simpele kist waarin de stenen tafelen worden bewaard" (1955:82). Likewise, it is unsatisfactory

that he (1955:110f.) downplays the function of the ark described in whole passages of the book of Joshua because of its 'Deuteronomistical' character, although the ark was involved in the book's miraculous events of crossing of the Jordan river and the collapse of Jericho. In particular, Brouwer's (1955:120) contention that the ark did not stand in the tabernacle but in a Canaanite temple in Shiloh is debatable since he understands the term הֵיכָל differently from the tabernacle. Thus according to him, there stood in Shiloh the tabernacle and simultaneously the pagan temple. With respect to David's carrying of the ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6), it may be more disputable that he (1955:169) insists that David considered the ark simply as God's war-emblem: "Daar denkt hij de ark nog zuiver as het oorlogsembleem van de God die voorop gaat." For him (1955:70), the cherubim over the *kapporeth* on the ark are a throne. Incidentally his presumption (1955:142) that the ark was housed for almost fifty years in Kiriath-Jearim hardly matches the biblical chronology.

Maier (1965:5ff., 24, 29, 37) did research into the materials, referring to the ark roughly in the chronological order of the biblical books, while he classified the texts in detail on the basis of historico-literary and *überlieferungsgeschichtlichen* criticism. Although he (1965:1) commences his work along the same vein as Sevensma, who presupposed the division of literary sources in his dissertation, he (1965:5ff.) outstrips Sevensma by following the contemporary tendency of more complicated criticism to spell out the texts involving the ark; the sigla R^{LJ} which he uses in the analysis of Numbers 10:29-36 were not known before Eissfeldt, who designated L (Laienquellen) as the oldest document. His research on the ark is initiated with his lack of conviction that the Tent of Meeting has any relation to the ark (Maier, 1965:3). After all, he (1965:3, 12-18) assigns the pericopes referring to the ark in the wilderness, such as Ex. 33:1-17 and Num. 10:33b-36, to a late interpolation: "es gibt für die Existenz der Lade vor der Richterzeit keinen verlässlichen Beleg." For him (1965:27, 39, 73), the miraculous narratives of Jos. 3f. and 6 were recorded on the basis of Jerusalem theology in the late period of the kings to glorify the ark according to the example of "the ark narrative" in the books of Samuel. Eventually, the occurrence linked with the ark in the book of Joshua is ascribed to the aetiological event in conformity to Noth and Keller (1965:29). Moreover, he (1965:41) contends that the ark had never been in Bethel, since he considers Jud. 20:27f. as a post-deuteronomistic insertion. As a sequel to this claim, the meaning of the ark in the period of Judges remains

unknown (1965:50). While his criticism focuses on the amphictyony hypothesis according to which the ark is considered as a central sanctuary of the twelve tribes, Mair (1965:59) seems to believe that the ark was fabricated as a container for a covenant document, or *Bundessymbol* of the twelve tribes of Israel.

By distinguishing several stages in the development of the story, according to a variety of terms by which the ark is designated in the texts of Samuel, Maier (1965:45-50, 60) proposes that the oldest version of 'the Ark Narrative' can be recognised by the designation "the Ark of God," while "the Ark of YHWH" will be characteristic of the later "Ladeerzähler," in the same way as the documents in the Pentateuch are separated on the basis of the different names of God. In particular Maier (1965:61) takes 'Israel' in 2 Samuel 6:1, 5 as the Northern Tribes, which implies that David chose the people out of the Northern parts of Israel to carry the ark. The result is that Maier cannot help estimating David's attempt to carry the ark as a political and military trick in order to unite both kingdoms which were opposed to each other, namely the lines of Saul and David (1965:63). However, it may be hard to construe historical events concerned with the ark entirely from a political perspective. For him, the ark passes for a dynastic symbol related to the covenant (cf. 1965:63, 69, 70, 75, 81). As a whole, his study on the ark methodologically revolves around Eißfeldt's hypothesis and an *überlieferungsgeschichtlichen* approach.

Woudstra's (1965) work, *"The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship,"* offers salient theological and exegetical insights on this subject, especially based on the position that the biblical materials are considered as literally reliable documents of the revelation contained therein. However, his study is not an all-inclusive research on the ark in the Old Testament, as the title of his book suggests. In particular, it lacks numerous details about the 'ark passages,' such as the origin of the ark in Exodus, the crossing of the Jordan river, the destruction of Jericho in the book of Joshua and the carrying off of the ark and its transfer to Jerusalem in the books of Samuel. However Woudstra (1965:20-27) rightly criticizes different views that the ark concept originated from social and cultic traditions of the peoples surrounding Israel. On the whole, his thematic research appears to take on an apologetic tendency rather than an exegetical one. In the case of his explanation of the ark in Deuteronomy, when he uses the phrase "Its purpose is a parenetic one" or "a summary nature," his apology for the sanctity of

the ark in "D" against von Rad's demythologizing, is unconvincing and he fails to prove that "D" recognizes that the ark is more than a receptacle. Presumably due to such a trait, specific significance of the ark as a historic fact is insufficiently clarified. Although he (1965:55) rightly observes that the ark is to be regarded as a true pledge of Yahweh's presence, he fails to demonstrate God's various attributes and the dynamic meaning of his activities which occurred at the events concerned with the ark. While his attitude towards the biblical document tends consistently to resist extra-biblical analogies, the biblical meaning of the footstool linked with the ark is not accepted in that the method for its interpretation stems from outside (1965:88-90). His exegesis of 2 Sam. 11:11 appears not to be persuasive when he (1965:119-121) tries to explain that the ark was not used as a palladium of battle. This appears to be derived from his stiffly apologetic standpoint against critics' notions. It is undesirable to take an approach that rejects a theological understanding simply because it is related to syncretism, even though the text calls the ark a footstool (cf. 1 Chr. 28:2; Ps. 132:7).

In the monographs issued by Schicklberger (1973), Campbell (1975), Miller, Jr. and Roberts (1977), their authors call the account of the ark in the books of Samuel "the Ark Narrative." This is founded in the theory of Rost (1965:124ff.) who believes that the narrative of 1 Samuel 4-6 and 2 Samuel 6 consisted of a circular pattern detailing David's rise to power. The editor of the Books of Samuel inserted it separately in the historical context around the tenth century. Since this position is closer to traditio-historical criticism than historico-literary criticism, it has little interest in the historicity of the texts.

The starting point of Schicklberger's study in *Die Ladeerzählungen des ersten Samuel-Buches* (1973) is to separate 1 Samuel 4 from the following chapters on literary and traditio-historical grounds. He (1973:42, 70ff.) tends to consider the "novellistische Katastrophenerzählung" of 1 Samuel 4 as an originally independent unit of an oral narrative following Rost's word statistics (v. 1a (LXX).b. 2-4. 10-12. 13aa (without **יָשָׁב עַל־הַכֶּסֶּף**) βγb. 14b-18a. 19-21 (without **הִלְקָח** in 21b?). That is to say, the omitted content of verses 5-9 and Yahweh's defeat of the Philistines show a late stage of the development of holy war ideology tied with Isaiah's theology (1973:187). It remains open whether such a literary analysis is appropriate. For Schicklberger (1973:172f.), the purpose of the narrative in 1 Samuel 4:1-6:16

is to express a judgment derived from past events and to make an assertion of a religious nature, namely that Yahweh is bound to the ark, and that the ark and its God can, and did, demonstrate their power. He (1973:223f.) construes that the intention of the narrative is to bring the ark tradition into full theological consciousness, emphasizing the ark as the expression of the nearness of Yahweh, as opposed to the insistence of the Zion tradition. Because of the composed theological nature of the *Katastrophenerzählung* which is associated with the loss of the ark, Schicklberger (1973:199f.) seems to use the narrative about the ark as an etiological and cultic saga rather than historical event. He (1973:232f.) dates the text of the narrative as late eight or early seventh century, particularly by referring to similarity between topographical-political situation of the narrative and that of Hezekiah. As a whole, his work gives undue value to analysis of the narrative instead of its explication. In addition, his positive appraisal of Hobni and Pinhaz's service to the ark seems generally inadequate: "ihren Dienst an der Lade treu verrichtend" (1973:15).

Campbell's (1975) literary analysis is also based on that of Rost. He (1975:166-168) adds additional parts such as 1 Sam. 4:22; 6:5-9, 17-18; 2 Sam. 6:16, 20-23 to the original texts to which Rost ascribed. With respect to the relationship between 1 Samuel 4-6 and 2 Samuel 6, he (1975:126-143, 169-174) regards the story of 2 Samuel 6 as the conclusion of "the Ark Narrative." However, this view is directly confronted by an opposing view that there are many differences between the vocabulary and style of 1 Samuel 4-6 and 2 Samuel 6. He (1975:201) considers that the theological intention of the narrative is to show "that Yahweh brought the old epoch to an end by the defeat of his people and the departure of his glory" and to indicate "that Yahweh looks with favour on the new, the Davidic era in Jerusalem." For him (1975:202) the narrative is merely a theological work to legitimate Yahweh's blessing on the beginning of a new Davidic era. While Campbell underscores Yahweh's freedom and initiative in the event of the Israelite defeat and the ark's captivity in Philistine, he failed to spell out the attributes of the covenantal God who acted in the matter. For instance, he (1975:200) avoids answering the question about the cause of the Israelite failure: "It is not attributed to any sin, any national fault, any breach of covenant. In fact, covenant is not mentioned, except in the title of the ark. No cause is alleged. It is not an end, 'because' - it is simply an end." Yet this contention seems to result from observations that exclude the historical context of the narrative. That is, his

literary-analytical inclination, which is focused on the 'end' and the 'beginning,' might cloud his theological insight. Besides, it looks clumsy to depict the sovereign movement of Yahweh as a second or new Exodus and new Conquest (1975:205) because these historical events have to do with people's movement. With relation to the ark, Campbell's insistence is on the freedom and initiative of Yahweh (1975:205). However, as the title "The Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4-6; 2 Sam 6): A Form-Critical and Traditio-Historical Study" expresses itself, so he (1975:39) questions the historicity of the events connected with 1 Samuel 4-6 and 2 Samuel 6: "neither section is history; both are theological narratives."

In contrast to Schicklberger and Campbell, Miller and Roberts (1977:25) define the boundary of 'the ark narrative' beginning with the presentation of religious corruption of the Elide sons and ending with the ark being given to a new caretaker in the boondocks of Israel: 1 Sam 2:12-17, 22-25, 27-36; 4:1b-7:1. Here the authors use the prophecy of a man of God in 1 Samuel 2 as an introduction to the narrative in 1 Samuel 4 because they (1977:18f.) feel that there should be some reason for Yahweh's displeasure toward Israel. Then the question arises as to why Yahweh's oracle to Samuel about the punishment against the Elides (1 Sam. 3:12-14) should not be involved in the narrative, if it commences with the prophecy of the Elide sin and God's judgment of his house. It appears that they are more interested in the reconstruction of the story than the historical progress of the events. The authors (1977:73-75) believe that the narrative was formulated prior to David's imperial expansion and his subduing of the Philistines to verify Yahweh's superiority over Dagon and to account for Israel's temporary dispossession of the ark. The theological intent of the narrative, alleged as a theologically full-grown legend, appears to take on the nature of political etiology (1977:75) regardless of God's resolution to reform Israelite offices by punishment of the perverted priests in whole historical context. According to them (1977:60), the issue of the narrative in 1 Samuel is not what happens to the ark, but what Yahweh is doing among his people. Yahweh's power and purpose are the essence of this narrative. The narrative shows how the divine intention to punish and slay the Elides was brought about in an event which engulfed all people - the defeat of the Israelites at the battle of Ebenezer (1977:70). However, his view (1977:70) seems unfounded that the ark is lost because those accompanying it are the faithless sons of Eli and that he (1977:58, 70) simply regards the ark as a throne, neglecting the procedure of argument.

Above all, the conspicuous trait of this work is to explicate the events by using the extrabiblical parallels. Yet it may be hard to determine to what extent the documents are useful to understand the meaning of Yahweh's action in Philistine, apart from their expectation. In particular, it is difficult to grasp the meaning of the phrase: "The incident of these five verses is rooted in Canaanite mythology ... but at the same time, in typically Israelite fashion, it is 'demythologized' (1977:72)." In their interpretation of 2 Samuel 6, "If the Assyrians could offer sacrifices all the way from Assur to Babylon--a quite considerable distance--why could David not offer sacrifices every six steps from the house of Obed-Edom to Jerusalem?" (1977:96). It is still doubtful to explain a practice of Yahweh's cult on the Babylonian analogy.

Arnold's monograph is mainly confined to textual problems of the ark and Ephod in Hebrew and Greek texts. His argument (1917:13ff.) began with the textual criticism of 1 Sam. 14:18. He (1917:22f.) contends that the Massoretic text should be sustained, specifying the irrelevance of the Greek text on the grounds that Ephod has no relation to divination and the whereabouts of the ark was unknown during Saul's reign. Recognizing that historically the ark was in Kiriath-jearim during the battle of Michmash, he (1917:24ff.) proposes that the ark that Saul ordered brought should be a different ark. This idea reflects Jewish tradition that there were two arks in the early stage of Israelite history. Furthermore, he (1917:27ff.) maintains that the reference to the ark in 2 Sam. 11:11 is associated with another ark, and that the "Ephod" in the Massoretic text of 1 Sam. 23:6, 9; 30:7; 1 King. 2:26; 1 Sam. 21:10; Jud. 17f., 8:27 should be replaced by the "ark," on the basis of the Massoretic text in 1 Sam. 14:18. Arnold's argument directly raises some questions: Where did the different arks come from?; Did Yahweh authorize the other ark?; Are such arks themselves justified as a source of information for divination? Why is there no plural form of the designation referring to the ark in the Old Testament?, etc. His hypothesis (1917:34ff.) of manifold sacred boxes is also combined with different forms of divine appellation. The assumption that אֲרוֹן יְהוָה is a different object form אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהִים may be able to be sustained on the basis of Canaanite linguistic usage rather than biblical evidence. He (1917:133) conceives that the ark is a miniature temple and ordinarily the sacred box was not too large to be carried by a single person. As a whole, if Arnold's contention is persuasive, more problems should still be settled exegetically and theologically, in particular those related to the Deuteronomistic position.

As evaluated above, judgments of the meaning and the function of the ark differ according to the individual standpoint, although it is broadly accepted that the ark played a paramount part in Israelite religion and lives. Whether or not the methodologies and viewpoints that the authors employed to determine the meaning of the ark are appropriate, the outcome of the research leaves not only much to be desired but ends with a debatable and biased result. Nevertheless, there may sometimes be instances where previous studies are helpful if their premises are critically appraised. In my opinion, whatever their postulate is, it is important to examine the biblical materials, acknowledging the intention of the divine Author as he made use of surrogate authors at different times. This also means that in studying the biblical writings the acts of God in history cannot be ignored, since the plain reading of the text places God's revelation in the process of actual history. In the exegetical process the previous assumption should be scientifically scrutinised so as to come to grips with the *magnalia Dei*. This also implies an account of the methodological stance of the researcher.

1.2. The Aims of this Study and its Hypothesis

This thesis aims to examine the ark of Yahweh in the whole Old Testament from a redemptive historic standpoint applying a philological-historical method of exegesis, i.e. a three-dimensional approach, in contrast to the historico-literary and the *überlieferungsgeschichtlichen* approaches.

Although the contributions of scholars who used the same sort of approach should be acknowledged (cf. pp. 18-19), this monograph will be a fresh attempt within this field to deal with the ark as described in the entirety of the Old Testament. Moreover, this research will also contribute to the theological development in Korea where this subject has never before been broached in spite of its importance.

The aims of this study thus become clear: the research will be concerned with an elucidation of the ark on the basis of the biblical texts and their apparent intentions while making manifest its richness of meaning.

The point of departure in this study is the self-evident nature of the Scripture (cf. Holwerda, 1972:1). The Old Testament as well as the New Testament is given by God. The Holy Spirit not only inspired the authors but also moved the people of God to accept the two testaments as the authoritative word of God (Lion-Cachet, 1989:1). The special interest of God resulted in the formation of each biblical book and the collection of books through *providentia specialissima*.

Primarily, the interpretation of Scripture is to be guided by faith, in contrast, for example, to Fohrer (1972:31), who investigates the Old Testament in terms identical to those of any other literature and who states that understanding the Old Testament does not require faith. It is natural that the interpretation of Scripture is part of the real experience of the interpreter; one can apply all the exegetical instruments available from historical, linguistic, and philological research and never reach the heart of the matter unless one yields to the basic experience out of which the biblical writers speak, namely faith (cf. Hasel, 1995:200, 201; Körtner, 1994:60; Cazelles, 1971:89). Therefore, *a priori*, Christian faith should be admitted in understanding the Scriptures.

Furthermore, the fact that God's revelation consists of two aspects (event and word) and that the Scriptures appear as a written form of history requires that the exegete should consider historical and philological approaches in their exegesis of the Bible. History is the first context for interpretation. The exegete is to pay due regard to the historical aspect because the nature of Scripture, God's eternal Word given in human words in history, demands it (Fee, 1996:32; cf. Lion-Cachet, 1989:2). Then the term 'philology' is used in many fields including linguistics and literary study. The reason why the term 'philological' method (instead of the 'grammatical' method, which has been traditionally used) is adopted here is because the methodology of this study will not overlook the theory of literary interpretation entirely in exegesis of the biblical texts; rather, it will employ it properly: "terwyl ons onder filologie verstaan die bestudering en verklaring van die inhoud van die oorgelewerde en beskikbare teks" (Verhoef, 1973:28). It is necessary to consider literary forms of the biblical texts in a proper way, for Scripture has a variety of ways of speaking (Heb. 1:1) and the process of interpretation requires a variety of hermeneutical approaches, corresponding to this variety in types of texts.

Exegesis is also in need of theological insight. Without such a perspective the work of

exegetical interpretation may easily become endangered by isolating individual texts from the whole. The theological perspective may not only be obtained from the Old Testament itself but from the relationship between the Old Testament and the New Testament and sequential processes through the two Testaments. For Christian scholars, the Old Testament should not be regarded as mere Hebrew literature or the Hebrew Bible but should be accepted as an authoritative canon which is not different from the New Testament. The principle of this interpretation, a tradition already illustrated in Augustine (*De civitate dei*, 5:18): "*reuelante testamento nouo quod in uetere uelatum fuit*" (The New Testament reveals what is veiled in the Old) already reflects the redemptive historical approach in exegesis at a theological level. Thus, a theological presupposition is required as the starting point of biblical exegesis.

There are different theological themes, motifs and concepts available for describing the meaning of Old Testament texts: covenant, kingdom of God, promise and fulfillment, redemptive history, the name Yahweh, God himself, etc. (Hasel, 1995:139-171). Although they all bear to some extent their own worth as themes of the Old Testament, redemptive history, introduced as "Heilsgeschichte" in German, is preferred and adopted in this study for interpreting the Old Testament. This concept links the two Testaments together (cf. Fuller, 1992, 102; Cullmann, 1948:68, 69) and it acts as a ground of religious life and faith of Israel (Weippert, 1973:419-421). Redemptive history also has the advantage of being able to be used as a comprehensive concept relating to a variety of other themes such as covenant, God's reign, promise and fulfillment. The redemptive history theme has the distinctive character of opposing the use of the Old Testament in other religions such as Judaism and Islam (cf. Ridderbos, 1988:25). In many respects, it may deserve to be adopted as a theological point of departure to interpret the Bible, since redemptive history never remains merely as a static topic but provides itself with a proper and exegetical perspective as a dynamic theme which denotes God's activity in redeeming and perfecting his saving will (Maier, 1990:167-173). The concept of redemptive history is a theological presupposition that is set forth by the Bible itself. Needless to say, it is not the only perspective, as Long denotes (1994:99): "Redemptive history is a necessary condition of the truth of the Christian faith, even if it is not sufficient condition thereof."

However, because the term 'redemptive history' (Heilsgeschichte) was first introduced in rationalistic circles it still is flawed like other terms that originated from the rationalistic approaches

of the Old Testament (Trimp, 1986:44). Greater discussion on this matter will be presented in the next chapter (2.4).

Nevertheless it could be relevant for this study to use this term. More specifically, the term can be used to understand the historical texts of the Bible: for the Bible itself is representative of the concept of redemptive history, even though it preceded this term and thus does not directly mention it.

To be sure, the Bible, as the Word of God, does more than describe history. The biblical text points to bare facts in history, but it tells history with redemptive significance. Redemptive history, as a process of the historical realization of God's eternal plan for salvation in Christ, plays a key role in God's revelation. Thus, the Bible actually has a redemptive-historical character. For centuries the Bible has told us that God has saved his people. Therefore, historical events should be approached via the text in which the concomitant narratives are included. Within this context the concept of the narrative will not be separated from historicity, because narratives that exclude historicity cannot be regarded as portraying God's work.

Redemptive history as an exegetical viewpoint at the theological level has a variety of manifestations and is related to them. These include *historia revelationis*, history of covenant, salvation history, God-centred, Christocentric and Christological approaches. These concepts and their reciprocal relationship will be more comprehensively discussed in the next chapter. The exegesis based on this idea comprises the method of the historical-philological interpretation. This approach, primarily from the perspective of redemptive history, which is my hypothesis will be applied to the exegesis of the texts in question.

1.3. Scope and Limitations

This study will deal with all the texts referring to the ark of Yahweh in the Old Testament. Naturally, the exegesis is not an exhaustive investigation on every text containing the word 'ark' but a study of the text showing its function in progress of history. After an exegesis of these Old Testament texts, an attempt shall be made to define a theological concept applicable to

the New Testament idea, so that the ark of Yahweh in the Old Testament also has important meaning in the New Testament.

It is necessary to utilize textual criticism in this study, as many parts of the texts in the books of Samuel may be corrupt. The materials for the purpose of this study will be limited in the form of several important codices and versions such as MT, \aleph , Q, T, Syr, LXX, LXX^a, LXX^b, LXX^L, Vg.

As regards the canonical status, all relevant critical methodologies do not need to be examined in detail, if it is considered that some of them lie in the same vein. Thus, after the introduction to the instances in which some kinds of criticism are used, their limitations, presuppositions and arbitrariness will be pointed out and examined thoroughly. It is not necessary to be so intensely involved in the higher criticism because a close study of these methods is not necessary for our purpose.

The Near Eastern texts or archaeological excavations outside the Bible will be used only as secondary sources. The ark will be examined and subsequently compared with cultic objects from different religions which are alleged to have the same meaning as that of the ark.

The archaeological efforts for recovering the lost ark are irrelevant for the purpose of this study because the archaeological meaning of the ark that might be found in the future is different from that of the Old Testament.

1.4. Study Methods

First, an evaluation of historical-literary criticism and traditio-historical criticism, including modern literary criticism, will be made. Next, an attempt will be made to introduce and define the concept of redemptive history (Heilsgeschichte). Yet, this term invites misunderstanding in the field of Old Testament studies because the term in itself does not belong solely to Reformed theology. On the contrary, it is a concept that was developed alongside ideal or rationalistic theology during the last two centuries. In this section the idea of 'redemptive history' on the basis of, *inter alia*, the views of Schilder (1931: 365; 1946:225; cf. Greidanus, 1970:30ff.),

Holwerda (1953:89ff.), and Trimp (1986:12-17), in opposition to Hofmann (1841, cf. Kraus, 1988:226-230; Steck, 1959:31), Cullmann (1946:107-156; 1967:104-110), von Rad (1957:114), Bultmann (1975:306) and Pannenberg (1967:121; 1963:95-114), will be developed.

The third chapter will focus on the exegesis of the given texts. Of course, these exegeses will be crystallized through an elaborate process including an attempt to handle the problems of canonicity (the term 'introduction' will be avoided in this study because it is not a confessional but neutral term), reconstruction of the Hebrew texts through textual criticism, grammatical analysis, application of historical situations and a decision about the meaning.

For the canonical status the standard works of scholars such as Kraus, Houtman, Holwerda, Clements, Childs, Eissfeldt, Aalders, Driver, Harrison, Young, Soggin, Rendtorff etc. will be consulted.

The Masoretic text is to be used as the point of departure for textual criticism. In the case of obscurity with regards to the contents and possible corruption of the Hebrew text, the above mentioned versions and codices are used.

For grammatical analysis, the grammar books of Gesenius-Kautzsch, Joüon, Joüon-Muraoka, Jenni, König, Lettinga, Waltke and O'Conner are to be consulted, as well as the dictionaries such as *HALAT*, *BDB*, *TWAT*, *THAT*, etc.

For historical and geographical research the books of Bright, Albright, Herrmann, Aharoni, Jagersma, Pedersen, De Vaux, etc. will be consulted. The research of the so-called 'Albright school' may be useful, despite its tendency to adhere to the results of archaeology in such a way that these results may supercede historical events as related in the Bible.

The final step of this research involves consultation of different Old Testament commentaries and articles which may shed light on modern tendencies.

In addition structural analysis will be used where deemed necessary, even though the method often appears to be of little help in determining the meaning of the texts since its results may vary according to different theologians and their schools.

The fourth chapter will initially demonstrate the manner in which the ark differs from the sanctuaries of the other religions outside of Israel, even though many modern scholars draw parallels between them. The meaning of the ark shall be theologically defined according to the themes derived from exegetical research.

Themes of revelation history of the Old Testament as well as the New Testament will be established. This part will systematically and fully explain the function and meaning of the ark. This study will thus reveal the relevance of the ark for Christians believing in God.

In the conclusion, the results of this study will be outlined in order to offer a possible application of this knowledge for modern Christians.

2. Main methods applied to the study on the ark of Yahweh

To give a detailed account of all the various exegetical methods is not the primary aim of this research, nor would a short summary of these be satisfactory, for that could lead to an over-simplification of a complex problem. It will be more appropriate to deal with the principal contemporary methods which reflect the essence of recent tendencies found in biblical interpretation. The reason why several methods are selected in this chapter is that they are main methods which have been applied to the research on the ark of Yahweh. The treatment of the methodologies in this chapter has the advantage of avoiding unneeded overlap of the assessment of irrelevant criticism at each exegetical point. The exegetical methods to be examined are as follows: 1) historical-literary criticism, which has not only been welcomed widely as a comprehensive methodology of the Old Testament study since Wellhausen but also was predominantly employed in Sevensma's and Maier's study of the ark of Yahweh (Sevensma, 1908:1; Maier, 1965:5f.), 2) traditio-historical criticism, including modern literary criticism which is an alternative methodology to historical criticism. Although both tend to move in an anti-historical direction by focusing on literary traits (cf. Long, 1994:149-160), the studies on "the Ark Narrative" by Campbell (1979:39) and Schicklberger (1973) use literary criticism, and 3) the redemptive historical approach as a theological method which will dominate the exegetical method in this study.

2.1. Historico-literary criticism

2.1.1. Its application to studies on the ark

The title, "historical-literary criticism" reflects Wellhausen's study in which he combined both literary and historical criticism: "Wellhausen's method is historical and literary" (Morgan & Barton, 1988:82). According to him (1927:35-38; 340-360), the whole of Israel's history, including the events related to the ark, is considered as an unrealistic history created by P as a back-projection of the priestly religion.

This approach which has become widely accepted was applied to the research on the ark by numerous scholars, even though a difference of range and extent of the application apparently exists between them. Specifically Wellhausen (1927:40f.) seems to doubt Mosaic origin of the ark in that he thoroughly denied the existence of the tabernacle in Exodus 25 where the instructions for both are found: "die hebräische Überlieferung, ... für welche doch die mosaische Stiftshütte eigens bestimmt ist, nichts von derselben weiss," while he (1927:43) believes that the existence of the ark of Yahweh is certainly traceable towards the end of the period of the Judges (1 Sam. 4-6). In fact, for him the existence of the ark has nothing to do with that of the tabernacle because it is fabricated by "P," although the two belong necessarily to each other; one cannot exist without the other, according to the Old Testament text. Moreover his advocacy that atonement by blood was developed in "P" in the final stages of historical evolution of Israelite religion contrasts to the biblical text concerning the origin of the ark, since the atonement place should be located on the ark from the outset (Ex. 25:17ff.; 30:6; 35:12; 39:35; 40:20; Lev. 16:2, 13-15; Num. 7:89). As a proponent of Wellhausen's literary criticism, W. Lotz (1901:12, 15, 30, 41f.) asserts that the different designations of the ark determine the character of the texts in question and the meaning of the ark: JE, *Lade Jahves* or *Lade Gottes: Fetisch*; D, *Bundeslade: der Verhältniss zwischen Gott und Israel*; P, *Lade des Zeugnisses: die Bestätigung* with *eine gewissermassen sakramentale Bedeutung*. In many cases those who take up the position of historico-literary criticism tend to oppose traditio-historical criticism and vice versa. This is illustrated in K. Budde's research, which criticizes the empty throne theory of Dibelius and Gunkel. He (1901: 193-197; 1906:491, 507) contends that the ark cannot be the throne, asserting correspondent use of the texts as well as denoting the flaw of the *religionsgeschichtliche* method: "Es ist also ein großer Irrtum, wenn man meint, mit der Einführung des leeren Thronsitzes dem Verständnis der religionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung Israels einen Dienst zu leisten." Yet he (1906:493, f.) still holds fast to Wellhausen's hypothesis, so that the ark is simply a boxlike container as D describes, and the position of the cherubim on the ark ascribed to P goes back to the model of the cherubim in the Solomonic temple.

As previously mentioned, the influence of this approach is dominant in the study of the ark. In particular, the works of Sevensma (1908:90, 99f.) and Maier (1965:45-50, 60), which classified the documents and dates in accordance with the designations of the ark, evidently

demonstrate that they positively applied the method of historical-literary criticism to their research. In the case of Dibelius' work, despite his *religionsgeschichtliche* approach, he (1906:47) also basically follows the theory of multiple sources. According to them, in so far as the ark is concerned, its meaning is given on the basis of documentary character: for D it is just a box; for P it is a valuable thing for the law. Furthermore, Eissfeldt (1960:281-284) who looks upon L as the earliest source, elaborately analyzes the materials pertaining to the ark's fabrication in accordance with historical-literary criticism. He (1960:284) holds that D, who took over JE^R, must report "von dem Befehl zur Anfertigung der Lade und von dessen Ausführung gleich bei der Erzählung von der herstellung der Ersatztafeln berichten (Deut. 10, 1-5)," and that P, who depends on JED and retains the framework of the stream of JE^R-narratives by changing and omitting many parts of them, defines the fully qualified priests as Aaron's descendents carrying the ark containing the tablets.

In this manner they have substantial identity with negligible difference on the meaning of the ark, since they share in the same position as exegetical methodology. If their result and method are to be accepted, the ark would become merely an imaginative production with theological intent for the Jewish community in the post-exile period. Such a notion would deprive the biblical texts referring to the ark of historical reality. Because they tried to pursue the meaning of the ark, neglecting the peculiarity of divine revelation and reliability of the biblical passages, it is impossible that they came to proper conclusions. That is to say, it is undesirable and unsatisfactory to deal with the ark just as a retrospective product of the period of the second temple. In fact, however prolific they may be, their conclusions are hardly acceptable, if they employ an irrelevant viewpoint on the biblical materials for the explanation for the ark. Therefore it is necessary to evaluate this methodology on which their studies hinge.

2.1.2. The evaluation

As demonstrated above, the volume of research resulting from the application of historical-literary criticism to the study of the Old Testament far outweighs its usefulness in providing a clearer understanding of the ark. Thus, it is only necessary that several problematic areas

relating to historical-literary criticism as an exegetical method be dealt with here instead of giving a too detailed evaluation of Wellhausen's theory.

First, it can be questioned if there is sufficient evidence in the argument of the historico-literary criticism with which Wellhausen and his followers separated the biblical sources and dated them in order to elucidate the development of the Israelite religion and history. Although they have attempted to prove why one source should be dated later than an other, and vice versa, it still remains unconvincing. In fact, the outcome of his study on the Old Testament is the result of his own uncritical acceptance of the literary criticism of the day. For instance, three strata with which he (1927:6-14) worked were adopted from contemporary scholars like Hupfeld (three sources, 1853:VIIIff.), Nöldeke (Jehovist: a combination of J and E), and Graf (late dating of P, 1866:2f.) without any criticism. Even Graf's argument on the late dating of P on which Wellhausen's reconstruction rested is substantially based upon Reuss (1879:241): "Le code sacerdotal date donc d'une époque postérieure à l'exile et c' est code qu'Esdras et Néhémie ont fait accepter par le peuple vers l'an 444 av. J.-C." Reuss had already in 1833 expressed in a lecture this idea that the so-called basic document, i.e., P, was in reality the latest source (cf. Eissfeldt, 1976:219). Thereafter, Graf wrote, in a letter of October 7 1862 to Reuss, his teacher that he accepted the notion: "Dass der ganze mittlere Theil des Pentateuch erst nachexilisch ist, davon bin ich vollkommen überzeugt..." (cited from Külling, 1964:7). This conviction seems to go beyond scientific proof and is purely subjective in nature. Wellhausen's confirmation comes not through objective disputation in which he weighs opposing arguments, but through a decision: "In 1867 hoorde hij dat Graf de wet na de profeten plastste, en zonder nader onderzoek was Wellhausen in zijn hart al gewonnen: N.B. geen literaire kritiek overtuigde hem, maar zijn visie!" (Holwerda, 1972:26). In the long run, Reuss' 'intuition' regarding the dating of the books of the Old Testament became part of Wellhausen's conception of the history of Israel.

In any case, the absence of evidence is exposed in the process of the formation of a documentary hypothesis. In his dissertation, Külling (1985:43-57) maintained that it is absurd that in 1869, the 'P' portions were assigned to the exilic/post-exilic era with one fell swoop based on literary-analytical grounds without proof, and that not until later were arguments brought out to undergird the thesis. In addition it appears reasonable that Linnemann (1990:132-

137) expounded the process of how 'scientific result' can be formed. At the outset there was the intuition. At the end was the conception. Finally, the tradition followed. In Wellhausen, such a conception could only inevitably lead him to an erroneous conclusion rather than reconstruction of a real history of Israel.

Second, the philosophical context of the spirit of the age which shaped Wellhausen's methodology must be discussed: Hegel's historical philosophy. His philosophical system claims to provide a unitary solution to all the problems of philosophy, logic, law, history, culture, etc. It represents the actual development of the *Absolut*. Hegel (1921:31-39) holds that this *Absolut*, first and foremost, puts itself forth in the *Unmittelbarkeit* of its *innerhalb Selbstbewußtsein* and then negates this positing and finally regains itself through the negation of the former negation that had constituted the finite world. This triadic pattern is concretely described as the terms *Sein (ohne alle weitere Bestimmung)*, *Nichts (einfache Gleichheit mit sich selbst, vollkommene Leerheit)* and *Werden (die Bewegung des unmittelbaren Verschwindens des Einen in dem Anderen)* in his *Wissenschaft der Logik* (1948:66f.). This is the model for all scientific thinking according to Hegel's view of science (for the case of philosophy, cf. 1921:31f.). It is not possible to trace the development and expansion of the system in detail, yet one can at least consider the main triad in which the whole nature of *Gedachte* is supposedly brought together and synthesized.

If religion is understood in the framework of Hegel's dialectical structure, religion is the relationship between the limited and unlimited spirit which progresses through history, namely, the unlimited spirit continuing to advance to a higher stage of self-consciousness. Clinging to the scheme of *Sein-Nichts-Werden*, it proceeds from the position where it last achieved its highest stage: *Naturreligion* (Hegel, 1905:189-237; 1921:443-451), *Religion der geistigen Individualität* (Hegel, 1905:248-318; 1921:452-480) and *die absolute Religion*, Christianity (Hegel, 1905:320-331; 1921:481-506). "Die vollendete Religion, die Religion, die das Sein des Geistes für sich selbst ist, in welcher sie selbst sich objektiv geworden, ist die christliche" (1905:321). Therefore, in terms of Hegelian speculation, all religions can be classified as higher or lower religion according to their various phenomena. Likewise he (1921:493f.) depicted the Trinity, *Dreieinigkeit*, as something having three phrases: *Wesen* (Father), *Fürsichsein für welches das Wesen ist* (Word), *Fürsichsein sich selbst Wissens im Andern*

(Spirit). For Hegel the truth is a process of the truth emerging since everything is *Bewegung*.

J. F. L. George (1835) and W. Vatke (1835) also applied Hegelian thought to the study of Old Testament and Israelite religion. According to both Vatke (1835:205ff.) and George (1835:11ff.), the history of the Israelite religion can be divided into three stages: a pre-prophetic (natural religion, *Sein*), a prophetic (commencing with Moses, *Nichts*) and post-prophetic stage (the outline of which begins in the writings of Jeremiah, Ezekiel etc., *Werden*). In the terminology and construction of Vatke's book (1835:249) the extensive influence of Hegel's historical philosophy emerges: "Die spätere religiöse Anschauung des hebräischen Volkes hat daher eben sowohl die sabäische Naturreligion und vorzugsweise die Verehrung des Saturn zu ihrem empirischen Ausgangspunkte, als die Offenbarung der göttlichen Idealität und Heiligkeit zu ihrem höheren Principe." With respect to Vatke's view, it is interesting to note that Wellhausen (1927:14) also confessed to the great influence of his work on his own study: "Meine Untersuchung ist ... nähert sich der Art Vatkes, von welchem letzteren ich auch das meiste und das beste gelernt zu haben bekenne," though his statement seems to be connected directly with documentary sources.

It is true that the spirit of that age was used to offer new insights to the churches and present a new angle for the understanding of the Bible. As a historical product, however, such an exegetical method may not be of relevance to future ages. After all, Wellhausen's failure in historical insight saddled the study of Israelite antiquity with a heavy freight. Therefore, Wellhausen's historical-literature resulted in shading our understanding and consequently prevented acknowledgment of the real history depicted in the Old Testament.

Third, it must be considered that classical literary criticism underestimated the comparison between biblical and extra-biblical literature in the Near East and simultaneously overlooked the results of archaeological excavation, being exclusively engrossed in internal biblical evidence.

The variety of designations of God has for a long time been obstinately accepted and applied as an explanatory criterion for biblical texts. However some Near Eastern literature provides us with proofs that different divine names had nothing to do with the origin of the literatures. Many deities bore multiple names. In the Babylonian *Enuma elish* (translated by E.A. Speiser, Pritchard, 1969:61-72), Ea is also Nudimmud (Tablets I, II), Tiamat is also Mother Khubur (Tablets I, III), and Marduk is also Bel (Tablet IV). In the Ugaritic texts such as *Poems of*

Baal and Anath and *Aqhat* (translated by H.L. Ginsberg, Pritchard, 1969:129-142; 149-155), Kothar-wa-Khasis is also Hayyin (Aqht A, v), and Baal is also Hadd (IV AB ii, iii). In the Sabaeen Inscription (translated by A. Jamme, Pritchard, 1969:665) of Old South Arabia, 'Almaqah or 'Ilumqah has epithets Thahwân, and Thwr-Ba`lm. In the Hittite *Song of Ullikummi* (translated by A. Goetze, Pritchard, 1969:121-125), Ullikummi is referred to as Kunkunuzzi-Stone (the diorite man) (III-d, KUB, XXXIII, 106 iv). It is striking that the different names of one deity were freely put down in one tablet or the text and not in separated documents. In consideration of these phenomena, there is no real warrant for attributing any significance to YHWH and Elohim as literary markers.

In terms of the literary approach, Schmidt (1982:50) acknowledged the impossibility of the classification of sources according to the variation in the divine name: "In den meisten Fällen bleibt der Wechsel (von Gottesnamen: my note) aber sachlich unerklärbar." On a different level Soggin (1989:87f.) rejected God's names as a criterion by observing that in the Samaritan Pentateuch an ancient translation such as LXX lacked consistency in rendering and setting God's names, viz. אלהים and יהוה. Thus it is the opinion of this paper that these two names might be used in turn, according to the preference of certain religious groups and the progress of time in the history of Israel.

As matter of fact many details of Israelite history and religion have been confirmed by the spade (cf. Thompson, 1990:33-74), even though *l'archéologie ne peut prouver l'historicité des textes bibliques* (Cazelles, 1971:151; Lion-Cachet, 1995:32, 34). Above all patriarchal history, regarded only as a fictional story by the followers of the hypothesis ("Was übrig bleibt, ist mit nichten die historische Objektivität, sondern das Schema," Wellhausen, 1927:333) became undisputed actual events through the support of the concrete evidence of the archaeological discoveries at Nuzu. The evidence found there exposed Nuzu social practices regarding adoption, the rights of primogeniture, irrevocable blessings etc. (Pritchard, 1969:219-220; cf. 159f.; Vaux, 1961^a:72-86; Whybray, 1995:20f.). The text from Mari offered the historicity of cultural a picture relating to places and persons in the patriarchal period (cf. Ahlström, 1994:180ff.). Thus, the patriarchal narratives can hardly be regarded as JE, originating from the period of the divided monarchy. As regards the tabernacle, Wellhausen (1927:40f.) denied the possibility of its existence due to the destitute situation of the wilderness. Such a notion is now challenged by

a hands-on excavated tabernacle of Midianites in Timma. If these people could worship in a multicolored cloth tabernacle in the late second millennium, why not the Hebrews? (cf. Kitchen, 2003:279).

In the case of Deuteronomy, Kline (1963:41; cf. Lion-Cachet, 1989:36f.) emphasized the structural unity and integrity of Deuteronomy in a comparison between the Hittite suzerainty treaties and those of the covenant at Sinai. The literary unity of Deuteronomy has been illustrated extensively by international treaties recovered from Boghazköy, the ancient Hittite capital. Consequently the book can confidently be placed in the period from which it purports to have come, namely in the second millennium B.C. rather than in the age of Josiah (Kitchen, 1966:90ff.; Hoffner dated the structure of Hittite treaties most closely resembling that of the Old Testament covenant form as ca. 1344-1271 B.C., 1994:146). Although it may not directly prove the antiquity of the biblical document with the ancient custom, it provides a possibility that there existed such a covenantal document in Israel at that time.

Judging from the internal and external evidence mentioned above, the critical analysis of the classical theory of historical-literary criticism, once so confidently heralded as "absolute," has shown that it in fact employed the *a-priori* method, instead of the *a-posteriori* approach used by modern science (Harrison, 1980:27). An author's convictions were, by definition, biases. Any evidence such biases adduce is baseless. Naturally the belief that the Bible is a reliable word of God is a kind of *a-priori* conviction, that it is given to us by God through the work of the Holy Spirit. However, in the biblical perspective, the external evidence, if it is trustworthy, is not to be disregarded.

Fourth, it can be highlighted that, according to the historico-literary criticism of the Wellhausen school, no room for the intervention of God in human history is made because the criticism grew out of a methodology formed from the study of classical texts. This treated the Pentateuch and the historical books by the same standard (cf. Soggin, 1989:88). In the Bible's own testimony, it must be accepted that the Bible is God's Word in written form, which records God's self-disclosure as well as his people's varied inspired responses to his person and his acts in history. This truth remains, even if human writers composed the Scriptures in the midst of their own cultures and circumstances, writing from their own experiences and with their own motives for their readers. God's revelation comprises miracles or supernatural

explanations of biblical reports. But because the historical-critical method itself systematically and insistently excludes the notion of divine intervention in history, such incomprehensible events are sought to be explained in a different way: "Skepsis und Zweifel sind die Ansatzpunkte, der klassischen historischen Kritik" (Maier, 1991:244). In this case, historical criticism comes to pass for *Sachkritik* on the biblical text, denying the historical facts. Thus, Maier's rejection of historical criticism as exegetical method relates to its intrinsic character: "Die Mißtrauensbewegung, die der historischen Kritik inhärent ist, befindet sich in einer offenkundigen Divergenz und Dissonanz zur Vertrauens-bemühung der Offenbarung. Sie verhindert die notwendige Offenheit der Auslegung" (1991:248). Its character is in the same line with the Enlightenment worldview which demands that one views human reason as absolute norm. Its request is nothing less than alternative religion that supplants biblical faith (cf. Harrisville & Sundberg, 1995:262-269). In fact, "the honest historian ought to be free of preconceived notions that simply deny the possibility that an all-powerful God could act in human history." (Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard, 1993:95). W. Abraham (1982:7) argues, in the introduction to his book, that "it is possible to believe in special divine revelation without any sacrifice of critical judgment in either history or science." The methodology where the interpretation of the Bible is fundamentally subject to human reason, resulting in the partial acceptance and partial rejection of the revelation of God to his people through his Word and history, may hardly be sanctioned as the desirable method for biblical exegesis.

2.1.3. Summary

It will have to be recognized that historical-literary criticism as developed by Wellhausen and his followers stimulated interpreters to give attention to problems of the biblical texts and that it has advantages to finding possible sources that have been used; the authors of other books of the Bible did make use of sources (cf. 1 King. 11:41; 14:19, 29; 1 Chr. 29:29; 2 Chr. 9:29; 20:34). It is, however, difficult to accept the result of the study clinging to specific sources like J, E, D, and P (cf. Lion-Cachet, 1995:43). It helped to 'solve' many exegetical problems, but it also opened up new ones.

2.2. Traditio-Historical Criticism

2.2.1. Its application to studies on the ark

Gunkel (1977) plays a pioneering role in traditio-historical criticism, although the concept of 'tradition' was formulated by Richard Simon (1682:36-46). Specifically, Gunkel's attention was focused on problematic areas in the formation of Old Testament literature: its historical stage, oral tradition, *Sitz im Leben*, *Gattugen*. This interest led him to believe that different types of literature like myths, epics, songs, fables and sagas spread, as the oral tradition in the earlier Israelite history later assimilated into the Old Testament like the ancient Near Eastern Literature that surrounded Israel (Gunkel, 1895). Hence, for him (1977, 1987) biblical historical events belong merely to (frequently *ätiologische*) *Sagen* that are *Märchen* ("Schöpfungen der dichtenden Phantasie") which have been blended with historical tradition, even if he (1977:XII) appraises the saga ("iher Natur nach Poesie") highly with aesthetic sight and is deeply under the impression of her beauty.

In respect to the ark, Gunkel (1906:35-42) considers the ark to be a *Thronsitz*, particularly in relation to cherubim on the grounds of the (extra-) biblical passages such as Jer. 3:16; Num. 10:35f.; 1 Sam. 3:3; Ex. 25:22, 30:6, Num. 7:89; Ez. 1; Ap. Joh. 4 and Near East parallels: "der alte Orient stellt solche Thronträger nicht selten dar; in dieser Obliegenheit sind sie an der Lade jahves abgebracht" (Gunkel, 1987:97). He (1906:33f.) supposes that the original meaning of *Jahvelade* (the old name) should be provided differently from that of *Lade des Budndes Jahves* (the late name) because there was no legal character in the religion of ancient Israel. Thus he (1906:34f.) came to a conclusion like that in the process answering the question: "wie können aber die Zehngebote ein kriegerisches Palladium gewesen sein?" In fact the gist of Gunkel's article is almost identical to the statement of Meinhold (1900:17f., 25ff., 43ff.) who writes that Moses manufactured the ark after the Egyptian model and Israelites gave the concept of *die leeren Throne* to the ark in Sinai. To the same vein, Dibelius (1906:60-63) clarified the meaning of the ark on the analogy of the *ledige Thronwagen* of Ahura Mazdâ, as stated above. For him (1906:56, 110), the ark is an empty throne of Yahweh and also functions as *Kriegspanier* and *Feldzeichen*. Furthermore, Hugo Gressmann (1991:17; 1913:221), who insists that "We

must interpret the individual narratives by themselves, as Gunkel's *gattungsgeschichtlichen* method had established for Genesis," defines the texts of Exodus 32-34 as etiological sagas to explain the reason why the worship of the golden calf was prohibited in the land of Canaan later: "Die Lade ist der von Jahve selbst gewollte Ersatz für das willkürlich geschaffene goldene Kalb." As a result, he (1920:1-17) denies the existence of the ark in the wilderness because it is possible that only in P's idea does the gold ornamentation of the ark and its connection with kapporet and cherubim mirror the situation of the wilderness. Yet, he (1920:42) defends the statement that the ark in the land of Canaan stemmed from the Amorite symbol related to Baal's worship, by identifying the ark of Yahweh with the chest of Joseph. For him (1913:231f.), the ark with cherubim is *Thronszitz* as Gunkel: The image of deity resides in the ark. With respect to the contents of the ark, Gressmann (1920:25) argues that the ark originally contained a golden calf as Yahweh's image, and later on, the tablets of the Mosaic law. Moreover, he (1920:25, 28ff.) connects the idea of a golden calf with the image of Yahweh as *Kriegsgott* and then relates it to אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in Psalm 132:2, 5 which is identical to Ephod. Besides, Gressmann (1920:44, 64f. 68) mythologically supposes that there probably were two images: an image of female deity, the image of Yahweh's wife was added to the Yahweh's image, by taking notice of the number 'two' of cherubim, as if Yahweh were Baal. In this respect W. Reimpell (1916:330f.) suggests that the function of the ark made under the Midianite and perhaps Asia Minor influence was varied in the lapse of time: *die Kasten von Jahwe, Jahwes Thronszitz, Gesetzesbehälter* (cf. Dus, 1964: 241-251, The original idea of *der Thron Jahwes* of the ark which was already made in Egypt was developed to *die Bundeslade*). Likewise W.B. Kristensen (1933:171-180) describes the ark, Yahweh's throne, as a place of divine revelation under the strong parallel influence with the throne of Apollo (ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Ἀμυχλαίου) and different sorts of Egyptian divine thrones. He (1933:187f.; 194) explains the meaning of covenant as the relationship between Horus and Set, and connects two tablets of the law with Osiris' "kist der twee landen van de twee landen": "De twee steenen tafelen waren, zonder eenigen twijfel, met de Egyptische kist der aarde onafscheidbaar verbonden," although he doubts that there were tablets in the ark. On *religionsgeschichtliche* viewpoint, he (1933:195-199) maintains the universal character of the ark: "Ieder volk heeft dat op individueele en zelfstandige wijze uitgewerkt." Besides, Miller and Roberts (1977) attempted to elucidate the significance of

the ark and the events linked with it on the grounds of the extrabiblical parallels. They (1977:72) went so far as to suggest that some parts of the biblical materials are rooted in Canaanite mythology, albeit they assume that the mythology was not indiscriminately employed.

Such a tendency of traditio-historical criticism comprising comparative religion emerges in the works of M. Noth. He (1954:88) asserts that presumably the ark was originally the movable sanctuary of nomadic clans, even though "Über ihre Herkunft wissen wir nichts Zuverlässiges mehr zu sagen." In relation to its function, for him (1954:89ff.; 1966:46ff.), the ark is regarded as the *räumlichen Mittelpunkt der altisraelitischen Ampiktyonie* whose theory is based on analogy of Greek and Italian amphictyony. On the other hand, von Rad (1958:123, 126), who considers biblical history to be history of Israelite tradition, denies the origin of the ark in the wilderness: "Die Lade ist ein Kultgegenstand, der aus dem Kulturland kommt" which is "gegen die Herkunft der Lade aus Wüstenzeit ausgesprochen." For him, the meaning of the ark is varied according to different traditions of P (describing glory of the ark) and D (taking it for a receptacle for the tables): "daß P in der Zelt-, das Dr. aber in der Ladetradition steht." This notion is in substantial agreement with Maier (1965:1ff.). It may be said that the studies of Lewis (1977) and Campbell (1975) share in this viewpoint. Thus it may not be necessary to enumerate every scholar following traditio-historical criticism in this section.

As in above, the statements of the scholars who comprehensively applied traditio-historical criticism to the research on the ark can hardly be propped up by the biblical texts since the method as such rejects the biblical materials as primary sources. This appears to be a limitation of this methodology.

2.2.2. The evaluation

Having reviewed traditio-historical criticism as a method of Old Testament study, an evaluation of it may now begin. It is over-simplification to simply state that traditio-historical criticism is concerned with the various stages between form and redaction criticism and the history of a tradition in the Old Testament in accordance with the general sorting of methods by biblical scholars. As seen above, the method contains many kinds of criticism relating to

literature and is multilateral in nature: literary, *religionsgeschichtlich*, cultural, anthropological, sociological. By examining the contentions of several leading figures in the field, a criticism of the fundamental problems of this approach as a method of biblical study will subsequently be submitted in a seriatim manner.

First, Gunkel, who initiated the *Überlieferungsgeschichte* in the interpretation of the Old Testament, was deeply inspired by the Romanticism of J. G. Herder (1993, originally 1782-83), who gave a romantic-intuitive internalisation to the rationalistic-speculative view of history of Lessing. For Herder, with regard to the past religious and historical statements, the critical distinction between the historical relative and the eternal truth entirely recedes. The respectful listening to experience of life makes the critical-rationalistic approach to history disappear and, therefore, does not require speculative compensation and linkage. Gunkel's view on history, which he perceives to be historical sagas in the book of Genesis, reflects his romantic tendency. In his aesthetic insight into sagas and biblical exegesis, Herder's dominant influence is present. Such traits appear in his treatise, "Ziel und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testaments" (1913). By dealing with the relationship between soul and word, Herder (1993:675) aesthetically admires the poetic expression and style found in the Old Testament: "Die Sprache, die viel ausdrückende, malende Verba hat, ist eine poetische Sprache: je mehr sie auch die Nomina zu Verba machen kann, desto poetischer ist sie. Ein Nomen stellt immer eine Sache tot dar: das Verbum setzt sie in Handlung, diese erregt Empfindung, denn sie ist gleichsam mit Geist beseelt." Likewise, Gunkel (1913:14) holds that the exegete should be an artist, by stressing not analysis but creativity: "Exegesis im höheren Sinne ist mehr eine Kunst als Wissenschaft. Der Exeget soll etwas von einem Künstler an sich haben; und darum braucht er mehr als nur Wissen und Verstand ... Der Exeget soll schaffen können," even though his exegetical work is not creative. In this way, Gunkel's work on Old Testament interpretation referring to the folk literature of the world is, as a whole, under the influence of the spirit of Herder's romantic intonation. Yet it should be recognized that such an attitude towards Old Testament literature gave merit to the analysis and classification of poetic writings. However it is limited as an exegetical method and fails to penetrate them.

Second, Gunkel (1977:IX) contrasts saga with history by stating that the saga is to history what poetry is to prose: it has to do with nature as well as genre of literature, thereby implying

that according to his point of departure, the narratives in biblical literature lack historical meaning. In its nature the saga is not objective, nor is it interested in the facts, being defined by him (1977:VIII) as "volkstüm-liche, altüberlieferte, poetische Erzählung, die Personen oder Ereignisse der Vergangenheit behandelt." Contrary to his definition of the 'literal' meaning, in endeavouring a reply to the questions of curious humans on the determinative phenomena of general-human, ethnological, or local nature, he holds that the etiological sagas mould fictional occurrences of the past. He (1987:21) appears to deem that the saga contains more historical character than Märchen because "wie häufig sich solche Märchen und Märchenmotive mit geschichtlichen Überlieferungen gemischt haben und so zu Sagen geworden sind, so wird man nicht bezweifeln." Thus, for him (1987:164f.), even biblical narratives demonstrating historical events concerning Saul and David belong to sagas. However, it is sometimes hard to discern to what extent historicity of the events should be recognized in a certain text according to Gunkel's classification of the *Gattungen*, due to the inconsequentiality of the nature of the relationship between the saga, myth and *Märchen*. It may be unconvincing that such an ahistorical disposition on the biblical text is useful to spell out the significance of God's action in history and the religious history. Thereof, Holwerda (1972:121) justly observed that his aesthetic disposition barred him from an objective perspective on the historical facts of the biblical documents. Hence, further exposition of the problem of the saga through an evaluation of Gunkel's exegetical methodology will prove to be a pointless exercise.

Third, an important presupposition of traditio-historical criticism is the concept of *Religionsgeschichte*. This science which originated from English deism, and developed into a work of general, religious science, was adopted in its entirety as a tool explaining the origin and process of tradition in the Old Testament, as well as *das Eigentümliche* of Israelite religion. The *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* sought, at this point, to answer the question concerning the historical relationship between the Old Testament and extra-biblical religions. As a result, the *Religionsgeschichte* basically have its fundamental positive relationship with phenomenological and religious parallels (cf. Leeuw, 1930:1893). On the basis of this notion, although Gunkel (1895:VI) searched for the origin of some theological themes of the biblical literature in Babylonian myth, his primary interest lay more towards an examination of the peculiarity of the Israelite religion than towards a stereotyped comparison with Babylonian

myth. Moreover, he (1895:VI) sought neither a denial of the *Eigentümliche* of Israelite religion, nor destruction of the faith, "daß sich in dieser Geschichte (= Israel's) Gott in besonderer Weise offenbare." However, remarkable congruity exists between the concept of the 'revelation' in the *religionsgeschichtliche* research and the phenomenon of etiological reduction which manifests itself in most religions other than Christianity. He (cf. Klatt, 1969:102) magnified God's revelation to the universe: "Fern sei es von uns, Gottes Offenbarung auf Israel zu beschränken." Thus, it may have to be acknowledged that after Abram's calling the revelation was focused on Israel. If the *religionsgeschichtliche* method is not suitable to exegetise the biblical texts, the research to which this approach was applied by the likes of Dibelius, Gressmann, Kristensen, Noth, Miller and Roberts would be depreciated as an exegetical method for the study of the ark.

In addition, it is submitted that inherent to every society is the ability to acquire and develop its own unique cultural form, independent from the cultural influx of other advanced cultures. For example, a traditional Korean fairytale similar to German *Hänsel und Gretel* exists, concerning step-mother maltreatment but being otherwise totally unrelated. Following this train of thought, however, does not do justice to the imperialistic idea that the superior culture always affects the inferior. Traditio-historical criticism is continually exposed to the precarious theory of *religionsgeschichte*, which equates all religions and in which truth and falsehood do not exist.

Fourth, it is said to be von Rad and Noth who employed the traditio-historical approach for the Old Testament study in earnest. These two scholars are respectively theologically and historically minded. Von Rad sets to work from the premise that the Old Testament contains certain *Credos* which do not report factual history, but *Heilsgeschichte*. Yet, in his theology *Heilsgeschichte* is identified with the confessional-kerygmatic picture of Israel's history and 'traditio-history'. In this way a substitute for a historical reconstruction of events and theological beliefs is created. Yet a logical gap between 'what Israel believed' and 'what we (should) believe,' continues to exist. The history referred to by von Rad is merely coloured by faith and moulded by Jahwist theology. Von Rad (1938:62ff.) ascribed the Hexateuchal composition to the Jahwist, while criticism of this was rendered by Rolf Rendtorff (1977:111, 165), a supporter of the redaction of *deuteronomitisch* circle. The conjectures on redactors have closely

accompanied traditio-historical criticism with a large number of arguments, but they are arbitrary.

Noth's view regarding historicity in the Old Testament correlates with that of von Rad. Noth attempts to reconstruct a factual history of Israel from biblical history, which means that he considered Israelite history in the Old Testament as an unreal or traditional history connected to what Israel professed. His hypothesis of the amphictyony (different tribes moved peacefully into the land of Canaan united around a central shrine) appears to result from the application of the *religionsgeschichtliche* idea to the historical study. However the historical study founded on the findings of modern archaeology is sufficient to drive a wedge into his hypothesis, that Jericho's destruction (where the ark played a key role) was a direct result of the conquest itself while Ai and the surrounding territories were destroyed by subsequent military attacks (cf. Mazar, 1990:331; Wood, 1990:44-58).

Fifth, advocates of traditio-historical criticism regarded oral tradition as a fundamental element in understanding the Old Testament. Two examples of this are the case of cycles of oral sagas being the substance behind the Pentateuch and seeing that the written Old Testament was only created by the post-exilic Jewish community (cf. Nielsen, 1961:39ff.). However the view that Israel's religion and life in the pre-exilic period largely depended upon oral tradition lacks credibility. Abundant evidence exists in Israel and other ancient Near Eastern countries of a convention to employ professional scribes to record official matters in writing (cf. 2 Sam. 8:17) (cf. Harrison, 1985:201-210). It seems improbable that the Israelites were less scrupulous in the transmission of their sacred texts than were the Egyptians or the Mesopotamians. Therefore, it is no longer necessary to assume that an extended period of oral transmission is a necessary prerequisite to the written form of many, if not all, of the Old Testament documents, as is commonly believed in traditio-historical criticism. It is G. Widengren's (1948) view that a strong tendency to make haste with the fixation of the traditions existed in the Old East and in Israel, in order to prevent their alteration. The firm tradition of the Mosaic period, as well as of ancient peoples other than the Hebrews, was that any events of importance were generally recorded in written form quite soon after they had taken place. Modern scholars like A. Gunneweg (1959:40f.) and R. de Vaux (1967:46f.), also sound a warning against a one-sided emphasis on oral tradition. Actually the primary purpose of oral transmission was the dissemination of the pertinent information to the people of the day and age in which the events

occurred. Thus, there can be little doubt that in most cases both oral and written tradition existed side by side for lengthy periods.

2.2.3. Summary

The Age of Enlightenment was characterized by the enthroning of human reason accompanied by a revolt against external authority. One offshoot of this new era was the claim that the Old Testament ought to be subject to the same principles of careful scrutiny as those generally applied to secular writings. In the principal interpretation of the Bible as God's revelation in history, the Bible's own nature and aim should be reflected. If not, no one can strive to attain the interpretational destination, that is, the intention of the biblical texts. It reconstructs the supposed tradition-history behind or beneath the text, which is *de facto* equated with *Heilsgeschichte* (which never occurred as it is reported) and does not care whether the present form of the biblical texts portrays factual history. In the Reformed view, Scripture is a presentation of real events which represent the true meaning of history more faithfully and accurately than a mere chronicle of the actual course of history. Such a dynamic nature of the biblical history overcomes the problem of divorcing the kerygma or confession from history as such.

2.3. Narrative criticism

It is found that there, at times, emerge the phrase 'narrator' under the title, "Ark Narrative" which Campbell (1975) and Miller & Roberts (1977) used in their titles. The intention of the narrator holds a key post in their works although sometimes author, redactor and narrator are not distinguishable. In fact, recently, the work that searches for the intent of the narrator is considered nearly a monopoly of narrative criticism belonging to modern literary theory. It is true that they did not apply the theory of narrative criticism to their research properly; preferably they might ignore the theory in their writings. Nevertheless it may be necessary to examine the theory of the criticism if it is, directly or indirectly concerned with the studies on the ark. In this section it should be mentioned in passing to the benefits and pitfalls in the interpretation of biblical literature.

Narrative criticism is a method of interpreting biblical narratives with the help of modern and ancient literary theory. It approaches the biblical narrative as a literary text that may be analysed in literary terms like other works of literature. Although Powell (1990:19) thinks of narrative criticism as an independent movement in its own right, apart from secular literary movement, this criticism is basically subsumed under the broader label 'literary criticism' (cf. Tannehill, 1990:488). The goal of narrative criticism is to read the text as an *implied reader* who is presupposed by the narrative itself and who is distinct from any real, historical reader and is rather a hypothetical concept (cf. Powell, 1990:19-21). Whereas the concrete concept of an *implied reader* can not be set up, the idea is considered as the interpretive principle by the narrative critic. With regard to this aim, narrative criticism tends to focus on text understanding and thus regards the real author and the real reader as extrinsic to the communication act that transpires within the text itself. This concept of the implied reader, the reader in the text, moves narrative criticism away from being a purely reader-centered type of criticism and makes it a more text-centered approach (Powell, 1990:20). Narrative as a literary type has two aspects -- *story* (the content of narrative) composed of events, characters, settings, and plots and *discourse*, referring to the rhetoric of the narrative. Unlike other literary methods, narrative has the concept of time on the level of plot: "plot is a sequence of actions often explicitly connected in terms of cause and effect, leading from an initial situation, through complication, to some

sense of resolution or 'revelation'." (Gunn & Fewell, 1993:2). Because narrative critics tend to think that the reader is guided through devices intrinsic to the process of storytelling, they are interested in some basic elements concerning how the story is told like other literature: point of view, narrator, rhetorical devices, narrative patterns (cf. Powell, 1990:23-34; Osborne, 1991:154-164).

To describe narrative criticism concretely, it is necessary to compare it with its closer methodologies. The following comparison may be helpful. While narrative criticism is like structuralism in that it is also a text-centered approach to literature, the two methods are distinct in that narrative criticism is more concerned with defining the surface meaning of the story than with discovering deep structures that undergird it. While narrative criticism is similar to rhetorical criticism in that it also is interested in discerning the effect that a work has on its reader and in explicating the reason for this effect, they differ in that narrative criticism interprets the text from the perspective of an idealized *implied reader*, and in narrative criticism it is less necessary to know the historical situation of the actual readers for whom the text was originally intended.

As the tendency of narrative criticism found in general literature study gives impact to biblical narrative, biblical narrative is in general written using certain recurrent literary techniques. This becomes apparent when one examines the following main features of biblical narrative: its use of patterns of gaps and variation of repetition, its presentation of narrative events out of chronological sequence, and its selectivity in what the reader is told (cf. Satterthwaite, 1997:125). When the general theory of narrative criticism is applied to interpretation of the biblical narrative, one seems to be able to overcome some problems inherent in other interpretive methodologies. For instance, in historical criticism the patterns of gaps and variation of repetition are seen as indications of a composite narrative, a secondary compilation of earlier sources. But for narrative critics this is a very common characteristic of narratives and is understood as an inherent device of the text, a strategy of the narrator (cf. Sternberg, 1987:138ff., 242-247): "it is a key to perception, to interpretation" (Berlin, 1983:136). In narrative criticism the historicity of biblical narrative is not expunged in the process of the presentation of the narrative events out of chronological sequence, or in the development of the plot. This is unlike other literary movements in 'secular' literary criticism which repudiate the significance of historical investigation for the interpretation of texts (cf. Whitelam, 1991:64). Furthermore, narrative criticism can overcome

the problem of redaction criticism, a type of criticism which tries to seek the theology of a biblical writer. Narrative critics investigate the narrator's control of narrative time, including order, duration and frequency. Such investigation can reveal how the narrator evaluates and what he selectively emphasizes as the story is told (cf. Tannehill, 1990:488f.).

These apparent advantages, however, do not always operate as an actual merit in biblical study. In order to create a coherent narrative, narrative critics generally have to select and reorder events as well as extrapolate the similarities and differences extant between them (cf. Satterthwaite, 1997:125). This occurs because although narrative criticism tends to view the narrative as an interactive whole, it does not view the given text of the Bible as a whole. This is a general phenomenon also in the works of Campbell and Miller & Roberts. The process of such reconstruction, in a sense, appears to be similar to that of historical criticism. In many cases, the historicity of biblical narrative is undermined or disregarded in expounding biblical narratives on the basis of narrative criticism (cf. Gunn & Fewell, 1993:6; Campbell, 1975:39). Alter (1981:24) sees biblical narrative as "historicized prose fiction." For him the book of Esther is "in fact a kind of fairytale" (Alter, 1981:34). Sometimes narrative critics take an ambiguous position on time and history. Ricœur (1986; 1988) distinguishes between mortal time - in which the characters of a story live out their lives measured by calendars, watches - and monumental time - which refers to the broad sweep of time that includes but also transcends history. This notion of time seems to reflect a neo-orthodox view of history. By nature, narrative criticism usually pertains not so much to theological statements as to the narrator's control. Still, theological and dogmatical statements have a place in narrative criticism, in that biblical narratives mainly suggest such utterances (e.g. Ex. 3; Matt. 16:16).

Like other literary methodologies, narrative criticism requires a high level of literary technique in its application to biblical interpretation. A full understanding of biblical narrative can only be achieved with the assistance of the kind of professional expertise that only a trained literary critic can offer. Indeed, it is too laborious and sometimes impossible for a non-specialist or even some specialists, to grasp the concept behind terms such as real author, implied author, narrator, narratee, text, narrative, implied reader and real reader and to discern their relationships (cf. Chatman, 1978:151; Osborne, 1991:155). Narrative criticism regards the role of the narrator as important; this is whom the *implied* author employed to tell the story. For Powell (1990:25)

the narrator's relationship with the implied author and the real author is not clear. Alter (1981:155-177) and Sternberg (1987:380ff.) opine that the biblical narrator is reliable and authoritative and should not to be distinguished from the author. Alter (1981:158) considers the biblical narrator as "omniscient," for this narrator is presumed to know what God knows, as on occasion he may remind us by reporting God's assessments and intentions or even what God says to Himself: "We are never in serious doubt that the biblical narrator knows all there is to know about the motives and feelings, the moral nature and spiritual condition of his characters, but, as we have seen on repeated occasions, he is highly selective about sharing this omniscience with his readers." It is sensible that the narrator does not necessarily have to be "omniscient." It can be enough to maintain that he is just *inspired* by the Holy Spirit. If this is not held, confusion between the author and the narrator will not disappear. The biblical narrative is a superb work of art in its own right as a form of literature, but strictly speaking, it hardly follows the structure of narrative set up by modern literary theory: exposition, complication, crisis, climax and resolution (Robert, 1995:54f.). This fact implies that it is not always appropriate to analyse the biblical narratives by methods normally used for the study of modern fiction. Thus, it will be a unilateral statement that the full meaning of the text can only be apprehended when its literary qualities are appreciated. Narrative criticism tends to evoke readers' excessive imagination from biblical narrative and to dramatize the narrative in the terms that it is literature (cf. Berlin, 1983:137f.; Sternberg, 1987:445-475). It is doubtful that the rich imagination of the reader helps him to distill the actual message from the biblical narrative. Kaiser (1995:86f.) too warns against this point. Powell (1990:85-91) enumerates the benefits of narrative criticism such as text-centred.

In consideration of these statements, it may be acknowledged that narrative criticism has not only a rightful place in the pantheon of critical methodologies within the hermeneutical temple, but in some way bears more advantages than other literary approaches and historical criticism which, in dividing and atomizing texts, undermines a proper understanding of plot, theme, and character. Its merits, however, may be able to prove themselves valuable for explication of the biblical narrative only under the premise that the biblical narrative should be recognized as *God-breathed* narrative which is historically reliable. The biblical scholars may have to be interested in narrative approach, not because human beings are storytellers by nature

but because God put his revelation also in the vessel of 'narrative.'

2.4. The redemptive-historical approach as a theological interpretation

2.4.1. Redemptive history as a central theme of the Scriptures

To understand God's goal in the Old Testament, it is necessary to read the text very carefully. Since there is no direct reference to it in the Old Testament, we must find it under the surface. Childs (1985) suggests that God revealed himself for every one to see and know who he is. God apprises man of his existence and his attributes through his activity, for his person and action cannot be separated. God revealed himself through different names, as in Isaiah's proclamation to encourage the Israelites captured in Babylon: "I am Yahweh, your Holy One, Israel's Creator, your King" (Isa. 43:15); "I, Yahweh, am your Saviour, your Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob" (Isa. 49:26). It is natural to consider that there may be a certain reason why he manifests himself in such diverse ways: simple revelation may not be his purpose. The concept of God's revelation itself is in some way repeated and intertwined with the meaning of his notification, which sounds like principle of identity used in logic. God's revelation has greater purpose than simply to give notice of his activity. He intends for humans to know his existence and work, trust in him and eventually praise him (Isa. 43:21). It should be stated here that the goal of God's revelation in history is for man to glorify God: the glory of God is the eventual purpose of all his revelation and actions. His glory is the goal of all of his acts. However, it is not necessary that the term 'goal,' which means the purpose toward which an endeavour is directed, has to be identified with 'theme' even if they are closely linked with each other on the ground that a theme can occasionally be regarded as a goal. It appears reasonable that the achievement of a goal generally requires a plan and its performance. It is no different with God. He has a goal to be glorified, by creating creatures and executing their restoration. In fact, while the ultimate intention of God's different designations enumerated by Isaiah is to proclaim God's glory, the theme of these passages is connected to God's salvation for his people through his power and faithfulness.

It is right to observe that the content revealed in the dialogue between God and Moses in Exodus 3 refers to various aspects of Yahweh: "Jahweh, die God van die vaders (in 'n

verbondsverhouding)," "Jahweh, die God wat verlos," "Jahweh, die God wat in 'n persoonlike gemeenskap met die mens staan," "Jahweh, die Heilige God." (Lion-Cachet, 1995:568-573). Yahweh had a purpose to be glorified and praised by the people. This came about by his revealing who and what he is. It may not be immoderate to say that the theme of the communication between them is about the salvation of the Israelites from the land of Egypt. The reason why Yahweh mentioned such phases related to his person and work in this context appears to disclose his will to deliver Israel from Egypt but not to introduce and recognize Moses God's seemingly complicated identification as such.

The express purpose of the record of the Bible is to point out the theme and story of redemption. If Adam and Eve did not commit the original sin in Eden, the Bible would not have needed to be recorded. It was written after the Fall and was done so to make known God's salvation to human beings: especially the term, τὰς γραφάς in John 5:39 which indicates the Old Testament. Without the extant form of the Scriptures everyone might be able to directly communicate with God and freely contact his revelation in a blameless state. Thus, it is not unreasonable to take salvation through Jesus as the central theme of the Bible: the purpose for the recording of the Bible has to do with information on the salvation that is in Christ. Westermann (1968:9) brought this to light, "Das Alte und das Neue Testament stimmen darin überein, daß in ihrer Mitte der Bericht von einer Rettung steht. In beiden wird Gott primär und eigentlich als der rettende Gott verkündigt." Thus, salvation should not be just regarded as one of various themes of the Old Testament. Even though major theological themes such as promise, covenant, and kingdom have the advantage of serving as organizing principles from which the biblical revelation may be approached, they remain reflections and shadows of the great salvation in Jesus Christ that is to come at the end of the age (VanGemeren, 1988: 26).

Some objections to redemptive history as the central concept of the Old Testament are to be anticipated simply because the Old Testament contains many theological and historical perspectives. Among them there is the approach that the history of the Old Testament is not solely redemptive history but also that of judgment for those who disobey God. The prophets in particular proclaimed 'the Day of Yahweh' to the Israelites who disobeyed God. The implementation of God's judgment is not so much based on his unconditional initiative as on

people's ungodliness and wickedness by their abrogating the covenant set up between them. Even the judgment of the Last Day will be given as an outcome of the refusal of the design of God's salvation. Thus, it may be hard to uphold 'judgment' as a theme of the Bible on the same level as salvation; God's primary work is redemption, not judgment. Childs (1985:49) makes this point clear: "I would argue that the most suitable biblical term for God's purpose with his creation is 'salvation' or 'redemption.'" The concept of covenant, as suggested by Eichrodt (1957) is a central theme of both Testaments and must be understood by the biblical reader if he wants to understand the Bible. Yet in its interconnection with the redemptive idea, the covenant is prone to serve as a frame or structure through which God provides man with salvation for the future (Coccejus, 1990:3): their intimate tie emerges also in Drommer's (1991:403) expression "de heilshistories-verbondsmatige prediking." Moreover, it appears normal to have doubts that even the events of creation and the Fall recorded in the beginning of Genesis are forced to be explained through the insight of redemptive history, for they are not included in the domain of redemptive history. This problem is solved in terms of the goal of the biblical record. The documentation about the creation might be proposed to illuminate God as a Creator who, with power and wisdom created the universe. This creation included human beings in a guiltless and perfect status. Simultaneously the event of the Fall portrays the origin of sin and supplies the need for redemption. Strictly speaking, the two events may not be explained separately from the concept of redemptive history. In a sense, some statements attempting to spell out the relationship between the two have flaws. For instance, it is inadmissible that von Rad (1975:381) contends that "in ihrer Darstellung schon die Schöpfung als ein göttliches Heilswerk verstanden wird," because for him *Schöpfung* and *Heilswerk* seem to be a product of theological structure of Israelite faith: The *Jahweglaube* which originally was *Heilsglaube* early absorbed *Schöpfungsglaube* which was known in Canaan in very ancient time (Rad, 1936:146f.). Lohfink (1994:116-135) underscores the close connection between the two, "Hence there is no salvation for human beings apart from creation" and "we will find our salvation only in creation." It should, however, be observed that his premier concern lies in "how the element of salvation which the priestly writing depicts as the cultic nearness of God to Israel relates to the order of creation." It focuses on the salvation which happens by the cultural creativity of human beings that makes the world a temple in combination

with the completion of the Creator's *creatio*. In his argument concerning salvation through cultural activity, it appears difficult to distinguish God's creation from human creation.

The notion of the kingdom of God as a central concept in both the Old and New Testaments posed by G. Klein (1970:642-670) can be understood in a broad view on redemption. Childs (1985:49) comprehends the two ideas in one line: "To make use of the biblical term 'kingdom of God' as an equivalent to salvation - his rule over all that he created - will perhaps serve to prevent any restriction of God's work to the individual human soul, but also point to the divine initiative of bringing his cosmic will to completion, which is an eschatological force energizing the world." G. Ladd (1952:83f.) too correlates them closely: "The kingdom of God is ... primarily a soteriological concept. It is God acting in power and exercising his sovereignty for the defeat of Satan and the restoration of human society to its rightful place of willing subservience to the will of God. ... The 'history' of the kingdom of God is therefore, the history of redemption."

It should be noted that no concept is broad enough to include adequately within its grasp the totality of the Old Testament reality. It is not going too far to state that redemptive history plays such a significant part in the Old Testament that it is remarkably broad enough to, at times, be compared with other themes, even if it is not an all-inclusive center. Recently Dillard and Longman III (1994:36) offered this concept as central to Old Testament theology, by advocating G. Vos' statement: "Many years ago Vos, the father of modern biblical theology, showed how revelation was a reflex to the history of redemption. Thus, as God's redemptive plan progressed through the ages, so the history of revelation unfolded."

Let us consult the introduction (1.2) of this dissertation, the section where this question is raised: Should a theme such as salvation be acquired from the New Testament in order to grasp the meaning of the Old Testament? R.N. Whybray (1987:170-172) maintains that "it is necessary to rule out the traditional Christological principle of interpretation, whereby the Old Testament is understood as looking forward to, or as in some way foreshadowing, the Christian dispensation. That this was the way in which the New Testament writers understood it ... is irrelevant for the interpretation of the Old Testament" and "the Old Testament can only be properly understood if it is studied independently." His position with respect to the Old Testament as a non-Christian book failed to take note of the fact that the designation 'Old Testament' itself was derived from

the New Testament (2 Cor. 3:14). McKenzie's (1974:319-325) announcement, "it is time to say goodbye to *Heilsgeschichte*" derives from the same notion that the Old Testament is not a Christian book. It is evident that a Christian who knows Jesus as the Messiah from God's revelation in the New Testament will take a different attitude towards the Old Testament than the Jews who accept only the Old Testament as their canon in the name of *Tanakh* or Hebrew Bible. It is reasonable as well as confessional that Christian scholars deal with the Old Testament in view of the New Testament because an interpreter should yield to the basic experience out of which the biblical authors speak, namely faith. It seems natural that Eichrodt (1957:2) would stress the insight offered by the New Testament to explicate Old Testament theology: "Worauf es für uns ankommt, ist also eine Darstellung der alttestamentlichen Gedanken- und Glaubenswelt, die sich stets bewußt ist, daß die alttestamentliche Religion bei aller unverwischbaren Eigenart in ihrem eigentlichen Wesen nur von der Vollendung aus begriffen wird, die sie in Christus gefunden hat." Thus, it appears to be the most typical and frequent approach to the Old Testament that its texts are Christologically interpreted: "Daß christologische Interpretation im Christentum immer eine wichtige Rolle eingenommen hat, zeigen die unterschiedlichsten hermeneutischen Ansätze im Christentum" (Dohmen & Stemberger, 1996:172-174). For the two Testaments Greidanus (1999:193) appeals to the idea of revelational progression: "... as we move from the Old Testament to the New Testament, we notice progression in redemptive history as well as in revelation. But progression does not make the Old Testament non-Christian. The headwaters of a river are not a 'nonriver'; they are an essential part of the river as it flows downstream." Redemptive history unfolds a progression in the outworking of God's plan of redemption which will unfold completely in the restoration of all things throughout the ages.

Regarding the relationship between the Scriptures and redemptive history, it can be said that God's Word entails more than the portrayal of historical events: it centers around God's redemption of man. As such, the Old Testament has a redemptive-historical character. The narrative of God's salvation and guidance of his people along the way of salvation throughout the centuries is contained therein. It is true, however, that Scripture does not comprise an exhaustive history of redemption. To put it more clearly, God's work of salvation takes place throughout the whole of history, of which only a small portion is recorded in the Bible. These are crucial moments in redemptive history, moments which believers need to know in order to

come to the knowledge of God's work of redemption: "... in de Heilige Schrift, die van deze geschiedenis datgene ons verhaalt, wat wij weten moeten, om haar ontwikkeling te leeren kennen naar de beheerschende gedachten en feitelijke wendingen" (Schilder, 1931:365).

The Old Testament texts which appear to have nothing to do with the concept of redemptive history nonetheless actively illuminate this theme. Even the poetic books such as Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs are directly and indirectly linked with the theme despite being relatively devoid of historical allusions. For instance, the book of Job deals with some redemptive components; 'redemption' is an important theme in the event of Job's sacrifices (1:5; 42:8f.), his faith in לַיהוָה and the Resurrection (19), the thought of redemption in Elihu's story. What is so stunning is that the 'redemption scenes' are, in fact, the crux of the book. The Psalms generally classified into *Die Antwort Israels* in 'Old Testament theology' (Kraus, 1978:9) reflect the response of redeemed people to Yahweh. Basically, the Psalms instruct them to praise Him on the basis of redemptive history and to cry out to God to save them, even if they are not historically oriented. This principle is also evident in the Wisdom literature of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, offering explicit knowledge about how to live wisely under God's providential guidance. The book of Proverbs can be applicable to the 'generation of the law' the delivered people should observe: "A proverb is better suited than one of the Mosaic laws for teaching this essential element of wise living" (Fuller, 1992:38). Regarding history, it is fair to point out that while the poetic books don't reflect upon historical events, they are alive with the spirit of history: they grasp for and grapple with those essential concepts that set the Hebrew faith apart from that of its neighbours and insure its survival in a pantheistic, power-greedy world (Bullock, 1988:19).

As observed above, it appears impossible to properly construe Old Testament texts without giving proper attention to the concept of redemptive history. 'Redemption' is at the heart of Scripture. By using redemptive history as a point of reference, the message, and purpose, of the Old Testament is easier to spot and understand.

2.4.2. The concept of redemptive history

'Redemptive history' displays a word combination in which two words are distinctly recognized: redemption and history. To begin with the latter, it is important to differentiate history and historiography. The first refers to the events that have taken place in the past, and the second, to a description of those events, which approximates a scientific form. This use of language implies that 'history' is not centered on a specific happening but presupposes a long series of facts implicitly related, the description of which are characterised by chronological and underlying cohesion. For the most part, biblical history follows a roughly chronological order (Dillard & Longman III, 1994:24). Therefore the historical presuppositions and perspectives of the historians involved must be accounted for in the formulation of history. In the area of history a person can distinguish various subsections, but in every instance the person is the divider who elects on the basis of a specific interest or academic object something from history. The implications that the word 'history' contains in 'redemptive history' show that the biblical text as a historiography is the text that narrates the historical events with divine purpose, such as redemption.

Redemptive history does not allow for a reduction of history into one subsection, nor is a new division of history provided by it. This may well be the case in religious or church history throughout which all manner of records are made but redemption is one magnanimity *sui generis* that aligns all various subsections to itself.

Redemption is something of God and, as such, goes far above our understanding. Redemption is revealed to us by God and redemptive history stands or falls together with 'revelation-history' and what is commonly known as 'covenantal history,' the relationship in which God is seen to be giving redemption. Redemption thus pertains to the word and work of God. It is the salvation that God promised and worked out, a salvation that presupposes the sin from which human beings should be liberated from sin in all forms. Redemption can involve personal lives. This could imply a plurality of *Heilsgeschichten* seen as *zielgeschiedenissen* or *levensgeschiedenissen* of those people who have encountered redemption in their lives. But in this sense, redemption compounded in redemptive history is seen as everything focused on the promises and deeds of redemption as it is crystallized in God's people on earth and is interested in, or testified to, in a worldly perspective. It is still about one redemption that according to different phases of dispensation (Old and New Testament) and the concomitantly

determined circumstances in which God's people lived, is in various ways made manifest, yet can still be centralized and focused on Jesus Christ the Saviour. The following postulations will help to bring light to the concept of redemptive history.

First, redemptive history is history. Redemptive history should not be seen as holy history removed from an ordinary, 'profane' history existing outside of it. In all events, God is involved and everything that happens is sanctified via his sovereignty: the opposite of redemptive history is not called 'secular history' in a biblical sense. Namely, redemptive history and history in its entirety can certainly be distinguished; they are not separate. There is only one history but there is, with and within history in its entirety, a quite specific manifestation of God's salvific and perfecting will for his own people (cf. Maier, 1990:168). Moreover it is not *Urgeschichte*— neither *Übergeschichte* nor *Überlieferungsgeschichte*. Redemptive history occurs on precisely the same level as general history: "Gods verlossingswerk maakt dus geen aparte geschiedenis, los van de 'profane'; het komt de geschiedenis in, en voltrekt zich *met* en *door* haar (Schilder, 1954:53). Through the power of God, the beneficiaries of redemption are led through history, from a determined, specific beginning to a determined, specific end. The completion of history, thus, will signify the complete fruition of redemptive history.

Second, redemptive history is one unity. This unity originates from the attribute of the Triune God. In this regard Schilder (1946:225) defines redemptive history as "... het in den tijd naar vast plan door God successief verwerkelijken van Zijn gedachten des vredes over ons, en het ten uitvoer leggen van wat Vader, Zoon en Geest." Despite phenomenon that history is polymorphic, history forms a unity in Christ in whom God might gather together in one all things in the dispensation of the fulness of times (Eph. 1:10). He is Alpha and Omega (Rev. 1:8) and beginning, process and end of history (Rom. 11:36).

Then Cullmann (1948:107-156) underlines Christ as the crux in his concept of the *Heilsgeschichte* in opposition to Bultmann's (1975:306) view on it: according to pre-Christian thought Christ is the end of the *Geschichte* and *Heilsgeschichte*. But for Cullmann there is no idea of the 'before time.' For Pannenberg (1967:121; 1963:95, 97) who holds fast to his eschatological principle, the future seems to be the middle point of history because in the whole

of history even God can be understood by the future. History is the fulfillment of the eternal Counsel of God in time. The unity in Christ implies that he founded the basis of history as realization of God's eternal decree with his suffering and death, and merited complete salvation through his resurrection.

Third, redemptive history is progressive. God did not execute his design instantaneously but gradually realized it by continually revealing himself in history. The expression, 'the successive realization in time,' illustrates the progress, the development in redemptive history. This progress should not be disassociated from the unity, since there is a progression in unity and a unity in progression: "Historie betekent altijd eenheid en voortgang tegelijk. Maar wie hier het verband negeert en de ene historie oplost in een groot aantal zelfstandige geschiedenissen, verliest beide, zowel de eenheid als de progressie" (Holwerda, 1953:89). The progression of redemptive history is discussed by many theologians with various interpretations.

Von Hofmann's exposition of this subject matter negates the difference between prophecy and history although he (1844:8ff.) places emphasis on the growing, coherent development of the process through which salvation comes about. He attempted to explain the relationship between *Heilsgeschichte* and general history on the basis of the idea of prophecy: "Jedes Geschehen sei Weissagung kommenden Geschehen." (cf. Cullmann, 1948:123, 163). His concept of prophecy adheres to the standpoint of historical progression but simultaneously bears an element of a recurrent view of history. This is far from a biblical view of history. In fact each prophecy can be history but each occurrence is not always prophecy. G. Vos (1983:15-17) refers to the organic progression of revelation centering around redemptive history, stating that 'biblical theology' is characterized by the organic progression of revelation. However, the expression 'organic progression' demands clarification. The expression itself is derived from the historical view of the German Romanticists of the eighteenth century. Only if the flower originates from the bud and the stem from the seed can one branch be derived from another. Within this notion, history itself becomes reality, receiving autonomy with revelational qualities. This is also out of step with the notion of history the Bible presents (cf. Trimp, 1986:43). Besides K. Schilder (1939:96f.) understands progression of revelation as rectilinear. However, his idea is not endorsed by the Bible, for there were times of revelational scarcity.

Cullmann (1948:104) depicted the progression of redemptive history as a whole, based on form criticism. In his first work (*Christus und Zeit*) he began with rectilinear time but changed it later. Furthermore, he (1967:107) understood the progression of redemptive history as "the corrections caused by the occurrences upon the transmitted *kerygma*." The progression of revelation, however, cannot be summarized using frameworks such as the 'organic,' the 'linear' or the 'wave.' This is due to the near impossibility of a meticulous exposition of the progression. However, a progressive surge, *voorwaartse drang*, can be detected in the Old Testament narrative from the promise to its fulfillment (cf. Trimp, 1986:49). Progression and development exist within the Old Testament and between the Testaments, and within the New Testament and in the period from the time of the New Testament to our present day. This nature of progression requires a certain exegetical viewpoint of the historical text.

Thereby redemptive history comprises the totality of history in which the Father of Jesus Christ is at work realizing his resolution to live in a loving relationship with his people. It is the way of God and man: it goes before God, with God and after God (Trimp 1986:12-17). The history of the triune God with his people is found in no 'other history.'

2.4.3. The necessity of redemptive history in exegesis

The bestowing of attention upon redemptive history is no new phenomenon. This has occurred since Irenaeus (1989:454f., 533) objected to gnostic docetism. After the Reformation, theologians such as Bengel (1770) declared that the aim of redemptive history is associated with the "biblische Theologie" whose methodology in a sense is rooted in the idea of redemptive history as a key to the Christian exploration grown out of the denial of the doctrinal thought of Reformation and Orthodox churches (cf. Steck, 1959:12). The work, the "Erlangen School" employed was the conception of redemptive history as an objection to historical criticism (Harrisville & Sandberg, 1995:135f.). At the outset of the twentieth century, a time during which many studies were centered around religious history, Justus Köberle (1905:2) attempted to explain the relationship between the historical life of Israel and its religious history: the "Realität der göttlichen Offenbarung" and a "wirklich geschichtlichen Verlauf der

Religionsgeschichte dieses Volkes" were connected to each other. Through Schilder's emphasis on redemptive history, the danger of Barth's historical perspective is exposed and the historical text in the exegesis and sermon is dealt with in a redemptive-historical way. Prior to Cullmann (1967:108f.), the redemptive-historical viewpoint was wholly based upon New Testament thought. Pannenberg (1967:121) raises the universal historical idea in redemptive history in objection to the dialectic or kerygmatic theology of Barth and Bultmann. Within the design of universal history he attempts to compromise the idea of revelational history in the Old Testament and the historical view of Hegel. However, it appears that his concept culminates in the secularization of the biblical history of salvation.

This concept is then employed by various theologians in autogenous ways but with differing aims and ideas. They appear to say that the Bible should, at any rate, be read and expounded upon in a redemptive-historical way, for the Bible indeed deals with God's work of salvation throughout the ages.

In the exegesis, exclusive focus should not be placed on historical fact. The Bible narrates more than simple occurrences - a deeper meaning exists (cf. Gootjes, 1990:7ff.). The question of interpretation should center around the meaning of the description of objective facts. The exegete should, therefore, be bent upon locating history and the redemptive significance it contains.

If the redemptive-historical character does not occupy its rightful position in biblical textual interpretation, the danger of allegory may arise. Indeed, the possibility exists that everything described in the Word can be reduced to mere symbols of a higher reality. Trimp (cf. 1986:24; 1991:182) evaluated appropriately that allegory, having its background in Greek thought, is virtually a mutilation of the Old Testament: "Allegorie blijkt een soort apologetisch wapen te zijn, dat ook op de bijbel werd toegepast, toen men streefde naar een synthese tussen de inhoud van de bijbel en de inzichten binnen de gangbare hellenistische cultuur."

Other dangers include the moralization and psychologization which occur in the so-called exemplary method (cf. Greidanus, 1970:73ff., 78ff.). This method fixates its attention on the characters described in the Bible. According to this anthropocentric exposition, these characters, in their thoughts and actions, are nothing more than examples to us. This method detracts from the work of God described in the biblical texts. Although Christians may be able to learn from

certain aspects of the characters described in the Bible, this can only happen in relation to God's work of redemption.

The negation of redemptive history also paves the way for the so called *autonomie-bewegingen*. According to this approach, the literary work itself must be central in the interpretation; thereby the Bible is seen as a literary work. Those who advocate the autonomy of the literary work mostly have no interest in the historicity of the Bible but only in the externals, such as form and construction. Although structural analysis can be a handy aid in exegesis, it does not necessarily enlighten the interpretation of the text's content. Those placing their expectations wholly in the literary approach routinely promote the secularization of biblical interpretation and preaching; e.g. this can be seen in the narrative preaching. This also is an antipode of redemptive-historical exegesis and preaching (cf. Trimp, 1991:184-195).

2.4.4. Summary

The redemptive history which comprises the totality of history and forms unity in Christ and progressive realization of God's eternal counsel in time is a central theme of the Scriptures. As a result, it appears impossible to properly interpret Old Testament texts without appropriate application of the concept of redemptive history. The redemptive history is to be placed as a useful methodology of theological approach to biblical interpretation because the Bible itself requires the bestowing of attention upon redemptive history, both in exegesis and in preaching.

3. Exegesis

The term, 'ark' in English is rendered from the Hebrew term, אֲרוֹן. Yet the etymology of אֲרוֹן is uncertain. What is known is that it has some cognates from the Semitic language: Akk. *arānu*; Phoen. 'rn; Emp. Aram. 'rnn (pl.); Nab. 'rn'; Jud. Aram. 'rwnh (*DISO*, 25; *CAD A-II*, 231; *Ahw*, 65). The fact that in the texts outside of the Old Testament this word is used for a 'chest,' 'cashbox,' 'coffer,' 'ossuary,' 'sarcophagus,' it is obvious that אֲרוֹן means a container, chest or ark which has the shape of a rectangular wooden chest. A secular usage of אֲרוֹן occurs when it is rendered as a coffin (Gen. 50:26) and chest for money (2 King. 12:10, 11; 2 Chr. 24:8, 10, 11). Then in the Old Testament the vast majority of occurrences specify the ark of the cultic object (195 times) in various designations (cf. Seow, 1984:185). Accordingly, research on the ark in the Old Testament requires exegetical work.

The texts which will be dealt with in this section will be exegetized in accordance with the order of the Christian classification of the Old Testament: Pentateuch, historical books, Psalms and prophetic books.

In the Pentateuch, Exodus 25:10-22, 37:1-9, Num. 10:33-36, and Deut. 10:1-5, 8 will be treated. The verses such as Lev. 16:2 and Num. 7:89, which illustrate only a few functions are explained in the process of exegesis of the main texts. That is why they are not needed exegetically to be treated apart.

In the historical books, the texts that constitutes historical units will be examined. However it is not necessary to deal separately with parallel passages in Chronicles and the books of Samuel because Chronicles contains no new meaning of the ark (cf. Maier, 1965:82). Nevertheless the chapters concerning the ark will continuously be consulted. Judg. 20:27, 1 Sam. 14:18, 2 Sam. 11:11, and 1 Chron. 28:2 will be considered in chapter 4.

The sections of the poetic and prophetic books will be Psalm 132 and Jeremiah 3:16. Yet Ps. 99:5, which appears to be concerned with the ark, will be handled in the following chapter.

3.1. The ark in the Pentateuch

3.1.1. Ex. 25:10-22; 37:1-9: Yahweh's instruction and Bezalel's construction of the Ark

Pertinent data of both Ex. 25 and Ex. 37 are dealt with in this section. While both stories tell of the construction of the ark, certain statements, words and grammatical elements of Ch. 25 are missing in Ch. 37.

3.1.1.1. The canonical status

Since Wellhausen's (1899:1, 81) classification of this passage into Q (Grundschrift), it has allegedly been ascribed to P (cf. Houtman, 1996:357), often regarded as a late and idealized description, entirely untrustworthy as a guide to the date, necessity and utilization of the ark. Fritz (1977:117f.) states that only vv. 10-14; 16-18; 21a; 22a belong to 'Grundbestand' in P. Furthermore, presupposing two different traditional strings in the 'Ladeabschitt,' Owczarek (1998:59-63) suggests a more subdivided scheme from the text: "V.16-22 sind in jedem Fall als sekundär auszuscheiden. Die Ladethematik verteilt sich wie folgt auf die Redaktionsschichten: V.10-15. 17-20. 21a und V.22 sind der P^s-Schicht zuzuschreiben, auf die die Aufnahme der Tradition von der mit den Keruben verbundenen Lade sowie die Verbindung von Lade und כפרת and der Bezug auf die Sühnefunktion des Kultes zurückzuführen sind. V.16 und 21b sind als noch spätere Ergänzung durch R^{dr} anzusehen, da sie die spätdtr. Ladedeutung voraussetzen." Her meticulous analysis denotes that the concept of the 'Priestly code' is meshed with that of tradition: a combination between historico-literary criticism and tradition-historical criticism. Smith (1997:164) ascribes only vv. 21, 22 in the text to a priestly redactional addition as the final priestly redactional touch.

The critical method prevents us from getting historical information on the origin of the ark depicted in the book of Exodus and from trusting the biblical report on its existence. Through this text one can touch only a report and tradition coloured by the theology of P, but not factual

history in the period of Moses: the ark is merely a theological product by P. It may be unreasonable to state that the history of the provenance of the ark is weakened by this hypothesis, since Yahweh has worked and revealed himself in each step of historical progress. It is not necessary to indicate the problems of the documentary hypothesis again in this section for it was treated in the previous chapter (2.1). Actually the problems concerning the identification, character and date of 'P' are still debated: it is not even yet decided whether it is a 'source' (cf. Janowski, 1982:11ff.), 'redaction' (Smith, 1997:165) or 'compositional layer' (cf. Nicholson, 1998:196-221). The hypothesis may be accepted under the condition that P contemporarily signifies the priestly portrayal of Moses' role in this text.

Traditio-historical criticism is likely to continue influencing research on the ark. This method (see 2.2) is to study the ark in terms of the development of ideas and institutions associated with God's presence, including Israel's theological reflections about God's relation to sanctuaries. According to traditio-historical criticism, the ark does not belong to Moses but is a retrojection into ancient times from the exilic or post-exilic period, dependent on the temple of Solomon for many of its details (cf. Fretheim, 1991:266): "die Lade ist nicht Bestandteil der ursprünglichen Heiligtumskonzeption" (Owczarek, 1998:61). Yet Seow (1992:389) alludes that "The ark was from the start a cultic and political symbol; its presence signified the presence of Yahweh." In the same line Zobel (1973:394) states that *kapporeth* appears only in P, offering the impression that the plate is an object to be distinguished from the ark itself. This indicates that originally it was not connected with the ark but was later connected with the essential cultic function of the ark. However, there is no example that only *kapporeth* has been used apart from the ark in the Israelite cult (cf. Ex. 39:35; 40:20; Lev. 16:2, 13-15; Num. 7:89). Jackson's (1995:120) suggestion concerning the position and placing of the *cherubim* on the ark in Ex. 25:19, 20 and 37:8, 9 seems to reflect the needs of the Solomonic Temple as described in 1 Kings 6:14-30; 8:6-9. This sounds like cultic etiology which Gunkel as a pioneer classified (cf. 2.2.).

However, contemporary exegetes may have to try to obtain a synchronic reading from the final form of the recorded revelation which confronts us.

Even those who sustain the concept of P for the texts relating to the ark do not seem to preclude entirely the fact that the ark played a principal role for the existence and religion of

Israel in the earlier period. There is no convincing evidence to eliminate the possibility of the historicity of the 'biblical tradition' concerning its origin and of such texts as Num. 10:35, 36; 14:44 which confirm the Bible's own testimony that the ark accompanied the Israelites under the leadership of Moses from Sinai onward (cf. Lotz, Kyle & Armerding, 1979:293; Seow, 1992:389).

3.1.1.2. Textual and grammatical problems

In the textual criticism the Massoratic text is inevitably regarded as the most reliable text. Nonetheless, it is still open to take other texts in consideration when it is impossible, or in a few cases, not desirable, to follow the Massoretic text.

25:10. עָשׂוּ is read as וְעָשִׂיתָ (pf-cons. 2 per. m. sg.) in \mathfrak{M} and LXX^B (v. 9, ποιήσεις): 'you' supplants 'they': the two translations appear to make a coherent pattern with the following command words. It reflects one of many harmonizations of LXX such as Joshua 8:2 (עָשִׂיתָ ... תבון לכם, και ποιήσεις ... προνομευεις σεαυτῶ). אָרֹן is expressed as κιβωτὸν μαρτυρίου in the LXX, even though the MT lacks הָעֵדוּת: it is likely that the LXX underscores the unique role of the אָרֹן. For reference, Longacre (1992:185) calls the imperative form like וְעָשׂוּ with וְעָשָׂה in v. 19 an isolated goal-announcing and goal-enjoining imperative which is given to a particular individual to make something according to specifications, or to act as specified in a given situation.

25:11. וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתוֹ has ultima accent before אֹתוֹ, which is distinctive as a pf-cons (GK § 49 1). עָלָיו is replaced by לָּו in some manuscripts such as \mathfrak{M} , LXX, Syr and Tg. MT renders physical description, 'over it,' while other versions seem to imply a function of the golden molding, 'for it' or to mention direction 'to it.' In consideration that עָשָׂה עַל means 'make and connect' with the previously mentioned object and וְזָרָב is made as a kind of rim, MT appears better. Various texts show a tendency to square this phrase with לָּו וְזָרָב קָבִיב in Ex. 30:3.

25:12. 'Its feet' as a literal translation of פְּעֻמֹתָיו hardly matches the ark, but still appears

closest to its basic meaning (Childs, 1974:523). The word "corners" of Vg, Pes, Tg (McNamara, 1994:106) was never used in such a way (Jacob, 1992:774).

25:17. כַּפֶּרֶת is derived from the verb כָּפַר < Akk. *kapāru* 'wipe off,' 'smear on,' 'purify' etc. (CAD K 178). In the late Hebrew pi'el form, this verb means 'forgive,' or 'atone' (HALAT 470). The actual meaning of a term found in biblical texts should be determined by its biblical usage and internal evidence rather than by etymology (cf. Janowski, 1982:100ff.), but the etymological meaning should be taken into account in the process of translation. The term ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα (propitiatory cover) of LXX is an irrelevant translation for כַּפֶּרֶת (cf. Koch, 1995:65-75). Vg followed LXX: propitiatorium.

25:18. מִקְשָׁה from קָשָׁה 'be hard,' or 'severe' appears to refer to hammered rather than poured metalwork (Durham, 1987:357).

25:19. עֲשֵׂה (imp. m. sg) is read as יַעֲשׂוּ (ni. ipf. m. pl.) in ו (end of v. 18) and LXX (in v. 18): ποιηθήσονται (they are to be made). LXX has changed the intent of MT and created a tautological statement, reiterating the making of the two cherubs at the two ends by appending τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου to the preceding and beginning a new clause with καὶ ποιήσεις (Wevers, 1990:400). מִן of מִן־הַכַּפֶּרֶת should be seen as a partitive sense (BDB 579ff.). Several Tg versions and ו substitutes יַעֲשׂוּ for יַעֲשֶׂה (ipf.2 p. m. sg.).

25:20. פָּרְשֵׁי, pt. pl. st.- cons. of פָּרַשׂ (Joüon § 121m). לְמַעַן is not translated in Vg.

25:21. אֲשֶׁר אֶתֵּן אֵלַיךְ is omitted in ו. The translator of ו might regard the phrase as dittography of v. 16.

25:22. נִוְעַדְתִּי (ni. of עָד) needs the preposition לְ: "I appoint myself to meet you." LXX is not proper: γνωσθήσομαι = וְנִוְעַדְתִּי, "I will make myself known." LXX appears to confuse עָד with דָּע. MT obviously makes a word play on מוֹעֵד and the nif'al of עָד (Wevers, 1990:401). שְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵי has a sense of 'zugehörigkeit' (cf. Let. §70, e): 'Israelites.'

37:3. וְנִתְּתָהּ of ch. 25:12 between עַל and וְהָבָה is absent, but the meaning of וְנִתְּתָהּ is contained in עַל.

37:5. ו added בָּהֶם to the end word, וְנִתְּתָהּ אֵת־הָאָרֶן to seemingly accord with the instruction narrative. LXX: αὐτὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

37:6. ו reads אֲרָכָה as אֲרָכוּ and רַחֲבָה as רַחֲבוּ (with masculine suffix).

37:9. The ipf-cons. of וְהָיוּ of MT is changed into the pf-copula. (וְהָיוּ) in ו and LXX

which show a consistency of verbs. אִישׁ אֶל־אָחָיו is read as אָחָד אֶל־אָחָד (one toward one) in מ. It is a character of מ to attempt clarifying the meaning of a text.

3.1.1.3. Form and Structure

On the one hand each text is largely constituted of two parts respectively: the ark and the atonement place, and the two texts. On the other hand, the instruction for building the ark and the narrative of its construction can be juxtaposed in terms of command and execution as follows:

| Ex. 25:10-20 | Ex. 37:1-9 |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| וַעֲשֵׂה אֲרוֹן (10) (pf-cons. 3.m. pl.) | וַיַּעַשׂ בַּעֲלָאֵל אֶת־הָאָרוֹן (1) |
| וַצִּפֶּיהָ (11) (pf-cons. 2. m. sg.) | וַיִּצְפֶּהוּ (2) |
| וַעֲשִׂיהָ | וַיַּעַשׂ |
| וַיִּצְקֶתָּהּ (12) | וַיִּצֶק (3) |
| וַתִּצְפֶּהָ | |
| וַעֲשִׂיהָ (13) | וַיַּעַשׂ (4) |
| וַצִּפֶּיהָ | וַיִּצְרֶהָ |
| וַתִּבְנֶהָ (14) | וַיִּבְנֶה (5) |
| וַעֲשִׂיהָ (17) | וַיַּעַשׂ (6) |
| וַעֲשִׂיהָ (18) | וַיַּעַשׂ (7) |
| וַתַּעֲשֶׂה (ipf. 2. m. sg.) | וַתַּעֲשֶׂה (8) |
| וַתַּעֲשֶׂה (19) (imp. 2. m. sg.) | וַתַּעֲשֶׂה (9) |
| וַתַּעֲשֶׂה (ipf. 2. m. pl.) | וַתַּעֲשֶׂה (9) |
| וַתִּדְבֹר (20) (pf-cons. 3. c. sg.) | וַתִּדְבֹר (9) |
| וַתִּדְבֹר (ipf. 3. m. sg.) | וַתִּדְבֹר |

While the above-mentioned verbs of both columns for the most part share common objects and constituents of each sentence (both chapters used the same verbs), the commands to place **עֵדוּת** 'testimony' (25:16) and to put the atonement place on the ark (25:21), including the promise to meet and to speak with the Israelites there (25:22), have no counterparts in ch. 37. The verbs used in Ex. 25:10-22 are characterized by the grammatic form of perfect consecutive, second person, masculine singular: 11 times in 27 verbs. Those in Ex. 37:1-9, however, have the forms of ipf-cons. 3 per. m. sg. used 9 times. The only infinitive form (**לַעֲשׂוֹת**) of verse 5

corresponds to 25:14. With this mutual congruity, the author seems to attempt to exhibit a decisive observance in accordance with the commands.

Jackson (1995:119), however, observes that the heart of the passage is a series of twelve commands (including the first verb in verse 10 of מ). Vv. 15, 16 as well as vv. 21, 22 are later additions on account of the remarkable consistency in pattern between them. Yet if his argument is justified, וַיִּצְוֶה , the most important verb, should be replaced by מ ; most likely מ harmonized the verb with other verbs later on, and the reason why וַיִּצְוֶה is missing from chapter 37 should be exposed more clearly. In fact Bezalel has nothing to do with the command of 25:15 in character of the command: it is natural that the performance is omitted, while the commands relating the Testimony (vv. 16, 21) appear not to involve him; perhaps the Testimony is given shortly after making the ark. Furthermore, it stands to reason that chapter 37 lacks the promise of 25:22 belonging to God's favour: God's command is usually accompanied by a promise with respect to his design (cf. Gen. 12:1-3). Hence, it sounds unfounded that such a series of verbal forms determines the meaning of the text and discerns whether they belong to the primary text or the latter. Besides, Longacre (1995:40f.) made a diagram of this passage by focusing on patterns of *waw*-consecutive sentences and of sentences without *waw*: this diagram "illustrates both the operation of minus *waw* in binding together clauses in paratactic (and chiasmic) sentences, and the operation of minus *waw* in indicating a specification on the paragraph level. This diagram also serves to illustrate WQTL (*waw*-consecutive perfect) forms as mainline of this discourse type and considerations of thematicity in setting up embedded paragraphs." He is of the opinion that sequential minus *waw* sentences are expounded by embedded paragraphs while introductory *waw*-consecutive sentences are expounded by sentence structures. It seems interesting to observe that the paragraph illustrates nicely the mainline role of WQTL clauses in instructional discourse by explicating the manner in which considerations of thematicity lead to the positing of embedded paragraphs-- although it still remains equivocal to what extent such a method as discourse analysis is helpful in penetrating the meaning of the text.

3.1.1.4. Explanation

3.1.1.4.1. The instruction and construction of the ark (Ex. 25:10-15; 37:1-5)

Ex. 25:10; 37:1 The historical provenance of the ark is confronted in this section which delineates its size and materials in considerable detail, despite Houtman's (1996:357f.) allusion: "Het gaat mij er daarbij niet direct om de geschiedenis van de schrijn in kaart te brengen, maar om een indruk te geven van de vorm, de functie en het karakter van de schrijn en van de ermee verbonden voorstellingen." **וַיֵּשְׂרֹף** demonstrates that the ark is built because Yahweh has initiated its construction rather than because the Israelites decided to do so. **וַיֵּשְׂרֹף** ("They are to make") is distinctly different than the other wording ("You are to make"). **וַיֵּשְׂרֹף** appears to intend to establish a link with the verb **וַיֵּשְׂרֹף** in v. 8: "And let the children of Israel make Me a sanctuary in the following way: let them make, first of all, an ark, etc." (Cassuto, 1967:328). The construction of the ark is above-all about the whole community of Israel rather than just Moses.

The ark was to be made of **עֵצֵי שִׁטִּים** (acacia wood: Fensham, 1977:187f.) which grew in the vicinity. Identifying **שִׁטִּים** with *Acacia raddiana*, Zohary (1982:116) states that the common acacia (*Acacia raddiana*) which attains a height of 5-8 m and is suitable for building, is compatible with the text. The use of this acacia wood, even if it was expensive (DBI, 1998:42), appears to imply the wilderness-origin of the ark. After all, cedar wood was used for the construction of the Solomonic temple (1 King. 1:9, 15ff.): it is directly opposite to Broekhuis' statement (1986:150), "De ark is in kanaän ontstaan."

From a different angle, Heinemann (1995:37-40), accepted that *acacia nilotica*, used commonly as building material in Egypt, is the identification of **שִׁטִּים**. Illustrating that "In der Religion spielt die Akazie als einer der heiligen Bäume Ägyptens eine wichtige Rolle," he denotes that the acacia wood as the material of the ark reflects the influence of Egyptian religion ("Kasten-Kultur"): "Archäologisch kann dieses Detail wohl nur als Hinweis auf ägyptischen Einfluß interpretiert werden, da nur dort größere Gegenstände aus Akazienholz gefunden wurden. Außerdem spielt die Akazie in der ägyptischen Religion als heiliger Baum eine wichtige Rolle und eignet sich so auch als Baumaterial für einen heiligen Kasten." However, it is difficult to admit that the manufacture of the ark was affected by Egyptian religion with respect to the acacia wood, in spite of the common cultural phenomenon emerging in Israel's religion, for the

material was chosen by Yahweh himself. The question that he has been posed, "Wie weit der ägyptische Einfluß beim Bau der 'Lade' und in der Religion des Volkes Israel reichte, und wie diese 'ägyptische Lade' die Bedeutung erlangte, die die alttestamentliche Überlieferung veranschaulicht" cannot be properly answered unless the distinction between Egyptian animism and Israelite revelation-religion is nullified.

The size of the ark is given as *two and a half cubits long, a cubit and a half wide, and a cubit and a half high*. אַמְנָה (cubit) means literally 'forearm': the distance between the elbow and the tip of the middle finger of an average-sized person (cf. Deut.3:11, בְּאֵמְנָתוֹ). It implies that the length of the cubit is flexible. In fact, while Powell (1990:462) distinguishes five different lengths for the cubit in Babylonian history: the 30 fingers ($\approx 50\text{cm}$), two 30-fingers cubits ($\approx 1\text{m}$), the pace cubit (≈ 75), the cubit of 24 fingers ($\approx 50\text{ cm}$) and the Archaemenid royal cubit, A.S. Kaufman (1984:120f.) introduces three kinds of ancient Hebrew cubit depending upon the number of handbreadths into which the cubit was divided: five, six or seven. According to him, 'the cubit of Moses' identified as the 'first standard' belongs to medium cubit which was assigned to the length of six handbreadths or twenty-four fingerbreadths whose division was adopted by other ancient civilizations such as Egypt, Greece and Rome. Especially, he (1984:131) concludes that "the first standard, known as the cubit of Moses and used in the construction of the Ark of the Covenant and of the Tent of Meeting was 42.8 cm." If his observation is right, this would give external dimensions of 107 cm in length and 64.2 cm in both width and height. At any rate, the measurements represented the configuration of the object; the form and the object itself were inseparable and comprised the item itself.

Ex. 37:1 states that *Bezalel made the ark*, which appears to decipher that Bezalel personally made the ark because of its paramount importance. Yet he must be seen as a director who was in charge of construction of the ark and other objects, even if the command was given as a third person plural form (עָשָׂה). Moses' statement in Deuteronomy 10:3, "I made the ark," is to be understood in the same way as the phrase "the house which king Solomon built" in referring to the temple. Bezalel is the one whom Yahweh has filled with the Spirit of God, and with skill, ability and knowledge in all kinds of crafts. He was the one called to make artistic designs for work in gold, silver and bronze, to cut and set stones, to work in wood and to engage in all kinds of artistic craftsmanship (Ex. 35:31-33). The work of the Spirit is different

in Old Testament times from that in the New Testament: it is particularly related to the office of service to God with *kunstwerk* rather than to eternal salvation (cf. Gootjes, 1992:32f.).

25:11. *You are to overlay it with pure gold: both inside and outside, and make a gold molding around it.* $\overline{\text{קָדַשׁ}}$ is always the verb for overlaying wood with metal (cf. 13, 24, 28; 26:29, 37; 27:26; 30:3, 5), and this verb had to be repeated in the subsidiary clause, as an adverbial designation might appear in addition to the accusative use of the noun: "*inside and outside.*" The second verb need not to be translated repeatedly in English. The ark should be overlaid with pure gold to enhance its dignity and beauty and there shall be a twofold overlay. Gold was the most precious of metals, because of its scarcity, malleability and resistance to tarnishing. It is often associated with God and is symbolic of his holiness, majesty and unchangeable nature (DBI, 1998:557). *Pure gold* is gold of the highest grade, having undergone extra steps in the refining process to free it from impurities, which is applicable only to the ark in this text and not the poles which were covered with ordinary gold. The rings and $\overline{\text{זָרָה}}$, too, were fabricated of ordinary gold. For Egyptian people gold has a special meaning: "Gold spielte dabei aber nicht nur eine wirtschaftliche sondern auch eine kultische Rolle, denn es galt als Metall der Götter, insbesondere des Sonnengottes 'Re', und seine Unveränderlichkeit galt als ein Sinnbild für das Weiterleben nach dem Tod" (Heinemann, 1995:35). It is in this context that the position of the body of Tutankhamun, a pharaoh in the middle period of New Kingdom (ca. 1300 B.C.), discovered reposing within a nest of three coffins can be understood. The innermost coffin had been made of solid gold while the two outer ones of hammered gold over wooden frames (Settgast, 1980, Abb. 29). However, the Bible does not confer such divine meaning to material such as gold: "zwar ist das Gold nicht göttlich" (Lurker, 1973:119): it is just used as a metaphor for the almighty (Job 22:25f.), the Messianic meaning (Isa. 60:60), and faith in Christ (1 Petr. 1:7). It is likely that in this context the molding gold associates with the holiness of God (Hague, 1997:506).

With respect to overlaying the ark with pure gold, two rabbinic traditions made concrete description (*Yoma* 72b; *Sheqalim* 6:1, 49d): a nest of three separated chests of slightly varying dimensions was constructed ("Three arks did Bazalel make: the middle one of wood, nine [handbreadths] high; the inner one of gold, eight high, the outer one of gold, a little more than

ten high"); the wooden chest was simply overlaid with gold inside and outside. Either design would have been familiar to contemporary Egyptian artisans. In the light of archaeological finds in Egypt the method of overlaying the ark appears to follow the method of attaching hammered plates to the wood by means of small nails: it is solid enough to keep the two tablets of stone (cf. Cassuto, 1967:329).

עָשָׂה עָלָיו means 'make and connect' with the previously mentioned object, so that it rests on it (Jacob, 1992:772). The exact meaning of זָר used only in Exodus in the Old Testament is unknown, but in LXX זָר is translated as κυμάτια στρεπτά χρυσά (intertwined golden foliage): in Σ, στεφάνη for זָר (37:2). The fact that especially στεφάνη is used as the translation of מִסְגֵּרֶת (25:25): *labium* (lip, edge), *corōna* (circle) in Vg implies that זָר and מִסְגֵּרֶת were understood as interrelated terms of meaning by the old translators (cf. Houtman, 1996:366). It is a golden ornament in the form of a garland of flowers or leaves running right round the four sides of the ark on the top.

25:12. *You are to cast four gold rings for it and place them on its four pedestals, with two rings on one side and two rings on the other side.* The rings for the ark serve to contain bearer poles, cross-bars for the beams. However, the problem is that the text is almost silent as to the precise placement of the rings on the sides of the ark, even if פְּעֻמֹת is alluded. The meaning of the pl. f. form of פְּעֻמֹת is far from clear, but it occurs three times in relation to the feet of an object (37:3; 1 King.. 7:30, Sæbø, 1989:704). This word cannot simply be translated as 'corners' (Vg, Pes, Tg), for it was never used so, nor does it mean 'feet': the ark had no feet. According to Jacob (1992:774) it is something like pedestals: "No object which was flat and even on all sides could possess feet; like beams and pillars it could at most possess pedestals (*a-do-nim*)."
Although it is not prescribed by God, the presence of the pedestals seems apparent. Thus, the ark could hardly stand on its bottom plate and its corners and possibly did not come into direct contact with the ground. The rings then were not fastened on the long side, but along the width and namely beneath the lower corners (Rashbam, 1997:308), so that the ark would be borne aloft, which would also make transportation easier. Rashi (1930:133) has a different view: "It was on the upper corners near to the cover that the rings were placed."

25:13-15. *Poles* fabricated of acacia wood and covered with gold should be so long that the bearers might not be in danger of pushing against the ark and should be inserted into the rings on the sides of the ark. This injunction was observed even after the ark found its permanent resting place in Solomon's temple, as noted in I Kings 8:8. This arrangement by divine direction probably originated as a precautionary measure to protect the ark from contact with profane hands for the sake of its holiness. Verse 15 stressed the continuous mobility of the ark with repetition in positive and negative forms: *The poles are to remain in the rings of the ark; they are not to be removed from it.*

It is interesting to note an Egyptian parallel; a chest found in Tutankhamun's tomb is portable, with four poles inserted into each ring inside of the four feet (Settgast, 1980:29). Ex. 25:13ff. has no indication about the number of poles, but probably two long poles were used to carry the ark. Of course, it is possible that there were four poles used for the ark if there were eight rings in total by translating ׀ at the beginning of the word אֲשֶׁר as meaning 'and' as in Yoma 72a. However, the ׀ of אֲשֶׁר should be seen as the so-called *waw explicativum* (GK §154 a, footnote 1. b): 'cast four rings ... *namely* with two rings on one side.'

On the basis of the Bible -- the reliable document of divine revelation -- the different assumptions with respect to the provenance of the ark are to be ruled out (cf. Schmitt, 1972:65-98). Gressmann (1920:42), identifying the ark of Yahweh with the chest of Joseph, defends the statement that the ark in the land of Canaan stemmed from the Amorite symbol related to Baal's worship. Guthe (1899:31) states that the ark of Yahweh was derived from the bark which was carried around in the Egyptian procession on which the image of the god stood in the wooden niche with four pillars, in front of which people prayed and worshipped: "Die Gottesbilder der Aegypter befanden sich in einer kleinen Barke, ... Sie vertrat also der Aussenwelt gegenüber das Gottesbild. An die Stelle der Barke, die vom Nil unzertrennlich ist, trat in der Wüste die Lade, der Kasten, um ein Haus oder Obdach oder überhaupt nur irgend einen Inhalt anzudeuten." Hartmann (1917/18:209-244) connects the ark with Egyptian or Babylonian origin: "die Deutung der Lade als eines Tammuz kastens oder Osirissargs ist vielleicht wie wer gezeigt haben, gar nicht ohne weiteres von der Hand zu weisen." Reimpell (1916:326-331) holds that the ark was

taken over by the Midianites from the Hittites and consequently borrowed by Moses for the making of the ark. Schmitt (1972:65-98) reaches the conclusion that "Demgegenüber sind die auf Grund der alt Texte und vor allem des archäologischen Materials gewonnenen Argumente für eine Herkunft der Lade aus dem ägyptischen oder kanaanäischen Kulturland von geringerem Gewicht." For von Rad (1958:123, 126) "Die Lade ist ein Kultgegenstand, der aus dem Kulturland kommt," which is "gegen die Herkunft der Lade aus Wüstenzeit ausgesprochen." (cf. 4.2.1. on evaluation). In addition, some have tried to explain the origin in extra-biblical literature by seeking analogies with Greek and Arabic arks, yet there is no consensus about the analogies.

3.1.1.4.2. The Testimony (Ex. 25:16)

You are to put in the ark (the tablets of) the Testimony, which I will give you. This verse is omitted in Ex. 37. The tricky point of this section is in regard to the word תְּאֵדָוָה which can bring forth variant translation: 'testimony,' 'Bundesbestimmungen' (Volkwein, 1969:39f.), "stipulations" (of a covenant or agreement) (Kitchen, 1979:460), 'etwas »Geschriebenes«' (Janowski, 1982:294), 'grondwet' (Houtman, 1996:357, 370), 'covenant' (Rashbam, 1997:311), 'pact' (Sarna, 1991:160). A scholar such as Jacob (1992:771) leaves it in the transcribed form of the Hebrew word without any attempt to construe in order to shun misleading.

While the word 'testimony' is a simple translation following the Akkadian *adê* and the Hebrew תְּאֵדָוָה , 'grondwet' (stemmed from the root אָדָו) and 'covenant' seem to be intended to be harmonized with the tablets of the Decalogue (1 King. 8:9). The word 'pact', 'Bundesbestimmungen' and 'etwas Geschriebenes' sound as an interpretation grounded on the Akkadian *adê* and Aramaic ܐܕܘܘܗ for the stipulations of a vassal treaty: "Beide Wörter haben ungefähr die gleiche Bedeutung «Vasallenvertrag», «Vasallenvertragsbestimmungen»" (Volkwein, 1969:37; cf. CAD, 131ff. "a type of formal agreement"). We need to keep in mind that the ark is sometimes called 'the ark of the covenant,' a term which can be compared with the suzerain pact in the Near East. All above translations except the first are acceptable basically in terms of illuminating the content of the word, but they tend to attempt interpretation, without contemplation

of a stylistic feature given according to the intention of the author in this text, even though *ברית* and *עדת* are exchangeable with respect to the ark (cf. Deut.31:9, 25, 26; Jos. 3:3, 6, 8 and Ex. 25:22; 26:33, 34; 30:6, 26; 39:35; 40:3, 5, 21; Num. 4:5; 7:89; Jos. 4:16). Apart from the texts in which the ark is alluded to, *עדת* is used as a synonym of *ברית* two times (2 King. 17:15; Ps. 132:12). *ברית* in these texts is to be understood as a term for the obligation (cf. Owczarek, 1998:167).

The noun *עדת* is mostly regarded as an abstract form of *עד* (cf. Leeuwen, 1976:210), which is likely derived from Akk. *adê* (pl. tantum of *adû*, Ungnad, 1992:46f.; von Sodon, § 61 h). It is deemed unnatural to apply the Akkadian meaning to this text so as to translate the term properly, since the covenant between Yahweh and Israel is different from a kind of mutual agreement; the commencement of the covenant is completely one-sided in the Old Testament, although "the agreement called *adû* was drawn up in writing between a partner of higher status (god, king, member of the royal family)" (CAD AI 133).

עדת is used as a legal term in the Old Testament: a heap of stones between Laban and Jacob (Gen. 31:48) or giving a sandal to another (Ruth 4:7ff.). Thus, the term itself is closely connected with meaning 'testimony' or 'witness' as concerns legal usage (cf. Gen. 31:50; Ex. 20:16; Num. 35:30; Jos. 24:22; Job 16:19 etc.). Basically such a testimony bears the concrete nature of persuading someone. Hence, the term is employed to intend something concrete when associated with the ark. That is to say, the word *עדת* refers not so much to treaty or covenant, in the general sense, as specifically to the stone tables, 'etwas »Geschriebenes«' or to the concretization of the covenant at Sinai (Ex. 25:21; 40:20) (cf. Seow, 1984:194). Although the scroll of the Law was deposited in the ark according to the Talmud (*Baba Bathra* 14b), *עדת* in this verse is rightly identified with *לוחות הָעֵדוּת* (the tablets of the testimony) in which the Decalogue is inscribed (Ex. 34:28f.); Utschneider (1988:110) alludes that it is nowhere stated that God actually gave the *עדת* to Moses; 40:20 simply reports that Moses 'took and placed' (*וַיִּקַּח וַיִּתֵּן*) the *עדת* into the ark. It implies that the glory theophany on Sinai is closely linked with the testimony in the ark; this law is given in glorious theophany and is expressly referred to as the testimony indicating a link between the glory and the law (Hague, 1997:507). In the context the word *עדת* manifests the covenantal nature of the Ten Commandments, especially with its preface: "they testify to the covenant that was made between

the Lord and the children of Israel" (Cassuto, 1967:326) and the Testimony "is the seal of the Lord's covenant with Israel" (Hague, 1997:502). Thus, it appears that von Rad (1958:208f.) compared אָדָמָה of Yahweh with *Königsprotokoll* in ancient Egyptian texts. It reminds the Israelites of the redeeming hands of Yahweh and simultaneously the covenantal obligation that He imposed on them: "Das 'Zeugnis', von dem in diesem Kontext geredet wird, ist ... etwas, was sich von Zeit zu Zeit ereignet, indem Jahwe sich 'bezeugt'" (Owczarek, 1998:171).

As regards the Ten Commandments, whose title originates from ten utterances in the style of direct commands, literally 'words,' its origin, nature and function have been in debate. Since Reuss (1890:81) it has widely been accepted among critics that "die Propheten älter als das Gesetz" are. Particularly in his twelve theses, it is conspicuous that Deuteronomy is the first legal code: "6. Les prophètes du 8e et du 7e siècle ne savent rien du code mosaïque. 7. Jérémie est le premier prophète qui connaisse une loi écrite et ses citations rapportent au Deutéronome" (cf. Holwerda, 1972:18f.). This means that the Decalogue is not just far from Sinaitic origin but later than that of Deuteronomy. Thereafter, most scholars who hold fast to historico-literary or *überlieferungs-geschichtliche* position came to disaffirm its Mosaic origin. They believe that the Decalogue is a result of accumulated traditions in historical process, as von Rad (1966:205) stated that "So hat Israel also selbst am Dekalog lange gearbeitet bis er nach Form und Inhalt so universal und so knapp": "Der Dekalog ist nicht aus einem Guß" (Levin, 1985:168) or "Der Dekalog hat zweifellos eine Vorgeschichte" (Kratz, 1994:214). The views of the origin of the Decalogue are varied: Stamm (1959:28) believes that its origin date from the period of Judges; Nielsen (1965:105f.) assumes that *Grundgesetz* of the Decalogue, a set of ten prohibitions, is issued from the ninth century in North Israel; Gerstenberger (1965:141-144) locates the origin of the Decalogue as an expression of *Sippenethos* in the moral instruction of the clans and the tribes of early Israel; Lohfink (1990:204, 209) regards the *Sabbatgebot* to be *Hauptgebot* that was formed in the period of Exile; Crüsemann (1992:408) supposes that generally the Decalogue of Deuteronomy in 7 BC was a model of that of Exodus; Kratz (1994:236) thinks that the Decalogue is dated in the spiritual area of Deuteronomistic movement between Hosea and Deuteronomy; E. Otto (2000:11-129) assumes that the Decalogue was given by the *dtr Hauptredaktion* (DtrD) in the *frühnachexilisch* situation (515 BC) lest Israel

be taken captive; Hossfeld (2000:46-59) ascribes the Decalogue to *Ansatzpunkte* of Deuteronomy in 7 BC; Waschke (2001:227ff.) ascribes its origin to Hosea 13:4. Besides there is a variety of views on the differences between the Decalogue in Ex. 20 and that of Deut. 5: While the likes of Crüsemann (1992:408) and Hossfeld (1982:161f.) state that the Deuteronomistic Decalogue is a model of that of Exodus, the scholars such as Levin (1985:169) and Kratz (1994:232f.) maintain that the Decalogue in Ex. 20 is older than that of Deuteronomy. To discuss here these canonical problems concerned with the Decalogue would carry us too far away from the purpose of this thesis. Nevertheless it is, in passing, needed to point out the problem of Alt's theory about the legal form. Alt (1959:278-332) distinguished two main forms of law: *das kasuistisch formulierte Recht* and *das apodiktisch formulierte Recht*. According to him the Decalogue belongs to the latter and has its origin in Israel: "Auf kanaanäische Herkunft deutet ja auch nicht das Mindeste in den apodiktischen Satzreihen hin, weder die Anschauungen, die aus ihm sprechen, noch auch nur die allgemeinen Kulturverhältnisse, die sie voraussetzen." However the apodictic form of the Decalogue of Israel is not distinctive because there are found many parallels of categorical law in Near Eastern literature: some examples of apodictic style are the formation from the treaty of Mursilis II with Manapa (McCarthy, 1978:61) and from the regular wisdom connections such as some Babylonian proverb texts and the Wisdom of Amenemope (Gerstenberger, 1965:131-138). These parallels demonstrate that Alt's *formgeschichtlich* research should be modified and that there is no reason that the Decalogue should be dated as a late product. At any rate arguments of its late dating are insufficient in consideration of historical state and reliability of the text.

The contents of the Decalogue traditionally construct two parts: the first table contains commandments pertaining to God (1-4); the second does the commandments to neighbours (5-10) (cf, Millard regards the fifth command as *Abschluss* the first table, 2000:211-216). According to the preamble (20:1, 2) the Ten Commandments are characterized by historical setting: Israel's deliverance from the house of slaves in Egypt into a new relationship with Yahweh. It denotes that the Decalogue is not universal law but confined to people redeemed from slavery: The people observe it not to be saved but vice versa. Thus this introduction proclaims that the Decalogue should be observed on a different level from duty of legalism. The people's keeping it is caused by grace of God's redemption.

The first Commandment can be translated as *You shall have no other gods in my presence* (3). The last phrase, **עַל־פְּנֵי** is translated as "in my presence" instead of 'before me' or 'beside me' (cf. Simian-Yofre, 1989:656) because they should not be regarded as His rivals in worship. The grammatical construction shows divine prohibition: ipf. + **לֹא**. This Commandment is of fundamental importance by referring to the object of worship: Yahweh only is their God. It does not mean that this command recognizes the existence of other gods (cf. Deut. 6:4). From the outset it emphasizes Yahweh's exclusivity (cf. Kratz, 1994:210f.) and contains his exclusive demand because his claim is based on Israelites' exclusive relationship with God through the once-for-all and historical experience of exodus. The prohibition of the first Commandment is primarily a warning in consideration of syncretism of the Canaanite circumstances and simultaneously an instruction that there should be no priority beside Yahweh.

The second Commandment prohibits the making and the worshipping of any idols or images (**פְּסֻלִים**). The emphasis of this prohibition resides in the manner of worship: ban of any kind of worship alongside an idol, which was widespread in Egypt and Canaan (Ex. 32:4-6; Judg. 8:27; 1 King. 12:28; 2 King. 10:29; 18:4; Am. 5:26). The reason for this prohibition is not that God is an imageless God but he (**אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ**) is a jealous God. He cannot tolerate his people's behaviour of worshipping a creature because his jealousy is another expression of his monopolistic love of them (cf. Isa. 42:8). This command is followed by the warning of judgment and the promise of blessing, a trait of covenant relationship. According to the phrase, *those who hate me* (**אֲנִי וְאֵלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתַי**), God appears to make much of the internal motivation of idolatry prior to the behaviour of worshipping images. While judgment on idolaters reaches as far as *third and fourth generations*, blessing on the faithful to the command is unlimited. This imbalance between *the three and the fourth generation* and '*thousands*' is a remarkable confirmation that mercy eventually outstrips judgment (McConville's translation of **אֲלֵפֵי** as 'a thousand generations' appears not to be proper, 2002:127).

The third Commandment forbids misuse of the name, Yahweh. Name has significant meaning in the Old Testament since it is not merely a label of goods but concomitant with the personality of the called one (cf. Zimmerli, 1985:66). While to blaspheme God's name is to blaspheme God himself, to glorify his name is to glorify him (Ex. 20:24; Ps. 7:17; 9:2; Isa. 24:15; 25:1; 42:8; 48:11; 52:5 etc.). Moreover name refers to all that Yahweh has revealed of

himself: his power, his love, his justice, his immutability etc. This command has ethical aspect as well as cultic (cf. Veijola, 2000:57; Lang, 1981:97-105). Yahweh's name which signifies fidelity to his covenant (Ex. 3:15) must not be misused in worship, as the names of the heathen gods are used to manipulate gods in their services, nor be used for false swearing in daily life (Lev. 19:12; Ps. 24:4; Jer. 5:2).

The fourth Commandment treats a stipulation of the Sabbath day. Yet the verb with the emphatic-imperative role (inf. abs., Lett, § 73 c.4) in this command, שָׁבֹתִי differs from that of Deuteronomy, שָׁמַרְתָּ. The former indicates that the Sabbath day already existed, and the latter means intentional presentation. Even the motivation to have to observe it is different between Exodus (20:11) and Deuteronomy (5:15): the command of Exodus is based on God's rest ensuing six days of creation (Gen. 2:3) and that of Deuteronomy on Yahweh's deliverance of Israel from the slavery in Egypt. However the two texts mutually are not exclusive to each other but theologically well harmonized in the viewpoint of a variety and progression of God's revelation: festive commemoration of God's creation and redemption. The Lohfink's (1990:204, 209) statement what ascribes the *Sabbatgebot* to the period of Exile is contrary to the stream of revelational history which began with creation and which proceeds toward the goal of redemption. Particularly the term, 'rest' would attract Israelites who had experienced drudgery in Egypt. Then *Observing it holy* denotes that day being marked as out of the ordinary run of human activity (cf. Ex. 16:23-30) and devoted to divine service. This contains perpetual obligation and hope (Heb. 4:9), although it was given in the particular time and space. The result of the observance of this command positively affects the universal realm of human life (cf. Brueggemann, 2001:72ff.). Later the concept of the Sabbath day is expanded to the institution of the Sabbath year and Jubilee (Lev. 25).

The fifth Commandment is dealing with authority of parents and society which is a fundamental element of family and the fabric of the community. Even though his command simply makes mention of children's honouring of the parents, in Israel the requirement of obedience extends to the representatives of the whole community such as priests, prophets, kings, elders, judges, etc. (cf. Gen. 45:8; Deut. 17:2; 21:18-21; 2 King. 2:12; 13:14). In fact it is important to support parents who are financially active. Thereby, the order of Israelite society begins with that of the smallest unit of society: shift from parental to civic authority.

However this principle of obedience to authority may have to be applied to all community because all kind of authority comes from God (Rom. 13:1). Otherwise the society will be downfallen. There is affixed to this command a particular promise: *the first commandment with a promise* (Eph. 6:2). The content of the promise refers to longevity in the promised land: it sounds physical but it aims at spiritual life since the land is governed by God. This command of Deuteronomy underlines its importance by attaching the promise of prosperity, *and that it may go well with you*. There appears another addition to Deuteronomy, *as Yahweh your God commanded you* which probably is in reference to the text of Ex. 20.

The sixth Commandment is concerned with protection of life: *You shall not murder*. Primarily the verb, רָצַח is to be defined as 'killing outlawed,' this is, 'to murder' or 'to commit homicide' rather than killing of *Gemeinschaftswidrigkeit* or *Privatsphäre* whose idea may concede murder by collective consent (cf. Hossfeld, 1993:655). The prohibition on unlawful killing (רָצַח) is not applicable to judicial and military context, while the act of an accidental רָצַח is prescribed in Numbers 35 by making allowances for the circumstances. This prohibition on neighbour murder and even suicide is indispensable since life is God's gift and it is not at human disposal. This is an essential stipulation for the covenant community of Israel. As regards pedigree of this command, Hossfeld (1993:658; 1982:276ff., 281ff.) considers this command as a part of the core of the Decalogue which rests on Jeremiah (7:9) but it can be reversed because there are many utterances concerning this command of the Decalogue in the earlier period (Num. 35; Jos. 20; 1 King. 21:19; Hos. 4:2).

The seventh Commandment refers to marriage life and sexual conduct: *You shall not commit adultery*. This prohibition contains extramarital intercourse and prohibited coupling (Deut. 22:9-30) as well as sexual relations between people married to others. The regulation of the marriage belongs to the original creation order (Gen. 2:24). Then the verb (זָנָה) is used with a male subject: adultery seems to be primarily an offence committed by a man with another man's wife (Deut. 22:22), even though the man and wife are held responsible and pay the penalty. Furthermore a woman is more vulnerable to legal process than a man because of her need to protect her virginity (Deut. 22:13-19) (McConville, 2002:129). The demand of this command is cardinal for Israelites to avoid the practices of Canaanite religions (Num. 25:1; 1 Sam. 2:22; 2 King. 23:7; Jer. 2:20; Ez. 23:37ff.) and to establish an ideal community by

keeping sexual purity and chastity. The function of this prohibition is closely connected with that of the fifth Commandment to maintain social structure. This command related to marriage bond is used for relationship between Yahweh and his people (Jer. 2; Ez. 22f.; Hos. 2, 4).

The eighth Commandment is about the protection of the property of others: *You shall not steal*. To steal is to take unauthorized possessions of what does not belong to one. This includes all kind of theft such as fraud, robbery, embezzlement, extortion, exploitation etc. The basic idea of this ban is to recognize personal ownership as steward of materials which God distributed, even though Yahweh is real owner of all (Ps. 24:1). The right of possession should be used effectively and responsibly for the benefit of the community. On the contrary, to infringe this law is to disrupt not only individual well-being but also the welfare of a community. Thus this provision is also fundamental for Israelites to maintain faithful community to God. Breach of this prohibition is mainly done through the violation of the ninth and tenth Commandment (cf. Jos. 7:1).

The ninth Commandment addresses the realm of jurisprudence with prohibition of false evidence against neighbour in the court: *You shall not give false testimony against your neighbour*. God's people are to be honest. However the emphasis of this prohibition resides in 'neighbour' but not in general instruction of honesty. This is an action for all members of the community to be benefitted by faire judgment of the law. In fact the extent of the penalty of the accused depends on the testimony of the witness in the court (cf. 2 King. 21). The false evidence functions as a mischief to estrange the relationship between members of the community and to undermine its structure. This command instructs that the witness is to leave private interests or feeling of revenge but to act out of love in heart in the court. To do full justice to the truth in giving testimony can really uphold the law that protects everyone in the judicial process.

The tenth Commandment goes beyond legal crime and to its inner motivation: *You shall not covet your neighbour's*. The term, **רָצַב**, itself has a neutral character: it is used in a positive and negative way (cf. Ps. 19:10; 68:16; Son. 2:3). Here it is used in a negative sense. **רָצַב** is primarily connected with the material and physical but its outcome affects spiritual problems. Thus command functions as a prop to obey the aforementioned commandments because to covet actually leads to infringe the whole Decalogue (cf. 2 Sam. 11, 12:5; 2 King. 5:20; 21;

Mat. 19:16:22; 2 Tim. 3:2). God fundamentally constrains the possibility of breaching the commands with this final code which treats the source of sin. This is different from all other law promulgated by kings in the ancient Near East. Thereby, the Ten Commandments are concluded with the prohibition on inner disposition out of selfish motive.

As mentioned above, the Decalogue is a basic law of all institutions of the Israelite community. Then Harrelson (1997:159-165) considers the Decalogue to be a chart of human freedom as a foundation of human rights. Naturally, it contains such an element but it may primarily have to be conceived as a manifesto of divine right as redeemer, since the Ten Commandments basically are God's demand for his covenantal relationship with the Israelites, who already experienced God's redemption from Egypt. Furthermore it appears insufficient to explain its function simply as "den von Gott gewährten Freiraum zu umfassen und zu sichern" (Waschke, 2001:230) because Israel could only enjoy freedom in the service of God in a new relationship. Above all, it should be underlined that Yahweh wanted the covenant relation with his people through the exodus. This relationship is a foundation for the people to be 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation' (19:6). On the one hand, the Decalogue was not provided as a religious or moral law of an ancient community, but as a means of fulfilling the holy destiny God intended for them, regardless of *Sippenethos*. It was, on the other hand, given as a means for people to thankfully honor the God of redemption (cf. Mackay, 2001:339).

The fact that now only two tablets of the Decalogue should be put in the ark signifies not only that it is the most fundamental Law of legal corpora in Israel but also the ark is at the center of Israelite life.

From this verse (Ex. 25:16) that the the tablets of the Decalogue are put in the ark, its function is simply seen as housing them (1 King. 8:9). Yet it is broadly argued that the ark has more than the function of a container of the stone tablets, considering that the practice of depositing in the ark the tablets of stone was an ancient and widespread Near East legal tradition. It symbolically underscored the importance of the document and projected the idea that the presiding deity witnessed and guarded it and oversaw its implementation (Sarna, 1991:160). When King Mattiwaza of Mittani and Suppiluliumas of the Hittite monarchy made a treaty for nonaggression and mutual assistance, one copy was deposited 'before the Sun-goddess

of *Arinna*' and the other one 'before the deity of *Tešub*' the god of Hittites: in front of the image of the god (Pritchard, 1969:209). In Egypt, Ramses II, who made a treaty with the Hittite king Hattusilis, confirms that duplicates of the document lie 'beneath the feet' of the respective gods of the contracting parties (cf. Vaux, 1967:258f.; cf. Seow, 1992:389; Matthews & Benjamin, 1997:86:90). It is completely unknown whether there is some relationship between the Near Eastern custom and Israel's religion or whether the royal treaty between emperors actually affected the Hebrew people, who were liberated from slavery just before and were wandering in the wilderness. It is even unknown whether it was indeed applied to the relation between a deity such as Yahweh and his people. Nonetheless, it is said that this ancient custom makes it clear why the testimony to the covenant made between Yahweh and Israel was enshrined in the ark. The command of Yahweh in v. 12 is supposed to entail implications for the symbolic meaning of the ark: it stands for the footstool of God's throne (1 Chr. 28:2), which is an important prerogative of royalty, a token of dignity and power in the Near East: "L'instrument de ce traité est déposé dans l'arche et, puisque celle-ci est le piédestal et, plus tard, le marchepied de Yahvé, ce traité est ainsi mis sous les pieds de Dieu" (Vaux, 1967:256). However, it is still debatable that unequivocal elucidation of the meaning of God's revelation rests on comparison with the religious and political custom of an ancient society. Such a product is derived from the traditio-historical postulation according to which the ark is facilely affiliated with the enthronement conception which views Yahweh as king of Israel. It goes without saying that Yahweh is indeed king of Israel and the universe, having royal imagery surrounding the sanctuary. However, the concept of footstool is rather of broad application in the Old Testament: רַגְלֵי הַיְהוָה in Ps. 99:5 is Zion (Kraus, 1978:853); Isa. 66:1 denotes that earth is a footstool. In these cases the expression of footstool obviously appears to have nothing to do with the idea of *Königsprotokoll*. Thus, suffice it to say that with this command Yahweh unfolds that he is the redeeming saviour whom the people should obey permanently in accordance with the covenant; that is to say, Yahweh wants to have fellowship with his people on the ground of the commandment, and that the ark symbolically signifies his presence (cf. Ps. 132:5ff.).

3.1.1.4.3. The atonement place (Ex. 25:17; 37:6)

Ex. 25:17/37:6 refer to the divine instruction and fabrication of *an atonement place*. תָּפַחַת is a derivation of the verb כָּפַר , which has *kaparū* as an Akkadian cognate. While the qal form of the Hebrew verb means 'cover,' 'paint,' 'smear,' its pi`el form means 'atone,' 'appease' (HALAT 470; cf. Gen. 6:14). Similarly the simple verb of Akkadian *kaparū* has the meaning of 'wipe off,' 'smear on' (CAD K 178f.), and the D stem (intensive form like pi`el in Hebrew) *kuppuru* signifies 'wipe off,' 'clean,' 'rub,' 'ritually purify,' 'pull out by the roots' (CAD K 179f.; AHW 442f.); the Akkadian noun *kupartu* means 'purification' (CAD 549). It is observed here that the Akkadian cognate corresponds closely to the Hebrew כָּפַר . In both stems Akk. D stem and the Hebrew pi`el form attract attention the meaning of תָּפַחַת , since the contemporary debate about the derivation and foundational meaning of the root כָּפַר revolves around the pi. stem of the verb כָּפַר ; linguistically, the same root in a different stem is a different word (Averbeck, 1997:691ff.). Thus, כָּפַר is grammatically far from the meaning of 'cover' (cf. Lev. 17:11); the basis of translation, 'atonement cover' of NIV, 'verzoendeksel' of NV is feeble. The concept of 'cover' for כָּפַר was formed under the influence of the Arabic *كفر*, *kafara* 'cover,' 'conceal' or 'hide' since the lexica associated the two terms (Lang, 1984:304; AEL 7, 2620).

LXX renders $\text{ἐπίθεμα ἱλαστήριον}$ for תָּפַחַת ; the Greek translator inserts the two Greek words ἐπίθεμα and ἱλαστήριον where only תָּפַחַת occurs in this verse (cf. v. 18; Lev. 16:2, 13-15). In the combination, ἐπίθεμα has the leading position syntactically, which is an independent noun 'lid,' 'cover,' whereas ἱλαστήριον functions as an attributive adjective 'propitiatory,' signifying the cultic relevance of that part of the ark (Koch, 1995:67). Wevers (1990:398) exposes the reason for this translation: "Since this is its first occurrence, Exodus defines it as an ἐπίθεμα 'lid, cover'." Koch (1995:68) points out some problems which the choice of ἱλαστήριον entails: "The adjective is used in common Greek in connection with gifts or a monument propitiating a deity or a hero."; "With ἱλαστήριον , an expression was adopted that encompasses a propitiatory effect for this part of the ark of the covenant. The idea could scarcely have arisen from a strict reading of the Hebrew text because there the intention of *kipper* is not to propitiate the deity but rather to cleanse the holy place and the members of the

community with the help of God's gracious support." It is reasonable to decline ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα since the rendering of כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם is irrelevant, for the term ἱλαστήριον points to the only place of propitiating the deity: "Nirgends meint *kippær* ein Beschwichtigen Gottes" (Lang, 1984:309), and the pi`el stem of the Hebrew term כָּפַר cannot afford to be translated as ἐπίθεμα. Moreover כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם is not actually connected with the ark as a lid, and it is stuck for a word to call כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם הָאָרוֹן 'the atonement cover of the ark' (cf. Janowski, 1982:275). 'Atonement place' (Sühneort, verzoeningsplaats) or 'mercy seat' (KJV, RSV) might be a better rendering of כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם: for reference, Janowski (1982:273, 346f.) too translates כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם as "Sühnmal," "Sühneort," recognizing it as "an die Herleitung von כָּפַר pi. »sühnen, Sühne schaffen«."

Most Jewish exegetes (Rash, 1930:134; Rashbam, 1997:311; Cassuto, 1967:323; Sama, 1991:161; Jacob, 1992:775) tend to regard כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם as 'cover' or 'function of cover' that is to be placed above the ark which was open at the top. This appears to reflect their traditional position, namely אָרוֹן הַקֹּדֶשׁ, 'holy ark' transferred to the receptacle for the scrolls of the Torah in the synagogue. Houtman (1996:371) succinctly responds to such a notion: "Benadrukt moet worden dat de כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם niet de functie van deksel vervult en geen onderdeel van de schrijn is. אָרוֹן duidt op zichzelf een compleet voorwerp aan, een kist met deksel. כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם is een zelfstandig object" (cf. Maass, 1971:844; Janowski, 1982:275; Tarragon, 1981:8). In fact, there is a difference between the materials used for the two objects: the ark is fabricated of acacia wood with overlaying pure gold, while כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם is metallic, made of pure gold without wooden quality. Although the כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם is placed on the ark, various texts provide an explanation on its independent character in the description of its position in view of the ark: הַכַּפֹּת־רָחֵם אֲשֶׁר (Lev. 16:2) and הַפְּרָכֶת אֲשֶׁר עַל־אָרוֹן הָעֵדוּת (30:6; Lev. 16:13).

The כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם is an independent object with its own function, though it has a close connection with the ark like two components of one thing. Cassuto's (1967:325) statement that it connotes the throne of God is without sufficient foundation. In a broad sense the כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם is *the place of revelation* (Houtman, 1996:371) over which Yahweh manifests himself (Lev. 16:2, אֲרָאָה וַיִּשְׁמַע (עַל־הַכַּפֹּת־רָחֵם) and addresses (וַדַּבַּרְתִּי אֵלָיךָ מֵעַל הַכַּפֹּת־רָחֵם; Num. 7:89, וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּדְבַּר אֵלָיו מֵעַל הַכַּפֹּת־רָחֵם). Yahweh reveals himself over the כַּפֹּת־רָחֵם, namely the presence and appearance of Yahweh comes to be associated with a concrete object. Similarly

Janowski (1982:347) elaborately interprets כַּפֹּרֶת as "der in die Form einer »reinen Ebene« gefaßt Ort der Gegenwart Gottes in Israel": this annotation is likely to reflect the Day of Atonement of Lev. 16. At the atonement Day, in particular, Aaron was to sprinkle the blood of the bull with his finger on the front of the כַּפֹּרֶת seven times and next he was to slaughter the goat for the sin offering for the people and sprinkle its blood like bull's blood in the כַּפֹּרֶת and in front of it (Lev. 16:14f.). The blood on the כַּפֹּרֶת indicated that Israel's sin, which failed to meet the requisite of Yahweh's commandment, is put under the כַּפֹּרֶת and is atoned for by a substitutionary death (Rooker, 2000:21). This ritual exhibits that כַּפֹּרֶת has to do with the gracious atonement for the people.

Moreover, Moses, who has experienced Yahweh's glorious theophany on the Sinai mountain, is able to have the same experience without climbing the mountain to meet him. Here כַּפֹּרֶת is linked with God's glory, which implies that כַּפֹּרֶת is related to holiness because holiness is an attribute of God closely connected with his glory (cf. Ps. 99). The כַּפֹּרֶת is a holy object over which Yahweh manifests himself (contra Tarragon, 1981:12, "La sainteté de ce socle à chérubins vient alors du rite: ce n'est par l'objet qui est saint, mais le rite"). The concept of holiness about כַּפֹּרֶת can probably be strengthened by its location; the placing of the כַּפֹּרֶת over the ark appears to emphasize and warrant its authority and holiness. Nobody need touch it by placing it over the ark, even in transporting it. The כַּפֹּרֶת as the place of revelation and the atonement in the official rite occupies a central location in the sanctuary; it is for maintenance and the restoration of the ideal relationship between Yahweh and Israel (cf. Houtman, 1996:372).

3.1.1.4.4. The cherubim (Ex. 25:18-20; 37:7-9)

You are to make two cherubim. The translation for the Hebrew כְּרֻבִים is generally substituted by its transliteration. The root *krb* is not otherwise attested in biblical Hebrew, but it has some cognates in the Semitic language. The Hebrew root is possibly furnished by Akk. *karābu*, 'bless' rather than other roots such as Aramaic, 'plow' or Arabic, كَرِب 'nearness' or 'bring near' (cf. Freedman & O'Connor, 1984:326; *AEL* 7, 2603). The Akk. *karābu* has two

derivations worth noting: *kāribu* and *kurību*. The form *kāribu* as an active participle describes any person or image in a gesture of blessing and adoration (*CAD K*, 216), while the diminutive *kurību* represents a protective genius with specific non-human features which is applied to cultic images (*CAD K*, 559). Yet, the above words seem insufficient to unravel the significance of the biblical *cherubim*.

As to the origin or background of the *cherubim* on the ark, Mettinger (1997:203) maintains Phoenician provenance: "the background of the cherubim throne in Jerusalem is to be sought in the West Semitic ambit, more exactly in Phoenicia, and not in an originally Hurrian-Mitannian tradition." However, to what extent such a Canaanite religion affected the revelational religion of Israel is unexplicable

The Old Testament does not depict the definite form of the *cherubim* except for two outstretched wings. This may imply that it was well-known in ancient civilization and required no elucidation for the Israelites. The general figure of the cherubim is abundantly attested to in the Ancient East. It is usually connected with an imaginary creature that mediated between deity and man: it is described as a hybrid creature having a human face and the body of an ox with wings or in other forms combining elements of the body of a man or an ox or a lion or an eagle. Such images express the addition of divine nature and power to the creatures. "In Ägypten spielen teilweise die Götter Isis und Nephthys diese untergeordnete Rolle; in Schlangengestalt bewachen sie die Pforte der Unterwelt, als geflügelte anthropomorphe Wesen beschützen sie die Mumie im Sarg" (Lurker, 1973:103). In Mesopotamia, hybrids with the body of a lion have a lion's head with wings, with a dragon's head and wings, a human head with or without wings, or the head of a goat and wings. (Collon, 1987:32-74). In Anatolia and Syria, there are similar images, like a winged lion with eagle, falcon or dragon parts (Metzger, 1985:320-322). The form of the Egyptian sphinx was prevalent. It had the body of a lion with a human head and was a widespread feature of the art of Mitanni, Syria and Canaan (Keel & Uehlinger, 1992:190f.). The postures of the images were mostly of fighting statues, standing guardians with decorated long spears or crouching figures. Such representations are highly reminiscent of the description of the cherubim in Ez. 1:6-11; 10:14-22. However, a comparison of the non-Israelite creatures with the cherubim over the ark and with Ez. 41:18, 19 shows considerable variation in the artistic theme. In particular, the figure of the cherubim over the ark

appears identical to nothing else. There still remains a difficulty to adequately apply such syncretistic parallels to the cherubim, which played a prominent part in Israel's most sacred rites. So, the best way to attempt reconstructing a picture is to return to the text.

Out of hammered gold at the two ends of the atonement place. The cherubim were not of one piece with the כַּפֹּרֶת but separated from it. The text expressly states that the כַּפֹּרֶת was pure gold while the cherubim were of ordinary gold, even though the cherubim and כַּפֹּרֶת were linked at both edges (Jacob, 1992:776). In terms of the various postures of the images, on the כַּפֹּרֶת there perhaps was not sufficient room for two images of quadrupeds, and it appears that the cherubim on it were erect figures. Similar to the way a bird flies by flapping its wings in the air, the cherubim with wings are symbolically connected with something heavenly and transcendental. However, the Old Testament does not describe to what extent the cherubim were thought to be possessed of divine qualities.

They are to be cherubim with their wings spread upward. This command mentions the form of the outstretched wings of the cherubim; indeed the wings of all cherubim are spread wide (cf. King. 6:27; Ez. 1:8, 9, 11, 23). It is widely contended that here one function of the cherubim is found: their outstretched wings would be, so to speak, a throne of God, an empty throne on which God, invisible to the human eye, would sit. It is the empty seat that clearly indicates that God has no likeness whatsoever, for in the very place of his enthronement no representation was to be seen (Cassuto, 1967:322). Furthermore, Haran (1959:36) maintains that the wings, spread horizontally, form the throne, in opposition to the translation 'upward' for לְמַעַל. It is also argued that cherubim thrones are well attested to in Egypt and Syria-Palestine. The Pharaohs' thrones discovered in the tombs (the 18th dynasty, Thutmose IV, Amenophis III) had the shape of the winged sphinx. An engraved ivory plaque (1350-1150 B.C.), excavated in the LB level of Megiddo, shows a king on a throne seat supported by winged sphinxes of Phoenician style. On one of the long sides over the sarcophagus of Ahiram, king of Byblos (10th century B.C.), a procession with offerings and prayers moves towards the deceased king who is sitting on a throne supported by the winged sphinx whose feet were on a stool. He was a deified king (Vaux, 1967:243-247; Haran, 1958:14-25; Gressmann, 1920:190f. Nr. 665, 666; cf. Metzger, 1994:79f.). Many scholars contend that these archaeological finds illustrate that the winged cherubim over which Yahweh is sitting had the

function of the throne as a royal character; Yahweh reigns over Israel as the king who is sitting on the cherubim.

The repeated references to God enthroned above the cherubim seem to have been uttered in order to leave little doubt that the Israelites shared a similar concept (Ps. 18:10; 80:1; 99:1; Is. 37:16). Moreover, their meaning is extended by the argument that with the outstretched wings they do not simply represent a fixed throne, but a moveable one reflecting God's omnipresent attribute: the cherub is described as the vehicle of Yahweh, which is able to carry him through space (Ps. 18:11; 2 Sam. 22:11; cf. Ez. 9:3; 10:4). Sarna (1991:161) added theological significance to them: "As bearers of the celestial throne, they evoke belief in divine, transcendent sovereignty. Their permanent place above the ark is God's immanence -- his enduring presence in the covenanted community of Israel." However, such a theological achievement concerning enthronement requires more meticulous investigation of the related texts of the Old Testament. In fact, the translation of **שֵׁבֶת הַכְּרֻבִּים** is too frequently juxtaposed to the concept of enthronement. This matter will be thoroughly examined in the exegesis on the texts of the book of Samuel (cf. 3.2.2.4.1) because it is quite a controversial point. Above all here it is necessary to remember that metaphysical concepts, such as divine omnipotence and omniscience, used to be expressed by a physical form like the cherubim for ancient people (cf. Borowski, 1995:36-41).

Therefore, provisionally, the spread wings of the cherubim seems to be associated with expression of the idea concerning the power and the majesty of Yahweh, instead of a throne-concept derived from pagan circumstances outside Israel. It will be instructive to remember that Eißfeldt (1940/41:190f.) tried to confine utilization of the materials from the surroundings of Israel: "Diese Beschränkung des Blicks auf die ATliche Überlieferung selbst ist um so mehr geboten und um so eher berechtigt, ... daß allzu frühzeitiges Absehen von ihr, verbunden mit allzu bereitwilligem Eingehen auf Erwägungen allgemeiner Art und allzu großer Freudigkeit zu Analogieschlüssen aus ähnlich anmutenden Erscheinungen in Israels Nachbarschaft zu einer Skepsis gegen jene Überlieferung geführt haben, die sie in Wahrheit kaum verdienen dürfte."

Overshadowing the atonement place with them, and each is to be turned towards the other, the faces of the cherubim are to be toward the atonement place. Haran (1959:36ff.), arguing that the cherubim function only as a throne, gives another addition to it in this verse. **שֵׁבֶת**, the participle form of **שָׁבַת**, means literally 'overshadowing,' 'screening,' but is translated

as 'guardian.' In Gen. 3:24 (see Alexandre, 1986:403-441, for classical exegesis), the task of the cherubim is to 'guard' or 'keep' (לְשַׁמֵּר) the Garden of Eden, and it is also applied to God's appointment for a cherub to drive the king of Tyre from power for abuse of trade and violence (Ez. 28:14, 16), although the cherubim in this text is not related to the ark. Thus, it appears that the cherubim have a function to protect and guard the atonement place and the ark beneath it; their wings form a kind of canopy. "Als mengwezens, in het bezit van de excellente eigenschappen van verscheidene imponerende wezens, zoals kracht, snelheid en schranderheid, zijn de cherubs bij uitstek geschikt om als bewaker en beschermer op te treden" (Houtmann, 1996:374). Josephus' (*Ant* 7.103f.) description about the wings of the cherubim covering the ark 'as under a tent or dome' renders the verb for the cherubim's overshadowing of the ark as 'cover.' This appears to imply a protective function, even if his understanding is lacking. The expression "*each is to be turned towards the other, the faces of the cherubim are to be toward the atonement place*" is ambiguous. The textual difficulty is that the verse implies that the cherubim faced each other and simultaneously that they faced the covering of the ark. In many cases פָּנָיו refers to the side toward the viewer (the candelabrum, Num. 8:2, 3; the altar, Lev. 6:7; the curtain of the holy of the holies, 4:6, 17; the headcovering of Aaron, Ex. 28:37; the tent, 26:9). Apart from the applications, it is said that the cherubim actually possessed a face. Rashbam (1997:314) explains that 'facing the covering' means 'facing the middle of the covering.' So, since the cherubim were placed on the atonement place at the edges, 'facing each other' and 'facing the middle of the atonement place' is a consistent interpretation based on the repeated preposition לְ in the phrase. Jacob (1992:777) provides a clarification of Rashbam's interpretation: "As their gaze was directed toward each other, they looked over the *kapporet*." Notwithstanding, this is still not clear to our understanding. The phrase וְשֵׁנֵי פְּנֵיהֶם אֶל־אִחֵיו appears primarily to indicate the confronted status rather than the concrete face of the cherub, even if it had an actual face. "*Each is to be turned towards the other*" means that the cherubim do not look at each other, but confront each other in posture. Their faces should be in the direction of the atonement place to watchfully carry out the role of guards. The rabbinic tradition regarded the face of the cherub as the face of a little child (cf. Michaeli, 1974:233), but it is not necessary to make such an unbridled conjecture about it further.

From the above elucidation, it is known that cherubim are regarded as an exposition relating to the majesty of Yahweh. At the same time, they recall the garden of Eden, the place where Man dwelt when he was free from sin. Therefore, they link the atonement place to the idea of the atonement of sin.

3.1.1.4.5. The location of the atonement place and the Testimony and Yahweh's promise (Ex. 25:21, 22)

You are to put the atonement place on top of the ark and put in the ark the Testimony, which I will give you (v. 21). The order of this verse looks illogical; it is impossible to put the Testimony into the ark after the atonement is placed on its top. But, in fact, there is no problem in making sense of this command because language is not always based on logic, but on the habit of a certain group. The author seems to want to make a successive allusion to the atonement place from v. 20. Houtman's (1996:378) opinion that the most important instruction should precede is unacceptable, for one is not superior to the other. This verse provides for the union of the ark and the atonement place, and the phrase "put in the ark the Testimony, which I will give you" leads to a repetition of the content in v. 16. The atonement place is an independent object, but has a tight connection with the ark, like two components of one thing. It cannot exist and be used apart from the ark. The ark without the atonement place is unimaginable and vice versa. The command to put the atonement place -- linked with the cherubim -- on top of the ark suggests that they are united in the simple ark. Thus, the instruction commences with the ark and ends with it. As for their connection, de Vaux (1967:234) draws a remarkable picture with the two: "Ce sont l'arche-marchepied et les chérubins-siège qui, *ensemble*, constituent le trône de Yahvé." Yet his mosaic appears to exceed the biblical concept, for he (1967:258ff.; 1961:67f.) took the meaning of the ark from extrabiblical parallels that show that the instrument of the treaty was placed beneath the feet of god, holding that the concept of the throne pertaining to the ark is a later theological product: "Il n'y avait pas de chérubins dans le culte du désert, donc pas de «trône» de Yahvé." So it is guesswork to mention the idea of the throne in this regard but it is sufficient to state that the whole unit, including the ark, represents God's

presence among the covenantal people and his reign over them. The repeated command about the Testimony emphasizes the fact that the atonement place and the wings of the cherubim protect the tablets of the law and recall the function as a place of revelation.

There I will meet you by appointment and speak to you, from above the atonement place, from between the two cherubim over the ark of the Testimony, everything I will command you for the Israelites (v. 22). The atonement place on the ark is represented as the place of revelation; there Yahweh reveals himself and speaks. As the Redeemer, Yahweh issues his covenantal commandment to Israel through Moses, who is to be the intermediary of God's will for His people. In this extraordinary promise the proper understanding of Moses' special status before God and for Israel also appears to be underscored; he is an authoritative prophet (Num. 12:6-8). Thus, from its beginning, Israelite religion is not focused on object worship but on the Word of God; the primacy of the divine word is explicit in the worship. In this verse the first designation with qualification is given to the ark: אֲרֹן הָעֵדוּת, for the tablets of the law are kept therein (see 3.1.1.4.2). The ark of the testimony as a permanent witness to the commitment will make Israel obey it. The introduction of the LXX, "κιβωτὸν μαρτυρίου" in verse 10 appears to underline the unique role of the ark.

3.1.1.5. Summary

Contrary to presumptions about its diverse provenances, the ark is a holy object of which the design was given by Yahweh himself on Sinai. It is clear that the ark was designed to be a symbol of the presence of God in the midst of his people when the people were to leave the mountain where God had revealed himself to them (Ex. 30:6).

The fact that the Testimony identified with the tablets of the law is put into the ark reminds the people of Israel that they were saved by the redeeming action of Yahweh and are in a covenantal relationship with him.

Although the atonement place is linked with the cherubim and is placed on top of the ark, it is an independent object with its own function; it is the locus of revelation and atonement. Its

permanent place is the top of the ark; it never exists apart from the ark. The meaning of the word 'atonement' in the name 'atonement place' is not a consideration in this text.

The cherubim, with their outstretched wings, have the function of expressing the majesty of Israel's God and as acting as guardians of the atonement place and the ark.

Hence the ark has a comprehensive significance with the cherubim and the atonement place; it is a symbolic object by which the mediators, such as Moses, meet their God and receive his commandments. The ark is a kind of cultic article for the oracle, but, as such, is not an object of worship as in the religious practices surrounding Israel. Glory associated with God's presence on Mount Sinai is now connected with a new object, the ark in the tabernacle in the camp. In short, the glorious epiphany of Yahweh occurs through the ark. Israel could expect God's intimate closeness and his guardianship. The intimate presence of God with his people, which played a cardinal role in Israel's idea of the covenantal relationship, was strengthened in the new covenant by its development of concepts concerning the continuing immanence of the risen Christ with the Church. The work of the Holy Spirit in the world and within Christians is another facet of the intimate presence of God (cf. Gowan, 1994:213).

The ark was made to serve as a comfortable assurance that God would indeed accompany the Israelites on their journey. As a result, the entire passage is intended to open a new aspect of redemptive history with the command to construct the ark, which elucidates that Yahweh is immanent among them and leads them into a new future with the further command and prophecy. The entire passage is intended to transform the ark -- with its rings and poles, atonement place, Testimony, and cherubim -- into the locus of communication between God and the people, with Moses as mediator.

3.1.2. The ark in Numbers (Num. 10:33-36)

3.1.2.1. Text and form

V. 33. Tg provides, instead of its translation, an explanation of יהר יהוה: מטורא דאיתגלי: "from the mountain upon which the glory of the Lord was revealed." It shows the periphrastic tendency of Tg: Tg^{N1} and Tg^{Ps-Jon} inserted בית מקדשה 'of holy house' and שכנתא 'the presence' respectively. The second phrase, דרך שלשת ימים, looks like dittography. Milgrom (1990:80) renders it as "on *that* three days' journey," but there is no equivalent for "that." Syr substitutes 'one day journey.'

V. 34. In LXX this whole verse is located after the contents of v. 36, thereby connecting the song of the ark with the statement about the ark. This arrangement appears as the result of reflecting the order of occurrence. Moreover LXX has not only supplied the verb ἐγένετο to connect the subject (ענן יהוה) and predicate (עליהם) of the nominal sentence, but also added the participle σκιάζουσα (overshadowing) to inform what the purpose of the divine cloud was (cf. Wevers, 1998:159). Actually the Greek words have no counterpart in MT, and *nomen rectum*, יהוה, is omitted in LXX. For the arrangement of the text MT is backed by μ and Tg. Tg interpolated the term יקרא "of glory" between ענן and יהוה, and supplied מטל 'travelling' to the nominal sentence. Tg^{N1} and Tg^{Ps-Jon} invented new predicates of the nominal sentence by supplying מגן 'a shield' and מטלל עיליהון 'a shelter around them' next to דיי, respectively.

V. 35. For some scholars (Levine, 1993:318; Noordtjiz, 1983:95; cf. Joüon, § 118 b, n) יהי is regarded as durative, frequentative as the force of the narrative opening. But the tense of the imperfect consecutive is mostly punctual, which has just a preparatory function of narrative (Lettinga § 72 d 1). In particular, ב of בנסע is employed as temporal at this point. קומה does not simply serve "zur Vermeidung eines Hiatus gewöhnlich" (GK § 72 p 3), but here as an emphatic usage (Joüon § 33), for this term might be used as an exclamation. The Hebrew anthropomorphic expression מפניך 'from your face' is rendered as מן קדמך 'from before you' in Tg and is omitted in LXX. The LXX's omission of מפניך, which affirms the basis on the fight of Yahweh's enemies, appears to be associated with the rhyme of the first two stiches of the ark song. Instead, LXX added πάντες to משנאך so as to accentuate the meaning of the phrase.

The couplet (vv. 35, 36) is set off by inverted *nuns* (*nun menuzzeret*). In fact, there is no satisfactory answer to it. The general concept on the inverted *nun* is that the concerned verses stand in an improper place (GK § 5 n). According to the rabbinic tradition (Sif. Num. 84) this is not their proper place nor do the enclosed two verses form a separate book. The latter is supported by the Mishnah (*Midrash Yadayim* 3:5): "A biblical scroll that contains eighty five letters, as in the section that begins: 'when the Ark was to set out,' defiles the hands" and is confirmed by similar signs (something like διπλή, ἀντισίγμα) in Greek papyri and grammatical literature (Lieberman, 1950:38-43). It is unknown if this couplet was taken from 'an apocryphal book of Eldad and Medad' (cf. 11:26) in a medieval tradition from Cairo (cf. Leiman, 1974:353). Levine (1976:123) states that the status of Num. 10:35, 36 is given the syntax of medieval Hebrew, but the verses' orthography shows antiquity: "On notera Asia dans ces vv., un abondant usage de la «*scriptio defectiva*», ce qui semble un nouvel indice d'antiquité du texte" (Vaulx, 1972:146). While Milgrom's (1990:81) statement that this couplet may be a fragment of a larger saga on the life of Moses is unfounded, Massoretic scholars appear to have understood this part as an independent unit -- at least if they inserted the inverted *nuns*.

V. 36. וּבְנַחֵהּ is replaced by וּבְמַנּוּחָהּ in \mathfrak{M} . ב and נ are confusing in the old Hebrew (Seebass, 1993:5). The suffix (cf. GK § 7 c, 91 e) points out הַאֲרֶץ שׁוֹבָה serves as an emphatic usage of שׁוֹב (Joüon § 33); it does not need to be changed into שׁוֹבָה to correspond to קוֹמָה. Tg inserted the clause שְׂרֵי בִיקְרָךְ בְּגוֹ, 'reside in your glory among' to clarify the ambiguous phrase, שׁוֹבָה יְהוָה רַבְבוֹת אֱלֹפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, whereas Tg^{N1} elaborates further. "Return, O Lord!" is extended by the addition "from your powerful anger and return to us in your good mercies." The various suggestions *BHS* makes for רַבְבוֹת reflect its unusual form in MT. שׁוֹב appears to be constructed with an accusative here, as LXX reads: ἐπίστρεψε ... χιλιάδας. The verse can be used in a special case such as Job 42:10 (GK § 118 f; König § 210 f), but such combination is clumsy here; it should then have been הַשׁוֹבָה. Because of the absence of the preposition in front of רַבְבוֹת, רַבְבוֹת יְהוָה can at first glance be understood as a genitive connection -- apposition (cf. Lettinga, § 71 a, 1). אֱלֹפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is unrelated to 'thousands' as an exact numeral unit but designates 'clans,' or 'group' as a rough numeral one in the premonarchic period (cf. Mendenhall, 1958:60, 66).

33 *And they set out from the mount of Yahweh and went three days' journey. The ark of the covenant of Yahweh went before them (three days' journey) to scout a resting place for them.*

34 *The cloud of Yahweh was over them by day when they set out from the camp.*

35 *When the ark set out, Moses said, "Rise up, O Yahweh! May your enemies be scattered and your haters flee from your face."*

36 *When it came to rest, he said, "Return, O Yahweh of Israel's myriads of militias."*

3.1.2.2. The context

With regard to the circumstances of the text, Num. 10:11-13, the introductory historical reference, outlines the time frame, the parameters of the geographical movement, and the initial response of the people journeying in obedience to Yahweh's command. The departure from the Sinai wilderness takes place on the twentieth day of the second month of the second year after the departure from Egypt, or about a month after the celebration of the Passover (9:1-4) and less than two months after the initial setting up of the tabernacle (Ex. 40:17). The geographical boundaries of this initial movement are the Sinai and Paran wilderness. In accordance with the law, the order of tribal organization and the tasks of Levites are arranged for the journey to the promised land (10:14-28).

In the camp of Paran's wilderness, Moses appealed to Hobab's special expertise in the wilderness to provide valuable assistance to the Israelites in the harsh conditions they would face during the coming journey (10:29, Hobab is probably Moses' brother-in-law, cf. Cole, 2000:175f.). As a leader of the people, Moses shared his leadership with Hobab. This is human leadership under the ultimate direction of Yahweh through the cloud and the positioning of the ark of the covenant. The context shows human leadership, while the text illustrates divine guidance.

3.1.2.3. Explanation

33a. *And they set out from the mount of Yahweh and went three days' journey.* Eventually, the camp of the twelve tribes of Israel, with God's presence in its midst, begins its climactic march from the wilderness of Sinai toward the promised land. The first stage of the march is a three-day journey to Taberah (11:3) in the wilderness of Paran (10:12). *הַר יְהוָה* generally designates Mount Zion after the temple was built (Ps. 24:3; Is. 2:3; 30:29; Mich. 4:2), but here Tg renders this expression as a designation for Mt. Sinai in which Yahweh revealed himself. It is also supported by Gen. 22:14, if the vocalization of MT is accepted (*בְּהַר יְהוָה יִרְאָה*): the mount where Yahweh appeared as Tg rendered. A day's journey does not usually imply specific length measurements (Powell, 1992:908). Although "three days' journey" sounds like quite a long distance (cf. Jon. 3:3), the march of Israel for three days would not be a long distance, in consideration of the scale of all the people from aged men to young children and all their equipment. Their first station is presumed to be Taberah (11:3). It is striking that this initial march from Sinai is equivalent to the entire distance from Egypt to Sinai which is also a three-day march (Ex. 3:18). Incidentally, it is interesting to note that Midrash (*Likkutim* 2.17) compares the forced march from Sinai with a schoolboy's running away after school.

33b. *The ark of the covenant of Yahweh went before them (three days' journey) to scout a resting place for them.* *אָרוֹן בְּרִית יְהוָה* is a new name for the ark. This description connotes the ark in which the 'tablets of the covenant' were deposited (Deut. 9:9, 11, 15). It is said that this association of the ark is typical of the Deuteronomists (cf. Fritz, 1970:15; Budd, 1984:115; Seow, 1992:387; Levine, 1993:316), but it is immediately challenged by the fact that the covenant passes for a key theological concept for the so-called P among critics (cf. Gen. 17). At any rate, the ark in this text signifies the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel: his protection and her obedience in the wilderness. The phrase "the ark went before them" seems difficult to understand on the basis of v. 21 and 2:17; it should be placed between the camp places of Reuben and Ephraim. While it is acceptable that the ark marched at the head of the Israelite camps and that the other holy objects which the Kehatites took care of were carried between the camp places of Reuben and Ephraim, it is unimaginable that there are two arks: one in front and one in their midst as some rabbis considered, since it is a non-biblical solution. From passages such as Num. 14:44, Jos. 7:6; 8:3 it appears that the ark was in the

midst of the camp when the camp was at rest, but it travelled in front during the march. The literal rendering 'a distance of three days' (Gispén, 1959:163) for the phrase "three days' journey" in the second part of v. 33 cannot be sustained, for the ark had to be visible in order to serve as a guide (Milgrom, 1990:80). Of course, a respectable distance would separate the ark from the people; in Joshua 3:4 this distance is given as 2,000 cubits (about 900 m). The sentence makes sense without the phrase, for the same phrase is syntactically connected with the second part of the sentence. The verb *הִלַּךְ*, 'to circumambulate,' 'scout,' 'survey' is frequently employed in Numbers 13, 14, especially to scout the land of Canaan. The Hebrew noun *בְּנוֹחָה* usually connotes a permanent, secure habitation (Deut. 12:9; Jer. 45:3; Ruth 1:9), but here a place to encamp. The context of the word relates to the seemingly military function of the ark on the march (cf. Levine, 1993:317). Indeed the phrase 'the ark scouted it,' which is written in an almost personal fashion, is a symbolic expression for the guidance of Yahweh, who is closely associated with it. This is contrary to Eichrodt's (1933:43) view, according to which the ark is identified with Yahweh himself, even if the same term is applied to Yahweh himself in the passage such as Deut. 1:30 (*יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם הִלִּיךְ לְפָנֵיכֶם*). The fact that the ark leads the Israelites to the resting place reminds Christians of the true rest which can be found in Christ.

34 *The cloud of Yahweh was over them by day when they set out from the camp.* "The cloud" is suspended over the camps of Israel for shade and protection (cf. Ps. 105:39) while the ark serves symbolically as a guide; both are signs that Yahweh works in their midst. Elsewhere the cloud is often linked with God's presence (cf. 12:4, 5; 14:14b).

35 *When the ark set out, Moses said, "Rise up, O Yahweh! May your enemies be scattered and your haters flee from your face."* 36 *When it came to rest, he said, "Return, O Yahweh of Israel's myriads of militias."* This couplet is generally called 'the song of the ark' which is enclosed by the inverted *nuns*. However it is hard to decide if it is used as a song, for the first word in each stanza is grammatically structured as an imperative. The idea that Moses could command Yahweh as to whether and when he was to set out is in direct contradiction to Israel's knowledge concerning man's position relative to God (Noordtzijs, 1983:95). It would be more proper to see this part as a prayer rather than a formula such as a

song or incantation (Ohmann, 1983:67). Moses' prayer in the first verse of the couplet is reflected almost verbatim in the prayer of Psalm 68: **יָקוּם אֱלֹהִים יַפְרֹצוּ אֹיְבָיו וְתוֹסֵף מִשְׂנְאָיו**. This poetical expression appears to have been considered as an independent part, as it was dealt with in the previous section, but roughly to be harmonized with the historical context of the march in the wilderness.

קוּמָה is of the emphatic imperative form: 'rise up' (cf. Joüon § 33). The verb **קוּם** is often used to express 'advancing' or 'rising' in order to attack (cf. Judg. 5:12) -- as a battle cry (cf. Deut. 19:11; Ps. 27:3), especially for the use of the ark in battle (cf. 1 Sam. 4:1-10; 2 Sam. 11:11). **אֹיְבָיו**, 'your enemies' and **מִשְׂנְאָיו**, 'your haters' connote that the enemies and haters of Yahweh are those of Israel as well, "Die Sache Israels ist also Sache Jahve's" (Keil, 1862:232). Moses wished Yahweh to arise to attack his enemies and haters, meaning that Israel wanted to enter the land of Canaan safely behind Yahweh. It is broadly stated that **קוּמָה** (rise up, advance) obviously matches the image of the ark as the chariot-throne of Yahweh (Dibelius, 1906:27, 102-110; Metzger, 1985:355; Schmitt, 1972:54ff.; Milgrom, 1990:374f.). With respect to the throne-theory, Reimpell (1916:331) appears to compromise Dibelius' theory of the evolutionary development of the religion: "Als Jahwe im Laufe der Zeiten geistiger verehrt wurde, und man gelernt hatte, in religiösen Dingen weniger konkret zu denken, wurde die Lade als Thron umgedeutet." Leaving of the ark is a sign which Yahweh stands up, **שׁוּבָה** (return) again suggests the image of the ark as the throne-chariot: **שָׁבָה**, in the manuscripts that *BHS* suggests, forms a correspondence to **קוּמָה** in v. 35, but **קוּמָה** signifies 'advance' (to defeat His enemies, who are identical with Israel's enemies). They tend to comprehend the two imperative verbs, **קוּמָה** and **שׁוּבָה** as the meaning of 'stand up' and 'sit down' like the action of standing and sitting on a chair. On a different level, Noth (1982:71f.) excludes this tendency: "Daraus ergibt sich die Vorstellung, daß die Lade sein (Tron=)Sitz oder allenfalls der Fußschemel eines gedachten Sitzes sei. ... Aber diese Konjektur wird durch keine alte Überlieferung gestützt und ist auch deswegen gewagt, weil der zweite Ladespruch offenbar nur noch lückenhaft erhalten ist." Opposing the so-called "throne hypothesis," Janowski (1993:259) conceives "die Lade nicht als Gottesthron, sondern als militärisches »Führungssymbol« im JHWH-Krieg." Notwithstanding, Kristensen (1947:180) contends that this verse undergirds the theory of *kisttroon* by analogizing Yahweh of Israel with Horus of Egypt. Still, such an analogy should be cautionary because its attempt is rooted in the failure to notice the unique

character of the revelational nature of Israel's religion (cf.3.1.1.4.3).

As a matter of fact, Moses' prayer contains a feature different from that which can generally be expected; a deity, presumably seated on a throne, is not invited to rise when that throne moves forward. At the resting of the ark Yahweh is not invited to be seated but rather to return, not to the ark, but to the Israelites, according to the content of the prayer. Apparently, the setting forward of the ark, in sacramental fashion, signifies the rising of Yahweh, although it is hardly identified with Yahweh. Corresponding with this sacramental connection between Yahweh and his ark is Moses' urgent plea that Yahweh arise. One might also say this is Moses' active *cooperation with, the sacramental realization of* the sign as embodied in the ark's motion (Woudstra, 1965:93). Thus, this text certainly has nothing to do with the connotation of the portable throne or the chariot-throne of Yahweh, contrary to the statements of the scholars mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Since it lacks the preposition, it is contestable whether **רַבְבוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** is linked with Israel (Gispén, 1959:164; Budd, 1984:112) or with Yahweh (Vaulx, 1972:146; Milgrom, 1990:81; Seebaas, 1993:4). The former provides the direction of Yahweh's return, while the latter offers a divine epithet. Primarily, the phrase **יְהוָה רַבְבוֹת**, based on the Massoretic vocalization, passes grammatically for a genitive connection with the plural form of the constructive state of **רַבְבָּה** (*HALAT* IV, 1096). If so, it seems natural to accept this expression as an epithet of Yahweh. The name, "Yahweh of Israel's myriads of militias" is called Israel's God, as the prophets Elijah and Elisha are called "Israel's chariots and horsemen" (2 King. 2:12; 13:14). The epithet of Yahweh is compounded with other constructs such as "God of Israel" (Is. 21:10; Zep. 2:9), "Mighty One of Israel" (Is. 1:24) and "the God of the ranks of Israel" (1 Sam. 17:45). The word "hosts" (< *ṭavā*) refers to celestial hosts or armies (Jos. 5:14, 15), including the sun, moon, and stars (e.g. Deut. 4:19). Indeed the old war narratives in the Old Testament describe how the heavenly bodies warred on the side of Israel (Jos. 10:12, 13; Judg. 5:20). Thus, this prayer expresses that Israel's myriads of militias on earth are the counterpart of Yahweh's hosts in heaven (cf. Milgrom, 1990:81). It is interesting to find a close Egyptian parallel in the prayer of Ramses II, who called on *Amun* when his troupe left him in the battle with Hittites in Kadesh and Orontes: "Als ich ihnen rief, fand ich, daß Amon nützlicher für mich ist als Millionen von Fußtruppen und Hunderttausende von Wagenkämpfern, von Brüdern und Söhnen zusammen vereint" (Erman & Ranke, 1923:467). The deity is called

a god comparable to an army at war.

Here it is held that the ark served as a palladium, a sacred object that was believed to have the power to preserve the city or state possessing it. The Israelites would at times use the ark as a war mascot or such a palladium in their mind, but the ark should not be considered as a palladium in the biblical way; from passages such as 1 Sam. 4-6, we know that the ark itself is not a guarantee for victory in war. This opposes the ideas of Snaith (1967:225) and Vaulx (1972:147). The main purpose of the ark was to stimulate Israelites faith in Yahweh, who is symbolically associated with the ark, and to obedience of God's demand in terms of the covenant. Hence, Moses spoke to Yahweh rather than the ark. After all, without God on its side, no victory is possible for Israel.

In v. 36 Moses asks Yahweh, the militant God, to return to his people and his habitual place in the camp when the battle is over. It is completely unknown if Moses expressed this phrase whenever the ark set out and came to rest, but it appears to exhibit that, to a degree, the march of the Israelites in the wilderness had a kind of liturgical character. Passages such as Jos. 6; and Ps. 24; 47; and 132 demonstrate the role of the ark in this procession.

3.1.2.4. Summary

This section of Numbers reports that in the first stage of the march from Mt. Sinai, Israel was led by the ark, conceived as God's presence, and was protected by the cloud of Yahweh. With a symbolical expression of God's guidance and protection, it is clear that the ark plays a principal role between Yahweh and his people. He fights outside and is gracious inside.

Verses 35 and 36 describe Yahweh as a warrior who scatters his enemies. Moses' speech, 'Rise up,' is not to deify the ark magically but to ask Yahweh's help in the march. The situation he prayed for is completely different from that of deity sitting on a portable throne in the ancient Near East because Yahweh would sit on the ark at its outset if it were a throne-chariot. That the ark personifies God shows the sacramental coupling between Yahweh and his ark. Israel wanted to enter the land of Canaan safely behind Yahweh. However, this text does not clarify whether the ark was used as a palladium.

Both of these short poetic pieces give the impression that the inauguration of the march was

a liturgical procession of God's holy and obedient people through the wilderness with their divine warrior in their midst (Olsen, 1996:58). In fact, the march itself toward the land of Canaan is based on faith in Yahweh. He will continue to lead and protect his people according to the terms of the covenant, as the designation of the ark in this text implies.

In an overview of the progressive nature of redemptive history, one can see that Yahweh's guidance and protection for the Israelites in the wilderness, manifested through the existence of the ark, provides the churches of the New Testament with a rich warranty of protection.

3.1.3. The ark of Deuteronomy (10:1-5, 8 and 31:26)

3.1.3.1. Canonical status and form

Driver (1902:118) considered that the first pericope which deals with the ark (Deut. 10:1-5) once stood in Ex. 34:1-5 but was eliminated by P, the compiler, as inconsistent with more detailed particulars contained in the narrative of P (Ex. 25-31; 34:29-40:38). Yet his hypothesis seems purely arbitrary (cf. 2.1). From another angle of literary analysis, these passages are usually understood to be part of the larger section (9:7-10:11) because the section generally employs the plural pronoun in contrast to the singular which predominates. Fretheim (1968:3) comes to the conclusion that the plural sections may have been worked into the older traditions (in the singular) at the time of its promulgation in Jerusalem under Josiah, by accepting Steuernagel's attempt to isolate an older core of the book which incorporated the singular pronoun from a later stratum which used the plural. However, the reason for the change in this section may be nothing other than that the author here turns from direct exhortation to historical narrative.

Critical theory generally says that the ark in Deuteronomy is completely void of any sacred character and is described as a simple receptacle in which the tablets of Ten Commandments were kept. According to this theory, this was in line with typical Deuteronomistic expression (Brouwer, nd: 82; Eißfeldt, 1960:283; Rad, 1958:112; Fretheim, 1968:4; 1998:52; Labuschagne, 1987:220; Clements, 1989:54; Seow, 1992:391; cf. Tigay, 1996:105). For an exposition of the primitive feature of the ark, von Rad (1983:56) maintains, that "Die Lade ist in unserem Text recht nüchtern als ein Behälter zur Aufbewahrung der Tafeln verstanden (1 Kön. 8:9). Diese Auffassung unterscheidet sich erheblich von der älteren, die in ihr den Thronszitz Jahwes sah (4. Mose 10:35f.; 1. Sam. 4:4; Jer. 3:16f. u.ö)." His more explicit description of the ark in Deuteronomy is that "es handelt sich bei der dt. Auffassung als eines Aufbewahrungsbehälters für die Gesetzestafeln offenbar um ein "Entmythologisierung" und Rationalisierung der alten Anschauung!" (Rad, 1947:27). Thus, having associated the ark with the concept of the throne, he could facily conceive of a rationalized or demythologized one in the 'Deuteronomic expression.' However the account of the ark in this text is of a summary nature; the making of the ark is mentioned only in passing because it is unnecessary to restate all the details of the

original injunction (Woudstra, 1965:96). Furthermore Deuteronomy still uses language attaching sanctity to the ark in the same text: the Levites should serve *in the presence of Yahweh* (Deut. 10:8). The connotation of the phrase, *in the presence of Yahweh* in Deuteronomy itself and so called 'Deuteronomistic' books is tightly linked with the ark (Deut. 17:2; 18:7; 26:10; Jos. 4:13; 6:8; 7:23; Judg. 20:23, 26; 1 Sam. 6:6 etc.). Should statements like von Rad's keep coherency, the ark would be recognized as a holy object even in Deuteronomy.

Therefore the 'Deuteronomic' text related to the ark still describes its sacred character and does not suggest that it is a simple chest. In Deuteronomy, the ark bears not only a significant role as the repository of the law tables but is circumspectly conveyed by the Levites in accordance with the holy writ (Deut. 10:8). Indeed it is not persuasive that scholars belonging to the traditio-historical circle insist that this text concerning the ark exposes a different tradition (cf. 2.2).

To construct a form using the ark passages (Deut. 10:1-5), Labuschange (1987:217) considers the term 'tablets,' which is used seven times, as the central icon of the text. Yet it is enigmatic for him to attempt inferring significance by the number of times this term is used: "In de numerieke structuur van de tekst wordt voor het aantal woorden in vss. 1-2 het *kābōd*-getal 32 gebruikt en in vss. 3-4, het dubbele godsnaamgetal 34. In de eindformule $81=55+26$ wordt het andere godsnaamgetal gerealiseerd." It is interesting to note that Christensen (1991:195) composed a careful structure with this text by referring to how the term 'tablets' is mentioned seven times. His structure is outlined as follows:

- A two stone tablets like the first ones (10:1)
- B I will write on the tablets the words (10:2)
- C on the first tablets which you broke (10:2)
- D two stone tablets like the first ones (10:3)
- C' on the tablets as at the first writing (10:4)
- B' He wrote ... the ten words (10:4)
- A' I put the tablets into the ark which I had made (10:5)

At the first glance this pericope is elaborately analyzed in the form of chiasmus centering around 'tablets.' However it is still wondered if this is one of the conventions with which the author of the book is consciously working. A close reading of the text demonstrates that the whole narrative accords with the very natural process of the event in terms of the instruction and the performance between Yahweh and Moses: The summary pattern of this text seems

simply to be expressed in ordinary sentences without grammatically particular emphatic usage or inversion of the words to accentuate some part. It is obvious that we cannot state that the frequency of a certain word in a passage always determines its theme. Thus it is difficult precisely to evaluate that the ark is less important than the tablets on account of literary structure, although the significance of the ark should be underscored enough in this narrative context.

3.1.3.2. Explanation

10:1 *At that time Yahweh said to me, "Hew for yourself two stone tablets like the first ones and come up to me on the mountain. Also make for yourself a wooden ark. 2 I will write on the tablets the words that were on the first tablets, which you broke. Then you are to put them in the ark." 3 So I made the ark out of acacia wood and hewed two stone tablets like the first ones, and I went up on the mountain with the two tablets in my hands. 4 Yahweh wrote on these tablets as the first writing, the Ten Words he had spoken to you on the mountain, out of the midst of the fire, on the day of the assembly. And Yahweh gave them to me. 5 Then I returned and came down the mountain and put the tablets in the ark I had made, as Yahweh commanded me, and they are there now.*

בַּעֵת הַהוּא, "at that time," indicates the time of Moses' intercessory prayer for atonement on behalf of the people and the time when he acted more than just as a mediator of the covenant (9:25-29). The interpretation of the verses immediately following is significant. That is to say, this ark passage consists of Yahweh's response to Moses' intercession for Israelite sin. Yahweh's command, "*Hew for yourself two stone tablets like the first ones and come up to me on the mountain,*" shows how the broken covenant can be restored; it is "an invitation of covenant renewal" (Merrill, 1994:198). The injunction of the construction of the ark also should be understood within this context: the ark as such is not accentuated in the text referring to it.

According to the substantial tradition of the Jews, the ark in Deut. 10:1, 3 was not the same as the ark of Ex. 25ff.: "it was a provisional ark into which the tablets were placed immediately after Moses' descent; they remained in it till the final ark could be prepared, for the new tablets

were not to be broken" (Ex 34.1, Jacob, 1992:772). It seems possible to conceive of a temporary container for the two stone tablets at this time. However, this view creates a problem which revolves around the expression **וְהָיָה שָׁמָּה**, 'and they are there'; this phrase can be translated as 'and they are there till now' in content, which denotes the time of the composition of Deuteronomy. It tells that the ark is the same one as in Ex. 25. Moreover, the ark also was made of the same material, 'acacia wood,' even though its trait in this text is not described in more detail than that of Ex. 25. Even the information of making the ark, "*I made the ark out of acacia wood,*" need not to be seen as conflicting with the report of Bezalel's construction of it (Ex. 37:1-9); Moses commissioned him to fabricate it. Thus, 'a wooden chest,' the translation of NIV for **אֲרוֹן עֵץ** can mistakenly lead us to think it was a different ark.

The expression, "*Yahweh wrote on these tablets as the first writing, the Ten Words*" (4) underlines the agreement of the new document with the first, emphatically marked as **עֲשֵׂרֵת דְּבָרִים** and, simultaneously, Yahweh's activity to directly announce it to his people (Rose, 1994:513). Yahweh wanted to re-establish the covenant between him and his people by rewriting the Ten Commandment; Moses' intercessory prayer was granted.

The phrase, "*Then I ... put the tablets in the ark I had made, as Yahweh commanded me, and they are there now*" (5), provides another important function of the ark as repository of the tablets of the Ten Commandments. However, this reality seems to conflict with Amsler's (1985:54) comparison of the Decalogue with the suzerain pact: "L'écriture sur les deux tables n'intervient que dans un acte second, au service de l'acte premier de la proclamation par la voix de YHWH lui-même, exactement comme le protocole du contract de vassalité est établi après la proclamation de la relation de vassalité par le suzerain lui-même" because Yahweh's restoration of the covenant is one-sided in this case. The text, as a whole, exposes Yahweh's gracious response to Moses' intercession. The emphasis resides in the tablets of the covenant in this whole chapter rather than the ark: how the covenant is restored and remains among them. This context is concerned with the obligations to the covenant faith, in accord with the contents and character of the book of Deuteronomy. It still upholds well the ark as the visible symbol of Yahweh's presence, for the people's communion with him is based on his commandment. Hence it is quite different from the school of thought which deciphers the ark of Yahweh as a mere receptacle on the basis of this text, as many scholars have suggested.

Deut. 31:26, *"Take this book of the law and place it beside the ark of the covenant of Yahweh your God. There it will remain as a witness against you."* סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה הַזֶּה (This book of the law) appears to indicate all the law and the book of Deuteronomy Moses wrote. The law Moses wrote should be placed beside the ark; it is here, at least, called 'the ark of the covenant.' This verse suggests that the law was also to be conceived as constitutive of the community and authoritative for it. Here the law is firmly tied with one aspect of the significance the ark bestows: it has divine authority. Before his death, Moses exhorted with a command that the people of Israel should stick to the covenantal law. This law is not directly linked with the tablets of the Decalogue but with the ark containing them. The significance of the Law is underscored in that it is placed in a specially designed, sacred place, namely, in the presence of Yahweh, even if the context is not directly to accentuate divine presence as such, but rather the permanent location of the tokens of the covenant (McConville, 2002:443). Thus, this verse shows that the ark is not a simple wooden container for the tablets of the covenant; it plays an important role as a sacred object affiliated with Yahweh's presence and authority.

3.1.3.3. Summary

The ark passages in Deuteronomy were recorded in a summary form, when Yahweh accepted Moses' intercessory prayer for the Israelites who were tainted by sin. Yahweh reconstituted the relationship with his people by rewriting the Ten Commandments on the tablets. The Deuteronomic texts concerning the ark deliver a succinct message: Yahweh wants to keep the gracious communion with his people in accordance with the law. The relation of the ark to the Ten Commandments or the Book of the Law presents another significant function of the ark; the role of the ark in Deuteronomy is concerned with strengthening the importance of Yahweh's Law. It still has the symbolic meaning of the glorious presence of Yahweh. Therefore, any interpretation which suggests that 'D' depicts the ark as a simple container in the demythologized state should be dismissed. 'D' did not deprive the ark of anything of its substantial nature.

The ark document in Deuteronomy demonstrates the covenantal restoration of Yahweh's plan of redemptive history on the basis of his promise to the patriarchs. Through amazing

grace, disobedient people are given another chance to obey the commandment of Yahweh in his presence. It signifies their further progression towards Christ.

3.2. The ark in historical texts

3.2.1. The ark in Joshua

3.2.1.1. The ark in Jordan (Jos. 3:1-4:24)

3.2.1.1.1. Canonical status

It is clear that the traditio-historical approach dominates the study of the historical narrative in the book of Joshua.

For instance, Noth (1953:31-33; cf. Noort, 1998:148) believes that these chapters mean to report two traditions, one dealing with the erection of a monument in the river bed (3:12; 4:4-7, 9) and another dealing with a similar monument at the sanctuary of Gilgal (4:1-3, 8, 20-24). According to him, the narrative recorded in the book of Joshua is nothing but the result of the growth of different traditions. It contains a series of etiological and hero legends as Maier (1965:24, cf. 29) remarks: "Schon früh wurde in diese Jordansteine-Ätiologie eine Ätiologie des Gilgal-Steinkreises." Following Noth's assumption, Dus (1960:125ff.) defines explicitly the character of this section with the expression, "Die erste »Schicht« von Jos 3-4: die Sage über den Jordanübergang, als Ätiologie der »Jordansteine« 4:9 entstanden." Likewise, Mowinckel (1964:33-35), thoroughly accepting Noth's analysis of this narrative, regards the history of the conquest led by Joshua as "existierende ätiologische Lokalsagen" which originally have nothing to do with the figure, Joshua, nor with the conquest of the land: "das ist nur eine sekundäre Leitidee unter die sie gestellt worden sind." For him (1964:35) "die Überfahrt über den Jordan, ist recht stark vom Deuteronomisten überarbeitet und mit retuschierenden und theologischen Zusätzen erweitert worden." Langlamet (1969:128) succinctly defined the etiological nature as "la version israël de la légende de fondation du sanctuaire."

If this position is embraced, the narrative of these chapters would serve only to provide a fictitious origin of the stones that the Israelites, after generations, found in the Jordan river. Later, scholars who cherished Deuteronomy would artificially annex the theological meaning to the story following the spirit of the book in order for the narrative to look like a factual event in Israelite history. In fact, this view can be a momentous issue to intimidate a substance of

Israelite religion, for Micah asked sinful Israelites to "Remember [your journey] from Shittim to Gilgal" (6:5). When Micah commanded the people to repent, he did not appeal to a theological tradition but to the historical event, that is to say, God's leading to the promised land. Thus, it seems undesirable to state that the religion of Israel is founded on a fictional event.

Unlike those who fundamentally reflect the historicity of the biblical text, by using the idea of etiology, Soggin (1970:43-55) holds that these chapters represent an ancient liturgy (*l'antique rituel*) in which a Jordan "crossing" (*la traversée*) was symbolically enacted in a cultic ceremony. This cult act was subsequently "historicized" by Dtr. and became the story of the crossing. Along the same lines Coats (1985:137-157; also Ottosson, 1991:54; cf. Görg, 1998:11-14) attempts to explain the event of the crossing of the Jordan river in the liturgical view. He (1985:143) considered the occurrence as a cultic tradition which is prior to the account of the 'Red Sea' crossing: "the Sea crossing derives from the specific event of the Jordan ritual." The assertion that the history of the Jordan crossing is the result of a growth of ritual tradition does not match the mainstream views on the narrative. The focus of the text seems to be God's guidance for people obedient to the covenant rather than cultus.

With regard to the relationship between historicity and tradition, Curtis (1994:74ff.), sees the book of Joshua as a theological tradition and implies the possibility of finding historicity in tradition: "it is possible that real events lie somewhere in the background of traditions which, in the form in which they are presented in the book of Joshua, seem to have an etiological interest or seem to have been shaped by cultic considerations." However, according to his view on biblical literature, it is always uncertain whether or not Joshua was an actual historical figure. For him (1994:68-72), Joshua is nothing more than a figure in tradition. This tendency coincides with Alt's (1959:196) "dogma of history." The expression, 'biblical tradition can comprise real historical events' is certainly prone to downplay and undermine the historicity of the Old Testament.

As for the editorial date of the book of Joshua, Niehr (1998:194) considers it as differently interwoven traditions and maintains that the book of Joshua probably is a product of the exilic period: "Das Zentralthema des Josuabuches ist das Land Israel unter den Aspekten seiner Inbesitznahme und Verteilung unter die Stämme Israels. Eine Verortung dieser Thematik ist in der vorstaatlichen Zeit nicht mehr möglich; auch hierfür ist die exilische Zeit plausibler."

However, his notion hardly fits with the evidence of the biblical text itself regarding the date. The editorial formula, "to this day" (Jos. 6:25) indicates that Rahab (perhaps her family) lived among the Israelites, while this book was edited, even though many scholars including Langlamet (1969:59) and Coats (1985:142), like to consider the phrase as an etiological formula. Another inner evidence of this book is an allusion to the Jebusites: "Judah could not dislodge the Jebusites, who were living in Jerusalem; to this day the Jebusites live there with the people of Judah" (15:63). This verse implies that this book was written not later than David's reign because Jerusalem was subdued by him (2Sam. 5:6ff.). In addition to the formula, the biblical record suggested that Sidon was larger than other cities in its vicinity (11:8, cf. 19:28). In fact, Sidon seems to have had a dominant position in the Phoenician coast in the fourteenth century BC, according to the messages of Abi-Milku, the ruler of Tyre (EA 149, 151) among the Tell el Amarna letters (Moran, 1987:382-383, 385-386) in which Zimredda, the ruler of Sidon who swore fealty to the Egyptian Pharaoh, aligned himself with the revolt corps and attacked Tyre. So the book of Joshua seems to have been formed before 1200 BC since Sidon was destroyed at the hands of a king of Askalon ca. 1230 BC (Albright, 1975:515). Hence, the book of Joshua was probably recorded between the death of Joshua and David's reign.

The idea of tradition in understanding the historical event is always equivocal in the treatment of historicity and is created in the sphere of reluctance to recognize a supernatural event such as the crossing of Jordan river, in the biblical text as a factual event. As a result, the emphasis on the concept of tradition is likely to seriously undermine the divine origin of the Old Testament. At any rate, it may be conceivable only in the circle of traditio-historical criticism to maintain that the literally reliable document of the revelation that manifests magnificent history like the entrance into the land promised to the patriarchs, is simply regarded as a tradition containing etiological legends. The problem of traditio-historical criticism was comprehensively treated in chapter 2.2.

3.2.1.1.2. The text

3:1. **וַיִּשְׁפָּךְ הוֹשֵׁעַ** appears to be a bit out of keeping with the other plural verbs in the Hebrew syntax. At first, it seems to reflect the principal role of Joshua.

3:8. LXX reads אָתָּה as the logical connective, עַתָּה (now, therefore). The two terms are alike, so an error could have occurred in copying during dictation. This mistake becomes obvious in consideration that MT is backed by Tg which is recorded in the same letter as Hebrew.

3:9. דְּבַרְיָ in יְהוָה דְּבַרְיָ is translated as singular, 'τὸ ῥῆμα' in LXX and Vg. Soggin (1970:43) sees ך as a dittography: "il peut s'agir d'un cas de dittographie: le *yod*, abréviation primitive pour YHWH (ך), a été ensuite confondu avec le suffixe, une fois que le Nom divin fut de nouveau écrit *in extenso*." Even if there is no decisive norm to assess his view on a dittography, these old versions look valid considering that all of the prophetic formulae, שְׁמַעוּ דְּבַר־יְהוָה, is written in the singular noun form (דְּבַר) without exception (Jer. 7:2; 19:3; 42:15; 44:24, 26; Ezek. 3:2; 36:1; Hos. 4:1).

3:10. LXX has omitted יְהוֹשֻׁעַ יְיָ אֱמַר on stylistic grounds. It appears to be a clumsy expression as an old historical narrative of MT. The term, בְּזֹאתָ (by this) looks ambiguous; it refers to what stands in verse 11 (Kroeze, 1968:54) and is backed by Tg.

The order of peoples' names in MT agrees with Vg and Tg but disagrees with LXX, VL and Syr. The places of the Amorites and the Jebusites are changed in OL. Syr places the Hittites at the top of the list; it seems to follow the list of the Canaanites in Deut. 7:1 and Jos. 12:8. In the case of LXX, an exchange of positions occurs between the Hivites and Perizzites and between the Girgashites and Amorites. The order of LXX is seemingly affected by 9:1.

3:11. Following Syr, Soggin (1970:43) prefers to insert 'Yahweh' after הַבְּרִית אֲדֹנָי to harmonize with verse 13 (l'Arche de L'Alliance de YHWH, Seigneur de toute la terra). However, this suggestion is strange and incorrect grammatically as Langlamet (1969:46) notes: "emploi de l'article devant le *nomen regis*!" Moreover more reliable versions such as LXX, Tg advocate MT.

3:13. LXX added τῆς διαθήκης to the ark. The character of LXX's consistency about the previous expressions (3:3, 6, 8, 11) emerges in this verse, while Tg lacks such harmonization. LXX omits מִלְּמַעְלָה וְיַעֲמְדוּן דְּאֶחָד "from above on a heap." Instead the phrase appears in the translation of v. 16: ἀνωθεν ... πῆγμα ἐν ἀφεστῆκός. The reason for LXX's omission is puzzling. Tg agrees with MT and disagrees with LXX.

3:14. According to MT (both Alepo Codex and Leningrad Codex), הַאֲרֹן הַבְּרִית, with a definite article in front of אֲרֹן, rules out a genitive connection. Gesenius (GK §127 g)

suggests that the term has been added by a redactor. His idea matches with Tg which omits the following term. Woudstra's (1981:87) observation that this expression might be read as "the ark, i.e., the covenant," stressing the close association between the two seems understandable. However, it may be unnecessary to take such a grammatical construction to emphasize the covenantal character of the ark since the genitive connection of the two terms itself confirms it enough. In fact, the issue of the grammatical structure of the phrase remains open. Tentatively, it may be natural that the phrase is considered as an anacoluthon of genitive connection, on the basis of different versions such as LXX, Syr, VL and Vg.

3:15. $\text{עַל־כָּל־גְּדוֹתָיו}$ does not fit well with the topography of the Jordan. It can literally be translated as 'above all its banks' but it is unknown how many banks the river had at that time, although a river usually has just two banks. כָּל appears to be used to stress גְּדוֹתָיו in content rather than the indication of a number.

3:16. עָבְרוּ is replaced with εἰστήκει , 'stood' in LXX. It is seen either as a rendering of the seemingly similar word, עָמַד or as a result of a consideration of the chronological arrangement with the following verses. Tg, Syr and VL agree with MT, even if VL (and Vg) placed the whole sentence in verse 17. Vg substituted the location, בְּגֵדֵי יַרְדֵּן with "contra Iordanem." This appears to be an attempt to solve the ambiguity of the phrase, בְּגֵדֵי יַרְדֵּן .

3:17. בְּקִי forms hiph'il inf. abs. of קָיָה . This is the case in which inf. abs of hiph'il is used as the adverb, "firmly" (Shin, § 63).

4:2-3. The plural form of Yahweh's command to Joshua in MT does not agree with the context of v. 1. LXX renders the singular imperative in v. 2, harmonizing the situation. However, despite such incongruity, MT may have to be sustained, for one of the fragments of 4QJosh^b seems presumably to have read the verbs as plural, even if the verbs were corrupted (cf. Tov, 1992:206). The *Vorlage* of Qumran assists the textual tradition of MT in that *dativus ethicus* grammatically was written in plural form and means that the verb too is in plural form: שְׁמַרְטוּ לָכֶם . It looks to be emphatic to the deeds of the whole of Israel.

The number, שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר in verse 2 is omitted in LXX because of its simplification, even if Sipilä (1989:68) sees it as an addition. Yet, it is well harmonized with the content of 3:12, and Tg, Syr, VL and Vg follow MT.

4:3. בְּקִי forms Hiph'il inf. cons. of קָיָה but it can be seen to have a similar function with בְּקִי of 3:17: *scriptio plena*.

Langlamet (1969:51) surmises "la meilleure explication du grec" for corrupted MT, while Tg, kal of Athol and replaced the noun אֱלֹהִים with the pronoun αὐτῶν. With respect to this text, grammar, as in the sentence, אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ (Let. § 65 r). Besides, LXX added not necessary because it is natural to use a singular verb for double subjectives in Hebrew אֱלֹהִים. If its omission is linked in accordance with singular person of the verb אֱלֹהִים, it is 4:11. LXX shows again congruity concerned with the ark by adding τῆς διαθήκης and omits the number 40 among different traditional numbers such as 7, 12, 48, 49, 70 etc.

However, he failed to adequately explain the reason why the biblical author had to intend solely 'd'aboutir à ce chiffre traditionnel n'est sans doute pas étranger à l'insertion de la glose." ordres de Yhwh, de Moïse et de Josué: 16 + 10 + 14 = 40 emplois du pi. אֱלֹהִים. Le désir was intentionally inserted into MT to mention pi. אֱלֹהִים of forty times: "On obtient ainsi, pour les Dominus) agree with MT. Langlamet (1969:51) presumes that the reference to Moses' command Im'mr l'm) and Vg (donec omnia compleentur quae Josue ut loqueretur ad populum praeceperat the ark such as in the case of 3:13. Instead, Tg, Syr (dm' dšlmü klhwn p'gm' dpqr mri' l'šü command, אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ is omitted, while τῆς διαθήκης was added to finished all that the Lord commanded him to report to the people' and the reference to Moses' οὐκ ἐπέλεγεσθαι ἰσχυροὺς πάντα ἀ ἐνετέλεστο Κύριος ἀγαγεῖλαι τὸ λαὸν ἕως ἄνωJoshua 4:10. The status of LXX's rendering is not thorough. It simplified the whole verse freely: situation: a second set of twelve stones.

4:9. LXX, VL and Vg added the meaning, 'other' (ἄλλους, alios), to אֱלֹהִים to concretize the numerum filiorum) follows it as a rule.

1983:40). MT seems to be closer to the original text, for Tg exactly matches MT and Vg (iuxta interpolation of a different traditional formula within the transmission of the text) (Butler, οὐκ ἐπέλεγεσθαι τῆς διαβάσεως at the completion of the passing over' which seems to reflect an 4:8. אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ 'according to the number of the tribes' is rendered in LXX as ἐν τῇ 6:20.

4:6. LXX's singular person on אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ seems to reflect Deuteronomy simplifying them instead of literal translation.

LXX understood אֱלֹהִים as vocalization, אֱלֹהִים and interpreted אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ theologically, 4:5. LXX rendered אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ as εἰσπυθεῖν ἡνὸν πρὸς πρῶτον Κυρίου.

Syr and Vg literally back MT. LXX appears to offer an interpretation of this verse rather than rendering.

4:16. אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית of MT has a variety of versions. LXX gave a long modifier to the ark: τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ μαρτυρίου Κυρίου, whereas Vg amended it as *arcam foederis*. On the ground of calculation, Langlamet (1969:52-54) explains again the reason why an original הַבְּרִית of MT was replaced with הַבְּרִית: "pour indiquer la seizième mention de l'arche" of 30 occurrences of the word 'ark' in this book. However, the modifier of the ark has nothing to do with how many times the word 'ark' occurred in this book. Vg exposes coherence with previous phrases (3:3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17; 4:7, 9). LXX seems to display disposition of interpretation. Syr (q'bwt' dshdwt') follows MT.

3.2.1.1.3. Explanation

It is not the task of this study to exegetise verbatim all the contents of this section but suffice it to explain how the ark is depicted and what function and significance it has in the historical narrative of the book of Joshua.

After camping by the Jordan river, the Israelites are ordered to get instructions for passing over it: "*When you see the ark of the covenant of Yahweh your God, and the Levitical priests carrying it, then you are to move out from your positions and follow it*" (3:3). The name, the ark of the covenant which is the sacred chest containing tablets of the law (Ex. 25:21; Deut. 10:1), is used properly here to express the idea that Israel's privilege as God's people was linked to the sacred obligation to keep the covenant that God in his grace had made with them. Because of its sanctity, the ark should be carried by the designated persons: the Levites, especially the sons of Kohath (Num. 4:4, 15). The office described with double words הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם (the priests the Levites) in this text is not to give room for the priests of other tribes. That office is confined to the tribe of Levi. In fact, the phrase הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם dominantly occurs in Deuteronomy (17:9, 18; 18:1; 24:8; 27:9, cf. Jos. 8:33). Although all Levites are not the priests, on the basis of the reference to the offices in Jos. 8:33 and Deut. 27:9-14, it is likely that the author of this book equates הַלְוִיִּם and הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם, for the latter term is used for those who actually participated in the ceremony at Gerizim and Ebal (cf.

McConville, 1984:137). The primary task of the priests is to take care of the sanctuary (Num. 1:53; 3:28, 32). This office is characterized by the function of שָׁמַר i.e., to protect God's holiness in the holy area. In the same sense, the priests were called to serve by carrying the ark.

The holiness of the ark is also found in the next verse, "*there will be a distance of about two thousand cubits between you and the ark; do not go near it*" (3:4). "*About two thousand cubits*" is rendered about 900 meters. Brouwer (nd:109) alludes that this section is inserted by a later scribe on the ground that such distance between the ark and the people is not to be found again in the future ark narratives. However, it was probably a special protective measure God ordered for this once for all time event in the redemptive history of Israel, namely crossing the Jordan river. Moreover it seems to be unnecessary to restate the distance, although the distance continued to be kept in the procession and the fact that the phrase is recorded once can hardly result in later interpolation.

According to Jewish tradition Midrash Tanḥuma (Cohen, 1970:13), two thousand cubits was the extent of the permitted Sabbath day's journey: "In the future you will stand there and observe the Sabbath. Do not go more than two thousand cubits from the ark on any side, so that you can go and pray before it on the Sabbath." In the geographical situation, the distance of two thousand cubits is approximately that of the outer bank of the Jordan (el Ghor) to the inner bed (ez Zor) which is located lower. Then the people from the high position could see well how the priests touched the water of the river (cf. Kroeze, 1968:52). At any rate, the Israelites should not approach the emblem of Yahweh's indwelling amongst Israel; there should not be a lack of reverence for its sanctity by any rash handling or inadvertent touching (cf. 1 Sam. 6:9; 2 Sam. 6:7). The ark shows Yahweh's people his way into the promised land, but it also represents a holy presence from which the people must keep their distance. The divine presence brought enormous responsibility; Yahweh's presence was certainly a blessing but, coincidentally, it was also a threat.

Thus, the people are commanded to be *sanctified* (3:5). The outward ordinances for sanctity which are applied to other important events (Ex. 19:10, 14-15; Num. 11:18; Jos. 7:13) and appear in the purification of clothes and sexual abstinence (Ex. 19:10-15; Gen. 35:2) should induce spiritual reflection and a humble attitude. Both of these are needed in order to be able to experience Yahweh's presence. Under the condition of holding sanctity, Yahweh *will*

do wonders among the Israelites. The wonders נִפְלְאוֹת (ni. ptc. f. pl. of פִּלֵּא) generally are such impressive acts as miracles that astonish people. However, the substantive נִפְלְאוֹת (13x) with פִּלֵּא (10x) is frequently associated with Yahweh's acts of salvation: the Exodus event (Ex. 3:20; Mic. 7:15; Ps. 98:1), the wilderness journey (Ps. 78:12ff.), the crossing of the Jordan (Jos. 3:5) and the conquest of the land of Canaan (Ex. 34:10). In particular, this marvellous act of Yahweh which is connected with the way to cross over the Jordan, a natural barrier, will be a significant moment for the Israelites as they experience a new phase of the redemptive history of Yahweh.

Yet verse 6 seems not to be well arranged chronologically since the content of this verse is directly linked with that of verse 14. Such a phenomenon sometimes happens in the process of describing an occurrence (cf. Jon. 4:5). Thus, it may be natural that verse 6 is placed next to verses 7-13 because it is chronologically overlapped with what is described in verse 14.

Before they cross over the river, Joshua's position is to be exalted: "*Today I will begin to exalt you in the eyes of all Israel, so they may know that I will be with you as I was with Moses*" (3:7). God is now about to publicly fulfil what he promised to Joshua (1:1-9). Joshua's exaltation functions as an official confirmation of his leadership in front of all the people of Israel. Yahweh knows that it is vital for both the people and Joshua to have confidence in his leadership for the upcoming wars in Canaan. Yet, the nature of his leadership is more a spiritual one than a military or strategic one (1:10; 3:2-4, 5-6, 9-13, etc.). Yahweh's exaltation of Joshua as a spiritual leader does not aim at his position as such but at another purpose: that the Israelites know that Yahweh is with Joshua. This accentuation can also be found in this subordinate clause with *nun paragogicum*.

As for the grammatical construction, אֲשֶׁר יִדְעוּן, *nun paragogicum* in the clause, Hoftijzer (1985:44) explains, "is concerned with an aim which will certainly be attended (provided the action in the principal clause takes place)." According to this grammatical structure, the principal clause is Yahweh's exaltation of Joshua and the subordinate clause points to a conviction of the people's acknowledgement that Yahweh is with Joshua. Naturally, Yahweh is with all his people but he is with Joshua in a special way. The manner of his particular accompaniment with Joshua is suggested with the mention of Moses, who is the best example. The people who experienced Moses' leadership in the wilderness are able to apprehend its meaning. With Yahweh's proclamation, Joshua comes to continue to lead the Israelites after Moses.

Coats (1985:140) states that Joshua's initiative with the ark matches Moses' initiative with the rod which was used in the separation of the waters of the Red Sea. However, such comparison between the ark and the rod appears clumsy. The latter may symbolize Moses' authoritative position but the former has nothing to do with Joshua's status. In fact, the function of Joshua differs from that of Moses when the miracles occurred, even if Yahweh exalted both of them as prominent leaders of the Israelites. Joshua's role with respect to the impending miracle of the parting of Jordan's water is less direct than that of Moses at the Red Sea. Moses was himself instrumental in the miracle (Ex. 14:6, 21), but Joshua merely gave orders. It may be that Yahweh's presence in the ark also plays a role in this difference.

Joshua had to commend the priests who carry the ark of the covenant: "*when you reach the edge of the Jordan's waters, you must stand in Jordan*" (3:8). In the conjunctive sentence with the preposition, כִּי of כִּבְאֲנֵכֶם serves as leading a time clause (Broc. § 163 c). The purpose of this command is to give an opportunity for all the people to affirm realistically that Yahweh is with Joshua, as he was with Moses.

In addition to the order to the priests, Joshua draws the attention of the Israelite people to instruct them, : "*Come here and listen to the words of Yahweh your God*" (3:9). Grammatically, a curious form (GK § 66 c) of גָּשׁוּ (qal, imp. 2. m. pl. of נָגַשׁ) which is expressed as an exception (Berg. II. § 25 c) can be explained by the influence of the *Antepaenultima* on the just following word, הִנֵּה (BL § 13 p, 52 t). In fact, *the words of Yahweh* which the people should listen to are to indicate נְפִלְאוֹת which was previewed in v. 5 and בְּאוֹתָהּ in v. 10, namely, stoppage of the Jordan's flow which is concretely depicted in v. 13. Joshua's command is to require the people's actual faith that Yahweh is with him and simultaneously with them: *by this you will know that the living God is in your midst* (3:10a). The NIV rendering of בְּאוֹתָהּ "This is how" is not clear. It seems understandable for the term to be regarded as the wonders in v. 13. Here, Joshua introduced Yahweh as אֱלֹהֵי חַי 'the living God' (cf. Waltke and O'Conner, 1990:151). This term is employed as a polemic against pagan gods whom the Canaanites worshipped. Since Yahweh is the living God, totally different from dead idols, Joshua said, "*he will certainly drive out before you the Canaanites, Hittites, Hivites, Perizzites, Girgashites, Amorites and Jebusites*" (3:10b) according to his promise (Gen. 15:18; Ex. 23:28; 33:2; 34:11, etc.). The assurance of Yahweh's ejection of the peoples is expressed in the paronomastic use of the inf. abs., הוֹרֵשׁ יוֹרֵשׁ.

Among the various lists of Canaanite peoples in both number and order, these seven nations appear to form a standard list of Canaanitic peoples (cf. Gen. 15:19-21; Ex. 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23, 28; 33:2; 34:11; Num. 13:29; Deut. 7:1; 20:17; Jos. 3:10; 9:1; 11:3; 12:8; 24:11; Jud. 3:5, etc). The biblical texts offer us some information on the territories that these peoples had occupied at that time. The Canaanites probably are the people living near the sea and near the Jordan River (5:1; Num. 13:29), even though the term, 'Canaanites' is frequently an all-inclusive word referring to any people living in Canaan. The Hittites are found in the hill country of Judah (Gen. 23:1-3; 26:34; Jud. 1:22-26; Ezek. 16:3, 45). The Hivites lived in the mountainous region to the north (Jos. 11:3; Jud. 3:3). The Perizzites seem to have lived in the region of central Palestine (Gen. 13:7; Jos. 17:15). The Girgashites appear only in the lists of peoples of the Bible. According to Hostetter (1995:63), they lived toward the north of Palestine, because the region is the only area left in Palestine. In this case, the Amorites probably refer to the people East of the Jordan River (Num. 21:26; Deut. 4:46; Jos. 13:10, 21), although the name of the people seems often to be synonymous with the Canaanites (Gen. 15:16; 36:2-3; Jos. 24:15; Jud.1:34-35; Ezek. 16:3). The Jebusites inhabited Jerusalem (Jos. 15:8; 18:28). In fact, there were more nations living in Palestine than these seven peoples (cf. Gen. 15:19-21) but these are deemed as representatives of the nations occupying the entire land of Canaan at that time (cf. Num. 34:2-12). If the number has a symbolic meaning, the seven symbolize the entire number of the oppressive and corrupt authorities presently ruling the land (Hamlin, 1983:28). By God's miraculous action, the people of Israel will come to know surely that Yahweh will expel all the Canaanite nations.

As a sign of God's expulsion of the pagan nations from Canaan, the ark is modified as "*the ark of the covenant, the Lord of all the earth*" (3:11). Yahweh is the owner of all the earth including Palestine. As its possessor, he has right to claim ownership of the land of Canaan. In consideration of the construction of this phrase, the author seems to intend to show the ark as identical to Yahweh in this situation because the connection between אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית and אֲרוֹן כְּלֵי הָאֱלֹהִים is not genitive but appositive: *the ark of the covenant, i.e., the Lord of all the earth*. Thus, the ark preceding the people signifies God's guidance to the Jordan River. Their attention to such divine leadership is provoked by the first word of this verse, הִנֵּה: everything is focused on the ark of Yahweh.

The sequence of the next verse appears a bit clumsy: *Now then take you twelve men out*

of the tribes of Israel, out of every tribe a man (3:12). As for grammatical peculiarity of distribution, in this case, the numbered object too is repeated (Num. 13:2; 34:18): לְשֵׁבַט אֶשְׁמָרָה אֶשְׁמָרָה (GK § 134 q). The content of the verse directly has nothing to do with the preparation or the event of passing over the Jordan River. The choice of twelve men is linked with the occurrence after the people's crossing over it (4:2). This verse seems to show the writing style of the author in that the actual meaning of נִפְלְאוֹתָא (v. 5) is revealed as a stoppage of the Jordan's flow in verse 13. Joshua's behest indicates succeeding task after crossing the river.

And when the soles of the feet of the priests carrying the ark of Yahweh -- the LORD of all the earth -- set in the waters of Jordan, the waters of Jordan shall be cut off. The waters coming down from above will stand in one heap (3:13). Finally, the identity of נִפְלְאוֹתָא spoken in verse 5 is revealed here: standstill of waters flowing downstream. It will produce a dramatic scene since the miracle will occur at the moment when the priests bearing the ark set foot in the Jordan. Joshua's explanation for God's miracle contains an element which challenges the people's faith: God's guidance is not one way. Yahweh wants to work through the covenantal obedience of the people: פְּנֵיָהּ (י in inf. cons. of פָּנָה replaced י, Berg. § 28 d). Here, the ark of Yahweh is modified once more by the phrase, *the LORD of all the earth* which depicts that he is sovereign over whole the earth. Thus, the magnificent modifier of the ark appears to have a suitable function in this military context, for Yahweh will exhibit His creational force by expelling the Canaanites in the future, as the victor and the Lord over the gods of the defeated population of Canaan (Mann, 1977:197). This designation for God, אֲדֹנָי כָּל־הָאָרֶץ, is found later in Mich. 4:13 and Zach. 4:14.

Now the procession towards the miraculous action of Yahweh starts with Joshua's command, "*take up the ark of the covenant and pass over in front of the people*" (3:6). The expression, '*they took up the ark*' is tantamount to Yahweh's own arising in terms of Num. 10:35, even though Yahweh is not able to be virtually identified with the ark.

Joshua's command is executed: "*when the people moved from their tents to cross the Jordan, with the priests bearing the ark of the covenant ahead of the people (3:14)*" This march is a sort of parade of faith because they would not dare, without faith to take the risk of marching towards the Jordan River in accordance with Joshua's command. In this verse, the emphasis lies on the ark.

When those who carried the ark reached the Jordan, and the feet of priests carrying the ark touched the water's edge (3:15a), the waters of the Jordan from above stopped (3:16a). With respect to the structure of this sentence, the writer wanted a dramatic unfolding of the narrative in verses 14-16, for he delays the climax the reader longs for, by using subordinate clauses in verses 14, 15: he leaves us in suspense as to what actually happens until verse 16 which contains the principal sentence (cf. Kroeze, 1968:57; Howard, 1998:130). In this kind of syntax, the author causes the readers' attention clearly to converge on the miracle, not the crossing. The climax tells us, in a very impressive way, that the waters of the Jordan stopped. The feature of the water's stoppage is described by the two following verbs: קָבַעַ, 'rise' and נִכְרְתָו, 'cut off': the former is cause, while the latter is effect. Then, the expression, *the water piled up in a heap very far from the town Adam in the vicinity of Zarethan*, is not clear. It is to be paraphrased: the piling of the water extended very far from the town Adam to the Zarethan, if Q^rrē, אֲדָמָה is accepted (cf. Glueck, 1946:157). Geographically, Adam is located 28 km north of Jericho, controlling the Jordan fords just below the confluence of the Jabbok, and its vicinity was famous for the occasional landslides which could dam the floods of Jordan (Bimson, 1995:18; Aharoni, 1974:34). The wall of water stretched out very far into the region: inf. abs., נִכְרְתָו is *casus adverbialis*, GK § 113 h; Berg. § 12 h). They could watch the stoppage of the water and its effect. The water was suddenly cut off all the way downstream to the Sea of the Arabah: hi. pf., קָבַעַ expresses an adverbial notion (JM § 177 g; Broc. § 133 b). Finally, they could come to affirm that Yahweh, the living God, was with Joshua, as they saw his marvellous action in fulfilment of Joshua's prediction (v. 13).

The second part of this verse underscores the supernatural nature of this occurrence: *The Jordan overflows all its banks all the time of harvest* (3:15b). This parenthesis has respect to the time of crossing, which is dated as the tenth day of the first month, *Abib*, April (4:19). At this time, the river is at its fullest, swollen by the long winter rains first and later by the melting snows in the Anti-Lebanon range (cf. Boling, 1982:168). This information about the natural condition tells us that it is impossible for the Israelites to pass over the natural barrier for themselves under such unpropitious circumstances: it is an actual miracle performed by Yahweh's mighty act. While the downstream of the Jordan was cut off, *the people passed over opposite Jericho*. Yet, the phrase, נִגְדָה יְרִיחוֹ is vague. Vg (3:17) found an alternative term "contra Iordanem" to avoid the difficulty. However, such an attempt is not a desirable solution.

Although the basic meaning of the preposition, **כַּגֵּב** is 'against' and frequently used as a sense of 'before' (Ex. 19:2; Neh. 13:21; 1King. 8:22), it, here, is rendered as 'opposite' which describes a place between the Jordan and Jericho. The most satisfactory point would be the ford that Arabs call al-Maghtas, 12 km southeast from T. es-Sultan and 13 km due west from T. el-Hammam (Boling, 1982:170).

The priests that carried the ark of the covenant of Yahweh stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, while all the Israelites passed over on dry ground, until the whole nation had completed the crossing on dry ground (3:17). It is interesting to note that two contradictory ideas exist simultaneously: **מִלֵּא** 'full' (3:15) and **בְּיַבֵּשׁ הַיַּרְדֵּן** 'on dry ground' (3:17). Yahweh's marvellous activity is highlighted even more in this situation. The people passed over the Jordan on dry ground, while the ark remained in the middle of the river on dry ground with the priests, who are carrying it, standing firm. In the description of this event, the writer employs the term, 'completely' (**כִּלְיָוָה**) twice (vv. 16, 17) to picture a vivid image of successful crossing of the Jordan River, while the term is not found in Joshua's explication of the same event (4:7, 22). The ark, the supreme symbol of God's indwelling, is viewed as silently directing the whole proceedings as the priests stood firm on dry ground.

The successful entrance into the promised land occurs because of Yahweh's guidance through the awesome miracle and the people's fidelity to a covenant whose meaning is implied in the ark; the event did not occur through a simple ritual ceremony, as Coats (1985:140f.) suggests, even though such a seemingly cultic element cannot be ruled out entirely from this section. In the whole historical event the central role of the ark, the emblem of Yahweh's actual presence, is underlined even if the ark itself is not the cause of the miracle as Soggin (1970:51) assumes; "Pour le liturge ancien, la présence de l'Arche dans le lit du fleuve était la cause efficiente du miracle" because the ark as such should not be used in a magical or superstitious way.

However, the narrative of the miracle to which the ark is central is not finished yet in chapter 3: the Israelites have one more task to complete. For the sake of progeny, significant events are marked in history through the erecting of monuments. This was no different for Israel: they had to set up a sign to inform future generations of the *Magnalia Dei*. The sign is marked with twelve stones out of the midst of Jordan, out of the place where the priests' feet stood firm, according to the number of the tribes of the Israelites. Joshua set up the twelve

stones as a historical monument in Gilgal (4:20). The stone would not be big because one man could take it out of the riverbed. Yet, the set of the twelve stones bears tremendous significance: *"the waters of the Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of Yahweh; when it crossed the Jordan the waters of the Jordan were cut off (4:7)"* and *"Israel crossed over this Jordan on dry land"* (4:22).

The interpretation of the setting of the memorial stones (vv. 5, 9) has yielded different conclusions. Generally, those who contend that there was just one set of twelve stones in the narrative believe that verse 9, *"Joshua set up twelve stones in the midst of Jordan"* shows another independent tradition (cf. Gray, 1967:65; Butler, 1983:49). Yet there is no foundation for the assumption that the biblical text consists of a collection of different traditions. In particular, on the ground that verse 9 is a parenthetical aside, Howard (1998:136) declines the traditional idea that there was one set of twelve stones set up on the bank (vv. 3, 5, 8) and another set of twelve stones set in the riverbed by Joshua (v. 9): "only one set of stones existed" ... "Joshua had initially set up twelve stones in the riverbed itself, where the priests had stood." He connects the term, אֲבָנִים of verse 9 with the last word, אֲבָנִים of verse 8: "'there' refers to the stones on the riverbank (not in the riverbed)." Primarily, his clarification looks attractive enough to solve the tricky issue, since the setting of the memorial stones demanded a slightly complicated process (3:12; 4:2-5, 8), while Joshua's action seems prompt. Furthermore, putting the stones under the water superfluously looks meaningless (v. 9). However, if his notion is accepted, several problems are raised. When Joshua's setting up the stones is regarded as his initial action, the tense of the verb, אָבָן should be understood as pluperfect and then the object, אֲבָנִים, necessitates an attribute, such as the definite article. Moreover, it seems unnatural that the 'there' of verse 9 resumes the narrative of verse 8 to link two 'theres' together because the demonstrative adverb אֲשָׁמָּה usually refers to location which is mentioned in the close sentence, and the subjective of אָבָן should be אֲבָנִים in verse 9, for the imperfect consecutive, אָבָן serves apparently to represent a progress in the narrative (GK § 111 d). Besides the grammatical problem, if the 'there' in the phrase, *"they are there to this day"* (v. 9) signifies 'there' in verse 8 *"laid them down there,"* this editorial formula should have been placed after verse 20 in which Joshua set up the stones in Gilgal. Thus, it is more likely to see that Joshua set up another twelve stones at the spot where the feet of the priests carrying the ark of the covenant stood, as ancient biblical translators understood (LXX, VL and Vg).

Joshua's initial action seems natural to mark the precise place where the priests had stood with the ark of the covenant. The stones Joshua set up in the riverbed can proclaim at the low level of water that 'the ark then stood there!': "*Yahweh your God dried up the waters of Jordan, ... as Yahweh your God did to the Red sea*" (4:23). The entry into the promised land, with all its truly spiritual implications, would thus be etched indelibly upon their hearts. The children of the Israelites must not forget Yahweh's gracious guidance with the ark and the fulfillment of the promise to their fathers. It was a gift from Yahweh; they could enter the promised land without battle or swords flashing. The success or failure of the entrance completely rests on the people's faith and not on their ability. God's promise is fulfilled only by faith and obedience to his commandments. From the perspective of redemptive history, already during the Old Testament period their minds would be "raised to Christ, " (Calvin, 1979:xxii) who, typically, had accompanied them on their trek through the desert (1 Cor. 10:4) and who, in the symbol of the ark, had stood by them in the death-like experience of the Jordan crossing until they were safe on the other side.

With respect to the different titles such as 'the ark of the covenant' (3:3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17; 4:7, 9, the ark of Yahweh (3:13; 4:11) or 'the ark of the Testimony' (4:16), Butler (1983:45) comments that these different titles of the ark appear to reflect different stages in its history and function within Israel and her theological reflections. His statement seems to reflect Noth's (1953:31ff.) theory: 'the ark of Yahweh' and 'the ark of Yahweh of all the earth' belong to the older *Bestand* of the narrative but contrary to it 'the ark of testimony' is later. This is baseless if his idea is related to Noth's theory because this text itself, containing all three designations of the ark, rejects such a conception. In fact, the different designations of the ark remind the people of its various meanings. 'The ark of Yahweh', carried as the people journeyed, symbolized their belief that Yahweh went with them, guiding them to places of rest (Num. 10:33). 'The ark of the covenant' or 'the ark of the testimony' symbolized the commands of the covenant which formed the people of Israel. This whole covenant relationship and way of life went with them as they crossed over the Jordan (Hamlin, 1983:24). The ark was thus a symbol of the awesome presence of the God of the covenant in their midst as they crossed over into the new land.

Ultimately, the purpose of the crossing of the Jordan River is to affirm that the living God is with Joshua and among the people (3:7, 10), and to therefore always fear Yahweh their God (4:24). This miraculous guidance of God demands them to fear God which is presented as the

goal of life (Ecc. 12:13). It is not simple to grasp its connotation at a glance, for the word, 'fear' is used with various meanings (cf. Jon. 1:5, 9, 10, 16). According to Akkadian literature, the fear, *palâhu* (verb), *puluhtu* (substantive) is defined as man's essential attitude before gods and king, which is not only for right conduct but for respecting the order established by the power and right cultic service (Derousseaux, 1970:58). This appears to be used as its general definition, implying an idea of distance and feeling of terror. In the Old Testament, the word is frequently employed with 'serve', in the situation that reminds the people of God's marvellous guidance (Deut. 6:13; Jos. 24:14; 1Sam. 12:14, 24; 2King. 17:33, 36). The meaning of the fear extricated from the context of those verses which tie two words is different from just a feeling of terror. In consideration that the fear is demanded as a response to God's gracious lead, it should be closely tied with the concept of loyalty and commitment. Fear involves a kerneled idea that explains the covenant. The Israelites who crossed over this Jordan on dry land should serve Yahweh with loyalty and commitment: it is holy fear based on respect and trust. This is the ultimate purpose of the miraculous event in which the ark of the covenant played a crucial part.

3.2.1.1.4. Summary

This section which consists of three parts, -- proclamation of the miracle (3:1-13), the event of the miracle (3:14-17; 4:15-18) and the fixation of the miracle -- is sufficient enough to display the prominent role of the ark that manifests Yahweh's indwelling. Yahweh let the ark precede the Israelites and lead them into the land promised to the patriarchs. In this event the ark appears to be used as a vanguard, as a physical representation of divine presence and it displays its sanctity and power (which is actually God's). Through this whole narrative, the ark of Yahweh is always central. The two primary theological themes of the book, 'divine initiative' and 'divine presence,' Vannoy (1997:815) suggested, can also be expounded with respect to the leading role of the ark. The most frequently used designation, ark of the covenant, seems to require the people's faith and obedience to the commandments. Thus, the Israelites' entrance into the land of Canaan can be said to be achieved by faith in Yahweh and obedience to his word because Yahweh acts through the faith of the people, even if the entry was treated

as a mere product of Israelite faith. Despite the central role of the ark in this historical occurrence, the ark as such does not bear magical and mystical power. Instead, Yahweh acts in association with the ark. Thus, the ark should not be employed as an object of worship. It is incorrect to consider the entry into the land the result of a ritual or cultic procession. The ritual ceremony itself is not effective but faith is the decisive element even though the ritual factor is obvious in this text (3:5).

The ultimate purpose of this miraculous event was that the Israelites who crossed over this Jordan on dry land will fear Yahweh. Two sets of twelve stones in the riverbank and in the riverbed proclaim to the people of God to continue serving Yahweh with loyalty and commitment. The once-and-for-all time event ushered in a new phase of the redemptive history of Israel which should forever be carved on the hearts of the children of the Israelites for all generations.

3.2.1.2. The ark in Jericho (Jos. 6:1-21)

3.2.1.2.1. Canonical status

The historical event discussed in this chapter is still challenged by the critical theory of the 'Wellhausen school' and the *überlieferungsgeschichtliche* school. It is generally believed by these schools that the picture of a complete and comparatively sudden conquest of the land of Canaan under Joshua was the product of a later shaping of the historical material. Schmid (1975:161) contends that this document of the sixth chapter of Joshua's book is not "Geschichtsbericht sondern eine theologische Erzählung." Coats (1985:148) evades a straightforward answer to the historicity of the destruction of Jericho's walls and appears to appeal to the tradition: "It is of no value to ask this text how Joshua really brought the walls down, just as it is of no value to ask a contemporary priest who conducts the ritual how Jesus really died and rose from the tomb or to ask a contemporary rabbi how the Israelites really escaped from Egyptian oppression. In this pericope, the walls of Jericho fall when the ritual is properly executed, *ex opere operato*." The latter sentence in the quotation should be attended cautiously; that is to say, 'this pericope' is likely to be meant to be of legendary nature. In other words, for Coats it does not matter whether the walls of Jericho really fell or not.

Long (1994:116-118) indicated that Ramsey (1982) holds a different view on the essence of Christianity. He does so by treating his question, "If Jericho was not razed, is our faith in vain?" In the Christian viewpoint he responds correctly to the question: "For the majority of those who call themselves Christians, the historicity of the core events of redemptive history, precisely because it is *redemptive* history, can never be dismissed as insignificant considerations."

This case is directly applied to the historicity of Jesus' resurrection because the two events lie on the same horizon of the redemptive history of God. Apparently the destruction of the walls of Jericho is one thing while Jesus' resurrection from the dead is another. Some Christians seem to be able to answer that it is not important for their faith whether the downfall of the walls of Jericho actually happened or not. However, Christians have to keep in mind that it is tied with the serious matter of the reliability of the whole biblical document; if the record of the devastation of the walls of Jericho is dubious, the documentation of Jesus' resurrection too is unreliable. Paul's warning against those who denied the historical reality of Jesus' resurrection

from the dead is powerful in its criticism: "And if Christ has not been raised, our preaching is useless and so is your faith" (1Cor. 15:14). The biblical message tells that the historical fact of the resurrection of Jesus became the substantial confession of the Early Churches, not vice versa as the theory of form criticism has suggested. It is not only the matter of the church of Corinth but also of the Christian Church of all ages.

As a matter of fact, plenty of archeologists have dug up the ground of Jericho doing research on the destruction of the city (Sellin & Watzinger, 1913; Watzinger, 1926; Garstang, 1927, 1930, 1937; Albright, 1939; J. & J.B.E. Gastang, 1948; Kenyon, 1957; Kenyon & Holland, 1982-3; Ussishkin, 1989; Wood, 1990; Mazar, 1990, etc.). A quite remarkable agreement is found in the comparison between the archaeological evidence at Jericho with the biblical narrative describing the Israelite destruction of the city; the city was strongly fortified (2:5, 7, 15; 6:5, 20); the attack occurred just after harvest time in the spring (2:6; 3:15; 5:10) and the inhabitants had no opportunity to flee with their belongings (6:1) and at the same time the siege was short (6:15) and the city was not plundered (6:17-18): Kenyon (1957:23) recovered six bushels of grain in one season in her limited excavation; the walls were levelled, possibly by an earthquake (6:20) (Kenyon, 1982:370); the city was burned (6:24). However, one major problem remains: the date, 1400 B.C. Most scholars will reject the possibility that the Israelites destroyed Jericho around 1400 B.C. because of their belief that Israel did not emerge in Canaan until about 150 to 200 years later, at the end of the Late Bronze II period (cf. Bimson & Livingston, 1986:41; Mills, 1999:13-22). According to Fritz (1994^a:116; the original German edition was issued in 1985), the fall of Jericho provided a chance for Israel to occupy the land of Canaan: "The decline of Canaanite urban culture remains so far largely inexplicable." It is certain only that the occupation of the land by the Israelites, who later became the carriers of the Iron age culture, was not the *cause* but the *result* of this breakdown, while the scholar such as Garstang (1937:1222) ascribed the destruction to invading Israelites: "The link with Joshua and the Israelites is only circumstantial but it seems to be solid land without a flaw."

However, quite recently, new evidence has come to light suggesting that Israel was a resident in the land of Canaan throughout the Late Bronze II period (Wood, 1990:57; cf. Mazar, 1990:331), although Schwienhorst (1986:72), regarding the conquest of Jericho as a product of "theologische Ätiologie" is sure of the historicity of the event: "Eine Datierung der Grundsicht auf Grund archäologischer Forschungen zur Datierung von Mauern auf Tell

es-Sultān scheint mir nicht möglich zu sein, weil sie den literarischen Charakter der Geschichte verkennt." The result is that alternative conceptions such as the theory of peaceful infiltration to the land by nomads in the course of changing pasture ground, advocated by Alt (1959:89-125) and Noth (1954:67ff.) and the theory of a revolutionary uprising of the lower classes and replacement of the ruling population by a new society, suggested by Mendenhall (1970:100-120) and Gottwald (1978:2-7), are ruled out. Therefore, it should again be warned that we must make light of the reliability of the biblical document of history, even though this history is not reliant on the edge of the spade of archaeologists.

3.2.1.2.2. The text

6:1. The narrative of the destruction of Jericho begins with the conjunction ׀, which denotes that it has a historical relationship with the previous events. Two participle words, וּמְסֻגָּרָהּ סֻגְרָהּ (one qal active; the other pu`al passive) express the situation. This acts as a circumstantial clause (GK, § 141 e). The translation of LXX, συγκεκλεισμένη καὶ ὠχυρωμένη, is a bit clumsy because the first word is a passive form and the second means 'fortified.' The proper rendering of the Hebrew word is "tightly shut."

מִפְּנֵי can be literally translated as "in the face of" although "on account of " is preferable (HALAT, 889; cf. KJV). מִפְּנֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is omitted in LXX. Butler (1983:65) assumes that the phrase may well be an 'explanatory' plus in the later Hebrew tradition. Yet, LXX is particularly short in this chapter and disagrees with other ancient versions such as Tg, VL, Vg and Syr (5:16).

6:2. הַחַיִּל הַגְּבוּרִי is declarative perfect (Lett. § 72 bd). גְּבוּרִי הַחַיִּל, 'mighty warriors' can act as a synonym of אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה, 'the men of war' or 'warriors' in vs. 3.

6:3. The two major verbs (סָבְרוּם, 'march around'; תַּעֲשֶׂה, 'do') are both second person, but the first is plural and the second singular. Israel is alternately viewed as a single unit or as a plurality. LXX harmonizes them, by reading them singular throughout. MT looks consistent. However, it is understandable that God instructed warriors, Joshua and the priests (v. 4) in turn. Tg backs MT. Tg rendered אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה as גְּבוּרֵי עֲבָדֵי קִרְבָּא, 'men waging battle.'

6:4. The verse is lacking in LXX^o, probably by haplography in the *Vorlage*: *w[sb`h ... w]hyh* (cf. Boling, 1982:202). הַיְבֹלִים, the signal horns are here short instruments. They are used for signalling or sounding festive alarm but are not used as musical instruments (Herzberg, 1986:40). VL and Vg add 'covenant' to the ark: *praecedant acram foederis*: it seems to harmonize it with the name of the ark written only in verse 6 of this chapter.

6:5. בְּשָׁמְעֵכֶם אֶת־קוֹל הַשּׁוֹפָר is lacked in LXX. However, the part of MT is needed, for it is the record of the command for the act, כְּשָׁמַע הָעָם אֶת־קוֹל הַשּׁוֹפָר in verse 20. Tg, Syr, VL and Vg support MT.

6:6. LXX is not translated discretionally: אֲרָרָא is changed into εἰσηλθεῖν and it lacks בֵּן and Joshua's whole speech: "שָׂאוּ אֶת־אֲרֹן הַבְּרִית ... אֲרֹן יְהוָה."

6:7. LXX lacks reference to the ark, but this appears to be an internal Greek haplography: *k[ibotos ... k]uriou* (cf. Boling, 1982:202). אֲרֹן is to be changed with Q^rrē, אֲרֹן.

6:8. LXX omits reference to Joshua's speech and presents further instructions with the imperative mood of v. 7: καὶ ἑπτὰ ἱερεῖς ἔχοντες, 'and let seven priests advance,' while MT describes the beginning of the action. It seems awkward in terms of process of the event. Tg added אֲרֹן to יְהוָה to concretize the situation.

6:9. Tg rendered הַמַּאֲסֵף as שְׁבַט דַּבִּית דָּן, 'the tribe of the house of Dan.' This seems as an interpretation to reflect Numbers 10:25. This case is applied to verse 13 also.

6:10. לֹא־יֵצֵא מִפִּיכֶם דְּבָר is omitted in LXX. Its translator appears to have thought that the verse is unnecessarily long. Yet, Tg, Syr, VL and Vg back MT.

6:11. הִיטֵב has the hif'il form which is different from LXX, "καὶ περιελθοῦ ἡ κιβωτὸς" and Vg (qal), "circuivit ergo arca Domini." הִיטֵב הַמַּחֲנֶה וַיֵּלִינוּ בַּמַּחֲנֶה 'they entered the camp and lodged in the camp' is rendered incorrectly in LXX, which presents the ark as a singular subject: "ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐκεῖ." LXX tries to stress the dominant role of the ark in this verse.

6:13. LXX changes the marching order, to the priests being in front of the warriors, contradicting its own order in vs. 9. This was probably the result of a scribal mistake (cf. Butler, 1983:66).

6:15. LXX omits כַּכֹּשֶׁפֶט הַזֶּה 'according to this procedure' and the reference to 'only' and 'compassing around the city seven times' to make a kind of summary of the verse.

6:17. LXX is emphatic about the divine name, translating לַיהוָה as Κυρίῳ σαβαώθ.

6:18. According to Tov (1997:86), פְּתִיחַת־רִמּוֹ of MT creates the impression of a contextually

inappropriate reading because of the threefold repetition. Furthermore, the meaning which is required here for **לְאַרְיִמֹנִים** is not paralleled elsewhere.

μῆποτε ἐνθυσμηθέντες, 'lest you covet' of the LXX undoubtedly reflects **פִּן־הַחַמְדִּי**, and this reading is preferable in the present context. The translator of LXX considered that the letters **ד** and **ר** were confused. However, the rendering of the LXX looks reasonable but it seems unnecessary to revise the MT text because it makes sense: *lest you make yourselves accursed*.

6:9. Tg added a long modifier to **אֹצֵר בֵּית מִקְדָּשָׁא דִּי: אֹצֵר**, 'the treasury of the house of the sanctuary of Yahweh.' The translator appears to have thought of the temple of Yahweh.

6:20. **וַיִּרְעוּ הָעָם**, 'the people shouted' is omitted in LXX, which has led Fritz (1994^b:67) to interpret this phrase as dittography. In fact, the expression looks a bit awkward as it is but the verse appears gradually to stress the moment of the shouting with added utterance in v. 20b: **וַיִּרְעוּ הָעָם וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ הַקּוֹל וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ הַקּוֹל וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ הַקּוֹל**. Noort (1996:273), rather, finds a chiasmatic structure in this verse: the shouting of the people (a): the blast of the signal horns (b); hearing of the sound of the signal horn (b'): the shouting of a battle-cry (a').

3.2.1.2.3. Explanation

The pericope recounting the downfall of the walls of Jericho can be outlined as follows: Yahweh's promise and instruction for victory over Jericho (2-5), Joshua's command (6-7, 10, 16-19), and the people's implementation of God's instruction (8-9, 11-15, 20-21). The conquest of the land of Canaan commences with the assault against Jericho -- the gateway by which they could enter the land. The text denotes that this should be read as a successive event to the previous history of redemption such as the crossing of the Jordan because the conjunction **ו** is combined to the first word of the verse: **וַיִּרְיֵחוּ**. Jericho is usually identified with *Tell es-Sultān*, in the western outskirts of the modern city of Jericho, but questions of identification of ancient sites continue to concern scholars (cf. Noort, 1998:164ff.). The site is strategically located, from which one has access to the heartland of Canaan. Interesting enough, Noort (1996:278f.) contends strongly that the Jericho recounted in Jos. 6 has nothing to do with Joshua's conquest: "Jericho was in de Late bronstijd groter dan Kenyon dacht, maar kwam niet boven en kleine

nederzetting in een deel van het vroegere stadsgebied uit. Daarmee blijft de welbekende these overeind: in de vertelde tijd was er geen Jericho, dat veroverd kon worden, en met de 'Landnahme' in historische zin heeft Jozua 6 niets te maken ... De val van de grote stad Jericho was niet militair, niet historisch, maar *topografisch* noodzakelijk. Men kon om Jericho lettelijk niet heen." His statement may stand solely under the assumption that the narrative grew and became more complex with the traits of liturgic form and the miracle story. The name, Jericho, probably indicates that this city was 'a city of the moon': יְרִיחוֹ appears to be derived from the term, יָרֵחַ, 'the moon' (HALAT, 418), Akk. *warḫu*, the moon (AHW, 1466). This pagan city is destined to be destroyed by the people of Yahweh. The double use of the participles סָגַר, 'shut up' in vs.1 in combination with vs. 1b, בָּא (come in), יָצָא (go out) is indicative of the absolute inaccessibility of the city; the active participle appears to have to do with 'go out' and the passive one with 'come in.' The parenthetical statement of the first verse, '*Jericho was tightly shut on account of the Israelites and there was none who went out or came in*' (Waltke & O'Connor, 1990:623), delineates the situation of the Israelites when they arrived at Jericho; it was apparently hopeless. According to Besters (1967:5-23), בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל mostly is used by the priestly tradition, Deuteronomist and post-priestly and post-Deuteronomistic redactors. Yet, this is not persuasive because the phrase, בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל appears approximately 630 times throughout the Old Testament (Kühlewein, 1971:320). The shut gate is a barrier to Israel's divinely ordained movement to take possession of the land (Hess, 1996:128). The king of Jericho chose to face down this desert people who had had no experience in storming a fortress, even if he had heard of the proclamation in the great deeds of the exodus, in the crossing of the Red Sea and of the Jordan, and in the military victories that had already happened. However Yahweh promised Joshua. He would overcome any hindrance with the typical formula of triumph over his enemies: "*I have given into your hand her king and the mighty warriors*" (2). This initiative is strengthened by the signal term, רָאָה, 'see.' בִּידְךָ נָתַתִּי, 'I have given into your hand' grammatically means, quite literally, (Let. § 72 b 3), that the victor has already won (cf. 2:8-11; 5:1). The victory formula, "*I have given into your hand,*" בִּידְךָ נָתַתִּי has the corresponding Akkadian expression, *ina qāti nadānu*, "give into the hand," which is used with reference to a god granting victory over enemies, as early as the Old Akkadian period (Moran, 1963:337). The notion of the phrase, בִּידְךָ נָתַתִּי, as an idiom prevailed among the ancient peoples in the Middle East. The locution, בִּידְךָ נָתַתִּי manifests,

from the first, that this conquest belongs to Yahweh but not to Israel; it is Yahweh's war. What Israel has to do is only to keep the covenantal relationship with obedience to divine instruction. The summarized divine direction tells that the main emphasis resides in God's initiative act in giving Jericho into Israel's hand, but much verbal explanation precedes and surrounds the act. According to Yahweh's instruction, they had to march around the city in the procession for seven days. Therefore, the instruction focuses upon a daily movement around Jericho, culminating in the seventh day. The signal horns are blown and the people raise a shout. This scene indicates Yahweh's leadership of a military expedition, but on the ground of the position of the ark Brouwer (nd:110) maintains that "de ark is in deze optocht niet meer het heilig teken van Gods leiderschap."

The priests carried the signal horns and armed men preceded the ark. A rear guard followed the ark perhaps to protect it. Recognizing the pivotal role of the ark in this event, Coats (1985:147) interprets this victorious occurrence from a cultic view: "Just as the ark marks the entry into the land as a symbol of God's presence with Joshua as the people cross the Jordan in cultic procession, so the ark marks the first major victory of God over the Canaanites in the land, an event effected by cultic procession." It is true that the description of the event defined by the divine instructions is not a description of military strategy, a plan that will permit Joshua to assault the city, to gain entry by breaching the walls with the machinery of war. However, it is difficult to say that the ritual, properly executed, effected the destruction of the walls of Jericho. A purely ritual ceremony would not require armed men in the cultic procession and the blast of the signal horns, which is used when people go to war (Num. 10:9) or to inform of a coming calamity (Am. 3:6), nor the shout which encourages military morale (1Sam. 4:5-6). Obviously, the ritual as such is hardly effective to raze the walls of Jericho. Rather, it is an act of faith (Heb. 11:30) as well as an act of Yahweh, which cause Jericho to fall. Fritz (1994^b:68f.) alludes that the verses (4acb.6.8.9.12.13.16a.20aß) concerning 'cultic procession' belong to a later redaction because he regards the narrative of Jericho's fall as "ein sorgfältig gebautes Stück." With respect to the effectiveness of the cultic, there is no need to think of the magical rites of circumambulation, rituals which, from a magical view, would effectively bring about the desired end; the biblical worldview stands opposed to that of magic and precludes magical manipulation, even if the popular mind of the Israelite may at times have shown traces of magical thinking (Woudstra, 1981:109). The procession of the Israelites disassociates the ritual

procession such as that recorded in the Babylonian New Year's festival, the *akitu*, accompanied by incantations of the king (*ANET*, 331-334) and the royal procession of the Hittite king followed by the heavily armed bodyguards: UGULA LIM (overseer of the Clanmen), ERIN.MES (provincial contingents), NIMGIR.ERIN.MES (herald of the troops) and heavy and golden spear men (Beal, 1992:528), which presents a purely political and military character.

In accordance with Joshua's command, a military contingent marches around the city once each day; the heavily armed go first (7, 9), followed by the priests with the horns on which they blow constantly (8), the ark and, finally, a rear guard. LXX translated verse 11 revolves around the ark as a whole: the ark is rendered as the subject of three different verbs: καὶ περιελθοῦ ἡ κιβωτὸς ... ἀπῆλθεν ... καὶ ἐκοιμήθη, 'and the ark went around ... entered ... lodged,' even though כִּבְוֹתַי should be read in the hif'il form: "he made the ark of Yahweh go round..." and the two verbs, הִלְכוּ, יָלְכוּ, form qal, imperfect-consecutive, 3rd person, masc., plural. Schwienhorst (1986:25) correctly observed that "'Lade' als Objekt zu *sbb* im Hif'il wird aber sonst immer mit Partikel 'aet' angeschlossen (1 Sam 5,8b.9.10; 1 Chr 13,3)." However he fails to seriously consider that this verb bears the double accusative; it looks unnecessary for each of two accusatives to receive *nota accusativi*, פִּנְסִי: Jotūn (JM, § 125 r N) classifies this sentence as one of various kinds of accusatives. Thus, the versions of LXX and Vg. (*circuivit ergo arca Domini*) tend to accentuate the ark's semi-independence of movement. In the sight of Jericho's inhabitants, this procession might possibly be shown as an eccentric behaviour, a strange strategy to attack the city. However, Israel should demonstrate the ark, the symbolic presence of Yahweh, to the people of Jericho; Yahweh, the God of Israel who had stopped the flow of the Jordan before the Israelites until they had crossed over, will fight instead of them. Day after day there is the same line of march, the same awe-inspiring sounding of the signal horns. In the midst of it all is Yahweh, invisibly present under the emblem of the ark.

The new beginning in vs. 12 and the description in vs. 13 are made clear by vs. 14 as the practice from the second to the sixth day: vs. 14 informs that the encirclement around the city took place once each day for six days. The launch - in the terse statement of vs. 15, with יָלְכוּ as a historical formula - underscores the new phase of divine action. At this point, special consideration should be given to the phrase, 'to get up at daybreak.' Regarding the expression, 'at daybreak' in Ps. 46:6f., Janowski (1989:184-191) explicates that the motive of Yahweh's

help *am Morgen* reminds that "Jahwe die gegen die Gottesstadt anstürmenden Feindvölker in einer dem kosmischen Chaoskampf analogen, anfänglichen Tag überwunden und in dieser Bewahrung der kosmischen Ordnung seine universale Schöpfermacht erwiesen"; he connects the motive with "die transzendente Herkunft des Kommens und Eingreifens Jahwes" in cultic and individual invocation. However, the Israelite petition for assistance to extricate themselves from adverse circumstances and God's help are not restricted to some designated times such as 'at daybreak' (Judg. 7:9-25; Ps. 22:3; 42:9; 77:3, 7; 78:14). The prayer at daybreak may be associated with the pattern of the daily life of the people; the Israelites start their daily work early in the morning. Although Yahweh's help *am Morgen* may signify His particular act in the poetic supplication, it is unknown whether the term, 'at daybreak' in vs. 15 has especially to do with Yahweh's marvellous intervention in the same way. It seems that the Israelites have to get up at daybreak on account of their seven-fold amplified responsibility: the seven circuits of the march around the city on the seventh day.

The number 'seven' of the seven days it took to defeat Jericho is symbolic of completeness, fulfillment, totality and perfection. It has fundamental significance in the time scheme of the created world (Gen. 1:1-2:3). The motive 'seven' in such Mesopotamian literature as the Epic of Gilgamesh (*ANET*, 77, 94f.), in which seven is a key organizing principle, probably originated from an event which coincided with the biblical report on the six-day creation and rest on the seventh day. The fact that Yahweh's direction is linked with the number 'seven' appears to insinuate a triumph of completion over Jericho. It is issued from Yahweh's initiative rather than from the priestly tradition which regards God's creation as a key of Israelite religion (cf. Coats, 1985:148f.). It becomes an integrating and unifying theme between creation, history and worship, as a result of development to an extraordinary degree in the process of progression of revelational history (cf. Jenson, 1997:35). At the end of the seventh encirclement around the city the blast of the signal horns occurs and the people raise a shout of triumph founded on divine promise (16): כִּי־נָתַן יְהוָה לָכֶם אֶת־הָעִיר. At the sound of the signal horns, the people broke into shouting (20a). *And the wall collapsed; so the people stormed the city right from where they were and took it* (20b). The core of the event is to be found in vs. 20: וַתִּפֹּל הַחֹמָה פְּתָחָהּ. At the cry of the people the walls fell flat, not outward or inward, but downward; the city collapsed. This is the moment when the divine promise of Jericho was fulfilled (vs. 5): "By faith the walls of Jericho fell, after the people had marched around

them for seven days" (Heb. 11:30). And yet it sounds strange that Coats (1985:149) mentions 'the power of the ritual' and 'the gift of the ritual' as the cause of the successful conquest over Jericho.

3.2.1.2.4. Summary

The pericope concerning the downfall of the walls of Jericho undergirds the primary role of the ark as the prominent symbol of Yahweh's presence. Simultaneously, it shows that Joshua listened to the instruction of Yahweh, carried out the divine command, received the promised land, and experienced the presence of Yahweh. The ark substantially functioned as an emblematic instrument with which Yahweh fulfilled the promise to the patriarchs through the conquest over Jericho. The ark made the Israelites experience the very real presence of Yahweh. Yet the ark as such, did not affect the victorious event directly or indirectly, although it is true that scholars have often placed the ark within the orbit of semi-magical operations (cf. Dus, 1960:107-134). The divine direction was carried out by the obedience of the people before the invisible presence of Yahweh; the designation, 'the ark of the covenant,' seems to demand such observance. It turns out that the glorious victory belongs to Yahweh but not to Israel's military. Yahweh's triumph over the city through the ark discloses a new aspect of his redemption in the historical progression of Israel and coincidentally one aspect of his attribute which is omnipotence. Through this victory over Jericho and the upcoming victories over the people of Canaan, God displayed his continual guidance over the people.

3.2.1.3. The ark near Shechem (Jos. 8:33)

3.2.1.3.1. Exegetical explanation

This passage recounts how Joshua built an altar to Yahweh on Mount Ebal, according to the instruction of Moses preserved in the Book of the Law of Moses. Furthermore, the passage depicts the main event of worship: burnt offerings and sacrificed peace offerings placed on the altar. Here Joshua inscribed a copy of the law of Moses on stones in the presence of the Israelites. The text (33) shows the ark as a significant part of the worship ceremony, presided over by the Levites, in accordance with the command of Moses. Carried by the priests, the ark of the covenant of Yahweh was located between Ebal and Gerizim. With its position settled, Joshua read all the words of the law, the blessings and the curses, in the midst of the whole assembly of Israel, including the women and children, and the aliens who lived among them (34f.). Joshua's actions concerning the construction of the altar and the offerings followed precisely the Mosaic introduction (Deut. 27:1-8). Yet the stones on which a copy of the law was written were probably not the stones of the altar, the large white-washed stela prescribed in Deut. 27:1-7. The article in **עַל־דְּבָרֵינוּ** need not mean a peculiar thing like the altar because in Hebrew the employment of the article denotes a single person or thing as being present to the mind under given circumstances (GK, § 126 q). Thus presumably we would have to assume that he set up a second set of stones.

Verse 33 describes how the ark forms the center of the following ceremony, the law's blessings and curses. It is remarkable that while the movement of the ark comes from the command of Joshua it is observed according to the law of Moses. This does not imply that Moses still has some personal influence over Israel but that Yahweh's law should be kept from generation to generation (Deut. 6:2).

Although all Israelites were likely gather around the ark, the representatives of the people, -- such as their elders (**זְקֵנָיו**), officials (**שֹׁטְרֵיהֶם**) and judges (**שֹׁפְטֵיהֶם**) -- seem to be underlined in the ceremony. The ark was surrounded on all sides by Yahweh's own people, both aliens and native-born (note: these aliens were probably a mixed multitude, **רַב עַרְב** (Ex. 12:38)). The presence of aliens in the ceremony was assumed and commanded (Deut. 16:11, 14), based on Yahweh's love for them; the law of Deuteronomy viewed such aliens as economically

underprivileged and provided special means of support for them (14:29; 16:11, 14; 24:17; 19-21; 26:12-13; 27:19). Special protection (1:16; 5:14; 24:17; 27:19) and even privilege (14:21; cf 17:15) were granted to them. No class of the Israelites was exempted from the worship service. They were divided so as to stand on both sides of the ark of the covenant of Yahweh. Facing the priestly Levites, half of them stood *in front of* Mount Gerizim while the other half stood *in front of* Mount Ebal in seemingly a little altered stand from what Moses had commanded: עֲלֵי גֵרִיזִים instead of עֲלֵי אֵבֶל or אֵבֶל (Deut. 27:12f.). It may be that they were indeed on top of the two mountains and that those on Mount Gerizim were considered those to be *in front of* Mount Ebal and vice versa (Houward, 1998:217). The ark presumably appears to be positioned in Shechem or its vicinity because ancient Shechem, as 'the navel of the land,' was located between two high mountains Ebal and Gerizim (cf. Wright, 1985:43). This can be assumed even though the name of Shechem is not mentioned in this text.

Incidentally, it is striking that Shechem is nowhere mentioned as having been attacked by the Israelites, leaving open the possibility that it may have been occupied peacefully or even joined Israel in alliance. Hereof, Bright (1991:139) plausibly holds that the city lords capitulated to Israel, by fearing that `Apiru such as slaves, abused peasants and ill-paid mercenaries ran away to join the Hebrews: "Sometimes whole areas went over to them. We have seen how they succeeded in gaining control of a considerable domain centred upon Shechem." However, the assertion of proprietary rights to the district of Shechem which Jacob purchased (Gen. 33:19) may not be precluded when they took possession of this terrain. In conjunction with this location Noth (1954:86, 91) asserts that the shrine near Shechem was the center of a cultic amphictyony patterned after that of Greece: "Aus alledem ergibt sich, daß das Heiligtum bei Sichem wahrscheinlich einmal der amphiktyonische Mittelpunkt des israelitischen Stämmverbandes gewesen ist." However his theory was challenged by many scholars including Wright (1969:128f.), Anderson (1970:148), Herrmann (1980:146), Gottwald (1979:356f.), Bock (1998:40-42). In particular Herrmann (1980:146) states that "Die These von der Amphiktyonie hat, wie sich sogleich zeigen wird, nur einen Schein des Rechts." With the result that he failed rightly to consider the uniqueness of the revelational religion of Israel, he is completely sceptical of biblical history concerning tribal organization of Israel in the wilderness, and the entrance into the land of Canaan, and its occupation (cf. 2.2).

According to the command of Moses (Deut. 27:9, 14), the Levites (or the Levitical priests)

had to proclaim both blessing and curse in front of the assembly of Israel. Yet the context necessitates that Joshua be seen as the subject of the sentence (34), even if the reading of the law leaves the subject of the verb (שָׁמַע) ambiguous. Joshua is inserted as the subject in LXX: ἀνέγνω Ἰησοῦς. Here Joshua functions as a Levite and a worthy successor to Moses. It remains obscure if it is abuse of his authority or not. Any how this is the first public reading of the law mentioned after Moses's death. The passage does not specify the range of all the words of the law -- the blessing and cursing Joshua inscribed and read. Yet this law probably refers to the content of Deut. 27:15-26 on account of a close correlation between the altar commandment in Deuteronomy 27 and the description of the building of the altar in Joshua 8. It goes beyond our concern to verify whether or not the ceremony in Jos. 8:33-35 is the original one as Na'aman (2000:154) contends at the standpoint of source criticism. In any event it may have to be comprehended in the light of Deuteronomic passages because it is natural that the injunction precedes the performance in historical progress. It is apparent that the blessing and the curse Joshua proclaimed are related to the content of Deut. 27:15-26. Most of this which consists of twelve parts, correspond to the Decalogue in some way (the prohibition of images: 1st, 2nd; despising parents: 5th; moving neighbor's boundary stone: 8th; withholding justice: 9th; improper sexuality: 7th; murdering neighbor: 6th). Even though the law contains only curse, the law contains the positive idea also, blessing, by highlighting the degree of obedience; this is not a list of curse in the strict sense but a list of statutes whose violation brings a curse (cf. Merrill, 1994:346). Hence presumably all the words of the law -- the blessing and cursing Joshua read in front of the people -- appear to be associated with the fundamental law centered on the Decalogue rather than the whole legal corpus. This ceremony of the reading of the law for the entire assembly (קָהָל) of Israel newly underscores the significance of covenantal loyalty to Yahweh who faithfully led them to the promised land. That is to say, the covenant renewal takes place when Israel has entered the middle area of the land (cf. Deut. 27:2). The covenant unilaterally commences from God's side on the basis of his redemptive grace but thereafter the covenantal relationship is maintained in a mutual commitment (cf. Straus, 1995:25ff.). On the side of the people, steadfast love is the typical quality of the covenantal relationship, a quality of God and what is required of his covenant partners. The balance between God's initiative and Israel's required response is illustrated by its varied use of the term בְּרִית, sometimes in parallel with the idea of an oath (Deut. 4:31), and sometimes with that of a command or law

(cf. McConville, 1997:749f.). The oath is a form of a conditional self-cursing; the breach of the covenant is directly connected with the curse. Thus, blessing and cursing are the two poles around which the history of the covenant revolves (Deut. 11:26; 30:1).

ברך appears usually in the pi`el form in the Old Testament (233 times), while the qal form of the verb is used in the passive form only 71 times. This presents a blessed status; it has a factitive form to get an objective (cf. Jenni, 1968:216f.). The blessing basically signifies power; it is associated with the ability to meet all the desires of the human condition, including the enjoyment and improvement of life, harvest, achievement and the prosperity of descendants (cf. Mowinckel, 1953:64f.). For instance, the promise of God's blessing to the patriarchs consists of property and wealth (Gen. 24:35; 26:12), descendants (Gen. 28:3), and land (Gen. 35:12) and Deuteronomic blessing mentions prosperity, abundance, fertility, health and victory (Deut. 7:12-16). In a word, the blessing is something good, something fundamentally required for happiness. In this context, the blessing is connected with life on land received as a gift of Yahweh while the curse provokes Israelites' attention to abrogation of the covenantal relationship.

3.2.1.3.2. Summary

The ark of the covenant is positioned at the center of the ceremony of the covenantal renewal near Shechem. This positioning signifies that Yahweh, who is symbolically present by or at the ark, led Israel to the land of Canaan. The ark seems to lead her to this destination, as if it is synonymous with Yahweh. The ark as an emblem of Yahweh's invisible presence in the ceremony functions as a reaffirmation that Yahweh is with his people and requires their observance to his law to maintain the covenantal relationship: his unleashed blessing is conditioned by absolute loyalty to the covenant. Yahweh with the ark displays his another attribute, faithfulness to his promise, and unfolds a new epoch of redemptive history in the promised land.

3.2.2. The ark in the first book of Samuel

3.2.2.1. Canonical status

From a historico-literary perspective, Wellhausen (1899:169f.) holds that this book and Kings were edited in the Babylonian Exile. For him the books of Samuel are characterized by a 'Deuteronomic' revision similar to that of Judges, and 1 and 2 Kings. The ideas found in these books are associated with those of Deuteronomy and could have been formulated during the Babylonian Exile. Wellhausen's view on the criticism of the Pentateuch was developed by his successors; they saw the line of sources continue as far back as the historical books. For instance, Budde (1890:167ff.; 1902:30, 226f.) assigns "Die Geschichte der Lade" (1 Sam. 4:1-7:1) to JE and its redaction to P and simultaneously he indicates J and E of the 'Hexateuch' as lines of a continuing story in his discussion of 2 Samuel 6. He states that it is also possible that J is a unique source of this chapter. The Massoratic text uses two names of God: אֱלֹהִים in vv. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12 and יהוה in vv. 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21. Budde argues that above all יהוה is original because of אֱלֹהִים אֲרֹן should be added afterwards. He ascribes the final redaction to a 'Deuteronomic editor'. Driver (1913a:136-138) ascribes the texts concerning the ark in the books of Samuel to JE because the ark was sent for and taken into battle (1 Sam. 4) and because the liturgical institutions (2 Sam. 6:13, 17, 18) are written in a simpler form than that of D and P. Eissfeldt (1976:373), considering L (Laienquelle) as the older source next to J and E, maintains that the story of the ark must have originated from the mouth of the people and thus belongs to L: "So muß die, jetzt den verschiedenen Zeitpunkten des Erzählten entsprechend, in zwei Teile auseinandergerissene L-Erzählung von den Geschicken der Lade (I 4-6 und II 6) dem Autor von L als eine zusammenhängende Größe vorlegen haben." Oesterley and Robinson (1946:90) doubt the correctness of Eissfeldt's analyzing three sources. Pfeiffer (1966:363ff.) again singles out a very different possibility, especially the mixed sources of the early and the later one, by considering the books of Samuel as the result of successive additions: "In the early source, as in actual life, good and evil are inextricably mixed in human character; Saul and David pass alternatively from the noblest to the basest deeds. In the late source, as in the Psalms, there are but two classes of men, saints and sinners, saved and damned."

As mentioned in the previous chapter (2.1), the documentary hypothesis remains in all respects an assumption. Sources such as J, E and L are purely presupposed apart from the unity of the books.

The other view on the books of Samuel is suggested by the *Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Kritik*, which appeared in the critical camp around a half century after Wellhausen (cf. 2.2). The books are regarded as products composed by some cycles of narratives a redactor collected; the Deuteronomistic final-redactor could take over the whole but he did not have to alter it (cf. Harrison, 1985:699). Gressmann (1991:17) developed a theory about the origin of the divergent cycles: "We must interpret the individual narratives by themselves, as Gunkel's *gattungsgeschichtlichen* method had established for Genesis." Refining the main lines of Wellhausen's theory of a pro- and an anti-monarchial source, Noth (1957) underpins the role of the Deuteronomist, According to Noth, he was not simply a compiler, but was also an author who composed a new literary entity out of older traditions. At the same time, he attributes a decisive function of a Deuteronomistic hand in the chapters treating the rise of the monarchy. However, from the other perspective, Weiser (1961:164) has entirely refused the hand of the 'Deuteronomist' and sees the polarity set up by Wellhausen as misleading. He has argued for a variety of originally separate elements of local tradition, each of which had a different concern and function: "The author of the whole must be sought at the court amongst David's intimates." Rost (1926) identified a pre-canonical *Ladeerzählung* and *Thronnachfolgegeschichte* (Michal's episode) as the major subunits of Samuel. This literature is given as evidence of the religious and political life of Israel. Rost (1926:8, 46) crystallized the theory that 1 Sam. 4:1b-7:1 and 2 Sam. 6 were originally part of a large document, an independent *Ladeerzählung* (1 Sam. 4:1b-18a, 19-21; 5:1-11ba, 12; 6:1-3ba, 4, 10-14, 16, 19-7:1; 2 Sam. 6:1-15, 17-20a) which was the *hieros logos*, 'cult myth,' for the Jerusalem temple in which the ark was ultimately housed. According to him (1926:38), this composition rose from a member of the priesthood living in Jerusalem during the reign of either David or Solomon. The narrative of the previous history of the ark was intended to edify festival pilgrims visiting Jerusalem: "Die Erzählung diente dem Zweck, den Besuchern des Heiligtums, besonders wohl den Festpilgern, die Bedeutung der Lade darzulegen, was am besten geschehen konnte durch die Erzählung ihrer wunderbaren Schicksale" (Rost, 1926:151).

Rost inclusively affected many scholars in this field: "Die größte Wirkung auf die vergangenen Jahrzehnte hat zweifelsohne die Arbeit von L. Rost ausgeübt" (Schickberger, 1973:25). Among those who consider both two sections (1 Sam. 4:1b-7:1; 2 Sam. 6) as a unity are Seeber (1956:14ff.), Noth (1957:54f., 64), Herzberg (1965:47f.), Schreiner (1963:52ff.), Schmitt (1972:142ff.), Campbell (1975:201), Stolz (1981:40) and Niehr (1998:214). Accepting Rost's delimitation of the source boundaries linked with the 'ark narrative,' Campbell (1975:126-143, 167-174, 201) regarded the narrative of 2 Samuel 6 as the closing or conclusion of the 'ark narrative': "If 1 Sam 4 marks the end of an epoch, 2 Sam 6 marks a new beginning, the resumption of Yahweh's relationship with Israel." However, he (1975:202) takes another stand on the aim of the narrative; it has nothing to do with a *hieros logos* destined for curious pilgrims. Rather, it marks the end of the pre-Davidic epoch in Israel's history as YHWH's doing and it indicates that YHWH looks favourably upon the new political situation, to wit -- the Davidic dynasty in Jerusalem.

Contrary to such a tendency, Schicklberger (1973:129ff.) rejects the unity of the two narratives and even the term 'ark narrative.' Instead, he posits that the entire story should be designated as the "Katastrophenerzählung." According to him, an 11th century B.C. narrative was expanded to a "Ladeerzählung," but only after the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C.; this version was later inserted, with some modifications, into the Deuteronomistic History. Schicklberger (1973:235) contends that Rost's thesis "ist nicht mehr aufrecht zu halten." The main reasons why Schicklberger (1973:129ff.) and Miller & Roberts (1977:23ff.) reject the texts of 1 Sam. 4-6 and 2 Sam. 6 as a larger documentary are as follows: 1) 2 Sam. 6 is not as legendary as 1 Sam. 4-6; 2) David plays a central part in 2 Sam. 6; 3) the terminology and style of both parts differ from each other; 4) 1 Sam. 7:1f. and 2 Sam. 1f. hardly match each other; 5) it is not plausible that a uniform script was divided into the two parts and turned into the present text, 6) 2 Sam. 6:6ff. is not less miraculous than 1 Sam. 5f.; 7) the 'ark narrative' aims at the tradition of the ark carried to Jerusalem; David can naturally come up first in the last section, 8) the changing names of the priests denotes a time distance from 1 Sam. 7:2. They suppose that 2 Sam. 6 can be recognized as a sort of separate text with an explanation of ceremonies which convey the introduction of national gods in a new royal city. McCarter (1984:183) says that the king in this text plays a more important role than the ark, just as in 1 Sam. 4-6, by comparing the narrative with varied literature out of the Near East, whereas Campbell (1979:33) persists in

stressing that 2 Sam. 6 is the conclusion of the 'ark-narrative' while he reacts to the thesis of Schicklberger and Miller & Roberts. With an extended conception on the narrative, Davies (1977:10f.) interposes an objection to the delimitation of the 'ark narrative' by making its beginning 1 Sam. 4: "it is difficult to deny that both the ark and the sons of Eli belong to the original narrative. But if ch. 4 is to be included within the ark-saga, chs. 1-3 must also be added." Despite the pros and cons concerning the extension and interdependence of the 'ark narrative,' it is evaluated that the conjecture that the texts of 1 Sam. 4-6 and 2 Sam. 6 should be called the 'ark narrative' and the argument that undergirds a connection between the two sections is apparently overwhelming, as mentioned above.

Notwithstanding, it appears insubstantial to determine and to single out what relationship the two texts have and which document 2 Sam. 6 originally belonged to. The text does not have to be removed from its connection to the contexts in the present texts of the books of Samuel nor need it be placed in a different setting. Noth (1957:137) believes that the *Vorlage* of this narrative can be found in the 'Gibeon-tradition'. Campbell (1975:221), as Rost does, contends that it originated from the circle of the temple of priests in Jerusalem before the introduction of the ark in the temple of Solomon. From an identical angle, Soggin (1989:214) suggests that the aim of the 'ark narrative' is simply to show how the ark reached Jerusalem under David, having been captured a number of decades earlier by the Philistines: "JHWH wechselt seinen Wohnsitz und zieht von Schilo nach Jerusalem, dem (späteren) zentralen Heiligtum" (cf. Schroer, 1992:48). Even this theory matches the recent tendency of research into the Old Testament which is interested in 'narrative criticism' but not in historicity (cf. 2.3.4.). Von Rad (cf. 1966:120, 135ff; 1975:380ff.), who distinguishes between two kinds of historical documents, -- one is to pass the test of modern historical-criticism and the other is to project the Israelite's vision on history -- regards the historical narrative as the theological interpretation of the history. This is a typical *gattungsgeschichtlichen- and überlieferungsgeschichtlichen* notion (2.2).

The present form of the text need not be torn on the basis of the hypothesis that the texts would become a complex of a variety of narratives. The attempt to seek the original form of the document and to reconstruct it in the name of the 'Narrative' will probably result in something hazardous; the text might be separated from its historical context.

Although the narrative related to the ark (1 Sam. 4:1-7:1; 2 Sam. 6) appears to have its own

style, theme, bias and lexicographical peculiarities apart from the unity of its surroundings, the text itself betrays a historical continuation in which Yahweh operates for the future redemption of his people. The narrative of 1 Sam. 4-6, to some extent, focuses on the retribution for the sins of the Elide house by containing the nexus of sin and judgment. The installation of the ark in 2 Sam. 6 is tightly affiliated with the history of David's new reign after his enthronement. Thus, it appears irrelevant to circumscribe this section of the book of Samuel as a precanonical body with the title 'ark narrative.' Smelik's (1992:43) conclusion that a separate self-contained 'ark narrative' never existed should be consulted once more: "there are no compelling reasons to assume the pre-existence of an ark narrative before the composition of the Book of Samuel."

3.2.2.2. The text of 1 Sam. 4:1b-7:1

The books of Samuel have caused scholars of the Old Testament a lot of brain-racking in relation to the context because it is apparent that the extant Hebrew texts of the books are corrupt in a great many places. According to one perspective, LXX is important to reconstruct the texts, for this version would be based on a better text-form than MT (cf. Harrison, 1985:41, 42). Regardless, the MT should be the starting point in all respects. The text criticism is restricted to the words which offer varied versions and which need to be grammatically exposed.

4:1. LXX appears to have restored what MT lost: "Καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραισ ἐκεῖναις, καὶ συναθροίζονται ἀλλόφυλοι ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς πόλεμον." VL follows LXX: "ET factum eat in diebus illis. convenerunt Philistijm in pugnam" (cf. McCarter, 1980:102f.) because the narrative begins abruptly with the war situation. LXX informs us of the new fact that the Philistines initiated the hostilities. However, it is difficult to accept it as a genuine restoration. Important ancient versions, (Tg, Syr and Vg) except VL which is based on LXX, agree with MT. פְּלִשְׁתִּים 'the Philistines' is translated as οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι 'the foreigners' in LXX. This name seems to reflect a Jewish view on the ethnic, as Ἕλλημι is translated as 'the Gentile' in the Christian view (cf. Rom. 1:14, NIV).

הָאֶבֶן הַזֶּה 'the stone,' 'the help' were written in *nomen rectum*, which is different from the

pronoun, Ebenezer, אֶבְנֵי הָעֵזֶר (5:1; 7:12). אֶבְנֵי הָעֵזֶר is to be considered grammatically as apposition (cf. GK, § 127 h; Kön., § 303 cg) but the context appears to necessitate comprehending it as genitive connection.

4:2. ἔκλινεν in LXX seems to reflect נָטָה 'to incline' but such a usage is without parallel. Klein (1983:37) recommends to correct the verb וַתִּטֵּשׁ as וַתִּקַּשׁ 'smite' according to 2 Sam. 2:17, which reflects its usual trait (Caquot & Robert, 1994:74). Stoebe (1973:128f.) renders it as "ging hin und her," by understanding וַתִּטֵּשׁ as an Aramaizing imperfect form וַתִּשׂ. However, it appears acceptable that McCarter (1980:103) retains the consonantal text, but reprints it as a qal passive, וַתִּטֵּשׁ : "and the battle was deployed" (Judg. 15:9; 2 Sam. 5:18, 22).

4:3. LXX lacks אֵלֵינוּ 'to ourselves.' LXX reads אֶת־אָרוֹן בְּרִית יְהוָה 'the ark of Yahweh's covenant' as τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν 'the ark of our God.' The translator of LXX possibly read אֵלֵינוּ as אֱלֹהֵינוּ by virtue of its displacement after יְהוָה.

4:4. אֶת־אָרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת is simply rendered as τὴν κιβωτὸν κυρίου in LXX^B, + τῶν δυναμεῶν in LXX^A, + τῆς διαθηκῆς in LXX^L. These varied renderings of the LXX versions expose an aspect of the Hellenistic character of the LXX: "Besonders bedeutsam ist die Entschränkung der Gottesvorstellung, die darin liegt, daß man durchweg den Gottesnamen יְהוָה mit κύριος wiedergab: «Die Bibel, deren Gott Jahweh heißt, ist die Bibel eines Volkes; die Bibel, deren Gott κύριος heißt, ist die Weltbibel»" ... "in der LXX, die ja im Gegensatz zum hebräischen Urtext immer missionarisch, propagandistisch und apologetisch orientiert ist" (Würthwein, 1988:80). Klein (1983:37) conjectures that the source of the word "hosts" may be 2 Sam. 6:2 = 1 Chr. 13:6. However, the term was for the first time used already in 1 Sam. 3:3.

4:6. LXX missed the word קָוֶל; both times it occurs in MT. LXX shows the nature of simplification, while Tg, Syr, VL and Vg back MT.

4:7. אֱלֹהֵי is to substitute for אֱלֹהֵי because of the reference by the Philistines to the Israelite 'gods': the Philistines as polytheists assumed that more than one god must have assisted the Israelites. The verb in LXX is in accord with the subject: οἱ θεοὶ ἤκασιν πρὸς εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, 'the gods have come from them to the camp.'

4:8. בְּמִדְבָּר 'in the wilderness' is contrary to biblical history (Ex. 7:20-12:30), so that many scholars prefer to amend it as וּבַדְבָּר or וּבְמִדְבָּר 'and with pestilence' (Wellhausen, 1871:55; Driver, 1913^a:47; Boer, 1938:83; Dahood, 1964:401f.; McCarter, 1980:104; Klein,

1983:38). However, it is not necessary to believe that the Philistines had precise information on Israel, since they disclose themselves as typical pagans by referring to the ark as the Israelite gods and by confusing the plagues in Egypt, which happened before the Exodus, with the sojourn of Israel in the wilderness (cf. Smelik, 1992:46).

4:9. Payne (1949:223) misunderstood the text of LXX: "The Hebrew is of course repetitive but the Greek removes not only the reported clause 'and be men' but also the idea that the Hebrew were, or had been, servants of the Philistines. The translator evidently was not inclined to concede such service" because LXX translated the text of MT as a whole, except changing לְכֹמֶם into ἡμίην.

4:10. פְּלִשְׁתִּים which occurs in MT and 4QSam^a is omitted in LXX. In relation to רַגְלֵי, Stoebe's (1973:131) assumption that "LXX ταγμάτων scheint רַגְלֵי zu lesen" is unfounded because רַגְלֵי implies 'infantries' in the military sense (HALAT, 1107).

4:13. LXX lacks יָשָׁב 'sitting.' יָדָהּ מְצַפֶּה [Q^rē: יָד] 'by the side of the road, watching' is translated as παρὰ τὴν πύλην σκοπεύων τὴν ὁδόν 'by the gate, watching the road' in LXX which is conflated. Boer (1938:83) suggests that יָדָהּ should be read as כְּדַרְךָ 'in the manner of' compared with Gen. XIX 31: "in his chair, as it were, on the look-out." Althann (1984:30) reads יָדָהּ as יָדָהּ 'how': "how he was watching the road," by rejecting Q^rē: יָד. McCarter (1980:114) emends the phrase as יָד הַשַּׁעַר or עַל 'atop the gate' in accord with vs. 18. In fact, the position of the chair can be expressed differently according to the viewpoint of description. מְצַפֶּה in question can be rendered 'expecting' or 'expectantly,' which does not matter whether he is blind or not: "by the side of road, expecting."
4:15. Eli's age, תִּשְׁעִים וְשָׁמֹנֶה is modified as ἐνενήκοντα 'ninety' in LXX and + οκτω 'eight' in LXX^{OL}.

The form קָמָה as subject of עֵינָיו 'his eyes' is exceptionally employed instead of קָמוּ (Barr, 1968:30f.) but עֵינָיו as collective is frequently construed with the feminine singular of the verbal predicate (GK, § 145 k).

4:16. מִן־הַמַּעַרְבָּה is 'I have just come from the battle line' (GK, § 126 k).

4:18. LXX read הַזְכִּירוּ as qal, ἐμνήσθη instead of hiph'il. LXX reduced אַרְבַּעִים 'forty' into εἴκοσι 'twenty.' Noth (1957:65) prefers to choose LXX, for he regards the number 40 as a tradition that reflects Deuteronomistic redaction. Yet, his choice would be valid, if his presupposition about the tradition is accepted.

4:19. לָלַךְ as gal, infinitive construct of should be understood as לָלַךְ because this form is derived from the assimilation of ל to ל (GK, § 69 m).

4:20. $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקּוֹל אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא אֶת הַיָּם וְיִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַקּוֹל אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא אֶת הַיָּם$ the predicate, after a time-determination, being introduced by וְ , as happens occasionally (Driver, 1913:49). LXX: $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\iota\omicron\upsilon\theta\eta\nu\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota$ 'at the time of her death.'

4:21. וְיָלַד בָּבֶלֶת is rendered as $\text{o}\upsilon\alpha$ בִּבְלֶת in LXX: the first term $\text{o}\upsilon\alpha$ reflects 'alas' in Hebrew and the second one בִּבְלֶת shows double translation: $\text{bap}\upsilon\varsigma$ 'glory' + transcription of the Hebrew word בְּבֵלֶת 'glory.' McCarter (1980:114f.) follows Ugaritic 'y, 'where is?' or 'alas' and the LXX: "Where is (the) Glory?" or "Alas (for the) Glory!" According to biblical Hebrew בֵּל as negation is often uncertain (Stoebe, 1973:135). Yet, MT itself unravels the matter of the understanding of בְּבֵלֶת : בְּבֵלֶת 'the glory has departed.'

LXX has a truncated form of two repeated phrases, וְיָלַד בָּבֶלֶת (21, 22): $\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\nu$ $\text{Απόκλιται δόξα Ισραήλ}$ 'glory left from Israel.' This text which had been overloaded early on the introduction of the mention of the ark and the father-in-law and husband of Phineas' wife from a previous verse "corrected" by LXX in order to avoid the repetition. However, no correction of MT according to LXX is necessary here (Pisano, 1984:77f.).

5:2. וְיָלַד בָּבֶלֶת is replaced as $\text{τὴν κιβωτὸν κυρίου}$ 'the ark of the LORD' in LXX. Tg follows LXX, while Syr, VL and Vg agrees with MT. It looks like just variation.

5:3. LXX added $\text{καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς οἶκον Δαγῶν καὶ εἶδον}$, 'and they came to the temple of Dagon and looked,' to paraphrase the situation.

וְיָלַד בָּבֶלֶת does not make sense literally, 'Dagon having fallen before him.' It is to be conceived as 'Dagon has fallen on his face' in content, in correcting וְיָלַד such as LXX, Tg and Syr (cf. Stoebe, 1973:139).

At the end of v. 3, LXX^B adds a long passage almost equivalent to the reading of MT in v. 6: $\text{καὶ ἐβάρυνθη χεῖρ κυρίου ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀγγυτίους καὶ ἐβασάνισεν οὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπῆραξεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὰς ἔσπας αὐτῶν, τὴν Ἀγγυτίου καὶ τὰ ὄια αὐτῆς}$. It is out of place at this point.

5:4. LXX lacks τὴν ἐπαύριον 'on the morrow' corresponding to וְיָלַד בָּבֶלֶת after πρωὴ 'early.'

וְיָלַד בָּבֶלֶת and two palms hands' is expanded by putting division between τὰ ἰχθυη χεῖρῶν αὐτοῦ 'two palms of his hands' and $\text{οἱ καρποὶ τῶν χεῖρῶν αὐτοῦ}$ 'the wrists of his hands,' in LXX. There is little or no difference.

רַק דָּגוֹן is to be corrected as גֵּן דָּגוֹן 'only the torso of Dagon', considering LXX: ἡ ῥάχις and Vg: *truncus*. Cf. French translation of LXX: "Seul le tronc de Dagôn avait réchappé" 'Only the torso of Dagon had escaped' (Grillet & Lestienne, 1997:172).

5:5. LXX adds ὅτι ὑπερβαίνοντες ὑπερβαίνουσιν, 'because they cross it over by traversing it.' It seems to be added for an attempt to clarify the situation of the custom.

5:6. K^etib בְּעַפְלִים generally means 'with tumors' (McCarter, 1980:123) or 'with buboes' (HALAT, 814) which in any case can cause a serious ailment (cf. Arab. *`afalun*), while Q^ere בְּצִחְרִים signifies 'with swellings' (HALAT, 358) or 'with hemorrhoids' (Klein, 1983:47). See Bergen's commentary (1996:98) for various opinions on this. Instead of any of these words, LXX concretely construes it with a long passage: ἐπήγαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐξεξεσεν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὰς ναῦς, καὶ μέσον τῆς ξώρας αὐτῆς ἀνεφύησαν μύες, καὶ ἐγένετο σύγχυσις θανάτου μεγάλη ἐν τῇ πόλει, 'it brought up against them mice who swarmed in their ship and came up into the midst of their land. There was a great panic in the city - a deadly one.' The supplement of LXX looks reasonable, which parallels with the content of 6:4: "Five gold tumors and five gold rats" if those are offered as causes of the disaster which happened to them.

5:7. וְאִמְרָן as perfect-copulative in place of the imperfect-consecutive often appears. It is possibly a dialectical character in the book of Samuel (Hertzberg, 1965:38). Yet, such a stylistic nature provides no foundation for amendment of the text.

5:8. LXX and Vg take אֶל for the subject rather than the accusative, which is adopted by McCarter (1980:123): λέγουσιν οἱ Γεθθαῖοι Μετελθέτω κιβωτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς "The Gathites say, 'The ark of God was displaced to us.'"

אֶל would better be changed to אֶל־גַּת 'to Gath' with locative ending (Let, § 25 f).

5:9. אֶת־הַסִּבּוֹן between which אֶת־הַשִּׁשִּׁי is expected to come shows an unusual construction: it should be used to introduce temporal clauses with אֶת־הַשִּׁשִּׁי or כִּי (GK, § 164 d; Broc, § 145 bη). Ulrich (1978:95) suggests that the original reading was סִבּוֹן אֶת־הַשִּׁשִּׁי on the basis of 4QSam^a and LXX. Tov (1997:153) proposes this phrase of LXX^L as an example that the Lucianic text in Samuel often agrees with variants in 4QSam^a.

5:10. עֲקֵרוֹן is altered as Ἀσκαλῶνα 'Ashkelon' in LXX. It may be a scribal mistake since major ancient versions such as 4QSam^a, Tg, Syr, VL and Vg agree with MT. The text of 4QSam^a can easily be reconstructed: עֲקֵרוֹן] (cf. Ulrich, 1978:122).

5:11. 4QSam^a adds יהוה 'of Yahweh' to מְהוֹמָת instead of מוֹת. מְהוֹמָת is often used as nomen regens of גדלה (Deut. 7:23; 1Sam. 5:9; 14:20) or רבות (Am. 3:9; 2Chr. 15:5). 4QSam^a appears to be affected by Zechariah 14:13: מְהוֹמָת־יְהוָה. Quran Codex shows another instance in which the term is modified by deity: מְהוֹמָת אל (1QM 4:7). NIV is a bit clumsy: "For death had filled the city with panic" because מוֹת is masculine.

כְּבָרָה מֵאֵד יְד הָאֱלֹהִים שָׁם is replaced by ὡς εἰσῆλθεν κιβωτὸς θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ ἐκεῖ 'when the ark of God of Israel entered there.' Tg, Syr, VL and Vg agree with MT. Tg changed יְד הָאֱלֹהִים with מַחַת דִּי, 'the stroke of Yahweh.'

5:12. LXX, καὶ οἱ ζῶντες explicates a reflection of אֲנָשִׁים (cf. Boer, 1938:55).

6:1. Tg taking בְּקָרְוֵי for שָׂדֵה here usually means an 'inhabited territory,' but not 'field' in contrast to 'city.' It understood the term as Philistine cities.

LXX^B lacks יְהוָה in אֲרֻן־יְהוָה but LXX^L replaces του θεου 'of God' for יְהוָה.

The lacunal word בַּעַה of 4QSam^a seems troublesome to single out one of two: -ש or -ר to reconstruct it, but it should methodologically be reconstructed with שַׁבַּע, since no biblical manuscripts have a variant "seven" (Ulrich, 1978:181).

LXX adds καὶ ἐξέζεσεν ἡ γῆ αὐτῶν μύσας 'and their earth bubbled with rats' (cf. 5:6). It seems to be an explanatory addition to expose seriousness of the state.

6:2. LXX adds καὶ τοὺς ἐπαοιδοῦς αὐτῶν 'and their magicians' after לְקַסְמִים. 4QSam^a adds also וְלַמְעַרְנֵי 'and enchanters' (cf. Ulrich, 1978:51)

בְּמָה 'by what,' 'how' is *pause* form (GK, § 102 k) which is to be rendered as 'unter welchen Bedingungen' in content of the text (Stoebe, 1973:146).

6:3. LXX, Tg and Syr presuppose אֲנִי as the subject of מְשַׁלְחִים: "The personal pronoun which would be expected as the subject of a participial clause is frequently omitted (cf. Judg. 9:15; 11:9; Jer. 42:13, GK, 116 s).

אֲנִי need not to be effaced as dittography.

אֲדָתִי in LXX connects לָד 'to him or it' with the ark, but it has a closer link with the God of Israel.

תְּרַפְאוּ does not have to be changed to כַּפַּר in accord with 4QSam^a which is adopted by McCarter (1980:133) because כַּפַּר is concerned with 'atonement' (cf. 3.1.1.4.3). The Philistines' behaviour appears to have nothing to do with any awareness of their own sin or fault, although they mention אֲשָׁם.

לְכַם נִוְדַע is emended as ἐχιλασθήσεται ὑμῖν 'it will be propitiated to you' but Syr and Vg follow MT.

6:4. מִסְפָּר 'according to the number of' (GK, § 118 h).

4QSam^a and LXX have a lack of וְחַמֵּשָׁה עֶבְרִי זָהָב 'and five golden mice.' It is uncertain whether 4QSam^a and LXX are haplographic or MT is glossed. MT well matches verse 18, even though McCarter (1980:129) notes the phrase contradicts the content of the verse. VL which is suggested to have been translated from the proto-Lucian recension (Brotzman, 1994:81) disagrees with LXX.

LXX renders לְכַם וְלְסֻרְנֵיכֶם to 'for you, your rulers and τῶ λαῶ.' LXX seems to have added the term on the basis of chapter 5:10. Tg, Syr, VL and Vg back MT.

6:5. 4QSam^a lacks genitive endings in וְצִלְמֵי עֶבְרִיכֶם וְצִלְמֵי עֶבְרִיכֶם The versions of LXX are varied: LXX^B, καὶ μῦς χρυσοῦς ὁμοίωμα τῶν μυῶν ὑμῶν 'and a golden mouse of image of your mice'; LXX^{A0} μῦς χρυσοῦς (καὶ) ποιησετε ὁμοιωμα των εδρων υμων καὶ '(and) your will make a golden mouse in image of your seats and.'

6:6. It is striking that God, the subject of הִתְעַלְלָה 'he treated harshly,' is absent. This can be presupposed as independent.

6:7. It appears natural to connect the verb קָחוּ with שִׁתֵּי פָרוֹת as object and עֲשׂוּ with אֶתְהַחֲשֶׁה; the inversion of both words is not needed to provide a foundation to indicate a merger of varied sources.

אֲשֶׁר לֹא־עָלָה עֲלֵיהֶם עַל is altered as πρωτοτοκούσας ἄνευ τῶν τέκνων 'bearing the first born without the calves.' It simply looks like an interpretation. Tg, Syr, VL and Vg agree with MT.

6:8. אֲרוֹן יְהוָה is simply shortened as τὴν κιβωτὸν 'the ark' in LXX.

The term אֲרוֹן as a *hapax legomenon* has traditionally been understood as 'kist' (Vg. Tg.) but Caquot & Robert (1994:88) offers the possibility to conceive it as 'bag' according to Syriac and Arabic.

6:10. LXX writes the subject of יַעֲשׂוּ apart: οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι 'the Philistines.'

Gesenius' (GK, § 75 qq) rendering 'they shouted' for קָלוּ seems awkward in this text. LXX defends MT: ἀπεκώλυσαν 'they prevented.'

6:11. אֲרוֹן יְהוָה has variation: τὴν κιβωτὸν in LXX; *acram Dei* in Vg.

6:13. LXX reads לְאִתּוֹ as εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῆς 'to its encounter,' by reading it לקראתו

(cf. Judg. 19:3).

6:15. Rost (1926:14) assumes that the unmotivated mention of **הַלְוִיִּים** denotes the verse as later amplification in order for a later reader to take care of the right of the Levites. Yet, the Levites have a long history as a sacred tribe designated to represent the people before God (Num. 4:4, 15; Deut. 10:8).

6:18. **וְעַד** 'and to' does not make sense, so that the NIV and many scholars including Keil (1875:58) read it **עַד** 'a witness' and vocalization **עַד** 'still' also is supported by many (cf. Stoebe, 1973:148; McCarter, 1980:131).

אֲבֵל 'meadow' (Vg and Syr) should be read as **אֲבֵלֶיךָ** 'the stone' (GK, §126 x) like Tg (**אֲבֵלֶיךָ**) rather than LXX: λίθου (without definite article).

6:19. The subject of **וַיִּסֹּף** 'he smote' is missing, which leads Stoebe (1973:149) to suppose that the statement was repeated later at a proper place. However, it should understandably have been arranged if it were inserted later.

LXX adds οὐκ ἠσμένισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ιεχουίου ἐν 'the sons of Jechoniah did not rejoice with' before **בְּאֲנָשֵׁי בֵּית־שֵׁמֶשׁ**. McCarter (1980:131) modifies this version to read: "no members of priesthood had joined in the celebration with" on the basis of Josephus' text. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.16) surmised that God smote the people because the Beth-shemeshites were not priests. His notion would be an explanation, even if it is right.

The Hebrew proposition **בְּ** in **וַיִּרְאוּ בְּאֲרֹן** can indicate the object of the verb **וַיִּרְאוּ** 'to see' and thus means 'inside' which follows also that after **וַיִּרְאוּ** the preposition implies a curiosity or superiority nuance in the attitude at the sight of something (Caquot & Robert, 1994:89).

Most Hebrew manuscripts get the number **שִׁבְעִים ... חֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף** while a few Hebrew manuscripts lack **חֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף**. However, Josephus (*Ant.* 6:16) understands 70 rather than 50070. This is reasonable in consideration of 2 Sam. 24:15.

וַיִּתְאַבְּלוּ 'and they mourned' can take the collective noun **הָעָם** as a subject (Let, § 65 k).

6:20. **יְהוָה הַקָּדוֹשׁ הַיְהוָה** 'this holy God Yahweh' is written in LXX and LXX^L in incomplete form: κυρίου τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου 'this holy God'; 4QSam^a : **יְהוָה הַקָּדוֹשׁ** (Ulrich, 1978:64).

LXX reads **לָעֹמֵד** 'to stand' as διελθεῖν 'to pass.' It is the most likely to be corruption of **עָבַר**. LXX reads **יַעֲלֶה** 'he will go up' as ἀναβήσεται κιβωτὸς 'the ark of the LORD will go up.' This seems to display a character of LXX's rendering to avoid anthropomorphism (cf.

Würthwein, 1988:79).

7:1. LXX^L (and Syr) 'he devoted'; LXX^A modifies it as ηναγκασαν 'they obliged' according to the connection.

3.2.2.3. The background of the text in redemptive history

The spotlight of God's revelation in the book of Samuel moves to Elkanah's family in Ramathaim. The first part of the revelation presents the piety of the family during the period of the Judges. Here Hannah's barrenness was used as a point of contact through which Yahweh opened a new epoch to Israel. Yahweh would provide a new future for his distressed people in this difficult period through a faithful woman. Hannah's prayer soliciting a male child would result in the birth of a Nazirite who would reform the perverted state of Israel and bring about a return to holy, godly living (cf. 1:11; 2:1-10).

However, the plans of the religious leaders in Israel were different from Yahweh's design for the future of Israel. The priests, Hophni and Phinehas, committed sin before Yahweh and at the center of the life of Israel. The author disclosed the seriousness of their sin in a word 2:12): they were called בְּנֵי בְלִיעַל 'wicked men' (Ps. 18:5; 2 Cor. 6:15) . They did not know Yahweh as his priests: לֹא יָדְעוּ אֶת־יְהוָה, namely, they lacked respect, love and loyalty to him (cf. Fretheim, 1997:413). According to the text (1:13-17; 2:22) the feature of their turpitude is characterized in two ways : contempt for Yahweh's offering and the practice of the Canaanite religion in Shiloh.

Primarily in disobedience of the law (Lev. 10:14f.; Num. 18:18), they took the priestly share of the peace offerings before the fat was burned. As well, they ate fat from the sacrificial animals, which is explicitly prohibited in the law (Lev. 7:25). As a result, they prevented the people from restoring their impaired relationship with God by showing contempt for Yahweh's offerings. On the other hand, Hophni and Phinehas defiled the Israelite religion by having sexual relations with the women who served at the entrance to the Tent of meeting. It is succinct that their sexual misdeeds should not be considered as a simple moral mistake: יִשְׁכְּבוּן, the imperfect tense is usually employed to signify a repeated and habitual behaviour. They served Yahweh in the same way which the Canaanites dedicate themselves to their gods with

sexual intercourse. Under the miscreant circumstances, even Eli's reprimand was useless to deter them from committing sin; they perhaps were too old to obey him as his children (2:22-25).

Their serious transgression spiritually contaminated the sanctuary at Shiloh and the people of Israel (cf. 2:22). The religious situation of Israel demonstrates that the mistreatment of such an important office -- which was appointed to usher the people on the way to salvation and to assist them to maintain the relationship with God -- hindered their redemption. Hence, Yahweh could not but dispose of this corrupted office (2:27-36; 3:11-14) in order to protect them in his grace. He could not grant Israel a king who would rule the people in accord with Yahweh's law without first reforming the priestly office. The king is facilely susceptible to the temptation of dominating the people with his own power, like the pagan kings surrounding Israel. Therefore, the king needed capable office-bearers for an effective reign such as the priests and prophets, since the king was commanded to govern Israel, the people of the covenant, in conformity with all of Yahweh's law and decrees (Deut, 17:14-20).

Yahweh's will to innovate the Israelite religion emerges in the judgment of Eli's house and in Samuel's calling. The calling of Samuel provides a light to Israel in the darkness because Yahweh was planning to establish the office of a prophet who would deliver his word to his people (Act. 3:24). On the eve of the foundation of Israel's kingdomhood, Yahweh called Samuel as a prophet (נָבִיא), so that his people might enjoy the richness of his word of revelation. In a befouled sanctuary, he called Samuel four times, which reflects his sustaining attachment to a people who left him many times. It also shows his indomitable will to build a new kingdom for Israel. The section of 1 Sam. 4:1-7:1 concerning the ark is to be conceived in the context of Samuel's inauguration as a prophet who, like Moses (cf. Deut. 18:15-19; Garsiel, 1990:45), functions as Yahweh's impeccable and revered spokesman. At the same time, Elide house must be punished so that God can reform the corrupted offices of Israel and make straight the way of a king.

This historical background of the texts provides the direct source of Israelite catastrophe represented in the 'Ark Narrative.'

3.2.2.4. Explanation

3.2.2.4.1. The ark captured (4:1b-22)

This section commences with Israelite involvement in a fight with the Philistines, which seems to reflect Yahweh's retribution on the house of Eli (cf. 2:25). The Philistines are thought to have migrated in large numbers from the Aegean area, esp. Crete or Cyprus (Dothan, 1982: 21; Mazar, 1990:307f.), to the coastal regions of southwest Israel during the first half of the twelfth century B.C., where they assimilated with the various foreign and local Canaanite influences (cf. Howard Jr., 1994:231ff.). They had become a serious threat to the Israelites during the period of the Judges, most likely because they saw in Israel an intimidation to their security or to the security of their trade routes leading inland from the coast. Thus, they moved to gain control of the whole of western Palestine (Bright, 1991:185). They were not a particularly numerous people but were formidable fighters with a strong military tradition due to their mastery of a superior iron technology. This provided them with a military edge in controlling the surrounding areas both militarily and economically (cf. 1 Sam. 13:19-22). The Philistine army encamped along the banks of the Yarkon River at Aphek (modern Khirbet el-Muqanna?) where they could easily maneuver their military equipment, such as their iron chariots, while the Israelites pitched a base camp two miles to the east at Ebenezer (modern Izbet Sartah). Taking the initiative in battle, the Philistines deployed their forces to meet Israel, and Israel was defeated by the Philistines, who slew about four thousand of them on the battlefield (4:2). This battle should not be regarded as a mere skirmish or preliminary small-scale battle but as a full-scale war which would exert a decisive influence upon the whole of Israel in all aspects and for a long time. Moreover, this combat had a particular significance for the Israelites; at stake was whether or not they could defend the everlasting possession that Yahweh gave them as a guarantee of a blessed life on the basis of the promise to the patriarchs (cf. Gen. 17:8). The Israelites did not realize the cause of the unprecedented defeat nor find the rectification of that sin: repentance. It is interesting to note that the elders of Israel superintended the war-council to devise a countermove in the absence of Eli, the 'high' priest and the judge who was in charge of the deliverance of the people from calamity. Originally, the institution of עֲלֵמֵי was perhaps an organ of nomadic government. After the group had settled in one place the old

system of government, often for a long time, continued to function with little change: they came to have the extensive power of the city (Rut. 4:1-12) and of the larger areas (Judg. 11:5-11) (Mulder, 1998:378). Yet, the responsible elders attributed the defeat to Yahweh, "Why did Yahweh bring defeat upon us," which validates that their notion had nothing to do with a mere identification of Yahweh with the ark (cf. 3:3; 3:10; 3:21). They finally decided to use the last instrument which seemingly might save them from their enemies: the ark of Yahweh's covenant (4:3). It appears impossible to settle whether the subject of אֲרֹן and אֱלֹהֵינוּ is 'he' (Yahweh, RSV;) or 'it' (the ark, KJV; ASV; NIV) but the latter is deemed appropriate because their attitude was presumably changed after the meeting; the ark, based on an inseparable connection between Yahweh and itself, was now expected to give victory. Thus, for the Israelites, the utilizing of the ark signifies something more than "eine moralische Stärkung der Truppe" (cf. Hertzberg, 1956:35) because they came to confound the symbol with its essence. Notwithstanding, this event does not give room for the view which contends that the ark functioned habitually as a palladium of the battle, as scholars such as Dibelius (1906:34f.) Wellhausen (1927:47), Stoebe (1973:95), Kraus (1978:632) and Robert (1981:52) have supposed. After all, the ark was absent from the battlefield during the encounter (cf. Maier, 1965:47). Tarragon (1979:519) assumes the fact that the ark was used in the battle is an exceptional case: "L'arche contrairement à ce qu'on a souvent dit, n'a pas pour caractéristique importante d'être palladium guerrier: son emploi dans les batailles reste exceptionnel." At any event, according to the decision of the elders, probably with the consent of the whole camp (cf. 3:5), the ark as the visible sign of Yahweh's presence was about to function in the ideology of Israelite warfare as a battle palladium for the enemies of Israel (McCarter, 1980:109; Caquot & Robert, 1994:77). They did not earnestly consider whether the ark was permitted to be mobilized in battle or not, although they had never heard that the ark had been brought to the front of the previous conquest over the diverse cities in the land of Canaan. In fact, it is rare to find any biblical proof where the ark went onto the battlefield at any point in the history of Israel, in contrast with Bright's statement (1991:170). With the expectation of iterative victory, they perhaps wanted merely to revive the strategy of Jericho instead of looking for the reason for the defeat and trying to rectify their broken and stained relationship with Yahweh.

A specific designation of the ark, אֲרֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת יְשֵׁב הַכְּרִבִּים is introduced

in vs. 4. This designation has given rise to many theories pertaining to the ark even if the connection of the ark with the whole phrase is not yet explicit. The throne concept first rose from the epithet of Yahweh Zebaoth who is "enthroned upon the cherubim" (Lotz, Kyle & Armerding, 1979:293). In this text, the ark is at first associated with יהוה צבאות a phrase whose original meaning is obscure. The Akkadian *šābu* or *šābûm*, equivalent word to צבאות provides variant meanings (group of people, contingent of workers, troop of soldiers, army, people, population) but mostly is used in the collective sense (CAD 16, 46; AHW, 1072). As such, it appears to be associated with a kind of 'might' concept referring to a multitude. The Hebrew word, צבאות (fem. pl. of צב), has a variety of connotations in various biblical documents: the multitudes of Israelites (e.g. 6:26; 7:4; 12:17, 41, 51; Num. 1:3 etc.). The appellation reminds us of Yahweh as the God of the Israelite army (1 Sam. 17:45), powerful in war (Ps. 24:8-10) and the God of war (Ps. 46:7-11, Isa. 13:4). However, this name in the Old Testament implies a broader meaning (e.g. 1 Sam. 1:3, 11; 2 Sam. 7:8, 26; Ps. 69:7; 84:2, 4, 9; Isa. 6:3). On the basis of the verses mentioned above, the naming צבאות does not always indicate an earthly army. Ross (1967:77) separated the concept of a 'multitude army' from the designation יהוה צבאות for three reasons: 1. צב is used in this sense only in the Deuteronomic and later strands of the Old Testament. 2. with this meaning it is always singular. 3. a prophet such as Jeremiah, who strongly opposed the worship of the host of Heaven, could speak freely and without embarrassment of "Yahweh Zebaoth." According to Ross, all the verses of Samuel and Psalms in which יהוה צבאות stands do not point out the military character of Yahweh except 1 Sam. 17:45 and Ps. 24; he (1967:79-88) is of the opinion that "this (1 Sam. 17:45) may be due to the hand of glossator and the battle (in Ps. 24:8) is the primeval conflict of creation between God and Chaos." However, his argument does not seem cogent because there is no reason the meaning of the plural form of the word should be altered. Secondly, a fight between God and Chaos cannot be found in the Bible. Zobel (1989:892) has the propensity to easily grasp the sense of the word in view of the cult allegedly formed later: "Zwar hat der Titel seinen Siegeszug im Raum des Tempelkults begonnen, doch er wäre nicht zu dieser hohen Wertschätzung ohne die Mithilfe der Prophetie gekommen." Yet, his conjecture is to be dismissed when considering the exact dating of the formation of the book of Samuel (cf. 3.2.2.1.1). Schicklberg (1973:27f.) comprehends it as a relative idea by approving of Maag's explanation ("die depotenzierten mythischen Naturmächte Kanaans") as the most appropriate: "Jahwe sei

demnach Herr auch über die kanaanäischen Mächte und Gewalten." Eißfeldt (1966:103-123) explains the term as "kosmische Macht" and יהוה צבאות as "Machtfülle Jahwe." In spite of the varied conceptions of the word, the consensus is that the designation calls attention for God's might (De Groot and Hulst, nd:157) and victory. That is why LXX versions appear to read יהוה צבאות as κυριος των δυναμεων (6:2) or κυριος παντοκρατωρ (2 Sam. 7:8). On this ground, it is held that the name יהוה צבאות, which refers to the ark, reminds us of the holy object which played a principal role in the holy war of Israel and that the name צבאות יהוה invokes Yahweh as the divine king who defeated the enemies of Israel, particularly the Philistines, as its usage indicates (cf. Zyl, 1989:77).

However, here it is necessary to examine the connection of the ark with צבאות. The theory that regards the ark as a war-palladium inevitably associates the ark with the epithet in a martial sense. According to this view, Yahweh was originally a god of war and his symbol, the ark, was necessarily an emblem of war. Stoebe's (1973:95) contention pictures this supposition vividly: "Das צבאות ist ursprünglich von der sakral-kriegerischen Funktion der Lade zu verstehen und hat erst später eine Ausweitung ins allegmein Kosmische erfahren." His assumption appears to be rooted in the evolutionary theory applied to the religious history of Israel. Unlike such a prevailing notion, the Old Testament texts seem not to suggest that the two words are closely linked because only two verses (1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2) expose the connected form of the two words among the 285 cases in which צבאות occurs, e.g., Jer. 82 times; 'Proto'-Isa. 56; Sac. 53; Mal. 24; 1 Sam. 5; 2 Sam. and Dt.Isa. 6, etc. (Zobel, 1989:878). יהוה צבאות in the present text seems to display God's epithet to stress his omnipotence rather than directly to be concerned with the ark. This conception is particularly supported by Isa. 37:16 in which the phrase has nothing to do with the ark.

The other problem concerning the expression, ארון ברית יהוה צבאות ישב הכרבים involves the translation of the phrase ישב הכרבים. It is frequently assumed that this term invokes an 'enthronement theology.' The difficulty in the rendering of the expression is caused by the lack of a preposition between the two words so that variant versions of it have been proposed. The KJV and NIV inserted the preposition *between*, which reminds us of Gressmann's (1920) theory that the ark contained an image which at times was placed on the ark, between or under the cherubim, while many commentators with the RSV add the idea of *above* between the two terms (Keil, 1875:46; Hertzberg, 1965:33; Klein, 1983:36; Zyl, 1989:77f.; Caquot &

Robert, 1994:73). In fact, this attempt to translate the words **שֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים** is usually based on the presupposition that the cherubim are the throne of Yahweh. Stoebe (1973:128) and Stolz (1981:39) clearly exhibit such a trend, directly rendering **שֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים** as *Kerubenthroner*. Murray (1998:119) too easily links this element with the ark: "He may be summoned to assert his regal authority over his enemies by bringing victory to his people of the divine warrior-king enthroned over the ark in the shrine."

However, the term **הַכְּרֻבִים** is not explained with exclusive reference to the ark, since cherubim were variously represented: cherubim as guardians of the way to the tree of life (Gen. 3:24), on the ten curtains of the tabernacle (Ex. 26:1), on the veil (Ex. 26:31), involved in reference to God's movement (2 Sam. 22:11; Ps. 18:11; Ez. 1, 10) and in the temple of Solomon (1 King. 8). These utterances indicate that the function of the cherubim is not always the same. Then the cherubim as guardians to be found in the east of the Garden of Eden appear not to be alien to the garden or unfamiliar to Israelites in that the term has an article at first. Even though the figure of the cherubim is not clear, they probably are considered as composite beings connected with the presence of God, just as other texts describe (Ex. 25:18ff.; Ez. 1, 10). Their duty is to keep the way to the tree of life from the intruders. The cherubim on the curtains of the tabernacle and on the veil are forced to be embroiled by a skilled craftsman, not by an embroiderer (cf. Ex. 26:36) nor by an ordinary weaver (cf. Ex. 39:27). The emphasis of the injunction of the cherubim seems to reside in an aesthetic concern (cf. Janzen, 2000:343). However their beauty goes beyond great artistic value, to a description of God's splendid glory. As it were the cherubim on the inner surface of the curtain reflect the glory of God from the inside of the inner rooms. Unlike these two cases the references to the cherubim concerning God's movement appear to imply the meaning of the throne. Yet careful consideration of the verses shows us that two passages (2 Sam. 22:11; Ps. 18:11) which contain the same content hardly match the cherubim and the throne because this verse is a poetical expression without a real image. The *cherub* (NIV, cherubim) in the first clause of this verse is paralleled with *the wings of the wind* in the second which do not exist (cf. Klement, 2000:202). Hence Haman (1998:108) appears to allude that the cherub may here be a poetic term for clouds because of the parallelism in verses 9-10. In the midst of the storm Yahweh was there, controlling all the forces at his disposal. He comes with majesty to bring deliverance. Likewise the cherub in these verses also is far from the concept of the throne of God, although the interpretation on it

still remains open. The wings of the cherubim that stretch from wall to wall in the temple of Solomon are different from the cherubim on the ark. The cherubim covering and protecting the ark reflect the glorious and majestic presence of Yahweh at the ark which is positioned in the Most Holy Place of the temple, Yahweh's eternal, dwelling place (1 King. 8:13). Then the cherubim in the vision of Ezekiel draw a vehicle as if they were God's chariot throne (Ez. 1, 9-11). Here it is hard to describe its very complex phenomenon but it is necessary to scrutinize some verses directly to recall the throne: Ez. 1:26; 9:3; 10:4, 18; 11:22. As to the throne in Ez. 1:26, its likeness was above the firmament which was over the heads of the living creatures who are considered as the cherubim. This description appears different from the expression that the cherubim or their parts are composed of the throne: it is an independent part of the creature. Thus, in the strict sense of the word, it is difficult directly to connect the concept of the throne with the cherubim on the basis of this verse. In this case the cherubim may be described just as bearers of the throne. Likewise a close reading of the passages in Ez. 9:3; 10:4, 18; 11:22 demonstrates that the cherubim are hardly related to the concept of the throne, albeit they remind us of the image of the throne. Their common expression is כְּבוֹד אֱלֹהֵי מֵעַל הַכְּרוּבִים. The English translation, 'glory of God on the cherub' is not distinguishable: whether the glory is on it or God is on it. Hebrew verbs clarify what the subject is by using genitive connection between God and glory and mostly female verbs denoting the subjective as glory: God's glory was on the cherub. Then it is wondered if the place of God's glory can be equated with God's throne. Indeed God's glory is present at many places such as cloud (Ex. 16:10), mountain (Ex. 24:16), tabernacle (Ex. 40:34f.; Num. 14:10), people (Lev. 9:23; Num. 16:19), temple (1 King. 8:11) but they are not called the thrones. Henceforth, the cherubim which occurred in Ezekiel are not directly to be regarded as the throne.

As mentioned above, the cherubim have a broader meaning: the various self-manifestations of Yahweh. Notwithstanding the function of the cherubim, only one point is clear: they represent God's glory. It matches well that the metaphysical notion used to be expressed by physical form in ancient times. If they were meant to be the throne, the word, כִּסֵּא would have been used at least one time in the Old Testament. Particularly the wings are for flying not for sitting on them. The general imagery of the outstretched wings of the cherubim seems to be linked with something splendid, majestic and glorious.

The verb, יָשַׁב in הִכְרַבִּים has a variety of connotations such as sit, sit down, be

enthroned, lie down, rest, remain, stay, dwell, inhabit, settle, be inhabited, populated, be set, be established, stand, endure, etc. (*DCH* IV:317f.). The term, יָשָׁב is always combined with preposition עַל (Ex. 12:29; Deut. 17:18; 1 King. 1, 2; 2 King. 10:3, 30; 11:19; Ps. 47:8; 132:11; Prov. 20:8, etc.), when it is juxtaposed with כְּסֵא. The phrase, יָשָׁב הַכְּרֻבִים would probably be translated as *one sitting enthroned on the cherubim* without many difficulties if it has preposition עַל. Yet it is not always interpreted as the concept of the throne, although there is a suitable preposition between the words. For instance the phrases of Ps. 29:3, 10 display that Yahweh sits (or is inhabited) on the many waters or the flood: יְהוָה לְמַבּוּל יָשָׁב. On the grounds of this expression it may be difficult to maintain that the flood is the throne of Yahweh. In this context the flood may be understood as an object to have to be controlled by God's forces rather than the throne. Thus the collocation of יָשָׁב הַכְּרֻבִים cannot naively be matched with the idea of the throne of Yahweh.

Primarily the outstretched wings and the faces of the cherubim let us envision something transcendental to represent God's glory with his omnipotence and omniscience rather than the throne (Borowski, 1995:36-41). The replicas of the cherubim on the ark served rather to direct the attention of the worshipper to the heavenly sanctuary with its heavenly Occupant, of which the earthly counterpart was meant to be a faithful image. The symbol of the phrase יָשָׁב הַכְּרֻבִים only could convey the idea of majesty and glory, which is now associated with it. The idea of indwelling, therefore, was not foremost in this expression (cf. Hague, 1997:506). Yet as the last resort, we would literally accept the rendering, *inhabiting the cherubim* without preposition (cf. *YLT*). Or as Woudstra (1965:73) proposes, the phrase יָשָׁב הַכְּרֻבִים can possibly be translated as 'one who is inhabiting *at* or *with* the cherubim,' which has connotations identical with paraphrase, 'one who is inhabiting in glory and majesty.' Accordingly, the expression need not be intimately affiliated with the ark so as to grant room for the concept of enthronement. Instead, יָשָׁב הַכְּרֻבִים has a closer link with Yahweh's epithet, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in the structure, far from the ark. A detailed explication about the cherubim may be consulted in the previous section 3.1.1.4.4.

The ark, the prominent emblem of the glorious and majestic presence of Yahweh, is carried to the battlefield with Hophni and Phinehas, the sons of Eli. However, the ark made no resistance against those carrying it. The arrival of the ark raised the morale of the Israelites and it was greeted with wild shouts of exhilaration that caused the ground to shake (vs. 5). The

phrase 'all Israel' appears to reflect the scale of the battle. So great was the commotion in the Israelite camp that the Philistines heard it two miles away (Bergen, 1996:91). Despite the first triumph of the Philistines, they seem to believe that they were in a defensive position just before the second engagement, *when they realized that the ark of Yahweh had come into the camp: "God has come into the camp," they said. "We are in trouble! Nothing like this has happened before. Woe to us! Who will deliver us from the hand of these mighty gods? They are the gods who smote the Egyptians with all the plagues in the wilderness.* (vss. 7, 8). The Philistines disclose themselves as typical pagans by referring to the ark as the Israelite gods and by confounding the plagues in Egypt, which happened before the Exodus, with the sojourn of Israel in the wilderness. Nevertheless, they understood an aspect of the redemptive history of Israel in their simplistic thinking: cf. "Mit jener Kriegspredigt unmittelbar vor Eröffnung der entscheidenden Schlacht haben die Philister auf ihre Art das heilsgeschichtliche Urbekenntnis Israels an sich gerissen" (Timm, 1966:521). Their rough knowledge that Israel had experienced a supernatural deliverance from the Egyptians energized the Philistines to fight with determination: *"Be strong, Philistines! Be men, or you will serve the Hebrews, as they have served you. Be men, and fight!"* (vs. 9). In fact, at the sight of Yahweh, they did not have to encourage their army to overcome fear and to take the field against Israel; Yahweh used the corrupt office-bearers to bring about the downfall of Israel (cf. 2:25, 34). The battle drove Israel into catastrophe; she lost three thousand infantry, the ark was captured, and the two priests, Hophni and Phinehas, were slain (vs., 10). The Israelites mobilized the ark, a tangible representation of God's presence, onto the battlefield. They used it as if it was a sort of war-palladium. Yet even the ark could not deliver them. This defeat evidently demonstrates that the ark of Yahweh was not intended to be used as a war-palladium, as was the case with many of the nations surrounding Israel. The Israelites might have utilized the ark like the ancient Chinese people who brought the stones from T'ai shan (literally, huge mountain) for good fortune: "Pelgrims uit alle windstreken bezoeken de berg. De grondgedachte is, dat men zich van de gunst van een goddelijke beschermer wil verzekeren door persoonlijk tot de berg te komen en deze aan te raken ... Men neemt nl. een steen van de T'ai shan mee en plaatst die bij zich in huis. Daardoor behoudt men de beschermende nabijheid van de goddelijke berg" (Bouwer, nd:30; Eichhorn, 1973:47). In any case, it is apparent that they failed to realize that the presence of Yahweh is made secure in a saving manner only when this presence is grasped through faith. Brueggemann

(1990:32) denotes that the defeat of Israel is not so much due to Yahweh's absence as the will of Yahweh, for Yahweh is now present in the ark. Yet, the will of God will not be done in total impertinence to the state of the people's faith. This disaster fulfills the prophecy by the anonymous man of God against Eli and his house (2:27-36). Yahweh could no longer take care of the Israelites in the battle because they declined his protection by refusing to obey his holy law. Yahweh's retribution against them, sustained for centuries, was executed, which is reverberated in Ps. 78:59-61, "*When God heard of it, he was furious, and greatly repudiated Israel: So that he abandoned the tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent which he dwelt among men; And gave his power to captivity, and his glory to the hand of the enemy.*" Shiloh, generally identified with Khirbet Seilun, where the ark was once housed, was now overrun and had become a meaningless place in the religious history of Israel. The archaeological evidence of the city is dated as 11th century B.C. (cf. Delcor, 1964:143; Bishop, 1988:62-64) although Schely (1989:196-201) is reluctant to recognize this point, by denoting that the tradition of Shiloh was succeeded to Jerusalem by David. Yet, it is reasonable to say that the tabernacle managed to be protected (1Chr. 16:39; 2Chr. 1:3).

At any event, the occupation of the Philistines caused a tremendous impediment to the development of Israel until the reign of David. Their garrisons were placed at strategic points (10:5; 13:3f., 23) and they deprived Israel of the metal industry. In doing this, they protected their own monopoly on iron and prevented Israel from manufacturing weapons (13:19-22) (cf. Bright, 1991:186). Above all, the occupation connotes that Israel, on account of her unbelief, failed to maintain the possession which Yahweh presented her.

The last part of this chapter (vv. 12-22) outlines two more occurrences: the death of Eli and the death of his daughter-in-law after she gave birth to Ichabod. The outcome of the battle is delivered to Eli while he is sitting on his chair by the side of the gate. The image of Eli sitting on the chair is familiar to the reader since it was already mentioned in 1:9. The place "wijst op een hoge positie en houdt verband met Eli's ambtelijke kwaliteit. Het zitten heeft hier wel een praegnante betekenis en hangt samen met 'zitting houden'" (Wolff, 1975: 48f.). With the reference to the chair, the text implies that the lamp of the office was extinguished here and its service disappeared. The report reaches the climax in vs. 17 when the messenger tells about the death of Eli's two sons, Hophni and Phinehas, and the capture of the ark of God. Eli might be

anticipating the loss of his sons since he had already heard of Yahweh's decree from a man of God (2:27-36) and Samuel (vs. 13). Eli, who had led Israel forty years died not from the shock of news of his sons but from the anguish of knowing what Israel has done: *When he mentioned the ark of God, Eli fell off his chair backward by the side of the gate. His neck was broken and he died* (vs. 18). His death appears to be a devastation of the office, of high priest, when in fact it is, in a sense, an act of God's faithfulness to an office he has instituted. Through the death of Eli and his family, the holy office of 'the priest' is protected and honoured. As a result, Yahweh prevented his people from going the way of corruption.

The following scene (vv. 20-22) recounts the death of Phinehas' wife, who was delivering a baby. With the news of the collapse of the Elide house and the captivity of the ark, fatal complications in the birthing process caused the woman to die shortly after giving birth to a son. A hopeful birth turns into a sorrowful, tragic fatality. Instead of rejoicing in the most honourable achievement a woman in the Near East could attain, she was listless and distracted despite words of comfort because of her anxiety over the ark. With her dying gasps, she gave a significant name to the child: אִי־כָבוֹד 'the glory has departed' whose explication she mentioned two times (vv. 21f.). She recognizes that the fact the ark is gone symbolizes that Yahweh is absent and Israel bereft. The service of the priest without the ark will be of no use in Israel even though the priesthood is hereditary. The ministration of the office, a mechanism of salvation, disappeared with the ark and this fact necessitated the impeccable work of the eternal office of Jesus Christ.

3.2.2.4.2. The ark in Philistia (5:1-6:1)

The captured ark was brought first from Ebenezer to Ashdod, located some 3 km inland beyond the line of the dunes. The first Philistine settlement was a well-planned and densely built city of some twenty acres in area. At the end of the eleventh century B.C., Ashdod had expanded to a size of about 100 acres, thus, becoming one of the largest cities in the country (Mazar, 1990:308). The ark was placed beside an idol of the Philistine god, Dagon, inside his temple. Dagon was the patron deity of the middle Euphrates region from the 3rd millennium B.C. and was responsible for blessing the spheres of military expansion, fertility, living and

deceased human rulers, and divine advice (cf. Handy, 1992:1-3; Healey, 1999:216ff.). The Hebrew etymological definition of his name (דָּגָן, grain) appears hardly to be separated from a god of grain even if such a notion finds no solid evidence in *ANET*. Just like the Israelites, the Philistine people committed the mistake of taking the symbol for reality. They performed a ritual to Dagon, the deity who was thought to have given the Philistines victory over both Samson (cf. Judg. 16:23) and Israel's God, by dedicating the ark as a war trophy to Dagon. They seem to ascribe the triumph to their god; they saw the combat as not between Israel and Philistines, but between Israel's Yahweh and the gods of the Philistines (cf. Ex. 12:12). In so doing, they thought that they could humiliate the God of the Israelites and assert Dagon's superiority over him (Robinson, 1993:34). However, they could not help but be frightened at what they had done by placing the ark beside the idol. This fear was reflected in their curiosity: *the people of Ashdod rose early the next day* (vs. 3a). Dagon was found in a posture of reverence and submission before the ark of Yahweh: *"there was Dagon, fallen on his face on the ground* (v. 3b). The text insinuates the futility of the Philistine's idolatrous practices (cf. Ps. 115:4-7; 135:15-17; Isa. 44:9-20). Yet, it was actually hard for them to accept the unprecedented event as reality. The phrase *"They took Dagon and put him back in his place"* shows how they did not understand Yahweh's surging power and freedom. Hence even the capture of the ark entails no real curtailment of Yahweh's actual potency (cf. Brueggemann, 1990:36). Dagon's humiliating act was repeated the next morning and was even more severe than the previous day; his head and hands had been cut off in the manner reminiscent of a grisly military execution (cf. 17:51; 31:9; 2 Sam. 4:12). At this point, Bergen (1996:97) rightly denotes that Zwickel (1994:239-49) misses the parallels noted in the other Scriptures that suggest that Yahweh was "executing" Dagon using a technique of military execution. Zwickel does this when he compares the broken statue with archaeological data and concludes the story has been modified during the postexilic period to conform to later iconoclastic customs. Yahweh, by desecrating Dagon, substantiated his superiority to the territorial supreme deity once again. This is supported by Delcor (1964:151) who simultaneously points out the Philistines' influence on the Israelite religion and culture. As a result, this accident caused the non-Semitic Philistines to enact a new regulation of a pagan threshold-cult: *"Thus, to this day neither the priests of Dagon nor anyone entering Dagon's temple at Ashdod step on the threshold"* (vs. 5).

Yahweh's supremacy, by bringing the plagues against Philistia, extended to the people of

Ashdod and its vicinity as well as Dagon (vs. 6): אֲשְׁדּוֹדִים is typically a metaphorical and anthropomorphical expression which covers a wide range of the concept of power (cf. Dreytza, 1997:405). The Philistines had to experience the scourge in order to understand that this was the same Yahweh who had brought plagues against Egypt (cf. 4:8). The plague קִטְבִּים (K^etib) or בִּטְחָרִים (Q^erē) is variously interpreted as it is mentioned above (p. 171). It can hardly be pinpointed with an equivalent name in modern medical terms but the context provides that it was probably an epidemic disease; in those days hemorrhoids were not treated as an epidemic illness (Hentschel, 1994:65). Harrison, a former physician (1985:714) explicates it cogently: "This description, remarkably objective as it is, furnishes abundant evidence symptomatically for a diagnosis of bubonic plague, the dreaded scourge of antiquity, which is conveyed to man by the rat flea (*pulex cheopis*), and spread by droplet infection with a short incubation period." Nevertheless, in calculation of Yahweh's judgment against Dagon, a deity of fertility, it appears to deserve provisionally to postulate that "Waarschijnlijk komt het me voor, dat we hebben te denken aan een geslachtziekte, althans een ziekte aan de levensbronnen" (Wolff, 1975:52). If the long sentence of LXX, "it brought up against them mice who swarmed in their ships and came up into the midst of their land. There was a great panic in the city -- a deadly one," reflects the Hebrew *Vorlage*, where this part appears to be missed, then Zyl's (1989:75f.) statement will be valid: "Blijkens ugaritische teksten kan men een verband legen tussen deze godsdienst en de vruchtbaarheidscultus. Dat suggereert ook de associatie van Dagon met Astarte (vgl.31:8-10; I Kron. 10:10). De bedreiging van de korenoogst door de muizenplaag (6:4) wijst in dezelfde richting, evenals het mogelijke verband tussen de naam Dagon en het hebreeuwse woord voor 'koren' (*dagan*)." Yahweh's judgment was brought against not only the religion but the physical and economical well-being of the inhabitants of Ashdod (cf. Ex. 12:12). Perhaps learning a lesson from history, the Ashdodites decided that "the ark of the god of Israel must not stay " (vs. 7) among them (Bergen, 1996:98). According to the Aegean model (cf. Freeman, 1996:117-120), a pan-Philistine council of lords who were also simply called 'kings' (cf. Howard Jr., 1994:242; מְלָכִים, tyrants < τύραννος, cf. HALAT, 727) gathered and determined to have the ark moved to Gath (vs. 8) which is located closer to the district of Judah.

The attestation of Yahweh's supremacy was made anew in Gath with the multiplication of the vastness of his punishment against all the citizens of Gath: "*Yahweh's hand was against*

that city, throwing it into a very great panic. He afflicted the people of the city, both young and old, with an outbreak of tumors." Due to the magnitude of Yahweh's chastisement for the people of Gath, the ark was sent to Ekron, where its arrival created even more distress than it had in Gath: "Yahweh's hand was exceedingly heavy (כִּבְדַּר מְאֹד) upon" (vs. 11). The tumors or buboes afflicted the citizens of Ekron and many of them died. Just as the Israelite cry under Egyptian bondage came up to God (Ex. 2:23), so now the Philistine plea reached the heavens (vs. 12). The ark had been in Philistine territory for seven months (6:1). The number indicates "wholeness" or "completeness" and in the Old Testament often refers to complete periods of chastisement and purification (cf. Lev. 26:21, 24, 28; Dan. 9:1f.). Perhaps the seven months the ark was in Philistia was a period of complete chastisement for the Philistines. During these seven months, they paid in full for all their iniquities (Robinson, 1993:37). All these events demonstrate that even the enormously powerful Philistines are powerless before the God of Israel. Through his sovereign power, Yahweh himself opened the way for the ark to be returned to His people.

3.2.2.4.3. The ark's return to Israel (6:2-7:1)

This chapter shows how the Philistines recognized their defeat and surrendered to the God of Israel. The Psalmist sings that Yahweh woke up from sleep: "*Then Yahweh awoke as one out of sleep, as a mighty man wakes from the stupor of wine. He smote his enemies; he put them to everlasting shame*" (Ps. 78:65f.). On account of the miserable disaster, the priests and diviners ("Orakelpriesters," HALAT, 1041) were called upon to determine the most efficacious means of removing the ark from their territory. The law (Deut. 18:10, 14) prohibits that the Israelites consult with diviners, a class of religious leaders. However, they used their own method based on the Philistine religion. Here a question arises whether it is possible that God's will was revealed to pagans like the Philistine priests and diviners as God works among unbelievers and reveals his will to them in different ways. As an answer, it is possible to say that Yahweh was teaching his royal might, judgment and deliverance in even the pagan world. The Philistines assumed that the plagues were caused by the anger of the God of Israel and advised their people to return the ark with a guilt offering (vs. 3) and pay honour to Israel's

God (vs. 5). At first, they had to send precious gifts of the five lords of Philistia to compensate for the evil of the infringement upon Yahweh's right. As to a guilt offering (חַטָּאת), it is generally defined as a cultic ceremony whose purpose is to make atonement for *desecration* of *sancta*, that is, the mishandling of sacred things by treating them as if they were common rather than holy. This is detailed in Lev. 10:10 (Averbeck, 1997:559). Yet, in this passage it denotes primarily compensation or reparation for the infringement of the rights of another or for the misappropriation of one's property. Here the Philistines have misappropriated Yahweh's ark; that is their sin (Robinson, 1993:38). The term "guilt offering" with which they attempt to avert God's wrath, exhibits that there is fear in these heathens of the retaliation of Yahweh and coincidentally, that the people of Yahweh have to acknowledge that the violence against the law of God results in the threat of death. However, the means they recommended for the guilt offering was totally wrong: the recommended statues were detestable animals -- rats and a gift of five golden images of unclean portions of the human body, tumors -- instead of the sacrifice of a ram (cf. Lev. 5:14-16; 7:1-6): On the ground of Milgrom's finding a Hittite parallel, Geyer (1981:300f.) contends that the mice should be understood as a mouse used to remove disease in the Hittite ritual of Ambazzi thus rejecting LXX's explanation of a plague of mice and to identifying the plague as bubonic. His statement looks plausible in consideration of the cultural influence of the Hittites on the Philistines. Yet this parallel is still difficult to understand. While the Hittite patients believed that the mouse carried disease on a long journey from the bowstring to the high mountain, the devastation of the Philistine cities appears to have been more than simply the outbreak of a disease (cf. 5:6). Moreover, the parallel seems to fail to settle the golden image of the tumors which were sent with the mice. Nevertheless, there is a small connection to the cultic ritual in their magical performance which requires the images of tumors and mice as apotropa: "Die Anfertigung der Figuren der Mäuse (und Beulen) wurde durch den Auftrag der philistäischen Priester und Wahrsager motiviert, so daß sie nicht (wie innerhalb der Bilderpolemik üblich) der Willkür, sondern der Auskunft des kultischen und göttlich autorisierten Personals (und damit letztlich göttlichem Willen) entsprang" (Berlejung, 1998:309).

Whatever the case, they directed the Philistines to transport the ark on a cart, a means of transportation for the ark explicitly forbidden in the law (Num. 7:7-9; cf. 2 Sam. 6:3-13). Unlike the ark's entrance into Philistia under cheers and triumphant song, it now leaves the territory in a silent and exotic procession. Although the mounting oppression of the hand of

Yahweh humbled them, they wanted to see once and for all whether the disaster really came from the might of Israel's God or not: "*Watch, if it goes up to its territory, Beth Shemesh, then He has brought this great disaster on us. But if it does not, then we will know that it was not his hand which smote us, but that it happened to us by chance*" (vs. 9). The transporting of the ark was accurately organized as a test on the ground of the advice of the priests and the diviners who were seen as being able to understand this accident. The Philistines used natural maternal instinct for the test, by letting two cows pull a new cart. These two cows had calved and had never been yoked and had been forcefully separated from their unweaned calves (vs. 7). Nevertheless, "*Then the cows went on the straight road toward Beth Shemesh, along the highway and lowing all the way; they did not turn to the right or to the left*" (vs. 12). The might of Yahweh transcends natural law to firmly validate that the plague was caused by himself, which manifests explicitly that only Yahweh is the universal King before whom all things should kneel (1 Cor. 15:25-28; Eph. 1:22). The most powerful instinct they could choose was not able to bend Yahweh's sovereign will towards the establishment of his kingdom. While the Philistines interpreted their disasters as the result of the deliberate actions of an angry foreign deity, the Israelite audience interpreted these events as the triumphant execution of law-promised judgment against a nation who had desecrated the promised land through abominable practices (cf. Bergen, 1996:101).

Verse 13 shows that the people of Beth-Shemesh were out harvesting wheat in the valley when the ark entered the city. The arrival of the ark during the harvest season of May/June appears to expose the reason why there were so many people present to greet it. Beth Shemesh, in the valley of Sorek, was a Levitical city set aside for the clan of Kohath, the Levitical family charged with the responsibility of caring for the ark (Num. 4:4, 15). Acting in priestly fashion, the people of the city prepared a great sacrifice to Yahweh in celebration of the ark's return. Here, the great rock in Joshua's field served as an impromptu altar for the burnt offering with which the people greeted the ark's return. By the way, it remains unsettled why there is no conflict over the sacrifice of milch cows. The law, after all, mandated that sacrificial animals were to be unblemished males (Lev. 1:3; 22:9). It could be considered that this offering was held under special circumstances. After the Philistine lords observed the Israelites' joyful activities, they returned to Ekron that day, leaving behind the five gold tumors and five gold rats as well as the ark (vv. 17f.). Believing that their strange penance for the troubles was

effective, Yahweh had disclosed his will to the Philistines through such a strategy.

The people of Beth-Shemesh rejoiced at the arrival of the ark, but did not pay homage to Yahweh who symbolically resides in it: *they had looked into the ark* with curiosity (vs. 19). *Statenvertaling*, the old Dutch translation, concretely speaks of 'opening of the ark to inspect its content.' Actually, it was prohibited for even the Kohathites whose duty was to transport the ark, either to touch or view the sacred objects. Thus, the first task of the Israelites would have been to hide the ark from view while avoiding any physical or visual contact with it. This shameless disregard for the ark's sanctity and the violation of its sacred space brought swift and direct judgment from Yahweh. According to MT and LXX, "*He smote of the people fifty thousand and seventy men.*" However, the much smaller number seems more likely to be correct because the population of Beth-Shemesh could not have been so numerous, as it was a small town of, at most, a few thousand inhabitants (Gordon, 1986:103). It is still not clear why the inhabitants as a whole should have been afflicted (cf. Baldwin, 1988:77); it reads better as "seventy men" and most modern versions and Josephus have made this alteration (ἑβδομήκοντα, *Ant.* VI, 16). Such magnitude of divine punishment against them implies that Israel was to fear Yahweh much more than Philistia or any other nation: everything that God did was for his people.

Since Beth Shemesh was a Levitical city, the inconceivable questions the men of Beth Shemesh asked, "*Who can stand before Yahweh, this holy God? To whom will the ark go up from here?*" (6:20), seem to reflect their spiritual darkness; they would not have to mourn the heavy blow Yahweh had dealt them, if they understood that it was caused by a 'violation of the law.' The question of the Beth-Shemites is answered when the inhabitants of Kiriath Jearim accept their request: "*The Philistines have brought again the ark of Yahweh; come down, and take it up to you*" (6:21). Eventually, the ark came to be housed under the protection of Eleazar in Kiriath Jearim (7:1), a Canaanite city, one of the four cities which formed the Gibeonite league (Jos. 9:17). This was also known as Baalah (Jos. 15:9) or Baale-Judah (2 Sam. 6:2) whose name may be attributable to the city's prominence as a traditional religious center.

It is interesting to note that extra biblical evidence of the ark's returning to Kiriath Jearim was found in the form of an ostrakon at the site of `Isbet Sartah (Ebenezer) during the 1976 season of excavations. This ostrakon did much to support the biblical tale of the ark coming

back to reside at the Judahite site of Kiriath-Jearim (Shea, 1990:73-79). The text on the ostrakon appears to challenge Ahlström's (1984:142) position that 'the ark narrative' is a literary fiction with a tendentious, religio-political thread. The fact that the ark was taken to Kiriath Jearim and not back to Shiloh suggests strongly that the Shiloh worship center had been destroyed by the Philistines the previous fall (cf. Bergen, 1996:104).

As to Eleazar, which is a common priestly name (cf. Ex. 6:23; 1 Chr. 9:20; 23-21; Ez. 8:33), it is possible that the man was a member of the Levitical tribe. Miller and Roberts (1977:20, 25f.) argue that Eleazar was Eli's successor because it is apparent that he was consecrated to have charge of the ark, while Willis (1979:209ff.) contends that Samuel was Eli's successor as leader of Israel. Above all they *sanctified Eleazar his son to keep the ark of Yahweh* unlike the Beth-Shemites' behaviour (6:19). The picture of 7:1 shows at least that the ark is treated on the basis of the law: The ark's installation and protection at Kiriath-Jearim also prove how important the suitable service for Yahweh in accord with the law is

The ark remained concealed for the time being. Israel had to wait a long time until an ideal worship of Yahweh, which included the presence of the ark, would be restored. The return of the ark signified the importance of the physical symbols of God's ongoing redemption of the people; without the ark, a symbol of the covenant, Israel was not complete. The Israelites would suffer worse for their failure to act in accordance with the spiritual enlightenment that was theirs, even as the Philistines would suffer for their ignorance of Yahweh and his law.

3.2.2.5. Summary

The theory of *Ladeerzählung*, as an independent pre-canonical document, initiated by Rost, is hardly able to be used as a delimitation of the source boundaries. The narrative has an intimate connection with many historical events even if it appears to have its own stylistic, theme, bias and lexicographical peculiarities apart from the unity of its surroundings.

The Hebrew text of the book of Samuel bears many corrupted parts (5:3f., 8; 6:18 etc.) which need to be corrected and supplied according to LXX and other ancient versions which show variations, in spite of their weakness.

The narrative pertaining to the ark (1 Sam. 4:1b-7:1) should be regarded as a whole, a

historical context in which Samuel appears as Yahweh's impeccable and revered spokesman, like Moses (cf. Deut. 18:15-19), and the corrupt house of Eli is punished so as to make straight the way for a king. At this time, Yahweh prepares a new epoch for Israel. The religious situation of Israel demonstrates how the corruption of an office appointed to usher the people to salvation hindered their redemption, Yahweh could not but dispose of this office (2:27-36; 3:11-14) in order not to lead his people to the path of death. Yahweh manifested the will of innovation to the Israelite religion through the judgment of the Elide house and Samuel's calling; the former step was taken by the involvement in the battle with the Philistines.

After the first encounter with them, the Israelites did not realize the cause of the unprecedented defeat, nor did they grasp what could be used to rectify that sin: repentance. Thus, the ark was mobilized on the second engagement even though the Israelites had sought to find the cause for the defeat and their strained relationship with Yahweh. The result of their using the ark as a palladium was more disastrous than the first; the ark was captured and the Elide house was destroyed. They could have defeated the Philistines even without bringing the ark into the battlefield if they were faithful to the law of Yahweh. As a result, the glory departed from Israel.

Even during the period of the detention of the ark in Philistia, Yahweh demonstrated his superiority and sovereignty over the territorial supreme deity by desecrating Dagon and by bringing the plagues against the people of the Philistine cities. With severe judgment over the Philistines, he made a way for the ark to return to his covenantal people to establish the kingdom he was planning. The punishment against the Israelites beside the Philistines shows that the Israelites would suffer worse for their sins than would the Philistines suffer for their ignorance of Yahweh and his law.

As for the ark, it is not permitted to be mobilized into the battle as a war-palladium, nor suggested as a throne, which is associated with the cherubim and God's epithet, Yahweh Zebaoth, which signifies omnipotence and majesty. Despite humans' treatment of the ark, Yahweh reveals it as the glorious and majestic emblem of his actual presence. It symbolically requires obedience to the law and simultaneously plays a cardinal role in the progressive history of God's redemption to unfold a new era of kingdom.

3.2.3. The ark of Yahweh in 2 Samuel 6

3.2.3.1. The context

The book of 2 Samuel details the story of David, the second king of the undivided kingdom of Israel. After Saul's death David was forced to fight Saul's house for a long time, even if it was not an all-out war; only localized warfare in the border is reported (2:12-32). "*David grew stronger and stronger, while the house of Saul grew weaker and weaker*" (3:1). Then Abner went from Ish-bosheth over towards David because Ish-bosheth objected to Abner's intercourse with Rizpah, Saul's concubine, and doubted that Abner intended to come to power (3:6-11). David's reign over Israel was extended by the assassination of Abner and Ish-bosheth (3-5:3). However, he did not want to come to the throne in such a way, although there was no one who would fight for the kingship of Saul's house. This is clear from his reaction on the death of Abner and Ish-bosheth (3:31-39; 4:9-12). All the tribes anointed David king over entire Israel (5:1): 'Israel' in the first verse was used to mean 'the whole people,' apart from the 'Personal union' theory that each kingdom retained its own character in the united kingdom as suggested by Alt (1953:66-75) and Herrmann (1993:103). David had to fight the Philistines as soon as they saw the anointing of David as the proclamation of the independence of Israel; it hardly seems reasonable to think that they coveted the conquest of Jerusalem as Aharoni (1974:260) and Eissfeldt (1965:44-46) held, because there is a direct connection between David's anointing and the attack of the Philistines (cf. Ohmann, 1990:133; Bright, 1991:198). David knocked off the attack of the Philistines with the help of God (2 Sam. 5:17-25). Thereafter his first undertaking was to conquer Jerusalem, the last Canaanitic enclave, which was ruled by the Jebusites. He connected it to an old religious custom (cf. Holwerda, 1953:60) of making the city the centre of the country, which does not belong to Judah nor to Israel, as a royal city, the capital of the united kingdom (5:6-10). Now it was time for him to bring the ark, left in Kiriath-Jearim, to Jerusalem. This event had political and religious meaning for a theocracy, although for Wellhausen (1927:412-20) it is regarded as only an ideal that came out of Babylonian Exile.

Although no concrete information about exactly when the ark was brought over is provided, this project was probably one of the first undertakings of David after he settled down in

David's city. If the date 930 B.C. is accepted as the year of the division of the kingdom (Thiele, 1984:79), then David's reign should commence around the period when the Syrian states such as Aram Zobah and Damascus had remarkably been strengthened by aligning with other powerful countries in the Old Near East (cf. Pitard, 1987:89).

The kingdom ruled by David became the ideal kingdom of the Israelites from that time on; Zion functions as the centre of the world (Ezek. 38:12) because it is the place in which God dwells and where God and man can meet. Thus, the carrying of the ark to Jerusalem forms an epochal moment in history; the splendid kingdom of David begins under God's reign.

3.2.3.2. Text criticism and grammatical analysis

It is said that where Samuel and Chronicles deal with the same thing, a certain text-form should be overtaken. However, this is not necessary, as the two books are independent in nature. Here MT will serve as a starting point though. Of course old versions as 4QSam^a, dated in the first half of the first century BC and consisting of fragments of a singular, continuing role which contain 1 and 2 Samuel, especially 2 Sam. 6:2-9, 12-18 (Ulrich, 1978:221, 271), LXX, Vg, Tg, books of Chronicles and the work of Josephus will be of help at some points where MT looks doubtful as to reconstructing the texts. But the modification of the text will be as limited as possible.

V. 1. וַיִּסְּף is a declension of אָסַף 'gather' which lacks נ in the shortened form. Possibly it is an orthographic variant: absorbed by the sound harmony (GK. § 68 h; Barr, 1989:90).

בְּ of בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל is replaced as εξ in LXX, which can be accepted, for בְּחֹרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is in Tg and Syr, and *ex Israel* in VL and Vg. שְׁלֹשִׁים is read as 'seventy' in LXX which would be an exaggeration (cf. 1Sam. 11:8 in LXX).

V. 2. כָּל־הָעָם has to do with בְּחֹרֵי (Waltke and O'Conner, 1990:223, 224). מִבְּעַלֵי יְהוּדָה, "out of the citizens of Judah" (LXX, Tg, Syr, Vg) or "from Baale Judah" (KJV, RV). However, בְּעַלֵי should be the name of a place, otherwise the antecedent of מִבְּעַלֵי cannot be found. Then בְּעַלֵי would be ascribed to dittography, and the name of the place will be Baalah (Jos. 15:9, 10), Kiriath-Baal (Jos. 15:60; 18:14) or Kiriath-Jearim (1 Sam.

6:21; 7:1, 2). Segal (1965/66:44) regards ׳ of בעלי as dittography of the initial letter of יהודה. מן of מבעלי is not suitable to unite the content of the context: *uralter Schreibfehler*. בעלתה אל-קריית, "towards Baalah ..." fits 4QSam^a and 1 Chr. 13:6 in contents: "towards Baalah that Kiriath (cf. Goslinga, 1962:108, 109; Keil, 1875:258; Anderson, 1989:97).

שם שם does not need to be seen as dittography, for the second word can be an expository note (Kirkpatrick, 1890:90), although the second שם in 1 Chr. 13:6, 4QSam^a and LXX is lacking. Many manuscripts read שם "there" for the first שם (Syr).

V. 3. האלהים is respectively written as κυριου in LXX^L and יהוה as ubiquitous in Tg.

אל in MT is often replaced as על in Samuel (4QSam^a and LXX, cf. Ulrich, 1978:194)

בית in v. 3 differs from בית in v. 5 in content. The first word should be a physical structure, while the second one indicates a group of people (Waltke and O'Conner, 1990:224).

עזא shows the orthographic variant עזא in some manuscripts instead of עזא (cf. vv. 7, 8).

The proper name אחיו is incorrectly translated as "his brothers" in LXX. *Ahio* as a common noun with suffix could refer to Eleazer. Then, the repetition of 'his brother' (vv. 3f.) without indication that Eleazer is intended seems unlikely (Gordon, 1986:232). Major ancient versions such as Tg, Syr, VL and Vg rendered it as a proper pronoun.

V. 4. וחדשה וישארו מבית אבינדב אשר בגבעה in MT appears to be dittography, for 1 Chr. 13:7, LXX and 4QSam^a lacks these six words.

V.6. נכון in MT is read as כידן in 1 Chr. 13:9. 4QSam^a reads נודן (cf. Ulich, 1978:195) or נורן (Herbert, 1997:121). LXX^B reads Νωδαβ and LXX^A does Ναχωυ, while α' does not see it as proper noun: ετοιμης. In consideration that all these renderings on the proper noun are close to one another orthographically, one of them can be chosen as a reliable text. The most frequently used syllables are double נ, the first and fourth letters, and then נ is selected often. Next frequency lies on כ or כ. If 4QSam^a should read נורן as Herbert (1997:124) insists that "4QSam^a deviates from all witnesses," כ would be the next one. Thus, it is plausible that MT is close to the original one, *contra* Japhet (2002:278) who selected כידן. VL and Vg agree with MT. Likewise α', Tg and Syr translated it as ni. ptc. of כון according to its root meaning, 'firm': אתר מתקן, 'the appointed place' instead of נכון נכון.

שלח sometimes omits the substantive object: יד "hand" (GK. § 117 g; Kön. § 209 c; Broc. § 127 b). However, 1 Chr. 13:9 and 4QSam^a have את-ידו "his hand."

בּ of בּוֹ can be partitive: וַיִּחַזֵּב בּוֹ, "he picked its part."

בְּקָרָה as collective is constructed with the plural (Lett. § 65 k; Kön. § 346 e; GK. § 145 b).

The meaning of שָׁמְטוּ הַבְּקָרָה is not sure (HALAT, 1441). LXX reads περισπασεν αυτην and Vg, *declinaverunt eam* (transitive verb). It is possible that שָׁמְטוּ gets an intransitive meaning (1 Chr. 13:9), even though it is still doubtful philologically (Driver, 1913b:267)

V. 7. LXX has a lack of the word שָׁלַח < שָׁל. LXX^a has προπετεια. Akk., *sullū*: brutality, disgrace (HALAT, 1391; Selms, 1933:43).

1 Chr. 13:10 has לפני "before" in stead of עם. LXX melts together both versions to clarify the situation: παρὰ τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ κυρίου ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.

V. 8. על אֲשֶׁר פָּרַץ יְהוָה פָּרַץ, "because Yahweh made a hit," inward object-accusative (cf. GK. § 117 p; Lett. § 74 e).

וַיִּקְרָא has a common subject.

V. 9. The imperfect of יָבוֹא functions with the potential meaning of 'can' in English (cf. Lett. § 72 c 3)

V. 10. על-עיר is confused with אל in many manuscripts, and probably both prepositions are interchangeable (Broc. § 108 c).

V. 11. וְאֵת-כָּל-בֵּיתוֹ is written as וְאֵת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ in 1 Chr. 13:14, "and all that he possesses," LXX contains both of them to clarify: ὅλον τὸν οἶκον Αβεδδαρα καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ.

V. 14. מְכַרְכֵּר is a form of pt. m. act. pilp. of כָּרַר, 'dance' whose meaning literally is 'whirl.'

הַגִּיבֵר אֶפְוֵד בְּדָ shows the passive construction with an accusative (JM. § 121 o).

V. 15. בֵּית is omitted in Syr. The omission hardly refracts the meaning, for it considers it as pleonatic.

וַיִּרְוֶן יְהוָה בְּרִית is added to אֲרֹן in VL and Vg. The term is never employed in this chapter. It looks like just a variation.

V. 16. In stead of וַיְהִי 4QSam^a, 1 Chr. 15:29 and LXX contain וַיְדַבֵּר: Campbell (1975:131) chose וַיְהִי as *lectio difficilior*. By following MT, De Boer (1991:145-148) explains that the perfect with ו can be used to reflect a repetition of a conclusion or report, or to indicate a condition for a following story, accepting the Hebrew syntax of Davidson. He believes that the composer added verse 16 so as to connect the ark narrative with Michal's story.

V. 17. **בְּמִקְוֹמוֹ** is not found in Syr and 1 Chr. 16:1 but in 1 Kings 8:6. But it is not necessary to say that **בְּמִקְוֹמוֹ** is originated from 1 Kings 8:6.

The order of the MT (**עֲלֹת לְפָנַי יְהוָה וְשָׁלָמִים**) and LXX (ὀλοκαυτώματα ἐνώπιον κυρί καὶ εἰρημικός) is different from Syr and 1 Chr. 16:1: **עֲלֹת וְשָׁלָמִים לְפָנַי הָאֱלֹהִים**

V. 18. **הָעוֹלָה** as a singular form can be used as a collective, but **עוֹלֹת** in verse 17 is plural (Driver, 1913b:270).

V. 19. **ל** in **לְמֵאִישׁ וְעַד־אִשָּׁה** points out a moving direction: 'from men to women' (Broc. § 117 b).

אֶחָד and **אֶחָדָה** in the MT is sometimes used as an indefinite article. In particular, they are related to **אִישׁ** and **אִשָּׁה** in the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings (JM. § 137 u).

V. 20. **הַגְּלוֹת וְהַגְּלוֹת** are forms of inf. cons. and inf. abs. ni. of **גָּלָה** The inf. abs. emphasizes the inf. cons. Here the inf. abs. is used as an adverb.

הַרְקִים should be read as **הַרְקִדִים** "dancers" (cf. Wellhausen, 1872:169).

V. 21. The short version of MT does not have to be considered as the result of a homoioteleuton, for MT still has same words (**יְהוָה** and **לְפָנַי יְהוָה**, twice) and varied codices of LXX have other different words (see critical apparatus of BHS).

וְשִׁחֲקֵתִי is form of perfect consecutive used to express ideal connection: *hinter absolut vorausgestelltem Umstand* (Kön. § 367 g).

V. 22. **וְנִקְלָתִי עוֹד מִזֹּאת** is rendered as καὶ ἀποκαλυφθήσομαι ἔτι οὕτως, "and I will still uncover myself." This translation reflects verse 20.

בְּעֵינַי of MT is written as ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου in LXX, which offers a better contrast with the following sentence. But the verse of MT is not objectionable. Tg, Syr, VL and Vg back MT.

אֶכְבְּדָהּ as a cohortative may be able to offer a special emphasis (cf. Anderson, 1989:99).

3.2.3.3. The form and structure (cf. 1 Chr. 13 and 15-16)

The beginning of 2 Samuel 6 is not directly connected with the end of chapter 5 but is still related in chronology, though roughly. The author is about to describe how David wanted to turn Jerusalem into the residence of Yahweh by bringing the ark of covenant to it (cf. Goslinga, 1962:107).

This chapter contains two main events: the carrying of the ark to Jerusalem (vv. 1-15; 17-19) and Michal's breaking with David (vv. 16, 20-23). The two stories are not divided but are intimately interwoven into each other as one continuous story; the second event depends on the first one. It is stated that Michal's event would not have been an integral part of the ark-narrative. Rost (1926:106f.) regarded 'Michal's episode' as a possible beginning of the *Thronachfolgegeschichte* with an original dynastic oracle in 2 Samuel 7. Politically it may be a prelude to the event of a king's succession. Then Gunn (1978:66f. 73f.) suggested that this story originally belonged to the sequence of 2 Sam. 5:1-3. Yet he appears not to consider the historical process between David's anointment and his transfer of the capital to Jerusalem, by attaching weight to literary composition. Concerning the relation of this story with the context Carlson (1964:82-96) still has a different opinion: the 'ark narrative' is connected with the annual festival in *sukkōt*. For him the theme of 2 Samuel 6 is the restoration of fertility: David wearing only a linen ephod and dancing without restraint (14), Michal looking down through a window (16), David blessing the people (18), and returning to bless his household (20), and David giving food to every man and woman (19). However since he attempts to interpret each theme of the chapter in terms of the background of Canaanite myth and religion, his *überlieferungsgeschichtlichen* research is hardly supported by the biblical grounds, in consideration of the character of Israel's religion: Israel's prosperity rests on a covenant relationship with God but not on fertility cult. Those problems that Carlson suggested will shortly be treated.

As regards the relation between 1 Sam. 4-6 and this chapter, there are two major arguments: a closure of the ark narrative, a separate unit. After Rost (1926) identified the *Ladeerzählung* (1 Sam. 4:1b-7:1; 2 Sam. 6:1-20) as a separate narrative, a majority followed his theory (cf. Eynikel, 2000:88f.). Then just a handful of opponents suggested a variety of reasons for dissension: linguistic problems, content, genre, etc. The likes of Miller and Roberts (1977:23f.) disagree about the connection of the two parts, by holding that only four expressions are shared with each other and that 2 Samuel 6 tends to be the historical chronicles reporting the return of a lost cultic image. Van Seters (1983:346-353) maintains that the ark narrative is just part of the wider theme of the ark as the symbol of the divine presence in exilic Deuteronomistic history but it is never an independent document. In the same vein Smelik (1992:35-58) insists that there are no compelling reasons to assume the preexistence of an ark narrative before the

composition of the Book of Samuel, by suggesting problems of historical improbabilities, its thorough-going theological nature, *Sitz im Leben*, disagreement among scholars, earlier source, oral transmission. However Eynikel (2000:88-106) recently refuted the arguments against the existence of an independent ark narrative, by concluding that the ark narrative (1 Sam. 1-6; 2 Sam. 6:1-19) contains the Eli narrative (1 Sam. 1-4). Particularly he attempts to confute the arguments of the opponents separately and to settle the subjects of discussion. Here it would be proper to deal with his five solutions (2000:96) to argue the connection of the two narratives and to evaluate them. 1) He quotes van Seters' statement, "the connections between the two parts the ark narrative greatly outweigh their differences." Yet van Seters' intention is not to argue that the two narratives are originally composed of a literary unit but probably to denote that there is a historical continuation between 1 Sam. 7:1 and 2 Sam. 6. 2) "2 Sam. 6:2-19 provides an excellent closure for the ark narrative." Since generally a great literary work does not finish with an incomplete content such as 1 Sam. 7:1, it seems plausible on the the grounds that the ark narrative is recognized as an independent literature. Yet this conjecture would be altered if the emphasis resides in what happened chronologically rather than on literary plot. 3) "The enormous power that the ark radiates is the same in both parts." Here the phrase, "power that the ark radiates" sounds like the ark is a fetish. It differs from the description of the text that tells us "the anger of Yahweh was kindled against Uzzah and God smote him" (2 Sam. 6:7). This power is not of the ark itself but of God; it occurred as a token of his wrath. Such a power of God with the ark is not confined to the ark narrative but found in the crossing of the Jordan river (Jos. 4) and destruction of Jericho as well (Jos. 6), even though the result of God's mighty action occurred differently. 4) "Abinadab's house is mentioned in both parts." It seems to be natural if the two texts have reliability to show historical continuity, prior to consideration of a literary unity. 5) "The share vocabulary of 1 Sam. 4-6 and 2 Sam. 6 is admittedly limited but important." He gives two examples: "the new cart" and the queries of the Philistines (1 Sam. 6:20) and David (2 Sam. 6:9). It is right that the new cart is a shared vocabulary. Then it would be a significant proof for literary connection of the two materials if they are fictional writings. Yet such terms would have to be used if the texts report historical events. In addition the following example is the shared vocabulary that Eynikel quoted from van der Toorn & Houtman: מִהַנְעִשָׂה לְאַרוֹן אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (1 Sam. 6:20) and אֵיךְ יָבוֹא אֱלֹהֵי אֲרֹן יְהוָה (2 Sam. 6:9). In his quotation it is a mistake to translate אֱלֹהֵי as 'to us.'

There is only one shared word between two sentences: **וַיִּזְכֹּר**. Thereby these two phrases hardly match each other well. If we denote a shared vocabulary of 2 Sam. 6, it would be said that this chapter is closer to 1 Sam. 5: Baal-Perasim, Perez-Uzza. Thus in fact it may be sufficient to say that the phrases he suggested had better be regarded as a common response to such a disaster rather than as a clue for a whole literature. Moreover he did not explain the reason why the shared vocabulary is important, compared to other vocabulary.

Those who consider that the ark narrative originally contained two parts believe that the old tradition was properly arranged in historical setting. In particular Eynikel (2000:100) holds oral transmission of the ark narrative, stating that the frequent repetition of phrases using the same wordings is an indication of mnemotechnique wording. Here he gives an example with the wording, "the hand of the Lord was heavy upon" as if it were a musical refrain. However it is hard to acknowledge the expression as an indication of mnemotechnique wording because the phrase irregularly occurs twice only in 1 Sam. 5. Such an apparatus might be expected to occur in 2 Sam. 6, if it was handed down as an oral tradition. If 2 Sam. 6:1-19 is a conclusion of the ark narrative at the literary level, more similarities should have been proven. If 1 Sam. 7:1 functioned as a good juncture to bind 2 Sam. 6, the title of the location should have been accorded at least. In fact this attempt of literary approach is mainly based on ahistorical methodology such as traditio-historical criticism. It is not necessary to stress their literary unity by undermining historicity of the narrative, since it is not sure that it existed as an independent unit of an ark narrative which existed before the composition of this book. Moreover the story concerning the ark is not confined to the 'ark narrative' in the book of Samuel. Thus it may be hard to agree that this chapter is the conclusion of the 'ark narrative.' The narrative appears to occur in the recording of a historical event because the author of the book of Samuel would have written various events according to both methods, in the horizontal (descriptive) and the vertical (thematic) way. At any rate, in this thesis, it is most important that the content of the narrative is to be accepted as a reliable document, whether or not it is associated with the 'ark narrative' in terms of literature.

The occurrence presented in this chapter is reflected more poetically in 1 Chronicles 13, 15-16 where the process of carrying the ark gets much more attention: extended consideration with people (13:1-5), evident indication of the place (13:6), report of the ceremony (15:25-16:3),

arrangement of the procession and the appearance of the priests and the Levites (15:1-24; 16:4-42). Then the fact that the tension between David and Michal is not reported here is based on the intention of the authors of Samuel and Chronicles, who made different choices from the materials available. The parallel pieces in Chronicles offer greater support for a better understanding of this chapter. On the ground of its contents 2 Sam. 6 can be divided into three parts. They are as follows (for a detailed analysis, see Campbell, 1975:133-135).

| | 2 Sam. 6 | 1 Chr. |
|--|----------|------------|
| I. The first attempt to carry the ark | 1 - 11 | 13:1-14 |
| 1. The preparation to carry the ark | 1 - 2a | 13:1-6a |
| 2. The ark | 2b | 13:6b |
| 3. Attempt to transfer the ark | 3 - 5 | 13:7-8 |
| 4. Perez Uzza | 6 - 8 | 9 - 11 |
| 5. The ark in the house of Obed-Edom | 9 - 11 | 12 - 14 |
| II. Festive entry of the ark in David's city | 12-19 | 15:1-16:43 |
| 1. The procession around the ark | 12-15 | 15:1-28 |
| 2. The contempt of Michal | 16 | 15:29 |
| 3. The first worship in Zion | 17-19 | 16:1-43 |
| III. The tension between David and Michal | 20-23 | |
| 1. The mockery of Michal | 20 | |
| 2. The answer of David | 21, 22 | |
| 3. The judgment of God | 23 | |

3.2.3.4. Explanation

3.2.3.4.1. The first attempt to carry the ark (vv. 1 - 11)

3.2.3.4.1.1. The preparation to carry the ark (vv. 1 - 2a)

David again brought together out of Israel chosen men (v. 1). עָרַב indicates that there

has already been a large meeting, one which is not reported in the text. Hertzberg (1965:225) finds the word **לַעֲדָתוֹ** as an inconceivable augmentation. It is generally said that it does not match the 'ark-narrative.' According to Campbell (1979:39, 40), all of verse 1 is not required in order to connect this 'ark-narrative' with 1 Sam. 7:1. However, this word may be able to prove that the hypothesis of the 'ark-narrative' is groundless; it stresses the continuous historical story in 2 Samuel (cf. 3.2.2.1.2). The 'meeting' reminds us of 'David and his men' (5:6 and 21), but this group was not big in scale, while it seems to be evident that the previous meeting was quite large group. The group was a military group David gathered to fight against the Philistines (Chap. 5). Regarding their army, Goslinga (1962:108) believes they fight against the Jebusites as well as the Philistines, but this military action appears to be undertaken by the personal troop of David (cf. Bright, 1991:200). Keil (1875:258) contends this point, stating that the first assemblage must be the people's meeting in Hebron, one that was not brought together by David. A remarkable irony of this gathering is that whereas people of this time were brought together usually for the sake of war, they now came together for peace. **בַּחֹרֶךְ** 'the chosen' would be regarded as the men whom David chose as warriors earlier to fight in the war (cf. Weisman, 1981:443). Although he did not really need to gather such an armed force for this expedition, it is conceivable that he wanted to mobilize them: "zijn regering was in de eerste tijd sterk militair getint" (Noordtzijs, 1977:117; cf. 1 Chr. 13:1). It seems undesirable to seek a Babylonian parallel concerning this military expedition: "Just as Assurbanipal's army participated in the return of Marduk to his new sanctuary, so David's army participated in the return of the ark of Yahweh" (Miller and Roberts, 1977:16).

אֶלֶף is where some difficulty lies because it has in general been doubtful that **אֶלֶף** points out exactly one thousand in number. However, it would be acceptable that **אֶלֶף** in this text means one thousand in consideration of Mendenhall's statement (1958:60, 66) that in the early monarchy the royal army contained units of a thousand men under the command of an officer appointed by the king. Thirty thousand men were chosen out of all the tribes, out of the 'whole Israel' (1 Chr. 13:6) matching national assemblage; according to Albright (1963:56), the population during the ruling of David and Solomon doubled in number, possibly from 400,000 to 800,000. As a military escort, they were to be accompanied by an enthusiastic procession for the ark. However, it is totally unidentified how the expression "whole Israel" can be coordinated with a Babylonian parallel: "The reference to 'all the people that were with him'

recalls the gathering of the whole population of Babylon to bring Marduk to his temple after his liberation" (Porter, 1954:170, 171).

According to 1 Chr. 13:1-3, the plan to take the ark to Jerusalem is formed by David himself. The reason David undertook this project is clear if we take into consideration the political and spiritual policy he diligently pursued: "Through the ark he sought to link the newly created state to Israel's ancient order as its legitimate successor, and to advertise the state as the patron and protector of the sacral institutions of the past ... It was a masterstroke." (Bright, 1991:200, 201; cf. Jagersma, 1979:150; Hermann, 1980:200; Brueggemann, 1990: 247f.; Japhet, 1997:132-139). Albertz (1992:193) refers to the shrewd statesmanship in David's undertaking: "Es war David selber gewesen, der die geniale Idee hatte, das nach der Zerstörung von Silo vergessene tribale Kultsymbol der Lade in seine neue Hauptstadt zu überführen (2 Sam 6), um sie so auch zum kultischen Mittelpunkt seines Reiches zu machen." Noth (1956:176) and de Tarragon (1979:523) connect his political intention with a central function of tribes of the new kingdom. In contrast with a more general view, Van der Toorn and Houtman (1994:231) consider such a notion as "a Deuteronomic phantom, produced by the projection of a late theological ideal upon Israel's prehistory." Yet, this occasion appears far from a Deuteronomic character because the ark is repeatedly described simply as אָרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים (seven times) but not אָרוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים or אָרוֹן בְּרִית יְהוָה which are deemed as typically Deuteronomistic and the atmosphere of the sacrifice in this chapter is closer to P rather than Deuteronomic disposition, according to critical views.

At any rate, as regards David's motive, it appears to be somewhat unreasonable to evaluate David's action only as a political move, separated from personal affection for the ark (Ps. 132:1-7 shows us how David yearned for the ark). It may be impossible to ignore that a firm and unshakable trust in Yahweh motivated him to hold this occasion: faith, thus, appears to precede political concern. It appears that his zeal for the Israelite God drove him to transfer the ark to the new capital city of Israel. With his personal faith colouring this official event, his reign begins with the expectation of Yahweh's sovereignty. It can be said that David's political interest is closely connected to his theocracy.

He and all his men arose from Baalah -Judah to bring up (v. 2a). 'Baalah -Judah' should be the same place as Kiriath-Jearim in 1 Chr. 13:6 (cf. Jos. 15:60; 18:14), even though it is

stated that Baalah -Judah and Kiriath-Jearim were two neighbouring locations of topographical origin which were identified as each other later (cf. Schicklberger, 1973:139). 'Kiriath' as a local name seems to refer to a kind of antiquity, considering that Kiriath-Sepher was the old name of Debir (Jos. 15:15; Jud. 1:11) and Kiriath-Arba was that of Hebron (Jos. 14:15) (Anderson, 1989:101). The city lay on the border of Judah and Benjamin (about 12 km to the west of Jerusalem) and was one of the most prominent cities of the Gibeonites (cf. Jos. 9:17-27). Now the place passes for 'Deir el -`Azar' in Arabic and 'Qiryat Ye`arim' in Hebrew (Aharoni, 1974:380). Here the ark stayed for about 80 years (cf. Goslinga, 1948: 35; 1962:110), whereas Brouwer (nd:160) and Keil (1875:260) argued 50 and 70 years respectively. There are reasons why the ark of Yahweh drew little attention from the Israelites for such a long period of time. One reason is that the Israelite people were no longer interested in the ark after the war in Ebenezer (1 Sam. 4:10, 11) because, perhaps, they thought that it had failed to guarantee victory and was simply an object of fearfulness. A more practical reason is that Kiriath-Jearim, as a member of the Gibeonites union (Jos. 9:17), was a predominant Amorite and Canaanite city. It is probable that the city had been under Philistine suzerainty. Thus, the city had been left inaccessible to the Israelite authorities. Now that the threat had disappeared, the Israelites could have an opportunity to carry off the ark (cf. Mauchline, 1971:222; Goldman, 1986:220). Another reason is related to the faith of the monarch. Saul, known as an ungodly king of Israel, appears hardly interested in the dedication to Yahweh symbolically residing in the ark and possibly regarded it as little importance (1 Sam. 22:18, 19; 23:1, 27; 1 Chr. 13:3): hereof dispute on whether Saul ordered the bringing of the ark (cf. Toorn & Houtman, 1994:) or Ephod (Kio, 1996:240-246) in 1 Samuel 14:18 is another matter (cf. 4.2.1).

3.2.3.4.1.2. The ark (v. 2b)

This verse gives a long explanation regarding the name of the ark in relation to the name of God: *the ark of God, which is called by the Name, the name of Yahweh Almighty, who is inhabited at the cherubim that are on the ark.* "Cette formule est une légitimation des titres nouveaux donnés à Yahvé en relation avec l'arche, antique symbole de sa présence au milieu de son peuple" (Vaux, 1967:259). Calling out Yahweh's name as it refers to the ark does not

express that the ark is renamed, as if it belongs to another deity (cf. Fohrer, 1971:24). Rather, this name shows how the ark is a possession of Yahweh. The same thing is said of the temple (Jer. 7:10, 11: 32:34; 34:15) (cf. Zimmerli, 1985:64; Anderson, 1989:102). Concerning the 'name,' Zimmerli (1985:66) provides a proper explanation: "Es ist eingangs festgestellt worden, daß der 'Name' nicht eine auswechselbare Etikette bedeutet, sondern das Wesen des Benannten in sich befaßt. Es ist andererseits auch ganz deutlich, daß 'Name' die anrufbare Seite eines Wesens ist. Im Namen ist der Angerufene anzutreffen. Das Anrufen seines Namens 'betrefft' ihn." It is also an indication of the presence of God. The name is often connected with צבאות יהוה which is commonly believed to hold a connotation closely associated with a God's omnipotence: see section 3.2.2.4.1 for a detailed explanation (1 Samuel 4:4). Yahweh Zebaoth as a God's epithet is reflective of God's ability to redeem, to protect and to lead the people of Israel. The connection of the name of the ark with the cherubim symbolizes Yahweh's glorious and majestic presence. Now David as a theocratic king demonstrates that the ark still is the external sign of the security, preservation, and the future of Israel.

3.2.3.4.1.3. Attempt to transfer the ark (vv. 3-5)

The Israelites set the ark of God on a new cart (v. 3a). In contrast to how the ark was pulled into battle as if a chariot of war, it is now being pulled along on a cart led by two cows. Schulz (1920:68) goes so far as to insist that the movement and notion of the act resemble that of someone sitting on an animal and being dragged along. He argues this despite the character נשׂא which refutes his position since it is different from רכב (hi.). A new cart (cf. 1 Sam. 6:7) which is not yet contaminated is deemed suitable to carry the holy object. They try to place the ark on the cart the same way the Philistines did, even though it violates the law; a holy object like the ark must be carried on the shoulders of the designated men of God (cf. Num. 3:29-31; 7:9). It is not reported why David chose such a method to do the job, but the sons of Abinadab were possibly superstitious, for they saw a new magical power in the ark when the Philistines returned it on a new cart.

The house of Abinadab was located on the hill (v. 3b). It is still the same house as in 1 Sam. 7:1. Most likely, Abinadab himself is already dead. Hertzberg (1965:228) notices that it

was "vielleicht der heiligen Stätte," but if that is so, the word **במה** 'high place' may have to stand, as in 1 Sam. 9:12, 13, 14. It is imaginable that the transport of the ark involved some risk when it came time to negotiate the hill. The route which was taken to transport the ark may have been from the eastern end of the Sorek valley by way of Kiriath-Jearim to Jerusalem (cf. Dorsey, 1991:186).

It is held that *Uzza* was once identified with Eleazar from 1 Sam. 7:1. 'Uzza' may be a shortened form of Eleazar (Budde, 1902:228; Toorn & Houtman, 1994:223). This said, he cannot be the same figure or a brother of his, for there is a chronological chasm of circa 80 years between Eleazar and Uzza. It may be possible that he is a grandchild of Abinadab (cf. Goslinga, 1962:111; Hertzberg, 1965:228). The proper name *Ahio* is translated as 'his brother' in LXX: **אֶחָיו**, not **אֶחָיוֹ** in LXX (cf. Wellhausen, 1872:167; Budde, 1902:229; Caird, 1953:1077; Campbell, 1975:129, 171). The word can be translated so, but it seems plausible that the name is a variant of **אֶחָיוֹ** "Ahijah" (Yahweh is brother) (Smith, 1899:293; Anderson, 1989:103). Certainly Uzza and Ahio were appointed as escorts. According to verse 4, Ahio preceded the ark while Uzza stood next to the cart, near the ark.

The procession initially bears a festive character. The expression *whole Israel* reflects the national aspect; the ark is the holiest possession of the people. The verb **שָׁחַק** in pi. means here 'to dance,' 'play' and 'skip' (cf. 1 Sam. 18:7; *HALAT*, 1226). In particular, 'skip' indicates that they moved in a certain direction at the same time: "Die übliche Übersetzung Tanzen is hier nicht ganz korrekt. Der kultische Tanz, mit Beteiligung der Frauen, heiß **חֲגֹל**" (Stoebe, 1994:189). The participle used here indicates some kind of continuous motion. Unlike the refined motions of a cultic dance, they skip with gladness before Yahweh with accompaniment of various musical instruments and songs of gladness (cf. 1 Chr. 13:8). Thus a frenzied rejoicing and religious enthusiasm in the presence of God makes the procession an overwhelming experience.

The following words **בְּכָל עֵצֵי בְרוֹשִׁים** form the *lectio difficilior*. Many scholars tried to reconstruct it after the parallel of Chronicles: **בְּכָל עֵץ וּבְשִׁירִים** : Goslinga (1962:112) says, "de vermelding van cypressenhout als materiaal ware in dit verband volkomen bijkomstig." They believe that the emendation of this text should be allowed following the text of Chronicles. They also believe the latter makes the origin of the MT explicable: changing the place of **ו** and **ש**, replacing **ו** with **ש**, and crossing **ו** and **ש**. It sounds acceptable to correct the text of Samuel after Chronicles. However, the problem is not solved completely with this correction: it is not

certain that the text of Chronicles is its original text. The names of musical instruments in Samuel differ from those of Chronicles.

Smith (1899:294) holds that "nor is it known that fir (or cypress) wood was used in the manufacture of musical instruments." According to recent research (cf. Walker, 1997:740f.) the cypress is *Juniperus Phoenicea* or *Juniperus excels*, an especially durable kind of wood which is identified as a chief tree of Lebanon (Is. 60:13) and is associated with cedar (2 King. 19:23; Ps. 104:17; Is. 14:8; Zech. 11:2). Soggin (1964:376) mentions the 'Schlaghölzer' or 'Klappern', a percussion instrument made of it. This research is supported by Stoebe (1994:189). Hence, this could be an instrument made of cypress. With the help of old versions (LXX, Tg and V) this text can be applied as follows: with various instruments of cypress. The Hebrew term עָוָה matches instrument less than כִּלָּי . The text of Chronicles is helpful because it details the procession much better. In some cases it does not seem to be possible to translate exactly the different terms for the musical instruments. Sometimes the names of instruments appear to imitate the sound. כְּנֹוֹר is the most frequently mentioned stringed instrument in the Old Testament. It was made in the shape of a lyre and is also called David's harp (1 Sam. 16:16, 23). It must have been an instrument similar to the Greek Kitára-lyre, which is often played with a harp in an ensemble. Josephus (*Ant.*, VII, 306) said that the lyre had ten strings and the harp twelve. The association of the lyre with singing is ancient (Gen. 31:27) and significant in the Psalms (cf. Pss. 57:9; 98:5; 147:7 etc.) (cf. Jones, 1992:937). תְּפִילִּים indicates how the tambourine, an instrument consisting of a small drumhead with jingling disks fitted into the rim, was used as a rhythmical accompaniment for song and dance. In Israel, tambourines were played by women just as in Mesopotamia and Egypt (Ex. 15:20; Judg. 11:35; 1 Sam. 18:6). What instrument מִנְעָנְעִים (נָעַע , to shake) refers to is totally uncertain, but most likely it was a shaking instrument, perhaps even rattles. Vulgata translated it as a sistra: "The sistrum was an Egyptian instrument which consisted of rings hanging loosely on iron rods and making a tinkling sound when shaken" (Goldman, 1951:221). צִלְצְלִים , cymbals (צִלְצַל , to tinkle) here appear for the first time in the Old Testament. It was a percussion instrument consisting of a concave brass plate that made a loud clashing tone when used in pairs. The Levites later used these instruments too (2 Chr. 5:12f.; 29:25; Neh. 12:27). The accompaniment, with all these instruments, served to give expression to the festive rejoicing and to raise it to a level. The procession was an enormous manifestation with music, dance and song. It was a special

national festival but the rejoicing does not last long because of the death of Uzza.

3.2.3.4.1.4. Peres-Uzza (vv. 6-8)

The words **נְכוֹן נָרָן** can be translated in three ways: as a proper noun; nif'al, a participle of **נָרַן**; 'accident' derived from the verb **נָדַה** 'to strike'. The first view is held by Wellhausen (1871:168), Budde (1902:229), Smith (1899:292), Driver (1913b:266f.), De Groot (1935:90), Hertzberg (1965:228), Goslinga (1962:113), McCarter (1984:161), Anderson (1989:103) and others. Wellhausen argues that **נָרָן** is the parallel in 1 Chr. 13:9 descended from **נָרַן < נָרַן**. Noth (1966:85) states that it is very probable that **נָרָן** is a chronistical interpretation of **נָרָן**. The second opinion brings about different meanings: 'a certain' (Ackroyd, 1977: 66), 'secure' (Arnold, 1917:62), 'permanent' (Marget, 1920:70-76), or 'prepared' (Seow, 1989:97, following Pesh, Tg and Aquila). The third opinion is translated as "Tenne des Schleges." This idea was established by Keil (1875:261) and is supported by Tur-Sinai (1951:279). Tur-Sinai exposed the existence of the noun in the defective Hebrew original of the LXX over the Beth-Shemesh episode in 1 Sam. 6:19. Here **נְכוֹן** is to be related to a proper name. The other possibilities (the prepared threshing-floor or the permanent threshing-floor) can be defended philosophically and etymologically, but not applied in this context. The LXX, 4QSam^a and the parallel in Chronicles represent a proper noun, even if this is different from that in the MT. Tur-Sinai (1951:283) supposes that **נָרָן** should be translated as a synonym of **נְכוֹן**: ruin, destruction. It makes acceptable that **נָרָן** is used by a late author instead of **נְכוֹן**.

The location of the threshing-floor of Nachon is unknown. It cannot be the same place as that of Arauna in chapter 24. According to Simons (1952:245), a spot somewhere on the south-western heel of Jerusalem is probably included in it. Carlson (1964:80, 81) associates this place with "the garden of Uzza" in 2 Chr. 25:4 and Jer. 39:4. He bases this on the unclear meaning in verse 13 "each six steps." The garden of Uzza is located near David's city: about 200m to the south of the city. However, there is no reason to accept that the ark was carried to that direction because the road led to the north-west of Jerusalem (cf. Dorsey, 1991:203; Fritz, 1990:105). It is important that **עֲזָיָה** in 2 Chr. 21:18, 26 is a variant and shortened name of **עֲזַיָּהוּ**. This garden is said to have been built by Uziah (Gispén, 1955:112; Hobbs, 1985:309).

However, it is nowhere written that the threshing-floor became the garden of the king. In any case, the threshing-floor is located not far from Baalah-Judah.

Uzza reached out and took hold of the ark of God, for the oxen stumbled (v. 6b). The verb שָׁמַט (qal) has almost a transitive meaning in other places (Ex. 22:11; Deut. 15:2; 2 King. 9:33; Jer. 17:4). However, it can here better be taken up as intransitive, since it does not have an explicit accusative and הַכֹּהֵן should be the subject. The LXX, Tg and Vg follow the vocalization שָׁמַטוּ (his shaking), which can be regarded as the result of שָׁמַטוּ. The reason why the oxen stumbled is not mentioned. This question is meaningless: "Is there perhaps a hint that the oxen stumbled because they knew (cp. the cows in 1 Sam. 6:7-12 which are divinely controlled) that they were at a holy place, whereas David and his men had not recognized this?" (Ackroyd, 1977:66). Although the reactionary activity of Uzza is comprehensible, his deed was sinful in nature.

Yahweh's anger burned against Uzza because of his irreverent act (v. 7). עַל-הַשֵּׁל of the MT is found only in this part of the Old Testament. It is not clear where שֵׁל is originated from. The old versions such as LXX^a and Vg translate the word with *propeteia* and *temeritas* (rash). Selms (1933) calls it *oneerbiedigheid* a meaning which is properly used in this context. Uzza's understanding indeed appears to come out of too little knowledge of the holiness of the ark. There is no reason to remove עַל-הַשֵּׁל (McCarter, 1984:161), by replacing it with a parallel text from Chronicles or 4QSam^a, as some scholars propose (Hertzberg, 1965:226; Mauchline, 1971:224; Gordon, 1986:232). Chronicles offers a plain interpretation for עַל-הַשֵּׁל: "because he put forth his hand to the ark."

Uzza died beside the ark through God's punishment. Yet it is not necessary to suppose that the ark radiated the enormous power, as Eynikel (2000:96) mentions. There are different views regarding his fault, the cause of his death. According to Hertzberg (1965:228) Uzza had disregarded the usual precautions taken when serving the ark: "so daß Ussa schenll hinzuspringt, offenbar unter Außerlachtlassung der sonst bei der Bedienung der Lade üblichen Maßnahmen." But Mauchline (1971:224) states that "Uzza's act was one done on the spur of the moment to save the Ark from damage." Anderson (1989:104), concerned with the holiness of the ark, and Dus (1961:7) notice that "Uzza sinned in that he did not grant Yahweh the freedom to choose his own resting place." All these explanations about the cause of Uzza's death are unclear. Yahweh's freedom does not seem to have to do with Uzza's offence. It only makes sense that

Uzza violated the law of God by touching the ark (Num. 4:15). The ark should be moved about only with carrying poles (Ex. 25:14). Another explication of 1 Chr. 15:13 explains the underlying cause of the punishment, and this explanation is above all the others; the infringement came out of a lack of respect for the prescription God himself gave and thus, Uzza has no excuse. In fact, undertaking to carry the ark on a cart from the beginning was awry. Presumably the Philistines too touched the ark but they were not punished by God. However, now he intervened. Yahweh expected complete observance of the law from his own people. One out of the congregation was punished severely: Uzza is exponent of the slovenliness of all relating to the law. God maintains his right and holiness. K. Schilder (unpublished syllabus) in a lecture in the United States elucidates this event from the perspective of God's covenant: " God wil het wel de grote genade geven van het teken van zijn inhabitatie in Zijn volk, maar het volk mag de zegen niet scheiden van de verbondswraak en God herinnert er nu aan dat verbondszegen nimmer los staat van de verbondswraak. Deze daad bedoelt n.l. het volk terug te voeren tot de woordgehoorzaamheid en Jahve te doen vrezen: a) in Zijn genade, b) in Zijn recht." Indeed, faith is the acceptance of Yahweh's promises and demands. All that happened has to do with the plan of David to try to set up the worship in Jerusalem. God treated the king roughly so that the service would be organized in accordance with his law (cf. Gootjes, 1987:2). This event is an obvious warning to king David: "Wie alle anderen Sterblich, so muß auch dieser große König die Erfahrung machen, daß über die Lade Gottes niemand verfügt als Gott selbst" (Dietrich & Naumann, 1995:134).

As for the smite, Seow (1989:99-101) is inclined to regard the reference to Yahweh's anger in this text as authentic to the ritual in the light of the Ugaritic parallel (*KTU* 1.6.II.30-37). Primarily it is understandable that he refutes the theory of Deuteronomistic editing of this passage with this statement. However it is wondered what the disaster has to do with the ritual even though the Ugaritic document has the cultic *Sitz im Leben*. Moreover he mentions that the element of divine anger understandably belongs with the motif of the divine warrior's advance against the enemies (Hab 3:8; Job 9:13). The Ugaritic literature displays how Anat thoroughly vanquished Mot, the enemy of Baal. Naturally such a mythological description is a deification of nature in the agricultural cycle of the year. Then it appears clumsy that the victory of Anat against Baal's enemy in the mythological combat is compared with Yahweh's wrath against Uzza. It may well state that Yahweh considers Uzza to be not so much an enemy as a

member of covenantal people who are responsible for serving him in accordance with his law. In fact it is groundless to hold that God regards creatures such as monsters and the phenomenon of nature, like a great wave, as a rival to be defeated. Thus Seow's explanation with the Ugaritic parallel is hardly applied to the event of Uzza.

"David was angry" (v. 8a). The expression לָּ ... אַחַז points out the ignition of wrath (Gen. 4:5; Jon. 4:9). David's anger was not directed against God but against the disaster which had evoked Yahweh's wrath (cf. Peterson, 1999:164). It is curious whether a distinction can be made between these two: the disaster on the one hand and the intervention of God on the other. In the Old Testament it is seldom that someone is angry with God (Gen. 4:5; Jon. 4:1, 4). Another translation of אַחַז can be offered here: 'he was deeply grieved' (cf. Gen. 45:5; 1 Sam. 15:11). The next verse is the basis of this translation: "David was afraid of Yahweh." 1 Chr. 15:13 makes it known that David realizes that they did not inquire of God about how to carry the ark in a prescribed way. It is true that David himself was informed later of the legal prescription concerning the treatment of the ark, but it is unimaginable that David did not know the regulation entirely before the first attempt to carry it was made. So he had a right to be angry with himself. The death of Uzza stopped the procession and the festive mood came to an end.

The verb אַחַז makes David the subject, as in the LXX, but the last words of the verse 8, "*to this day*" do not support it. The appellation 'Perez Uzza' is indirectly derived from David himself; the king memorialized the event by renaming the accident site 'Perez Uzza.' Sometimes the story is considered a fiction on the ground of the name 'Perez Uzza': "in fact Perez `Uzza, the place-name on which the etiological legend of a man named `Uzza and the punishment God gave to him is based, was originally עוֹרֵץ עֵלִי (ה), i.e. 'great breach', 'great, severe blow and affliction' "(Tur-Sinai, 1951:283f.; Schicklberger, 1973:141; Stoebe, 1994:193). However, the place-name reminds the Israelites, covenant people, of the real event and the concrete activity of God. From generation to generation it should continually be narrated that fellowship with God can be realized only in accordance with his law.

3.2.3.4.1.5. The ark in the house of Obed-Edom (vv. 9 - 11)

David was scared when he noticed that Yahweh's displeasure was aroused: *David was afraid of Yahweh*. This 'being afraid' (אָרָא) is not the same as respectfulness (Gen. 22:12; Jos. 24:14) but fear and anxiety which come from feelings of nullity and a guilty conscious (Deut. 5:5). However, this attitude is, to some degree, necessary in the relationship with God, otherwise a man will commit a sin: "Nu overvalt David grote vrees, en dat is goed" (Ohmann, 1990:167). At this moment, David sees the risk of association with the ark, i.e. that of God's fellowship; David's anxiety is not derived from a consciousness of the "gevaarlijkheid van de ark" (Goslinga, 1962:115). Next to blessing (v. 11) stands the danger of the curse for those who associate with God. However, David still has the desire to place the ark on in Zion, the City of David (5:7): "There is no longer any doubt concerning the identification of the city of David with the triangular hill wedged between the valleys of the Tyropoen and the Kidron, and overlooking the gardens and pools of Siloam (2 Chr. 32:30)" (Barrois, 1981:782). He is considering his bad situation; *How can the ark of Yahweh come to me?* It cannot be attained in the way he wants; he has to submit to God's veto. At this moment, David's intention to take the ark to the City of David appears to die.

Since David must lodge the ark somewhere as soon as possible, it arrives at the neighbouring house of Obed-Edom the Gattite, the man out of Gath, the well-known Philistine city. Budde (1902:230) and Schulz (1920:71) suggest that it was deposited in a Philistine house perhaps because no Israelites wanted the dangerous object. However, it is doubtful that at that time David had enough time to choose a suitable place. Kraeling's (1928:156) supposition that the ark is placed in the house of Obed-Edom to satisfy Resheph, the god of plague with whom the divinity Edom is associated, is groundless from a biblical ground. It is uncertain if he is of Philistine birth, even though there are variant views on it: Budde (1902:230) and Gordon (1986:233) suppose that he was a Philistine who became a Levite later (1 Chr. 15:18) and McCarter (1984:170) says more concretely that "Oben-Edom is probably another partisan whose loyalty dates David's days in Gath and Ziklag, a man upon whom David can rely. Dietrich & Naumann (1995:134) regard him as "einer edomitische Söldner." Many places with the name Gath appear in the Old Testament, e.g. Gath Hepher (2 King. 14:25); Gath Rimmon (Jos. 19:45; 21:24); Gittaim (2 Sam. 4:3); Gath Padalla in Sharon. Some scholars (Keil, 1875:262; Goldman, 1986:222) believe Obed-Edom originated from the Levite city Gath Rimmon and identify him with the equable Levite in 1 Chr. 15:18, 21, 24 and 16:38. However, "juist

door de toevoeging Gattiet wordt Obed-Edom in 1 Chr. 13:13 en hier in v. 10 van anderen met die naam onderscheiden" (Goslinga, 1962:84f.). His name appears to be non-Israelite in nature: "Der Man ist ein Philister aus Gat, der sich in jener Gegend angesiedelt" (Schulz, 1920:71; cf. Noth, 1966:137-139). Stoebe (1994:191) demonstrates that his name itself has the nature of "Verehrer einer fremden Gottheit" rather than "Nachkommen eines nach Edom verkauften Slaven." In this sense it is reasonable to vocalize אֱדֹם עֵבֶד into אֱדֹם עֵבֶד, an earth-deity known in Amorite onomastica according to Seow's (1989:103) suggestion. Thereby it is possible to explain the name, but it is still difficult to persuade someone he was a Levite. There is also the issue of the division of geographical names. In any event, no information about this Obed-Edom is provided in the text.

The benefits of the presence of the ark in the house of Obed-Edom (v. 11) occurred in sharp contrast to the death of Uzza. It is like sunshine after a heavy rain. The ark stands under the shelter of Obed-Edom for three months. During this period he experiences the blessing of Yahweh in all that he has (1 Chr. 13:12). Even though there is no further description on these blessings, they probably came in the form of material prosperity (Lev. 26:3-13; Deut. 18:1-14). It is true that a period of three months wouldn't be enough time to enjoy much prosperity, but it is possible that, in general, life went more smoothly for Obed-Edom at this time. It is a visible blessing (v. 12). Yahweh blessed him for the sake of the ark, though it is unknown from the text if Obed-Edom served God or not. God's presence itself is a blessing. The service of God can become dangerous when it is not done in accordance with his commandments: "het doel van dit schriftgedeelte is, Gods voorbeeldig handelen te benadrukken" (Gootjes, 1987:2).

3.2.3.4.2. Festive entry of the ark into David's city (vv. 12-19)

3.2.3.4.2.1. The procession around the ark (vv.12-15)

The report that "*Yahweh has blessed the household of Obed-Edom and all that belongs to him, on account of the ark of God*" David considers this a sign of Yahweh's approval of his plan to carry the ark to Jerusalem. He reacts immediately, as if he were waiting for it. LXX^L expounds this situation more by adding this sentence, "and David said, 'I will turn this

blessing to my house" (και ειπεν δαυιδ επιστρεψω την ευλογιαν εις τον οικον μου). Without any anxiety he is convinced that the transport of the ark will not conflict with God's will. While Chronicles does not disclose David's awareness of the blessing of Obed-Edom, the text assigns a broad account over the preparation to carry the ark to David's city (1 Chr. 15:2-15) which is identical with the part, the southeastern spur, conquered by David (Mulder, 1998:103; Mare, 1987:26f.). Many things happened before the new procession begins; the sons of Aaron and the Levites are gathered, sanctified and appointed for the task. 1 Chr. 15:2, 13 shows us that David checked exactly the legal prescription for transport of the ark; it had to be carried by Levites and priests, not by military soldiers (Ex. 25:12-15; Num. 4:4, 15). He goes to bring up the ark of the covenant with the elders of Israel and the commanders of the military units he had assembled (1 Chr. 15:3, 25). The festive character of the procession elevates into something much more pure than the first procession, for God approves of this transport. The singers and musicians consist all of Levites (1 Chr. 16:16-24).

When those who were carrying the ark of Yahweh had taken six steps, David sacrificed a bull and a fattened calf (v. 13). ׀ִשָׁשׁ ׀ִשָׁשׁ ׀ִשָׁשׁ does not mean 'each six steps.' This runs contrary to the interpretation of Miller and Roberts (1977:96), who explain these words in the light of the parallel to the return of Marduk, the god of Babylon. They hold the following opinion; "If the Assyrians could offer sacrifices all the way from Assur to Babylon ... a quite considerable distance ... why could David not offer sacrifices every six steps from the house of Obed-Edom to Jerusalem?" Goslinga (1979:118) puts it very practically, "Het mag toch wel haast ondenkbaar heten, dat men na elke zes schreden halt hield om te offeren, dus bv. over een afstand van 600 m reeds honderd maal had moeten stilstaan. Men zou dan op één dag niet tot zijn doel gekomen zijn." The distinction between Yahweh and Marduk should be considered before making use of parallels with Babylonia. The Assyrians might have to bring offerings all the way from Assur to Babylonia in order to satisfy their god, while Yahweh does not need to be treated in the same manner. Concerning the phrase McCarter (1984:171) speaks of Solomon's installation of the ark and Carlson (1964:87) does *sukkōt* festival, "the pause every six paces is characteristic of the *sukkōt*." They appear to go over the biblical thought. The beginning of the undertaking is a pivotal moment, so that the first six steps form a symbolic beginning. The meaning of the number 'six' is uncertain here; the argument that "the number six in the Jewish tradition is a typical fertility number" (Carlson, 1964:88) does not match this context. By this

number the hope for a bright future may be intended because the number 'seven' indeed means 'perfect' for Israelites (Rut. 3:15, Waal, 1979:51). Instead of the expression 'the first six steps' 1 Chr. 15:26 gives an exposition: "Because God had helped the Levites who were carrying the ark of the covenant of Yahweh." The offering seems only to be brought in the beginning of the procession, which is deemed a burnt-offering (Job 42:8; Ez. 45:23). It is an expression of gratitude for the favourable beginning of the undertaking while simultaneously a prayer for successful advancement; Yahweh is recognized as the actual leader and head of the procession. It shows that David had become very cautious, since he did not bring an offering. David is the subject of נָסַח, but it is not necessary that he himself carried out the offering. This could have been done by another person under his direction (cf. Deut. 10:1-5; Ex. 37:1). This contrasts with Mowinckel's (1961:116) view, "der König ist selbst Opferpriester." The text in Chronicles gives reason to think that others made the sacrifice: "they (probably Levites) sacrificed" (נָסַחוּ).

"David was dancing before Yahweh with all his might" (v. 14a). מִכְרָךְ (pt.) indicates that David himself moves continually forward in a rhythmical dance. His dance is evoked by the unspeakable joy which profound solidarity with Yahweh offers. The King of kings enters the city which David chose (2 Chr. 6:6; 33:4). David's dance is not seen as a refined, legitimate liturgic dance which points out the qualification of priests, nor a political behaviour to the contrary of Brueggemann (1990:250): nowhere does it read that the priests danced before the ark. Rather, David and the whole people did this in the presence and before the countenance of Yahweh. It should not be regarded as the prelude of the 'holy wedding' with Michal or as a fertility rite, as Porter (1954:166) and Carlson (1964:87) argue. They interpret it as a Canaanite ecstatic dance. The narrative gives us little clue about David's intention, but it is plausible that the dance is an expression of his sheer joy (cf. v. 5; Pss. 149:3; 150:4). קָנָן (pt. pass.) describes his attire during the dance; instead of a royal garment he wears a linen Ephod (עֲפֹדָה). This attire does not imply that David played the role of priest as Bergen (1996:331f.) supposes, for such apparel is worn exclusively by priests (the clothes of the priest described in Ex. 28 is called עֲפֹדָה but not a linen Ephod (Kroeze, 1937:212)). The young Saemel, who did not belong to the body of priests, wore such clothes as a temple-servant (1 Sam. 2:18). The Ephod, not worn by children (Tidwell, 1974:507), indicates a certain relationship between the man wearing it and the sanctuary. It symbolizes

dedication to God. At this moment David feels himself united with the holy people, the kingdom of priests (Ex. 19:6). He humbly serves God by the ark and with ordinary men- and women-servants of Yahweh. While his disrobing, leaping and dancing are for the glory of Yahweh, they are seen as offensive for his wife, Michal.

"David and the entire house of Israel brought up the ark of Yahweh" (v. 15). The participle בְּעִלְוֵי as a result of the וַיִּלְעָלְוּ in v. 12 does not represent a new moment. *With shouts* (not military shouts, cf. 1 Sam. 4:5f.) *and the sound of trumpets* the procession proceeds. With the same terms the whole earth is exhorted in Ps. 98:6 to shout with joy before Yahweh, the King (cf. Ollenburger, 1987:36). Trumpet or horn made of ram's horn serves not only to give signals (1 Sam. 2:28) but also to assist festivity (Joel 2:15; Ps. 47:5; 81:3; 98:6; 150:3). The author of Chronicles mentions other musical instruments as well: *trumpets, and of cymbals, and the playing of lyres and harps* (15:28). In several psalms the memory of this big event is contained (24; 47; 68; 132): In particular, Ps. 24:7-10 details the glory of this procession. It may have been sung by David as he entered through the gate of the city. Ps. 24 may have been an accompanying song sung when the ark was lifted up and laid down ("Begleitsprüche für ihr Aufheben und Niedersetzen," Zimmerli, 1985:63).

Mowinckel (1961:213) connected this procession with the so called annual *Thronbesteigungstag Jahwäs*: "Jeden Neujahrstag kommt Jahwä wieder und besteigt seinen Tron. Dieser Tag ist sein Tag, der Tag Jahwäs (Neh 8:10; Hos 7:5), an dem er alle die Grosstaten übt, die sein Reich begründen. Man hat den Tag mit einer grossen Prozession begangen, dem Königseizug des siegreichen Gottes, bei dem Jahwä selbst (unsichtbar?) in seinen Palladium, der Lade, zum Tempel hinaufgetragen wurde (Ps 132, 24, 47:6, II Sam 6)." He sees a parallel with the festivals dedicated to Marduk: the *Akkitu* festival in Babylonia is correlated to the festive worship of Israel. However, it is doubtful that there was an annual entrance of the ark into the city of David in Israel. It is certain that David's carrying of the ark in 2 Sam. 6 is a unique event in the history of Israel. In particular, selecting Zion as the earthly throne of the King who reigns eternally (Ps. 29:10; 66:7; 146:10 etc.) is not comparable with the ascendance of the throne. This historical installation of the ark appears to become an ideal model for the restoration of the Israelite religion in the period of the post-exile because the Chronicler commences religious contents of his book with this event (cf. Dempsey, 1998:233-239).

3.2.3.4.2.2. The contempt of Michal (v.16)

וַיִּרְאֵהוּ, *Then it happened so*. In this case the combination with ׀ and perfect form has a special meaning; it offers a short repetition in order to accentuate the significance of the preceding event. This is probably the event following v. 19 (Boer, 1991:147). In regards to the phrase *Michal daughter of Saul looked down through a window ... she despised him in her heart*, the author seems to prepare us for what he tells us in vv. 20-23. Michal is not called the wife of David but the daughter of Saul. "The reason for these abnormalities is clear; Michal is not behaving as David's wife (contrast 1 Sam. xix) but as his opponent; she is acting like a true daughter of Saul" (Clines, 1991:128). The expressions 'king David' and 'before Yahweh' seem more to reflect the feeling of the author than that of Michal because it is doubtful to what extent she acknowledged David as king. She saw him leap and dance in an undignified manner before the eyes of female slaves. David, on the other hand, was dedicating himself to God during the dance, being aware of the eyes of Yahweh.

The phrase, '*looked down through a window*' (רָאָה, nif.), often represents looking from 'up' to 'down' (cf. Judg. 5:28). 'Looking up' has the opposite meaning of 'looking down.' Ackroyd and others (1977:69, 70; cf. McCarter, 1984:172; Porter, 1954:166; Carlson, 1964:94-96) draw this picture, based on Ancient East culture: "a frequent theme of ancient pictorial art is the portrayal of a woman at a window, goddess or (sacred) prostitute, and thus this suggests the part Michal should be playing in the ritual. Underlying the narrative here are indications of a ritual eventually held to be too alien for Israel, that of the 'sacred marriage': the ceremonial leading up to a marriage between king and queen as representative of god and goddess, and designed to bring fertility and well-being to the whole community." However, the text does not allow us to make such an analogy, one which is not harmonized with the law God prescribed. Keel (1996:11-14) also argues that David's dance reflects the sexuality and fertility of a Canaanite traditional dance. This argument was the result of research on Middle and Late Bronze Age seals. Hence, Michal criticizes David because Yahweh does not correspond with the "alten Image des Wettergottes" but "sonnenhaften JHWH" enthroned upon the powerful cherubim who governs with justice and righteousness. But such an assessment for Michal is challenged by vv. 23.

She despised him in her heart. The word, בָּזָה 'despise' means an actual working of the

heart; the addition 'in her heart' underlines how deep her despising is. Brouwer (1955:168) directly links her contempt with "Davids *priesterkleding* en daarmee van zijn priesterdienst." Yet his action has nothing to do with the priestly office as above mentioned. The exact reason for her despising is not exposed clearly. It is possible that Michal was not interested in the plan of David to realize God's lordship over Israel; there is an obvious contrast between the festive joy at the great moment of the entrance of the ark and Michal's feeling. The contrast is emphasized also by the names 'daughter of Saul' and 'king David.'

3.2.3.4.2.3. The first worship on Zion (vv.17-19)

The ark found a resting place, being set *במקומה* 'in its place' (Ps. 132:13, 14) which Rowley (1939:125-127) considered as an allusion to an already existing shrine. He seems to assign such passages as 2 Sam. 6:17; 7:2, 6; and 2 King. 8:4 to a later redaction. Scholars such as Rupprecht (1977:103ff.), Noth (1956:176) and Brouwer (1955: 169) assert that the ark is placed in an old Jebusite temple on the threshing floor of Arauna, but their assertion is unfounded.

The tent prepared for the ark seems not to be identified with the tabernacle or the tent of meeting. Instead it is meant as a temporal residence for the ark, until a fixed residence for it is built. Any information on the form and arrangement of the tent on Zion is not given. The tabernacle was in Gibeon (1 Chr. 16:39; 2 Chr. 1:3), after the ark was absent from Shiloh: "Toen de Filistijnen de ark roofden in de slag bij Afek, 1080 voor Christus, is Silo waarschijnlijk kort daarna verwoest. Ps. 78:60-64 kan daarop zinspelen en Jer. 7:12-15 ook. ... In 1Sam. 21 lezen we van priests in Nob. Stond daar toen de tabernakel? En is deze vandaar overgebracht naar Gibeon, 1Kon. 3:4?" (Ohmann, 1990:168). The tent stretched out by David might be an ordinary tent or a house of cloth, poor in contrast to the distinguished standing residence in which king David may now stay (7:2) (Schilder, 1974:20). According to 1 Chr. 16:37ff., singers and gatekeepers ministered regularly before the ark of the covenant of Yahweh in the tent, while Zadok the priest and his fellow priests presented daily burnt offerings before the tabernacle at the high place in Gibeon. Now Yahweh had his resting place on Zion; he would stay there forever (cf. Ps. 68:17; 132:13, 14).

David sacrificed burnt offerings and peace offerings before Yahweh (v. 17b). It is the first worship for Yahweh on Zion in which David appears to be the leader. Here he made positive use of priests for the service as he did with the offerings in v. 13. Concerning David's behaviour regarding the offerings, the dance before the ark and the blessing, most scholars (Ackroyd, 1977:70; Gordon, 1986:234; Koolhaas, 1957:106) attribute it to his function as priest-king, similar to the behaviour of the kings in Egypt, Mesopotamia and South Arabia and the Hittite monarchs. However, the Bible tells us nowhere that David had such a double office: "Israel de priester-koning alleen maar heeft verwacht: de Here Jezus" (Holwerda, 1953:57). As the transport of the ark began with an offering (v. 13), so it closes with one as well. While for the burnt offering the whole animal is burnt except the skin (Lev. 7:8), only specified parts of it are burnt on the altar in a peace offering. The priests take a part of the meat and the rest of it is eaten by those who offered it. This becomes a festive meal before Yahweh (Lev. 3:1; 7:11-18). The burnt offering is viewed as a special element of the peace offering, and often both of them appear along side each other (Deut. 27:6, 7; 1 Sam. 10:8; 13:9; 2 Sam. 24:25; 1 King. 3:15; 2 Chr. 29:35, cf. Gerleman, 1976:931). While the offering shows harmony between God and man, the sacrificers play an important role when the community is confronted with new events and circumstances (cf. Pedersen, 1953:348). The term **שְׁלָמִים** matches this context well in the meaning of maintenance or restoration of the appropriate relationship with God; the well-being of the human being has to do with his right relationship with God (Rowley understands **שְׁלָמִים** as 'peace' and 'well-being', 1967:122f.). David wanted to lead Israel into a renewed relation with God so that she might become his own people. Another function of the peace offering (Lev. 7:15) is added here; the people wanted to thank God because the procession was successful. Keil's (1875:264) view that they were dedicated to the 'newly built house of God' is groundless. The expression '*before Yahweh*' appears to identify Yahweh's presence in David's tent with the ark installed there at David's behest (cf. Murray, 1998:137f.)

After the offerings *he blessed the people in the name of Yahweh Zebaoth* (v. 18b). The blessing for the people by David does not indicate a special priestly right of the king. Indeed the blessing was not exclusively the task of priests but also that of fathers and leaders of the people (Moses, Ex. 39:43; Deut. 33:1; Joshua, Jos. 22:6). Mowinckel (1953:41) regards David's blessing as an ancient royal practice: "Auch im alten Israel galt der König als heilig, als "Sohn Jahwes," durch die Salbung mit dem "Geiste Jahwes" ausgerüstet, ein "Elohim," ein

Gottwesen, der Kanal für den Segen der Gottheit; ... Der sakrale König hat aber auch als "Vertreter" seinen Platz unter den heiligen kultischen Personen," but it is unknown if David used the priestly blessing mentioned in Numbers 6:24-26. The phrase "*in the name of Yahweh Zebaoth*" can mean 'in the order of Yahweh Zebaoth.' As a theocratic king he behaves in place of Yahweh. He may bestow the blessing of Yahweh Zebaoth who is present at the ark and enthroning in Zion: 'Yahweh, who inhabits at the ark, is with you all.' Concerning the name Yahweh Zebaoth, Brongers (1965:8) illuminates the blessing of David: "Daß es sich hierbei um mehr als einen reinen Wunschspruch gehandelt hat, versteht sich von selbst. Der Segen ist exhibitiv aufzufassen, d.h. er ist eine objektive, reale Macht." He gives much attention to the blessing itself, as if the blessing has a certain magic power. In reality, the biblical blessing never has anything to do with an invisible power in the universe, but the covenant: "Es geht um die Macht Gottes" (Greiner, 1998:186). It is significant that the people of Yahweh can hold the blessing in their heart as they go back to their homes.

To the blessing, David added a material gift. The verse, '*He gave a loaf of bread, a cake of dates and a cake of raisins to each person in the whole crowd of Israelites, from men to women*' (v. 19), underscores that 'all the participants' received the presents. While the etymology and meaning of חֶמְדָּה are uncertain, its translation is diverse as well: 'a cake of dates' (Anderson, 1989:107), 'a bottle of wine' (Keil, 1875:265), 'a piece of meat' (Tg, Vg). According to Goslinga (1962:122; cf. Gesenius, 1982:87) it can be thought of as a portion of meat on the basis of the numerous slaughters. His view is not acceptable, in light of the rule of the peace offering: "*The meat of his peace offering of thanksgiving must be eaten on the day it is offered; he must leave none of it till morning*" (Lev. 7:15). David could not run the risk that certain people might not eat the meat that day. For the time being the word חֶמְדָּה is often translated as 'a cake of dates' (HALAT, 93; Koehler, 1948:397f.; DCH, 418). This translation is based on a corresponding root in Arabic which means 'a traveller's provisions for a journey'; this could easily suggest the meaning here as 'date-cake' (Mauchline, 1971:225f.).

A cake of raisins which is proper to take for a trip can also hold cultic meaning (Hos. 3:1), but it seems not to fit this context. Everyone had to receive this royal gift as coming from Yahweh, who now resided on Zion (Ps. 132:15). The notion that David's distribution of food on this day was affected by the custom of certain coronation rites in the ancient Near East in which the coronation was accompanied by a banquet (cf. Porter, 1954:168) is doubted.

Now that the ark is set in Zion, Zion comes to have a special meaning. It becomes 'the city of God' (Ps. 48:7) because God resides there (Isa. 8:18). The city becomes the centre of the religious life of the Israelites and the world (Ez. 38:12), since Yahweh reigns over the world as its King. Because of the designation Yahweh Zebaoth, Zion is designated as a place of unassailable strength. Such utterances in Psalms (46; 48; 76) about Zion do not have to be considered as productions of a 'Zion-tradition,' maintained to be associated with Jebusite tradition, or developed only after Jerusalem's deliverance from Assyrian aggression in 701 (cf. Strong, 1997:1318). Rather, they show the redemptive progression of God's revelation in history: "De zogenaamde Sion-theologie is een theologoumenon dat in de Schriftkritische Oudtestamentische wetenschap de kracht van een dogma heeft gekregen en uitgaat van een verkiezingstraditie, n.l. Jahwe's verkiezing van Sion, die met die van Davids huis parallel loopt. Vooral in de Psalmen en bij Jesaja treedt die traditie op de voorgrond" (Ohmann, 1990:135). At any event, as Rendtorff's allusion (1999:103), "die Einbringen der Lade nach Jerusalem war der erste Schritt, mit dem die Grundlagen für die weitere Entwicklung gelegt wurden."

3.2.3.4.3. The tension between David and Michal (20-23)

3.2.3.4.3.1. The mockery of Michal (v. 20)

It is obvious that the verb בָּרַךְ in this verse means more than just 'greeting.' Most likely after his massive distribution David went to the house, still in a festive and thankful mood, to wish the blessing of Yahweh on his family also. For him the joy of the people is also the joy of his family. However, the attitude of Michal, who was absent from the national ceremony, is unexpected: *'How the king of Israel has distinguished himself today, disrobing in the sight of the maids of his servants as one of the foolish would shamelessly disrobe!'* Obviously, it was not well-intended for Michal to tell her husband he should have behaved in a more dignified manner. Ironically she speaks of 'honour' (כָּבוֹד), while she sketches its opposite meaning in the subordinate clause (אֲשֶׁר); Josephus (*Ant.*, 7, 87) mitigates the asperity of these

insulting words by means of the initial prayer for the king's welfare (cf. Begg, 1997:34). It is striking that David does not stand up for his כבוד longer, but typifies himself sooner with the opposite קלל (v. 22): "קלל bildet mämelich die entscheidende sprachliche und sachliche Opposition zu כבוד" (Crüsemann, 1980:225). Actually, she greeted him with sarcastic criticism, accusing him of indecent behaviour and disapproving of his actions. In her view David's כבוד consists of the applause of female slaves by whom Michal appears to mean all the young women of Israel, even though אמהות denotes literally 'unfree women.' Thus, it seems a bit cursory for Crüsemann (1980:226) to state that "Damit (אמהות) sind die Hauptfrauen der freien Israeliten aus der anzüglichen Bemerkung ausgeklammert." There seems to be excessive scorn in her description of David's appearance, when she compares him with frivolous men 'רקים' (cf. Jug. 9:4). What she may have had in mind was to see the heroic appearance of her husband as the king of a newly united kingdom but not that of a godly king of this new kingdom. With respect to a Canaanite sight on v. 16, Willi-Plein (1997:419) points out that David's cultural assimilation is without biblical basis: "Der Mann, der im leinenen Priesterschurz einen kultischen Solotanz aufführt und anschließend mit Band- und Schelamimopfer und Speisenverteilung ein Kultfest kanaänischer Stadtkultur beging, war nicht mehr ihr Mann - und er war, nach ihrer und somit nach der Ansicht des durch sie sprechenden Erzählers, auch nicht mehr in dem Sinne, in dem Saul es gewesen war, der König von Israel."

3.2.3.4.3.2. David's answer (vv. 21, 22)

The core of David's immediate and emphatic answer is the repeated phrase 'before Yahweh', which summarizes why he behaved the way he did and how he did so. Michal's behaviour identifies her as one who was not a child of God. Paul's words can be applicable to her: '*Natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, ... because they are spiritually discerned*' (1 Cor. 2:14). The subordinate sentence informs us that he was the chosen king of Israel: 'to choose' (בחר) is not related with the 'eternal choice' of salvation. Instead it justifies his kingship. David was not appointed as a בל, but as a ניד who stands in front, and is compared with, the *praepositus* or *praefectus*. The same author makes it known that ניד has a stronger theological character (Ohmann, 1990:111). "Het theocratische

karakter dat deze benaming als titel voor de koning van Israël had, komt vooral naar voren in de uitdrukking, waarin het bijna voortdurend voorkomt: **יְיָ** over mijn volk Israël. Juist in deze verbinding geeft het de bijzondere plaats van Israëls vorst onder de koning Jahwe aan" (Koolhaas, 1957:65). In connection with **יְיָ** it should be indicated that it is doubtful whether it originally describes the charismatic warrior, for the term is not used for the figures in the premonarchic period: "Allgemeine Erwägungen möchten dafür sprechen, erschwerend bleibt allerdings die Tatsache, daß der Titel in keiner der vorköniglichen Rettergeschichten erscheint. Wenig wahrscheinlich ist es, daß dieser Titel schon in vorköniglicher Zeit mit der Salbung verbunden gewesen sein sollte" (Zimmerli, 1985:74).

Incidentally the preposition **אִתּוֹ** translated as 'with' by Goldman (1983:224f.), does not appear to give a motive for the interpretation: David expects the honour of the female slaves. This translation is still likely to cause trouble because of David's status as a dignified king and a godly man.

Brueggemann (1990:253) asserts that the Yahwistic claim is centred on the conversation between the two. We can see this through the use of a fantastic chiasmic structure. Murray (1998:155) added 'implied narrators' as the first line (v. 16b) and the last (v. 23):

Implied narrator: Michal's looking down
 Michal: honor
 maids
 shamelessly
 David: *before Yahweh*
 chose me above ... above
 prince over
 before Yahweh
 contemptible
 maids
 honor
 Implied narrator: Michal's childlessness

It seems natural for us to conclude that David's intention in this dialogue is simply to refute Michal's argument. To argue that he deliberately set up his argument this way is a bit of a stretch. All David does is offer a reason for his behaviour and then illuminate the validity of his behaviour.

3.2.3.4.3.3. The judgment of God (v. 23)

The conflict between David and Michal is more than just an ordinary quarrel which can often happen between spouses at home; it has to do with the kingdom and work of God. The author tells us that God intervened in the debate. The copulative links in v. 23 with the scene described in the previous verses (vv. 20-22) point out the result.

Therefore, Michal daughter of Saul had no children to the day of her death (23). The result of the argument between David and Michal should not be treated as an explicit reflection of the pro-Davidic tradition: "Warum hatte König David keine Kinder mit seiner ersten Frau, der Königstochter Michal? Wer diese Frage stelle, ist nicht schwer zu erraten: die Anhänger des Hauses Saul, allgemein die in Davids Reich offenbar nie zufriedenen Nordisraeliten. Wer ihnen hier eine Antwort erteilt, ist ebenfalls klar: prodavidische, höfische Kreise" (Dietrich & Naumann, 1995:136) because this view is purely based on redaction criticism (cf. 2.2). It is clear that Michal is here punished by God; she became barren. It can also be considered as God's punishment that David stayed away from her and never had intercourse with her from that time on. Perhaps this is what caused her to be childless. Indeed, her barrenness appears to have nothing to do with his political intention to build his house, in contrast to Müllner's (1997:383) conclusion: "David beraucht zur Etablierung seines Hauses die Unfruchtbarkeit der Saulstochter Michal." Sterility is a kind of trial of God for a woman in Israel (Gen. 30:1; 1Sam. 1:5f.). In the case of Michal it is more severe because it is given as a result of unbelief; she despised the pure joy in the presence of God, was not interested in the entrance of the ark, and was indifferent to the notion of being under God's rule. Her childlessness means that she lost the opportunity to become the mother of David's heir (cf. Smelik, 1992:58) because of her unbelief. Hence, she is excluded from the throne of the Great King and a place in the Messiah's line. Through the completion of the punishment and rejection of Saul and his house, announced in 1 Sam. 13 and 15, Saul's blood is entirely excluded from the throne of Israel. This is a part of God's judgment over Saul's house (cf. 21:1-14).

3.2.3.5. Summary

David's plan to carry the ark to Jerusalem is not likely to have to do with sheer political

calculation, as: "hoe moet ik mijn onderdanen uit het noorden, blijvend aan mij verbinden?, of: hoe verkrijg ik voor mijn nieuwe koningschap de gewenste sanctionering? Het is ook geen manipulatie van het heilige voor eigen doeleinden" (Ohmann, 1990:168). He carried out his supervising task as a theocratic king who had a strong regard for the worship of Yahweh. He wanted to lead the people on their way to serving God. Of course, it should not be excluded that this was executed with political intentions. However, these intentions were benevolent in nature; the people were to be united as one.

The ark is a sign of the presence of Yahweh. Fellowship with God, who is present at the ark, is God's gift to his people. Coincidentally, it can be dangerous when the people behave in discord with God's law. In the wrath of Yahweh against Uzza, we can find God's other attribute which was revealed in relation to the ark: holiness. The people belonging to the old covenant could also enjoy communion with God because of the work of Christ which was to come. This relationship with God also forms the core of Christian faith.

From the perspective of the New Testament, the ark is a foreshadowing of God's presence in Christ. In fact the rejoicing before the ark of God and the blessing David gave through the presence of the ark are based on Christ.

Although David chose Zion first, the place was eventually chosen by God; Yahweh recognizes David's undertaking (Ps. 68:17ff.; 78:68; 132:13). Yahweh already let him know that he chose Jerusalem (2 Chr. 6:6; 33:4). In the historical event of the transporting of the ark one can see the climax of a long series of events which began when Moses promised the people Π from all their enemies (Deut. 12:10) and spoke with them of '*the place Yahweh, your God will choose from among all your tribes to put his Name there for his dwelling*' (Deut. 12:5). God's promise is now fulfilled completely (cf. 1 King. 8:56): his promise is not thwarted! From now on Jerusalem will play a dominant part as the administrative center of the country and at the same time as the central point of Israelite religion. With the ark stationed in Zion, a new facet begins in the history of Israel: complete theocracy is realized. To realize God's complete reign through the establishment of the theocracy is David's purpose in transferring the ark to Jerusalem. Here the ark underscores Yahweh's rulership (cf. Davis, 1999:62). Yahweh reigns over his people as the King residing in Jerusalem. Hence, Israel is able to experience 'the kingdom of God' in the old covenant. David's installation of the ark forms the overture and the transit of the promise of the Davidic dynasty: the Messiah's promise. One can see the

redemptive historical progress as it moves towards the arrival of Christ.

Because of her unbelief, Michal can no longer be a Messianic mother; the redemptive history of God takes place in, and through, his faithful covenant people only. Hence, this event shows us God's faithfulness.

3.2.4. The ark of Yahweh in 1 Kings 8:1-11

3.2.4.1. The context

The book of Kings commences with the problem of Solomon's succession to the throne. Taking advantage of the passive attitude of David, the old and feeble king (1:1-4), towards the problem of succession of the throne, Adonijah conspired with Joab and Abiathar to acclaim himself king (1:5ff.). However, the intrigue ended in smoke because according to his oath (1:17) and God's word (1 Chr. 22:9), David, when he was informed that Adonijah became king, ordered that Solomon be made king at once (1:33-35).

Solomon who was acclaimed as a king of the united monarchy of Israel began to exercise power by conducting a purge of accomplices and reactionaries such as Adonijah, Joab and Abiathar to tighten official discipline and fulfil David's will. His expurgation cannot be evaluated as an entirely political action. The death of Abiathar is the fulfilment of God's prophetic words which were addressed to Samuel (2:28).

Solomon's reign, on the whole, was peaceful: there appears to be only one military campaign. He went to Hamath Zobah and captured it (2 Chr. 8:3). Instead of serious military operations, he had to strengthen the realm which had reached maximum dimension under David. He fortified the major cities such as Jerusalem, Hazor, Megiddo, Gezer, Upper Beth Horon and Lower Beth Horon (cf. 1 King. 9:15; 2 Chr. 8:5f.).

Although he was already married to Naamah, Rehoboam's mother ("Rehoboam was forty-one years old when he became king," 1 King. 14:21), he made numerous foreign noblewomen his wives to strengthen diplomatic ties with neighbouring countries. Most distinguished of Solomon's wives was the daughter of the Pharaoh of Egypt, probably Siamun, at the time of the next-to-the-last of the Twenty-first Dynasty (Bright, 1991:207f.). It shows how elevated the national prestige of Solomon's kingdom was.

He ruled the people with outstanding wisdom which was given as an answer to his prayers (3:12; 4:29; 10:1-4). Furthermore, through the vigorous trade with surrounding countries including Arabia (probably related to Sheba's visiting), he gave unprecedented prosperity to Israel (cf. Kitchen, 1997:138f.). Jesus' reference to 'Solomon's glory' flatly verifies that his kingdom attained the height of prosperity at that time (Mat. 6:29). The temple he constructed in

Zion, by making use of an amicable relationship with Hiram, can be recognized as his most brilliant feat. This was a significant event in Israelite religion and history. The construction of the temple means that **בְּנֵי־הַתֵּמֶלֶךְ** which Yahweh promised to Moses was accomplished (8:56).

David transferred the ark to Jerusalem. That was followed by its new resting place at the temple. The ark with the apparatus of the temple entered its place in the inner sanctuary of the temple, the Most Holy Place. It is most likely that the date of this historical event would be September or October (*Ethanim* by the old calendar, that is, Babylonian Tishri) between 961-958 when the beginning of Solomon's reign was dated in 973-970 (cf. Handy, 1997:105) and one year after the completion of the building is calculated (cf. 6:38, 8:2).

3.2.4.2. Canonical status

The dominant sort of criticism is historical literary criticism and traditio-historical criticism even though a variety of critical views is abundant in this small unit. Modern critics believe that this account contains an ancient pre-Deuteronomistic tradition and that has been revised and expanded by both Deuteronomistic and later editors (cf. Jones, 1984:191; DeVries, 1985:121f.; Würthwein, 1985:84ff.). According to Würthwein (1985:86), the original text may have contained a simple statement: "1 im Jahre x ..., 2 im Monat Etanim, am Fest ..., 3 Kamen alle Ältesten Israels herein ... 4 und trugen die Lade Jahwes hinauf." Then the rest of the contents in this section could be assigned to a later compiler(s). In particular, it remains unconvincing that the *Jahresangabe* was deleted by the hand of a later editor. Furthermore, Gray (1970:203) attributes some phrases to addition by a post-Deuteronomistic hand: **כָּל־עֵדוּת יִשְׂרָאֵל** (5a), **קִדְשׁ** **הַקִּדְשִׁים** (6a) and vv. 10f. Mulder (1998:384) holds that the attribute **מוֹעֵד** proves to have been added to **אֱדָל** later. In the case of Würthwein (1985:85), the reason for priestly insertion of **וַיִּשְׂאוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים אֶת־הָאָרוֹן** (3b) is to protect the privilege of priestly service for the ark. If historical authenticity of the biblical document is recognized, such suppositions about priestly editors make it hard to elucidate the priestly function which is seen in the pre-monarchical history of Israel (Joh. 3:3; 6:6).

From the Canaanite and Mesopotamian view, de Moor (1972:18) squares **אָדָּל** in 8:2 with the New Year corresponding to Ugaritic *r'iš yn* and to Babylonian *Tashritu* which became

Tishri in later Hebrew sources. It is plausible that the date is identical to the New Year Festival. Yet, such extra-biblical sources do not have the ultimate solution to the reason why Solomon waited for eleven months after finishing the project of the building.

From another point of view, it is said that the present form of this section reflects a connection with the priestly 'ark' tradition and the Deuteronomistic presentation of temple dedication (Long, 1984:96). This tendency appears to agree with Rad's (1958:109-129) assumption of the theological combination of two originally separated traditions (cf. 4.4). In 8:1, the phrase "the ark of the covenant" appears as a typical Deuteronomistic style; Fretheim (1999:52) emphasizes that the function of the ark as a repository of a copy of the law is central for the Deuteronomic tradition.

The critical position mentioned above is to be accepted if the assumption of Deuteronomistic history and historical literary criticism are acknowledged as justifiable. The view of Deuteronomy on the ark was already dealt with in 3.1.2.2.1. The problem about appellations of 'the ark of the covenant' is treated in 4.1.3. In fact, it is difficult to determine that the literary unit was combined with different layers of sources. It may be important to examine the present form of the document as it is, instead of reconstructing and analysing the text on the basis of an arbitrary hypothesis.

3.2.4.3. The text criticism and the grammatical analysis

V. 1. LXX preface these words with the sentence: Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσε Σαλωμῶν τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ μετὰ εἴκοσι ἔτη. It is most likely to be an explanation about וַיִּסְּ.

וַיִּסְּ: this jussive is used for the ordinary imperfect form without any collateral sense (GK, § 109, k). LXX^B harmonized שְׁלֹמֹה with the second reference to הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה, by adding ὁ βασιλεὺς to שְׁלֹמֹה. וַיִּרְשָׁם is replaced with Σὼν in LXX to match the last word of the Hebrew verse. Numerous versions such as LXX, Syr, Tg and Vg. inserted כֹּל before וַיִּסְּ: pleonastic. This addition is unnecessary for the translation of this text. LXX^L and LXX^B added explicative 'ἔστι' Σιῶν.

V. 2. LXX lacks בְּחַג הַזֶּה הָיָה הַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי. The minus elements of LXX, which may also

be considered a plus of MT, Tg, Syr, Vg, contains the first mention of 'the Feast' (of Tabernacles) in the historical books (cf. Neh. 8:14, Tov, 1992:282). 4QKgs. backs MT, even if it is partially corrupted.

V. 4. Likewise verse 3, this verse is also abbreviated and clarified as a whole in LXX which leaves out **וַיַּעֲלֶה אֶת־אֲרוֹן יְהוָה** (cf. vv. 3, 5, 7). LXX translated **בְּאֵהָל** as *εἰν τῷ σκηνωματι του μαρτυριου*. **בְּאֵהָל** may be written as haplography. LXX lacks **וְהָלְוִיִּם וַיַּעֲלֶה אֶת־הַכֹּהֲנִים**: the translators of LXX appear to have regarded this phrase as a pleonasm and two groups as one.

V. 5. The sentence of this verse shows that the collective proper pronoun precedes the predicate. LXX^B shortened **כָּל־עֵדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל** as *καὶ πασ Ἰσραηλ* but 2Chr. 5:6 harmonizes the phrase of MT. **אֵהָו** is omitted in LXX^{BL}; it appears to be associated with his initiative. LXX tersely gave a free translation to the redundant phrase **אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִסְפְּרוּ וְלֹא יִמְנוּ מְרֹב**: *ἀναριθμητα* 'countless.' The same expression is found in 3:8.

V. 6. **לְבֵית כְּפֹרֵי דֵי מִתְקִין לִיהּ בְּגוּ בֵיתָא** is expanded as the phrase, **בְּבֵית הַכֹּפְרִים** in Tg: "to the house of atonements that was prepared for it, in the midst of the house."

V. 7. **וַיִּסְכּוּ ... פְּרָשִׁים**: since Hebrew customarily continues a non-finite tense with a finite tense with energetic *Waw*, **וַיִּסְכּוּ** in this case implies no idea of succession (JM, § 118, 1). **אֵל** should be understood as **עַל**.

V. 9. LXX added *πλακες της διαθηκης* to **שְׁנֵי לְחֹת הָאֲבָנִים**. It probably is explanatory insertion, for important ancient codices such as Tg, Syr, VL and Vg agree with MT.

Vv. 10, 11. LXX^B omits **יְהוָה** in **בֵּית יְהוָה**. LXX^B appears to think the term as pleonasm, LXX^L agree with MT: *τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου*.

3.2.4.4. Form and structure

This section is largely to be divided into three major actions: **קָהָל** (congregation), **עָלָה** (procession) and **בִּוֵּן** (installation). Each unit is defined by reportorial verbs, *waw*-consecutive forms which narrate the steps in the text. However, it seems meaningless to go further into the detailed reconstructions in order to understand the text. It may be helpful to use a modified analysis of Long's (1984:96) text:

| | 1 Kings 8 | 2 Chronicles 5 |
|---|-----------|----------------|
| I. Solomon's summons to assemble people | 1-3a | 1-4a |
| II. The procession | 3b-5 | 4b-6 |
| A. Transfer of the ark and implements | 3b-4 | 4b-5 |
| B. Description of accompanying sacrifices | 5 | 6 |
| III. The installation | 6-11 | 7-14 |
| A. Placing the ark under the cherubim | 6-8 | 7-9 |
| B. Description of tables of stone | 9 | 10 |
| C. Confirmatory epiphany | 10-11 | 11-14 |

The structural components of this narrative have remarkable affinity with the event of David's transportation of the ark to Jerusalem in 2 Samuel 6: David's summons to assemble people (6:1,2), a procession to bring up the ark to Jerusalem (6:5; 6:12-15), cultic sacrifices (6:13, 17), they deposit the ark in its proper place (6:17). The description about Solomon's accomplishment is one more significant feature. It is Yahweh's epiphany in his glory, filling the temple (8:10, 11) which is a sign of Yahweh's confirmation. The glorious feature appeared when the holy object was installed in its ultimate destination, the temple which Solomon had built.

3.2.4.5. Explanation

3.2.4.5.1. Solomon's summons to assemble people (1-3a)

Then Solomon assembled the elders of Israel, and all the heads of the tribes, the chief of the Israelite families, to King Solomon in Jerusalem, to bring up the ark of the covenant of Yahweh from Zion, the City of David. And all the men of Israel were assembled to king Solomon at the feast in the month of Ethanim, the seventh month. And all the elders of Israel came (1-3a). The centrepiece of Solomon's dedication was formed as the transportation of the ark of the covenant from the tent David had prepared for it (2 Samuel 6) into the Holy of

Holies of the new temple. After finishing the project of building the temple (1 King. 7:51), Solomon assembled (קָדַח) the elders to complete his dedication, by furnishing the temple with the ark. The word קָדַח, the substantive was generally translated as ἐκκλησία in LXX, and was here associated with religious assembly even though it was often used to designate persons gathered for a military reason (Gen. 49:6; Judg. 20:2; 21:5, 8; 1 Sam. 17:47; 2 Chr. 28:14 etc.). Originally, the institution of זְקֵנִים was perhaps an organ of nomadic government but in the time of the monarchy זְקֵנִים of Jerusalem became part of the upper stratum in the increasingly centralized government. In these verses, זְקֵנִים of all the tribes of Israel to this special cultic manifestation (cf. Mulder, 1998:378). זְקֵנֵי אֲשֵׁר introduced as leaders appear to be taken as explanations of the זְקֵנִים. Especially, Hubbard (1991:52) accounts for זְקֵנֵי אֲשֵׁר: "They were the titular 'chiefs of the Israelite families,' the ones responsible for learning the law and leading their families to obey it." The text seems to stress single-minded, unanimous participation of the people in employment of the word "all": כָּל-אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, כָּל-דָּאֵשִׁי and כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל זְקֵנֵי. This convocation of the leaders throughout the country is enough to display the gravity of the cultic event.

The ark of the covenant of Yahweh was about to be transferred from the old location, the City of David which is identified as Zion, to the new temple which was built on the summit of Mount Moria where David sanctified the threshing-floor of Araunah (cf. Mazar, 1989:53). It reminds us that the temple was constructed outside the confines of David's Jerusalem which consisted of the City of David (Mare, 1987:26). With this opportunity, the boundaries of Zion could presumably be expanded to the temple mount (cf. Ps. 9:12; 20:3; 48:3; 50:2).

Solomon chooses to bring up the ark into the temple during the feast in the month of Ethanim, the seventh month which coincides with our month of September or October. אָדָּר points to the Feast of Tabernacles, the most prominent of the three great pilgrim feasts which traditionally took place during this month (Lev. 23:34). This date means that there is a gap in time between completion of the project and dedication, in consideration of 1 King. 6:38: "*in the month of Bul, the eighth month, the temple was finished in all its details according to its specifications.*" Thus, Solomon waited for eleven months at least to transport the ark into the temple after all the work he had done for the temple of Yahweh was finished. Ewald (1878:245) holds that Solomon dedicated the temple before it was finished: "... the king

determined to arrange the festival of the actual consecrating of the new sanctuary in this month, so that the dedication of the temple should take place the week before." However, such a statement is directly challenged by the report of completion of the temple's construction in 1 King. 7:51. To show the reason why he had to delay the event, Mulder (1998:381f.) searches in the New Year's festival Canaanite world, by mentioning that de Moor (1971:59f.) stresses the link between the New Year's festival and the feast of dedication of the Baal temple. According to them, Solomon's delaying the function was an act of obedience to an ancient eastern tradition according to which sanctuaries must preferably be dedicated on a New Year's Day which coincides with the feast of the king's own coronation. Yet, this explanation appears not to gain support from the Bible. Many scholars (cf. Kronholm, 1986:849f.) believe that the Feast of Tabernacles in Israel was of Canaanite origin, but Moses commanded the Israelites to observe the feast in the wilderness before their entrance to Canaan.

The Feast of Tabernacles was the only festival event in the Israelite calendar where rejoicing is commanded by God (Deut. 12:7, 12, 18; 14:26; 16:11, 14; 26:11; 27:7). The Israelites were to celebrate this occasion by living in tents during the entire seven-day period. That was to remember the departure from Egypt and the sojourn at the tents during the long journey through the wilderness to Sinai (Lev. 23:43). During this feast Moses renewed the covenant with the second generation of freed Israelites. He also commanded them to read the law at this observance every seven years (Deut. 31:9-13). Thus, Solomon's choice of the Feast of Tabernacles for this historic event was strategic in that it was at the traditional time of national gathering: a reminder of 1) Israel's deliverance from Egypt, and 2) the gracious guidance of Yahweh through the wilderness, plus 3) a time of covenantal renewal (cf. House, 1995:137). It unquestionably shows the significance of this occasion.

3.2.4.5.2. Transfer of the ark and sacrifices (3b-5)

The priests took up the ark, and they brought up the ark of Yahweh and the Tent of Meeting and all the sacred furnishings in it. The priests and Levites carried them up (3b-4). The relationship between the priests and Levites shows its various features in the

process of historical progress. According to Mosaic law (Deut. 18:18), the priests appear to be distinguished from the Levites. As a result, their tasks are different from those of the Levites: Carrying the ark was one important duty of the priests (Deut. 10:8; 31:9), while the Levites were the guardians of the tabernacle and the protectors of sanctuary from unlawful entry (cf. 4:15). During the period of Ezekiel, the Levites had a subordinate order of cultic officials (Gunneweg, 1965:185): "Aaroniden und Leviten zusammen bilden den Stamm Levi, die Aaroniden sind die Priester, die Leviten ihnen als Clerus minor unterstellt. Stellung und Aufgabe jeder der beiden Klassen sind genau festgelegt" albeit the terms, **הַקֹּהֲנִים** and **הַלְוִיִּם** were treated synonymously in the period of Malachi (O'Brien, 1990:48). David also used both terms without any distinction (1 Chr. 15:11-15, 26). However, the relationship appears not to be the point of hierarchic character but of function when their position and duty were treated differently. In this text, with all the supportive secular leaders in place, it now becomes the priests' privilege to carry the ark, and the Levites' privilege to carry the sacred furnishings, to the temple (House, 1995:138). This practice by the priests and Levites coincides well with the regulation of Mosaic law. Solomon was careful not to repeat the blunder that David made when he transferred the ark into Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6:3). This form of the verb **עָלָה**, when they brought up the ark, is appropriate, since the temple mount was on a higher elevation than its old place.

And King Solomon and the entire congregation of Israel that were assembled to him were before the ark, sacrificing so many sheep and cattle that they could not be recorded or counted (5). It was **לְפָנַי הָאֲרוֹן** that the whole assembly of the Israelites sacrificed innumerable sheep and oxen: before the visible symbol of the presence of Yahweh. The stem-modification of the verb, **מְזַבְּחִים** (pi. pt. pl) frequently intends an iterative and successive element (Jenni, 1968:205). The expression, **לֹא יִסְפְּרוּ וְלֹא יִמְנוּ מַרְבֵּ** which demonstrates the splendid scale of the feast sacrifice implies an unsurpassable dimension in the material sense even though "Die Menge der Opfer in 1. Kön. 8, 5 ... kann angesichts von 1. Kön. 8, 62f. (s.o.) nicht ausschlaggebend sein" (Jenni, 1968:207). It is interesting to note that Josephus (*Ant.* VIII 102) describes the superlative degree of this sacrifice, by reporting "drenching the ground with libations and the blood of numerous victims, and burning so vast a quantity of incense that all the air around was filled with it and carried its sweetness to those who were at a

great distance."

3.2.4.5.3. The installation of the ark (6-11)

The priests then brought the ark of covenant of Yahweh to its place in the inner sanctuary of the temple, the Most Holy Place, and put it beneath the wings of the cherubim. For the cherubim spread their wings over the place of the ark and overshadowed the ark and its carrying poles (6-7). The climax of this festive event is when the ark reaches its destination. The ark is placed in the inner sanctuary (מְקוֹמוֹ אֶל־דְּבִיר) of the temple, the Most Holy Place (6:16) that Solomon had specially prepared (6:19). Yet, the rendering of KJV for דְּבִיר does not make sense. The text indicates that the מְקוֹם of the ark is in the דְּבִיר of the temple. However, the מְקוֹם cannot refer to a separate shrine within the דְּבִיר (cf. 6:19). Moreover, the fact that the דְּבִיר already carries the superlative title the Most Holy Place hardly leaves room for an even more special shrine for its principal cultic appurtenance (Murray, 1990:302f.). The ark comes to rest under the wings of the cherubim that stretch from wall to wall and that are different from the cherubim on the ark (6:27). They covered the ark to protect it. The cherubim (cf. 3.1.1.4.3) reflect the glorious and majestic presence of Yahweh at the ark which is positioned in the Most Holy Place of the temple, Yahweh's eternal dwelling place (8:13). This description of the occasion of bringing up the ark illustrates that the ark still functions as the presence of Yahweh among his people unlike the Tent of Meeting. However, Fritz (1996:86) describes it as if the role of the ark disappears after its installation in the temple: "Das Zeltheiligtum wird von Tempel abgelöst, indem die Lade in den Tempel übernommen wird. Im Tempel hat die Lade dann keine besondere Bedeutung mehr besessen, da die Vorstellung der Bindung göttlicher Gegenwart an die Lade durch die Vorstellung vom Wohnen Gottes im Tempel verdrängt worden ist." The ark was treated differently from the Tent of Meeting which had played a part from the period of the wilderness but is now replaced with the temple.

These poles were so long that their ends could be seen from the Holy Place in front of the inner sanctuary, but not from outside the Holy Place; and they are still there today (8:8). The long poles were permanently attached to the ark (Ex. 25:12-15), but this passage

makes it clear that these were attached to the long side of the ark and extended through the curtain in front of the adytum so that their ends could be seen from the holy place in front of it (cf. DeVries, 1985:124). The poles remain in the ark to serve as a visible reminder of the hidden ark's presence. The phrase, *וְעַתָּה בְּיָמֵינוּ* refers to a point of time before the ark was lost in the destruction of the temple 587 B.C. (cf. Cogan, 2001:280)

There was nothing in the ark except the two stone tablets that Moses put in it at Horeb, where Yahweh made a covenant with the Israelites when they came out of Egypt (9). Most exegetes are perplexed over the annotation of this verse. Noth (1968:180) suggests that "Die ausdrückliche Betonung ... will offenbare apokryphe Vorstellungen abwehren wie etwas die von Hebr 9:4, nach der der Krug mit Manna (Ex 16:33) und der Aaronstab (Nu 17:25) in der Lade aufbewahrt gewesen wären, was an den beiden genannten AT-Stellen gar nicht gesagt wird." His comment appears not to appreciate the evidence of the New Testament, i.e., the latter two objects never existed. Similarly, Fritz (1996:87) appears to attribute this phrase to the character of the 'deuteronomistischen Theologie' without any hesitation. Mulder (1998:392) conceives the expression with an emphatic tone because "a great deal more of the Canaanite religious legacy was incorporated in the new temple without any of the usual polemics." His assumption was to be derived from the tension between the northern tribes and Jerusalem (cf. 1998:388). He seems to consider the word *רק* 'only' as a later addition of the redactor. Another solution was provided by House (1995:139): "This emphatic comment probably is intended to clear up the possible misconceptions that Aaron's rod and a jar of Manna were there as well. These items were placed alongside the ark but never in it." His suggestion appears plausible to some extent. However, the remark stressed by the term *רק* may still hint that there were only the stone tablets in the ark at the time but there had been other things in it before. Thus the word *רק* leads the readers in the period of the New Testament to be conscious of harmony with the content of Hebrews 9:4. A bit differently, it can be thought that the jar of Manna and Aaron's staff may have been lost in an unknown disaster before Solomon's temple, which appears consistent with the stories told in the two testaments. However, it is also puzzling that what happened to the ark is not recorded.

The text makes it clear that there was nothing in the ark except the two stone tablets. It still remains obscure how to answer the mystery that two other things vanished before Solomon's

temple was built. However, in the viewpoint of progress of revelational history, it seems reasonable that the jar of Manna and Aaron's staff disappeared since they were associated with the lives of Israelites in the wilderness. In particular, Aaron's priestly succession was broken (cf. 2 Sam. 2:35; 1 King. 2:27) and Yahweh, in the resting place, gave מְנוּחָה that he had promised Moses and would bless the people with abundant provisions (cf. 8:56; Ps. 132:16). Thus, the jar of Manna and Aaron's staff might have played no special role in the period when the temple became a central part of Israelite religion, just as the Tent of Meeting lost its function at that time.

Adding the supplementary explanation that Moses put the two stone tablets in the ark at Horeb, which is identical to Sinai (cf. Deut. 10:5), the author highlights the Israelite covenantal relationship with Yahweh when they came out of Egypt. The Decalogue inscribed in the tablets still remains perpetual as fundamental law of the covenant community (cf. 3.1.1.4.2. on Decalogue). This is far from ein *Dynastieorakel als Dokument des Davidsbundes* or *Königsvertrag* between king and people, as Maier (1965:70f.) surmises. Unlike such a political notion, the reference to the Decalogue demonstrates that the Solomonic temple is connected with a Sinaitic covenant and God's presence in the temple is conditioned by the covenant law of Israel. Thus the ark placed in the temple appears to grant legitimacy to the temple as God's residence.

When the priests came out of the Holy Place, the cloud filled the house of Yahweh. And the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud, for the glory of Yahweh filled Yahweh's temple (10-12). These verses correspond in many respects to Exodus 40:34f. What happened to Moses there as the cloud descended on the tabernacle also happens to the priests in these verses. The cloud is particularly combined with כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה, so that כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה is present in the cloud (Ex. 16:10). Here, כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה and מַלְאָן הָעֵינָן signalled that Yahweh approved of his new quarters and had occupied them, as he did so with the cloud filling the tabernacle when Moses dedicated that earlier worship center. לַעֲמֹד לְשֵׁרֵת was virtually used as a typical expression for the official work of the priests before Yahweh (Num. 16:8-9; Deut. 10:8; Ez. 44:11; 2 Chr. 29:11). The awesome glory of Yahweh appears to prevent them from serving Yahweh temporarily. As a whole, these verses serve to underscore that, after the transfer of the ark, the Solomon temple is the legitimate continuation of the dwelling of

Yahweh who in the time of Moses dwelt in a wilderness sanctuary (Mulder, 1998:396). This scene testifies that Solomon's project was not simply motivated by a political concern, as Buis (1997:97) supposes. Indeed, Yahweh's people are continually able to live before his glorious presence.

3.2.4.6. Summary

On the occasion which Solomon held during the national feast days which were commemorative of the exodus, the redemptive work of Yahweh and the renewal of the covenant, the ark, which was residing in the tent that David had prepared for it, was brought up into the temple. It is a historical moment when the ark is housed in the final destination; a place chosen by Yahweh's sovereignty (Ps. 132:13f.). Moreover, it takes a special position under the cherubim which signify Yahweh's glory. It means that the ark still functions as a cardinal symbol of Yahweh's presence even if after the transfer of the ark, the Solomon temple is approved as Yahweh's legitimate residence with the cloud of Yahweh's glory. The meaning of the temple as Yahweh's resting place was furthermore embodied by the ark positioned in the inner sanctuary of the temple, the Most Holy Place. Now, the Israelites came to integrate a new phase of their religion centered on the temple in the historical progression. It is a privilege for them to associate with Yahweh dwelling in the temple.

However, the allusion to the stone tablets on which the law of the covenant had been engraved accentuates the importance of the observance of the law in maintenance of the people's relationship with Yahweh. Thus, his residence in the majestic house and glorious association with his people will continually be guaranteed, but only when they behave in accordance with his commandment and his gracious covenant.

3.3. The ark in the Psalms and in prophecy

Psalm 132 is the only psalm where the אֲרֹן is explicitly mentioned in the Psalter. Yet there are allusions to the ark in the Psalms even if there is no consensus of opinion on what passages in the Psalms imply the ark. While Kirkpatrick (1890; cf. Davies, 1963:51) finds a reference to the ark in ten other psalms, and even a possible eleventh: 9:2; 15:1; 24:; 44:9; 47:5; 63:2; 68:1; 78:61; 94:6; 99:5 (?); 101:2, Gunkel (1926:284; 566f.) ascribes only three Psalms as referring to the ark: 24; 68; 78. Weiser (1987:50) denotes twelve references to the ark in Psalms in conjunction with "Jahwehtheophanie auf der Lade" in the cult: 3:8; 7:7; 10:12; 17:13; 35:23; 44:24, 27; 27:6, 9, 12; 59:5f.; 80:2; 82:8; 94:1f.; 102:14. Although each has variant views on the poetic passages deemed related to the ark, it appears hard to judge whether some verses in the Psalms indicate the ark or not. Davies (1963:51-61) cogently proposed that there are about 70 references to the ark in the Psalms focusing on terms such as 'strength,' 'beauty,' 'glory' and 'before Yahweh or God' as clues: 78:60f.; 96:6; 105:4; 81; 63:3ff.; 68; 77:11-16; 20;21; 95:6; 56:14; 61:8. For the most part, his special study on references to the ark appears acceptable because the cultic context of the Psalms reflects the ark passages mentioned in the historical books such as Numbers, the books of Samuel and Kings.

For instance, Psalm 78:60f. as a historical psalm ("And he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh, the Tent of dwelling with man, and he surrendered his *strength* to captivity, and his *beauty* into the enemy's hand") matches a historical description of the fall of Shiloh and the capture of the Ark as recounted in 1 Sam. 4-5. With respect to Chronicles, Ps. 105:4, the lines "Seek Yahweh and his *strength*. Seek his *face* perpetually" appear to be linked with implicit reference to the ark; this verse is a mere repetition of David's praise during the moving of the ark into Zion (1 Chr. 16:11). And "your *strength* and your *glory*" of Ps. 63:3 seems connected to the significance of the ark. Ps. 21:14, "Arise, Yahweh, in your *strength*" reminds us of 'the song of the ark' in Numbers 10:35f.

Nevertheless, it is unnecessary to deal with all psalmic references that appear to refer to the ark because it is sufficient enough to grasp the use and significance of the ark in Israelite worship from the texts in this study. Hence, Psalm 132 which seems to be explicitly associated with the ark, will be singled out as the object of exegesis in this chapter.

3.3.1. The ark in Psalm 132

3.3.1.1. The canonical status and the form

The period of the psalm's origin is fraught with controversy. Gunkel (1926:586) dates the psalm at a later period of the kingdom of Judah by assuming the Davidic monarchy as a contemporary institution: "Keine Spur ist in dem Liede davon, daß Jahve Zion inzwischen verlassen hätte, oder daß Davidhaus nicht mehr im Besitz der Krone wäre. Daß schon von den Söhnen der Söhne Davids gesprochen wird, führt in eine spätere Zeit des jüdischen Königtums." On its definitive content, Jacquet (1979:525) is sure that this psalm is a product of the liturgy of the second Temple: "*le poème offre une ligne de pensée nette et cohérente.*" Seybold (1996:11, 497) classifies this psalm as *Wallfahrtspsalm*, which was derived from the post-exile situation, by acknowledging that vv. 8-10 quoted old materials such as 2 Chr. 6:41f. Recently Pietsch (2003:137) ascribes this psalm to the Persian period because of its unitive and intentional composition: "Psalm 132 hat sich eine einheitliche und planvoll gestaltete Komposition aus der persischen Zeit erwiesen, in deren Zentrum eine aktualisierende Neuinterpretation der Nathanverheißung steht." Then Rogerson and McKay (1977:136f.) appear to take a compromised view. They believe verses 1-16 are a psalm composed before the exile, and verses 17f. an addition made after the exile. However, the latter is able to be held, when their translation, "There will I renew the line of David's house for 'the Hebrew phrase of v. 17a קָרַן לְדָוִד מִיְמֵי אֲבֹתַי is justified.

However, many scholars state that the psalm dates from the late pre-exile period, on the grounds that the quoted material is much more ancient. They believe the date should be firmly fixed before Solomon's death (Roberts, 1973:343) and the material contains an accumulation of allegedly deuteronomistic features such as 'servant' (v. 10), 'fruit of womb' (v. 11), 'lamp' (v. 17) (Mettinger, 1976:276ff.). Resting upon Mettinger's statement that Ps. 132 exhibits a later development of the basic promise of Nathan in 2 Sam. 7, Allen (1983:209) concludes that Psalm 132 is a royal and prophetic liturgy which did not necessarily originate later than the period of Josiah. Allen concludes this by recognizing the possibility that a later form of the tradition of Nathan's promise is echoed in vv. 11-12.

It appears more important to note that the term 'ark' is explicitly alluded to in this psalm only, in contrast with the general tendency that it is mentioned so little in the psalms; the reference to the ark looks like a reflection of the pre-exilic situation of the first Temple: "Da die Heilige Lade erwähnt wird v. 7f. ... kann der Psalm nur aus der vorexilischen Zeit stammen" (Weiser, 1987:538). Of course, it is true that this psalm offers a recollection of the past related to David's transportation of the ark to Zion. Yet it should be considered that interest in the ark probably disappeared from the liturgy before we make the mistake of referring to a clear connection of this psalm with the cult of the second Temple. Jeremiah's prophecy (3:16) implies the needlessness of the ark in the service of the Temple: "*they will no longer mention the ark of the covenant of Yahweh. It will never enter their minds or be remembered; it will not be missed, nor will another one be made.*" In addition to this, Rendsburg (1990:87-90) contends that linguistic evidence proves that Ps. 132 has a northern quality and composition; it refers back to earlier Israelite history. Hence, the origin of Ps. 132 appears to match the liturgical feature of the pre-exilic state. Of course, it is not entirely dismissed that this psalm was composed to commemorate the dedicatory event of Solomon's temple (Groningen, 1990:311f.). Moreover, it is unnecessary to deny a pre-exilic date so as to negate the theory of the 'Royal Zion Festival,' as Kruse (1983:291) does.

In traditio-historical criticism, this psalm is regarded as the main source of hypothesis that the ark was carried in procession for both the 'New Year Festival' and 'Royal Zion Festival' celebrations. Mowinckel (1966:93f., 111-117) argued the theory of the New Year Festival of Yahweh's Royal Inthronization on the basis of this psalm and 2 Sam. 6 and 1 King. 8. His view on '*Thronbesteigungs psalmen*' is mostly based on '*altbabylonische Neujahrfest*' which was held twice a year (*Nisan* and *Tashritu*). In the *Akitu*-ritual, the gods ratified their rule: In particular, *Nabû*, Marduk's son and heir, demonstrated his right to a superior rank in the hierarchy of the gods and acted as the tutelary deity of the king. In 8 *Nisan*, the gods of the cities of the empire assembled and acknowledged the supremacy of Marduk and Babylon, his city. After a formal meeting in the assembly-hall with Marduk sitting enthroned on the 'Dais of Destinies' identified with the *primaeval* 'holy mound,' the gods go in procession to the *Akitu*-house (cf. Mowinckel, 1966:XI-XVI; Jeremias, 1987:7-14; Toorn, 1991:331-339). This parallel was expanded to the interpretation of the psalm by Mowinckel. Contrary to Mowinckel's

theory, Kraus (1978:1059) contended that no trace is to be found in these texts of an accession to the throne by Yahweh. Instead, he proposes the 'Royal Zion Festival' according to which during the Davidic monarchy on the first day of Tabernacles, an annual festival was held with a procession and cult-dramatic performance of the *hieros logos* by which Zion and David's dynasty had been 'chosen' by Yahweh. The heart of the festival was the carrying of the ark into the Temple in remembrance of the first transfer of the ark from Kiriath-Jearim to Jerusalem under David or from the Tent to the Temple under Solomon. However, Kraus' theory is not far distant from that of Mowinckel. In fact, those who consider the ark as the throne of Yahweh or his footstool have a tendency to combine a cultic role for the King with the notion of coronation feast, although the whole theory of the Festival apparently hinges on the interpretation of these few lines, e.g. Ps. 47, 24, 132 and possibly some others, with which Mowinckel has stirred the imagination of so many scholars. The biblical evidence for an annual commemoration of the ark's transfer to Zion remains obscure, even if an evident reference to the procession with the ark appears to be provided in Ps. 68:25f., which seems probable. It is to be regarded as a song of the festive event of 2 Sam. 6 rather than that of an annual procession of the ark. With respect to this hypothesis, it should be considered that for the most part, the support of the theory has been heavily furnished by the *religionsgeschichtliche* perspective; namely, parallels with the Babylonian *Akitu* festival . .

As to the form of Psalm 132, it is notoriously complex. In order to analyse its structure, we need to consider certain clues. Dahood (1970:241f.) classifies it into three stanzas: 1-5, 6-10, 11-18; Seybold (1996:496-99) divides it into four strophes: 1-5, 6-10, 11-13 and 14-18; Jacquet (1979:525) divides it into five different literary models: prayer (1, 10), oath (3-5, 11c-12), quotation (2, 11ab, 13), professional song (6-9) and oracle (15-18); Fretheim (1967:129f.) makes a litany composed of four parts between priest and choir. However, there is a general agreement that this psalm can be divided into two major sections (cf. Gunkel, 1926:565ff.; Weiser, 1987:538ff.), verses 1-10 and 11-18, each introduced by the recall of oath and its citation (vv. 2-5 and 11-12). The first section concerns David's role in finding a resting place for Yahweh, and the second concerns Yahweh's role in maintaining David's throne in Zion. Of course, it is not intended that there be two independent poems. In fact, the

whole psalm is composed as a prayer and an answer according to the respective sections. This is the decisive literary feature of this rather complex composition (Mays, 1994:410); the form and the content are harmonized, as שׁוֹרֵב in v. 10 and שׁוֹרֵב in v. 11 are interwoven in content. There is no evidence that these psalms were collected and selected by a theologian, historian, or literary editor to formulate a supposed historical event (cf. Groningen, 1990:313), as some recent scholars such as Seow (1989:185-196) and Starbuck (1999:125) have proposed. They argue that the coalescence of Zion theology and royal (Davidic) theology into a royal/Zion amalgamated theology occurred early in the history of the Israelite monarchy. The section reflecting the historical event (6-9) may be interpreted eccentrically in prayer but it appears natural to refer these verses to the epochal moment of David's transfer of the ark to Zion and Yahweh's election of it. For the most detailed analysis of this psalm, consult Auffret's book (1999:96-111).

In attempting to determine its genre, the psalm has been classified as a 'Song of Zion' (Gunkel, 1926:568), a 'Royal psalm' (Bentzen, 1948:42; Holladay, 1993:69) and simply a liturgy (cf. Kraus, 1978:1576). In particular, Bentzen (1955:32) regards it as a 'historified myth,' while the story of the ark is a 'Davidic version' of the myth. It is true that the various topics proposed as its genre bear their own values, for they contain some important elements of the psalms. Yet, most commentators tend, intentionally or unintentionally, to overlook the title of the psalm, deemed as traditionally conceived by the compiler -- a 'song of ascents.' It seems unnecessary to preclude its title, even though the title as such does not always provide the origin of the psalm (Lettinga, 1976¹:39). That is to say, according to the title of this psalm, it appears unreasonable to ignore that this psalm belongs to the pilgrim's songs, as Seybold (1996:11, 497; cf. Mays, 1994:409ff.) suggested above. The reason why this psalm has been included in the sub-collection of ascent psalms is that just as David was faithful in finding the ark and a resting place for Yahweh, so too, the pilgrims, as they made their way to that same Zion, communed in David's faithfulness, seeking to prostrate themselves toward Yahweh's footstool (cf. Starbuck, 1999:127). The Israelite people who were forced to go up to the Temple three times a year would sing this psalm on their way to Zion, where Yahweh resided.

3.3.1.2. The text

- V. 1. עָנֹתָו of MT is understood as עֲנֹתָו (της πραυτητος αυτου, his humiliation).
- V. 4. שָׁנָה can be read as שָׁנָה such as many manuscripts (GK, § 80 g).
- V. 6. The third feminine singular suffix of שָׁמַעְנָהּ is generally related to the ark (is feminine, 1 Sam. 4:17; 2 Chr. 8:11). שָׁדָה instead of שָׁדִי is acceptable as some Greek versions (ά, ό) suggest. יָעַר is rendered as general noun "the wood" in KJV but as proper noun "Jaar" in NIV. NIV's translation is possibly better since יָעַר appears to be associated with יַעֲרִים of קַרְיַת יַעֲרִים (cf. Salem and Jerusalem): it may be a poetically shortened local name (cf. Kraus, 1978:1063).
- V. 8. לְמַנְחֹתָךְ is written as לְנִחֹתָךְ (prep. + inf. cons. + suff.) in 2 Chronicles 6:41. With regard to this distinction, Cross (1973:94) emends to לְנִחֹתָךְ, relating to Ugarit *nht* since he suggests that MT is a *lectio facilior* under the influence of v. 14. Yet, this emendation violates the symmetry of the psalm (cf. Allen, 1983:203).
- V. 9. 2 Chronicles 6:41 reads הַשְׂמֵעָה instead of צִדְקָה. הַשְׂמֵעָה appears as result of work of the priests clothed with צִדְקָה. יָרִנְנוּ is used as יִשְׂמְחוּ בַטּוֹב in 2 Chronicles 6:41.
- V. 11 מִן of מִפְּרִי has meaning of 'from among' which is derived from the idea of separation (GK, § 119 w). It is not necessary grammatically to insert certain words such as מֶלֶךְ in Tg. in front of מִפְּרִי to make sense (cf. Gen. 3:3).
- V. 15. It is funny to note that צִיד is translated as χηραν, "widow" in LXX: it looks like a corruption of θηραν, "hunt, prey."

3.3.1.3. Explanation

This psalm commences with a petition, a supplication to Yahweh: *Yahweh, for David, remember all his afflictions* (vs. 1). לְדָוִד is not to be the object of the verb, even though לְ can be sometimes used to introduce a direct object (cf. Ex. 32:13; Deut. 9:27; Ps. 25:7; 136:23). Yet, the phrase לְדָוִד does not denote that this psalm is a prayer for David who is dead, but rather signifies 'on behalf of his merit in the past' (cf. v. 10, בְּעֵוֶר). The verb זָכַר

is here used in a specific construction, in which not only what is thought of is mentioned, but also the person for whom this is a remembrance. David's affliction as the object of the verb זכר should not be understood in the merely mental or physical state but on the level of piety as well. LXX's rendering, πραύτητος 'humility,' can help us understand this, although the Akkadian cognate *anāhu* supports the Hebrew meaning, 'toil' (CAD AII, 101). The purpose of the prayer is to recall the pious hardships that David has endured in fulfilling the vow he made to Yahweh. This seems to have something to do with the events of carrying the ark to Jerusalem (vv. 2-5). With respect to the oath between the two of them, it is interesting to notice that David's oath to Yahweh (v. 2, לִיהוָה לִישָׁבַע) is paralleled by Yahweh's oath to David (v. 11, לְדָוִד לִישָׁבַע) and the content of the oath of David to Yahweh (vv. 3-5, in the first person) corresponds to the content of the oath of Yahweh to David (vv. 11b-12, in the first person) (cf. Fretheim, 1967:132; Auffret, 1982:506). The verses 3-5 show a kind of resolution, that is, David could not allow himself to rest until his oath is fulfilled. As for the phrase, 'I will not climb up my bed' (v. 3b), Rogerson & McKay (1977:138) apply an ascetic conception to help interpret this expression: "probably, he abstains from marital intercourse, a self-denial that often accompanied vows." However, there is certainly a reference to sleep, since their exposition is immediately challenged by the following verse: "I will not allow sleep to my eyes, nor slumber to my eyelids." Here, it is natural to maintain that the concrete object of David's fervour is associated with divine abode by discovery of the ark and its transfer to the City of David rather than the Tent or the Temple, as Kruse (1983:281) suggested. David was filled with perplexity on account of the ark because he knew of Moses' law, according to which the Israelites would worship Yahweh in the place he had chosen (Deut. 12:5). His anxiety indicates his affection and desire to be with God.

The divine epithet '*the Mighty One of Jacob*' which occurs in vv. 2 and 5 (Gen. 49:24; Isa. 49:26) seems to reflect the intimacy between Israel and God. But it is unnecessary to interpret this as the epithet of the ark, as Fretheim (1967:131f.) argues. '*The place of Yahweh*' and '*dwelling the Mighty One of Jacob*' (v. 5) that David was fervently eager to find are to be conceived as having the same connotations as '*his dwellings*' and '*his footstool*' (v. 7). The correct translation of the verse 6 is that '*We heard of it in Ephrathah*' (Kön, III § 22). Still, a grammatical difficulty exists in this sentence. What the object הָיָא (fem. sg.) 'it' indicates

is much debatable because there is no antecedent for 'it' in the previous sentence; **מִקְוֵה**; 'place' has a masc. sg. form and **בְּשִׁכְנֹתָיָהּ** 'dwellings' has fem. pl. form. It appears to be understandable that Mays (1994:411) understood it as the ark, without any hesitation, in accordance with the content. Yet, supposedly, it is forced, at first, to refer to the word *dwellings*. The term 'we' appears to be employed as a kind of foreshadowing: "Zuerst spricht ein Wir, die Suchgruppe Davids (6 f.), dann ein Beter, der im Stil der Ladesprüche (Nu 10,35f.) JHWH zum Aufbruch auffordert (8f.)" (Seybold, 1996:498). *Ephrathah* is probably the region where Kiriath-Jearim was located or otherwise a village or town not far from it. *Ephrathah* in v. 6 is perhaps geographically different from Bethlehem; Briend (1983:29) denotes that *Ephrathah* was mistakenly identified with Bethlehem, since it was David's city and he was the son of Jesse from the village of *Ephrathah* (1 Sam. 17:12). The following phrase, 'the fields of Jaar' (v. 6b), is described as a poetic designation of the surroundings of Kiriath-Jearim (cf. Kraus, 1978:1063): in 'the fields of Jaar' is the house of Abinadab, on a hill, the place where the ark was housed after it returned from Philistia (cf. 1 Sam. 6:21; 7:1; 2 Sam. 6:3). Rensburg (1990:88) prefers to interpret *Ephrathah* in v. 6 as an alternative designation for Ephraim, the connotation of which makes much more sense. After all, the home of the ark for most of Israel's early history was in Shiloh in the territory of Ephraim. However, this argument doesn't fit well with the biblical story of David bringing the ark into the City of David.

Let us go to his dwellings, let us worship at his footstool (7). This phrase has been frequently used to support that the cherubim are regarded as the actual throne and the ark as a footstool to that throne (cf. 3.1.1.4.2). However, the expression is somewhat ambiguous, for it can be a metaphorical and figurative description set in a poetic context rather than a theological definition. The structure of this phrase is not clear; is the parallelism complete or progressive? Even if the difference between 'go' and 'worship' might be an advancement of the mention of 'dwellings' in the first stichos, the possibility of a complete parallelism is not entirely precluded: 'footstool' would be applicable to the idea of 'dwellings' (cf. Woudstra, 1965:88f.). Likewise the same phrase, **לְהַדָּם רִגְלָיו** in Ps. 99:5 does not necessarily mean the ark because the term, **לְהַדָּם רִגְלָיו** is interchangeable with **לְהַדָּם רִגְלָיו** (v. 9) which functions as a refrain in the parallel structure (cf. Fabry, 1977:355). The biblical concept of the 'footstool' is not circumscribed to the ark but is, in fact, fairly broad. For instance, the term in Isa. 66:1 refers to

the earth: *The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool*; the idea of the footstool in Lam. 2:1 is broadly applied in view of a lament over the destruction of Jerusalem, Zion and the temple: (Yahweh) *remembered not his footstool in the day of his anger!* The expression of 1 Chr. 28:2 also appears not to point out the ark exclusively but the 'whole unit' of the ark containing the cherubim above the ark: "Lade und Kerubenthron sind nicht voneinander zu trennen" (Kraus, 1978:853). Therefore the biblical idea of the footstool does not give room to suppose that the cherubim are regarded as the actual throne and the ark as a footstool to that throne, as de Vaux (1967:256-260; 243-247) and others attempted to explain them, on the basis of, a Hittite parallel. In this psalm the footstool seems to be identical to *בְּנֵי־רִגְלָי* (v. 15) because it is synonymous with *בְּנֵי־רִגְלָי* (cf. Isa. 66:1) (cf. Fabry, 1977:354).

As regards the meaning of the footstool, God's footstool is a metaphorical expression of a resting place for the feet of the enthroned deity, unlike its concrete expression of Solomonic throne (2 Chr. 9:18). In Pss. 99:5; 132:7; Lam. 2:1, footstool is a metaphor for Zion. In 1 Chr. 28:2 it generally refers to the ark. In Isa. 66:1 it denotes the earth, as contrasted with heaven, as God's throne. The low stool which is used to support one's feet is naturally associated with the throne which symbolizes royalty. The footstool with the throne is an emblem of reign. While God sits on the heavenly throne as universal and eternal ruler (Pss. 11:4; 103:19), he puts his feet on the earth, specifically on Zion. This image is well matched with God's various attributes: greatness (Pss. 48:1; 99:2, etc.), glory (Pss. 8:1; 19:1; 148:13), majesty (Ps. 93:1; 1 Chr. 29:1), righteousness (Ps. 9:4) lordship (Act. 4:24), supremacy (Ps. 119:91; Isa. 48:13) and dominion (Col. 1:16), etc. The footstool as an earthly counterpart to the heavenly throne focuses on the attribute of divine immanence, although God's intrinsic attribute is transcendent. The fact that Zion is the footstool literally does not mean that God treads it under his feet in some negative way, as Yahweh made David's enemies his footstool. Instead the royal footstool stands for God's sublime and simultaneously gracious presence. That is why, Zion as God's footstool is the center of his people's worship but they approach it to pay obeisance to God, by expecting his righteous judgment (Pss. 9:4-7; 45:6; 89:14; 97:2; and gracious reign (Pss. 47:8; 93:1f.; 103:19).

In the context of this psalm the 'dwellings' and 'footstool' that the psalmist mentioned can really be understood only in connection to the ark which signifies the invisible presence of

Yahweh. The epithet, 'footstool,' which God called the ark, demonstrates his glorious and majestic presence and, at same time, intimates that the sanctuary could never contain the immensity of his essence, as men are prone to imagine. The mere outward temple, with all its majesty being no more than his footstool, his people were called upon to look upwards to the heavens and fix their contemplations with due reverence upon God himself (Calvin, 1993:149f.). Now, the psalmist exhorts the people to go up to the place, to worship a God who is present at the ark and the temple where it is placed, even though he is omnipresent in the whole universe. In this verse, the steps of the pilgrims reach their climax (cf. Millard, 1994:220).

Arise, Yahweh, to your resting place, you with the ark of your might (v. 8). The pregnant construction of $\text{קָוְמוּהָ} \dots \text{לְ} \text{לְ}$ seems awkward. It should be rendered as 'arise and (come) to' in consideration of the context. However, Hillers (1968:48-52) opposes this general rendering. He interprets the preposition לְ as 'from' instead of 'to' by appealing to the absence of examples of such a usage. He also translates the preposition as 'from' on the basis of Dahood's (1970:245) suggestion (*sub l*, 'from'). Actually, it is clumsy that this phrase is put as 'arise and rest,' since the verb was used mostly as a call for God to intervene vigorously on the people's behalf (cf. Num. 10:35; Ps. 3:8; 7:7; 9:20; 10:12; 17:13; 35:2; 76:10 etc.). His suggestion seems reasonable, but raises another question; does the notion that Yahweh rise with the ark and leave Zion, his resting place, even exist in the Old Testament? (Booij, 1978:341). There is nothing that parallels the prayer that Yahweh leave Zion. Furthermore, Dahood (1970:245) himself rejects Hillers' rendering 'from,' because he believes that this destroys the parallelism between vv. 7 and 8. The reason Hillers tried to translate the preposition לְ as 'from' appears to be his intention to challenge Mowinckel's theory that the ark was borne in procession during the time when Solomon's temple was standing. Willis (1990:207-221), following Hillers, rightly observed that the phrase קָוְמוּהָ יְהוָה is basically a military plea or summons. However, he failed to consider the construction of the verb with the preposition לְ .

As a matter of fact, many other scholars such as Fretheim (1967:136), Kraus (1978:1061), Weiser (1987:539), Mays (1994:409) maintain that this verse is the central passage referring to the annual festival of the procession of the ark. Yet, its use appears different when Ps. 132 is classified as a song of the pilgrims rather than a liturgical psalm. Allen (1983:209) argues that the psalm most likely used material concerning an 'ark procession,' but adds that this psalm

does not necessarily belong to the cultic milieu of the ark, which did not demand a special annual celebration (cf. contra the Feast of Sukkoth, according to Mitchell, 1997:267). Rather, this verse invites Yahweh, the God of heaven and earth, who symbolically dwells by the ark, to come into a new place of residence. The pilgrims who climbed to Zion would sing this part of the psalm in retrospect of the pivotal moment of the event which David performed at Jerusalem. "The ark of your strength" recalls the use of the ark in the holy wars such as the conquest of Jericho; Yahweh, who is invisibly present at the ark, not only leads the people, but also scatters their enemies. Now the conquest is complete; God has chosen his resting place among the Israelites in the city of Jerusalem. Yet, it appears insufficient when Kraus notes that "In 8b klingen mit עֲזָרָתִי זִיּוֹן Erinnerungen an die Zeit auf, in der die Lade Palladium des Heiligen Krieges war (vgl. 1S 4,3; Ps 24,8)" because the ark was not permitted to be used as a war-palladium.

It is interesting to note that the version of Solomon's dedicatory prayer for the temple in 2 Chr. 6 closes with a quotation of Ps. 132:8-11; Solomon pleads that the temple be a place of efficacious prayer, and the quotation bases the plea on the movement of the ark and David's role in it. The significance of the moving of the ark to Zion is expressed in v. 13: "*for Yahweh chose Zion, he desired it for his dwelling.*" In fact, David seems to take initiative and make the vow, which he fulfills (2 Sam. 6). Yet, what David did is reported as Yahweh's desire and choice (vv. 13f.). Mysteriously, the human initiative to find a proper resting place for the ark coincides with the divine choice. But, of course, this was no 'coincidence.' David's choice came about through the sovereign activity of Yahweh: cf. "Bezeichnenderweise wird auch niemals gesagt, David habe sich die Stadt ausgesucht (בָּחַר). Israels Gott ist es, der die Wahl getroffen hat" (Schreiner, 1963:56). At any event, from the time when the ark is set in Zion, this place comes to have a special meaning, which is 'the city of God' (Ps. 48:7), for Yahweh is inhabiting there (Isa. 8:18). The city becomes the centre of the religious life of the Israelites as well as of the world (Ez. 38:12), a connecting point between Israel and the world, since Yahweh reigns over the world as King there. Thus, Zion received the meaning of inviolability (vv. 13, 18) which the pilgrims would praise.

The second section of this psalm exhibits the prophetically written counterpart of David's vow and its fulfillment -- Yahweh's oath to maintain the line of David. It is generally accepted that verse 11 is Yahweh's response to David's vow. Verse 2, and the verses 13-16 are the

counterparts of the verses 6-9. Verses 17 and 18 are a summary answer to the petitions of vv. 1 and 10. Verse 18 is the answer to the hardship and humility David experiences in verse 1. Verse 17 is the answer to the request for the king to be looked upon favourably in verse 10; the dynasty will continue in strength and prosperity. In particular, the content of the verses 15-18 delineates that. With the installation of the ark in Zion, the City of David came to function as a representation and manifestation of the salvation and blessing of Yahweh's reign (cf. 133; 2:6). However, the oath regarding the permanence of David's throne and the promise of the blessing for Israel is conditional; Yahweh's oath for David's vow is dependent on his keeping Yahweh's covenant (v. 12). Yahweh's presence at the ark is also conditional. The kings of the Davidic dynasty are to be the servants of the covenant and its instruction (cf. Birch, Brueggemann, Fretheim & Petersen, 1999:239).

The Israelites who were on a pilgrimage towards Zion would praise Yahweh with the devotion of this psalm. They would recall the glorious scene of Yahweh's entrance into Zion through David's transfer of the ark. The blessing and prosperity of David's dynasty, prophesied by Nathan, was realized. This psalm demonstrates succinctly that the foundation and history of Israel revolved around the ark, the tangible representation of God's presence. Hence, Mays (1994:409) entitled this psalm 'David and Zion,' by regarding them as topics of central importance in psalmic theology. Here the ark links the two poles, for Zion becomes Yahweh's residence by means of David's choosing Zion and his transfer of the ark to that place.

3.3.1.4. Summary

Psalm 132, presumably sung by the pilgrims on their way of the temple in Jerusalem, was devoted to Yahweh in Zion. The origin of this psalm appears to match the liturgical features of Solomon's temple. As for its literary feature, it contains a harmonised and balanced form within the double structure of prayer and answer, containing many historical references. However, there is no evidence that this psalm was collected and selected by a theologian, historian, or literary editor intending to formulate a supposed historical event.

This psalm is, by and large, David's vow, and its fulfillment and Yahweh's oath and promise. David's vow is to abide with Yahweh, now that the transfer of the ark of the covenant

to the City of David, Zion, has been completed. This undertaking was perfectly in line with Yahweh's plan. The installation of the ark in Zion, Yahweh's permanent dwelling, initiates Zion as the center of Israelite life; everything the Israelites needed came from God (vv. 15ff.). Yahweh's oath and promise is to guarantee the permanent enthronement of David's descendants upon the throne of the kingdom Yahweh had established in Israel. The succession of David's dynasty implies a Messianic line which forms a core of redemptive history. However, Yahweh's oath to David's dynasty is rooted in a covenant which demands steadfast love for him.

The ark in this psalm, the emblem of God's presence, is propounded as a literary work linking the oaths of David and Yahweh, and as a foundation of prosperity for the kingdom of Israel. Those who were on the pilgrimage to Zion would praise Yahweh in Zion with this psalm by remembering David's historical event, namely, Yahweh's sovereign choice of Zion as the earthly center of the divine presence (cf. Anderson & Bishop, 2000:166) and Yahweh's oath to bless the kingdom as a whole.

3.3.2. The ark in Jeremiah 3:16

When you are multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, Yahweh declares, "they will mention the ark of the covenant of Yahweh no longer, it will not enter into mind, and they will not remember it, and they will not miss it, and it will not be made again.

Jeremiah 3:16 refers to the ark for the last time in the books of the Old Testament, as is well known. It is generally supposed that the reason why it is almost never directly mentioned in worship or other occasions after it was placed in the newly constructed temple of Solomon is that the role it played in Israelite worship became a secondary one. The ark was the most important object of Israel's pre-history (cf. Soggin, 1997²:215). However, it appears somewhat natural that the use of the ark was reduced after its installation in the temple because the significance of the ark was shared by the temple; the two functioned as symbols of the presence of God. Thus, it is unlikely that the decreasing importance of the ark can be attributed to Solomon's transfer of the ark to the temple.

As for the structure concerning the fading attention given to the ark, v. 16 belongs to a unit of Jeremiah's preaching which is introduced by the headline, "and Yahweh said to me in the days of the king Josiah." In this respect, it is broadly thought that vv. 15-18 were inserted into the original unit of vv. 14 and 19ff., echoing motifs from Ezekiel (cf. Craigie, Kelley, Drinkard, 1991:59f.; Brueggemann, 1998:46). In fact, the promise of a new shepherd is closely linked to Ez. 34. The transformation of Israel in Jerusalem sounds like the restoration of Jerusalem in later Ezekiel. The unity of Judah and Israel here articulated is either an echo or anticipation of Ez. 37:15-23. Yet, such an assumption of parallels may not offer absolute proof of later insertion, for the expressions about the restoration of Israel and Judah are frequently propounded in the prophetic books of Isaiah (cf. 2:2-4), Amos (cf. 9:11), Michah (cf. 4:1-4), Zephaniah (cf. 3:14ff.). This study pertains to the present shape of the text, even though the canonical form of this unit may look awkward.

The issue of whether or not the ark existed in the time of Jeremiah seems to rest on the translation, and the object, of verse 16. For instance, Soggin (1997²:219) suggests three cases. If it is late, as many scholars maintain, i.e. not by Jeremiah, it obviously means that the ark

disappeared in 586 B.C., although we don't know how. If the text is attributed to Jeremiah, (namely, directed to the north), the ark no longer existed in the earlier years of Josiah's reform, which occurred around the third quarter of the 7th century B.C.. If the verse refers to Judah, it can only mean that in the years 597-586 there was no ark in the temple. This argument can be held if we accept the translation of GNB: "Nor will they make another one." However, the ark could have still existed in the days of Jeremiah, even if the text is connected with his preaching before the fall of Jerusalem because this prophecy will be fulfilled in the distant future (v. 16a). Jeremiah sees beyond the catastrophe of his time, in which the chosen people are on the verge of collapse, to a future period in which many of the Israelites will be restored to the true faith in Yahweh. Regardless of the prophetic nature of this verse, Cazelles (1968:158) renders the imperfect verbs of this verse in the past tense by regarding this prophecy as being directed to the northern kingdom, **יְזַכְּרוּ בָּהּ**. "Par elle ils n'ont plus fait d'appel"; **יַעֲזֹבוּ** "n'ont plus gouverné." Yet, this suggestion appears to me much less likely than translating it as the future tense.

In any case, verse 16 obviously hints at the disappearance of the original ark, the ark which had attracted so much reverence in the past. Of course, the ark is here still regarded as the holy symbol of the presence of Yahweh in the temple, perhaps until the destruction of the temple. But it is not demoted to the role of unimportant cultic object on account of the temple cult (contra Carroll, 1986:150). Unlike the past and the present, in the projected future it will be irrelevant and undesired. The language implies that it will be destroyed and no attempt will be made to remake it (Jones, 1992:102).

Here, the question about the reason why Jeremiah prophesied the dispensability of the ark in the verse is raised. As a possible answer, Jones (1992:103) denotes the perversion of legitimate symbols and cultic objects like the ark and the temple at that time: "in the face of popular loyalty which regarded the ark and the temple with fetish-like devotion, this is like the shaking of the foundation. It is tantamount to the abolition of religion in its folk-character." His elucidation looks persuasive, for it properly reflects the reality of the corrupted religion of Israel. Yet, it is still insufficient to answer the question because Jeremiah's prophecy is not so much linked with contemporary reality as with features of the future. The question about the reason of the dispensability of the ark as a symbol can be answered within the context which treats the restoration and futural blessing, not through the people's repentance, but by Yahweh's

unilateral grace. The phrases "*When you are multiplied and increased*" (v. 16a) and "*At that time*" (v. 17a) form "ein Bild der eschatologischen Heilszeit" which, on the one hand, is associated with "die neue Ordnung auf dem Zion und die Heimkehr Israels und Judas aus der Diaspora des Nordens" (Werner, 1997:66) and, further, with the motif of the Pentecostal event, in which the ancient call to Israel to serve as a nation of priests (Ex. 19:5-6) would be fulfilled. On the other hand, they refer to how Yahweh's throne in Jerusalem will be like a magnet to which nations will come. In the days of salvation, the presence of God will not be symbolized by the ark, which had stood in the inner sanctuary, the holy of holies, access to which was given to the high priest alone because the divine presence will be so much more overpowering. Instead, God's presence will now be symbolized by the entire city, openly accessible to all in the larger context of the world (cf. Martens, 1986:55). Woudstra (1965:37f.; 1975:125) cogently attempts to unravel the significance of this verse in the relation between the concepts of cultus and culture. According to him, the connection between cultus and culture in the Old Testament is signified by the term *shalom*. This *shalom*-concept is essentially cultural in meaning, while it also plays a part in the concept of cultus (Num. 6:26). He believes that the *shalom*-situation will prevail throughout the city of Jerusalem 'at that time' (v. 17). This means that there will no longer be any need for a restricted area of the cultus as opposed to a city-wide area of culture. In this situation, culture and cultus will have become coexistent. Thus, a separate cult-object such as the ark will be superfluous when the cultus will have permeated all of culture. Furthermore, he (1965:38) rightly suggests an important insight on biblical exegesis: "Jeremiah's words must be understood in the light of the progress of God's revelation concerning the relation between cultus and culture. Only then will its full meaning be grasped." From this view, it is natural that the ark is mentioned as a dispensable object in the future, but it need not be considered to be a demythologized bit of ancient wood as a demotion of a once sacred object, in view of the allegedly Deuteronomistic treatment of the ark, as Carroll argues (1986:150). Here, the message of this Old Testament text pertaining to the ark implies that the Old Covenant is in the process of transition towards a new covenant: "Denn in der Heilszukunft wird das Gesetz des Herrn auf die Herzen geschrieben sein (31:33)" (Schreiner, 1993:29). However, through Jeremiah's preaching, the Israelites had to learn to live without the material symbol of the divine presence, even if they had regarded it as an indispensable object which maintained their identity as God's people (cf. McKeating, 1999:39f.).

Verse 17 appears to reinforce the thesis that the ark was understood to be a throne for Yahweh, as many scholars suppose (cf. Holladay, 1986:121; Carroll, 1986:150; Craigie, Kelley, Drinkard, 1991:61; Schreiner, 1993:29, Soggin, 1997²:221, etc.). However, it may be hard to simply contend that Jerusalem, as a futuristic throne of Yahweh, can be substituted for the ark; at that time, the people of God were fickle and unfaithful (2:27; 7). Most likely there was maltreatment and misunderstanding of the ark among the people, as Jones (1992:103) mentions above. One example of this misuse is that they mobilized the ark as a war-palladium into the battle (1 Sam. 4). In consideration of Jeremiah's preaching to the people, there is a possibility that they did not treat the ark properly during his time. According to Toorn (1997:242), they may have believed that the ark was an image or a material symbol of Yahweh, as special reverence of the Torah follows from the divine nature attributed to it in the Jewish community. They probably confused essence and symbol, and so the ark became little more than a fetish. The people may have called it Yahweh's throne, by misunderstanding it, but Yahweh's revelation through Jeremiah's prophecy may have had the intention of correcting this error: "*At that time, they will call Jerusalem Yahweh's throne.*" Thus, it is perhaps difficult to conclude that v. 17a is certain evidence that the ark was considered Yahweh's throne.

With respect to the disappearance of the ark, there are divergent traditions and opinions. 2 Macc. 2:4-7 says that Jeremiah was told to go up on Mount Nebo and to take the tent, the ark, and the altar of incense and seal them in a cave, where they would remain undiscovered until God restored his people. But this document is clearly a later legend, dependent on the present passage. In contrast to this tradition, 2 Esd. 10:20-22 claims that the sanctuary was destroyed and the ark was taken as spoils during the exilic period. According to Ethiopian tradition, Menelik, the son of Makeda, the biblical Queen of Sheba, took the ark of the covenant to the Axumite kingdom (cf. Taws, 1994:10). Haran (1963:46-58) contends that under the kingship of Manasseh of Judah the ark was removed from the inner sanctuary of the temple, to make room for an image of Asherah (2 King. 21:3, 7; 2 Chr. 33:3, 7). Price (1994:323) is convinced that the ark was hidden in a secret room beneath the temple mount, now the location of the Dome of the Rock, and controlled by Muslims. Nevertheless, it is not possible to extract reliable information from this text about the fate of the ark (cf. 4.8).

4. Theological concepts of the ark

In this chapter a variety of theological themes concerning the ark will be treated on the basis of the outcome of the exegetical study in the previous chapter. As well, it will take on the character of a summary of precisely overlapping topics. It seems reasonable to start this chapter with the various epithets for the ark because the names and the title of the ark reflect important theological notions needed to understand its significance.

4.1. The appellations for the ark

In conformity with the results of literary-critical and traditio-historical investigations, Maier (1965:82-85) concretely classified more than twenty different designations of the ark, in chronological order, to trace the development of the ark's function and meaning throughout various periods of its history. Although it appears nearly impossible to discern any consistent pattern in usage with such numerous references to the ark, it is fairly useful that Seow (1984:185) simplified and classified a total of 195 instances which clearly refer to the cultic object of the ark: eight epithets in four categories, namely, אָרוֹן אֱלֹהִים; אָרוֹן אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; אָרוֹן הַקֹּדֶשׁ; אָרוֹן הָעֵדוּת; אָרוֹן הַבְּרִית; אָרוֹן יְהוָה; אָרוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל. This section will provide an observation of the designations of the ark, according to this arrangement.

4.1.1. Ark

The term אָרוֹן occurs by itself, with or without the definite article, a total of 58 times. The simplest name of the ark as a seemingly neutral designation appears in most texts of the Pentateuch and historical books (cf. Seow, 1984:186). For Maier (1965:82) this appellation is attributed to the oldest one. It is definitely true because it was used as its neutral name referring to the box through all periods, even before the ark of the covenant was manufactured. אָרוֹן, which is rendered as 'ark' or 'chest,' is usually neutral a short while, with no special theological significance, when it is mentioned in introductory clauses such as Ex. 25:10; 37:1; Deut.

10:1ff. However the simple designation is directly-located with another term with some significance (Ex. 25:22; 26:33f.). As regards its definition, it is hard to define its theological meaning with the short expression as such. The fact that it is often used just as a simplified or abridged form alongside another epithet shows that the word appears to convey the same meaning as the name suggested in the context, since the hearers are able to take it for the conception of the epithet of the ark used in the text (cf. Jos. 3:15; 4:10; 6:4, 9; 1 Sam. 6:13.). For instance, the abridged expression 'ark' used in Jos. 3:15 and 4:10 could easily be understood to be the same as "ark of the covenant," mentioned in the previous verses. Thus, it is plausible that the meaning of the simple word אָרוֹן should be derived from the context, even if the term as such looks neutral, without any theological significance.

4.1.2. The ark of Yahweh/God

The most frequent occurrences among the variants of the ark are those used in construction with two divine names (82 times): the name אֱלֹהִים and the name יְהוָה. Most of these designations occur in the historical books in accord with Christian classification. On the basis of the different historical events of Israel mentioned in the books, Seow (1984:187) argues that "there can be no doubt that the ark came to be associated with divine names from the earliest periods of its history because of its function as a symbol of divine presence." Furthermore, von Rad (1958:121) suggests that אָרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים is the original name of the ark: "daß die Lade eines Elohim sich da draußen aufhielt, war der Anlaß all dieser Komplikationen, sondern die Landfremdheit! ... Die ganz Jugendgeschichte Samuels kennt den Namen אָרוֹן יְהוָה nicht. Man kann also getrost behaupten, die Bezeichnung für die Lade war ursprünglich אָרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים," Following him, Houtman (1996:359) conceives that אָרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים and אָרוֹן יְהוָה can be distinguished from each other in historical perspective: "אָרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים zou de oudste benaming zijn en een van oorsprong Kanaänitisch cultusvoorwerp aanduiden dat, na acceptatie in de cultus van Israel, ook אָרוֹן יְהוָה genoemd kon worden." Still, it seems so arbitrary to divide historical periods according to divine name (cf. 2.1). Nonetheless, the problem that the epithet of the ark אָרוֹן יְהוָה often occurs in the books belonging to periods earlier than Samuel still remains unsettled and subjective. Hence, there is no biblical

proof that the name אֱלֹהִים was earlier associated with the Israelite cultus (cf. Gen. 4:26).

As Seow (1992:387) denotes, it appears extremely difficult to claim that the two sets of names represent two different strata in the texts pertaining to the ark. Indeed, the occasional juxtaposition of the two, and sometimes the translation of the names in the versions (e.g., LXX 1 Sam. 4:3, 22; 5:2) and their mutual exchange in the parallel between 2 Sam. 6:17 and 1 Chr. 16:1, demonstrate that the designations אֲרוֹן יְהוָה and אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים are probably to be treated, for the most part as, interchangeable. The variations between the two usually appear stylistic rather than ideological. With the appellations of the ark אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים and אֲרוֹן יְהוָה, the ark generally signifies a symbol of the awesome presence of God in the midst of the people.

As well, there are the designations of the ark with special modifiers. In particular, Jos. 3:13 introduces the term, '*the ark of Yahweh, the Lord of all the earth,*' which gives a cosmic dimension to all of the events surrounding Israel's entrance into the promised land, already hinted at in Rahab's confession (Jos. 2:11). Yahweh, the God of the whole earth (Gen. 19:25; Ex. 19:5; Ps. 24:1), chose a people for himself "*out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth*" (Deut. 7:6). This is suggested by the words of Joshua (4:24): "that all the people of the earth might know that the hand of Yahweh is mighty" (Hamlin, 1983:25). Yet, the modifier '*the Lord of all the earth*' seems to have something to do with Yahweh, rather than the ark; it is not an epithet of the ark but of Yahweh. This also applies to the name associated with the divine name '*Yahweh Zebaoth who inhabits at the cherubim*' (1 Sam. 4:4; cf. 2 Sam. 6:2; 1 Chr. 13:6). It is held that this is usually regarded as the fullest and most ancient liturgical name of the ark. However, the term Zebaoth is intimately associated with Yahweh rather than the ark. אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת in those texts seems to be an epithet which stresses his omnipotence rather than one directly concerned with the ark. This conception is seconded by Isa. 37:16 in which the phrase has nothing to do with the ark (cf. 3.2.2.4.1).

4.1.3. The ark of the Covenant/ The Testimony

The appellations of 'the ark of the covenant' and 'the ark of testimony' appear 40 times (30 times with various forms of the divine name) and 12 times, respectively, throughout the Old

Testament. Critical circles posit that while the association of the ark with the covenant is typical of the Deuteronomists (it is their special designation of the ark), P uses the ark of testimony as a substitute name for the ark (cf. Seow, 1992:387). Yet it is fundamentally impossible to argue that the various names of the ark are from various sources. Indeed, it is inexplicable that the so-called P, for whom the notion of God's eternal covenant plays a central part (Gen. 17), would not have characterized the ark as the ark of the covenant.

In a practical way, the Hebrew words, **בְּרִית** and **עֵדוּת** are interchangeable with respect to the ark (cf. Deut. 31:9, 25, 26; Jos. 3:3, 6, 8 and Ex. 25:22; 26:33, 34; 30:6, 26; 39:35; 40:3, 5, 21; Num. 4:5; 7:89; Jos. 4:16). Regardless of the ark, **עֵדוּת** is used as a synonym of **בְּרִית** two times (2 King. 17:15; Ps. 132:12). Strictly speaking, however, **עֵדוּת**, which is rendered as 'testimony' basically refers to something concrete, such as the tablets of the covenant or "stipulations" of a covenant at Sinai, rather than to the covenant itself. In particular, the meaning of **עֵדוּת** was intimately linked with the Ten Commandments, even though the covenant had been established before. The Decalogue as testimony basically is God's demand for his covenantal relationship with the Israelites who already experienced God's redemption from Egypt. It should be underlined that Yahweh wanted the covenant relation with his people through the exodus. This relationship is a foundation for the people to be 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation' (Ex. 19:6). On the one hand the Decalogue was provided as a means of fulfilling the holy destiny God intended for them. It was, on the other hand, given as a means for the people to thankfully dedicate themselves to the God of redemption. Highlighting this aspect of the covenant character, the word **עֵדוּת** itself indicates the ark (Ex. 16:34; 26:33, 34; 30:6, 26). Nevertheless, both 'the ark of the covenant' and 'the ark of testimony' symbolized the commands of the covenant which formed the people of Israel. These appellations of the ark present the typical character and principal function of the ark as a marvellous emblem of God's presence; God's presence implied in the ark is not automatically realized in the midst of his people but the communion with God was only based on the covenant law, the Decalogue which is inscribed in the tablets as a fundamental law of Israel's legal corpus. See section 3.1.1.4.2. for detailed explanation of the testimony.

4.2. The ark, Kapporet and Cherubim

Present studies on the ark tend to focus on the symbolic significance of the separation of the components related to the ark. Haran's (1959:30-38; 89-98) research has been especially important. Before that time, ark studies focused on whether it should be conceived as a container for the two tablets of the law or as a kind of empty throne. This debate is closely tied to the explanation of the constituent elements of the atonement place and the cherubim. However, they are different objects, each with a significance of its own. Here their theological significance and relationship will be examined.

4.2.1. The ark

It is obvious that אֲרֹן means a container, chest or ark which has the shape of a rectangular wooden chest. Then in the Old Testament the vast majority of occurrences (195 times) specify the ark of the cultic object with various theological significances.

As regards its pedigree, many scholars produced different suggestions concerning the provenance of the ark, ascribing the biblical references to the ark to P's fabrication (cf. 3.1.1.4.1). Gressmann (1920: 1-17, 42), identifying the ark of Yahweh with the chest of Joseph, defends the statement that the ark in the land of Canaan stemmed from the Amorite symbol related to Baal's worship because it is possible that only in P's thinking does the golden ornamentation of the ark and its connection with kapporet and cherubim coalesce with the situation in the wilderness. However the internal and external evidence of the biblical materials does not allow us to imagine that Israel could not afford to manufacture precious things such as the ark, because of its destitute situation in the wilderness (Ex. 12:35f.; 33:5f.; cf. Kitchen, 2003:279). Guthe (1899:31) states that the ark of Yahweh was derived from the Egyptian processional bark, on which the image of the god stood in the wooden niche with four pillars, in front of which people prayed and worshipped. Possibly Israelites knew the Egyptian bark but there is a great chasm between the two. While the bark as a house of deity has a divine image behind the curtain, toward which people worship, the ark contains the

covenant law without any divine image: Although not an object of worship itself, Israelites should worship Yahweh who is present in the ark. Hartmann (1917/18:209-244) connects the ark with Egyptian or Babylonian origin: "die Deutung der Lade als eines Tammuz kastens oder Osirissargs ist vielleicht wie wer gezeigt haben, gar nicht ohne weiteres von der Hand zu weisen." Hartmann thinks Babylonian Tammuz to be identical to Egyptian Osiris in that both gods were vegetation deities, as a symbols of the repeatedly dying and revivifying nature (cf. Alster, 1999:834ff.). Yet Yahweh of the ark is not a nature deity and nowhere is there any trace of a fertility cult connected with the ark. Then Reimpell (1916:326-331) holds that the ark was taken over by the Midianites from the Hittites and consequently borrowed by Moses for the making of the ark. Reimpell supposes that Moses made the ark of a boxlike shape imitating the holy stairs and banks which were found in Midian where Sinai lies, and that such a holy stair plays a important role in the cult of the Sinaitic deity. However all the biblical materials in the early or later stages of Israelite history keep silent about such background of the ark. Most notably the form of the ark and its function as a container of the tablets of the law are far from those of a holy stone stair. For von Rad (1958:126f.) the ark is a cultic object made in the land of Canaan in order for Israel to get assurance of the continual presence of Yahweh, given its polytheistic neighbors. In fact the presupposition of his statement is based on the hypothesis that the ark has nothing to do with the tabernacle, which is allegedly fabricated by P, but with a cultic house such as a temple of Shiloh, the house of Obed Edom or the temple in Jerusalem. Naturally the ark is helpful for Israel to get assurance of the continual presence of Yahweh in the pagan circumstances of Canaan but the function of the ark may not be confined to that. Yet the history of God's guidance through the ark to the the promised land which is recorded in the book of Joshua would be totally nullified if the theory of P is accepted. His argument cannot help but be dismissed because the assumption of P is not persuasive.

Thereby the attempt to seek the origin of the ark outside of biblical evidence, such as the view of *Religionsgeschichte*, and inside historico-literary criticism, has yet to give a sufficient evidence for an answer. Thus this thesis returns to the reliable testimony of Yahweh that testifies to the Mosaic origin of the ark in the wilderness (cf. Ex. 25; 37; Deut. 10).

The ark as an object has been variously understood according to different methodologies: fetish-kist, bearer of God's image, house of deity, a miniature temple, throne, footstool, a

simple receptacle, war-palladium. These are conclusions of interpretation based on comparative religion and literary criticism. Gressmann (1920:25) argues that the ark originally contained a golden calf, Yahweh's image, and later on, the tablets of the Mosaic law. This assumption is to satisfy a double function of the ark as a throne and container. Yet nowhere is there found any clue on its function as container of a golden calf in the Old Testament. Guthe (1899:31) considers the ark of Yahweh to be a bearer of God's image just as the Egyptian bark bears the image of a god standing in the wooden niche with four pillars. Moreover Morgenstern (1943:94-106) considers the functions of the ark to parallel those of an Arabian *kubbe*, which was normally made of red leather, domed in shape, and suitable for mounting on the back of a camel. As above mentioned, it is not proper that the ark is explained in such a *religionsgeschichtliche* analogy. Even Arnold's (1917:133) suggestion of a miniature temple which housed the spirit of the divinity hardly matches the biblical idea that the divine attribute for God is not confined to a material object. Of course, the notion that considers the ark to be a fetish-kist or war-palladium, as Dibelius (1906:34f.) Wellhausen (1927:47), Stoebe (1973:95), Kraus (1978:632) and Robert (1981:52) suppose, fails to describe its biblical meaning properly, even if the Israelites thought of it in this way. The result of the Israelite battle against the Philistines truly reflects the absurdity of such a superstitious view (1 Sam. 4).

Besides the war in 1 Sam. 4, two verses appear to show that the ark is associated with war. The Massoretic text of 1 Sam. 14:18 reads "Saul ordered Ahijah, 'bring the ark of God,' for in that day the ark of God with the Israelites." This passage seems problematic since Saul's order is not harmonized with the situation of the same chapter, according to which "Ahijah carried the Ephod" (3). The rest of the books of Samuel implies that Saul had no particular interest in the ark, and moreover, the ark was stationed in Kiriath-Jearim until the initial reign of David (2 Sam. 6). To overcome this incongruency, Arnold (1917:26f.) maintains that the ark Saul ordered to bring is another ark. Yet his hypothesis of multiple arks is not advocated by biblical materials. Instead, the Hebrew text can be emended to read Ephod, not ark, according to LXX^{BL} which reads Ephod for 'ark of God.' The LXX's rendering which is accepted by most exegetes appears to be more reasonable. Thus, this passage demonstrates that the ark is not associated with the war. Another verse which is considered to show that the ark was in the battle field is 2 Sam. 11:11. In this verse we read about Uriah's rejection of David's suggestion.

The expression, "הָאָרוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה שְׁבִים בְּסֻכּוֹת" is ambiguous. The term, "סֻכּוֹת" is not normally used of tents for the Israelites (Lev. 23:42, 43; Neh. 8:14, 17), whereas the word which mentions the ordinary tent is אֹהֶל (Gen. 4:20; 12:8, 2 Sam. 6:17; 16:22 etc.). Woudstra (1965:119ff.) carefully considers the term as a reference to the festival of Sukkoth described in Exodus 34:22 and 23:16. However, Uriah's statement seems to stress the seriousness of the battle as a whole. Moreover, there seems to be no reason for him to reject enjoying the comforts of his house in such unusual circumstances, while people were celebrating the Feast of Tabernacles staying in booths (cf. Judg. 21:19-21). Yadin's proposal (1955:341-351) that the term, 'סֻכּוֹת' should be understood as proper noun, 'Succoth' which is located 45kms from Rabbath-Ammon is plausible. Then the militia (יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה) remained in the secure base of Succoth, serving as strategical reserve both against unexpected eventualities of fresh Aramean interventions, and as reinforcements for Joab's army. In any case, it appears that the militia with the ark was kept in reserve. In this case, the Israelites seem to have used the ark as an object of divination (Judg. 20:23-28), in consideration that the manner in which the ark was used is fairly different from the war against the Philistines in 1 Sam. 4. This may be a rare occasions and another example of Israel's abuse of the ark. Therefore this verse should not be used as evidence that the ark frequently functioned as a war-palladium in the Old Testament.

As regards the ark's figure of Deuteronomy, it is contended that 'D' viewed the ark as a simple receptacle according to the scholars such as Brouwer (1955: 82), Eißfeldt (1960:283), Rad (1958:112), Fretheim (1968:4; 1998:52), Labuschagne (1987:220), Clements (1989:54), Seow (1992:391). Yet, the ark in Deuteronomy is concerned with strengthening the importance of Yahweh's Law. It still has the symbolical meaning of the glorious presence of Yahweh because the context and the linguistic evidence do not uphold that 'D' viewed the ark as a simple receptacle: the Levites should serve *in the presence of Yahweh* (Deut. 10:8). The connotation of the phrase, *in the presence of Yahweh* in Deuteronomy itself and so called 'Deuteronomistic' books is tightly linked with the ark (Deut. 17:2; 18:7; 26:10; Jos. 4:13; 6:8; 7:23; Judg. 20:23, 26; 1 Sam. 6:6 etc.). Thus it is insufficient to say that 'D' depicts the ark as a simple container in a demythologized state; 'D' did not deprive the ark of anything of its substantial nature (cf. 3.1.3.2).

During the first half of last century, many scholars tended to interpret the ark as a throne, but since that period the mood has shifted to take it for a footstool due to the connection of the *religionsgeschichtliche* view with achievements of archaeological excavation (cf. 3.1.1.4.2). As a matter of fact, it is far-fetched to extract biblical significance from cultural phenomena of the countries surrounding Israel. The Old Testament succinctly testifies that Yahweh dwells upon a throne in heaven (Ex. 17:16; 1 King. 22:19; Isa. 6:1; 66:1), whereas the ark is never directly associated with the throne-concept; it has a box-like figure. Instead, Jerusalem or the sanctuary is Yahweh's throne on the earth.

With respect to the relationship between the footstool and the ark, it is noticed that the ark has nothing to do with the concept of the footstool according to the exegetical study on the ark passages so far. Yet some verses appear to link the ark with the concept of the footstool such as Ps. 99:5 and 1 Chr. 28:2. The phrase, "לְהַדָּרִים רַגְלָיו" of Ps. 99:5 is identical to that of Ps. 132:7 (cf. 3.3.1.3). In particular, לְהַדָּרִים רַגְלָיו is intimately tied with two locations, namely, Zion and the holy mount, in three other parts of the poem (cf. Kraus, 1978:853). The three terms do not refer to the ark so much as God's dwelling. According to 1 Chr. 28:2, David directly connects the ark with the footstool. In this case, the ark should be recognized as a footstool. However, this phrase seems not to denote the ark exclusively but 'the whole unit of the ark' containing Kapporet and Cherubim. Thus, the ark still is not with the concept of footstool in a strict sense. The fact that 'whole unit of the ark' is footstool demonstrates that Yahweh is tangibly and sublimely present at the ark to reign over the world as universal ruler with various attributes such as greatness (Pss. 48:1; 99:2, etc.), glory (Pss. 8:1; 19:1; 148:13), righteousness (Ps. 9:4), majesty (Ps. 93:1; 1 Chr. 29:1), lordship (Act. 4:24), supremacy (Ps. 119:91; Isa. 48:13), dominion (Col. 1:16), etc. (cf. 3.3.1.3).

The ark is a holy object of which the design was given by Yahweh himself on Sinai. The ark was a kind of cultic article used for oracle, but it was not to be worshipped as many other nations surrounding Israel worshipped idols. The glorious epiphany of Yahweh occurs around the ark. Israel could expect such intimacy and care from God. The intimate presence of God with his people, which played a cardinal role in Israel's idea of the covenantal relationship, was strengthened in the new covenant because the new covenant developed concepts concerning the continuing immanence of the risen Christ with the Church, and the work of the Holy Spirit in

the world and within Christians. The significance of the ark is related to a core biblical thought: God is *with* us.

In reality, the ark was used to lead Yahweh's people through the wilderness, bring them into the promised land, and establish an ideal kingdom of theocracy. The symbol of the holy presence was a vital component in the people's daily life. It is plausible that by using the ark as a magnificent emblem of his glorious presence, Yahweh designed it to manifest himself, revealing his various attributes and to fulfil his promise concerning the redemption of human beings in the period of the Old Covenant.

4.2.2. Kapporet (cf. 3.1.1.4.3)

In light of linguistic evidence, LXX's rendering, ἱλαστήριον, 'propitiatory' and ἐπίθεμα, 'cover' for כַּפֹּרֶת, adopted by some modern versions such as the NIV, NV (Dutch), appears inappropriate, since the term ἱλαστήριον, which points to the place of propitiating the deity, is far from biblical thought in contrast with pagans' conciliating their gods. Moreover the pi`el stem of the Hebrew term כַּפֹּר cannot afford to be translated as ἐπίθεμα. Thus the proper translation of כַּפֹּרֶת appears to be 'Atonement place' (Sühneort, verzoeningsplaats) or 'mercy seat' (KJV, RSV).

Unlike the position of most Jewish commentators (Rash, 1930:134; Rashbam, 1997:311; Cassuto, 1967:323; Sarna, 1991:161; Jacob, 1992:775) who regard כַּפֹּרֶת as 'cover' above the open ark, it is an independent object with its own function (cf. Houtman, 1996:371), though it has an intimate connection to the ark like two components of one thing. כַּפֹּרֶת was manufactured of pure gold, and was placed on the ark which adds the image of sanctity to it. It functions as the place of revelation and atonement over which Yahweh manifests himself (Lev. 16:2) and addresses the people (25:22; Num. 7:89) and atones Israel's sin (Lev. 16:13f.). This failed to meet the requisites of Yahweh's commandment which, put under the כַּפֹּרֶת, was atoned for by a substitutionary death (Rooker, 2000:21). Yahweh reveals himself over the כַּפֹּרֶת, namely, the presence and appearance of Yahweh comes to be associated with a concrete object. The experience of Yahweh's glorious theophany on Mt. Sinai is expanded to

the **כַּפֶּרֶת** which is linked with God's glory and holiness; **כַּפֶּרֶת** is a holy object over which Yahweh manifests himself and atones people's sin. The **כַּפֶּרֶת** as the place of revelation and atonement occupies a central place in the sanctuary; it is for the maintenance and restoration of the ideal relationship between Yahweh and Israel.

4.2.3. Cherubim (cf. 3.1.1.4.3)

It is nearly impossible to etymologically define the term, *cherubim*, generally substituted by transliteration of the Hebrew **כְּרֻבִים**. It has been attempted to reconstruct a picture of the cherubim in comparison to an imaginary creature such as a hybrid being having a human face and the body of an ox with wings or in other forms combining elements of the body of a man, ox, lion or eagle from the Ancient East (Lurker, 1973:103; Collon, 1987:32-74; Metzger, 1985:320-322; Keel & Uehlinger, 1992:190f.). However, the figure of the cherubim over the ark appears nowhere else in ancient religious times. There still remains a difficulty to adequately apply such syncretic parallels to the cherubim, an object which played a prominent part in Israel's most sacred rites. Hence, the best way to draw a figure is to turn to the text.

According to the biblical account, the cherubim, made of ordinary gold and linked with **כַּפֶּרֶת** at both edges, appear to be two erect figures. They have wings spread upward which overshadow the atonement place and they confront each other in posture, their faces directed towards the atonement place. Similar to the way a bird flies by flapping its wings in the air, the cherubim with wings are symbolically connected with something heavenly and transcendental.

On the basis of the archaeological finds this figure has provoked many scholars (Vaux, 1967:243-247; Haran, 1958:14-25; Gressmann, 1920:190f. Nr. 665, 666; cf. Metzger, 1994:79f.) to conjecture the cherubim are a throne of God, an empty throne on which God would invisibly sit. Yet such an analogy is challenged by Borowski (1995:36-41) who supposes that the metaphysical concept such as divine omnipotence and omniscience used to be expressed by a physical form like the cherubim for ancient people. Indeed there is no hint that the cherubim are a throne throughout the text of the Old Testament. The biblical materials display various functions of the cherubim: cherubim as guardians of the way to the tree of life (Gen.

3:24), on the ten curtains of the tabernacle (Ex. 26:1), on the veil (Ex. 26:31), involved in reference to God's movement (2 Sam. 22:11; Ps. 18:11; Ez. 1, 10) and in the temple of Solomon (1 King. 8). However none of them denotes that the cherubim are God's throne as we previously observed it in the explanation of the term. Likewise it is difficult to maintain that even the phrase **יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִּים**, frequently juxtaposed with the concept of enthronement, undergirds 'throne-theology.' This phrase with difficulty in the rendering of the expression caused by the lack of a preposition between the two words may be translated as 'one who is inhabiting *at* or *with* the cherubim,' which connotation is identical with the paraphrase, 'one who is inhabiting in glory and majesty.' Accordingly, the expression need not be intimately affiliated with the ark to grant room for the concept of enthronement (cf. 3.2.2.4.1).

The replicas of the cherubim on the ark served rather to direct the attention of the worshipper to the heavenly sanctuary with its heavenly Occupant, of which the earthly counterpart meant to be a faithful image. The figure of the cherubim on the ark presents Yahweh's transcendent sovereignty as well as his omnipresence, glory, and majesty.

4.3. The contents of the ark

It is justifiable to feel curious about what was inside, if the ark, first of all, is a receptacle. Yet regardless of biblical information on this topic, some scholars have different opinions about the contents of the ark. Vatke (1835:321) assumes that the ark originally contained a holy stone from Sinai to represent Yahweh's presence since the stone sets forth deity himself and his might, and radiates his holiness in the container (Gen. 28:10-22). Gressmann (1920:25) argues that the ark originally contained a golden calf, Yahweh's image. May (1935/36:220, 226) presumes that there were Urim and Tummim in the ark according to Arabian analogy of Betyls, found in the *qubba* of pre-Islamic times. Maier (1965:59) assumes that the ark was made as a container for the *Bundesdokument* or *Bundessymbol* of tribal organization which appears to be based on Noth's hypothesis of amphictyony. These interesting parallels seem to satisfy our curiosity to some extent but hardly provide a proper solution of the subject in question.

According to biblical materials, Hebrews 9:4 of the New Testament testifies that there were three objects in the ark, although Schroer (1992:50) denies their historicity: "Die alttestamentlichen Angaben über den Inhalt der Lade (Manna, Gestzestafeln) sind historisch nicht glaubwürdig." As to their historical provenances, the intact narrative in the Pentateuch affirms that from the beginning the ark served as a container for the tables of the law (Ex. 25:16; 40:20; Deut. 10:5; cf. 1 Kng 8:9). Two additional objects within the ark were a jar of manna (Ex. 16:33f.) and Aaron's rod (MT, Num. 17:25).

The fact that the stone tablets of the Ten Commandment were deposited in the ark appears to imply the essential importance of the law document. At times, the tablets named as אֲרֹן, indicate the ark (Ex. 16:34; 26:33, 34; 30:6, 26) (cf. 4.1.3). In comparative religion's view, the idea of *Königsprotokoll* has been quite widely circulated. This idea concerned the tablets of the Decalogue housed in the ark. It emphasized that the document of the pact or treaty was often placed beneath the feet of a god who served as witness to it in the ancient Near East (cf. Vaux, 1967:256). However, the dilemma resides in the question 'Is there a bridge to connect the religious and political customs of ancient society with God's revelation?' (cf. 3.1.1.4.2). Rather, it reminds Israel of God's gracious action to re-establish an intimate relationship with a

contaminated people who are guilty of worshiping a golden calf in the wilderness (cf. 3.1.3.2). Indeed, the tablets of the Testimony preach that Yahweh, as the redeeming saviour, demands the obedience and faith of the covenantal people in accordance with the commandment; only on this basis can their communion with God be sustained, even if the ark symbolizes Yahweh's actual presence. Thus, the Israelites continuously had to learn the content of the Testimony, rather than the interest in the tablets as such (Deut. 31:26ff.): "Wichtiger als die deponierten Tafeln werden die Lehren des Gesetzes, die es periodisch vorzulesen gilt" (Loretz, 1977:161).

According to Exodus 16:33f., Aaron had to take an Omer of Manna and keep it 'before' Yahweh for the generations to come. Then, he placed a jar of Manna 'in front of the Testimony,' which could only refer to the law, which was probably given later. The amount of an Omer is equal to an individual's daily bread. It is to serve future generations as a vivid reminder of Yahweh's providential care of Israel throughout the wilderness period. This jar with Manna is a warrant of God's gracious sustenance of the Church, albeit Manna was bestowed as Yahweh's response to the rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness (Ex. 16:3). The congregation of God could be satisfied with the bread of angels (Ps. 78:25). In the New Testament, Jesus says that he himself is the true bread of life (Joh. 6:31:35).

As for Aaron's staff, the difficulty lies in whether it was placed in the ark or not because Aaron's staff was to be put *before* the Testimony, according to Numbers 17:25. The phrase does not indicate that it was put in the ark, but the New Testament (Heb. 9:4) furnishes evidence that Aaron's rod was placed in the ark with other objects. Aaron's staff, as an admonitory sign, refers to God's punishment so as to prevent all the grumbling about the priesthood of Aaron and his descendants. Those who arbitrarily lay violent hands upon the office of reconciliation will die. The staff shows that Yahweh himself will clear the way for reconciliation; it is associated with blessing and life through the official service of Jesus Christ.

Still one problem remains: Kings 8:9; "*there was nothing in the ark except the two stone tablets.*" However, the remark stressed by the term פָּנֵי may still hint that there were only the stone tablets in the ark at the time but there had been other things in it before. Thus the word פָּנֵי leads the readers in the period of the New Testament to be conscious of harmony with the content of Hebrews 9:4. It should be stated that the two other things vanished before building Solomon's temple, if the testimonies of the Old and New Testament are rightly accepted. In the

view of progress of redemptive history, it is understandable that the jar of Manna and Aaron's staff disappeared since they were especially associated with the lives of Israelites in the wilderness. In particular, Aaron's priestly succession was broken (cf. 2 Sam. 2:35; 1 King. 2:27) and Yahweh in the resting place gave rest that he had promised Moses and will bless the people with abundant provisions (cf. 8:56; Ps. 132:16). Thus, the jar of Manna and Aaron's staff might have played no special role in the period when the temple became central to Israelite religion, just as the Tent of Meeting lost its function at that time. Yahweh wanted to lead his people to the way of faith with different sacred objects in the progress of redemptive history (cf. 3.2.4.5.3).

4.4. The ark, tabernacle and temple

מִשְׁכָּן, which is translated as tabernacle, is differentiated from אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד which is translated as Tent of Meeting; the former refers to structure and the latter to its religious use (cf. Jacob, 1992:880). The tabernacle of Yahweh, built in Sinai, refers exclusively to the tent structure inside the court, not to the sanctuary complex as a whole. This is true for most relevant texts in the Old Testament. It is the central place of worship, the sanctuary that houses the ark of the covenant. Frequently it is the location of revelation. It is presented in biblical narrative as the visible sign of Yahweh's presence among the people of Israel: concretely speaking, it is a reminder that the transcendent Creator is immanent.

However, as to the origin of the tabernacle and its relationship with the ark, Wellhausen takes a negative position. According to him (1927:39, 40), the biblical account on the existence of the tabernacle is just a myth, P's pious fraud. The tabernacle could not have been in the wilderness because, he speculates, its splendid materials could not have been found in the destitute circumstances of the wilderness. Recently, Gunneweg (1993:99) also adopted this classical criticism: "Das Zelt, wie es hier detailliert beschrieben wird und das dem himmlischen Vorbild entsprechen soll (Ex. 25, 40; 26, 30), ist zweifelsohne Retrojektion des Jerusalemer Tempels in die sogenannte Mosezeit." Wellhausen (1927:43) argues that the ark was broken up with the tabernacle at the end of the Judges' period, while the inseparable link between them had existed before: "Von dem Vorhandensein der Lade Jahve's allerdings finden sich gegen Ende der Richterzeit deutliche Spuren (1 Sam. Kap. 4-6). Bürgt nun die Lade für das Tabernakel?" Alluding to the abolition of the Siloh tabernacle, he appears to want to draw up this scheme: 'the tabernacle-the ark-the temple' as sanctuaries that stand for God's presence. In fact, in the chapter *Der Ort des Gottesdienstes*, he attempts to prove that the Israelite religion evolved from a low to a high point and from a primitive to a cultured condition. He bases this theory on Hegel's historical philosophy (cf. 2.1.2). However, the tabernacle was found at Gibeon during the period of David and Solomon (1 King. 3:4; 1 Chr. 21:29; 2 Chr. 1:3, 4). It appears to have been transferred with the ark (1 King. 8:4; 2 Chr. 5:2-5).

Through the impact of archaeology, sceptical supposition of the historicity of biblical documents was rooted out (cf. 2.1.2). Nevertheless, scholars continue to maintain that the

'priestly' account is schematized and idealized and that the 'priestly' writers read the theological interpretations and historical developments of later ages into their system. Modified Wellhausenists now point to such things as the lists and genealogies of P as containing information that cannot be passed over lightly (cf. Woudstra, 1970:89f.). According to von Rad (1958:123ff.), who belongs to the traditio-historical circle, the tabernacle and the ark radically diverged in origin as well as in theological significance: "Es ist keine Übertreibung: zwischen der Vorstellung des Kommens Jahwes in das Lager mit der Lade 1. Sam. 4 und der seines Kommens in den Wolken von oben auf das Zelt ist ursprünglich keine Brücke vorhanden." As to their distinction, the tabernacle was from the south and represented a theology of glory and dwelling in P, whereas the ark was from the north and represented a theology of covenant and presence in D. Nevertheless, he is of the opinion that there was a late, priestly coalescence of polarized ark and tent traditions in the history of Israel's theology: "Und jetzt erst war die Stunde gekommen, daß Lade und Zeltvorstellung verbunden werden konnten. Das war die theologische Tat des Priesterkodex, der selbst von Haus aus in der Zeltradition steht." In regard to Rad's assumption of the theological combination, Hague (1997:505) rightly observes that a close examination of the texts in question reveals the impossibility of isolating theological polarization along these traditio-historical lines. As well, the complete lack of consensus in identifying the proposed synthesis of a theological dialectic in P (which is itself seen in flux) has brought the historico-traditional methodology itself into question (cf. 2.2).

From the beginning, the tabernacle was not used merely as a covering for the ark, but as a tent-like sanctuary that symbolized that Yahweh resided among the Israelites (cf. Judg. 18:31) and met them in glory. In particular, Rendtorff (1999:61) connects the notion that in the tabernacle God represents the glory of his presence (Ex. 40:36f.) with his glorious presence in Sinai (Ex. 24:16f.). From this perspective, the function of the tabernacle is not clearly set apart from that of the ark because the glory associated with God's presence on Mount Sinai is also inextricably associated with the ark within the tabernacle in the camp; the glorious epiphany of Yahweh occurs by the ark. Furthermore, the idea that the tabernacle is to reveal the divine intention to be present with, and for, the believing community in a tangible way, in both the ritual of liturgy and the commonality of daily life (cf. Klein, 1996:275), is precisely tantamount to the significance of the ark. Thus, the unbreakable connection between the tabernacle and the

ark demonstrates a feature of Yahweh's foremost sanctuary, even though the tabernacle was dismantled during the journey and its appurtenances played no part in that case.

The ceremony of Solomon's transfer of the ark into the temple in 1 King. 8 explicitly displays the intimate association between the ark and the temple. The ark of the covenant of Yahweh was brought to its place in the inner sanctuary of the temple, the Most Holy Place, and put beneath the wings of the cherubim. Buis (1997:97) evaluates Solomon's ceremony to carry the ark into the temple from a political view: "Salomon achève ce transfert en le rendant définitif. Ainsi les anciennes traditions qui définissaient l'identité d'Israël passent sous le contrôle et la protection de la dynastie davidique: le document de l'alliance est enfermé dans un bâtiment qui est l'œuvre et la propriété du roi. Il faudra donc faire une synthèse entre ces traditions et l'idéologie royale, plus l'idéologie de la ville de Jérusalem." Yet, the response of God was positive (8:10), although it is unknown to what extent Solomon took advantage of the ark politically. Rather, it appears to mean not so much political succession as that of the tradition of the historical faith based on the exodus and Sinai's lawgiving, since the ark itself has irrefutable connections with history of the exodus (v. 9b, 10b). Linville (1998:279) also underpins such a historical liaison between the ark and temple: "The whole scene in 1 King. 8:1-13 seems infused with a sense that the dedication of the temple is not so much a singular event, but rather marks the ultimate end to the exodus itself."

Similar to the ark, the temple symbolizes God's presence as 'the house of God' (which occur 22 times throughout Kings). In particular, the cherubim fabricated by Solomon which differ from those of the ark, seem to multiply the meaning of the glorious presence of God with the ark; the transcendental creator and King is immanent. It is no exaggeration to say that the author of Kings views the ark and the temple as the place where God has deigned to dwell among the people (1 King. 6:13, 23-27; 8:6, 7, 10-13; 2 King. 19:15; cf. Ps. 11:4; 65:5; 138:2). Nevertheless, it also reminds them that God's presence, associated with the cultic objects, is thoroughly conditioned on the covenantal faith of the people. In this regard, Fretheim's (1999:54) comment is instructive: "The temple and God's dwelling therein is most fundamentally for the people. ... The emphasis is not for the sake of the temple *per se*, but for the sake of the people for whom the temple is integral to their faith and life and for the sake of God who desires to be present among them." Practically, faithful psalmists comprehended dwelling in

the temple as staying before Yahweh, so that they always longed for climbing up to the temple, especially when they were in difficulties (cf. Ps. 5:8; 26:8; 27:4; 42:3; 43:3; 65:4; 84:5; 116:26; 122:1).

Although the ark, the tabernacle and the temple are separate and independent cultic objects, they have inseparable connections to one another in the functional sense. Together they were the foremost sanctuary to manifest the glorious presence of Yahweh among the covenantal people, even though the function of the temple substituted for that of the tabernacle after Solomon's construction of the temple. However the ark with the atonement place and the cherubim was not only at the heart of the sanctuary but also highlighted as God's royal footstool among them (1 Chr. 28:2).

4.5. The ark and worship of Yahweh

From the perspective of religious science, cultic worship is generally defined as a 'designated and arranged form of communion with the divine being,' so that its concept contains the dedication of a ritualized offering and the congregation of worshippers whose purpose is to pay homage to God (Diebner, 1985:5). This definition is composed of two components: a material one, because of the stress which the cultus puts on sacred places, seasons, and rites, and a sociological one because in the cultus the determining factor is the community as a whole. While the cultus of the Old Testament apparently seems to have a similar structure with that point, above all it initiates from the fact that God wants to inhabit among his people. The essence of the cultus is spiritual intercourse between God and men, in both individual and community (cf. Ps. 22:3). In this regard, it is comprehensible that Bruggemann (1997:650) delineates the cult as a mediator: "the cult, in its many forms and expressions mediates Yahweh's 'real presence'." Yahweh, who is pleased to have communion with his people, exhibits his presence in the ritual practice. In the Old Testament period, the presence of God in public worship was overseen by priests, authorized office-bearers who were symbolical cultic objects just like the ark and the tabernacle. Hence, the ark, the palpable emblem of Yahweh's presence, played a tremendously momentous part in the cultic practice of Israel.

Notwithstanding, it is unknown how the ark was concretely utilized in cultic worship. Thus, many scholars have attempted to extract conjecture concerning the ark's use from Near East parallels. Particularly, Mowinckel (1966 II:93f., 111-117) argued that Israel annually carried the ark in procession at 'Royal Zion Festival,' by establishing the theory of the New Year Festival of Yahweh's Enthronement on the basis of 2 Sam. 6, 1 King. 8 and Ps. 132 and the likes. He (1966 I:297ff.) found at least twenty-two ideological continuities between Israel's kingship theology and that of the general ancient Near East. Furthermore, he (1962:52-60) contends that nowhere in the Old Testament do we meet with a 'metaphysical' unity of Yahweh and the king, or a really 'mythological' idea of the king's relation to Yahweh. Yet, in his opinion, the basic conceptions have been fundamentally altered under the influence of the Yahweh religion, although Israel has adopted a number of ideas, functions, and style forms of oriental monarchy. Royal concepts, which in Mesopotamia or Egypt took on mythological

force, have been taken out of the mythical-literal context and reinterpreted. For him, the king was 'adopted' not 'born' in Israel (cf. Starbuck, 1999:42).

As a matter of fact, concerning Yahweh's kingship, it is generally assumed that the nomads of the wilderness would not have used the analogy of kingship prior to the establishment of the monarchy. However the idea of Yahweh's kingship is presumed in several archaic, premonarchical poems (Ex. 15:18; Num. 23:21; Deut. 33:5). Apparently, Yahweh was king from the outset: Mowinckel's (1953:72, cf. Schmidt, 1923:131) translation, "Jahwe ist König geworden" for יהוה מלך, which is offered as his firm argument for the annual enthronement ceremony, should be corrected as 'Yahweh is King.' Here, Yahweh does need not to be ratified as a king on an annual basis.

Instead of the New Year Festival of Mowinckel, Kraus (1978:1059) proposes the 'Royal Zion Festival' according to which during the Davidic monarchy on the first day of Tabernacles, an annual festival was held with a procession and a cult-dramatic performance of the *hieros logos* by which Zion and the David's dynasty had been 'chosen' by Yahweh. The heart of the festival was the carrying of the ark into the temple in remembrance of the first transfer of the ark from Kiriath-Jearim to Jerusalem under David or from the Tent to the Temple under Solomon. However, the biblical evidence for such an annual festival remains obscure, even if an evident reference to the procession with the ark appears to be provided in Ps. 68:25f., which seems to be regarded as a song of the festive event of 2 Sam. 6 rather than an annual ark's procession (cf. 3.3.1.1). For reference to the procession with the ark, Maier (1965:80) concludes that "Nicht einmal aus Anlaß der deuteronomischen Reform und Bundeserneuerung dürfte die Lade ihren Platz im Allerheiligsten verlassen haben."

The Israelites were able to expect Yahweh's blessing encompassing the conception of protection, grace and peace in the cult. This is to be found in the priestly benediction, which is performed in front of the tabernacle which the ark housed, at the end of public worship (Num. 6:24-26; cf. Lev. 9:22). In that blessing, proclaimed before God's presence, they could always anticipate all that they would need to survive and even to enjoy prosperity physically and spiritually. In the promised land as well as the wilderness, the cultus of Israel could not dispense with the ark. The ark of the covenant was positioned at the center of the solemn cult of the covenantal renewal near Shechem (Jos. 8:30-35), which signifies that Yahweh, who is

symbolically present by or at the ark, led Israel to the center of the land of Canaan; the ark seems to conduct her up to the region, as if it is identified with Yahweh. The ark as an emblem of Yahweh's invisible presence functions as a reaffirmation that Yahweh is with his people and requires their observance of his law to maintain the covenantal relationship, in order for them to be blessed. Even in emergency circumstances, the ark was regarded as the center of designated cultus (cf. Judg. 20:27; 21:2). The significance of Shiloh as a cultic place was sustained by the ark because the site lost the cultic function after the capture of the ark (1 Sam. 1-4).

Moreover, the installation of the ark led Zion to rise to the surface as a central location for the Israelite cult (cf. Ps. 132:13f.), from which Yahweh bestows on the people blessing and eternal life (Ps. 133) since Zion was now a perpetual resting place for Yahweh and his footstool. In particular, the work of the priests in the cult exhibits the intimate connection with the ark; we see this in the fact that David appointed Levites to minister *before* the ark of Yahweh, to invoke, give thanks and praise Him (1 Chr. 16:4, 37). This is proof that cultic practice revolved around the ark during the monarchial period, although it naturally was a cultic center of the period of the wilderness, conquest and settlement. Therefore, it was unimaginable for the Israelites to practice public worship apart from the ark, the holy object which represents God's symbolical presence in the Old Testament. However, the ark is regarded as a dispensable object in the process of redemptive history (Jer. 3:16). Hence, the Israelite cult was not to be confined to such an object for all time.

4.6. The localization of the ark

Several places are mentioned in connection with the ark: Shiloh in Ephraim, and a series of cities at the borders of the Benjaminite territory: Gilgal and Jericho towards the East, Kiriath-Jearim towards the West, Jerusalem at the southern border and Bethel (cf. Judg. 20:27) at the northern border. The ark also appears in some Philistine cities, as in the Judaeen Beth-Shemesh, causing great disasters in each of these cities. In this section, locations which were sanctuaries of the ark will be treated.

4.6.1. The ark near Shechem (cf. 3.2.1.3.)

There is no evidence that the ark was located at Shechem, but the covenant ritual revolving around the ark was maintained by Joshua on the slopes of Mount Gerezim and Mount Ebal in the vicinity of Shechem (Jos. 8:30-35). The ark of the covenant of Yahweh was located between Ebal and Gerizim. With its position settled, Joshua read all the words of the law, the blessings and the curses, in the presence of the whole assembly of Israel, including the women and children and the aliens who lived among them (34f.). Joshua's actions concerning the construction of the altar and the offerings followed precisely the Mosaic instruction (Deut. 27:1-8). Verse 33 describes that the ark forms the center of the ceremony, the law's blessing and curses. It is remarkable that the movement of the ark comes from the command of Joshua but it is observed according to the law of Moses. This fact does not expose that Moses still had some personal influence over Israel but that Yahweh's law should be kept from generation to generation (Deut. 6:2). The ark was surrounded on all sides by Yahweh's own people including aliens and the native-born.

The ark of the covenant is positioned at the center of the ceremony of the covenantal renewal near Shechem, which signifies that Yahweh, who is symbolically present by or at the ark, led Israel to the center of the land of Canaan. The Israelites expected a blessed life in the promised land from Yahweh through the covenantal relationship with him.

However, the thesis that this event established Shechem as the tribal league shrine and that

the tribal league organizations constituted by the covenant and sanctioned at and by the central shrine at Shechem became especially meaningful for the northern tribes (Kelm, 1991:196) is too hypothetical. For example, it is said that the phrase *תַּחַת הָאֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר בְּמִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה* "under the terebinth in the holy place of Yahweh" in Jos. 24:26 suggests that the tabernacle was at Shechem, housing the ark (cf. Howard, 1998:440). Yet, it is not necessary to interpret *מִקְדָּשׁ* as a sanctuary such as the rendering in KJV because it sounds strange that the oak tree grows in a sanctuary. This tree was so conspicuous and so famous that it served as a landmark to identify other sites (Sarna, 1989:91). Thus, there is no certain evidence that the ark was at Shechem.

4.6.2. The ark at Shiloh

The presence of the ark in Shiloh is explicitly attested in 1 Samuel 2:3; 4:3. According to Joshua 18:1a, Shiloh was made the politico-religious center of Israel by the setting up of the Tent of Meeting during the days of Joshua, before the land had been distributed. It is unknown why it was singled out as an important cultic locus, although Schley (1989:191) reminds us that before Shiloh became an Israelite shrine it had been the site of an old Canaanite cultic center. He bases this hypothesis on archaeological evidence and his individual interpretation on Judges 21:16-24. At any rate, during these early years, Shiloh was administered by the Aaronite priesthood of Eleazar (Jos. 21:1-3) and his son, Phineas (Joh. 22:9-34), who was renowned for his cultic zeal during the early tribal wars (Num. 25:6-13; 31:1-12; Joh. 22:9-34). At one time, Shiloh may have claimed exclusive rights over the other sanctuaries of the land (cf. Jos. 22:9-34). Thus it is not persuasive that Brouwer (1955:190) maintains that Shiloh was not the central sanctuary. The location is said to have a 'house of God' (Judg. 18:31) and an annual festival was held there (Judg. 21:19): it is rash to assume from this verse that "the early Israelite tribes may even have worshipped together with non-Israelites at the shrine at Shiloh, before the Ephraimite hills fell totally into Israelite hands" (Schley, 1989:191).

The reference to an annual festival (1 Sam. 1:3) makes it clear that at various times some Israelites made pilgrimages to Shiloh; it is natural to suppose that very few people might attend

the annual occasion in consideration of the spiritual circumstances in the period of the judges. On a pilgrimage to the sanctuary at Shiloh Hannah prays in earnest to God for a child and vows the dedication of such a child to the service of Yahweh. Through Yahweh's remembrance of her, she conceives and bears a child whom she names Samuel. When the child is weaned he is brought to the priest Eli to be raised in the service of Yahweh at Shiloh. This event, along with the calling of Samuel at the sanctuary where the ark was housed (1 Sam. 3:1-14) implies the commencement of a hopeful situation in Israel. However, the Elide house would be demolished on account of the unfaithful implementation of the office (cf. 3.2.2.5). This event changed the fate of the sanctuary of Shiloh.

Incidentally, the slightly perplexing expression **מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה** 'the doorpost of Yahweh's temple' (1 Sam. 1:9; 3:3, 15) should first of all be considered as an interchangeable term with **אֹהֶל** 'tent' (Ps. 27:4). Concretely, it appears to indicate that the tabernacle had apparently become part of a compound that included auxiliary structures made of stone (Youngblood, 1997:1221). Thus it is not necessary to assume that the ark was in the pagan temple, alongside which the tabernacle stood, as Brouwer (1955:120) insists: "De ark is veilig opgeborgen in het heidense tempelgebouw."

At any event, Shiloh was the cultic center of Israelite tribes after the conquest and until the capture of the ark by the Philistines: Shiloh without the ark came to lose the function of the sanctuary.

4.6.3. The ark at Bethel

Judges 20:27 testifies that the ark was stationed in Bethel, which was located in Ephraim, probably at modern Beitin, about 10.5 miles north of Jerusalem on the border of Benjamin (cf. Southwell, 1997:440). Under normal circumstances, the ark was supposed to be in the inner sanctuary of the tabernacle at Shiloh. It appears that the ark was temporarily established at Bethel in an unusual situation, since *in those days* probably denotes that it was there during the entire campaign against Benjamin. It seems to have been moved there from Shiloh (cf. Judg. 18:31) in order to facilitate the inquiry of God by means of the high priest for the

campaign against Benjamin (Dam, 1997:184). Here, in consideration of Israel's battle against the Benjaminites, Block (1999:561) suggests that the Israelites brought the ark to Bethel from Shiloh presumably to function as a palladium, a symbol of God's "good luck," in the battle against the Benjaminites. Yet, he fails to observe the concrete situation of the combat and the use of the war-palladium; the Israelite camp was in Mizpah, whereas the ark was at Bethel. This biblical document provides another argument against the idea of the ark's habitual use as a palladium of battle (cf. 3.2.2.4.2).

It is apparent that in the very least, the Israelites understood the ark as the place of God's revelation (cf. 20:18, 23, 27); they had to inquire of Yahweh whether they should go up into battle against Benjamin, even though the ark as such was not the source of information of divine will. Incidentally, Dam (1997:184) assumes that "It thus seems highly likely that this inquiry took place by the use of *Urim* and *Thummim*, with the ark meeting the condition *lipnê YHWH*." Whether this is exactly correct or not, they wanted to receive God's direction at the historic place which once played an enormously important role in the religion of the patriarchs (Gen. 28:11-22; 31:13; 35:7) and which was in the vicinity of Gibeah, the enemy's camp, even if it is explicitly unknown why the Israelites moved it to Bethel. In particular, the scene where they presented burnt offering and peace offerings to Yahweh (20:26) suggests that there was a full fledged sacrificial cult with the priests, probably at the tabernacle (cf. Woudstra, 1965:129). Actually, it was not necessary for them to go as far as Bethel, located farther than Gibeah from Mizpah, the camp, if there was only the ark without the tabernacle at Bethel. It may just here be answered for Amit (1999:356) to question the reason "why the army abandoned the battlefield, went north to Bethel, and returned from there in order to make war in the area of Mizpah and Gibeah"; it is probable because of the tabernacle. Later then, the ark might be moved to Shiloh. At any rate, the ark, the important emblem of Yahweh's presence at Bethel, played a cardinal part as a place of Yahweh's revelation and as a cultic center.

4.6.4. The ark in Kiriath-Jearim

Willis' (1979:211) supposition, that the ark would have been carried into Ramah after

Shiloh was overrun and ceased to be the place where the ark was housed, is unfounded because the biblical report admits of no argument about that (1 Sam. 6:21). Furthermore the reference to the ark in Kiriath-Jearim (1 Sam. 7:1) seems not to function simply as a literary juncture between 1 Sam. 4-6 and 2 Sam. 6 to compose the complete 'ark narrative,' as many scholars hold (cf. Eynikel, 2000:88-106), but to demonstrate historical continuity of the event when David carries it to Jerusalem (cf. 3.2.3.3).

At any rate the return of the ark from the Philistine district to Israel signifies the importance of the physical symbols of God's ongoing redemption of the people; without the ark, a symbol of the covenant, Israel was not complete at that time. Yet for about 80 years, the ark was housed under the protection of Eleazar at the Judahite site of Kiriath-Jearim which was located on the border of Judah and Benjamin (about 12 km to the west of Jerusalem) and was one of the most prominent cities of the Gibeonites (cf. Jos. 9:17-27) but probably had been under Philistine suzerainty after Israelite defeat (cf. 3.2.3.4.1.1). This city was also known as Baalah (Jos. 15:9) or Baale-Judah (2 Sam. 6:2). As for Eleazar, which is a common priestly name (cf. Ex. 6:23; 1 Chr. 9:20; 23-21; Ez. 8:33), it is possible that the man was a member of the Levitical tribe. Miller and Roberts (1977:20, 25f.) argue that Eleazar was Eli's successor because it is apparent that he was consecrated to have charge of the ark.

The reason why the ark remained concealed for such long time appears to be associated with the indifference of the Israelite leader to the ark by the time (1 Sam. 22:18, 19; 23:1, 27; 1 Chr. 13:3). Israel had to wait for a lengthy period until ideal worship for Yahweh with the ark would be restored by David. The ark's installation and protection at Kiriath-Jearim demonstrate how important is the suitable service for Yahweh in accord with the law is. The provisional concealment of the ark appears to be indicative of a period of time God uses to prepare for a new future and simultaneously to demonstrate that God's action is not confined to the ark since he still worked for Israel at that time (cf. 1 Sam. 7:5-12).

4.6.5. The ark in Zion

In the period of David, Zion is identified with the City of David (2 Sam. 5:7; 1 King. 8:1).

After Solomon constructed the temple, the realm of Zion appears to have been expanded to the summit of the temple mount (cf. 9:12; 20:3; 48:3; 50:2).

The ark's movement, which began after the receiving of the covenant at Mount Sinai, would climax in the entrance of the ark into Jerusalem (Hess, 1996:131). Accordingly, Dempsey (1998:233-239) states that the Chronicler thought that the history of the ark's entrance to Zion and its installation in the temple was the model for restoration of proper worship in the post-exile period.

The destination of the ark's travel was Zion, Yahweh's permanent dwelling. The ark provided Zion with important status, as the city would play an immensely important part in the religious life of Israel. After the installation of the ark it was called the city of God (Ps. 48:7) and his footstool, for God resides there (Ps. 9:11; Isa. 8:18) and reigns over the universe. Zion as God's inhabiting place and as a center of the Israelite lives attracted regular pilgrimage: the city became the destination of the pilgrim's journey. Pilgrims could expect physical as well as spiritual blessing in Zion because everything they need came from God (128:5; 132:15ff.; 133; 134).

The psalmists exalted Zion as a city of God (48:1), the city of the Great King (48:2), the dwelling place (76:2), holy mountain (48:1; 99:9) and footstool (99:5; 132:7) in their songs. They praised Yahweh's reign in Zion (99:1f.; 110:2; 146:10). The significance of Zion remained, even after the ark disappeared; it is from Mt. Zion that Yahweh would rule over men forever (Mic. 4:7). The Israelites expected that the deliverance would come forth from Zion (14:7; 53:6). During the exilic period, the interest of the Israelites was in Zion. They never gave up the expectation of its restoration, even if they lived as captives in Babylonia (Ps. 137). It is from Zion that a redeemer would come forth (cf. Ps. 2:6; Is. 59:20). For them, it remained the navel of the earth (Ez. 38:12).

Accordingly, the ark was used as a substantial object that represented how Yahweh chose Zion as his eternal resting place. Indeed, it is on account of the ark that Zion was entitled to play such an important role in the history of Israelite faith.

4.7. The ark and Israel

This is a theological conclusion regarding the ark of Yahweh in Israelite history. The ark as God's very presence on earth was accompanied by Israel at the outset of the nation (if she is considered to have been formed as a nation after the Exodus). By manufacturing the ark at Sinai, in accordance with Yahweh's instruction, Israel could meet her God at the ark. The localization of his epiphany was focused there, whereas he had appeared only in tongues of fire from within a bush (Ex. 3:1ff.) and at the peak of Mount Sinai (Ex. 19:20; 24:10ff.). The ark was to be treated by the priests appointed in service of Yahweh, guaranteeing the sanctity of the ark. When the Israelites committed idolatry, the ark containing two tablets of the Ten Commandments was employed to restore the covenantal relationship with God. This shows us that Yahweh wanted to keep his gracious communion with his people in accordance with the law (cf. 3.1.2.2.1). During the wilderness wanderings, when the people of Israel were on the march, the ark led the way, representing Yahweh's leadership over the people as they made their way toward the promised land (Num. 10:35-36; cf. 3.1.2.1). By using the ark, Yahweh introduced a significant epoch in the process of redemptive history -- crossing the Jordan river and the conquest of Jericho (cf. 3.2.1).

Even in the land of Canaan, the ark as a marvellous emblem of Yahweh's invisible presence was the center of the covenantal life and cultus of Israel (cf. Jos. 8:30-35). They could experience Yahweh's glorious and majestic presence before the ark in the tabernacle. Thus, they used it as a place of God's revelation; they received his direction in urgent military situations (Judg. 20:27). However, they were punished when they mistreated or broke the covenantal law (cf. 1 Sam. 6:19; 2 Sam 6:6ff.). In a normative relationship with God, the Israelite tribes, scattered in the different districts in the whole area of Canaan, could live on the power of Yahweh, who inhabited at the ark. Accordingly, the capture of the ark by Philistines signifies distress for Israel since the ark's deportation stands for אֵין־כְּבוֹד 'no glory' (cf. 1 Sam. 4:21f.). Still, Yahweh brought about his sovereign will among the Philistines as well. While the ark remained at Kiriath Jearim, in other words, the ideal public cultus was not restored and the people of Israel mourned and sought after Yahweh. (cf. 1 Sam. 7:2)

The ark's movement, which began after the giving of the covenant at Mount Sinai, would

climax in the arrival of the ark at Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6). After the installation of the ark in Zion, Yahweh's inhabiting place, the city of Zion, played an enormously important role in the religious history of Israel (cf. 4.6).

The fate of the ark was dependent on that of the people of Israel (cf. Jer. 3:16); it may have disappeared during the destruction of the temple, but its significance, namely Yahweh's presence, sustained the Israelites until their return from Babylonian captivity. Yahweh resided among them in a different way until that time. At any rate, it may be justifiable to say that it is difficult to explain the religion and history of Israel without considering a physical object which symbolized the holy presence of God in the daily lives of Old Testament Israelites.

4.8. Disappearance of the ark

Jeremiah obviously hinted at the disappearance of the original ark, which had attracted honour and reverence in the past, through his preaching (Jer. 3:16). However, it is not certain when and how the ark was lost because the Bible itself is silent on this matter. As a result, assumptions on the disappearance of the ark have grown.

2 Macc. 2:4-7 says that Jeremiah was told to climb up Mount Nebo and to take a tent, the ark, and the altar of incense and to seal them in a cave, where they would remain undiscovered until God regathers his people: "It is recorded also that, in obedience to a divine command, the prophet gave orders for the Tent of Meeting and the Ark to accompany him, and he went off to the mountain from the top of which Moses had seen God's promised land. Arriving at the mountain, Jeremiah found a cave-dwelling into which he carried the Tent, the Ark, and the altar of incense; he then blocked up the entrance. Some of his companions went to mark out the way, but were unable to find it. Jeremiah heard of this and took them to task. 'The place is to remain unknown', he said, 'until God finally gathers his people together and shows them his favour' (*REB*). However, this document is clearly a later legend dependent on the passage of Jer. 3:16. In contrast to this tradition, 2 Esd. 10:20-22 claims that the sanctuary was destroyed and the ark was taken as spoil: "'Do not do that,' I urged; 'let yourself be persuaded because of Zion's misfortunes, and take comfort from the sorrow of Jerusalem. You see how our sanctuary has been laid waste, our altar demolished, our temple destroyed. ... and the Ark of our covenant has been plundered" (*REB*). This Jewish tradition appears to form a kind of etiological story concerning the disappearance of the ark of the covenant.

According to Ethiopian tradition, the biblical recount of the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon is significantly incomplete. What is missing is the content that Sheba came to marry Solomon, but failed to meet his requirement that she should not take anything from his palace without his permission. This tradition states that Menelik, the son of Makeda, the biblical Queen met Solomon and took the ark of the covenant back to the Axumite kingdom. The Orthodox Church believes that the ark is still resting in a small chapel in the city of Axum, but no one can see it (cf. Taws, 1994:10).

Haran (1963:46-58) contends that under the kingship of Manasseh of Judah the ark was

removed from the inner sanctuary of the temple to make room for an image of Asherah (2 King. 21:3, 7; 2 Chr. 33:3, 7). In this regard, Ezekiel describes the glorious chariot throne of God in great detail, while the ark is nowhere mentioned by him. Haran's (1959:34) argument that this omission of the ark in Ezekiel's prophecy can be explained by the fact that the ark no longer existed in his time was irrelevantly applied because the contents Ezekiel saw were a mere vision, and had nothing to do with the existence of the ark. The cherubim and temple described in his prophecy do not mean that they existed at his time. Certainly, the biblical document testifies that the ark was in the temple in the reign of Josiah after the period of Manasseh (2 Chr. 35:3).

Agreeing with Jewish tradition, Price (1994:323) is convinced that the ark was hidden in a secret room beneath the temple mount by Josiah. He did this to prevent its being captured by the Babylonians. This place is now the location of the Dome of the Rock and is controlled by Muslims. Nevertheless, it remains uncertain whether the ark has in fact survived.

The Old Testament nowhere tangibly mentions the fate of the ark, even its destruction as such. Yet, it tells clearly that the ark was a dispensable object in the process of the redemptive historical progression of God (cf. 3.3.2). Thus, it is biblically meaningless whether or not the ark has survived all these years because God wants to reside among his people in different way: through his Holy Spirit. In this regard, the disappearance of the ark may have been a part of God's sovereign plan.

5. Summary and conclusion

As for methodology:

As interpretational method, a three dimensional approach, the philological-historical-theological approach, was applied to this thesis, contrary to the tendency of the historical-literary and the traditio-historical approaches in which most of the studies about the ark have been established.

Historical-literary criticism helped to 'solve' many exegetical problems, but it also opened up new problems, in spite of its benefits. Accordingly, it is difficult to accept the result of the study clinging to specific sources like J, E, D, and P. In the long run, historical-literary criticism as a exegetical methodology failed to give satisfaction to a historical as well as to a literary study of the Scriptures.

The traditio-historical criticism is basically not suitable for use as a method of biblical exegesis because it does not treat historicity and God's revelation in the Bible properly. It reconstructs the supposed tradition-history behind or beneath the text, which is *de facto* equated with the history of salvation (which never occurred as it is reported) and does not care whether the present form of the biblical texts portrays factual history. It has the problem of divorcing the *kerygma* of the text from history as such.

Narrative criticism, belonging to modern literary approach which emerged as an alternative methodology, is a method of interpreting biblical narratives with the help of modern and ancient literary theory. It may once be acknowledged that narrative criticism, to some extent, bears more advantages than other literary approaches and historical criticism which, in dividing and atomizing texts, undermined a proper understanding of plot, theme, and character. Nonetheless its merits may be able to prove themselves valuable for explication of the biblical narrative only under the premise that the biblical narrative should be recognized as *God-breathed* narrative which is historically reliable. In all respects, narrative criticism is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Thus, this criticism can play a secondary role in interpretation.

The redemptive history which comprises the totality of history and forms unity in Christ and progressive realization of God's eternal counsel in time is a central theme of the Scriptures. As a result, it appears impossible to properly construe Old Testament texts without appropriate application of the concept of redemptive history. Redemptive history can be placed as a useful methodology of theological approach to biblical interpretation because the Bible itself requires

the bestowing of attention upon redemptive history in exegesis.

As for exegesis of the texts:

The report of Exodus manifests that the ark is a holy object of which the design was given by Yahweh himself on Sinai, contrary to presumptions about its diverse provenances. The ark has a comprehensive significance with the cherubim and the atonement place. It is a symbolic object by which the mediators such as Moses meet their God and receive his commandments. It is the locus of communication between God and the people. The ark is a kind of cultic article for oracle, but, as such, is not an object of worship as in the religious practices surrounding Israel.

The glorious epiphany of Yahweh on Mount Sinai is continually connected with the ark in the tabernacle. While in the context of Exodus, the ark was made to serve as a comfortable assurance that Yahweh would indeed accompany the Israelites on their journey to the promised land, it is eventually manufactured to reveal his attribute in each stage of the history of Israel. Yahweh offered a concrete way to ultimate redemption through the fabrication of the ark.

Numbers' text pertaining to the ark informs that in the first stage of the march from Mt. Sinai, Israel was led and protected by the ark: the ark plays a principal role between Yahweh and his people. Here Yahweh is described as a warrior who scatters his enemies. However, Moses' speech, 'Rise up' is not to deify the ark magically but to ask Yahweh's help in the march. The ark is not a throne-chariot. That the ark personifies God shows the sacramental coupling between Yahweh and his ark. Israel wanted to enter the land of Canaan safely behind Yahweh. He led and protected his people with the ark in the course of redemptive history.

The ark passages in Deuteronomy were recorded in a summary form, when Yahweh accepted Moses' intercessory prayer for the Israelites tainted by sin and reconstituted the relationship with his people by rewriting the Ten Commandments on the tablets. Its message is that Yahweh wants to keep the gracious communion with his people in accordance with the law. The role of the ark in Deuteronomy is concerned with strengthening the importance of Yahweh's law. It still has the symbolical meaning of the glorious presence of Yahweh: 'D' did not deprive the ark of anything of its substantial nature in consideration of the literary style and language of Deuteronomy. Yahweh used the ark to show his unexhausted grace when he wanted to retrieve his corrupt people to redemption with the covenantal law.

The book of Joshua is sufficient enough to display the prominent role of the ark that manifests Yahweh's indwelling, by showing that Yahweh let the ark precede the Israelites and led them into the land of Canaan crossing the Jordan, and conquered Jericho. Despite the central role of the ark in these historical occurrences, the ark as such does not bear magical and mystical power. Instead, Yahweh acts in association with the ark. In these events the ark appears to be used as a vanguard, as a physical representation of divine presence. The most frequently used epithet, ark of the covenant, seems to require the people's obedience to the commandments. Hence, it turns out that the successful entrance and glorious victory belong to Yahweh but not to Israel's military. The ark positioned at the center of the ceremony of the covenantal renewal near Shechem functions as a reaffirmation that Yahweh is with his people and requires their continuous observance to his law to maintain the covenantal relationship. Through this conformity, they will be blessed by him. Occupancy of the promised land as a phase of the redemptive history was accomplished by guidance of the ark which manifested God's omnipotence and faithfulness.

The narrative pertaining to the ark (1 Sam. 4:1b-7:1) should be understood as a whole, in the historical context in which Yahweh manifested the will of innovation to the Israelite religion through the judgment of the Elide house and Samuel's calling. The former step was taken by the involvement of the battle with the Philistines. After their defeat in the first encounter with them, the Israelites used the ark as a palladium which was more disastrous than the first encounter. The ark was captured and the Elide house was destroyed. As a result, the glory departed from Israel. Even during the period of the detention of the ark in Philistia, Yahweh substantiated his superiority and sovereignty over the territorial supreme deity by desecrating Dagon and by bringing the plagues against the people of the Philistine cities. With severe judgment over the Philistines, he made a way for the ark to return to his covenantal people to establish the kingdom. The ark is not permitted to be mobilized into the battle as a war-palladium, nor suggested as a throne, which is associated with the cherubim and God's epithet, Yahweh Zebaoth. Here too Yahweh reveals it as the glorious and majestic emblem of his actual presence. It symbolically requires obedience to the law. Here, despite Israelite abuse of the ark, Yahweh advanced redemptive work in conformity to his sovereign and eternal design for salvation.

In 2 Samuel 6, David's project to carry the ark to Jerusalem was not so much executed with political intentions as religious design. The death of Uzzah instructs that fellowship with God,

who is present at the ark, can be perilous when the people behave in discord with God's law. In the historical event of the transporting of the ark one can see Yahweh's sovereign choice of Zion and the climax of a long series of events which began when Moses promised the people Π from all their enemies (Deut. 12:10): God's promise is now fulfilled completely (cf. 1 King. 8:56). With the ark stationed in Zion, a new facet begins in the history of Israel: complete theocracy is realized, since David understood the ark as footstool. This became a religious model in the post-exile period. Yahweh reigns over his people as the King residing in Jerusalem. David's installation of the ark forms the overture and the transit of the promise of the Davidic dynasty -- the Messiah's promise. These elements display a new progression of redemptive history. However, because of her unbelief, Michal is ruled out from line of possible Messianic mothers. Here the ark shows that Yahweh is the sovereign.

According to 1 Kings 8:1-11, it is significant that the ark was brought up into the temple on the occasion which Solomon held during the national feast days which were for reminding of the exodus, the redemptive work of Yahweh and renewal of the covenant. Moreover, the fact that the ark takes a special position under the cherubim which signify Yahweh's glory proves that it still functions as a cardinal symbol of Yahweh's presence even if after the transfer of the ark, the Solomon temple is approved as Yahweh's legitimate residence with the cloud of Yahweh's glory. The meaning of the temple as Yahweh's resting place was furthermore embodied by the ark positioned in the inner sanctuary of the temple, the Most Holy Place. Now, the Israelites came to integrate a new phase of their religion centred on the temple in the redemptive-historical progression. However, the allusion to the stone tablets on which the law of the covenant had been engraved is to accentuate the importance of the observance of the law in maintenance of people's relationship with Yahweh.

Psalm 132 which consists of David's vow, and its fulfillment and Yahweh's oath and promise recalls David's transfer of the ark of the covenant to Zion. The installation of the ark in Zion, Yahweh's permanent dwelling, initiates Zion as the center of Israelite life; everything the Israelites needed came from God (vv. 15ff.). Yahweh's oath and promise is to guarantee the permanent enthronement of David's descendants upon the throne of the kingdom Yahweh had established in Israel. The succession of David's dynasty implies the Messianic line which forms the core of redemptive history. The ark, the emblem of God's presence, in this psalm is propounded as a literary work linking the oaths of David and Yahweh and as a foundation of

prosperity for the kingdom of Israel. This psalm newly accentuates the redemptive - historical significance of the transportation of the ark to Jerusalem and Yahweh's sovereignty.

Jeremiah 3:16 obviously hints at the disappearance of the original ark, the ark which had attracted so much reverence in the past. Naturally the ark is here still regarded as the holy symbol of the presence of Yahweh in the temple, perhaps until the destruction of the temple. However it is not demoted to the role of unimportant cultic object on account of the temple cult. Unlike the past and the present, in the projected future it will be irrelevant and undesired. The language implies that it will be destroyed and no attempt will be made to remake it. Through Jeremiah's preaching, the Israelites had to learn to live without the material symbol of the divine presence, even if they had regarded it as an indispensable object which maintained their identity as God's people. The function and meaning of the ark vanishes on a stage near the new covenant era in the progressive course of redemptive history: God designed to prepare for more abundant dispensation with his Word and Spirit.

As for theological concepts:

With regard to the appellations for the ark, it is unacceptable to assume that they are used as a norm to classify sources. The simplest form אָרוֹן, which is rendered as 'ark' or 'chest,' is usually neutral, when it is mentioned in introductory clauses (Ex. 25:10; 37:1; Deut. 10:1ff. etc.). Yet, the fact that it is often used just as an abridged form alongside another epithet shows that the word appears to convey the same meaning as the name suggested in the context (cf. Jos. 3:15; 4:10; 6:4, 9; 1 Sam. 6:13, etc.). Thus, it is plausible that the meaning of the simple word אָרוֹן should be derived from the context. The names אָרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים and אָרוֹן יְהוָה are probably to be treated for the most part as interchangeable names. The variations between the two usually appear stylistic rather than ideological. With the appellations of the ark אָרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים and אָרוֹן יְהוָה the ark is generally signified as a symbol of the awesome presence of God in the midst of the people. In addition, *the ark of Yahweh, the Lord of all the earth* (Jos. 3:13) and *Yahweh Zebaoth who inhabits at the cherubim* (1 Sam. 4:4; cf. 2 Sam. 6:2; 1 Chr. 13:6) are not an epithet of the ark but of Yahweh. Another appellations of the ark אָרוֹן בְּרִית and אָרוֹן עֵדוּת present the typical character and principal function of the ark as a marvellous emblem of God's presence; God's presence implied in the ark is not automatically realized in the midst of the people of the covenant but the communion with God was only

based on the covenant.

The ark as a holy object of which the design was given by Yahweh himself on Sinai has Mosaic origin. The ark was a kind of cultic article used for oracle, but it was not to be worshipped as many other nations surrounding Israel worshipped idols. The ark exclusively is not a throne, nor footstool, nor a war-palladium but a symbol of Yahweh's presence in a sacramental and covenantal sense. Notwithstanding, 'the whole unit of the ark' is footstool, generally speaking, which signifies God's righteous and universal reign as well as his tangible and sublime presence. The glorious epiphany of Yahweh occurs around the ark. Thus, the significance of the ark is related to a core biblical thought: God is *with* us. It is plausible that by using the ark as a magnificent emblem of his glorious presence, Yahweh designed not only to reveal his various attributes such as his omnipotence, omnipresence, majesty, sovereignty, glory, holiness, righteousness, etc. but also to fulfill his promise concerning the redemption of human beings in the period of the Old Covenant.

Kapporet, which is rendered as atonement place, is an independent object with its own function, though it has an intimate connection to the ark, like two components of one thing. כַּפֹּרֶת was manufactured of pure gold, and its being placed on the ark functions as the place of revelation and atonement over which Yahweh manifests himself (Lev. 16:2) and addresses the people (25:22; Num. 7:89) and atones for the sin of the people (Lev. 16:13f.). Thereby manifesting God's grace, it is for the maintenance and restoration of the ideal relationship between Yahweh and Israel.

The cherubim on the ark served to direct the attention of the worshipper to the heavenly sanctuary with its heavenly Occupant, of which the earthly counterpart meant to be a faithful image. The figure of the cherubim presents Yahweh's transcendent sovereignty as well as his omnipresence, glory, and majesty. Instead, the phrase יְשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים need not be intimately affiliated with the ark to grant room for the concept of enthronement: 'one who is inhabiting *at* or *with* the cherubim,' or 'one who is inhabiting in glory and majesty' (cf. 3.2.2.4.1).

The contents in the ark were the stone tablets of the Decalogue, a jar of Manna and Aaron's staff according to the testimony of the New Testament (Heb. 9:4). The fact that the stone tablets of the Ten Commandments were deposited in the ark appears to imply the importance of the law document. Indeed, the tablets of the Testimony preach that Yahweh, as the redeeming saviour, demands the obedience and faith of the covenantal people in accordance with the

commandment; only on this basis, can their communion with God be sustained. The jar with Manna is a warrant of God's gracious sustenance of Yahweh's people. In the course of the progress of redemptive history, the jar of Manna and Aaron's staff appear to have disappeared before Solomon's reign since they were especially associated with the lives of Israelites in the wilderness.

The tabernacle was a tent-like sanctuary that symbolized that Yahweh resided among the Israelites (cf. Judg. 18:31) and met them in glory. Equivalently, the temple symbolizes God's presence as 'the house of God.' As to the relationship of the ark, the tabernacle and the temple, they have inseparable connections to one another in the functional sense. Together they were the foremost sanctuary to manifest the glorious presence of Yahweh among the covenantal people, although they are separate and independent cultic objects. However it is highlighted that only the ark is called God's footstool as the heart of the sanctuary.

The essence of the cultus is spiritual intercourse between God and men, in both individual and community (cf. Ps. 22:3). Yahweh, who is pleased to have communion with his people, notifies his presence in the ritual practice. Hence, the ark, the palpable emblem of his presence, played a tremendously momentous part in the cultic practice of Israel. Yet there is no evidence that Israel annually carried the ark in procession for the New Year Festival (Mowinckel) or Royal Zion Festival (Kraus). At the least, Yahweh need not be ratified as a king on an annual basis. Numerous texts validate that the cultic practice of Israel revolved around the ark until the monarchal period (Num. 6:24-26; cf. Lev. 9:22; Jos. 8:30-35; Judg. 20:27; 21:2; 1 Sam. 1-4; Ps. 132:13f.; 1 Chr. 16:4, 37). In fact, it was unimaginable for the Israelites to practice public worship apart from the ark, the holy object which represents God's symbolical presence in the Old Testament, even though the ark as such is not an object of worship.

With respect to the localization of the ark, the ark of the covenant of Yahweh was located in the vicinity of Shechem, during the period of the conquest. It is positioned at the center of the ceremony of the covenantal renewal near Shechem, which signifies that Yahweh who is symbolically present by or at the ark led Israel to the center of the land of Canaan. After settlement in the land of Canaan, Shiloh was the cultic center of Israelite tribes in the period between the conquest of the promised land and the capture of the ark by the Philistines: Shiloh without the ark came to lose the function of the sanctuary (Jos. 18:1a; 18:31; 1 Sam 1-4). Under normal circumstances, the ark was supposed to be in the inner sanctuary of the tabernacle

at Shiloh. However, the ark was temporarily established at Bethel in an unusual situation, the military campaign against Benjamin (Judg. 20:27): the Israelites who understood the ark as the place of God's revelation (cf. 20:18, 23, 27) had to inquire of Yahweh whether they should go up into battle against Benjamin, even though the ark as such was not the source of information of divine will. On the way of returning from the Philistine territory to his people's region, the ark was housed under the protection of Eleazar at the Judahite site of Kiriath-Jearim, known as Baalah (Jos. 15:9) or Baale-Judah (2 Sam. 6:2) for around 80 years. The ark's installation and protection at Kiriath-Jearim exhibit how important the suitable service for Yahweh in accord with the law is. Finally, the ark's movement, which began after the establishment of the covenant at Mount Sinai, would climax in the entrance of the ark into Jerusalem, its destination. It was used as a substantial object that represented how Yahweh chose Zion as his eternal resting place. Indeed, it is on account of the ark that Zion was entitled to play such a pivotal part in the history of Israelite faith, as the psalmists exalted Zion as a city of God (48:1), the city of the Great King (48:2), the dwelling place (76:2), holy mountain (48:1; 99:9) and the place of his reign (99:1f.; 110:2; 146:10 etc.) as his footstool (99:5; 132:7).

The ark stood at the center of the Israelite religion and lives throughout her history. In other words, it may be impossible to explain the religion and history of Israel without mentioning the position of the ark in her community: the travel through the wilderness, entrance to the land of Canaan, the conquest, establishment of theocratical kingdom and the cultus. The Israelites could sustain gracious communion with Yahweh through the intermediation of the ark. The fate of the ark was that of Israel (cf. Jer. 3:16).

The Old Testament nowhere tangibly mentions the fate of the ark, even its destruction as such. However, it tells clearly that the ark was a dispensable object in the process of the redemptive historical progression of God. Thus, it is biblically meaningless whether or not the ark has survived all these years because God wants to reside among his people in a different way in the era of the new covenant, through his Holy Spirit. In this regard, the disappearance of the ark may have been a part of God's sovereign plan.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>AB</i> | Anchor Bible |
| <i>ABD</i> | The Anchor Bible Dictionary |
| <i>ABR</i> | Archaeology and Biblical Research |
| <i>AEL</i> | An Arabic-English Lexicon |
| <i>AHW</i> | Akkadisches Handwörterbuch |
| <i>AJSL</i> | American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature |
| <i>ANET</i> | Ancient Near Eastern Texts |
| <i>AOAT</i> | Alter Orient und Altes Testament |
| <i>AOTC</i> | Apollos Old Testament Commentary |
| <i>ASV</i> | American Standard Version |
| <i>ATD</i> | Alte Testament Deutsch |
| <i>AUSS</i> | Andrews University Seminary Studies |
| <i>BAR</i> | Biblical Archaeology Review |
| <i>BASOR</i> | Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research |
| <i>BBR</i> | Bulletin for Biblical Research |
| <i>BDB</i> | F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs |
| <i>BI</i> | Biblical Interpretation |
| <i>BJS</i> | Brown Judaic Studies |
| <i>BKAT</i> | Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament |
| <i>BN</i> | Biblische Notizen |
| <i>BSC</i> | Biblical Study Commentary |
| <i>BuK</i> | Bibel und Kirche |
| <i>BuL</i> | Bibel und Leben |
| <i>BWANT</i> | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| <i>BZ</i> | Biblische Zeitschrift |
| <i>BZAW</i> | Biblische Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| <i>CAD</i> | The Assyrian Dictionary by Civil |
| <i>CAT</i> | Commentaire de L'Ancien Testament |
| <i>CB</i> | The Century Bible |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| <i>CBC</i> | The Cambridge Bible Commentary |
| <i>CBQ</i> | Catholic Biblical Quarterly |
| <i>CJJ</i> | Calvin Theological Journal |
| <i>COT</i> | Commentaar op het Oude Testament |
| <i>DB</i> | Deutsche Bibel |
| <i>DBI</i> | Dictionary of Biblical Imagery |
| <i>DCH</i> | Dictionary of Class Hebrew |
| <i>DDD</i> | Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible |
| <i>EF</i> | Erträge der Forschung |
| <i>EHAT</i> | Exegetischer Handbuch zum Alten Testament |
| <i>EI</i> | Eretz-Israel |
| <i>ÉTR</i> | Études thologiques et religieus |
| <i>EvT</i> | Evangelische Theologie |
| <i>FAT</i> | Forschungen zum Alten Testament |
| <i>FRLANT</i> | Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| <i>GK</i> | W. Gesenius, Hebräische Grammatik, ed. E. Kautsch |
| <i>GNB</i> | Good News Bible |
| <i>HALAT</i> | Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament |
| <i>HAR</i> | Hebrew Annual Review |
| <i>HAT</i> | Handbuch zum Alten Testament |
| <i>HBT</i> | Horizons in Biblical Theology |
| <i>HCOT</i> | Historical Commentary Old Testament |
| <i>HTKAT</i> | Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament |
| <i>HUCA</i> | Hebrew Union College Annual |
| <i>IB</i> | Interpreter's Bible |
| <i>ICC</i> | International Critical Commentary |
| <i>IDB</i> | The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible |
| <i>IEJ</i> | Israel Exploration Journal |
| <i>ITC</i> | International Theological Commentary |
| <i>IVP</i> | Inter Varsity Press |
| <i>JBL</i> | Journal of Biblical Literature |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| <i>JM</i> | Jouon, P.-T. Muraoka |
| <i>JNES</i> | Journal of Near Eastern Studies |
| <i>JNSL</i> | Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages |
| <i>JQR</i> | The Jewish Quarterly Review |
| <i>JSOT</i> | Journal for the Study of the Old Testament |
| <i>JSOTS</i> | Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series |
| <i>JTS</i> | Journal of Theological Studies |
| <i>KAH</i> | Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts |
| <i>KAI</i> | Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften |
| <i>KAT</i> | Kommentar zum Alten Testament |
| <i>KHCAT</i> | Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament |
| <i>KJV</i> | King James Version |
| <i>KTU</i> | Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit |
| <i>KUB</i> | Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi |
| <i>KV</i> | Korte Verklaring |
| <i>MT</i> | Masoretic Text |
| <i>NAC</i> | The New American Commentary |
| <i>NCB</i> | New Century Bible |
| <i>NCBC</i> | New Century Bible Commentary |
| <i>NEB</i> | Neue Echter Bibel |
| <i>NedTT</i> | Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift |
| <i>NIC</i> | New International Commentary |
| <i>NIDOTTE</i> | New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis |
| <i>NIV</i> | New International Version |
| <i>NSKAT</i> | Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar Altes Testament |
| <i>NV</i> | Nieuwe Vertaling |
| <i>OBO</i> | Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis |
| <i>OLZ</i> | Orientalistische Literaturzeitung |
| <i>OTL</i> | The Old Testament Library |
| <i>OTS</i> | Oudtestamentische Studien |
| <i>PEFQS</i> | Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| <i>PEQ</i> | Palestine Exploration Quarterly |
| <i>PJB</i> | Palästinajahrbuch |
| <i>POT</i> | De Prediking van het Oude Testament |
| <i>REB</i> | The Revised English Bible |
| <i>Ref.</i> | De Reformatie |
| <i>RLA</i> | Reallexikon der Assyriologie |
| <i>RB</i> | Revue Biblique |
| <i>RGG</i> | Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart |
| <i>RSV</i> | Revised Standard Version |
| <i>SBLDS</i> | Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series |
| <i>SBLMS</i> | Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series |
| <i>SB</i> | Stuttgarter Bibelstudien |
| <i>SBT</i> | Studies in Biblical Theology |
| <i>SCSS</i> | Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series |
| <i>SVT (VTS)</i> | Supplements to Vetus Testamentum |
| <i>Syr.</i> | Syriac Version |
| <i>Tg.</i> | Targum |
| <i>TGUOS</i> | Transactions of the Glasgow University Society |
| <i>THAT</i> | Theologische Handbuch zum Alten Testament |
| <i>ThB</i> | Theologische Bücherei |
| <i>ThStKr</i> | Theologische Studien und Kritiken |
| <i>TOTC</i> | Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries |
| <i>TQ</i> | Theologische Quartalschrift |
| <i>TRE</i> | Theologische Realenzyklopädie |
| <i>TU</i> | Teste und Untersuchungen |
| <i>TWAT</i> | Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament |
| <i>TZ</i> | Theologische Zeitschrift |
| <i>UF</i> | Ugarit-Forschungen |
| <i>VT</i> | Vetus Testamentum |
| <i>WA</i> | Weimarer Ausgabe |
| <i>WBC</i> | World Biblical Commentary |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>WMANT</i> | Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament |
| <i>ZAW</i> | Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| <i>ZB</i> | Zürcher Bibelkommentare |
| <i>ZDMG</i> | Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft |
| <i>ZMR</i> | Zeitschrift für die Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft |
| <i>ZNW</i> | Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft |

Bibliography

Abraham, W. J.

1982. *Divine Revelation and the Limits of Historical Criticism*. Oxford: University Press.

Ackroyd, P.R.

1977. *The Second Book of Samuel*. CBC. Cambridge: University Press.

Aharoni, Y.

1974. *The Land of the Bible*. London: Burns & Oates.

Ahlström, G.W.

1984. The Travels of the Ark: A Religio-Political Composition. *JNES* (43:2): 141-149.

1994. *The History of Ancient Palestine*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Albertz, Rainer.

1992. *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Albright, W.F.

1939. The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology. *BASOR* (74): 18-20.

1963. *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Alexandere, Monique.

1986. L'Épée de flamme (Gen. 3,24): Textes Chrétiens et traditions Juives. in: *Hellenica et Judaica*.
Leuven: Peeters: 403-441.

Allen, L.C.

1983. *Psalms 101-150*. WBC 21. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.

Alster, B.

1999. Tammuz, *DDD*: 828-834,

Alt, Albrecht.

1953. Das Grossreich Davids. in: *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* II. München:
C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

1959. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* I. München: C.H. Beck'sche
Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Alter, Robert.

1981. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, INC. Publishers.

Althann, R.

1984. Northwest Semitic Notes on Some Texts in 1 Samuel. *JNSL* 12: 27-34.

Amit, Y.

1999. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Leiden: Brill.

Amsler, S.

1985. Loi orale et loi écrite dans le Deutéronome. in: N. Lohfink (ed.). *Das Deuteronomium:
Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*. Leuven: University Press: 51-54.

Anderson, A.A.

1989. *2 Samuel*. WBC 11. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.

Anderson, B.W.

2000. *Out of the Depths: The Psalms Speak for us Today*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John
Knox Press.

- Anderson, G.W.
 1970. Israel: Amphictyony: `am; kāhāl; `ēdāh. in: H.T. Frank & W.L. Reed (ed.). *Translating & Understanding the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press: 135-151.
- Arnold, W.R.
 1917. *Ephod and Ark: A Study in the Records and Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*. Harvard Theological Studies 3. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard.
- Auffret, P.
 1982. *La Sagesse a bati as maison*. OBO 49. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires Fribourg.
 1999. *Là moment des tribus*. BZAW 289. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Augustine,
 1924. *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*, vol. 1, London: SPCK.
- Averbeck, R.E.
 1997. \square in: *NIDOTTE* 1: 553-566.
- Baldwin, J.G.
 1988. *1 and 2 Samuel*. TOT. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Barr, J.
 1968 *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Barrois, G.A.
 1981. City of David. *IDB* 1. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Bauer, H. & P. Leander.
 1962. *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Baumgartner, W. (ed.).
 1967-1990. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, I-IV, Leiden: Brill.
- Beal, R.H.
 1992. *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitäts-verlag.
- Begg, C.T.
 1997. David's transfer of the Ark according to Josephus. *BBR* 7: 11-35.
- Bengel, J.A.
 1770. *Ordo Temporum a principio per periodos....* Stutgardiae: Ioh. Benedict, Mezleri.
- Bentzen, A.
 1948. "The cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel". *JBL* 67: 37-53.
 1955. *King and Messiah*. London: Lutterworth Press.
- Bergen, R.D.
 1996. *1, 2 Samuel*. NAC 7. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Bergsträsser, G.
 1986. *Hebräische Grammatik*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Berlejung, A.
 1998. *Die Theologie der Bilder*. OBO 162. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz.
- Berlin, Adele.
 1983. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. Sheffield: The Almond Press.
- Besters, A.

1967. Israël et Fils d'Israël dans les livres historiques (Genèse - II Rois). *RB* 74: 5-23.
- Bimson, J.J.
1995. *Illustrated Encyclopedia of Bible Palces*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Bimson, J.J. & D. Livingston.
1987. Redating the Exodus. *BAR*. Sep./Oct: 40-53, 66-68.
- Birch, B.C., W. Brueggemann, T.E. Fretheim & D.L. Petersen.
1999. *A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Bishop, R.E.
1988. Shiloh. *Biblical Illustrator* 15: 62-64.
- Block, D.I.
1999. *Judges, Ruth*. NAC 6. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publisher.
- Bock, S.
1998. *Kleine Geschichte Israels*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Boer, P.A.H. de.
1938. *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI; A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel*. Berkenwoude.
1991. The Perfect with *waw* in 2 Samuel 6:16. in: C. van Duin (ed.). *Selected Studies in Old Testament Exegesis*. Leiden: Brill.
- Boling, R.G.
1982. *Joshua*. AB. New York: Doubday.
- Boogaart, Thomas A.
1988. Narrative Theology in the Story of the Capture of the Ark. *RR* 41: 139-146.
- Booij, Th.
1978. *Godswoorden in de Psalmen hun funktie en achtergronden*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Botterweck, G. J. und H. Ringgren.
1973-1993. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament I-VIII*. W. Kohlhammer.
- Briend, Jaques.
1983. Bethléem-Ephratha. *Monde de la Bible* 30. Aug-Oct (29).
- Bright, John.
1991. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Brockelmann, Carl.
1956. *Hebräische Syntax*. Neukirchen: Erziehungsvereins.
- Broekhuis, J.
1986. De ark, in: W. van Benthem (ed.). *Verkenningen in Exodus*. Kampen: Kok: 149-155.
- Brongers, H.A.
1965. Die Wendung *b^ssêm jahw* in Alten Testament. *ZA W* 77: 1-20.
1971. Einige Aspekte der gegenwärtigen Lage der Lade-Forschung. *NedThT* 25: 6-27.
- Brooke, Alan England and Norman McLean (ed.).
1909. *The Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Brotzman, E.R.
1994. *Old Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Brouwer, C.

1955. *De ark*. Baarn: Bosh & Keuning N.V.
- Borowski, Elie.
1995. Cherubim: God's Throne?. *BAR* 21. (4): 36-41.
- Brueggemann, W.
1990. *Fist and Second Samuel*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press.
1991. 2 Samuel 6. in: *Telling Queen Michal's Story*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
1998. *A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile & Homecoming*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Budd, P.J.
1984. *Numbers WBC4*. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.
- Budde, K.
1890. *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*. Giessen: J. Rickersche Buchhandlung.
- Budde, K.
1901. Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung der Lade Jahwe's. *ZA W* 21: 193-197.
1902. *Samuel*. KHCAT. Tübingen: J.C. Mohr..
1906. War die Lade Jahwes ein leerer Thron?. *ThStKr* 79: 489-507.
- Buis, P.
1997. *Le Livre des Rois*. Sources Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda.
- Bullock, C. H.
1988. *An Introduction to the Old Testament Poetic Books*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Bultmann, R.
1975. *Das Problem der Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Herausgegeben von G. Strecker. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Butler, Trent C.
1983. *Joshua*. WBC 7. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.
- Caird, G.B.
1953. 1 and 2 Samuel. in: *IB*. Nashville.
- Calloud, Jean.
1976. *Structural Analysis of Narrative*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Calvin, J.
1979. *Commentaries on the Book of Joshua*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
1993. *Commentaries on the Book of Psalms IV*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Campbell, A.F.
1975. *The Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4-6; 2 Sam 6): A From-Critical and Traditio-Historical Study*. Missoula, Montana: The Society of Biblical Literature.
1979. Yahweh and the Ark: A Case study in Narrative. *JBL* 98/1: 31-43.
- Caquot, A. & P. de Robert.
1994. *Les Livres de Samuel*. Genève: Labor et Fides.
- Carlson, R.A.
1964. *David: the chosen King*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Carroll, R.P.

1986. *Jeremiah*. OTL. London: SCM Press.
- Caspari, D.W.
 1908 Die Bundeslade unter David. *Festschrift Th. Zahn*: 25-46.
 1926. *Die Samuelbücher*. KAT 7. Leipzig: Deichter.
- Cassuto, U.
 1967. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press. Cazelles, H.
 1968. Israël du nord et arche d'alliance (Jér. III 16). *VT* 18: 147-158.
- Cazelles, H.
 1971. *Écriture Parole et Esprit; trois aspects de l'herméneutique biblique*. Paris: Desclée.
- Chatman, Seymour.
 1978. *Story and Discours: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University.
- Childs, B.S.
 1970. *Biblical Theology in Crisis*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
 1974. *Exodus*. OTL. London: SCM Press.
 1985. *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Christensen, D.L.
 1991. *Deuteronomy 1-11*. WBC 6A. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.
- Civil, Miguel, A. Leo Oppenheim, Eirica Reiner (ed.).
 1956-1992. *The Assyrian Dictionary*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Clements, R.E.
 1983. *A Century of Old Testament Study*. Guildford, Surrey: Lutterworth Press.
 1989. *Deuteronomy* (OT Guides). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Clines, D.J.A.
 1972. X, X Ben Y, Ben Y: Personal Names in Hebrew Narrative Style. *VT* 22: 266-287.
- Clines, D.J.A. (ed.).
 1993-1998. *Dictionary Classical Hebrew I-V*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Coccejus, J.
 1990. *De Leer van het Verbond en het Testament van God*. vertaald door W.J. van Asselt en H.G. Renger. Kampen: Uitgeverij de Groot-Goudriaan.
- Cogan, M.
 2001. *1 Kings*. AB. New York: Doubleday.
- Cohen, A.
 1976. *Joshua-Judges*. Soncino: Soncino Press.
- Collon, Dominique.
 1987. *First Impressions: Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Coats, George W.
 1985. The Ark of the Covenant in Joshua: A Probe into the History of a Tradition. *HAR* 9: 137-157.
- Cole, R.D.
 2000. *Numbers*. NAC 3B. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Craigie, P.C., P.H. Kelley & J.F. Drinkard, Jr.

1991. *Jeremiah 1-25*. WBC 26. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.
- Cross, F.M.
1973. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Crüsemann, Frank.
1980. Zwei alttestamentliche Witze, I Sam 21:11-15 und II Sam 6:16, 20-23 als Beispiele einer biblischen Gattung. *ZAW* 92: 215-227.
1992. *Die Tora: Theologie und Sozialgeschichte des alttestamentlichen Gesetzes*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Cullmann, O.
1948. *Christus und Zeit*, Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G..
1967. *Heil als Geschichte*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Curtis, A.H.W.
1994. *Joshua* (OT Guides). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Dahood, M.
1964. Hebrew Ugaritic Lexicography II. *Biblica* 45: 393-417.
- Dahood, M.
1970. *Psalms 101-150*. AB. New York: Doubday.
- Dam, C. van.
1997. *The Urim and Thummim*. Winona, Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Davies, G.Henton.
1963. The Ark in the Psalms. in: F.F. Bruce (ed.). *Promise and Fulfilment*. Essays Presented to S. H. Hooke. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark: 51-61.
- Davies, G.Henton.
1966/67. The Ark of the Covenant. *ASTI* 5: 30-47.
- Davies, P.R.
1977. The History of the Ark in the Books of Samuel. *JNSL* 5: 9-18.
1992, *In Search of "Ancient Israel"*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Davis, D.R.
1999. *2 Samuel*. Ross-shire: Christian Focus.
- De Groot, J.
1935. *II Samuël*, TU, Groningen: Batava.
- De Groot, J. en A.R. Hulst.
nd. *Macht en Wil*. Nijkerk: G.F. Callenbach N.V.
- Delcor, M.
1964. Yahweh et Dagon ou le Jahwisme face à la religion des Philistins, d'après 1 Sam. V. *VT* 14: 136-154.
- Dempsey, D.A.
1998. The Ark and the Temple in 1 and 2 Chronicles. *Bible Today* 36: 233-239.
- Derousseaux, Louis.
1970. *La crainte de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament*. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf.
- De Tarragon, J.M.
1979. David et l'arche: II Samuel, VI. *RB* 86: 514-523.

- DeVries, S.J.
1985. *1 Kings*. WBC 12. Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher.
- Dibelius, M.
1906. *Die Lade Jahves. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* FRLANT 98. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Diebner, B.J.
1985. Gottesdienst. in: *TRE XIV*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Dietrich, M., O. Loretz, O. Loretz & J. Sanmartín (ed.).
1976. *Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit; Einschließlich der keilalphabetischen Texte außerhalb Ugarits Teil 1* Transkription. AOAT 24/1. Kerverlaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker.
- Dietrich, W. & T. Naumann.
1995. *Die Samuelbücher*. EF 287. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Dillard, R.B. & T. Longman III.
1994. *An Introduction to Old Testament*. Leicester: Apollos.
- Dohmen, Christoph & Günter Stemberger.
1996. *Hermeneutik der Jüdischen Bibel und des Alten Testaments*. Köln: W. Kohlhammer.
- Donner, H./W. Röllig.
1966-1969. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Dorsey, David A.
1991. *The Roads and Highways of Ancient Israel*. Batimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dothan, Trude.
1982. *The Philistines and their Material Culture*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Dreytza, M.
1997. ף, in: *NIDOTTE 2*: 402-405.
- Driver, S.R.
1902. *Deuteronomy*. ICC. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark.
1913^a, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
1913^b. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Samuel*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Droomer, N.
1991. "De heilshistories-verbondsmatige prediking". in: *In die Skriflig* 25 (3).
- Duhm, B.
1901. *Das Buch Jeremia*. KHCAT. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Durham, John I.
1987. *Exodus*. WBC. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.
- Dus, J.
1960. Die Analyse zweier Ladeerzählungen des Josuabuches (Jos 3-4 und 6). *ZAW* 72: 107-134.
1961. Der Brauch der Ladewanderung im alten Israel. *TZ* 17: 1-16.
- Eichhorn, W.
1973. *Die Religionen Chinas*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Eichrodt, W.
1933, 1957. *Theologie des Alte Testament 1*. Stuttgart: Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag.

- 1940/41. Lade und Stierbild. *ZA W* 58: 190-215.
1960. Die Lade und Gesetzestafeln. *TZ* 16: 281-284.
1965. *The Cambridge Ancient History* II:34. ed. by I.E.S. Edwards, C.J. Gadd and N.G.L. Hammond.
Cambridge: University Press.
1966. Jahweh Zebaoth. *Kleine Schriften* III. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr: 103-123.
1976. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Tübingen: J. B. C. Mohr.
- Elliger, K. und W. Rudolph (ed.).
1966/77. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Eynikel, Erik.
2000. The Relation between the Eli Narrative (1 Sam 1-4) and the Ark Narrative (1 Sam 1-6; 2 Sam 6, 1-19). in: J.C. de Moor & H.E. van Rooy (ed.). *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. Leiden: Brill.
- Epstein, I. (ed.).
1974. *Tractate Yoma*, Hebrew-English Edition of The Babylonian Talmud. trans. by Leo Jung.
London, Jerusalem, New York: The Soncino Press.
- Epstein, I. (ed.).
1976. *Tractate Baba Bathra*. Hebrew-English Edition of The Babylonian Talmud I, trans. by Leo Jung. London, Jerusalem, New York: The Soncino Press.
- Erman, A. & H. Ranke.
1923. *Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben im Altertum*. Tübingen.
- Eslinger, Lyle M.
1985. *Kingship of God in Crisis, A close Reading of 1 Samuel 1-12*. Almond.
- Ewald, G.H.A. von.
1878. *The History of Israel* Vol. III. London: Longmans, Green, And Co.
- Fabry, H.J.
1977. $\square\tau\tau$. *TWAT* II: 347-357.
- Fee, Gordon D.
1996. History as Context for Interpretation. in *The Act of Bible Reading*. ed. by Elmer Dyck. Downers Grove, Ill: IVP.
- Fensham, F.C.
1977. *Exodus*. POT. Nijkerk: Callenbach.
- Fohrer, G.
1971. Die alttestamentliche Ladeerzählung. *JNSL* 1.
1972. *Theologische Grundstrukturen des Alten Testaments*. Berlin: Töpelmann.
- Freedman, D.N. & P. O'Connor.
1984. $\square\tau\tau$. in: *TWAT* IV: 322-334.
- Freeman, C.
1996. *Egypt, Greece and Rome: Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fretheim, T. E.
1967. *The Cultic Use of the Ark of the Covenant in the Monarchial Period*. diss. NJ: Princeton.
- Fretheim, T. E.

1968. The Ark in Deuteronomy. *CBQ* 30: 1-14.
1991. *Exodus*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press.
1997. *אֲרֶכְשֵׁת הַיָּם*. *NIDOTTE* 2: 408-414.
1999. *First and Second Kings*. Westminster Bible Companion: Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Fritz, Volkmar.
1970. *Israel in der Wüste; traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung der Wüstenüberlieferung des Jahwisten*. Marburg: N.G. Elwert Verlag.
1990. *Die Stadt im alten Israel*. München: C.H. Beck.
- 1994^a. *An Introduction to Biblical Archaeology*. JSOTS 172. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- 1994^b. *Das Buch Josua*. HAT I/7. Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr.
1996. *Das erste Buch der Könige*. ZB, Zürich: TVZ.
- Fuller, Daniel P.
1992. *The Unity of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Garsiel, Moshe.
1990. *The First Book of Samuel*. Jerusalem: Rubin Mass, Ltd.
- Garstang, John.
1927. The Date of the Destruction of Jericho. *PEFQS*: 96-100.
1930. Jericho: Sir Charles Marston's Expedition of 1930. *PEFQS*: 123-125.
1937. Jericho and the Biblical Story. in: J.A. Hammerton (ed.). *Wonders of the Past*. New York: Wise.
- Gastang, J. & J.B.E. Gastang.
1948. *The Story of Jericho*. London: Marshall.
- George, J.F.L.
1835. *Die älteren jüdischen Feste mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuch*. Berlin: E.H. Schroeder.
- Gerstenberger, E. 1965. *Wesen und Herkunft des »apodiktischen Rechts«*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Gesenius, W.
1982. *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Geyer, J.B.
1981. Mice and Rites in 1 Samuel V-VI. *VT XXXI* 3: 293-304.
- Gispén, W.H.
1935. Bijbelse archeologie. in: *Bijbels handboek* 1. Kampen: Kok.
1955. *Koningen* IV. KV. Kampen: Kok.
1959. *Numeri I*. COT. Kampen: J. H. Kok.
- Glueck, N.
1946. *The River Jordan*. London & Redhill: Lutterworth Press.
- Goldman, S.
1986. *Samuel*. Soncino Books of the Bible. London and Bournemouth: Soncino Press.
- Gootjes, N.H.

1987. "Ons ten voorbeeld geschied". II, *Ref. jg.* 62/48, 49; 63/11.
1990. Redemptive Historical Interpretation. *Lux Mundi* (9-4): 6-16.
1992. De Geest in Bezaleël (Exodus 31:3). in: F.H. Folkerts o.a. (ed.). *Ambt en aktualiteit*. Opstellen aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. C. Trimp. Haarlem: Vijlbrief.
- Gordon, R.P.
1986. *I and II Samuel: A Commentary*. Exeter: Paternoster Press.
- Görg, M.
1998. Die Anfänge der kritischen Datierung des Buches Josua. *BN* 94: 11-14.
- Goslinga, C.J.
1979. *Samuël I*. KV. Kampen: Kok.
1962. *Het tweede boek Samuël*. COT. Kampen: Kok.
- Gottwald, N.K.
1978. Were the Early Israelites Pastoral Nomads?. *BAR* June: 2-7.
- 1979, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-1050 B.C.E.*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Gowan, Donald E.
1994. *Theology in Exodus, Biblical Theology in the Form of a Commentary*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Graf, C.H.
1866. *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des alten Testaments: Zwei historisch-kritische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: T.O. Weigel.
- Gray, G. B.
1912. *Numbers*. ICC. Edingburgh: T.&T. Clark.
1967. *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*. CB. London: Nelson.
- Gray, J.
1970. *I&II Kings*. OTL. London: SCM Press LTD.
- Greidanus, S.
1970. *Sola Scriptura; Problems and Principles in Preaching Historical Texts*. Ontario: Wedge Publishing Foundation.
1999. The Necessity of Preaching Christ Also from Old Testament Texts. *CTJ* 34: 188-197.
- Greiner, Dorothea.
1998. *Segen und Segnen, Eine systematisch-theologische Grundlegung*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Gressmann, H.
1920. *Die Lade Jawes und das Allerheiligste der Salomonischen Tempels*. Berlin: Kohlhammer.
- Gressmann, H.
1927. *Altorientalische Bilder zum Alten Testament*. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gressmann, H.
1991. The Oldest History Writing in Israel. in: *Narrative and Novela in Samuel*. (ed.) by D.M. Gunn. Sheffield: The Almond Press.
- Grillet, B. & M. Lestiennne.
1997. *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Premier Livre des Règnes*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Groningen, G. van.

1990. *Messianic Revelation in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Gunkel, H.
1895. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Entzeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1906. "Die Lade Jahves ein Thronstz". *ZMR*. 21: 33-42.
1926. *Die Psalmen*. HAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1977. *Genesis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1987. *Das Märchen im Alten Testament*, Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.
- Gunn, David M.
1978. *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*. Sheffield: JSOT.
- Gunn, David M. & Danna Nolan Fewell.
1993. *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University.
- Gunneweg, A.H.J.
1958. *Mündlichen und schriftliche Tradition der vorexilischen Prophetenbücher als Problem der neueren Prophetenforschung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1965. *Leviten und Priester*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1993. *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Guthe, H.
1899. *Geschichte des Volkes Isreal*. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Gutman, J.
1971. The History of the Ark. *ZAW* 87: 22-30.
- Hague, S.T.
1997. אֲרֹן. in: *NIDOTTE* 1: 500-510.
- Hahn, F.
1972. Problemen historischen Kritik. *ZNW* 63: 1-17.
- Halpern, Baruch.
1988. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Haman, Allan.
1998. *Psalms*. A Mentor Commentary. Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications.
- Hamlin, E.J.
1983. *Joshua*. Inheriting the Land. ITC. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Handy, L.K.
1992. Dagon. in: *ABD* 2. New York: Doubleday.
1997. On the Dating and Dates of Solomon's Reign. in: L.K. Handy (ed.). *The Age of Solomon*. Leiden: Brill: 96-105.
- Haran, Menahem.
1958. The Bas-Reliefs on the Sarcophagus of Ahiim King of Byblos in the Light of Archaeological and Literary Parallels from the Ancient Near East, *IEJ* VIII: 14-25.
1959. 'otf, maḥmal and ḳubbe. Note on the Study of the Origin of Biblical Cult Forms: The Problem of Arabic Parallels. *D. Neiger Memorial Volume*: 215-221.
1959. The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual. *IEJ* 9: 30-38, 89-94.
1963. The Disappearance of the Ark. *IEJ* 13: 46-58.

- Harrelson, Walter J.
1997. *The Ten Commandments and Human Rights*, Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.
- Harrison, R.K.
1980. The historical and Literary Criticism of the Old Testament. in *Biblical Criticism: Historical, Literary and Textual*. by Harrison, Waltke, Guthrie, Fee. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
1985. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans.
1990. *Numbers*. Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Harrisville, R.A. & W. Sundberg.
1995. *The Bible in Modern Culture: Theology and Historical-Critical Method from Spinoza to Käsemann*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Hasel, G. F.
1995. *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Hartmann, Richard.
1917-18. Zelt und Lade. *ZA W* 37: 209-244.
- Healey, J.F.
1999. Dagon. *DDD*: 216-219.
- Hegel, G.W.F.
1905. *Hegels Religionsphilosophie; in gekürzter Form/ mit Einführung/ Anmerkungen und Erläuterungen* herausgegeben von Arthur Drews. Jena und Leipzig: Eugen Diederichs.
1920. *Encyclopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften*. neu herausgegeben von Georg Lasson. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
1921. *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. herausgegeben von Georg Lasson. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
1948. *Wissenschaft der Logik*. herausgegeben von Georg Lasson. Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
- Heinemann, Olliver.
1995. Die "Lade" aus Akazienholz - ägyptische Wurzeln eines israelitischen Kultobjekts?. *BN* 80: 32-40.
- Hentschel, G.
1994. *1 Samuel*. NEB. Würzburg: Echter Verlag.
- Herbert, E.D.
1997. *Reconstructing Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Method Applied to the Reconstruction of 4QSama*. Leiden: Brill.
- Herder, J.G.
1993. Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie. in: R. Smend (hrsg.). *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke* Band 5. Frankfurt am Mein: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag.
- Herrmann, S.
1980. *Geschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*. München: Chr. Kaiser.
1993. 'Realunion' und 'Charismatisches Königtum' zu Zwei Offenen Fargen der Verfassungen in Juda und Israel. *EI* 24: 97-103.
- Hertzberg, H.W.
1965 *Die Samuelbücher*, ATD 9, 10, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1986, *Die Bucher Josua, Richter, Ruth*. ATD 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Hess, Richard.
1996. *Joshua*. TOTC. Leicester: IVP.
- Hillers, D.R.
1968. Ritual Procession of the Ark and Psalm 132. *CBQ* 30: 48-55.
- Hobbs, T.R.
1985. *2 Kings*. WBC 13. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.
- Hoffner Jr., Harry A.
1994. Hittites. in: A.J. Hoerth, G.L. Mattingly and W.M. Yamauchi (ed.). *Peoples of the Old Testament World*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Hofmann, J.C.K. von.
1841. *Weissagung und Erfüllung im Alten und im Neuen Testamente*. Nördlingen: C.H. Beck.
- Hoftijzer, J.
1985. *The function and use of the imperfect forms with nun paragomicum in classical hebrew*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Holladay, W.L.
1986. *Jeremiah 1*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
1993. *The Psalms through Three Thousand Years*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Holwerda, B.
1972. *Bijzondere Canoniek*. Kampen: Van den Berg.
1953. De heilshistorie in de prediking. in ... *Begonnen hebbende van Mozes...* Terneuzen: Littooj.
- Hossfeld, F.
1982. *Der Dekalog*. OBO 45, OBO 162, Freiburg, Schweiz Göttingen: Universitätsverlag
1993. פָּסַח, *TWAT* VII: 652-663.
2000. Der Dekalog als Grundgesetz - eine Problemanzeige, in: Kratz, R.G. & H. Spieckermann (Hg.). *Liebe und Gebot*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hostetter, E.C.
1995. *Nations Mightier and More Numerous: The Biblical View of Palestine's Pre-Israelite People*. N. Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL Press.
- House, P.R.
1995. *1, 2 Kings*. NAC 8. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publisher.
- Houtman, C.
1980. *Inleiding in de pentateuch*. Kampen: J. H. Kok.
1996. *Exodus III*. COT. Kampen: Kok.
- Howard Jr., D.M.
1994. Philistines. in: A.J. Hoerth, G.L. Mattingly & E.M. Yamauchi (ed.). *People of the Old Testament World*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
1998. *Joshua*. NAC 5. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publisher.
- Hubbard, Jr. R.L.
1991. *First & Second Kings*, Chicago: Moody Press.
- Hupfeld, H.C.C.F.,
1853, *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung*. Von neuem untersucht. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben.

- Irenaeus.
1989. *Against Heresies*. in: A. Roberts & J. Donaldson (ed.). *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* Vol 1. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Jackson, Jared Judd.
1995. The Ark and its Making. *HBT* 17: 117-122.
- Jacob, Benno.
1992. *The Second Book of the Bible: Exodus*. Hoboken, New Jersey: KTAV Publishing House.
- Jacquet, L.
1979. *Les Psaumes et le cœur de l'homme*. Belgique: Duculot.
- Jagersma, H.
1979. *Geschiedenis van Israël in het oudtestamentische tijdvak*. Kampen: Kok.
- Janowski, B.
1982. *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschaft und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*. WMANT 55. Neuchirchen-Vluyn: Neuchirchener Verlag.
- Janowski, B.
1989. *Rettungsgewißheit und Epiphanie des Heils: Das Motiv der Hilfe Gottes »am Morgen« im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*. Band I: Alter Orient. WMANT 59, Neuchirchen-Vluyn: Neuchirchener Verlag.
1993. *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel*. Neuchirchen-Vluyn: Neuchirchener Verlag.
- Janzen, W.
2000. *Exodus*. Waterloo, Ontario: Herald Press.
- Japhet, S.
1997. From King's Sanctuary to the Chosen City. *Judaism* 46: 132-139.
2002. *1 Chronik*. HTKAT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.
- Jean, Charles F. et Jacob Hoftijzer.
1965, *Dictionnaire de inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jenni, E.
1968. *Das hebraische Pi`el*. Zurich: EVZ-Verlag.
- Jenni, E. und C. Westermann (ed.).
1976. *Theologische Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* II. München: Chr. Kaiser.
- Jenson, P.P.
1997. שָׁבַע. in: *NIDOTTE* 4: 34-37.
- Jeremias, Jörg.
1987. *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jones, D.R.
1992. *Jeremiah*. NCBC. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Jones, G.H.
1984. *1 and 2 Kings*. Vol. I. NCBC. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Jones, L.L.
1992. Music and Musical Instrument. in: *ABD*.
- Josephus, F.

1988. *Jewish Antiquities*. J.St. J. Thackerar & R. Marcus (trans.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Joüon, S.J.P.
1965. *Grammaire de L'hebreu Biblique*. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical.
- Joüon, P. - T. Muraoka.
1991. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Kaiser, Jr., Walter C.
1984. *Toward an Exegetical Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
1995. Narrative. in: D. Brent Sandy & Ronald L. Giese, Jr. *Cracking Old Testament Codes*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Kaiser, Otto.
1984. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Kaufman, A.S.
1984. Determining the Length of the Medium Cubit. *PEQ* 116: 120-132.
- Kautzsch, E. (ed. and enlarge).
1990. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Second English Ed. by A.E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Keel, O.
1996. Davids 'Tanz' vor der Lade. *BuK* 51: 11-14.
- Keel, O. & Chr. Uehlinger.
1992. *Göttinnen, Götter und Gottessymbole*. Neue Erkenntnisse zur Religionsgeschichte Kanaans und Israels aufgrund bislang unerschlossener ikonographischer Quellen. QD 134. Freiburg/Basel/Wien.
- Keil, C.F.
1862. *Biblischer Commentar über die Bücher Mose's II*. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke.
1875. *Biblischer Commentar über die Bücher Samuelis*. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke.
- Kelm, G.L.
1991. *Escape to Conflict*. Fort Worth, TX: IAR Publications.
- Kenyon, Kathleen.
1957. *Digging Up Jericho*. London: Ernest Benn.
- Kenyon, K. & T.A. Holland.
1982-3. *Excavations at Jericho*. Vol. 5. London: British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.
- Kio, S.H.
1996. What did Saul ask for: ark or ephod? (1 Samuel 14:18). *The Bible Translator* 47, 2 April: 240-246.
- Kirkpatrick, A.F.
1890. *The Second Book of Samuel*. CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kitchen, K.A.
1966. *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*. London: The Tyndale Press.
1979. Egypt, Ugarit, Qatna and Covenant. *UF* 11: 452-464.
1997. Sheba and Arabia. in: L.K. Handy (ed.). *The Age of Solomon*. Leiden: Brill: 126-153.
2003. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Klatt, Werner.

1969. *Hermann Gunkel: Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Klein, G.
1970. Reich Gottes als biblischer Zentralbegriff. *EvT* 30: 642-670.
- Klein, R.W.
1983. *I Samuel*. WBC 10. Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher.
1996. Back to the Future. *Interpretation* 50: 264-276.
- Klein, W.W., C. Blomberg and R.L. Hubbard.
1993. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Dallas: Word Publishing.
- Klement, H.H. 2000. *II Samuel 21-24. Context, Structure and Meaning in the Samuel Conclusion*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Kline, M. G.
1963. *Treaty of the Great King*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Klostermann, A.
1887. *Die Bücher Samuelis und der König*. Nördlingen: Beck.
- Köberle, Justus.
1905. *Sünde und Gnade im religiösen Leben des Volkes Israel bis auf Christum: eine Geschichte des vorchristlichen Heilsbewusstseins*. München: Beck.
- Koch, Klaus.
1995. Some Considerations on the Translation of *kappōret* in the Septuagint. in: David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman and Avi Hurvitz (ed.). *Pomegranates Golden Bells; Studies in Biblical, Jewish and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Koehler, A.
1948. Ashpâr Dattelkuchen. *TZ* 4: 397-398.
- König, F. E.
1979. *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache III*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Koolhaas, A.A.
1957. *Theocratie en monarch in Israël*. Wageningen: H. Veenman en zonen.
- Körtner, Ulrich H.J.
1994. *Der inspirierte Leser*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kraeling, E.G.
1928. The Real Religion of Ancient Israel. *JBL* 47.
- Kratz, R.G.
1994. Der Dekalog im Exodusbuch, *VT* XLIV, 2: 205-238.
- Kraus, H.J.
1970. *Die Biblische Theologie: Ihre Geschichte und Problematik*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener.
1978. *Psalmen 60-150*. BKAT XV2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
1988. *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener.
- Kristensen, W.B.
1947. De ark van Jahwe, in: *Verzamelde Bijdragen tot Kennis der antieke godsdiensten*. Amsterdam:

Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers.

Kroeze, J.H.

1937. *Genesis veertien*; diss. Amsterdam, Hilversum.

1968. *Het Boek Jozua*. COT. Kampen: Kok.

Kronholm, T.

1986. ךד . in: *TWAT V*: 838-856.

Kruse, Heinz.

1983. Psalm CXXXII and the Royal Zion Festival. *VT XXXIII* 3: 279-297.

Kühlewein, J.

1971. ךז . in: *THAT I*.

Külling, S.R.

1985². *Zur Datierung der 'Genesis-P-Stücke'*. Riehen.

Labuschagne, C.J.

1987. *Deuteronomium* IB. POT. Nijkerk: Callenbach.

Ladd, G.H.

1952. *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Lane, E.W.

1968. *An Arabic-English Lexicon* 7. Beirut: Librairie du Liban.

Lang, B.

1981. Das Verbot des Meineids im Dekalog, *TQ* 161: 97-105.

1984. ךז . in: *TWAT IV*: 303-318

Langlamet, F.

1969. *Gilgal et les récits de la traversée du Jourdain*. Paris: Gabalda.

Leeuwen, C. van.

1976. ךז . in: *THAT II*: 209-221.

Leiman, Sid Z.

1974. The Inverted *nuns* at Numbers 10:35-36 and the Book of Eldad and Medad. *JBL* 93: 348-355.

Lettinga, J. P.

1976. *Grammatica van het Bijbels Hebreeuws*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

1976¹, *Hulpboek bij de grammatica van het Bijbelse hebreeuws*. Leiden: Brill.

Levin, C.

1985. Der Dekalog am Sinai, *VT XXXV*, 2: 165-191.

Levine, B. A.

1976. More on the Inverted *nuns* of Num 10:35-36. *JBL* 95: 122-124.

1993. *Numbers 1-20*. AB. New York: Doubday.

Lieberman, S.

1950. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Linnemann, Eta.

1990. *Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology?*. translated from the German edition by Robert W. Yarbrough. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.

Linville, J.R.

1998. *Israel in the Book of Kings: The Past as a Project of Social Identity*. JSOTS 272. Sheffield:

Sheffield Academic Press.

Lion-Cachet, F.N.

1989. *So het dit begin: Gods boodskap in die raamwerk van die historiese boeke van die Ou Testament.* Potchefstroom: DSP, PU vir CHO.

1995. *In die werkwinkel van Ou-Testamentiese eksegesi; Die verklaring van die Ou Testament in die praktyk.* Potchefstroom: DSP, PU vir CHO.

1995. *The Good Books of the Old Covenant: Canonics of the Pentateuch.* translated by J.J.F. Krüger. Potchefstroom: DSP, PU vir CHO.

1995. Die sentrale openbaring in die Ou Testament en die Christelike grondslag van die Potchefstroomse Universiteit. *Koers* 60/4: 563-577.

Lohfink, Norbert.

1994. *Theology of the Pentateuch, The themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

1990. *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur I,* Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH.

Long, Burke O.

1968. *The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament.* BZAW 108. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann.

Long, Burke O.

1984. *1 Kings with an Introduction to Historical Literature, The Form of the Old Testament Literature.* Vol. IX. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Long, V. Philips.

1994. *The Art of Biblical History.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.

Longacre, R.E.

1992. Discourse Perspective on the Hebrew Verb: Affirmation and Restatement. in: Walter R. Bodine (ed.). *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew.* Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

1995. Building for the Worship of God: Exodus 25:1-30:10. in: Walter R. Bodine (ed.), *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature, What it is and What it offers.* Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press: 21-49.

Loretz, O.

1977. Die Steinernen Gesetzestafeln in der Lade, Probleme der Deuteronomium- Forschung zwischen Geschichte und Utopie. *UF* 9: 159-161.

Lotz, W., M.G. Kyle and C.E. Armerding.

1979. Ark of the Covenant. *ISBE* I: 291-294.

Lurker, Manfred.

1973. *Wörterbuch biblischer Bilder und Symbol.* München: Kösel Verlag.

Maass, F.

1971. כפר. in: *THAT* I: 842-857.

Mackay, John L.

2001. *Exodus,* Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications.

Maier, Gerhard.

1991². *Biblische Hermeneutik.* Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus.

Maier, J.

1965. *Das Altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum*. BZAW 93. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann.
- Mandelkern, S.
1969. *Veteris Testamenti concordantiae*, Tel - Aviv: Sumptibus Schocken Hierosolymis.
- Mann, Thomas W.
1977. *Divine Presence and Guidance in Isrealite Traditions, The Typology of Exaltation*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mare, W.H.
1987. *The Archaeology of the Jerusalem Area*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House.
- Marget, A.W.
1920. *gwrn nkwn* in 2 Sam. 6₆. *JBL* 23: 70-76.
- Martens, E.A.
1986. *Jeremiah*. Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press.
- Matthew, Victor H. & Don C. Benjamin.
1997. *Old Testament Parallels, Law and Stories from the Ancient Near East*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Mauchline, John.
1971. *1 and 2 Samuel*. NCB. London: Oliphants.
- May, H.G.
1935/36. The Ark-a Miniature Temple. *AJSL* 52: 215-234.
- Mays, J.L.
1994. *Psalms, Interpretation*. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- Mazar, A.
1990. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible; 10,000-586 B.C.E*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mazar, E. & B.
1989. *Excavations in the South of the Temple Mount, The Ophel of Biblical Jerusalem*. QEDem 29. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University.
- McCarter, P.K.Jr.
1980. *1 Samuel*. AB 8. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
1984. *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*. AB 9. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- McConville, J.G.
1984. *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*. JSOTSS 33. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
1997. *תורה*. in: *NIDOTTE* 1: 746-755.
2002. *Deuteronomy*. AOTC 5. Leicester: Apollos.
- McKane, W.
1965/66. The Earlier History of the Ark. *TGUOS* 21: 68-76.
- McKeating, H.
1999. *The Book of Jeremiah*. Peterborough: Epworth Press.
- McKenzie, John L.
1974. *A Theology of the Old Testament*. London: Geoffrey Chapman Publisher.
- McNamara, Martin (trans.).
1994. *The Aramaic Bible vol. 2, Targum Neofit 1: Exodus*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

- Mendenhall, G.E.
 1958. The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26. *JBL* LXXVII: 52-66.
 1970. The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine. *BAR* III: 100-120.
- Merrill, E.H.
 1994. *Deuteronomy*. NAC 4. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publisher.
- Mettinger, T.N.D.
 1973. *King and Messiah*. Lund: Wallin & Dalholm.
 1997. Israelite Aniconism: Developments and Origins. in: K. van der Toorn (ed.). *The Image and the Book*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Metzger, M.
 1985. *Königsthron und Gottesthron*. AOAT 15/1. Neukirchen-Vuyn: Neukirchener.
- Metzger, M.
 1994. Jahwe, der Kerubenthroner, die von Keruben flankierte Palmette und Sphingenthronen aus dem Libanon, Ingo Kottsieper, Jürgen van Oorschot, Diethard Römheld & Harald Martin Wahl (hrgs.), »Wer ist wie du HERR, unter den Göttern?«. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 75-90.
- Michaeli, Farnk.
 1974. *Le Livre de L'Exode*. Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé.
- Milgrom, Jacob.
 1990. *Numbers*. The JPS Commentary. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Millard, M.
 1994. *Die Komposition des Psalters*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
 2000. Das Elterngesetz im Dekalog: Zum Problem der Gliederung des Dekalogs, in: E. Blum (ed.), *Mincha*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag: 193-215.
- Miller, P.D. and J.J.M. Roberts.
 1977. *The Hand of the Lord, A Reassessment of the "Ark Narrative" of 1 Samuel*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mills, M.E.
 1999. *Historical Israel: Biblical Israel; Studying Joshua to 2 Kings*. London: Cassell.
- Mitchell, D.C.
 1997. *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms*. JSOTS 252. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Moor, de J.C.
 1971. *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu*. AOAT 16. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Moor, de J.C.
 1972. *New Year with Canaanites and Israelites I*. Kampen: Kok.
- Moran, W.L.
 1963. The End of the Unholy War and the Anti-Exodus. *Biblica* 44: 333-342.
- Moran, W.L. (tr.).
 1987. *Les lettres d'el Amarna*. Paris: Cerf.
- Morgan, R. & J. Barton.

1988. *Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morgenstern, J.
 1942/43. The Ark, the Ephod and the "Tent of Meeting". *HUCA* 17: 153-226.
 1943/44. The Ark, the Ephod and the "Tent of Meeting". *HUCA* 18: 1-52.
- Mowinckel, S. 1953. *Religion und Kultus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 1962. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* 1. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 1966. *Psalmstudien* I-II. Amsterdam: P. Schippers.
 1964. *Tetrateuch - Pentateuch - Hexateuch*. BZAW 90. Berlin: Töpelmann.
- Mulder, M.J.
 1987. *Koningen I*. 1 Koningen 1-7. COT. Kampen: Kok.
 1998. *I Kings*. HCOT. Leuven: Peeters.
- Murray, D. F.
 1990. *MQWM* and the Future of Israel in 2 Samuel VII 10. *VT* 40: 298-320.
 1998. *Divine Prerogative and Royal Pretension: Pragmatics, Poetics and Polemics in a Narrative Sequence about David (2 Samuel 5. 17-7.29)*. JSOT SS 264, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Na'aman, N.
 2000. The Law of the Altar in Deuteronomy and the Cultic Site Near Shechem, in: S.L. McKenzie & T. Römer, *Rethinking the Foundations*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 141-161.
- Neusner, Jacob (trans.).
 1991. *The Talmud of the Land of Israel 15: Sheqalim*, Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Nicholson, Ernest.
 1998. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century, The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Niehr, Herbert.
 1998. Das Buch Josua, in: Erich Zenger, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Köln: Kohlhammer.
- Nielsen, E.
 1960. Some Reflections on the History of the Ark. *SVT* 7: 61-74.
 1961. *Oral Tradition*. Studies in Biblical Theology. no. 11. London: SCM Press.
 1965. *Die Zehn Gebote*, Kopenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard.
 1968. *Könige I*. BKAT IX1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Noordzij, A.
 1977. *Kronieken I*. KV. Kampen: Kok.
 1983. *Numbers*. BSC. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Noort, Ed.
 1996. De val van de grote stad Jericho: Kanttekeningen bij synchronische en diachronische benaderingen. *NedTT* 50: 265-279.
 1998. *Das Buch Josua*. EF 292. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Noth, M.,
 1930, *Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels*,
 1956. *Geschichte Israels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 1957. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

1966. *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
1982. *Das vierte Buch Mose, Numeri*. ATD 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- O'Brien, J.M.
1990. *Priest and Levite in Malachi*. SBLDS 121. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. and T.H. Robinson.
1946. *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*. London: S.P.C.K.
- Ohmann, H.M.
1983. *Tellingen in de woestijn*. Uitgave Bond van Mannen verenigingen op Geref. Grondslag.
1990. Een top bereikt: David wordt koning. *Ref* 66/6-8.
- Ollenburger, Ben C.
1987. *Zion, the City of the Great King*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Olsen, Dennis T.
1996. *Numbers, Interpretation*. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- Orlinsky, Harry M.
1946. *hā-rōqđī for hā-rēqđīm in II Samuel 6*. *JBL* 65: 25-35.
- Osborne, Grant R.
1991. *The Hermeneutical Spiral*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP.
- Otto, Eckart.
2000. *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*, FAT 30, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr Siebeck.
- Ottosson, Magnus.
1991. *Joswaboken; En programskrift för davidisk restauration*. Uppsala: Textgruppen.
- Owczarek, Susanne.
1998. *Die Vorstellung vom Wohnen Gottes inmitten seines Volkes in der Priesterschrift, Zur Heiligtumstheologie der priesterschriftlichen Grundschrift*. EH 625. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Pannenberg, W.
1963. *Offenbarung als Geschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1967. Hermeneutik und Universalgeschichte. in: *Grundfragen systematischer Theologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Payne, Barton J.
1949. *A Critical and Comparative Study of the Sahidic Coptic Texts of the First Book of Samuel*. unpublished diss. Princeton Theological Seminary.
1953. The Sahidic Coptic Text of 1 Samuel. *JBL* 72: 51-62.
1970. The Birth of Yahweh, in: *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*: 240-264.
- Pedersen, J.
1953. *Israel III-IV*. Copenhagen: Branner og Korch.
- Peterson, E.H.
1999. *First and Second Samuel*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Pfeiffer, R.H.
1966. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. London: Adam and Charles Black.
- Pietsch, M.

2003. »Dieser ist der Sproß Davids ...«. WMANT 100. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Pisano, Stephen S.J.
1984. *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pitard, W.T.
1987. *Ancient Damascus*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Porter, J.R.
1954. 2 Samuel VI and Psalm CXXXII. *JTS* V: 161-173.
- Powell, Mark Allan.
1990. *What is Narrative Criticism?*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Powell, Marvin.
1990. Masse und Gewicht. *RLA* 7: 457-517.
1992. Weights and Measurements. *ABD* VI: 897-908.
- Price, R.
1994. *In Search of Temple Treasure: the Lost Ark and the Last Days*. Eugene, Or.: Harvest House Publishers.
- Pritchard, James B.
1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts, Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rad, G. von.
1938. *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
1947. *Deuteronomium=Studien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1958. Zelt und Lade. *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, ThB* 8: 109-129.
1958. Das theologische Problem des alttestamentlichen Schöpfungsglaubens. *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, ThB* 8: 136-147.
1958. Das jüdische Königsritual. *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, ThB* 8: 203-213.
1966, 1975. *Theologie des Alten Testaments I- II*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
1983. *Das fünfte Buch Mose, Deuteronomium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ramsey, G.W.
1982. *The Quest for the Historical Israel: Reconstructing Israel's Early History*. London: SCM.
- Rashbam.
1997. *Rashbam's Commentary on Exodus* edited and translated by Martin I. Lockshin. BJS 310. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Rashi, S.
1930. *Pentateuch with Targm Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary: Exodus*. M. Rosenbaum and A.M. Silbermann (trans.). London: Shapiro, Vallentine.
- Rehm, M.
1956. *Die Bücher Samuel*. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag.
- Reimpell, W.
1916. Der Ursprung der Lade Jahwes. *OLZ* 11: 326-331.
- Rendtorff, Rolf.
1977. *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
1983. *Das Alte Testament: Eine Einführung*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

1999. *Theologie des Alten Testaments: Ein kanonischer Entwurf*. Band I. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Rendsburg, G.A.
1990. *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar Press.
- Reuss, E.
1879. *L'histoire sainte et la loi*. Paris: Librairie Sandoz et Fischbacher.
1890. *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke und Sohn.
- Ricœur, Paul.
1986, 1988. *Time and Narrative* Vol. 2, 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ridderbos, Herman N.
1988. *Redemptive History and the New Testament Scriptures*, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.
- Robert, Philippe de.
1981. Arche et Guerre Sainte. *ÉTR* 56:1 (51-53).
- Roberts, Edgar V.
1995. *Writing about Literature*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Roberts, J.J.
1973. The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition. *JBL* 92: 329-44.
- Robinson, G.
1993. *1 and 2 Samuel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Rofé, Alexander.
1985. Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated. in: Jeffrey H. Tigay (ed.). *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rogerson, J.W. & J.W. McKay.
1977. *Psalms 101-150*. CBC. Cambridge: University Press.
- Rooker, M.F.
2000. *Leviticus*. NAC 3A. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Rose, Martin.
1994. *5. Mose 1-11/26-34*. ZB. Zürich: TVZ.
- Ross, J.P.
1967. Jahweh $\text{š}^{\text{p}}\text{ā}^{\text{t}}$ in Samuel and Psalms. *VT* 17: 76-92.
- Rost, Leonhard.
1926. *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*. BWANT. 3/6.
- Rost, Leonhard.
1965. *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum Alten Testament*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
1982. *The Succession to the Throne of David*. Sheffield: The Almond Press.
- Roubos, K.
1981. Bijbelse instellingen. in: A.S. van der Woude (ed.). *Bijbels handboek* 1. Kampen: Kok
- Rowley, H.H.
1967. *Worship in Ancient Israel; Its Forms and Meaning*. London: The Camelot Press.

1939. *Zadok and Nehushtan*. *JBL* 58: 113-141.
- Rupprecht, Konrad.
1977. *Der Tempel von Jerusalem*. BZAW 144. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ryken, Leland, James C. Wilhot and Tremper Longman III (ed.).
1998. *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter Varsity Press.
- Sarna, Nahum M.
1989. *Genesis*. The JPS Torah commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
1991. *Exodus*. The JPS Commentary. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Satterthwaite, Philip E.
1997. Narrative Criticism: The Theological Implications of Narrative Techniques. in: *NIDOTTE I*: 125-133.
- Schicklberger, Franz.
1973. *Die Ladeerzählungen des ersten Samuel-Buches*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag.
- Schilder, H.J.
1974. Het tentkleed als heilsgeheim. *Ref.* 50/3.
- Schilder, K.
1946. 'De Spits' der Paaschprediking: Geen Openbaring-, doch Heils-historie. *Ref.* XXI.
1931. Iets over de eenheid der 'heilsgeschiedenis' in verband met de prediking. *Ref.* XI.
1954. *Wat is de Hemel?*. Kampen: J.H. Kok.
- Schley, D.G.
1989. *Shiloh: A Biblical City in Tradition and History*. JSOTS 63. Sheffield: JSOT.
- Schmid, H.H.
1975. *Die Steine und Wort: Fug und Unfug biblische Archäologie*. Zürich: TVZ.
- Schmidt, H.
1923. Kerubenthron und Lade, in: H. Schmidt (hrsg.). *EYXAPIΣTHPION* für H. Gunkel I; Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 120-144.
- Schmidt, Werner H.
1982. *Einführung in das Alte Testament*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schmitt, Rainer.
1972. *Zelt und Lade als Thema alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft*. Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Schreiner, J.
1963. *Sion-Jerusalem Jahwes Königssitz: Theologie der Heiligen Stadt im Alten Testament*. München: Kösel-Verlag.
1993. *Jeremia 1-25,14*. NEB. Würzburg: Echter Verlag.
- Schroeder, Otto.
1970. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts II*. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller.
- Schroer, Silva.
1992. *Die Samuelbücher*. NSKAT 7. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Schulz, A.
1920. *Die Bücher Samuel*. EHAT. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuch.

- Schwienhorst, Ludger.
1986. *Die Eroberung Jerichos: Exegetische Untersuchung zu Josua 6*. SB 122. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH.
- Seeber, W.
1956. *Der Weg der Tradition von der Lade Jahwes im AT* (diss. Kiel).
- Seebass, H.
1993. *Numeri*. BKAT IV-1. Neuchirchen-Vlyun: Neuchirchener.
- Segal, M.H.
1965/66. The Composition of the Books of Samuel. *JQR* 56: 318-339.
- Sellin, E. & Carl Watzinger.
1913. *Jericho: Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen (Jericho)*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Selms, A.
1933. *De Babylonische termini voor zonde en hun betekenis voor onze kennis van het babylonische zondebesef*. Wageningen: Veenman & zonen.
- Seybold, K.
1996. *Die Psalmen*. HAT I/15. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Seow, C. L.
1984. The Designation of the Ark in Priestly Theology. *HAR* 8: 185-198.
1989. *Myth, Drama, and the Politics of David's Dance*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
1992. Ark of the Covenant. *ABD* I: 386-393.
- Seters, van J.
1983. *In Search of History*. Hew Haven: Yale University Press.
- Settgast, J.
1980. *Tutanchamun*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Sevensma, Tietse Pieter.
1908. *De Ark Gods, Het oud-Israëlitische heiligdom*. diss. Amsterdam: Het Amsterdamsch Studenten-Corps.
- Shea, William H.
1990. The Travels of the Ark of the Covenant. *ABR* (3:3): 73-79.
- Shin, D.I.
1995. *A Hebrew Grammar of Bible* (Korean). Busan: Kosin University Press.
- Simian-Yofre, H.
1989. אֲרֹן, *TWAT* VI: 629-659.
- Simon, R.
1682. *A Critical History of the Old Testament*. trans. by H. Dickinson. London: Walter Davis.
- Simons, J.
1952 *Jerusalem in the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill.
- Sipilä, Seppo.
1989. The Septuagint Version of Joshua 3-4. in: Claude E. Cox (ed.). *LXX Congress of the IOSCS. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 31*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Smelik, K.A.D.
1992. Hidden Messages in the Ark Narrative. in: *Converging the Past*. OTS XXVIII. Leiden: Brill.

Smith, H.P.

1899. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. ICC. Edinburgh: Clark.

Smith, Mark S.

1997. *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus*. JSOTS 239. Sheffield: JSOT.

Smith, W. Robertson.

1885. Preface. in: Wellhausen, J. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, trans. by W. Robertson Smith. Edinburgh: Adan & Charles Black.

Snaith, N.H.

1967. *Leviticus and Numbers*. London: Nelsen.

Sodon, Wolfram von.

1952. *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

Sodon, Wolfram von.

1965-1981. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch I-III*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Sæbø, M.

1989. \square in: *TWAT VI*: 703-708.

Soggin, J.A.

1964. 'Wacholderholz' 2 Sam. VI 5a gleich 'Schlaghölzer', 'Klappern'?. *VT 14*: 374-377.

Soggin, J.A.

1970. *Josué*, CAT Va, Paris: De la chaux & Niestlé.

1989. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. translated by John Bowden from the Italian. London: SCM Press.

1997². The Ark of the Covenant, Jeremiah 3,16. in: P. Bogaert (ed.). *Le livre de Jérémie*. Leuven: University Press: 215-221.

Southwell, P.J.M.

1997. Bethel. in: *NIDOTTE 4*: 440-441.

Stamm, J.-J.

1959. *Le Décalogue à la lumière des recherches contemporaines*, Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé.

Starbuck, S.R.A.

1999. *Court Oracles in the Psalms: The So-Called Royal Psalms in their Ancient Near Eastern Context*. SBLDS 172. Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.

Steck, K. G.

1959. *Die Idee der Heilsgeschichte*. TS 56, Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag AG.

Sternberg, Meir.

1987. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Stoebe, H.J.

1973. *Das erste Buch Samuelis*. KAT VIII1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

1994. *Das zweite Buch Samuelis*. KAT VIII2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

Stolz, Fritz.

1981. *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel*. ZB. Zürich: TVZ.

Strauss, A.

1995. Schilder on the Covenant. in: J. Geertsema (ed.). *Always Obedient*. New Jersey: P&R Publishing.
- Strong, J.T.
1997. Zion: Theology of. in: *NIDOTTE*: 1314-1321.
- Stuhlmacher, P.
1972. Thesen zur Methodologie gegenwärtiger Exegese. *ZNW* 63: 18-26.
- Swete, H. B.(ed.).
1909. *The Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Tannehill, Robert C.
1990. Narrative Criticism. in: R.J. Coggins & J.L. Houlden (eds.). *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. London: SCM Press.
- Tarragon, J. M. de.
1981. La kapporet est-elle une fiction ou un élément du culte tardif?. *RB* 88 (5-12).
1979. David et l'arche: 2 Samuel 6. *RB* 86: 514-523.
- Taws, Donald H.
1994. Guardian of the Ark?. *New Horizons*. July: 10-11.
- Tedwell, N.L.
1974. 1 Sam. II 18 and 2 Sam VI 14. *VT* 24: 505-507.
- Thiele, E.R.
1977. *A Chronology of the Hebrew Kings*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
1984. *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Thompson, T.L.
1996. The Background of the Patriarchs: A Reply to William Dever and Malcom Clark. in: John W. Rogerson. *The Pentateuch*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academi Press.
- Tigay, J.H.
1996. *Deuteronomy*. The JPS Commentary. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Timm, Hermann.
1966. Die Ladeerzählung (1. Sam. 4-6; 2. Sam. 6) und das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks. *EvTh* 26: 509-526.
- Toorn, K. van der.
1991. The Babylonian New Year Festival: New Insights from the Cuneiform Tests and their Bearing on Old Testament Study. *Congress Volume*: Leuven. 1989. Leiden: Brill: 331-344.
1997. The Iconic Book Analogies between the Babylonian Cult of Images and the Veneration of the Torah, in: K. van der Toorn (ed.). *The Image and the Book*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Toorn, K. van der & Cees Houtman.
1994. David and the Ark. *JBL* 113: 209-231.
- Tov, E.
1992. 4QJosh^b, in: Z.J. Kapera (ed.), *Intertestamental Essays* in honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik. Kraków: The Enigma Press.
1997. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem: Simor.
- Trimp, C.
1984. Heilshistorische prediking. *Ned. Geref. Theologische Tydskrif*. 25: 188-195.

1986. *Heilsgeschiedenis en prediking*. Kampen: Van den Berg.
1991. Narratieve homiletiek?. in: *Ten dienste van het woord*. Kampen: Kok.
- Tur-Sinai, N. H.
1951. The Ark of God at Beit Shemesh (1 Sam. VI) and Peres 'uzza (2 Sam. VI; 1 Chron. XIII). *VT* 1: 275-286.
- Ulrich, E.C.
1978. *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
- Ungnad, Arthur.
1992. *Akkadian Grammar*. trans. by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars.
- Ussishkin, David.
1989. Notes on the Fortifications of the Middle Bronze II Period at Jericho and Shechem. *BASOR* 276.
- Utschneider, Helmut.
1988. *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Van der Waal, C.
1979. *Sola Scriptura* deel 1. Goes: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre B.V.
- VanGemeren, Willem.
1988. *The Progress of Redemption*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Academie Books.
- Vannoy, J. Robert.
1997. Joshua: Theology of. *NIDOTTE* 4: 810-819.
- Vatke, W.
1835. *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt* I. Berlin: Bethge.
- Vaulx, J. de.
1972. *Les Nombres*. Sources Bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda.
- Vaux, Roland de.
- 1960/61. Les chérubins et l'arche d'alliance, les spinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'Ancien Orient. *NUSJ* 37: 91-124.
- 1961^a. *Die hebräischen Patriarchen und die modernen Entdeckungen*. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag.
1961. "Arche d'alliance et Tente de réunion", in: A. Gelin (ed.), *À la rencontre de Dieu. Mém.* Le Puy: Éditions Xavier Mappes: 55-70.
1967. *Bible et Orient*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Verhoef, P. A.
1973. *Methodiek van die eksegeese*. Kaapstad: N.G. Kerk-Uitgewers.
- Veijola, Timo.
2000. *Moses Erben; Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Volkwein, von Bruno.
1969. Masoretisches 'ēdūt, 'ēdwūt, 'ēdōt - «Zeugnis» oder «Bundesbestimmungen»? *BZ* 13: 18-40.
- Vos, G.
1983. *Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Walker, L.L.
1997. בְּרִיתָא. in: *NIDOTTE* I: 740-741.
- Waltke, B.K. and M. O'Connor.

1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbraun.
- Waschke, Ernst-Joachim.
2001. *Der Gesalbte*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Watson, Duane F. & Alan J. Hauser.
1994. *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History & Method*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Watzinger, Carl.
1926. Zur Chronologie der Schichten von Jericho. *ZDMG* 80: 131-136.
- Weippert, Manfred.
1973. Fargen des israelitischen Geschichtsbewusstseins. *VT* 23: 415-442.
- Weiser, Artur.
1961. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. trans. by D.M. Barton. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Weisman, Z.
1981. The Nature and Background of Bâhûr in the Old Testament. *VT* 31: 441-450.
- Wellhausen, J.
1871. *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
1899. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Berlin: Georg Reimer.
1927. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. Berlin⁶: Georg Reimer.
- Werner, W.
1997. *Das Buch Jeremia (1-25)*. NSKAT 19I. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Westermann, Claus.
1968. *Der Segen in der Bibel und im Handeln der Kirche*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Wevers, John William.
1990. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SCSS 30. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars.
1998. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. SCSS 46. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars.
- Whitelam, K.W.
1991. Between History and Literature: The Social Production of Israel's Traditions of Origin. *JSOT* 2.
- Whybray, R.N.
1987. Old Testament Theology - A Non-existent Beast. in: Barry P. Thompson (ed.). *Scripture: Meaning and Method*. Hull: Hull University Press.
1995. *Introduction to the Pentateuch*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Widengren, G.
1948. *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*. Uppsala: Lundequistska.
- Willi-Plein, I.
1997. Michal und die Anfänge des Königtums in Israel. *Congress Volume*: Cambridge 1995: 401-419.
- Willis, John T.
1971. An Anti-Elide Narrative Tradition from a Prophetic Circle at the Ramah Sanctuary. *JBL* 90: 288-308.
1979. Samuel Versus Eli, 1 Sam. 1-7. *TZ* 35.
1990. QUMAH YHWH. *JNSL* XVI: 207-221.
- Wiseman, D.J.

1993. *1 and 2 Kings*. TOTC. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Weiser, A.
1987. *Die Psalmen 1-60*. ATD 14. Göttingen und Zürich: Bandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wolff, I. de & W.H. de Boer.
1975. *De geschiedenis der Godsopenbaring IV*. Enschede: J. Boersma.
- Wood, B.G.
1990. Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho? A New Look at the Archaeological Evidence. *BAR* 16, 2: 44-58.
- Woudstra, M.H.
1965. *The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.
1970. The Tabernacle in Biblical Theological Perspective. in: B. Payne (ed.). *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*. London: Waco: 88-103.
1975. The Ark of the Covenant in Jeremiah 3:16-18. in: J. Cook (ed.). *Grace upon Grace*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans: 117-127.
1981. *The Book of Joshua*. NIC. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Wright, G.E.
1969. *The Old Testament and Theology*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Wright, G.R.H.
1985. *Ancient Building in South Syria and Palestine*. Leiden: Brill.
- Würthwein, E.
1985. *Das erste Buch der Könige 1-16*. ATD 11.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1988. *Der Text des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung in die Biblica Hebraica*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Yadin, Y.
1955. Some Aspects of the Strategy of Ahab and David. *Biblica* 36: 332-351.
- Young, E.J.
1989. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Youngblood, R.F.
1997. Shiloh. in: *NIDOTTE* 4: 1220-1223.
- Zimmerli, W.
1985. *Grundriss der alttestamentlich Theologie*, Fünfte Auflage, Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz: W. Kohlhammer.
- Zobel, H.J.
1973. אֶרֶץ. in: *TWAT* I: 391-404.
1989. צִבְאוֹת. in: *TWAT* IV: 867-891.
- Zohary, Michael.
1982. *Plants of the Bible*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Zwickel, W.
1994. Dagon's abgeschlagener Kopf [1 Samuel v 3-4]. *VT* 44: 239-49.
- Zyl, A.H. van.
1998. *1 Samuel*. POT. Nijkerk: Callenbach.