

THE TABERNACLES OF MOSES AND DAVID

GERRIE MALAN

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS

It seemed to be a simple, straightforward question. A friend asked for my opinion on why David erected a tabernacle (tent) for the Ark of the Covenant in Jerusalem, instead of returning it to the Tabernacle of Moses at Gibeon. My first step was to listen to a podcast on YouTube in this regard, in which the speaker stated the reason being the fact that David was Ruth's great-grandson. As she was a Moabite, the speaker continued that David was prohibited in the Law of Moses from entering the Tabernacle. One article on the topic went even further, claiming it was because David was an illegitimate son (which, in terms of a popular contemporary interpretation, implied being conceived out of wedlock). Both podcaster and writer based their views on the following:

²A bastard shall not enter the assembly of Jehovah; even to the tenth generation shall none of his enter into the assembly of Jehovah. ³An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the assembly of Jehovah; even to the tenth generation shall none belonging to them enter into the assembly of Jehovah for ever (Deuteronomy 23:2-3, ASV).

Consequently I embarked on a study of the biblical record within the applicable cultural environment of the time right from the beginning – starting with Deuteronomy 23. As I progressed I realised again the reality of how misinterpreting Bible text may give an easy answer in one place, but create problems in others. Translation errors also contribute to interpretation errors – for example, rendering of the Hebrew *mamzer* as “illegitimate” in the Holman Christian Standard Bible (“bastard” in the American Standard Version). In the process thus far, I wrote the following two articles:

- [Deuteronomy 23:3-4 Understood Within Proper Context \(The Concept Of So-called Illegitimate Birth Revisited\)](#).
- [Four Women In The Genealogy Of Jesus According To The Gospel Of Matthew](#).

This article on the tabernacles of Moses and David is the concluding part of the study. I strongly recommend reading the abovementioned ones first. It will not only serve to form an accurate understanding of events involved in theories regarding the Tabernacle of David, but will also provide foundational knowledge for other parts of the Bible record, such as the Temple built by Solomon and his entry into it despite being a great-great-grandson of the Moabite, Ruth.

Let there be no doubt about the prominence of all kinds of assumption and philosophical side-stepping that are sadly not based on the correct context, to produce seemingly good explanations in sources I found on the Internet. I sincerely hope that this set of articles will serve to confirm in readers agreement as to why it remains a non-negotiable for us all to take personal responsibility for what we believe and not blindly accept what others say the Bible says. I speak from personal experience!

OVERVIEW: THE TABERNACLE OF MOSES

Tents were the standard dwellings of nomadic people, as Israel were since leaving Egypt. The tabernacle God instructed Moses to make, was a sacred, portable and provisional sanctuary. The basic Hebrew term *mishkan* that is translated as “tabernacle” comes from a verb which indicates temporary dwelling place:

¹The Lord spoke to Moses: (...) ⁸“They are to make a sanctuary for Me **so that I may dwell among them**. ⁹You must make [it] according to all that I show you – the design of the tabernacle as well as the design of all its furnishings.” (HCSB)

The structure that became known as the Tabernacle of Moses was a tent designed by God to fit in with the nomadic circumstances of the Israelites at the time. Most important among the furnishings was the Ark of the Covenant.

’ārōn: A common noun meaning a box, chest, or ark. (...) In a sacred or cultic context, the term identifies the ark of the covenant (Num 10:33), which at one time contained the tablets of the law (Deu 10:5); a copy of the Law which Moses had written (Deu 31:26); a pot of manna (Exo 16:33-34); Aaron's rod (Num 17:10). This word is often used with another word to denote the ark of the covenant: "the ark of the LORD your God" (Jos 4:5); "the ark of God" (1Sa 3:3); "the ark of the God of Israel" (1Sa 5:7); "the holy ark" (2Ch 35:3).ⁱ

This ark was to be housed in the very secluded part, known as the most holy place (or holy of holies), to which only the high priest Aaron would be allowed to enter once a year on the Day of Atonement. This event, to make atonement for the Israelites because of all their sins, was given to them as a permanent statute. The Ark was enclosed by the mercy seat on which God’s presence rested (Exo 25:10-22). It was the resting place of God’s (*shekinah*) glory.

Specific instructions were given on how the tabernacle and its furnishings were to be transported whenever the Israelite camp was to move on. Each one of the items was to be covered with specific cloths. Different families of the Levites were assigned specific tasks and these would be passed on to their descendants. In the ark’s case, this was the Levitical Kohathite family and their descendants. **They were, however not to touch any of the holy objects or to look at the uncovered holy objects, even for a moment, or they would die.** God even instructed Moses and Aaron to ensure that the Kohathite tribal clans were never wiped out from the Levites (Numbers 4).

Instructions on the tabernacle’s transportation included a specific sequence, with the ark being the last to be moved. These instructions ensured that the tabernacle had already been erected at the new site when the ark arrived. Israel’s camp was also to be erected around the tabernacle according to a specific outlay. **The tabernacle was always at the centre.** There was one exception to this transportation sequence - Israel’s crossing of the Jordan River when the ark of the covenant initially went ahead of them (Jos 3:14-17).

After crossing the Jordan, the Israelites camped at **Gilgal** on the plains of Jericho. While it is not described as such, this implied the setting up of the tabernacle there in the camp centre. After they eventually subdued the whole of Canaan, the entire Israelite community assembled at **Shiloh**, where the tabernacle was set up (Joshua 18:1) and the land distribution was completed. Shiloh was an ancient city to the north of Beth-el in the land allocated to Ephraim (Judges 21:19).

Not all sources agree on the period the tabernacle remained at Shiloh. Wikipedia references Talmudic sources stating it was 369 years, before its destruction by the Philistines.ⁱⁱ The Bible also does not describe how and exactly when the tabernacle at Shiloh was destroyed. Reference of such destruction is found in Jeremiah 7:12 and 26:6-9. Archaeological excavations at Shiloh in 2019

confirmed a burnt destruction layer dated close to 1094 BC., which indicates destruction after a period of 305 years.ⁱⁱⁱ

Our Bible record does not give us a detailed history of the tabernacle in Israel. Neither do ancient Jewish sources. It is also not the purpose of this study to search for such history. The book of Judges (20:26-28), however, does describe a turbulent time in Israel's tribal history during which the ark was at Bethel, and where Aaron's grandson Phinehas was serving before it. Although it is not stated as such, this would imply that the tabernacle was also there at that time – indicating a period away from Shiloh.

NOTE: In my study of the tabernacle's movement I realised once again how important it is to weigh content against Hebraic (and thus Biblical) thought. In this thinking approach, the focus is more on events that happen in cycles and not according to a straight and ongoing timeline. It focuses more on situations than attempts to generalise what has happened. Hebraic thought looks at "what" happened and not so much "how" it happened, as Greek (and therefore Western) thought would do. This means that one should look at what a text does say and not at what it does not say.^{iv}

The tabernacle and the ark was again at Shiloh during the time of Eli's high priesthood. During this period Israel was at war with the Philistines. The elders of Israel, without seeking God's will in this regard, decided to bring the ark from Shiloh to the battlefield, expecting this to give them victory over their enemies. However, Israel was defeated, the ark was captured by the Philistines, and Eli's two son's died. On receiving all this news, Eli, who had by then judged Israel 40 years, fell from his chair and died (1 Sam 4:1-11).

- There are different theories on what happened to the tabernacle equipment when the Philistines destroyed Shiloh after their aforementioned battle victory, as the Bible gives no description. One theory is that the curtains and other equipment were removed and hidden elsewhere when warning was received about the approaching Philistine warriors.

Talmudic sources speculate that the tabernacle in Shiloh had been built with stone walls with the old curtains used as roof covering. (Was this perhaps the same at Gibeon)? After Eli's death a sanctuary was erected at **Nob** and after the death of Samuel, who became Israel's judge in Eli's place, at **Gibeon**. The relocation to Gibeon was seemingly caused by the killing of the priests and inhabitants of Nob by Saul, who believed they conspired with David against him (22:6-19). This is where it remained for the rest of Saul's reign, throughout the reign of David, and until the temple in Jerusalem was built during the reign of Solomon.

The Bible does not describe what happened to the tabernacle that was at Gibeon. We read in 2 Chronicles 1:3 that Solomon and the whole assembly with him went to the high place that was in Gibeon because God's tent of meeting, which Moses had made in the wilderness, was there. Later, in the preparations for the Temple dedication, the Levites picked up the ark and brought it, the tent of meeting, and holy utensils to the Temple in Jerusalem (2 Chron 5:4-5). Although it is not clear whether this tent was the original tabernacle of Moses or the tent erected by David in Jerusalem, it may have been the latter as that was where the ark had been kept at the time. The description also seems to indicate so.

Not surprisingly, I found literature to be full of speculation and even pure malpresentation of Scripture as fact. One source, for example, stated that *"In 2 Chron. 1:3-4, Solomon will fetch the*

original Tent of Meeting from Gibeon. This means that, no matter what, the original Tent of Meeting survived the destruction of Shiloh."^v However, these verses do not make any such statement. Verse 13 indicates that Solomon returned to Jerusalem from the high place that was in Gibeon in front of the tent of meeting and he reigned over Israel. Here also, no indication is given that Solomon removed the tent from Gibeon. **As building of the Temple had not yet begun then, such action would have been premature and interfering with the religious ceremonies that had been continuing there.**

OVERVIEW: MOVEMENT OF THE ARK OF THE COVENANT FROM SHILOH ONWARDS

The Bible provides considerable detail on the history of the ark, which is understandable seeing that it was enclosed by the mercy seat on which God's presence rested (Exo 25:10-22), and was the resting place of God's (*shekinah*) glory. It remained in the tabernacle at Shiloh well into the priesthood of Eli under whom Samuel served. The Lord continued to appear in Shiloh, revealing Himself to Samuel (and not to Eli, the chief priest) by His word – and Samuel's words came to all Israel (1 Sam 3:21-4:1).

The various details of the ark's movement can be read in 1 Samuel 4-7, 2 Samuel 6, 1 Chronicles 13-16 and 2 Chronicles 5. I will just touch on some aspects for the purpose of this study.

Following defeat by the Philistines in battle, the elders of Israel decided to take the ark from Shiloh into battle with their enemies, but without seeking the Lord's will. Israel suffered defeat again and the ark of God was captured by the Philistines who took it to their city of Ashdod. God visited various plagues upon them and after the ark had been moved between different cities in the land of the Philistines for seven months, they could no longer bear these plagues. A decision was taken to return the ark to Israel, with some guilt offerings included – gold images of the tumours and mice that plagued them. Two milk cows were hitched to a cart bearing the ark and box containing the offerings. These went up the road to Beth-Shemesh, where the people were overjoyed to see it. They placed the ark on a rock and offered burnt offerings and other sacrifices to the Lord. Having seen this, the five Philistine rulers who walked behind the cart returned to Ekron that same day.

A large number of the men at Beth-Shemesh were struck down by God because they looked at (*or gazed upon*; Tanakh 1917) the ark. Their action was, of course, in contravention of the Lord's directive that not even the Levites were allowed to look at the holy objects, which would see them die (Num 4). Bible versions differ considerably as to how many died, which may be due to editing error in different source documents used. Consequently, however, the ark was moved to Abinadab's house in nearby Kiriath-jearim, where his son Eleazar was consecrated to take care of it. Some sources consider that Abinadab may have been a Levite and therefore regarded to be permitted by Law to look after the Ark of the Covenant (Num 1:50-51). Here the ark remained for about 100 years. Throughout this time religious ceremonies continued at the tabernacle, first at Nob and later at Gibeon. The absence of the ark from the tabernacle also meant the absence of the (*shekinah*) glory presence of the Lord there.

King David's Desire

David, a man after God's own heart (1 Sam 13:14 & Acts 13:22), desired to live in the continual presence of God:

I have asked one thing from the Lord; it is what I desire: to dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, gazing on the beauty of the Lord and seeking [Him] in His temple (Psalm 27:4). (HCSB)

After capturing Jerusalem from the Jebusites, David took up residence in this stronghold, which he named the city of David and which thus became the capital of Israel. A victorious battle with the Philistines followed. Having consulted with his leaders David asked for the whole assembly of Israel's approval to bring the ark to Jerusalem, **while noting it should also be from the Lord.**

David then assembled a large group of men and set out to bring the ark from Abinadab's house to Jerusalem. The first attempt failed because they did not transport the ark according to the prescribed way of God and it was placed in the house of Obed-edom, where it remained three months. For the second attempt they transported the ark in the way that the Law of Moses had stipulated. David instructed that no one but the Levites were to carry the ark (1 Chron 15:2). They successfully brought the ark and placed it inside the tent (or tabernacle) David had erected for it.

- Here the Levite Asaph and his relatives were appointed to be ministers before the ark of the Lord's covenant according to the daily requirements (1 Chron 16:37). This does not preclude the presence of a veil between them and the ark. It also does not indicate deviation from the original directives given by the Lord. The word *pāniym*, translated as "before" is a noun meaning "face" and is mostly used in a figurative, idiomatic phrase, as is the case here.^{vi}
- Zadok the priest and his fellow priests remained at the tabernacle in Gibeon to offer the regular morning and evening burnt offerings to the Lord and to do everything that was written in the law (directives) of the Lord (1 Chron 16:39-40).

This separation between the tabernacle at Gibeon and the tent housing the ark in Jerusalem would remain until the temple that was to be built by Solomon had been completed.

THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID IN JERUSALEM

We now come back to the original question - why David erected a tabernacle (tent) for the Ark of the Covenant in Jerusalem, instead of returning it to the Tabernacle of Moses that was at Gibeon? In my search for the answer I found much theological philosophising, assumptions and content creation in the many sources I worked through. I simply realised once again how philosophising and "creativity" in Scripture interpretation have robbed the Christian environment of the truth, not only in our time, but throughout the centuries past.

As I mentioned in my introductory observations, one popular theory is based on David being Ruth's great-grandson. As she was a Moabite, David would according to this view have been prohibited in the Law of Moses (Deut 23) from entering the Tabernacle (or congregation of the Lord). In addition, and based on Psalm 51:5 (verse 7 in the 1917 translation of the Hebrew Tanakh) David is also described as an "illegitimate" child and could therefore not participate in the worship at the tabernacle of Moses.^{vii}

This theory has important flaws when considered within the correct cultural and historical context of the time at hand. I will touch very briefly on the important aspects. If you have not, please see my articles, [The Mamzer topic of Deuteronomy 23 verse 3&4 understood within true context](#), and [Four Women in the Genealogy of Jesus in the Matthew Gospel](#), for a more expanded discussion of these often misrepresented matters.

Congregation of the Lord

- The first misunderstanding is the expression “congregation of the Lord.” The common Western view is that it describes a religious gathering such as a church meeting. However, according to Jewish interpretation the prohibition of entering the congregation (assembly) of the Lord in Deuteronomy 23 referred to limitation on marriage between an Israelite woman and a Moabite (or Ammonite) male convert.
- The reader may ask how the connection with/of marriage to the expression “may not enter the assembly of the LORD” was made. The answer comes from the Bible itself, for example:

○ *They assembled themselves against Moshe [Moses] and Aharon [Aaron] and said to them, “You take too much on yourselves! After all, the entire community is holy, everyone of them, and Adonai is among them. So why do you lift yourselves up above Adonai’s assembly [qāhāl]?”* (Num 16:3, CJB)

○ *²Because the community had no water, they assembled themselves against Moshe and Aharon. ³The people quarrelled with Moshe and said, “We wish we had died when our brothers died before Adonai. ⁴Why did you bring Adonai’s community [qāhāl] into this desert? To die there, we and our livestock?* (Num 20:2-4, CJB)

- Bear in mind that lineage was always tracked through the males, being the carriers of the seed, throughout most of the Bible times (see Deut 25:5-11). Marriage of an Israelite woman to a Moabite convert would introduce prohibited seed into the lineage, and into the “congregation of the Lord,” which was not so in the case of an Israelite male producing offspring through marriage with a Moabite female convert. This interpretation relating to marriage was eventually canonised in *Mishna Yebamot* (8:3).^{viii}
- The focus in this regard on the position of the male Israelite versus the female is reflected also in Deuteronomy 21:10-14, for example, which allowed marriage to a foreign woman captured in war. Ruth was a Moabite convert to faith in the Israelite God (Ruth 1:16). There was consequently no limitation in this regard of marriage to Boaz, David’s great-grandfather. Therefore, there was no limitation on king David as to his position as an Israelite and being a member of the “congregation of the Lord.”
- In studying the original construction of the tabernacle by Moses and the activities connected to it, I could not find any description of religious gatherings (in the sense of synagogue or church type meetings) by the Israelites inside the tabernacle, nor even the outer court. The outer court was where slaughtering of animals for the daily morning and evening sacrifices (burnt offerings), as well as individual sacrifices by Israelites took place. The burnt offering was brought to the entrance of the tabernacle to be accepted by the Lord and the animal was to be slaughtered before the Lord (Lev 1). The fire on the altar was to be kept burning continually (Lev 6:13).

- Even the strangers who lived among the Israelite people were allowed to bring sacrifices and burnt offerings to the tabernacle (Lev 17:8-9).

David as “Illegitimate” person

The second part of the flawed theory proposes that David was an “illegitimate” child (or *mamzer*), one conceived out of wedlock in the popular Western-minded view, and on this basis also not allowed to enter the congregation of the Lord according to Deuteronomy 23:2. This part of the theory is based on David’s cry in Psalm 51:5 (verse 7 in the Jewish Tanakh):

Indeed, I was guilty when I was born; I was sinful when my mother conceived me.
(HCSB)

Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.
(Tanakh, 1917)

Rashi, a Jewish Rabbi of the eleventh century and regarded as a foremost Biblical commentator, explained David’s cry as saying how could he not sin when the main part of his creation was through *coitus*, the source of many iniquities. Another explanation is that David described the main part of his creation being from a male and female, both of whom were full of iniquity. Thus although the soul is pure, his formation, as whole, had negative influences. According to Jewish mysticism, the thoughts of one's parents when the child is conceived creates the garments for the soul that is drawn down (from heaven).^{ix}

There is no Scripture describing or suggesting David being conceived out of wedlock, which in his case would also have implied an adulterous relationship of his mother. If that were so, she and the man with whom she committed adultery would have been put to death (Lev 20:10). This Psalm was a cry of repentance by David after Nathan the prophet confronted him with his sin involving Bathsheba. Please see my article on the *mamzer* topic for more information on the concept and prohibitions that applied.

Did everyone have access to the ark in David’s tabernacle?

Within the theories regarding the tabernacle of David is the notion that it was a simple, one-roomed tent, with no veil to cover any view of the ark. The internet abounds with pictures based on such assumption, and some show very small tents that only just cover the ark.

A lesson of one Bible college, for example, states that there was no veil and people had daily access into the presence of God. There was a constant flow of people into this tabernacle, bringing praise and worship before the Ark of the Lord.^x

I will be dealing with the outlay of the tent that David erected, but wish to make some observations first regarding this alleged/assumed entrance of people into the presence of the Ark of the Lord:

- The Lord’s original instructions on the movement and placement of the ark included that not even the Levites designated to carry the ark and holy objects were to touch any of these objects **or to look at the uncovered holy objects, even for a moment, or they would die.**
- Events pertaining to the movement of the ark since its capture by the Philistines confirm the Lord’s anger when it is treated without respect for His directives. At Beth-Shemesh, on the

return of the ark to Israel by the Philistines, a considerable number of Israelites died for gazing upon the ark (1 Sam 6:19). During David's first attempt to bring the ark to Jerusalem, Uzzah died for his irreverence in touching the ark. Realising and correcting their mistake of not following the Lord's procedures in the first attempt, the ark was successfully brought to Jerusalem and placed inside the tent (tabernacle) David had pitched for it (1 Chron 15-16:1).

- It would in the light of these events and David's acknowledgement that they did not follow the Lord's directives, be unthinkable to assume that in placing the ark inside the tent, he would once again ignore the original instructions by God through Moses.

The design of David's tabernacle

The view that David pitched a simple, one-roomed tent for the ark of the Lord is wrong and probably arising from the lack of any description in this regard in the Bible. An important lesson we should follow to protect us against misinterpretations of Scripture, and which I noted earlier in my discussion of the tabernacle Moses, is to not look at what a text does not say, but at what it does say. In our evaluation of this whole study of the tabernacles of Moses and David, and the movement of the ark of the Lord, we need to bear in mind that the Hebrew (or Biblical) thinking focused more on events that happened in cycles and not according to a straight and ongoing timeline. It focuses more on situations (what) than attempts to generalise what has happened (or how).^{xi} Our Western thought patterns, however sincere we may intend to be, can be misleading.

With all of this in mind, together with the discussion thus far, I am at peace with my conclusion that **David would have followed God's original tabernacle outlay and that the ark of the Lord was placed out of sight behind a veil in the tent.** To the Israelite there would be no need to explain the outlay, as it was a known concept for them. This understanding is certainly affirmed by the progress of events from thereon up to the building and dedication of the temple of God in Jerusalem by Solomon. Completion and commissioning of the temple itself, with all the Mosaic rituals and ceremonies concentrated once again in one place, puts all the philosophising and assumptions that describe movement away from the directives of God to a **temporary** "period of grace" into question. Just think, for example, how many times is the synagogue outlay explained in the New Testament? It is not done even once despite the prominent role it occupied in the NT text.

Why then, did David not simply return the ark to the tabernacle of Moses?

The popular answers which may be found woven into the discussion thus far vary from David's so-called bastard-status and therefore being prohibited from entering the tabernacle, absence of a veil separating people from the ark (presence) of the Lord, and God's mercy manifested.

My own (uninformed) previous belief was that the ark was at Kiriath-jearim, in close vicinity to the tabernacle at first Nob and then Gibeon, for almost 100 years. The priests were, however, satisfied to go through the rituals without the presence of the Lord and so made no attempt to bring the ark to its designated place in God's sanctuary behind the veil.

Another Scripture-referenced explanation: King David's view was that God had abandoned the old tabernacle (Psalm 78:67-72). The tabernacle of David was a foretaste of New Testament worship – "*Whosoever will may come!*" (Mark 8:34-35).^{xii} Three obvious flaws are present in this explanation: Firstly, Psalm 78 is a Psalm of Asaph and not of David. Secondly, the verses noted do not mention or even imply the tabernacle of Moses. They refer to the "tent of Joseph," in other words, the house/posterity of Joseph. Thirdly, the referenced portion of Mark has no mention of entering the tabernacle of David. What we see displayed here is the principle of proof-texting, taking Scripture portions out of their true context to "prove" a viewpoint.

All the while, through many writings and sermons and philosophising, the answer to King David's decision is in plain sight in the Bible, spoken to the entire congregation of Israel in King Solomon's dedication of the temple (2 Chron 6:4-6):

⁴He said: May the LORD God of Israel be praised! He spoke directly to my father David, and He has fulfilled the promise by His power. He said, ⁵"Since the day I brought My people Israel out of the land of Egypt, I have not chosen a city to build a temple in among any of the tribes of Israel, so that My name would be there, and I have not chosen a man to be ruler over My people Israel. ⁶But I have chosen Jerusalem so that My name will be there, and I have chosen David to be over My people Israel." (HCSB)

Jerusalem remained a Jebusite city after Israel's conquest of Canaan and only became the capital city of Israel when it was captured by David. It came to be described by God as the centre of the (known) world:

This is what the Lord God says: I have set this Jerusalem in the center of the nations with countries all around her. (Ezek 5:5, HCSB)

Taking the Ark of God's presence to Jerusalem was directed by God and was only a step on the way to the temple that would eventually be built by David's son, Solomon (1 Chron 17:1-15)..

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

A simple question I was asked, leading to an intensive study of various Old Testament Scriptures: Once again I realised how defective and limited much of my accumulation of "Bible knowledge" seems to be. This study, has taken me on a route spanning many centuries of Biblical history and much factual knowledge that has been polluted by many theological philosophies. When I started out I had little doubt that my findings would confirm my longstanding belief that for almost 100 years Israel's priestly caste were satisfied to go through the religious rituals without the presence of the Lord at the tabernacle of Moses. Consequently they made no attempt to bring the ark to its designated place behind the veil in God's sanctuary. I even regarded Isaiah 29:13 (repeated by Jesus of Nazareth in Matthew 15:7-9), as support for this view:

Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men (...) (KJV).

Today I know better and my knowledge of various concepts on the way to a new conclusion has been enriched enormously. The study, beginning with the *mamser* concept in Deuteronomy 23, going through the histories of four women mentioned in the Messianic genealogy recorded in the Gospel by Matthew, and now ending with the tabernacle of David in Jerusalem, has been an extremely valuable teaching.

Apart from correcting a number of flaws in my own Bible knowledge, I believe there are valuable lessons for the child of God's daily life to learn from David's decision and efforts to settle the ark of the Lord in Israel's capital city, Jerusalem. In fact, as I look at the political situations throughout the world, I realise more than ever before it would benefit the nations if they had leaders who followed David's example. He consulted with all his leaders and followed it up by acquiring agreement from the whole assembly (nation) of Israel for his desire to bring the ark to Jerusalem. Most importantly, however, he declared it needed to be God's will. Only then did he take up the task.

ⁱ ZODHIATES, S. Strong No. H727. The Complete WordStudy Dictionary. E-Sword version.

ⁱⁱ WIKIPEDIA. 2019. *Shiloh (Biblical City)*. [https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shiloh_\(biblical_city\)](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shiloh_(biblical_city)).

ⁱⁱⁱ MALES, A. 2016. *Reconstructing The Destruction Of The Tabernacle Of Shiloh*. Jewish Bible Quarterly. <https://jbnqnew.jewishbible.org/jbnq-past-issues/441-january-march-2016>

^{iv} WUENCH, Dr. HANS-GEORG. *The Stranger In God' Land -Foreigner, Stranger, Guest: What Can We Learn From Israel's Attitude Towards Strangers?*

http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1010-99192014000300019. Retrieved 23 September 2019.

^v KUKIS.ORG. *The Movement Of The Ark And The Tent Of God*.

www.kukis.org/Doctrines/Movement-of-Ark-and-Tent.pdf

^{vi} ZODHIATES, S. Strong No. H6440. The Complete WordStudy Dictionary. E-Sword version

^{vii} SMITH, D. 2016. *Why did King David set up the Tabernacle of David?* OpentheWord.org.

<https://opentheword.org/2016/09/18/why-did-king-david-build-the-tabernacle-of-david/>

^{viii} *Mishnah Yevamot (8:3)*. https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Yevamot.8.3?lang=bi

^{ix} DANZINGER. L. 2008. Email reply to my question lodged on the Ask The Rabbi facility at www.chabad.org. 1 June.

^x ONLINE BIBLE COLLEGE. 1984. *The Tabernacle Of David*. www.online-bible-college.com.

^{xi} WUENCH. Op.cit.

^{xiii} PHIFER, S. *God' Dwelling Places: David's Tabernacle. #107*. Global Christian Center.

<https://globalchristiancenter.com/worship-resources/fire-and-form-of-worship/1783-gods-dwelling-places-davids-tabernacle-107>.

BIBLE VERSIONS

Quotations in this article come from various versions of the Bible, as has been indicated in each case. They have been used according to permission granted by each publisher:

ASV (American Standard Version). E-Sword, version 12.0.1.

CJB (The Complete Jewish Bible) by David H. Stern. E-Sword.

HCSB (The Holman Christian Standard Bible), Holman Bible Publishers, Nashville, Tennessee. E-Sword.

KJV (The King James Version). E-Sword.

I dedicate this three-part study report to my two grandsons, Wayne Cloete and José Malan. Let the search for Biblical truth guide you through life and do not let the world's theological philosophies disturb your search. After all, it is the truth that sets one free, and not theology or philosophies. Follow the example of David and seek God's will whenever important decisions are to be made.
