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Preface

Recent breakthroughs in the study of genealogies have prompted this new study based on 1 Chronicles 1-9. Although the following discourse is by no means a final answer, it should be viewed rather as a step in the right direction.

Prior to the final approval of this thesis, the dissertation committee brought to my attention two quite recent works dealing with this same area. Because of my inability to read Modern Hebrew I was not aware of their existence. It is therefore at this point that I include a review of these two works, and add a note of appreciation to my translator, Dr. Alisa Wlickman.

The first is Sara Japhet's The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought (Jerusalem, 1977). She believes Chronicles is essentially a composition of a single author and can be dated generally in the fourth century; she bases this on the book's outlook, aims, characteristic language and style. If her approach is correct, the book was written after Ezra and Nehemiah.

Further, the theme of election has two focuses: that of Israel, and that of David. The former is almost non-existent and is based on the love Abraham had for God. The latter is shown both as pre-destined and as realized
in history—as Solomon's election proves also.

The activity of God in the history of Israel shows God's direct involvement in her fate. The kingdom over Israel is the kingdom of God. This is recognized in everyday life via the ruling king who sits on "God's throne over Israel" and is therefore "a king for God."

The Northern Kingdom is looked upon as illegitimate since it is in rebellion against God. However, the term "all Israel" includes both those loyal to God in the North as well as all Judah since they are all God's people.

The genealogies are an introduction to the remainder of the book as seen by its contents and form. They are concerned with the identity of the people and where they settled. Israel is made of twelve tribes and by their unification they express the real meaning of "all Israel."

The renewal of Israel's greatness will be a result of God's continued work in the nation of Israel and not an eschatological renewal. All the themes in the book, including the idealistic glorification of David and Solomon, point to this conclusion.

The second work (post-humously published) is by Mordecai Kazin, Census Lists and Genealogies and Their Historical Implications for the Times of David and Saul, edited by S. L. Bendor (Oranim, 1976). It is chiefly concerned with the military structure of Israel as found in the census lists within the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9 and elsewhere. The book is difficult to summarize.
because it consists of Kazin's notes and do not form a coherent whole. The census lists found in 1 Chronicles 1-9 basically reflect a restructuring of the political organization of the tribes of Israel during the time of Saul, David, and Solomon. The tribal society was being replaced by a central authority. He defines "valiant men" as professional fighters who belong to the king. The term is used in a military context unique to the monarchy.

Razin outlines three different census lists in Chapter Five with each belonging to a different period. Gad's (vv. 11-17) belongs to the time of Jeroboam; Reuben, Gad, and half of Manasseh's (vv. 18-20) belong to the time of Saul, and the third (vv. 23-24) to the time of David. Saul constructed his military power base against the Philistines in Transjordan. When David became king, he inherited this structure but reorganized it by appointing different leaders. This explains why there is no continuity between the three lists.

David's influence is also found in the census list of Issachar since all the "heads of their households" are present in David's administrative lists as well. The situation with Asher is similar. The mixed ethnic character of the list reflects appointments made by David intending to break the power of the traditional tribal organization. Zebulun (7:6-12), Naphtali, and Ephraim also fall into this scheme.

The boundaries discussed in Benjamin's genealogy
found in Chapter Eight are included with the intent that David can establish his right over Saul's legacy over "all Israel." The listing of the Gibeonites separately from Benjamin gives David a historical right to the territory since they were subjugated to Israel and not to Benjamin alone.

Finally, a discussion of the terminology for the word 'genealogy' must be given as a supplement to that found on pages 77 and 87 of this study. The two most common terms are שותי תַּלְדִּית and נִנָּה תַּלְדִּית. The former occurs in older literature and the latter in post-exilic Hebrew. The occurrence of שותי תַּלְדִּית in Chronicles is explained as the term found in its sources and is in keeping with the Chronicler's archaizing tendency.

נִנָּה תַּלְדִּית itself is based on the verb תַּלְדִּי, meaning "to bear, to begat," and is usually translated in the LXX by γενεαλογεως and in English as "generations." It means "to have oneself registered by genealogy" and suggests a written form.

Actually, the two terms are roughly equivalent since both are defined as "genealogy" in a general sense. This is shown in several ways. 1) In Chronicles both terms are used in tandem with the same genealogy in view (1 Chronicles 5:7, 7:9). It may be that שותי תַּלְדִּית became a standard formula for census lists (cf. Numbers 1:20ff) so that it was retained in these instances; in view of this, perhaps it should be inserted in 7:2 also (BH). 2) Both terms
INTRODUCTION

Before the investigation contained in this paper can begin, a word must be said concerning its organization. It will have two major parts. Part One will discuss questions of introduction relating to the narrative portion of 1 and 2 Chronicles with its genealogical section found in 1 Chronicles 1-9. The material covered will be a review of recent literature on Chronicles, a statement concerning its date and purpose, and an investigation of the unity between the genealogical section and the narrative section of Chronicles.

Part Two will investigate the nature of the genealogies themselves. This will include a survey of the recent literature dealing with genealogies, the nature of genealogies, the social structure of tribal Israel, and the external as well as the internal structure of the genealogies. This last item will attempt to deal with the form and function of the genealogies and their redactional history.

The question may be asked, "Why a study of genealogies at all?" A general answer is that an impressive amount of new material has been written on the books of Chronicles specifically and on various Old Testament genealogies in particular. Yet none of its new insights has been applied to 1 Chronicles 1-9 in a systematic way. It is the intent
of this dissertation to do this with the hope that it will advance our understanding of the relation between the genealogical and the narrative sections of the books of Chronicles, and further, to understand the redactional history of the genealogies.

Though methodological considerations will be discussed in detail within the appropriate sections, a general statement is in order here. The first section will apply the results of the theological approach to the genealogies to see if they are found in them also. This will chiefly concern the theological themes and historical motifs found in the narratives along with the particular exegetical methods employed by the Chronicler to communicate his ideas.¹

The second section will be a comparative investigation. By comparing the nature and use of genealogies which are found in an oral tribal society as well as in a literate centralized society with the genealogies of the Old Testament, new understanding can be discovered about their functions, origins, and structures. This approach necessitates the proposed description of modern oral genealogies and ancient Near Eastern genealogies.

¹The term 'Chronicler' is used for convenience only and should not be thought of as prejudging the larger question of Ezra and Nehemiah's relation to Chronicles.
PART ONE

QUESTIONS OF INTRODUCTION RELATING TO THE GENEALOGIES AND NARRATIVE SECTIONS OF 1 AND 2 CHRONICLES

CHAPTER ONE: A REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE ON CHRONICLES

Any discussion concerning the genealogies must take into account the context wherein the genealogies are found. This involves all positions adopted toward the questions of introduction regarding 1 and 2 Chronicles. It is the intent of this section to review recent scholarly contributions and to contribute further ideas to the discussion.

Historical Validity

Until recently, scholars tended to have little respect for Chronicles. Consequently, little was done in this area. The book appeared to be filled with error and inconsistency. The general attitude was that wherever the Chronicler deviated from his sources, he was unreliable. Wellhausen strongly defended this view. ¹ He did allow for an occasional

¹ Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, tr. J. Sutherland Back and Allan Menzies, (Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885), p. 207, says, "It is thus apparent how inventions of the most circumstantial kind have arisen. . . . One is hardly warranted, therefore, in taking the definiteness of statements vouched for by Chronicles alone as proof of their accuracy."
bit of factual history in one statement he made: "It is indeed possible that occasionally a grain of good corn may occur among the chaff. . . ."¹ Driver followed this view by saying, "In these and similar representations . . . there is certainly not much that can be true."² This view has been well represented by several English-speaking scholars such as Curtis and Madsen, Oesterley and Robinson, and Pfeiffer.³ The latter was the most vocal in his rhetoric against the historical value of Chronicles. He vividly displays his view by stating, ". . . the fantasy and picturesque detail of his tales would make him an eligible contributor to the Arabian Nights."⁴ In a recent article North has reaffirmed this position. He examined four events in the books of Chronicles which scholars such as Albright, Myers, and Noth see on the basis of archaeology as more accurate than the parallel data in 2 Kings. These are 2 Chronicles 32:3, 20; 35:20-24; 20:1-30; 33:10-17. He concludes ". . . that no single use of extrabiblical

¹Ibid., p. 224.


⁴Ibid., p. 806.
sources by the Chronicler has ever been proved."¹

Not everyone was negative toward the historical material in Chronicles because of the discoveries of archaeology. The Weidner texts led the way by revealing five of Jehoiachin's seven sons. This corroborates 1 Chronicles 3:17-18.² W. F. Albright strongly defended the historical reliability of Chronicles. His famous article, "The Date and the Personality of the Chronicler," began his campaign to defend the historical material therein.³ All the archaeological material was gathered and presented in the Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume.⁴ The Albright school was influential in forcing a new look at the historical trustworthiness of Chronicles. Jacob Meyers has recently given strong support to this view of Chronicles through his two-volume commentary in the Anchor Bible Series.⁵ A variation of this view is that of Noth and his


³ W. F. Albright, JBL 40 (1921): 104-127.


⁵ I and II Chronicles, 2 vol., (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1965), 1: xv, xviii, xxiv, xlv. The article by
followers who approach Chronicles in line with the literary critical method. ¹ He states that each historical fact must be thoroughly investigated before a decision can be made as to its historical value. ²

Many scholars choose to work with the theological aspect of Chronicles. They recognize that the Chronicler was writing for a specific historical situation. He carefully selected his material and organized it to fit his purpose. As will be seen later, it was a two-pronged aim: to legitimize the political and religious structure of the post-exilic community, and to show why they were in their present situation.

It was Hānel and later von Rad who pioneered in this approach. ³ Two basic methods are used by this school to determine the Chronicler’s theology. One is to see what material he omitted from his known sources, while the other examines what he added to those sources. ⁴ Neither approach

1 Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1943), pp. 110-122.
2 Ibid., p. 139.
4 A. M. Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses sources," RB 60 (1953): 481-508; 61 (1954): 349-386. He errs in finding a theological meaning in every difference between Kings and Chronicles. He also failed to allow for different textual traditions.
could produce a true concept of the theology of Chronicles. In addition, one needs an understanding of the arrangement of the materials. Instrumental in the molding together of all three aspects was Peter Ackroyd. His approach attempts to strike a balance between history and theology.

Central in this approach is the question of midrash. Does it exist in Chronicles or not? Back in 1896, W. E. Barnes presented his opinion that Chronicles was midrash. With no rigid definition of midrash, it was found throughout Chronicles. Even today the debate centers on the question of how to define midrash in these early stages of its development. Is it an exegetical method or a genre? Addison Wright concluded in his study that it was a genre of literature and not a technique of exegesis. He points out that the primary characteristic of midrashic literature is a quote of scripture which is followed by some type of comment. He feels it is very important for the elaboration or interpretation of scripture to exist to clarify the biblical text under discussion. The intent of the author


4Ibid., p. 133.
is very important for if this is known, the reader can then know that the comment is for the elaboration of the text. As a genre, midrash is a literature about a literature.¹

In his discussion of midrashic method, he isolates only one main factor: sequence. There must be a continuity between the text and the interpretation.² All other methods of exegesis and interpretation which occur in midrash may also be found in other types of literature. An example of this is the historian who uses scriptural quotations in his text. The intent of the author is to give historical facts which suit the purpose of the work. In doing this, the interpretation of the scriptural passage used may be changed. In such cases the work cannot be called midrash because the text is secondary to the work. Wright says, "History is concerned with the interpretation of events; midrash is concerned with the interpretation of texts."³ He finds no midrash in the Old Testament.

The very use of the term midrash in 2 Chronicles casts doubt upon this result. However, the term as it is used in 13:22 and 24:27 is neutral in its connotation.⁴ The strict

---

¹Ibid., p. 133.
²Ibid., p. 135.
A narrow definition of midrash is:

a learned and edifying elaboration and expansion of Biblical histories. . . .

We must picture midrash as a compilation which has gathered all sorts of material, a work not all of one piece but containing contradictions and repetitions.

Mosis and Ackroyd talk about exegetical methods found in the Chronicler, some of which developed into later midrash. The observed techniques are an assumed knowledge of the sources, reinterpretation of the texts used, and the light shed upon the present situation by the application of these texts. Childs appears to have a similar definition by which the exegetical method of Biblical writers can be termed "developing midrash." He finds two important rules. First, the interpretation of an old text is connected to a new situation. Second, the interpretation of a text is derived from the situation and moves back to the text. He calls this a form-critical understanding of midrash.

He examines three categories of exegetical activity: a) scriptural citation: in Chronicles this means investigating the use of the text in its new location; b) harmonization between

---

4 Examples are Jeremiah 29:13f, 1 Chronicles 28:9 and 2 Chronicles 15:2, Ibid., p. 54.
texts: the finding of two parallel accounts and weaving them into a third;  

1 c) establishment of a new context: the insertion of a text into a new context to give it a new role.  

2 Within the confines of these definitions, such exegetical activity is discernible in both the genealogies and the narrative sections of the book as will be seen later.

The theological approach generally isolates four basic themes in 1 and 2 Chronicles. These are retribution, cultus, Davidism, and legitimacy.  

3 Of course, the labels used differ among scholars, but the general consensus is consistent. One of the lesser themes which occurs occasionally is that of messianism—or in a broader context, eschatology.  

4 A recent contribution of the theological

---

1 2 Chron. 2:32; see B. S. Childs, Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, SBT 2nd ser., 3 (Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1967), pp. 104ff.

2 The example of Childs is the superscription of some Psalms which refers to David's life. Psalm 34 is connected with 1 Sam. 21:10ff. Childs, "Midrash," p. 57.


approach is the recognition of a close relationship between 
David and Solomon. The Chronicler regarded them as equal 
participants in the golden age of Israel. They are both 
kings by divine election, "all Israel" supports both, and 
they have a keen interest in the cult and its personnel. 
Further, Solomon is presented as without fault.¹

Williamson has shown that the accession of Solomon to 
the throne of Judah is modeled after Joshua's acceptance of 
the leadership over the Israelites just before the Conquest 
period. This serves to illustrate the unity of the reigns 
of David and Solomon in the eyes of the Chronicler.²

The Purpose of Chronicles

The theological approach, coupled with a proper regard 
for the history found in Chronicles, gives a new understanding

Rothstein & Hānel, Das erste Büch der Chronik (Leipzig: 
D. Werner Schell, 1927), II, ix-xi ; Gerhard von Rad, Das 
Geschichtsbild des Chronistischen Werkes (Stuttgart, 1930). 
Those who deny Messianism are: O. Flöger, Theocracy and 
Eschatology (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968); A. Caquot, "Peut-on 
parler le Messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?" RTP 99 
(1966): 110-20; G. Wilda, Das Königsbild des chronistischen 
Geschichtswerkes (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms 
Universität, 1959), pp. 109-112; W. Rudolph, "Problems of 
the Books of Chronicles," pp. 408-409; J. Newsome, Jr., 
"Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His 

¹R. L. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles," 

²H. G. M. Williamson, "The Accession of Solomon in 
of his work. It shows a sovereign God working through history. Elmslie described it as "the only instance in Hebraic philosophy of history presented on an immense scale."\textsuperscript{1} The Chronicler was striving to comprehend the events of history according to his particular theological viewpoint.\textsuperscript{2}

The centrality of the Davidic Kingdom and of the office of the prophet has often been noted in Chronicles. It was God who worked through these two areas (political and religious) in order to preserve Israel. Herein lay the future hope of Israel. In fact, the Chronicler emphasized that the Davidic King was a prophet.\textsuperscript{3} Von Rad noted that the Chronicler's theology of history emphasized almost a manipulative action by God upon Israel's history.\textsuperscript{4} It was God who formed the Davidic Kingdom. It was God who attended to the affairs of the Kingdom. It was God who exiled and restored Judah to the land.

The Chronicler's view of history served to indicate to the people the legitimate religious and political institutions necessary for a restored kingdom since it showed God's

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{1}W. A. L. Elmslie, "The First and Second Books of Chronicles," The Interpreter's Bible III (1952-7), p. 341.


\textsuperscript{3}James Newsome, Jr., "Toward a New Understanding," pp. 203-204.

\end{quote}
approval or disapproval of particular things. Everything approved is linked to the Davidic Age. Herein lies the purpose for the large amount of genealogical material.\textsuperscript{1} The high priest, Zerubbabel, the Levites, and the people in general are legitimized by genealogies. Since David and Solomon were the elected rulers, and since all proper cultic functions originated with them, all political and cultic institutions and personnel are traced back to them.\textsuperscript{2}

One purpose of the Chronicler then is to establish an ongoing kingdom which is properly connected to the Kingdom of God. The other purpose is to show the reason for the exile. By doing this the Chronicler hoped he would help the people not to make the same mistake as before. This aim is specifically stated by the Chronicler. The recurring theme in the prayer of Solomon is blessing and punishment. The most prominent literary technique after the death of Solomon is the development of this theme.\textsuperscript{3} This purpose served to make the books of Chronicles relevant to the situation of the age for which he was writing. The so-called theme of retribution is predominant in the explication of this purpose.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1} Chronicles 1-9; 23-27; Ezra 2:1-63, note especially v. 62.


\textsuperscript{3} 2 Chronicles 6:22-39.

\textsuperscript{4} Harrison, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 1158-1159.
The Date of Chronicles

Recent research has suggested that the books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are a compilation of three editions: Chr₁, Chr₂, and Chr₃. They are respectively dated 520-15 B.C.E., 458 B.C.E., and 400 B.C.E.¹ This view gives the memoirs of Nehemiah a separate existence from Ezra and Nehemiah 7:22b-8:12. This earlier edition is labelled Chr₂ and includes 1 Chronicles 10 through 2 Chronicles 34 plus the Vorlage of I Esdras which is based on the Egyptian textual family.² Chr₁ is the present MT of 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah. Chr₁ consists of 1 Chronicles 10 through 2 Chronicles 34 plus the Vorlage of I Esdras 1:1-5:65 which supports the work of Zerubbabel.³

The edition theory received its first formulation in an article by D. N. Freedman.⁴ His argument rests upon the emphasis on the Davidic Kingdom and the office of the prophet in Chronicles and their omission in Ezra and Nehemiah. He proposed that Chr₁ be dated ca. 515 B.C.E. and Chr₂ about 400 B.C.E.⁵ Several years later a linguistic study by S. Japhet concluded that Ezra and Nehemiah were earlier

² Ibid., p. 11.
³ Ibid., p. 13.
⁴ The Chronicler's Purpose, pp. 436-442.
⁵ Ibid., p. 441.
than Chronicles and were written by a different author.¹ J. Newsome rejected her findings and, writing one year later than Cross, independently came to conclusions similar to Cross though from a different vantage point.² The basic intent of his study was to support Freedman's position by the use of three arguments. 1) He shows the importance of prophecy and monarchy in Chronicles and its lack of importance in Ezra-Nehemiah. 2) He finds an international attitude in Chronicles which is non-existent in Ezra-Nehemiah. 3) Finally, the popular "Levitical sermon" in Chronicles is absent from Ezra-Nehemiah.³ From his analysis he believes 1 Chronicles 10 through 2 Chronicles 24 was written ca. 515 B.C.E.⁴ He feels this is the period during which kingdom, prophecy, and cult were of primary concern to the post-exilic community.

For the present then, it seems that the date of 400 B.C.E. and the unity of the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are seriously challenged. Ever since W. F. Albright showed that the so-called Greek words in these works were Persian,⁵ the list of scholars who have adopted

²"Toward a New Understanding," p. 217, note 42.
³Ibid., pp. 203-215.
⁵"The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," p. 117.
this date is impressive: W. Rudolph, Eissfeldt, J. M. Myers, Harrison, Ackroyd, and Elmslie, to name a few.\footnote{1}{Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. x; Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, p. 540; Myers, IOAB, p. lxxxvii-lxxxix; Harrison, An Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 1157; Ackroyd, TEF, pp. 25-27; Elmslie, The Interpreter's Bible III, p. 345f.}

Other evidence of the Aramaic section of Ezra being contemporaneous with the Elephantine papyri, is the fact that the last Persian king named is Darius II (423-405 B.C.E.), and the Davidic genealogy in 1 Chronicles 3:10-24 is said to continue until the seventh generation of Jehoiachin. Allowing 23 years per generation, the date of ca. 400 B.C.E. is approximately correct. It must be noted also that the Chr\textsubscript{3} is dated about 400 B.C.E. \footnote{2}{Cross, "Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," pp. 11-12.} Cross calls attention to the fact that no reference to Alexander is found; nor is any mention made of the suffering and chaos of the period of 350 B.C.E.\footnote{3}{F. Michaeli, Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et Nehémie, CAT (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestle, 1987), p. 12.} Today there is only one scholar who maintains a late date for Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.\footnote{4}{See Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, p. 450.} Most scholars hold the belief that additions entered the texts of the Chronicler's work at one time or another.\footnote{4}{See Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, p. 450.}
The Text of Chronicles

The Qumran discoveries have shed important light on the textual family lying behind the sections which the Chronicler borrowed from Samuel and Kings. It is unfortunate, however, that only four legible words from Chronicles itself have been found. 1 Actually, there are parallels between four passages: three from 2 Samuel and one from 1 Kings. A fragment from Qumran,2 Q Sam³, a Lucianic recension of the LXX, and Chronicles MT agree against the Samuel MT. It seems clear that the Chronicler used an old Palestinian text to compile his work. The indication is that the text of Samuel used by the Chronicler was superior to that of the MT. ³ Another valuable contribution is the work of Leslie C. Allen who assembled 46 MSS. of Paralipomena and compared them to determine the Greek Vorlage.

3 1 Q Sam // Samuel 23:9-12 // 1 Chronicles 11:12-14.
4 Q Sam // 2 Samuel 24:16b-17a // 1 Chronicles 21:15b-17a; Ibid., 128f, note 40a.

After comparing their variants with the MT of Chronicles, he found that in most cases the MT contained the superior reading. This work produced a strong defense for the received text of Chronicles.  

---

1 The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text, VI supplement (Leiden: Brill, 1974).
CHAPTER TWO: THE UNITY OF 1 CHRONICLES ONE THROUGH NINE AND 1 CHRONICLES TEN THROUGH 2 CHRONICLES 36:23

Scope of the Study and Methodological Considerations

Many scholars in the past have considered 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 to be a later addition to the main body of 1 and 2 Chronicles. Among these are Welch, Rudolph, and Myers. The major reasons for this are varied, but largely seem to be the result of preconceived notions concerning the intent and content of the genealogies.

As stated above, F. Cross has suggested that the work of the Chronicler passed through three editions: Chr₁, Chr₂, and Chr₃. According to his thesis, the genealogies were added in the third edition since they list genealogically the house of David and the high priests down to so late a date. Also connected with Chr₃ are the Hebrew

1 Adam Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism (Edinburgh and London: The Oxford University Press, 1935), pp. 185-86; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 3; Myers, IGAE, p. xli.


sections of Ezra and Nehemiah. Many recent articles upon
which Cross builds his case had already sought to show that
Ezra and Nehemiah were later compositions. The only recent
work defending the unity of the genealogies with the body
of Chronicles is Johnson's Biblical Genealogies.

It is the intent of this section to study the unity
between 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 and 1 Chronicles 10 through
36:23. This will follow a three-fold process: the theolog-
ical themes, the historical motifs, and the literary

techniques.

Important in the study will be the contextual functions
of the genealogies. Though the Chronicler has used many
different sources in the compilation of his genealogies,
he has united them in such a way as to give certain functions
to the individual segments as well as to the total structure.
The intention of this chapter is to demonstrate that the
same structure, theology, and literary techniques are used
in both the narrative and genealogical sections of Chronicles.

In discussing these themes, the relationship of Ezra
and Nehemiah to Chronicles --and thus to the genealogies --
will not be considered since that is outside the scope of

1D. N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," pp. 436,
442; S. Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles
James O. Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding," pp. 201-217;
Roddy L. Braun, "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's
Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew Toward an Historical Typology
of Biblical Hebrew Prose (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978),
pp. 69-75 suggests Chronicles and Ezra are linguistically
the same.

2See pp. 47-55.
the present study.

At this point a word of caution must be said regarding the relationship between our three categories. The work of the Chronicler is very intricate and so the different categories overlap. This is easily seen when the David motif is investigated, since it incorporates history, the cult, and various theological themes. If only one area of delineation is analyzed, the final result will be biased and quite inadequate. An example concerns R. Braun's recent study on the Chronicler's attitude toward North Israel.¹ He concludes that Chronicles displays a favorable attitude towards foreigners in general, and particularly toward North Israel which stands in sharp contrast to the attitudes of Ezra and Nehemiah.² His study is completely historical and it quite overlooks the theological basis for the Chronicler's statements and the meaning of "all Israel." The history and theology of the Chronicler is so interrelated that any delineation of the various themes will make use of the same blocks of material to illustrate and defend its points. Yet if all sides of a particular theme are not considered, a true understanding cannot be reached.

**Theological Themes**

**All Israel**

For the Chronicler "all Israel" is a technical term. This is shown in the apparently deliberate changes he

²Ibid., p. 59.
introduced between his work and his sources. These changes concern the omission or addition of the term "all Israel." It appears he desired to keep this formula free from other connotations so he took the liberty of substituting equivalents for them. This is especially seen in the lack of any consistent equivalent in the Chronicler's sources for his specialized sense of "all Israel." On only one occasion are each of the terms "all the tribes of Israel," "all the sons of Israel," "all the assembly of Israel," "the people of Israel," and the miscellaneous "these were in Israel" changed to "all Israel." Also, this is seen in two cases where the source has "all Israel" and the Chronicler substitutes "all the people" and "the army."2

The statement in 1 Chronicles 9:1a is to be considered a subscription to the preceding eight chapters.3 As such, the meaning of the term "all Israel" is easily and ideally defined as the twelve tribes of Israel united together as a

---

1 2 Sam. 5:1 // 1 Chron. 11:1; 2 Sam. 7:7 // 1 Chron. 17:6; 1 Kings 12:3 // 2 Chron. 10:3; 2 Sam. 24:4 // 1 Chron. 21:4; 2 Sam. 24:9 // 1 Chron. 21:5.

2 1 Kings 8:62 // 2 Chron. 7:4; 2 Sam. 11:1 // 1 Chron. 20:1. The section where the Chronicler preserves the "all Israel" of his source will be discussed later.

3 Ackroyd, TBG, p. 43, and Johnson, Biblical Genealogies, p. 57, n. 1 call it a colophon which is incorrect since a colophon is a later scribal notation. Rabbi David Kimchi translates the verse as follows: "So all Israel was registered'; though I mention part of their genealogy, I do not mention all. They were written in the 'Chronicles of the Kings,' namely, Sefer Yasar and Sefer Milchamuth, which are no longer in existence."
national community with a common cult. The fact that Dan and Zebulun are omitted does not detract from this concept for the important ingredient is that twelve tribes are present.

This concept of "all Israel" occurs in other ways as well. For instance, one is that "all Israel" is theologically bound by the tribe of Judah on one side (chapters 2 through 4) and by the tribe of Benjamin on the other (chapter 8) which clearly shows just who "all Israel" includes. Further defined, "all Israel" includes only those who join themselves to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, i.e., the kingdom of Judah. It is because they are of this kingdom that more genealogical material is given for them than for the northern tribes which had separated themselves from Judah. The genealogies of the priests and Levites divide the tribes almost equally. Symbolically, this shows that the proper cult gives a right relationship to God, and allows an individual to be included in "all Israel." The emphasis on Judah, Benjamin, and Levi further shows that they are the true Israel.

Many of these genealogies contain military allusions apparently because the only type of source material the Chronicler possessed was military records. Although this is not the case with the genealogies of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Napthali, Benjamin is listed in two different types of military genealogies. The genealogy in 7:6-12 appears to be a census list, while 8:1-28 is a list of military leaders.
The remainder of the chapter is a genealogy of the house of Saul. As will be discussed later, these military genealogies may be included because many of the constituents included in the "all Israel" who gathered around David were originally military personnel.

In the narrative portions of Chronicles, the phrase "all Israel" occurs 34 times. This motif can be divided into three categories according to when they occurred: before the divided kingdom, during the divided kingdom, and after the fall of Samaria.

First, the occurrence of the phrase "all Israel" will be examined during the period of the United Kingdom. As in the genealogical sections of 1 Chronicles, the military emphasis is still evident. Upon Saul's death, David is crowned king by "all Israel," and both David and "all Israel" capture Jerusalem and establish the new royal city.

The next reference to David and "all Israel" is chronologically before David's coronation and yet "all Israel" still supports him. This is clearly stated in 1 Chronicles 11:10

1 Johnson, Biblical Genealogies, p. 64.
2 1 Chronicles 11:1 through 12:40.
3 Johnson, Biblical Genealogies, p. 47.
4 The civil war between the house of Saul and David is entirely omitted (2 Samuel 2:8 through 4:12 cf. with 1 Chronicles 10:1 through 12:40). 2 Samuel 5:1, 3 use the phrase "all the tribes of Israel" and "all the elders of Israel" in such a way that they appear to be synonymous. As such, they reflect a political group which the Chronicler labels "all Israel."
and reiterated in 12:39. These mighty men, which includes all the tribes, came from "all Israel" to support David against Saul. In 12:30 only 3,000 Benjaminites support David because "until now the greatest part of them had kept allegiance to the house of Saul," even though each tribe is represented. In 1 Chronicles 19:17, "all Israel" means military men from the twelve tribes since the context is war. In the light of this data, a major segment of the group termed "all Israel" was military personnel.

Other references to "all Israel" show that other groups were included in this designation. The Chronicler sets forth the concept that "all Israel" established the cult in the royal city by bringing the ark there on their second attempt. Obviously, the term refers to the proper representatives from the tribes to support the event. The phrase occurs again when David presents the Temple plan and "all Israel" is limited to those described as "the assembly of the Lord" which includes politicians, military officers, and the civil servants. Similarly, "all Israel" in 2 Chronicles 1:2 is defined as "commanders of thousands and

1 Chronicles 12:1ff. alludes to the conflict between Saul and David and the whole section seems to assume a knowledge of the real issue between the two men. David never fought against Saul in the Samuel account; rather, David tried to stay out of Saul's way. Yet the nation knew David was to be king (see 1 Samuel 16 and 20:30ff.). For the mighty men, see 12:23-38.

2 Samuel 10:17.

3 Cf. 28:1 with 28:8.
of hundreds and to the judges and to every leader in all Israel, the heads of the fathers' [households]."

In another passage, 2 Chronicles 7:4-8, the phrase "all Israel" is used twice. The circumstance is the dedication ceremonies of the Temple. "All Israel" is defined as "the heads of the tribes, the leaders of the fathers' [households]" who are also called "all the men of Israel" at the beginning of the dedication ceremony.\(^1\) This designation does not include the elders since in 2 Chronicles 5:4 they are separate, but it does include the priests and the Levites.\(^2\)

There are three references where "all Israel" indicates a consolidated country and thus embraces all the lands ruled by David. The first concerns David's war against the Philistines who heard "that David had been anointed king over all Israel."\(^3\) Here an outsider is describing the new

---

\(^1\) Cf. 2 Chron. 5:2-4.

\(^2\) The parallel account in 1 Kings 8:62-65 differs from it in certain points. In 2 Chron. 7:4 "all the people" replaces "all Israel" and "all the sons of Israel" found in 1 Kings 8:62-63. Evidently, the Chronicler thought these terms were equal and they could not be the same as his theological "all Israel" so he chose to call them "all the people." 2 Chron. 7:6 and its concept of "all Israel" is not found in 1 Kings, but both 2 Chron. 7:8 and 1 Kings 8:65 use "all Israel."

\(^3\) 1 Chron. 14:8 and the parallel, 2 Sam. 5:17, states that David reigned "over Israel." The suggestion that 2 Sam. dropped the "יִשְׂרָאֵל" by homoeoteleuton has no textual evidence. The Chronicler inserted "יִשָּׂרָאֵל" before "יִשָּׂרָאֵל" many times and it is most likely this is true here (cf. 2 Sam. 6:21). It further appears the "all Israel" in 2 Sam. 2-8 refers to the Northern Kingdom (2:9, 3:12, 21, 5:5, 8:15).
land mass David would rule since previously he ruled only Judah. The second reference is a summary that David ruled over "all Israel" so that it, too, should be classified as geographical.\footnote{1 Chronicles 28:8.}

In the third example, David is addressing the politicians, military officers, and civil servants when he states that they made him king over "all Israel." The context suggests that "all Israel" should be taken in a general sense even though in verse 8 it is the assembly who is called "all Israel" as the appositional phrase, תְּהֹעְרֵר הַשְּׁתָּחָה, proves (1 Chronicles 28:8).

In summary, at the beginning of David's reign, "all Israel" seems to be composed of military leaders. After his consolidation of power, other types of national leaders, such as judges, priests and Levites are included, but not the elders. All these leaders seem to have joined themselves to David and share a common cult at Jerusalem.

Second, the use of the phrase "all Israel" will be examined during the period of the Divided Kingdom. This phrase has a prominent position in the enthronement narrative of Rehoboam found in both 2 Chronicles 10 and 1 Kings 12. Although in substantially the same form, there is one difference which is relevant to this study: "all the assembly of Israel" is changed to "all Israel."\footnote{1 Kings 12:3 // 2 Chronicles 10:3.} The

\footnote{1 Chronicles 18:14.}

\footnote{2 Kings 12:3 // 2 Chronicles 10:3.}
Chronicler was being consistent in designating this group as "all Israel" when they were acting in an official capacity. When they are called "people" they are not acting in an official capacity. The different groups included in the "all Israel" of this section are not defined although they may be the same groups included in "all Israel" during the United Kingdom. Clearly, the elders were not a part of it. Interestingly, when this assembly departed to anoint their own king, they were no longer called "all Israel," a fact that serves the Chronicler well as he develops a theological meaning for the term.

In 2 Chronicles 11:3, 13 the term "all Israel" again is found. Rehoboam was gathering the troops together to crush the rebels in the north when Shemaiah, the prophet, appears to the king and "all Israel in Judah and Benjamin." This is different from the phrase, "to all the house of Judah and Benjamin and to the rest of the people" used in the parallel passage. With both Chronicles and Kings these phrases are used for those people from the Northern Kingdom who are loyal to Rehoboam and live in Judah. Yet for the Chronicler it is important that the term is used in

---

1 Chronicles 10:5-7, 9, 10, 12 // 1 Kings 12:5-7, 9, 10, 12.
3 Chronicles 10:19 (cf. v. 17).
4 Kings 12:23.
a prophetic and thus a religious setting. It suggests that the people came south because they were loyal to the cult of Yahweh. This is specific in the second occurrence of "all Israel" in 2 Chronicles 11:13. Here the faithful priests and Levites went to Jerusalem with many people following them. They are called "all Israel" because they are loyal to the cult of Yahweh and the Davidic house.

In 2 Chronicles 12:1 and 24:5 "all Israel" is used in reference to the people of Judah only. In the first case it refers to the people of Judah and King Rehoboam when they became apostate. It is evident that because the king forsook Yahweh, the assembly ("all Israel") did also. This same usage for the term is found in 2 Chronicles 24:5. The Levites are to go into the cities of Judah and collect money from "all Israel." It is expected that all those loyal to Yahweh will give money to repair the temple.

At this point it is seen that in the divided kingdom period the concept of "all Israel" is used specifically for those who are loyal to the king and the cult of Yahweh and people from the Northern Kingdom are included if they meet the criterion. Here "all Israel" is strictly a theological term since it is used only in religious settings.

The third historical period in which the Chronicler uses the phrase "all Israel" is from the fall of the Northern Kingdom until the exile. It is used four times and each time it concerns the proper worship. In 2 Chronicles 29:24 it occurs twice when Hezekiah ordered sacrifices for "all Israel." To fully understand the term's
use here it must be remembered that Ahaz was very wicked and no doubt "all Israel" followed his example as in the case of Rehoboam. Therefore, the corporate sin of "all Israel" must be atoned by the Levites at the temple in Jerusalem. The next occurrence is still concerned with Hezekiah's reform and is found in 2 Chronicles 31:1. The great passover has ended and "all Israel" goes out to destroy the idolatrous worship centers. Once again the cult is prominent and only those loyal to Yahweh are involved. They are the true Israel and it also includes people from the Assyrian province in the North who have come down to worship.

The fourth case is found in the passage of 2 Chronicles 35:3 which is a preparation for Josiah's passover. The Levites are described as teachers of "all Israel" and holy ones to the Lord. The subsequent narrative makes it clear that here also the term is used to describe those most loyal to the cult, as shown in verses 16-19 when "the Levites, the priests, all Judah and Israel who were present, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" joined Josiah to participate in the passover. They are the assembly, "all Israel."

Attention must now be called to the phrase "all Israel and Judah" found in 2 Chronicles 30:1 and 6. It is obvious that here "all Israel" is separate from Judah. Further, there are no religious personnel or other officials involved,

1 2 Chronicles 12:1.
2 Cf. 2 Chronicles 30:1, 6, 11.
except for runners sent to call the people to the passover. Thus it seems justified to say that the term is strictly geographical here and has no theological significance.

In this survey of "all Israel" it was found that this term usually means those people who attach themselves to the Davidic house and to the worship of Yahweh. It is a truism that the term is only used with those kings who are considered loyal to Yahweh. As such, the term always has the theological meaning of "the people of God." There are a few instances where the phrase has a geographical connotation and does not have the theological overtones as elsewhere. Also, after the divided kingdom, the term always occurs with its theological meaning when the narrative concerns the religious aspect of the kingdom. Thus the phrase "all Israel" has the same basic meaning in 1 Chronicles 10 to 2 Chronicles 36 as it does in its single occurrence in the genealogical section in 1 Chronicles 9:1a.

Election

The real purpose of the genealogies of 1 Chronicles is more than an introductory genealogy to the genealogies of the twelve tribes as the chapter divisions suggest. It is more than the tracing of a superior strain of people by a lineage which preserved the worship of Yahweh.

---

1 It is used with Joash (2 Chronicles 24:5), but this is in the section where he is righteous and the Chronicler says, "he had done well in Israel and to God and His house." (v. 16)

It is more than the Chronicler's often-thought peculiar interest in genealogies so that his purpose was to present all the genealogical data found in Genesis. Nor is the idea that it was included for "art's sake" sufficient. The problem of the above views is that they have not been able to penetrate beyond the chapter division.

The real purpose of these genealogies in 1 Chronicles is to show the process of election and its culmination in the Davidic house. If this is correct, these genealogies simply list historical figures who were elected and blessed by God. It is a genealogical path culminating in the Davidic ideal.

That this is correct may be seen from the following observations. The first proof is found in the enigmatic lists. It was previously stated that the addition of the phrase "and the sons of Noah" was not warranted. The reason for this is that it points to election. After the listing of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, their genealogies are given in reverse order so that the genealogy of Shem occurs last. When the list commences again, Shem heads it. This clearly suggests the rejection of Japheth and Ham and the acceptance of Shem who becomes the elected one and in turn serves

---

Altmann (1963), p. 28.

1E. Podechard, "Le premier Chapitre des Paralipomenes," RB 13 (1916): 363-86. Why the genealogy of Cain was not included was never adequately explained.

2Johnson, Biblical Genealogies, p. 74.

3P. Ackroyd, TBP, p. 32 rightly sees election in this chapter.
Yahweh.

The next proof is that Jacob is always referred to as Israel.¹ The case with Edom further supports this. The rejection of Edom was long a theological theme of the prophets. "Jeremiah says, "Edom will become an object of horror" and will be abandoned. Ezekiel echoes the thought. Malachi personalizes it by using the eponymous names of Israel and Edom and declaring that "I loved Jacob but I have hated Esau."² Once this is recognized, it is easy to see the same thought pattern occurring in connection with Isaac and Ishmael. Furthermore, it shows the significance of the progression of characters. The rejected son or sons are genealogized first and the elected son is genealogized last.

The next indication of election is found in the preeminent place given Judah and David in the genealogical listing of the twelve tribes. This shows that David is the chosen one. Additional proof is found in the genealogy of Reuben.³ A short historical note recounts Reuben's rejection and how the birthright was given to Joseph; but it is Judah who is privileged to produce "the leader." At this point it is assumed that the reader of the genealogy knows the historical background of David, his anointing and his

¹¹Chronicles 1:34; 2:1; P. Ackroyd, TEP, p. 32 points this out.
²Jer. 49:17-18; Ezek. 35:8, 15; Mal. 1:2-3.
kingship. Thus David is the elected one of Israel. Solomon is also shown as the elected one since he is found in a cluster of names and continues the Davidic kingship.

It is a well known fact that election is clearly taught in the narrative portion of Chronicles. The first suggestion is found in Nathan's prophecy to David and David's subsequent prayer. The account parallels the one in 2 Samuel except for a small phrase which the Chronicler omitted: "When he commits iniquity, I will correct him with the rod of men and the strokes of the sons of men." The subject is Solomon, and this omission along with the omission of his other sins suggests that he was sinless. In substitution the Chronicler states that God's loving-kindness will always be with him and his throne is eternal. It appears that one who is specifically elected and is guaranteed lovingkindness has no need of correction.

The pronominal change from "your" in 2 Samuel 7:16 to "my" in

---

1 This is also a concept found elsewhere--Ps. 78:65-72.
2 Chron. 3:1-10.
3 Chron. 17:1-27; cf. 2 Sam. 7:1-29.
4 2 Sam. 7:14b.
5 The accounts of David and Solomon in 2 Sam. and 1 Kings includes their sinfulness as well as their goodness, thus the necessity of the words about correction. In 1 Kings 11, Solomon's failure is listed along with God's punishment. 2 Sam. 11 gives David's sin with Bath-sheba and his murder of her husband.
6 Chron. 17:14, 23, 27. It is interesting though that the sinful census of David is used by the Chronicler (2 Sam. 24 // 1 Chron. 21). This probably is because the incident fits his doctrine of salvation (see below).
1 Chronicles 17:14 gives the added weight that God will see to this because it is His kingdom and He has chosen Solomon. Not only is the Davidic house elected for perpetuity, but so also is the nation of Israel.

The next reference to election is much clearer. David announces to the nation that he will build the temple of God. In the pronouncement David outlines the narrowing process by which he and Solomon were elected.

Yet the Lord . . . chose me from all the house of my Father to be king over Israel forever. For he has chosen Judah to be a leader; and in the house of Judah, my Father's house, and among the sons of my Father He took pleasure in me to make [me] king over all Israel.

Here is an outline of the genealogy of the family of David which clearly fits that presented in 1 Chronicles 2 and 3. It must also be noticed that the kingdom is established forever and that Israel is the kingdom of Yahweh.

The election concept is continued in Solomon's prayer of dedication which is also found in the Deuteronomist.

---

1 1 Chronicles 17:22.
3 Ackroyd, TBP, pp. 8-9.
4 2 Chronicles 6:16 // 1 Kings 8:25. Note Chronicles has הָיָה for Kings הָיָה. This does not appear to have any significance, though Ackroyd, TBP, p. 113 feels it expresses the post-exilic concern with law.
The uniqueness of these parallel passages rests in the condition presented: "You shall not lack a man to sit on the throne, if only your sons take heed to their way, to walk in My law before Me. . . ." This suggests a view expressed after the capture of Judah and stresses the need to explain the lack of a king. It is not necessary to posit the interpretation that there will never be another king, for the passage does not imply the end of the Davidic dynasty but rather the hope of a future righteous king. 1 This being the case, there is no urgent political concern to be found here. 2

Very similar in tone is the reiteration of the same condition to Solomon by Yahweh. 3 Verse 18 has been modified from the parallel found in 1 Kings 9:5 since "throne" is omitted in Chronicles. Furthermore, the Chronicler has added אֲרוֹן which where 1 Kings reads אֲרוֹן. 4

The belief that David was elected king forever continues to play an important role even through the first

---

1 The prophets expressed this concept in messianic hope. Jer. 23:5-6, 33:15-17; Ezek. 34:23-24, 37:24-25.

2 Ackroyd, TBP, p. 113 sees this passage manifesting a similar spirit as 1 Chronicles 3.

3 2 Chronicles 7:16-20.

4 2 Chron. 7:18b. It may be that 1 Kings 9:5 has a textual error in this place since the LXX reads אֲרוֹן. It cannot be demonstrated that the Chronicler borrowed this phrase from Micah 5:1 since אֲרוֹנ occurs frequently in the Old Testament: 2 Chron. 9:26, 23:20, etc.
return under Zerubbabel. Abijah attempts to change Jeroboam's mind in his attack against Israel by the argument that he is the elected king by God's will and that in fighting Israel, he is fighting against the kingdom of God. Jehoshaphat's son Jehoram is said to be as wicked as Ahab of Israel and "yet the Lord was not willing to destroy the house of David because of the covenant which He had made with David. . . ." When Athaliah was dethroned, it was done in loyalty to the doctrine of the perpetuity of David. In a passage unique to Chronicles, the people even cheer the crowning of Joash, the rightful heir to the throne of David. Both Hezekiah and Josiah are given approval since they walk in the way of their father David.

What was said above clearly shows that the theology of the election of David pervades all of Chronicles. Especially convincing are the passages in which David and Solomon traced their election as king. There is no clear statement of the messianic concept in Chronicles, although some feel it is found in the genealogy of David because it includes

---


2 2 Chronicles 13:5-12.

3 2 Chronicles 21:7.

4 2 Chronicles 23:3.

5 2 Chronicles 23:11-15.

Ze-rub-ba-bel. This cannot be proven adequately. 1

Salvation

Throughout Chronicles the themes of divine blessing and divine retribution are presented as counterparts of the same working of God in history. Obedience creates the blessing and disobedience causes retribution. This idea is well known. Generally this twin theme is overshadowed by the label "retribution"--or "short-ranged retribution"--but it stresses the negative aspect rather than the positive. 2 Others seek to use dual-descriptive terms such as "seek-forsake" or "apostasy-repentance." 3 The term 'salvation' is chosen because it implies being saved from something evil and it accents the positive. It is also consistent with the Restoration as well as with the idea that God is controlling the historical circumstances to create the climate for blessing or retribution. 4 Salvation then is a

1Myers, IGAB, pp. 6-7; Stinespring, "Eschatology in Chronicles," JBL 60 (1961): 210. The inclusion of Zerubbabel in the genealogy of the Davidic kings may be explained as due to the concern for Davidism as easily as due to messianism.


4Newsome, "The Chronicler's Purpose," p. 207. Every aspect of God's role in the history of Israel will not be examined in this treatise since each is not expressed in the genealogies.
divine act. It is expressed in the lives of various kings, but it concerns the fate of the nation since the spiritual life of the king determines the direction of the nation.¹

1. The Form of the Salvation Narratives in 2 Chronicles

The second half of the Chronicler's composition is constructed of a series of narratives that have several key motifs, the number of which may vary in any given narrative, although the arrangement has a distinct pattern and order of appearance. When all are counted, there are seven characteristic motifs.

The first may be termed the seeking (יוו) motif, usually expressed in the positive and found in the narratives which describe the goodness of a monarch.² Only one wicked king, Rehoboam, is specifically said not to have sought the Lord.³ In other cases this is usually assumed. This motif is woven into the narrative section which is either concerned about the goodness or the military power of a monarch.⁴ In the latter case it is the seeking which gives the military power, and in the former case it is the seeking which makes the king good. As will be discussed later, the classical usage of יְוָו is to inquire of a

¹ 2 Chronicles 12:1.
² 2 Chronicles 14:3, 6; 17:3-4; 18:4; 20:3, 4; 26:5; 30:19; 34:3a.
³ 2 Chronicles 12:14.
⁴ For the former, see 2 Chronicles 14:3; 26:5; 30:19; 34:3a; for the latter, see 2 Chronicles 14:6; 17:3-4; 18:4; 20:3-4.
The second motif may be termed the religious acts of a monarch. This motif occurs much more consistently than the 'seeking motif'. When positive, these acts are usually cultic or legal in nature. The position of this motif is usually at the front of the narrative though there are exceptions. Although the narrative concerning Rehoboam implies piety in the example of his obedience, later this motif is more fully developed in the account of the desertion of the priests and Levites from the northern kingdom of Israel. In this position it appears to enhance the motif of pride and sin which followed these pietistic acts.

The third motif may be called military mobilization. This is concerned with the strengthening of fortifications and the mustering of troops. Actual battles fall into another category. This concept does not occur in all the narratives. An example is the case of Abijah. It may be that enough information was not available on him to include

---

1 Only two narratives concerning the reign of a king lack any mention of piety. These are 2 Chron. 13:3-21 and 26:5-21. The first concerns Abijah. In 1 Kings 15:3, he is cast in a bad light, but the Chronicler uses him as an example of repentance so that this bad information is omitted. In the case of Uzziah, piety is implied by the occurrence of the term יִשָּׁר, but no specific acts are listed as with the other examples.


3 2 Chron. 11:4b, 13-17.
this theme since the whole narrative is truncated.¹ The idea exists in this motif that the kings were able to fortify the cities and muster an army because they sought the Lord and revivified the cult. This is clearly set forth in the case of Uzziah. The Chronicler says, "as long as he sought the Lord, God prospered him."² Following this is a series of victories mentioned as well as a list of fortifications constructed in the land and the equipping of his army. The account of Hezekiah is no less explicit. After an account of his passover and other religious acts, the Chronicler says, "After these things and this faithfulness, Sennacherib . . . came. . . ."³ Hezekiah is faithful to God in this troubled time and Judah is delivered from Sennacherib. In the example of Manasseh, the mobilization precedes the acts of piety. The thought here is that after Manasseh repented of his wickedness, God gave him the strength to build and man his fortifications and then he was strong enough to perform his cultic acts.⁴

The fourth motif is a military engagement, though sometimes this appears in the fifth position. If the

¹ 2 Chron. 13:1-3. Abijah is said to have an army of 400,000 which implies the mustering of men. Since, however, the armies are already facing each other for battle, it is best to put this fact in another element of the pattern: the battle. Other examples are Joash (24:1-27) and Ahaz (28:1-27).
² 2 Chronicles 26:5.
³ 2 Chronicles 32:1.
⁴ 2 Chronicles 33:12-17.
monarch is obedient to God, he wins a victory; if not, he is defeated. Thus, Jehoram is defeated by the Edomites, Ahaz by Syria, Joash by Syria and Zedekiah by Babylon. Those winning battles are Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat and Uzziah.

A theme which is often interjected into this element is the "holy war." It is never as detailed as those accounts of "holy war" found in Joshua where von Rad found eleven different elements, but several main features may be found. A most impressive case is the battle of God against Israel during the reign of Asa. The elements therein are: 1) statement of faith that God is with them (vv. 11-12), 2) a cry (יִפְרָדֵד) to the Lord (v. 14), 3) blowing of the trumpets (v. 14), 4) the war cry (v. 15), 5) the belief that the battle is God's (v. 15), 6) the enemy, Israel, is utterly defeated and the enemy king, Jeroboam, is killed by God (vv. 18-20).

The case of Asa is not quite as spectacular. In this account Asa calls (יָקַע) to God and confesses his reliance on Him in a prayer. The battle is God's for He routed the Ethiopians before Asa. The Ethiopians are utterly defeated and the dread of the Lord falls on the neighboring peoples. The account of the battle between Jehoshaphat and Edom, et


2 Gerhard von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel, (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1951).

3 2 Chronicles 13:4-20.

4 2 Chronicles 14:8-14.
al. is quite different from the one above, though many of the necessary elements of the "holy war" are present. Jehoshaphat and the people pray and seek (יהוה) God's presence and cry out (יהוה) to Him. They confess their dependence upon Him while a great fast is taking place. A Levite rises up and declares that the battle is God's. Although Jehoshaphat's army does not fight, the enemy is utterly destroyed. As the people praise God, He wins the battle for Judah.

A final case of holy war is Hezekiah's fight against Assyria. Isaiah and Hezekiah pray and cry out (יהוה) to heaven. God sends an angel who destroys the enemy, and the Chronicler asserts, "The Lord saved Hezekiah."  

A fifth element occurring in the narratives of 2 Chronicles is the prophetic speech. The purpose of these speeches differs according to circumstances. Many of them

---

1 2 Chronicles 20:1-30.
2 1 Chronicles 32:20-23.
3 Two other examples of warfare are related to the "holy war." One is the deliverance of Jehoshaphat when he was with Ahab. Jehoshaphat cries out (יהוה) and God helps him. (2 Chron. 18:28-34.) The other is the war of Uzziah against the Philistines (2 Chron. 26:7-8). The Chronicler simply says God helped him.
4 2 Chron. 13 concerning Abijah has no prophetic input, but as noted this is a truncated narrative. Hezekiah (32:30), Manasseh (33:10a) and Uzziah (26:5) only imply or mention a prophet. No speech is attributed to them. In the latter case, the priests and Levites rebuke Uzziah (v. 16-17).
are rebukes. 1 Others are commands, 2 encouragement to
faith, 3 or predictions of misfortune. 4 It is within these
prophetic speeches and the response to them that the
Chronicler's theology of salvation plays an important role
in these narratives since they set the stage for the next
element.

The sixth element is the response of either the king
or the people to the prophetic speech. This simply entails
a statement of obedience and faith, or repentance, or
unbelief and disobedience. 5 The episodes of Jeshoshaphat
are unique in this regard. The prophets play an important
role in the narrative, and yet three of their pronouncements
require no response. In one case, Micaiah prophesies the
death of Ahab, the king of Israel, and no opportunity of
repentance is given because of the enormity of his sin. 6
After this episode with Ahab, Jehoshaphat returns to
Jerusalem and is met by Jehu ben Hanani. He rebukes the
king and goes on to say, "Good things are found in you, for

1 2 Chron. 12:5; 16:7-9; 19:1-3; 20:37ab; 21:12-15;
2 2 Chron. 11:4ab; 20:14-17; 28:8-11; 35:21 prophetic
words in the mouth of Neco.
3 2 Chron. 15:2-7 (Levitical sermon).
4 2 Chron. 18:4-22. Micaiah predicts doom for Ahab.
5 2 Chron. 11:4b; 15:8; 20:18; 25:10; 28:14-15; 12:6-8;
33:10; 35:22; 33:16.
6 2 Chron. 18:16-27.
you have removed the Asheroth from the land and you have set your heart to seek God." The third case is when Jehoshaphat allies himself with Ahaziah of Israel in the maritime adventure at Ezion-geber. Eliezer ben Dodayahu prophesies the destruction of the ships with no chance for repentance. The account in Kings differs. It only reports the destroyed ships and mentions no prophet. The hesitancy on the part of the Chronicler to point out the sin of Jehoshaphat and to record a call to repentance may be due to his partiality to Jehoshaphat. Several phrases used by the Chronicler demonstrate this: "The Lord was with Jehoshaphat because he walked in the earlier ways of his father David;" ". . . sought the God of his father;" "followed His commandments;" "The Lord established the kingdom in His hand;" "He took great pride in the ways of the Lord."

The final element is God's judgment upon the ruler on the basis of his response. Again, this is a doctrinal statement. Here it will be noted only that God forgives those who repent and punishes those who are unrepentant. The punishment is frequently inflicted upon an individual in the form of sickness or murder although in a few cases

---

1 2 Chron. 19:3.  
2 2 Chron. 20:37.  
3 1 Kings 22:48.  
4 Newsome, "Toward a New Understanding," p. 204.  
5 2 Chron. 17:1-6.
the nation is involved.\textsuperscript{1} In the case of repentance, God heals those afflicted.

The Chronicler is not a slave to his pattern for he may omit an element or even reverse the order. It seems that he attempted to use the material at hand and did not invent data just so he could complete his outline.

The most straightforward example of the Chronicler's narrative is that of Asa.\textsuperscript{2} This account contains two narratives which are closely joined together so that the Chronicler can illustrate his theology according to his tandem method as will be seen. The first narrative is found in chapters 14 and 15.

In this case, the \textit{\textit{Wôl}} concept (v. 3) is found in the midst of the acts of piety (vv. 1-4). It is Asa who commands Judah to seek (\textit{\textit{Wôl}}) the Lord. In verses 5 to 7 Asa mobilizes the nation and in verses 8 through 14 Judah wins a victory over the superior forces of Zerah, the Ethiopian. Azariah ben Obed, a prophet, meets the victors with a message to remain faithful (15:1-7). Asa responds to this message with more acts of piety (vv. 8-16).

It seems that the conclusion of this narrative forms the beginning of the new narrative in chapter 16. The response of Asa which consists of acts of piety is unusual as is the content of the prophetic speech. As was seen,

---


\textsuperscript{2} 2 Chron. 14-16.
the normal response is repentance or disobedience, but here Asa performs more acts of piety, which demonstrates that Asa obeyed the prophet's word. Following these pietistic acts is the element of mobilization. Asa pays Syria to fight Baasha of Israel because he is encroaching upon Judah's territory (vv.1-6). In verses 7 through 9 the prophetic speech is found in the form of a rebuke because of Asa's reliance upon a human power instead of upon God. Asa reacts negatively and imprisons the prophet (v. 10). Asa is then punished with a disease and dies (11-12).

Within these two narratives, there are two examples of the Chronicler's technique which shows the responses of obedience and disobedience. Other narratives have this dual emphasis as well. The section on Jehoshaphat is much more complicated and deviates from the above example, but it corresponds very closely to this tandem form. The narratives of the rule of Amaziah and Rehoboam are other examples.

In addition, the narratives of Joash, Uzziah, Hezekiah, and Josiah fit one or the other of these two types.

A third type is the form found in the narratives for wicked kings. The examples here are quite fluid, but the elements of the Chronicler's outline appear. The structures of these narratives are set forth below.

1 2 Chron. 17:1 through 21:3.
2 2 Chron. 25:1-24; 11-12.
3 2 Chron. 24; 26; 29-32; 34.
I. Jehoram: 2 Chronicles 21:4-19
   A. Acts of impiety (vv. 4-7; 11)
   B. Military defeat (implies mobilization—vv. 8-10)
   C. Prophetic speech in the form of a rebuke (vv. 12-15)
   D. Punishment of Judah and Jehoram (vv. 18-19)

II. Ahaz
   A. 2 Chronicles 28:1-15
      1. Acts of impiety (vv. 2b-4)
      2. Military defeat (vv. 5-8)
      3. Prophetic speech—in this case against Israel (vv. 9-13)
      4. Israel's response (vv. 14-15)
   B. 2 Chronicles 28:16-25
      1. Acts of impiety (v. 16)
      2. Military defeat (vv. 17-21)
      3. Unrepentance (vv. 22-25)

III. Zedekiah: 2 Chronicles 36:11-20
   A. Acts of impiety (vv. 12b-14)
   B. Prophetic speech (v. 15)
   C. Response (v. 16)
   D. Punishment (vv. 17-20)

In these examples the act of mobilization is omitted. No doubt the Chronicler felt it to be hopeless to include it since impiety produces defeat. Nothing is said about opportunities to repent or a request to repent. The first narrative of Ahaz is unique. It begins with Ahaz and Judah as the center of attention, but before the Chronicler is finished, all attention is focused upon Israel. The Chronicler can find no good in Ahaz so he turns to Israel and finds an example of their obedience to a prophet.¹ Nevertheless, the form of the narrative does not change.

¹This supports the thesis that the attitude of the Chronicler towards Israel is not all negative.
The narrative example of Zedekiah differs from the other two narratives in both its themes and sequence. The military defeat is omitted and the response to the prophetic speech is cited. It is also interesting to note that the statements within the elements start out with specifics and then become generalized. It is Zedekiah who rebels against Nebuchadnezzar, but more generally it is the officials and the priests who are unfaithful. Many messengers warn the country. Finally, the sins of Zedekiah and the people result in Judah's exile.

The pattern of the motifs of the narrative of Manasseh is unique. He is the only king who is characterized as evil at the beginning of his reign but who repents before his death. The elements in his narrative are arranged as follows:

A. Acts of impiety (v. 2-9)
B. Prophetic speech (v. 10a)
C. Response (v. 10b)
D. Punishment (v. 11)
E. Repentance (vv. 12-13)
F. Mobilization (v. 14)
G. Acts of impiety (vv. 15-16)

The narratives found in 1 and 2 Kings do not follow this pattern. The Deuteronomist is concerned with the religious acts of a king. The moral judgment of each king is given in a formula which stands at the head of the narrative. Then the writer lists that particular monarch's good and bad deeds as the formula directs. For example, "Asa did what was right in the sight of the Lord like David his father . . . but the high places were not taken
away . . . "1 Following this is a list of the right things done by Asa. The opposite case is true of Ahaz. The formula states, "... he did not do what was right in the sight of the Lord his God, as his father David had done."2 Then follows a list of the wicked deeds he perpetrated. The interesting point about this is that the narratives with formulas commending a ruler often mention a serious fault of the monarch which finally results in his sickness or assassination.3

The absence of prophetic speeches is most obvious. Only in the account of Hezekiah and Jehoshaphat do prophets play a dominant role.4 Also, the ritualistic circumstance of the battles is almost wholly absent in Kings. Only in the case of Hezekiah is the miraculous element present.5 Along these lines there is no account of an actual mobilization given by the Deuteronomist. It is clear that the Chronicler has uniquely arranged his material according to a predesigned plan.

The form used in the Chronicler's narratives is not found in his genealogical section. This is not surprising,

---

1 1 Kings 15:11, 14a.
2 2 Kings 16:2b.
4 2 Kings 19:20-20:19; 1 Kings 22:5-34. In this latter case the Chronicler incorporates the account into his narrative.
5 2 Kings 19:35; this account is used by the Chronicler.
since there is little opportunity for an extended narrative to appear, so that diversity of authors cannot be argued on this basis. It is evident, though, that the concept of "holy war" is found in these genealogies.

In the narrative note on Jabez, the "holy war" concept is found. He calls (חַרְבֹּת) on God in the context of battle and God grants him victory. This is quite similar to the case of Jehoshaphat who cries out (רוּת) to God in battle and is helped. A more detailed case is found in the joint battle of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh against the Hagrites and others. The Transjordanian tribes win because they cried out (רוּת) to God in battle. These "holy wars" which are abbreviated in form may be used as an argument for unity of authorship because they are different in form from those in Judges and Samuel.

2. The Sequence of the Narratives

Peter Ackroyd has pointed out that the contrasting themes of reward and punishment, obedience and disobedience, apostasy and repentance are characteristics often employed by the Chronicler. To a certain degree the Deuteronomist employed this technique, but the Chronicler uses it more often. The Chronicler presents his salvation narratives

---

1 2 Chronicles 18:31.
2 1 Chronicles 5:18-22.
3 Ackroyd, "The Theology of the Chronicler," pp. 105-107. He fails to recognize the existence of this method of presentation in the genealogies.
from the reign of one king, and second by taking contrasting narratives from two successive kings. The latter will be studied first.

a) Contrasting Type #1

In the genealogies, the contrasting examples have already been identified as those found in 2:7, 5:18-26, and 7:20-27, as well as in the introduction and conclusion of the books. Throughout the remainder of Chronicles it is just as prevalent.

The Chronicler characterizes the death of Saul as a result of his treachery (חַיַּה) against the Lord. This involved three actions on his part: he did not obey the word of the Lord, he sought the advice of a medium, and he did not seek (וַיַּלֶד) the Lord. The theological interpretation is that God took Saul's life even though in 1 Samuel he committed suicide. Saul represents the negative aspect of the contrasting theme of faithfulness and unfaithfulness.

David is the positive aspect in the contrasting theme. His rule is immediately accepted because he was chosen by God. The authority of his rule is shown by the account of military victories over the Jebusites and in the two battles with the Philistines. Hiram, the king of Tyre, also sends tribute which allows David to realize his position—"the

---

1 Chron. 10:13-14.
2 Chron. 10:14, 1 Sam. 31:4.
3 Chron. 11:2, 9; 14:2.
Lord establishes him as king.¹ A prominent element in the Philistine confrontation is that David inquires (נָא) of the Lord. This sets up a contrast with Saul who did not inquire (שָאָל) of the Lord.

David is also concerned with the cult. The attempt to move the ark to Jerusalem is placed before the Philistine war while in Samuel it occurs after the war. This again contrasts David's rule with Saul's and also assures Israel that the Philistines will be defeated. God's chosen ruler demonstrates the proper respect toward the cult whereas Saul neglected it.²

¹1 Chron. 11:4-9; 14:1-2, 8-17.
²Myers, I Chronicles, p. 101, 102; Ackroyd, TRP, p. 56.

The Chronicler has modified the account of David's ascension to fit his view of things. First, the material is arranged differently as the following chart shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Samuel 5 - 6</th>
<th>1 Chronicles 11 - 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Hiram</td>
<td>2. David's mighty men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Philistine War I</td>
<td>3. Ark I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Philistine War II</td>
<td>4. Hiram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ark I</td>
<td>5. Philistine War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ark II</td>
<td>6. Philistine War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ark II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chronicles, but not 2 Samuel, omits the material relating to the gradual gathering of followers by David, his rule at Hebron and the final atrocity which caused the followers of Saul to accept David as king. With the death of Saul, David immediately is king of "all Israel" at Hebron in Chronicles. Both accounts agree that when David became king of Israel (1 Chron. 11:4--all Israel; 2 Samuel 5:6--the king and his
Other examples are found in the reigns of Jehoram and Joash, Ahaz and Hezekiah, Amon and Josiah. In each case, the first king is the evil, unrepentant one. The example of Ahaz and Hezekiah is interesting because Ahaz is the worst and Hezekiah the most faithful of Judah's kings.

b) Contrasting Type #2

The narratives concerned with the kings of Judah abound with this contrasting pattern. One example is Rehoboam's unfaithfulness to the Lord and Shishak subjugates Judah as God's instrument of punishment. He removes the temple men), he captured Jerusalem. With this victory, David's mighty men are enumerated in Chronicles 11:10-12:40 to show that "all Israel" supported David. This is especially clear in 12:23-40. In Samuel most of these events are part of the Saul-David controversy. The Chronicler's "Ark I narrative" shows David's proper regard for the cult. Again, the "all Israel" concept occurs. This respect for the ark is what gives David the respect of the nations (Hiram and the fame and fear in the nations [14:17]) and the victory over the Philistines. The idols of the Philistines are burned in Chronicles. This shows the abhorrence of idolatry by the post-exilic community. The Hiram incident in 2 Samuel appears to be more of a congratulatory thing and the Philistine wars seem to be showing opposition, for the Philistines saw David as a threat. In the "Ark I narrative," Uzza did not even touch the ark according to the Chronicler (13:9) in contrast to 2 Samuel 6:6. In the "ark II narrative" the Chronicler emphasizes the Levites, a group who do not appear in 2 Samuel's "Ark II narrative."

Josiah did not obey Neco and was immediately punished, but the Chronicler implies his goodness in the conclusion of his reign by pointing out his piety (35:26). The account of Josiah in 2 Kings 22ff. stresses the law-book and its relevance to the needs of the exilic community (Ackroyd, TBP, p. 200). In 2 Chronicles, the law-book is not found until after the reform, a fact which lessens the importance of its find. The reform is a result of seeking (τῷ θεῷ) God. He purified the whole land of idolatry. Another difference is the continued emphasis on the Levites.
treasures. When the people of Judah humble themselves, God turns his anger away.  

The concept of humbling oneself (יִתְנַשֵׁב) before God or a prophet of God is a favorite theme of the Chronicler. Of its eleven occurrences in the Old Testament, eight are found in 2 Chronicles. Its inclusion in Solomon’s prayer by the Chronicler sets forth the pattern of repentance that the kings of Judah are to follow. God will forgive those who humble themselves. In Rehoboam’s case, this is exactly

12 Chron. 12:1-12.

God’s answer to Solomon’s prayer of dedication in the Chronicler’s account (2 Chron. 7:1-22) has a few ideas in it that do not occur in the parallel account of 1 Kings 8:62-9:1. First is the fire coming down from heaven to show Yahweh’s approval of the sacrifices (7:1b) and the presence of the glory of the Lord (2:3-4) replaces the blessing by Solomon found in Kings (1 Kings 8:54b-61). 2 Chron. 7:6, which concerns the music for the occasion, is unique. Although there are many other minor variations of style and word order, 2 Chron. 7:13-15 (which is not in Kings 9) is especially important for the Chronicler freely paraphrases various phrases from Solomon’s prayer. The first phrase, רְאוֹעָה יְהֹוָהֵנוּ תִּנְבִּיא וְהָעַל יִשְׁרָיֵל, (2 Chron. 7:13a) is almost exactly that of 1 Kings 8:35a // 2 Chron. 6:26a, the only difference being one of tense and mood. The next phrase (1 Chron. 7:13b), וְהָעַל יִשְׁרָיֵל נַפְתֵּל נָפְלָה, only appears as an idea in 1 Kings 8:37 // 2 Chron. 6:28 as does כִּי יְהֹוָה מְצַמֵּר מִשְׁפָּט. (2 Chron. 7:13c) only has the word מְצַמֵּר in common with its source (1 Kings 8:37 // 2 Chron. 6:28). The next verses (1 Chron. 7:14) are discussed in the text above, but the idea of repentance is found in 1 Kings 8:47-49 // 2 Chron. 6:38-39. The final verse (2 Chron. 7:13) has a close parallel in 2 Chron. 6:40, but no real parallel in 1 Kings 8.

3 Leviticus 26:40-42; 1 Kings 21:29; 2 Kings 22:19; 2 Chron. 34:27; 2 Chron. 7:14 (Solomon); 12:6, 7, 12 (Rehoboam); 30:11 (men of Israel during the reign of Hezekiah); 32:26 (Hezekiah); 33:12, 19 (Manasseh); Amon (33:23); and 36:12 (Zedekiah).

4 2 Chron. 7:14.
the result. Here, however, God gives only a partial restoration. The nation of Israel had been recently divided and God desired to use Rehoboam as an example to the kings who would follow his actions. Examples of kings who do not humble themselves are also given.

This concept of humility and its closeness to repentance is drawn from Leviticus 26:40-42. Only here does this concept appear in the Pentateuch. The Deuteronomist also uses this concept twice. Once it is used as a reference concerning Ahaz, king of Israel; another time it is used as a reference concerning Josiah of Judah.

Abijah and Jeroboam are on the verge of conflict when Abijah gives a speech directed at Jeroboam. His theme is the religious apostasy of Jeroboam which is so bad that the Northern Kingdom has no chance of winning a war against Judah. Nevertheless, Jeroboam attacks and is defeated. It is clear that God gives the faithful nation victory for their faithfulness and the wicked nation defeat for their unfaithfulness.

The reigns of Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah,
and Manasseh all follow this alternating pattern.\(^1\)

Manasseh is the most unusual case because the pattern is reversed. He starts with apostasy, but responds positively to God's punishment and becomes a faithful leader of Judah.

The use by the Chronicler of twin themes is found also in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9. The Transjordan tribes fight against a coalition led by the Hagrites.\(^2\) God gives them victory because of their faithfulness. Later, these tribes receive God's punishment for unfaithfulness.\(^3\) The same is true of the genealogy of Ephraim. One segment emphasizes Joshua whom God blessed and the other emphasizes Ezer and Elead whom God punished.\(^4\) Again, the mention of Achan implies the contrasting method since Achan receives punishment and Israel is saved by correction of the situation.\(^5\)

This method of presentation, the contrasting pattern, suggests unity of authorship since it occurs frequently in the genealogies and in the narratives of the books of Chronicles.

---

\(^1\) All the references in this note are from 2 Chronicles and reflect both parts of the alternating pattern. 2 Chron. 14:4-15; 16:1-12; 17:1-11; 17:12-19:1-3, 19:4-20:30, 36; 24:18-27; 25:3-13, 14-24; 26:5-8, 15-20; 33:2-11, 12-16; 24:4-17.

\(^2\) 1 Chronicles 5:18-22.

\(^3\) 1 Chronicles 5:25-26.

\(^4\) 1 Chronicles 7:20-27.

\(^5\) 1 Chronicles 2:7.
3. The Function of the Chronicler's Salvation Narratives

The following discussion will show that these narratives illustrate the Chronicler's doctrine of salvation. This is especially the case when a monarch repents or refuses to repent. The Chronicler's uniqueness rests in his emphasis upon a primary cause for salvation. It is God specifically who delivers or punishes. If man sins, he is immediately punished.¹ The Deuteronomist is more concerned with secondary causes. He stresses the complexity of a situation and shows how a person is victimized by it.² Very seldom is God the cause of death or disease in the books of Kings.

Within these theologies of events in Judah's history is found the cause of the exile of Judah. The Chronicler determines that Zedekiah and his generation are the immediate cause of it. He did evil, he broke his covenant, the priest and the people committed treachery (חָכָה), and they ridiculed and misused the prophets. Because of this, God punishes them.³ On the other hand, the Deuteronomist theorizes an accumulative guilt. At first, God overlooked Judah's sin for the sake of David.⁴ By the time of Hezekiah, the attitude of the Deuteronomist has changed. With

³2 Chronicles 36:12-17.
⁴1 Kings 15:4.
Hezekiah's sin, Isaiah prophesies that Judah will be exiled.\(^1\) God's patience is running out with Manasseh. He is an example of evil and very strong language is used to rebuke him and to predict the fate of Judah.\(^2\) The goodness of Josiah did not soften God's punishment for Judah. Manasseh's evil is still remembered.\(^3\) These references, which characterize the present reign of a ruler by the name of a past evil king, indicate an accumulation of guilt which God finally punishes.

With these distinctions settled, the theology of salvation will be shown as playing a major role in both the genealogies and the narrative sections of Chronicles.

Throughout the whole section, the righteous and the repentant wicked receive God's salvation. They are delivered from invaders by miraculous events. Manasseh was restored to his throne, and Hezekiah and Jehoshaphat were cured of sickness after they repented. Other kings receive God's blessing, but then pride sets in and they sin. God punishes them swiftly when they refuse to repent. In fact, this immediacy of punishment is a characteristic of the Chronicler. Josiah is a perfect example of this. The same day Josiah disobeys God's directive sent through Neco, he is wounded in battle and dies. Wicked kings are defeated

---

\(^1\) Kings 20:17, 18.


in battle and often assassinated.

In most of the above cases, it is God who does the blessing or punishing as the following sampling shows:

"God routed Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah." (2 Chron. 13:15)

"The Lord struck him (Jeroboam) and he died." (2 Chronicles 13:20)

"The Lord routed the Ethiopians . . . ." (2 Chronicles 13:20)

"The Lord established His kingdom in his hand." (2 Chronicles 17:5)

"God diverted him from them . . . ." (2 Chronicles 17:31)

"The Lord has destroyed your works." (2 Chronicles 20:37)

"The Lord was not willing to destroy the house of David." (2 Chronicles 21:7)

"Edom revolted . . . because he had forsaken the Lord God of his father." (2 Chronicles 21:10)

"Then the Lord stirred up against Jehoram the spirit of the Philistines and the Arabs . . . ." (2 Chronicles 21:16)

"The destruction of Ahaziah was from God." (2 Chronicles 22:7)

"Amaziah would not listen, for it was from God . . . ." (2 Chronicles 25:20)

"God helped him against the Philistines." (2 Chronicles 26:7)

"The Lord . . . delivered him into the hand of the king of Syria." (2 Chronicles 28:5)

"The Lord brought the commanders of the army of the king of Assyria against them." (2 Chronicles 33:11)

"He (God) killed him (Saul)." (1 Chronicles 10:14)

God is the controlling force behind the success or failure of a monarch and ultimately of the nation. The life and
response of the king determines God's grace upon him. This concept is found also in the genealogies.

The salvation concept has a shaky provenance in the genealogies. The first instance is totally concerned with retribution.¹ "And Er, Judah's firstborn, was wicked in the sight of the Lord, so he put him to death." This is a quote from Genesis 38:7. Its inclusion is intentional, since the similar fate of his brother Onan (who is involved in the same event) is not mentioned. It may be that the Chronicler felt compelled to include it to account for the absence of the firstborn in the following genealogy of the tribe of Judah. If so, the inclusion of Onan would have no significance and his presence may not have any theological implication even though it demonstrates the result of wickedness and God's personal action in man's fate.

The case of Achan is quite different. The doctrine of salvation is adumbrated here in its dual role. The Chronicler calls attention to the whole story surrounding him by the clever employment of a pun. Achan was disobedient (יָדַע) to the ban and violated the sanctity of the whole nation. Israel was punished through their defeat at Ai. However, once Achan's act was discovered and the situation was corrected by the death of the guilty, God's blessing once more came down upon His people and resulted in success

¹ 1 Chronicles 2:3.
against Ai.\(^1\)

On the other hand, divine blessing is emphasized in the short note concerning Jabez.\(^2\) In a short prayer, Jabez asks God's blessing upon him by the enlarging of his borders (probably by warfare) and by his being kept from harm. In a simple statement the Chronicler says, "And God granted him what he requested (\(וַעֲשַׇׂ֑יָּהוּ\))." This blessing receives special stress by a play on the name Jabez and the word for pain which should be his lot in life.\(^3\)

The idea of divine blessing in warfare is specifically stated when the Transjordanian tribes fight against a coalition led by the Hagrites and gain the victory when they cry out (\(יָנָּה\)) to God.\(^4\)

Closely associated with this blessing is the Chronicler's example of retribution. The tandem parts of salvation are given full development. The Transjordanian tribes forsook (\(יָנָה\)) God, and He therefore allowed Assyria to carry them off into exile.\(^5\) It is God who brings victory; it is God who inflicts defeat. God controls the forces of history to carry out man's just reward.

In a skilled and unique presentation, a composite

\(^1\)Josh. 7:1-8:29; see also Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, p. 53.

\(^2\)1 Chron. 4:9-10.

\(^3\)Ackroyd, *TBP*, p. 35.

\(^4\)1 Chron. 5:18-22.

\(^5\)1 Chron. 5:25-26; also 5:6 is relevant; cf. Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, p. 53.
genealogy of the tribe of Ephraim has a theological function. The genealogy traces two lineages connected to Ephraim as follows:

```
  Ephraim
    |   Shuthelah
    |       |
    |       Beriah
    |         |
    |         Rephah
  Bered       Tahan    Replha
    |         Telah
    |         Tahath
    |         Ladan
    |         Ammihud
    |         Elishama
    |         Non
    |         Joshua
  Tahath
  Eleadah
  Tahath
  Zabad
  Shuthelah
  Ezer   Elead
```

At the end of the first lineage a statement relates the fate of the last two men. They were killed in a cattle raid against Gath. The other pedigree ends with Joshua. The Chronicler assumes the reader knows Joshua as the great leader of the conquest who enjoyed God's full blessing. Note that the war theme is again adumbrated. Joshua, who often called upon God in war, received divine blessing; but Ezer and Elead received retribution because of their sinfulness. Joshua is also the symbol of the "holy war." This genealogy then illustrates the theology of salvation.

The summary in 1 Chronicles 9:1 states that "Judah was carried away into exile to Babylon for their

1 1 Chronicles 7:20-27.
unfaithfulness (יִרְשָׁד)." This is the extent of God's patience and of His punishment. The Chronicler is fully aware of the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy of restoration and of the reestablishment of the Davidic kingdom as God's kingdom. Since this is the case, he immediately incorporates the restored community into his list of genealogies. The full implication is that the people have abandoned their sinful ways and God thus blesses them. What is interesting here is that the Cyrus decree is not given—nor is the restored community placed at the end of Chronicles as would be expected. But this may be part of the structure since the whole theme of the work is explicated in 9:1 as the reason for Israel's exile. If this is the case, the conclusion is intimately related to the introduction. The introduction demonstrates God's retribution while the conclusion demonstrates God's blessing. Here again is the twofold aspect of salvation.

In summary, the theme of salvation is clearly set forth in 1 Chronicles 1-9. Often the context is warfare which is implied or explicit. When God is called upon in faith (יִקְשָׁד) or prayer (יִפְרַע), He blesses Judah; but if no faith is expressed, or Judah has acted treacherously (יִרְשָׁד), God punishes them. The term (יִרְשָׁד) occurred in three of the five examples studied, indicating a frequent motif to

1Jeremiah 25:12; 29.10.
2Ackroyd, TBP, p. 44.
be aware of in the ten other occurrences in the books of Chronicles. Its frequency in Chronicles and its absence in Judges, Samuel, or Kings shows it is a characteristic word. It was a popular word in the so-called P document and it occurs often in the exilic book of Ezekiel. There is no difference in usage between these books as will be seen later. The evidence here points to a unity of authorship for the genealogical and narrative sections of Chronicles.

**Historical Motifs**

Historical motifs serve to identify ideas and subjects related to historical personages, organizations, and juridical processes. The theological concepts identified within this framework above appear. These motifs provide the basic medium by which the Chronicler sets forth his message.

1. Davidism

The term Davidism is all-pervasive and is used to describe David's position in the thought of the Chronicler. In the genealogies, it is the lineage of David which begins with his kingship and ends with Hananiah's two sons

---

1. It is found in Joshua 22:16, 20, 22, 31.
3. Many theological ideas not identified in this paper appear in the narrative section of Chronicles, but because they are not observable in the genealogies, they are not outlined.
Polatiah and Jeshaiah who apparently lived circa 400 B.C.E. Therefore, there is complete continuity within the royal line into the post-exilic period, which is not present in any of the other genealogies. Here David's importance is expressed by the amount of space given him. It takes nine verses to list his sons and the important officials in his army who were related to him. Also he is the only king who has the number of his reigning years mentioned. The omission of Athaliah serves to show the importance of Davidism in this genealogy. It also shows that David held a major position in the Chronicler's scheme of things.

Davidism is even more pronounced in the narrative section of Chronicles. Chapters 10-29—which is the remainder of 1 Chronicles—concerns David and his kingship. He is not only in control of the government but is also instrumental in the establishment of the cult. This emphasis on David is validated by his supreme election and the rallying of "all Israel" around his throne. Davidism is further stressed by David bringing the ark to Jerusalem, defeating his enemies, selecting the site for the temple, establishing the proper cultic functions and officials, and being recognized by Hiram.

---

1 The whole reason for the inclusion of Abshai, Joab, Asahel, and Amasa in David's genealogy is the role they played in his rise to power.

2 1 Chron. 11:1-12:40; 17:14-27; 28:4-5.

In 2 Chronicles, the shadow of David hovers over all the kings of Israel. The reign of Solomon is filled with references to David.\(^1\) His rulings became models of uprightness by which other kings were judged.\(^2\) Though not unique to Chronicles, Jerusalem is called the city of David.\(^3\) The second Temple and its cult were modeled after the one founded by David.\(^4\) Thus from beginning to end, David left his mark upon the theological history of Israel.

2. Religious Structure

For the Chronicler, the cult is uppermost. Proper worship requires faith so it is no surprise that the temple and the cult occupy a central place in his work. When this same concern is sought in the genealogical section of 1 Chronicles, it is not readily noticed. It is there, however, in an adumbrated form.

The first indication of the importance of the temple is found in the name Bezalel.\(^5\) The inclusion of Bezalel serves to recall the building of the wilderness tabernacle.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) 2 Chron. 1:4, 8-9; 2:3, 7, 12, 14, 17; 3:1; 5:1; 6:4, 6-10, 15-17; 7:6, 10, 17-18; 8:14.

\(^2\) 2 Chron. 11:17; 17:3 (note the opposite of this reference in 21:6); 21:12 implies this; see also 2 Chron. 28:1, 29:2, 25, 30; 34:2.


\(^5\) 1 Chron. 2:20.

\(^6\) Exodus 31:1-5; 35:30-33.
A parallel to this is found in the account of Solomon building the temple. He asked Hiram, king of Tyre, for a man skilled with gold, silver, brass, and iron, as well as expert in working with purple, crimson, and violet, and experienced in engraving, all the qualifications Bezalel had. A man named Hurambi (whose mother was a Danite) is sent. It must be observed that the coworker of Bezalel was a Danite named Oholiab ben Ahisamach. The parallel is evident. Solomon needed an expert equal in skill to Bezalel and he finds one in the person of Hurambi. This insured a proper and authoritative link with the tabernacle.

A second indication of the link between the genealogies and the narrative of Chronicles centers on the phrase "the house of the Lord in Jerusalem." This occurs several times in 2 Chronicles in various forms. This phrase serves to emphasize the legitimacy of Jerusalem as the city in which the temple is to be built—especially as seen by

1 2 Chronicles 2:1-17.
2 2 Chronicles 2:7.
3 2 Chron. 2:12-13. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 200, believes the form makes secondary, so LXX The title may best be understood as my master (craftsman) as means this in Genesis 45:8, Judges 17:10, 1 Maccabees 11:32. Myers, II CAB, p. 10, and Ackroyd, TBP, p. 104, follow this suggestion.
4 Myers, II CAB, p. 12; Ackroyd, TBP, p. 104.
5 1 Chronicles 5:36, 6:17.
6 2 Chron. 3:1 duplicates 1 Chron. 6:17 while 6:4-11; 30:11; 33:4, 7, 15; 36:14, 23 have variations of this.
the various references showing God's approval of this site. ¹

The personnel of the temple also occupies an important place, especially the singers: the Gersomites, the Kohathites and the Merarites. Each genealogy stops with Heman, Asaph, and Ethan.² Closely related to these men are Ethan, Heman, Calcol, and Dara.³ From the time of David and Solomon music played an important role in the temple with Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman being assigned singing schedules.⁴ During Hezekiah's reform, this same emphasis was placed on the musicians, and the cultic duties established by David were followed.⁵

3. Legitimacy

Legitimacy in this discussion is the action employed to validate a person, a practice, or a social institution in some particular historical circumstance. The place of legitimacy in the work of the Chronicler is well known to scholars, but it has not been systematically demonstrated, and most commentators discuss it in a haphazard fashion.⁶

---

¹ 2 Chron. 3:1; 6:4-11; 33:4, 7; 34:23.
² 1 Chron. 6:18-33.
³ 1 Chron. 2:6.
⁵ 2 Chron. 29:25-30.
In the following discussion it will be observed that legitimacy pervades all of Chronicles and that it is the depository for all the other themes and motifs found there.

a) Legitimacy and the People of God

The presence of legitimacy is first shown by the relationship between the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-8 and those found in 1 Chronicles 9. In order to demonstrate this the Chronicler—by means of genealogies—shows the continuity between the pre-exilic Israel (1-8) and the post-exilic Israel (9). The genealogies in the latter are hinged back onto those of the former in many cases. The whole intent is to establish the legitimate people of God in the resettled community. The theological concept "all Israel" is incorporated into this since it is a qualification of just who are the true people of God. Biological purity is not enough. There must also be a spiritual purity.¹

b) Legitimacy and the Cultus

Though biological purity is not necessary in order to belong to the community of God, it is an absolute must if one is to participate in the cult. The genealogies found


² See the discussion of the theme "all Israel" above. Also note Ezra 6:21.
in 1 Chronicles 5:27-41 are used to determine those eligible for the Zadokite priesthood, as will be seen later.\(^1\) In 1 Chronicles 6:16-33 the Chronicler is careful to make certain that Heman, Asaph, and Ethan have a proper Levitical pedigree. This same concern for a legitimate cult is found in 1 Chronicles 23-27.\(^2\) Whatever view one may entertain on the inclusion of these lists in their present place, it is clear that they are related to those in 1 Chronicles 5:27-6:33. They are also used as a paradigm by the returning exiles to ensure that the Davidic ordering of the temple personnel is followed. Since God had established David's rule, this ordering is authoritative for post-exilic Israel.\(^3\)

The placing of Amminadab in the genealogy of Kohath may also be explained as a part of the legitimizing process.\(^4\) Since he married a daughter of Aaron, David—as a distant relative of the Levites—has the right to establish the official cult.\(^5\) David established the only authoritative

---

\(^1\) See the discussion in Section 2 under 5:41ff.


\(^3\) Ackroyd, TBP, pp. 39, 81-83, 87; D. N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," p. 437.


\(^5\) In this regard it should be noted that David himself never participates in the cult. Much stress is placed on the fact that the Levites are to be ministers of the ark (1 Chron. 15:2-28). In v. 26 the Chronicler has the Levites offering sacrifices, but in 2 Sam. 6:13, it is David who does so. In 2 Sam. 6:14, David wore an ephod (גֵּד), but the Chronicler calls it a יִת probably as a linguistic update. See Hurvitz, "Dating the P Code," pp. 24-56.
and legitimate pattern of worship as seen in the genealogies of the Levites and the abbreviated high priestly genealogy.\(^1\) The second high priestly genealogy has been an enigma to commentators, but once it is recognized that all these genealogies stop with the establishment of the cult, it becomes intelligible.\(^2\) This frequent observation gives it a permanent authority, in addition to the fact that those who established the cult, whether David or Solomon, were elected in perpetuity. Later reorganizations of the temple cult show their continuity by following the established patterns and retaining the priestly and Levitical personnel. In short, the age of the United Kingdom is the pattern for later Israel. The Chronicler has shown this genealogically.\(^3\)

This same idea is widely recognized as occurring in 1 Chronicles 23-27. There the genesis of the cult is given in detail along with lists and genealogies meant to give the impression of authority and legitimacy.\(^4\) Peter Ackroyd

---

\(^1\) 1 Chronicles 6:1-38.

\(^2\) See for example the comment of Curtis-Madsen, Chronicles, p. 127, that this second high priest list was an insertion by a later scribe; or that of Myers, I CAR, p. 45, that its purpose is to connect Zadok with the Aaronite line. Both miss the intent of the section.

\(^3\) Coggins, I & II Chronicles, p. 41 is on the right track when he states that there is a concern for the legitimacy of the temple’s priestly families. P. Ackroyd, TBP, p. 38 says, "... tracing of priestly genealogy is important for the establishment of legitimacy of priestly activity." The later priest must have a clear link with the earlier priest to assure continuity of worship.

\(^4\) We have no need to be concerned with the problem of additions made here, since they all fit the intent of the Chronicler. See comments of Ackroyd, TBP, pp. 81-82.
the Chronicler . . . made use of this method both to underlie the Davidic authority for the institutions known to them in their own time and also to make certain claims and assertions about that organization.

And later,

What remains as the most significant point . . . is the claim which is being made in these lists that the institutions, both religious and secular, of the later period have the authority of David.\(^1\)

D. N. Freedman writes,

\[\ldots\] the author [the Chronicler] is above all a legitimist, and he is concerned with the divinely appointed institutions and duly authorized personnel which administer them in behalf of the people of Israel.

The relation of Bezalel to the man from Tyre has already been mentioned. Here it must be reiterated that this supplies a legitimate connection of the Davidic temple with the wilderness tabernacle. The question of the legitimacy of the temple was uppermost in the Chronicler's mind, as is seen by the emphasis that God approves of Jerusalem as the site for His house and that the proper furnishings are present.\(^3\)

c) Legitimacy and Kingship

It was previously stated that the reason Athaliah was omitted from the royal genealogy in 1 Chronicles 3 was that

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 81-82.

\(^2\)The Chronicler's Purpose, p. 436.

she was an illegitimate ruler. A similar case is that of Jehoiachin who is regarded as the last official king in the royal line. The inclusion of Zerubbabel shows he was considered the legitimate successor of Jehoiachin—not of Zedekiah (I)—which continues the legitimate Davidic line. ¹

The theological principle of election discussed above is also concerned with the question of legitimacy: in short, he whom God elects is legitimate. Thus 1 Chronicles 1-3 shows the line of God's elected leaders for Israel. The emphasis on the election of David and Solomon in the narrative of Chronicles also supports this. ²

¹ The position of Shenazzar in 1 Chronicles 3:13 is unclear. Even if he is to be identified with Sheshbazzar (Ezra 1:8; 5:16; G. E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology, rev. ed. [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1949], pp. 108-110), he seemingly disappears. After his initial fame as leader of the returning exiles, it is Zerubbabel who receives the focus of attention. The identity of Shesbazzar as "the prince of Judah" probably has no messianic connotations, but rather demonstrates the continuity of the Davidic line. The phrase is also used regarding Nahshon in 1 Chron. 2:10 with no messianic overtones.

² Recent discussions have shown that Solomon is not really to be separated from David. The Chronicler carefully intertwines their reigns to insure a legitimate accession. See Roddy L. Braun, "Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles," pp. 503-516; H. G. M. Williamson, "The Accession of Solomon," pp. 351-361. One point overlooked in this discussion is that the election of Solomon is also stressed in the genealogy of 1 Chron. 3 by the listing of all the sons of David and then continuing with the royal line through Solomon.
Linguistic Evidence

In a discussion concerning the unity of authorship between two blocks of material, the vocabulary and literary techniques of one section are expected to be found in the other section as well. This type of investigation is a complicated task and must be properly controlled by rules.

An author's uniqueness must be separated from the literary custom of an era. The writings of late Biblical Hebrew have peculiarities not found in Biblical Hebrew or Mishnaic Hebrew. An author's uniqueness is recognized by the absence of certain linguistic features found in other books of the same period or by words with different nuances of meaning not found in other literature of the same period. If a supposed peculiarity is discovered, it must occur in both blocks of material under discussion, if unity of authorship is to be determined. A word of caution is necessary in this regard: a technical word may not occur in other forms of literature simply because of the subject matter. To claim that such a word is an author's unique expression, an alternative but equivalent word must be present within the period under discussion. Likewise, to claim that the material under discussion is not by the same

---

author because one section has peculiarities in it not
found in the other is not valid unless the subject matter
is taken into account. In this case, the genealogical
material of 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 does not offer any
opportunity for the use of many of the peculiar words which
are found in the remainder of Chronicles.¹ This lack of
diverse material in the genealogical section of 1 Chronicles
makes it difficult to reach a firm decision about unity on
linguistic evidence alone.² The evidence can be divided
into two sections: 1) that which is supportive of unity
because the evidence is neutral, and 2) that which actually
indicates unity.

1. The Neutral Evidence

a) The Imperfect Consecutive

Sara Japhet in her discussion of the formation of the
imperfect consecutive demonstrates a difference between its
use in Chronicles and other late books.³ She divides these
into three categories: "י"נ, נ"י/י"נ, and the היפילה.
A very distinctive characteristic of the Chronicler is his

¹ These criteria are based upon those used by H. G. M.

² This fact also makes it very difficult to argue for
diversity of authors. The numerous examples of words which
occur only in the narrative sections of Chronicles thus
cannot be used as evidence for diversity unless an alternative
word can be shown to be used there. There is none.

³ "The Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah,"
pp. 334-337.
retention of the first person singular in its long form whereas in Ezra and Nehemiah a short form also occurs. ¹ This form does not occur in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9; nor does any opportunity exist where it might have been used.

The other forms of the imperfect consecutive in the three categories are without exception short. Even when the source for the Chronicler's material contains the long form, he usually shortens it.² In 1 Chronicles 1 through 9, only three words appear to fit the three categories: נֵי (4:17,³ 7:23), נֵי (7:24), and נֵי (7:23). Nothing here contradicts the Chronicler's habit, but the paucity of material makes the evidence neutral in regard to unity of authorship.⁴

b) נֵי

This word is found fifteen times in Chronicles: ten times in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 and five times in the remainder of Chronicles.⁵ The only other books in which

¹Ibid., pp. 334-336.
²Ibid., pp. 334-35. The exceptions are 2 Chron. 21:13; 24:6; and perhaps 16:12, though Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 248 regards the נ in נ 핫 핫 핫 as a dittography from 핫 핫 핫. Read 핫 핫 핫 핫 핫.
³Some would change נ 핫 핫 핫 to 핫 핫 핫 핫 핫, but this does not follow the normal pattern because several names follow: Miriam, Shammai, and Ishbah.
⁴This is especially true when in Ezra and Nehemiah only three examples of the full form among the נ נ נ verbs and hiphil forms can be found: Nehemiah 4:3, 9 and 8:2. Among the נ נ נ verbs it occurs twice: Ezra 8:15 and Nehemiah 3:38.
⁵1 Chron. 4:33; 5:1, 7, 11; 7:5, 7, 9, 40; 9:1, 22; 2 Chron. 12:15; 31:16, 17, 18, 19.
it occurs are Ezra and Nehemiah, though it is also found in Rabbinic literature when pedigree is being argued or discussed. This particular usage indicates that the word had a wide use in late Biblical Hebrew. This is further supported by the lack of an alternative phrase in the other literature of the period. This being the case, this word is neutral testimony in the discussion of unity.

The concept of **ma'al** in Israel is a term used to describe a violation of sancta (`א`ו נ) and covenant/oath. These two components are intimately related as their terminology indicates. An oath made by the name of the Lord is called `ט ב, the oath itself is called `ט ת; the oath is sworn by `ט ת. In regard to **ma'al**, sancta and covenant/oath belong to God.

---

3 Lev. 5:15; cf. Deut. 26:13 = things set apart for the cult.
4 Lev. 26:15, 40; Ezek. 17, 19, 20; Dan. 9:7; Deut. 9:7. `א`ו נ is a word closely connected with `א`ו נ. It has been defined as an imposed agreement by a suzerain upon a people in the presence of divine witnesses (Exod. 31:18). The same concept is found in the Accadian `א`ד. D. J. Wiseman, "The Vassel Treaties of Esarhaddon," *Iraq* 20 (1958): 81, note 1.
6 Psalm 105:42; Ibid.
7 Psalms 89:36, 60:8; Amos 4:2; Ibid.
by virtue of a special relationship existing between God and the matter under concern.

A pointed illustration of a covenant/oath violation is the case of Zedekiah's infringement of his treaty with Nebuchadnezzar.¹ His disobedience to its stipulations is labelled as ma'āl.² Even though the covenant is between men, it is sworn by the name of God. This in effect makes it a treaty with God.³ Other examples of this class of ma'āl are false swearing,⁴ idolatry,⁵ adultery,⁶ and the mixed marriages which are found in the post-exilic period.⁷

Examples of sancta violation termed ma'āl are few. The books of Chronicles use it three times: Uzziah violates the sanctuary, Ahaz gives away holy vessels, and the nation of Judah goes into captivity because the temple was adulterated.⁸ A case of potential ma'āl in another account is the erections of the altar in Transjordan by Gad and Reuben. The other tribes believed the intended use was for sacrifices, but when it was made clear that the stones were

---

¹Ibid., pp. 237-238 and n. 12.
³2 Chron. 36:14; Ezek. 17:19.
⁴Lev. 5:22, 24; cf. v. 21.
⁶Num. 5:11.
⁷Ezra 9:2, 4; 10:2, 6, 10; Nehemiah 13:27.
for a witness between the tribes, the charge was dropped.\footnote{Joshua 22:16, 22.}

Ignoring \textit{herem} is also a violation of sancta. \textit{Herem} itself is a special possession of the Lord and as such is holy.\footnote{Josh. 6:17-19; 1 Sam. 15:2ff.; 1 Kings 20:42; Lev. 27:21, 28f.; Num. 18:14; Deut. 7:26; Ezek. 44:29.} Milgrom points out that the Achan example "explicitly teaches that appropriation of sancta for whatever purpose constitutes \textit{ma\'al}."\footnote{Milgrom, \textit{Ma\'al}, p. 237.} \textit{Herem}, however, is no ordinary sancta for once it is violated, those involved are executed by God.\footnote{Lev. 27:28, 29; Josh. 7:1ff.; 22:20; 1 Chron. 2:7; 1 Sam. 15:3-35; 1 Kings 20:42.}

\textit{Ma\'al} is not only an Israelite concept; it is found also among other peoples of the Ancient Near East.

The expression \textit{asakkam akalum} occurs in the Mari tablets. It seems likely that it is related to \textit{ma\'al} in the sphere of oath violation but not in the sphere of sancta.\footnote{Milgrom, \textit{Ma\'al}, pp. 241-242. Milgrom disagrees with M. Weinfeld, "The Royal and Sacred Aspects of the Tithe in the Old Testament," Beer-Sheva 1 (1973): 123, n. 6, where he sees an exact parallel of \textit{ma\'al} with \textit{asakkam akalum}.}

The Hittite text called "Instructions for Temple Officials" suggests the concept of \textit{ma\'al} in the realm of sancta.\footnote{A. Goetze, "Instructions for Temple Officials," \textit{ANET} (1955): 207-210.} Another Hittite text blames the violations of both sancta and oath for a plague on the Hittite
kingdom.

Many sinful actions recorded in the Old Testament fit the criterion of *ma'al*, but the author(s) do not designate them as such. Later, another author, in order to stress the seriousness of an action, applies *ma'al* to a particular action. A clear example is that of Zedekiah. An account of his reign appears in four books: 2 Kings 24:18-25:7; Jeremiah 37:1-39:10; Ezekiel 17:10-21; 2 Chronicles 36:11-21. The first two accounts do not label any sin as *ma'al*. Ezekiel terms the broken covenant with Nebuchadnezzar *ma'al*, yet the Chronicler does not similarly label the violation, although he stresses the sin of idolatry by calling it *ma'al*.

Another example is the application of *ma'al* to Ahaz. The account of his reign in Kings is loosely followed by the Chronicler. In Kings, the account simply relates the sins of giving the sacred vessels to Tiglath-pileser and his adoption of Assyrian gods, but the Chronicler pointedly designated the same sins as *ma'al*.3

This summary of *ma'al* shows that it is a word either of the so-called "P" document or of late Biblical Hebrew. Add to this the fact that the concept of *ma'al* appears in other ancient Near Eastern cultures, and it becomes clear

1 "The Plague Prayers of Mursilis," *ANET*2, p. 395, Num. 3-5.
3 It should be noted that 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, and among the prophets, only Ezekiel use *ma'al*.
that *macal* is a technical term which cannot be used to show unity of authorship. It can only be called a favorite word of the Chronicler, and cannot be used in an argument for unity of authorship.

d) **יָשָׁב**

This also is a favorite word for the Chronicler. It is used twenty-four times in the narrative section of Chronicles, but not once in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9.\(^1\) Driver defines the word as "to seek, to enquire of (God), in a general sense of seeking him in the various exercises and offices of religion."\(^2\) In older literature the word has the technical connotation of a special inquiry, usually by a prophet. The frequent use of *יָשָׁב* in the Psalms indicates that the word was a literary word common to the age.\(^3\) The absence of this word in the genealogies is not surprising since there is no context to which it may belong. *יָשָׁב* then cannot be used in an argument against unity of authorship.

e) **וַדָּבָר**

Driver lists this word as occurring in Chronicles about 40 times.\(^4\) Among its appearances is one found in

---

2. *Introduction*, p. 536.
1 Chronicles 9:32. Again, however, the word is popular in other books of the Old Testament: Exodus, Samuel, Kings, Esther, Isaiah, Job, Psalms and Ezra. In all these places the range of meanings is similar enough to warrant no isolation of a special usage. This indicates that the word was a favorite with the Chronicler and that it is neutral for our discussion.¹

f) הָנַי

Another favorite word of the Chronicler is הָנַי. It appears 15 times with the unique nuance "to strengthen oneself." Elsewhere in the Old Testament it means "to put forth strength, use one's strength."² Again, this word is not used in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9, nor is there any opportunity for its use. Therefore, הָנַי cannot be used to argue for diversity of authors.

g) הָנַי

Though this term does not occur in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9, it is a distinctive feature of the Chronicler's Hebrew.³ This absence in the genealogical section is not significant since there is no opportunity to use the word in that section.

¹ Williamson, Israel in the Books of Chronicles, pp. 53-54.
² Curtis-Madsen, Chronicles, pp. 29-30.
2. The Positive Evidence

a) The importance of lists and genealogies to both sections of Chronicles is well-known. In conjunction with these lists a vocabulary appears which frequently has a military connotation. The phrase "heads of the fathers' houses" as a military rank occurs often. The use of this term in a strict military sense only occurs once in the Pentateuch. The phrase "mighty warriors" used in apposition to "heads of the fathers' houses" or to men under their command is often found. These facts suggest unity of authorship.

b) The importance of this word lies in its complete absence in Ezra-Nehemiah even though there is ample opportunity for its use. It seems to be one of the Chronicler's

---


2 1 Chron. 7:2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 40; 5:24; 8:6, 13, 28; 27:1; 2 Chron. 17:14-19; 25:5; 26:11-12.

3 Num. 1:4, 16. Other occurrences in the Pentateuch are found in Exod. 6:14, 24; Num. 7:2; 17:2, 6; 25:15; 30:1; 31:26; 32:28; 34:1. They appear to relate basically to leaders of different tribes whose duties include military and judicial matters. J. R. Bartlett, "The Use of the Word הִמָּה as a Title in the Old Testaments," VT 19 (1969): 1-10, fails to make this distinctive. See especially pp. 7-8. Johnson, Biblical Genealogies, pp. 54-55 points out this difference.

4 Ibid., p. 55. See 1 Chron. 5:24; 7:2, 7, 9, 11, 40; 8:40; 12:28; 26:5; 2 Chron. 26:12.

favorite words. Because it appears frequently in the Psalms and in Isaiah, it is not an expression unique to Chronicles. But in 1 Chronicles 5:20 and 2 Chronicles 26:15 it occurs in the passive form. This may be significant since this is the only possible place in the first nine chapters where it could be used; it also occurs only in the passive form in two other places in the Old Testament. Thus it is an indication of unity of authors.

c) יַחְב

In Chronicles יַחְב is used with a special nuance which signifies a stylistic tendency. It occurs once in Nehemiah 9:25 in a rather liturgical prayer which contrasts sharply with the prose of Chronicles where the word occurs over 35 times. In other books of the period, it occurs once in Zechariah 14:14 and once in 1 Kings 10:27 which is the source the Chronicler used. In the example found in

---

1 Psalms 10:14; 28:7 (passive); 30:11, etc.; Isaiah 41:10-14; 44:2; 49:8; 50:7, 9.
2 Psalm 28:7; Daniel 11:34.
4 Driver, Introduction, p. 535. Its normal use in other books of the Bible is in a comparative sense; for instance, Judges 6:5, Joshua 14:4, etc.
6 Three times the Chronicler changes a different form of יַחְב to יַחְב: 2 Chron. 4:18 // 1 Kings 7:47; 2 Chron. 9:1 // 1 Kings 10:2; 2 Chron. 9:9 // 1 Kings 10:10.
1 Chronicles 4:38, שֵׁלֶד is used as an adverb, which is a construction found two other times. Keeping in mind the limited amount of prose in chapters 1 through 9, this example becomes a strong bit of positive evidence for the question under discussion.

d) שֵׁלֶד

This word does not occur in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 even though it would be possible to use it in 5:25 where the construct chain יְהָדָהֵן יִמְשָׁלָהא is used. Williamson has distinguished four meaning for יְהָדָהא: 1) it is used in the general sense of "lands"; 2) it is used particularly for Israel or for districts of Israel (1 Chronicles 13:2; 2 Chronicles 11:23; 34:33); and 3) the expression in Chronicles refers to the peoples of other lands (2 Chronicles 32:13 cf. 17, 13:9) while in Ezra-Nehemiah it refers to the heathen around the province of Judah (Ezra 3:3, 9:1, 2, 11; Nehemiah 9:30; 10:29).

The example in 5:25 does not fit any of these situations so it must be assumed the singular form of שֵׁלֶד is purposeful. Confirmation of this is found in 2 Chronicles 32:19 where the same phrase is found. יְהָדָהא does not occur anywhere else in the Old Testament. An alternate

---

1 2 Chron. 27:3; 31:5.
2 Israel in the Books of Chronicles, p. 55.
3 יְהָדָהא occurs in Ezra 10:2, 11 in the context of foreign women.
phrase does exist for הָעָלָה וְכָלָה and that is הָעָלָה וְכָלָה. The Chronicler's phrase then is a strong argument for unity of authorship.

e) מְלַחֲמַת

The interesting point about מְלַחֲמַת is that it occurs more times in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 (nine times) than in the remainder of Chronicles (one time). All other occurrences of מְלַחֲמַת are found in the so-called "P" document except one instance in Ruth 4:18. Its absence in other late literature, even though it could be used, shows that the word is a particular characteristic of the Chronicler and suggests unity of authorship.

f) גֶּפֶן

Another favorite form of the Chronicler is גֶּפֶן before substantives and infinitives when used in the sense of ג or ג. This form is found elsewhere, but the Chronicler uses it most often. Its presence in 1 Chronicles 4:39 and 5:9 suggests unity of authorship.

---

1 Gen. 34:30; 36:43; Jeremiah 1:14; Ezekiel 20:7 are a few examples.
2 1 Chron. 1:29; 5:7; 7:2; 7:4, 9; 8:28; 9:9, 34; 26:31.
3 In Ezra and Nehemiah, there are many lists to which the word is suited, but an alternate הָשְׁלָמַת is used; for example, Ezra 8:1.
This word is used in Chronicles in three ways: 1) 1 Chronicles 5:16—a unique use meaning pasture land of a particular district; elsewhere it always means a pasture land of a particular city. 2) 1 Chronicles 6:40ff. refers to the pasture land around the Levitical cities. This is a direct borrowing from Joshua 21:3ff. 3) In several places the words שֲַבֵּרָה and שֵׁבֵרָא refer to the Levitical city itself.

In the first and third meanings the word is unique to the books of Chronicles. Even though the first meaning is not paralleled in the narrative parts and the third meaning is not paralleled in the genealogical section, they may nevertheless indicate unity of authorship. If the author used the word in one section of the book in a peculiar sense, he may just as easily have used it in a unique sense in another section. If so—and this is speculative—it supports our claim.

h) הָנִבְּנָא

The word הָנִבְּנָא is one which the Chronicler borrowed from poetry and incorporated into his prose. It has two meanings, steadiness or reliability and permanent duty of an office. The second meaning is found in 1 Chronicles 9:22,

---


2 Ibid., p. 365, n. 5.
26, 31 and in 2 Chronicles 31:15.\(^1\) This peculiar use of the word strongly indicates unity of authorship.

1) \( \text{נִבִּית} \)

Though this word appears often in other books, its thirty-six occurrences in Chronicles make it a favorite word for the Chronicler.\(^2\) In 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 it occurs five times, which strongly indicates unity of authorship.\(^3\) This is an especially strong argument since the word occurs only two more times in late Biblical Hebrew: Ezekiel 44:14 and Nehemiah 10:33. It would seem that the Chronicler used an older expression.

j) Use of Two Plural Forms

"The combination of two plural forms (contrary to better usage)"\(^4\) is quite frequent in Chronicles. It occurs only in Ezra-Nehemiah in stereotyped phrases.\(^5\) It has been noted that the Chronicler alters his source to create this formation.\(^6\) All examples of this habit are found in both sections of Chronicles: 1) מִנְיָה מִשְׁפַּה 1 Chronicles 5:24; 12:31; 2) מִנְיָה מִשְׁפַּה 1 Chronicles 7:5, 7, 11, 40; 11:26.\(^7\)

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 365, n. 5.
\(^2\) Williamson, Israel in the Books of Chronicles, p. 56.
\(^3\) Chron. 6:17, 33; 9:13, 19, 28.
\(^4\) Curtis-Madsen, Chronicles, p. 35.
\(^6\) Williamson, Israel in the Books of Chronicles, p. 58.
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 58, n. 1.
Again, this strongly suggests unity of authorship.

k) The Technique of Assuming

This phenomenon of assuming that the reader knows the background of an event or a person is further manifested in the genealogies. It is most obvious in the genealogy of Ephraim, where the first segment ends with Ezer and Elead and the second with Joshua. The author found it necessary to explain who the first two men were, but it is assumed that the reader knows the history of Joshua.\(^1\) The pun on the name of Achan also assumes a knowledge of that event.\(^2\)

In the narrative sections of Chronicles, the Chronicler often assumes a prior knowledge of the facts on the part of the reader. This is seen, for example, in 2 Chronicles 11:13-17, where it is necessary to know the narrative of 1 Kings 12:25-33 in order to understand the event. Also 1 Chronicles 24:2 assumes a knowledge of who Nadab and Abihu were.\(^3\)

The Alternating Pattern

Another technique is exhibited by the method of presenting the salvation concept. In the discussion above,

\(^1\) 1 Chron. 7:21, 27.

\(^2\) Ackroyd, TBP, p. 33, 1 Chron. 2:7.

it was noted that the theme was presented in five different ways: 1) a man is given only retribution, 2) retribution is given and repentance or salvation follows, 3) a man receives only salvation, 4) salvation is given followed by backsliding and punishment, and 5) the combination of 3 and 4 with the theme of salvation spread over the reigns of two men or periods of time.  

In the narrative sections the same is observed. Saul, Jehoram, Ahaziah, Athaliah, an Amon are all examples of retribution. Manasseh is a classic example of a wicked man repenting after punishment and receiving the blessing of God. It is well known that both David and Solomon, as the Chronicler depicts them, received blessings from God. Joash and Josiah are the perfect examples of those who enjoy God's blessing and then lose it because of sin. The so-called alternating pattern is seen in the combined reigns of Saul and David. Also, as was previously noted, Hezekiah's goodness is contrasted with Assyria's wickedness. In a broader view, Ahaz and Hezekiah give a good example of the alternating pattern.

1 Chron. 2:3, 7; 4:9-10; 5:18-26; 7:20-29.
3 Chron. 33:1-20, 21-25.
5 See comments under salvation.
It is, therefore, clearly seen that the method of presentation is consistent in the two sections of Chronicles.

**Function**

It is obvious that the Chronicler was always concerned with legitimacy. The theology presented by Chronicles concerns itself with election and "all Israel." The first concerns legitimate kingship whereas the second concerns the legitimate people of God. Next the motifs of Chronicles also emphasize this aspect. David emerges as the legitimate model from which all other religious revivals draw their authority. This is so because he was elected king in perpetuity and because God revealed the temple site to him. Moreover, he is related to the Levitical line through Amminadab. In the motif of salvation, each king has his reign judged on the theory of spiritual legitimacy: did the king hold to the true faith? If the answer was positive, he was buried in the city of David in the kings' tombs. If negative, he was buried only in the city of David. It was also seen that the cult and the temple were legitimized by linking them to David and to the tabernacle. It may be said that every genealogy or segment which has a function adds weight to the absolute authority and divine acceptance of the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom.

So far not much has been said concerning the geographic

---

1 See 2 Chron. 21:20.
references which are found in the genealogies. The theory has been advanced that these references are included to redefine the territory of the Davidic kingdom.\(^1\) The passages referred to in support of this theory are all taken from the Davidic or Solomonic rule.\(^2\) The theological and historical fact for the Chronicler is that God divided the kingdom after the reign of Solomon, thus narrowing down the theocracy to include only the territory occupied by Judah and Benjamin.\(^3\) Consequently, it is much better to regard these place names as reflecting the region which Judah controlled after the kingdom was divided and to which the exiles returned. The list of Levitical cities was included because they were faithful to God and thus still retained inheritance rights. They could not, however, claim them because of the political situation. The cities mentioned for the Transjordan tribes are included for the sake of the historical notes. By this means their boundaries are outlined, and the geographical regions of the skirmishes are more intelligible. The cities listed in the genealogy of Ephraim are more difficult to understand. It may be a listing for the sake of Joshua, a type of sentimentalism. Or it may be that Ephraim was the center of the Northern

\(^1\) Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, pp. 57-60.

\(^2\) They are 1 Chron. 28:8, 2 Chron. 6:25b, 31; 7:20, 33:8.

\(^3\) 2 Chron. 10:15, 11:1-4. The Negev area was included in the genealogies because of the still strong Judahite settlements there. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, pp. 355-56; cf. Neh. 11:25-35.
tribes and thus of importance as the focus of the apostasy which crept into Judah under the influence of Jezebel and Ahtaliah. Another reason may be that the restored community occupied part of the tribal territories of Ephraim. But perhaps the best explanation is that both the Ephraimite and Manassehite exiles returned and settled in Judah, hence the Chronicler included their tribal boundaries. In support of this is the fact that Asher, Naphtali, Issachar, and Manasseh have no towns listed, and of course Dan and Zebulun were not even included. Thus, except for the idealism of the Levitical cities, the geographical listings reflect historical reality.

Conclusion

The above discussion has shown that the genealogies and the narrative sections of Chronicles form a unit. It may be argued by some that a few of the proofs are imitations by a later editor who had a clear grasp of the thought, technique, and theology of the narrative's author. If only a few similarities could be assembled, this would be true. But in view of the detailed, imaginative literary techniques, as well as the creative use of genealogies to give theological unity and motival consistency, it appears very likely

1Aharoni, The Land of the Bible, pp. 356-365; Gezer and Bethel are included in post-exilic Judah.

2It may be that the reason Manasseh's cities are found in the Ephraimite genealogy is because Manasseh was closely linked to Ephraim since they are both Josephites. Johnson overlooks this in Biblical Genealogies, p. 56.
that a single author is responsible for the two distinguishable and yet coherent sections of Chronicles.

This result casts considerable doubt upon the validity of the edition theory of Chronicles which puts most of the narrative portions at 515 B.C.E. and the genealogical portion at 400 B.C.E. On the basis of the above study, the date for both portions must be circa 400 B.C.E.
PART TWO

THE GENEALOGIES OF 1 CHRONICLES ONE THROUGH NINE

All of the recent advances made by scholars in the books of Chronicles have focused on the narrative portions. Much of the bypassing of the genealogies is the result of past attitudes toward them. They were often considered fictitious and of no particular value. Furthermore, there was a lack of any new research methods or results. Most commentators simply followed the conclusions of the older commentaries, and made no advancement toward the proper understanding of these genealogies. Many authors had only a specialized interest in the genealogies, which prevented them from making a thorough study of the subject. Little thought

1The most common genealogies to be dealt with in this manner are those of the high priests and the Levites. For example, see J. R. Bartlett, "Zadok and His Successors at Jerusalem," Journal of Theological Studies, NS (1968): 1-18 or André Lefèvre, "Note d'Exégèse sur les Genealogies des Qehatites," Recherches de Sciences Religieuses, 37 (1950): 287-92. Another common one is the genealogy of Benjamin or sections of it. See Aaron Demsky, "The Genealogy of Gibeon (1 Chronicles 9:35-44): Biblical and Epigraphic Considerations," BASOR 202 (April, 1971): 16-23. Also consider the special interest of A. Malamat in "King Lists of the Old Babylonian Period and Biblical Genealogies," JACOS 88 (1968): 163-173, where he illustrates his theory by using some of the genealogies of 1 Chronicles. The list could go on, but this is enough to show the piecemeal effect resulting from these studies. This does not cast doubt on the scholarship, but only points out the lack of a complete united study of the genealogies here.
was ever given to the possibility that although the pattern of the genealogy in its present context was a deliberate creation with the Chronicler's full cognizance, he did not conjure up genealogies themselves, but rather borrowed them from other sources and welded them into a unit. The intent of this section is to investigate the previous functions which other authors proposed for these genealogies, and to set forth this writer's suggestions for those original functions wherever feasible.

Both Johnson and Wilson in their aforementioned publications have done some work in this area. Wilson has concerned himself only with a few Biblical genealogies, whereas Johnson's investigation is spotty and needs to be further defined.

These genealogies are drawn from a wide historical period. Within the Biblical period, Israel went from a tribal society to a strong monarchical form of government. In spite of these changes, tribal vestiges still remained in later historical periods so that genealogies were not discarded altogether. It is possible, however, that some types of functions involving segmented genealogies had ceased. In the examination which follows, the genealogies will be catalogued according to the type of governmental structure in which they originated, and also according to their function--domestic, political-juridical, or religious.

It seems necessary therefore to undertake a new investigation of these genealogies, using the approach suggested
by Wilson. This study of the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 will investigate their form, their function, their origins, their transmissional history, and their theology.

The methodology employed in this section of the dissertation is still a comparative one controlled by the exegesis of the particular Bible passage being analyzed. The material to be compared is drawn from three sources: modern oral genealogies, ancient Near Eastern genealogies, and the genealogies of the Old Testament. The first mentioned area will provide knowledge of the complexity of oral genealogies in living social situations.

The investigation of the genealogies of the ancient Near East will discuss the existence of genealogies in a literary culture and usually in the context of a centralized government. To understand fully the nature of the genealogies in this type of environment, parallel genealogies must be found and analyzed in each of their contexts. As will soon be seen, many strange things can happen to a genealogy when it is removed from its original context and inserted into another.

The insights which will be discovered about genealogies will be used to illuminate the genealogies of 1 Chronicles and those found in the rest of the Old Testament where the present investigation might lead. These comparisons will help the investigator to look into ideas about Old Testament genealogies which otherwise may never have been considered.
These characteristics and uses discovered can serve also as a tool for contrasting genealogies and sharpening the skills of the investigator. All of this material will give an impetus for hypotheses concerning the origin, the apparent conflicts, and the social contexts of the genealogies.

It is at this stage of the investigation that exegesis is so important. It is paramount for the investigator to use the text in determining whether a particular hypothesis is acceptable. No theory must force a text to fit it. The text as it stands must support the hypothesis that is being applied to it.

Some may charge that a transcultural study of genealogies has little value for the Bible scholar, but such a negative viewpoint cannot be maintained. The data gathered here come from many differing cultures in different areas. The material from the ancient Near East provides confirmation, since it is at least 2300 years old. When all these genealogies are compared, many principles governing their structure and roles are discerned, and the Old Testament genealogies will be studied in the light of these results. The fallacy of forcing the Biblical genealogies into a mold found in a particular culture thought to parallel that of the Israelites is avoided by following the procedure outlined above.
Recent studies on the genealogies of the Old Testament have emphasized their function. Two types of studies have been involved. The first asked the question: what is the function of the genealogies in their present context? The emphasis in this type of question is on how the author used the genealogy which he found in his literature. The major study on this subject is Marshall Johnson's book *The Purpose of Biblical Genealogies*.\(^1\) It is only when Johnson considers the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 2-8 that he seeks to discover their origin, even though his discussion is general. This is not surprising, since the genealogies of 1 Chronicles are widely recognized as secondary to their present context. After identifying several types of functions for Old Testament genealogies, Johnson summarizes them on pages 77-82 of his book as follows:

1. Many of the OT genealogies (Genesis 10; 19:36-38; 22:20-24; 25:1-6, 12-15; 36) serve to demonstrate the relations between Israel and the neighboring tribes by tracing all the groups involved back to a common ancestor.

2. Some OT genealogies, particularly those in the "Toledoth Book," are used to link together originally independent traditions about Israel's origins.

3. Certain genealogies (Genesis 5; 11:10-27; Ruth 4:18-22) are used as literary and historical bridges

---

to span gaps in the traditions used by the biblical writers.

(4) Genealogies such as those in Genesis 5 and 11 sometimes function as a basis for chronological speculations.

(5) Several of the tribal genealogies in 1 Chronicles 2 - 8 are apparently constructed from military census lists, a fact which demonstrates the use of genealogies for political purposes.

(6) Some genealogies in 1 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah seem to have been used by office holders to legitimize their offices. Also involved in these passages may be a postexilic attempt to demonstrate the racial purity of Israel and to create a continuity between preexilic and post-exilic Israel.¹

Johnson's study does not consider the historiographic value of the genealogies although he identifies a function which may be based on authentic historic documents, as in point 5 above. The important result of this study is that each genealogy must be considered individually and cannot be fitted into a monolithic function.²

The second type of study asks the question: did this genealogy ever have any other function before it was used in its present context, and if so, does it have any historiographic value? This is the subject of a study done by Robert R. Wilson.³ It focuses on the form and function of genealogies and the possibility of their different functions as they were used in different social contexts. He concludes

²Ibid., pp. 172-173.
that genealogies in the Old Testament are "frequently altered by the people who use them and are consciously shaped for specific purposes."¹ This implies that not all genealogies are of historical value. Each one must be critically examined to determine if it can be used as an historical document.²

Wilson identifies four more classes of genealogies. The first is the "authentic genealogy," one that had an existence outside of the Biblical context.³ The second covers genealogies which take their names and kinship terms from the narrative tradition. The third comprises genealogies which take names from the narrative tradition, while the kinship terms are supplied by their compiler. The fourth consists of genealogies which take their names from independent lists with the kinship terms supplied by the compiler.⁴

Wilson's work is an invaluable tool for the student of genealogies. It may be characterized as a "prolegomenon" to all future studies in this field. One of his major contributions is his discussion of contemporary genealogies, based upon the careful work of field anthropologists. His work on the genealogies of the ancient Near East also has

¹Wilson, GHOT, p. 244.
²Ibid., pp. 246, 249.
³This first category is Noth's and will be discussed later on.
⁴Wilson, GHOT, pp. 248-249.
great merit and is likely to exercise wide influence in the
years to come.¹ His most important contribution, as discussed
above, is his investigation of the historiographic value of
genealogies in general. This is a clear advance over the
views of previous scholars who have investigated this
question. These older views will now be discussed briefly.

Prior to the last half of the nineteenth century,
genealogies were presumed to be reliable sources for recon-
structing the history of Israel. As modern criticism
advanced, this view generally declined. Wellhausen dealt
one great blow to it when he divided the Pentateuch into
different documents. He advanced the theory that P was a
late document and noted that most of the genealogies belonged
to P. Since Chronicles was also compiled rather late, he
concluded that it was worthless as a source in recon-
structing Israel's history. Concerning the genealogies in
Chronicles, he wrote:

One might as well try to hear the grass
growing as attempt to derive from such a
source as this a historical knowledge of
the conditions of ancient Israel.²

W. Robertson Smith was more conservative in his approach.
He pointed out that genealogies are frequently used in tribal
societies to express social and political relationships
between tribes. Genealogies were not attempts in writing

¹Summaries of these studies will be given, for they are
crucial to the discussion of this proposed study.

²Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, p. 215.
history but reflections of social conditions at the particular time in history. 1

As time progressed, the Albright school proposed the thesis that genealogies do contain material which could be valuable for history. Albright often pointed out the amazing accuracy of the Arabs in transmitting their own oral material. 2 Another advance was made by Martin Noth, who saw a distinction between primary and secondary genealogies. The former are the original documents created for specific purposes in the society, while the latter have no existence outside of the narrative in which they appear. The result is that some genealogies are reliable sources for history while others were manufactured in order to link together literary units. 3 Wilson thought that Albright and Noth's contributions were merely a refinement of the Wellhausen and Smith views. 4

Definitions

Wilson expresses concern about the standardization of genealogical terms for use in Biblical studies. They must, he suggests, have a neutral connotation so that no historical conclusions would be drawn from the terms themselves. The historical value of a genealogy can only be determined after the completion of a critical study of it. The terms and formula descriptions used in this paper follow Wilson's terminology.¹

A genealogy is a written or oral scheme of one's descent from an ancestor or ancestors by way of an enumeration of the intermediate forebears. It may exhibit breadth (a "horizontal" listing: Joseph begat Reuben, Simeon, etc.) and depth (a "vertical" listing: Abraham, his son Isaac, his son Esau, etc.) or depth alone, but never breadth alone.² If a genealogy comprises both dimensions, it is termed segmented and each manifestation of depth is called a segment. A genealogy which exhibits only depth is called linear. One additional ingredient is the presence of a kinship term or terms by which the names in the genealogy may be interpreted, and this term may have either an external or internal relationship to the genealogy. Each

¹Wilson, *GHOT*, p. 9.
²Breadth and depth must have a configuration of at least two names to be significant.
name in it represents one generation unless otherwise noted.

A genealogy in itself may be either of a narrative type or of a list type. One of the narrative type contains many subsidiary details, and yet the focus remains on the kinship relationships between the names, so that the genealogy is central to the narrative.

A genealogy may be of the list type in one of two ways. Either a kinship term is used between each name and the next and is thus internal, or it is implied and is thus external. Without the kinship term, by which the relationships between names are defined, there is only a list of names.¹

**Characteristics of Oral Genealogies**

Field anthropologists², in their reports on modern tribal societies have noted that in many cases genealogies are central to their tribal experiences.³ In these cases a genealogy is a mnemonic of the domestic, political-juridical,

¹Wilson, GHOT, pp. 10-11.

²The material in this chapter is a summary of the data gathered by Robert R. Wilson found in chapter I of GHOT, pp. 21-67. See also his summary in the article "Old Testament Genealogies," pp. 178-182. This material is based upon the field reports of anthropologists who adhere basically to the British School of Functional Anthropologists. The present writer has read these reports extensively in order to prepare this summary even though the chapter closely corresponds to Wilson's study.

and religious structures of the societies.\(^1\) This is significant, because the form and function of a genealogy are closely integrated and are important in everyday events.\(^2\)

In analyzing genealogies, however, it is necessary to separate form and function in order to facilitate their discussion.

**Segmentation**

In most tribal societies segmentation is a characteristic of their genealogies, and is a product of the tribal concept founded upon a lineage system. Lineage may be either patrilineal or matrilineal, meaning that a person may trace his or her ancestors through either the male or the female line for a determinate number of generations. If it consists of only three generations, it is called a minimal lineage; on the other hand, it may have a large number of generations. A unilineal descent group includes all the members of a lineage who are alive at any given time.\(^3\)

There are several items to be noted concerning a lineage system: first, segmentation or "branching" is implied. Second, segmentation implies at least two members who trace

---

1. Fortes, *Dynamics of Clanship*, p. 31.


their descent to the same ancestor. If only one member were listed, there would be no group and the resulting genealogy would be linear. Third, each group is related to a larger group, and this process can be continued to infinity. Each grouping may be a lineage no matter how small or large, as long as each is connected by a common ancestor. The name for the smallest group is "minimal lineage"; the name for the largest group is "maximal lineage".¹

A different type of genealogy found in tribal societies is linear genealogy.² This type of genealogy has no segmentation as a formal characteristic, and thus is not a mnemonic of the lineage.

**Depth**

An important feature inherent in all genealogies is depth. There is no consistent standard of depth, but by definition a genealogy must have at least two generations. The focus of our discussion is the depth of the segmented genealogy, and the genealogies of several tribes will be examined to show the wide range of depth which is possible.

Two tribes which exhibit a depth of only three or four generations in their genealogies are the

---


Nupe and the Luapula. Two other tribes which sometimes reach a depth of five generations are the Yoruba and the LoWili. Although there are several tribes which have genealogies with a depth of five to ten generations, others have ten to fourteen generations. These include not only African but also Arab tribes. Among the former are the Ashanti, the Nuer, the Tallensi, the Gusii, the Lugbara, and the Swazi. Among the latter are the Cyrenaican

1 S. F. Nadel, A Black Byzantium (London: Oxford University, 1942), p. 45.
8 Fortes, Dynamics of Clanship, p. 31.
Bedouins who count nine to twelve generations from the living descendants of the tribal ancestor, even though the tribe is known to be older than the time span represented by the twelve-generation genealogy. The Baggara Arabs usually trace their genealogies to the tribal founder who is nine to twelve generations removed from the living members of the tribe, yet it is interesting to note their claim of being descendants of Guheyna who lived before Mohammed. If a Baggara Arab is asked to cite the names of his ancestors beyond the depth limit, he will simply name his province or refer to himself as a "Baggara" or an "Arab."

Theoretically, a genealogy's depth has no limit, but in practice this is not the case. There are several limiting factors of which one is the social structure of the tribe. An example is the Luapula society where a living person becomes sociologically the deceased person, taking not only the role of the deceased but his identity as well. By using kinship terminology the new face with the old name may be two generations younger than the others in the same position, and yet they all are counted as brothers. In this way their genealogies seldom exceed four generations.

---


3 Cunnison, "History and Genealogies," pp. 22-23.
Other tribes limit the depth of their genealogies through their political structures. The resulting depth can be diversified: for example, the genealogical depth of Amba and Konkomba is small while that of the Tiv is large. This is the result of their attitudes to the number of generations that are politically important.¹

The lineage mechanism which creates a genealogy limits it as well. The result is that the people remember only those names which are significant for their status and position. The leaders of a tribe know a more lengthy genealogy than do their constituents. An aged person can cite a longer genealogy than a young person, because he knows more people and has been involved in more situations in which genealogies played an important role.² This implies that a person recites only that portion of a genealogy which is applicable to a particular situation. A genealogy's function thus markedly influences its form, and this will be dealt with more fully later on.³

Linear genealogies often exceed the depth of the segmented genealogy within the same tribe because the linear


³Wilson, GHOT, p. 27.
genealogy concerns a hereditary position and/or is a source of political power. Thus, the Luapula tribe, whose segmented genealogies reach only four generations, has a royal lineage of nine generations. The Buganda of Uganda recite a royal genealogy which goes back thirty generations. The Tikopá have several linear genealogies which vary in depth from eight to nineteen generations, the Yoruba have a forty-name genealogy, and the Nupe recite one of ten or more generations. These are just a few examples.

In summary, it is clear that depth is not uniform either within a society or between societies. Genealogies in the same societies differ in depth according to the purpose for which they are recited. Furthermore, there seems to be little correlation between the depth of several linear genealogies either among themselves or when compared with other cultures or with segmented genealogies.

Thus the anthropological literature provides no grounds for assuming the existence of a 'standard' genealogical depth in tribal genealogies.

---

1 Cunnison, "History and Genealogies," p. 27.
3 Firth, We the Tikopia, p. 225.
5 Nadel, The Black Byzantium, p. 45.
6 Wilson, "Old Testament Genealogies," p. 179.
7 Ibid.
Fluidity

An important though perhaps startling formal characteristic of genealogies is fluidity. This is a term used to describe a complex social mechanism which causes a genealogy to change its form. It often gives rise to apparently contradictory genealogies. This phenomenon is characteristic of all cultures which use genealogies, but it is most prevalent in those which use segmented genealogies.

The causes for genealogical fluidity are directly connected to the domestic, political-juridical, and religious structure of a culture. This is so because

the genealogical charter is indispensable for the conduct of lineage affairs at all levels of the internal structure and a knowledge of personal genealogical relationships is essential for the individual in the conduct of his social relations within his personal field of kinship.¹

Though the function of genealogies will be discussed in detail below, the Tiv society is a perfect example in which this process occurs.² The genealogy is a mnemonic for the lineage, hence it must change in order to mirror changes in the lineage alignments in each social context.³

The genealogical changes can be grouped into three categories: a change in the kinship relations between the names involved, the addition of names, and the deletion of

---

¹Fortes, Kinship and the Social Order, p. 167.
names. While discussing these changes, it should be kept in mind that more than one change may occur in a particular genealogy.

The first type of fluidity occurs in the relationship of names within the genealogy. This may be reflected in a variety of ways. A name may jump from one generational level to another level, either up or down, or the kinship relation on the same level may change. This occurs frequently and causes contradictions in genealogies. In the Yombe tribe of Africa a dispute occurred over the question of who should be the next chief. Genealogies were used to settle the issue and several genealogies were presented to support the claims of those vying for the honor. One of the differences between the genealogies was the occurrence in one genealogy of a pair of names as those of men, while in another genealogy the same names were those of women. The Bemba tribe have at least five different recensions of their royal genealogy. In each one the order of names differs once the generations go beyond the range of living memory. Among the Tiv, Ikakwer, the founder of a lineage, is listed as a man with two sons (Nyam and Ikaa), as a man with two wives (Nyam and Ikaa), and again as a woman.

1 Wilson, GHOT, pp. 35-44.
another situation where a certain Kiagba is an arbiter, Gor and Wandia have different mothers in one genealogy while in a different context they are said to have the same mothers.¹ The Gusii call the same person a son, wife, brother, grand-son, or brother's son of a second person.² Among the Baggara Arabs, the elders disagree about the order of names in their genealogies.³

The reasons for this type of genealogical fluidity is twofold: first, a name or a group of names loses its functional importance, so that exactitude is forgotten.⁴ Second, shifts within the genealogy may actually reflect changes within the structure of the lineage. These shifts are important. In the case of contradictory genealogies they reflect real or attempted realignment of lineage segments in certain domestic, political-juridical, and religious situations.⁵ When this happens, the segments' eponymous ancestors are regrouped to show the present situation either up or down on the genealogical "scale." If the founder of a segment is equal to other founders, he is represented on the same genealogical level. If he is considered on a lower level than the other founders, he may be put on a genealogical level with the sons of the

²Mayer, Lineage Principle, p. 9. Wilson, GHOT, p. 35.
³Cunnison, Baggara Arabs, p. 112.
⁴Fortes, Dynamics of Clanship, p. 35.
⁵Wilson, GHOT, p. 36.
other segment founders. However, in another social situation the genealogy may reverse itself.

The second type of genealogical fluidity is the addition of names or segments to a genealogy. Part of this process is the result of natural growth, since newly-born people must be added to the lineage.

Related to this is the development of new segments. This may be the result of ecological factors such as the amount of land available for cultivation, the amount of water available for the herds, or it may be simply the result of too many people in a social unit.¹

Another aspect of this type of fluidity is the addition of persons to a lineage who are not related in any way to the other persons already in it. In the case of individuals this is accomplished either by adoption or by some other affiliation process. The person involved is given a kinship relation by which he becomes related to the other members of the lineage, after which he is properly placed in the genealogies.²

By the same process, entire lineages may be adopted or grafted into a different lineage or tribe.

¹ For examples of the influence of ecology see Middleton and Tait, Tribes Without Rulers, p. 85; Cole, Nomads of the Nomads, p. 102; for a discussion of lineage growth see Meggitt, The Lineage System of the Mae-Enga, pp. 54-67; Fortes, Dynamics of Clanship, p. 106.

This grafting is expressed genealogically by placing the founder of the grafted lineage in the proper position on the host lineage's genealogy.\footnote{Wilson, GHOST, p. 38.}

The proper kinship term is supplied in these cases also. However, these grafted groups are often banned from participation in the more significant events of tribal functions, and are never fully assimilated.\footnote{Fortes, Dynamics of Clanship (London: Oxford University, 1945), pp. 40, 51-53; Kinship and the Social Order (Chicago: Aldine, 1969), p. 168; Evans-Pritchard, Nuer (Oxford: Clarenden, 1940), pp. 228-231.}

The third type of genealogical fluidity is the disappearance of names from a genealogy. These names may be lost either temporarily or permanently. The former usually occurs because certain names have no relevance to the occasion, but on another occasion they may recur.\footnote{J. A. Barnes, "The Collection of Genealogies," The Rhodes-Livingstone Journal 5 (1947): 52-53.}

It is the latter type of name omission that is of concern here. In the above discussion of depth it was shown that living genealogies are limited in depth, which indicates that names are omitted. The middle section of a genealogy is the one most susceptible to losing names. The lower section involves living members who are not easily lost, while the names at the head of a genealogy are functionally significant and necessarily remain constant. The technical term used for this type of fluidity is "telescoping,"
and it occurs extensively in genealogies.¹

Telescoping is the result of several factors. First, an entire segment may be destroyed by sickness, famine, or war, and when this occurs, the segment is usually omitted from the genealogy. Second, childless lineages die out naturally and may be quickly forgotten. Third, the process of splitting or fission causes a segment's omission from its original genealogy although it may be accounted for elsewhere. Fourth, the names of unimportant people are simply forgotten over a long period of time. Fifth, someone may suppress a name deliberately because it is tainted or because, if it is forgotten, it will enhance the obliterator's status; this sometimes happens to entire groups. Sixth, peculiarities in the use of names, titles, and kinship terms may facilitate the omission of some names from a genealogy.²

¹Wilson, GHOT, p. 39. Societies which exhibit telescoping are the Luapula (Cunnison, Luapula People, pp. 109-112 and "History and Genealogies," p. 22); Ewilile and Shila (Cunnison, "History and Genealogies," p. 29); Marri Baluch (Meggitt, The Lineage System of the Mae-Enka, pp. 55, 65, 77); Tallensi (Fortes, The Dynamics of Clanship, p. 35); Bwamba (Winter, Bwamba, pp. 15-17); Tikopia (Firth, Social Change in Tikopia, p. 229); Ashanti (Fortes, Kinship and Social Order, p. 167, n. 33); Yoruba (Lloyd, "The Yoruba Lineage," pp. 244-245); Somali (I. M. Lewis, A Pastoral Democracy (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 147-48); Cyrenaica Bedouin (Peters, "Bedouin of Cyrenaica," pp. 32-33); and the Nuer (Evans-Pritchard, The Nuer, pp. 199-200). It was Evans-Pritchard who first described this phenomenon.

²These types have been catalogued by Wilson, GHOT, pp. 39-41.
The last and most important reason for the occurrence of telescoping is the loss of function by some names within the lineage. The names which have a function in a genealogy are the living members of the lineage, the founders of the tribes and the phratries, and those names in-between which serve as integrating points between lineages. The following example of this is one given by Winter. If a man is the only son of a father who has several brothers, and his uncles in turn have sons, the man relates himself to his cousins by tracing all of the relevant descent lines back to the point where they meet in a common ancestor, the man's grandfather. The grandfather is thus socially important because through him the man's father is related to his brothers, and the man himself is related to his cousins. The man's father, however, is not socially important in this way, and as the lineage grows after the father's death, his name may eventually drop from the genealogy, although the grandfather's name will be retained as long as it is a point of segmentation and thus has a relational function. When the father's name disappears, the son's name will replace it, and the genealogy will then list the son as the son of his grandfather and the brother of his father's brothers. Names which have no function are not repeated and are thus forgotten.

---

1 Bwambe, p. 211.
2 Wilson, GHOT, pp. 40-42.
Certain situations may cause whole segments or whole genealogies to be lost. For example, societies which discontinue a monarchial form of government forget some of the names in the long royal genealogies which were used to regulate succession. Similarly, lists of ancestral names recited in connection with an ancestor cult become notably shorter if the cult is modified or discontinued.  

Crystallization

Crystallization is the result of certain social mechanisms which prevent particular units of a genealogy from being changed in number and name. This occurs in the upper levels of a genealogy which have been stabilized by the passing of time. It is not a universal phenomenon, for in most societies these genealogical units are subject to much change and fluidity which, in fact, may be considered the norm.

Of the few societies which manifest crystallization, the Ashanti and the Tallensi are two examples. The number of clans in the Ashanti tribe and the number of subclans in the Tallensi tribe always remain constant, although segments may detach themselves from the subclans of the Tallensi. If this occurs, they become less important in the genealogy.

1 Examples are from Wilson, GHOT, pp. 41-42; see Richards, "Social Mechanisms," p. 183 for a discussion of this type of process.

2 Fortes, Dynamics of Clanship, pp. 33-43; Kinship and the Social Order, pp. 160-161.
The Mae-Enga of New Guinea are a special case. Theoretically, the upper structure of the lineage system remains static, but groups are known to have changed their names and status.  

Internal Structure

Genealogies occur in both narrative and list form in tribal cultures. The most frequently encountered form is the narrative, and generally it is not elaborate. Its structure is simple, and gives only the necessary kinship terms between the names in the genealogy. However, a genealogy, which is concerned with origins, tends to become part of a myth and loses its individuality. The list form occurs infrequently, and is usually confined to certain ritual or political contexts.

Function of Oral Genealogies

The genealogies of living cultures are not the result of idle interest. They perform specific functions which fall into three categories: domestic, political-juridical, and religious. However, these categories cannot always be easily isolated, since a genealogy may involve several different functions at the same time. In such cases it is often difficult to determine where one function stops and another begins. If a particular situation demands the

---

1 Meggitt, *The Lineage System of the Mae-Enga*, pp. 49-54.
2 Wilson, *GHOT*, p. 44.
3 Fortes, *Kinship and Social Order*, p. 72 et passim.
involvement of a complete lineage, a domestic function takes on political-juridical overtones because certain legal consequences may ensue if these domestic responsibilities are not met. In cases like this the function may not fall clearly into any one category, but for the purposes of analysis these three categories will be used.

1. Domestic Functions

When a genealogy functions in the domestic sphere, it relates some individuals to others and to groups within the society, and defines their social rights and obligations to each other. The kinship terms used to link these individuals or groups together usually reflect accurately actual biological relationships. The social relationships thus expressed govern social conduct. This makes it imperative that each living member be incorporated into the lineage.

The practical result of all this is that a person's position in the lineage requires certain types of conduct toward the people surrounding him, and they in turn will act toward him according to his position. Some societies use definite social terms to address people who are on different status levels.

---

1 Ibid., pp. 72-75.
3 Note also that kinship terms are used to relate people geographically, economically, and politically.
4 M. Fortes, Kinship and Social Order, pp. 167-168.
5 Cole, Nomads of the Nomads, pp. 83-84.
The amount of social hostility a group may inflict upon another group is dependent upon the particular social position of the parties involved. Practices of theft, feuding, witchcraft, and the like are permitted or forbidden depending upon genealogical distance. The choice of a spouse is regulated by lineage position, as are matters of economics such as gardening, grazing, homebuilding, hoeing, and inheritance as well as many other daily concerns.

When a domestic problem arises, the proper genealogical segment is cited to justify positions. If it is challenged, an alternative genealogy is given. Usually these genealogies are segmented, but if an individual's claims rest upon one forebear in the past, a linear genealogy may be cited. In this case only a connection between the two persons needs to be proven. Thus both types of genealogies are found to be functioning in the domestic sphere.

---


3Wilson, GHOT, p. 47.
2. Politico-Jural Function

When a genealogy functions in the politico-jural sphere, it implies the

... maintenance or establishment of social order, within a territorial framework, by the organized exercise of coercive authority through the use, or the possibility of use, of physical force.'

The stability of the political structure is maintained by laws which are either written or oral. They are enforced by authoritative mechanisms which are sanctioned by a particular society and thus jural dimensions are present, too.

There are two types of governments in tribal societies. The first type is called "acephalous" and consists of politically organized groups with no centralized government. Though there are several types of acephalous political systems, the most important ones for this discussion are those which base their political system on the lineage or unilineal descent group. In these tribes the segmented genealogy delineates the political structure. The political positions are filled according to the status a person may have attained, and the genealogies are shifted to reflect the change. Thus the genealogy becomes a reflection of the political situation at that moment, and justifies the manner in which individuals and groups within the lineage act toward each other and toward non-lineage individuals and

groups.  

A segmented genealogy may also delineate and justify the distribution and boundaries of land. In some societies the land is distributed to members of a lineage on the basis of their position. In other societies the lineage uses the genealogy to claim the land which it occupies. This type of use usually concerns the lineage of the ancestors.

The other type of government is centrally organized. At the head of the political structure is usually a king or a chief. In this type of setting a linear genealogy is more apt to have a political function than is a segmented genealogy. The linear genealogy is used to justify the claim to inherited office. In such cases political offices may have long linear genealogies which link them to the first occupant of the office, and it is this link by which the office holders justify their right to power. The most prevalent examples are the king lists in which the names are not all those of blood relatives, and this fact may be recognized by the tribe even though each king is called a

---

1Middleton & Tait, Tribes Without Rulers, discusses acephalous political structures.

2P. & L. Bohannan, Tiv Economy, pp. 19-33; Cunnison, Baggara Arabs, pp. 65-76; Cole, Nomads of the Nomads, p. 91 --for a jural procedure over the ownership of wells see pp. 86-87.


4In many societies the chief or king is appointed on the basis of ability.
son of the preceding king. ¹ Other functions of a linear
genealogy which concern hereditary positions are priest,
military, and administrative offices. ²

There are two situations where linear genealogies are
particularly noticeable. The first is when a position is
vacant and an attempt is made to fill it. The second is
when the office holder must validate his position because
a challenger has arisen. In these cases contradictory
genealogies are cited by the parties involved in the hope
that their own genealogy will be declared authoritative in
the particular situation. ³

3. Religious Function

When a genealogy functions in the religious sphere,
it relates the living individuals to their cultic obliga-
tions. The most common use is in societies which have an
established ancestor cult. Usually the names of the tribal
ancestors must be recited at a ceremony observed on such
occasions. ⁴ Often these cultic recitations relate to the

¹ Wilson, GHOT, pp. 48-49.
² Richards, "The Political System of the Bemba Tribe--
M. Fortes & E. E. Evans-Pritchard (London: Oxford University
Press, 1940), pp. 95-96, 100.
³ Wilson, GHOT, p. 49.
⁴ Fortes, Dynamics of Clanship, pp. 19, 31; Firth,
Social Change in Tikopia, pp. 227-229; Monica Wilson,
Communal Rights of the Nyakyusa (London: Oxford University
Press, 1959), pp. 8-17, 40, 70-78.
political and domestic interests of the lineage, and the

genealogies must therefore be fluid in order to mirror

religiously significant changes in the social structure

of the lineage or group.¹

Cultures which have the rite of divine kingship or a

royal cult also cite the names of their ancestors at a

cultic ceremony, even though the society itself does not

have a lineage principle. In these cases there is a mixture

of political and religious function even though the greater

stress is placed on the former.² Some societies have special

religious offices such as that of priests whose succession

is based upon linear descent.³ Another area of the religious

use of genealogies is when certain professions invoke

ancestors connected with the profession to help them in a

particular situation. Wilson cites examples of Nupe

doctors and LoWili farmers engaging in this kind of

practice.⁴


²Wilson, GHOT, p. 54; E. E. Evans-Pritchard, "Divine

Kingship of the Shilluk of the Nilotic Sudan," Social

Anthropology and Other Essays (New York: The Free Press

of Glencoe, 1964), pp. 192-212; M. Wilson, Communal Rituals

of the Nyakyusa (London: Oxford University Press, 1959),

pp. 8-17, 40, 70-78.

³Wilson, GHOT, p. 54.

⁴Wilson, GHOT, p. 54, n. 97.
CHAPTER THREE: GENEALOGIES OF THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Most discussions of the genealogies of the ancient Near East are found in scattered articles about particular ancient Near Eastern problems or in studies of Biblical genealogies where parallels from the ancient Near East are cited. The most comprehensive study to appear is the aforementioned dissertation by Wilson. ¹ Though by his own admission the material gathered by him is not exhaustive, it contains all the important genealogies as well as some that are less important, the inclusion of which is designed to be representative of all the historical periods and cultures known. ²

Most of the genealogies known are from the Mesopotamian area because of the large amount of written material discovered in that region. This material covers a wide span of history starting with the Sumerians and ending with the fall of the Persian Empire. The genealogies of the rest of the ancient Near East are fewer in number and not nearly so varied as those in the Mesopotamian arena. ³

Wilson's study is important to the student of the

¹Wilson, GHOT, pp. 68-167; see also his summary in "Old Testament Genealogies," pp. 185-189. This chapter is a summary of Wilson's work and follows his outline and content closely.

²The terminus ad quem is the end of the Old Testament period. See Wilson, GHOT, p. 69.

³There are two reasons why this is so: first, accidents of history and archaeological discovery; second, the perishability of the writing material used.
ancient Near East and the Biblical scholar alike, and it is therefore necessary to summarize his findings in sufficient detail so that one may make comparisons with both oral and Old Testament genealogies.

Genealogical Formulas of the Ancient Near East

Although the formulas gathered cover many centuries, many languages, and many different types of inscriptions, they may be grouped into four major types.

The first type appears as "proper name (PN)₁, son of PN₂, son of PN₃, . . . ." It occurs in the royal genealogies, the Sumerian King List--A (SKL-A)--the Babylonian King List--A,B,C (BKL-A,B,C)--and in Aramaic, Egyptian, Ugaritic, Phoenician, Moabite, and Pre-Islamic Arabic epigraphic materials, all in various degrees of depth. In a genealogy of three-generations some confusion can occur in the proper relationship between the first and the third name, for the latter can be interpreted either as a son of the second name or as the grandson of the first name. A proper interpretation hinges upon the function of the genealogy. If it is determined that the latter interpretation is correct, the first name receives the emphasis.¹

A second major type clearly distinguishes between the son and the grandson. Variations of this do occur; for example, a word meaning "descendant" may be used. In genealogies deeper than three generations such a word is often used after the third name.

A third type uses a pronominal suffix which results in the form "PN₁, his son PN₂, his son PN₃ . . . ." A fourth type uses the form "PN₁, son of PN₂; PN₂ son of PN₃ . . . ." There are some variations of these basic types, but they are of no concern for our purpose.


1 This is done by repeating the kinship terms twice between the second and third names--PN₁, DUMU PN₂, DUMU DUMU PN₃ or by bn may occur. See Theophil Meck, "A Votive Inscription of Ashurbanipal Bu. 89-4-26, 209)." JAOS 38 (1918): 157ff., 11, 13, 14; KAI 7:1-3, 10:1, 14:13-14.


5 For a fuller discussion see Wilson, CHOT, pp. 72-76.
Genealogical Depth

The genealogies of the ancient Near East range from three to eight generations in depth. The most common are those which are limited to a depth of three generations. The greater the depth, the less frequent the occurrence. Wilson believes that the three-generation genealogy is "stereotypical." Genealogies that are longer than eight generations do occur, though they may be composites. Even in the king lists the genealogies seldom extend to more than five generations, although the second major division of the AKL-A cites a ten-generation genealogy. This occurs in the fourth section as well (iv 9-27), although most of the genealogical material is about five generations in depth. The Northern Arabic genealogies reach a depth of twelve generations, although the most common are from six to seven generations.

1Ibid., p. 76.
2For example, the Egyptian genealogies of the priestly families in the 22nd dynasty may reach 60 names; K. A. Kitchen, "Some Egyptian Background to the Old Testament," The Tyndale House Bulletin 5 (1960): 14-18; Borchardt, Mittel, pp. 99-100; see also the discussion of Wilson, GHOT, pp. 155-158.
3Wilson, GHOT, pp. 92-93.
4I 27-38; 11 9-18, 28-34, 36-43; iii 1-9, 11-16, 34-45; iv 1-8.
Fluidity

In the ancient Near East all the genealogies available to scholars are naturally in written form. Since writing freezes the form of a genealogy, it is to be expected that fluidity is infrequent. It is also difficult to show that it exists because of the scarcity of comparative material. However, in spite of these limitations, fluidity is found more frequently than one might suppose. The reason for its occurrence is closely related to the function of the genealogies.

The most common type of fluidity is telescoping. It occurs in all the cultures of the ancient Near East and in all the historical periods which have produced genealogies. The following representative examples are characteristic and will show the existence of telescoping in various contexts.

The genealogy of Esarhaddon skips the names of 62 kings between the third and fourth names and the omission was most likely intentional.¹ The genealogy reads as follows:

Esarhaddon . . . son of Sennacherib, . . . son of Sargon, . . . descendant eternal of Bel-bani, son of Adasi, . . . most precious progeny of Bal-til . . . .²

¹Wilson, GHOT, p. 78.

When the parallel in AKL-A is compared with it, it is seen that the first three names are in the correct sequence. The fourth name, Belu-bani, is the name of the founder of one of the early Assyrian dynasties; the telescoping is thus readily evident.¹ The reason for including Belu-bani may be that Esarhaddon considered him to be the founder of his own dynasty. Adasi was the actual founder of the dynasty, but he was a usurper. His name was included because it was the patronymic of Belu-bani's full name. Belu-bani thus lends more security as a legitimizing foundation.²

A very instructive and subtle example of telescoping is found in the genealogy of Adad-nirari III which runs as follows:

```
Adad-nirari . . . son of Šamši-Adad . . . son of Shalmaneser . . . (great) grandson of Assur-nasirpal . . . offspring of Adad-nirari . . . descendant of Tukulti-Ninurta, descendant of Shalmaneser, descendant of Ila-kabkabi
```

In a genealogical section of AKL-A, the genealogy of Adad-nirari III is listed as Adad-nirari (III), Šamši-Adad (V), Shalmaneser (III), Aššurnasirpal (II), Tukulti-Ninurta (II), and Adad-nirari (II).³ It appears that the fifth and sixth names of Adad-nirari's genealogy are

² Wilson, GHT, p. 78.
³ IR: 35, no. 3, 11.1, 9, 11, 15, 19, 21.
⁴ AKL-A iv 3-25; A. Poebel, "The Assyrian King List from Khorsabad," JNES 2 (1943): 71 defends the correctness of the list in this section.
reversed. Once it is realized that the genealogies do not differentiate between kings of the same name and that this Shalmaneser is described as the restorer of the temple Ešarhakurkurr, the solution is readily available.¹ From another document it is known that Shalmaneser I and not Shalmaneser II restored the temple. Shalmaneser was also the father of Tukulti-Ninurta I. Thus, Adad-nirari's genealogy is probably to be read as Adad-nirari III, Šamši-Adad V, Shalmaneser III, Aššurnasirpal II, Adad-nirari II, Tukulti-Ninurta I, Shalmaneser I, Ila-kabkabi. This results in 51 kings being omitted between Ila-kabkabi and Shalmaneser I, and 20 kings between Tukulti-Ninurta I and Adad-nirari II, when Adad-nirari III's genealogy is compared with AKL-A. In spite of the large gaps, the kings are linked together by the kinship term "son." Tukulti-Ninurta II has also been omitted, perhaps because of the shortness of his reign.²

Telescoping appears also in very short genealogies. Merodach-Baladan, who calls himself "son of Melišipak, descendant of Kurigalzu,"³ has omitted at least ten kings between Melišipak and Kurigalzu, according to BKL-A.

² Wilson, GHOT, pp. 79-80.
³ VAS 1.34, 11.10, 15, 20; BBS no. 5, col. 1, 11.20, 23, 25.
In non-royal genealogies of the ancient Near East, telescoping can generally be assumed between the second and third names of genealogies of three generations. Although it is often difficult to prove this, one method used to do so is by tracing the same person through the centuries. In Egyptian genealogies of the twenty-second dynasty, telescoping has been isolated by several scholars. The pre-Islamic genealogies also exhibit telescoping. The occurrences identified usually concern the eponymous ancestor.

Sometimes confusion of names causes telescoping. AKL fails to mention A-Anne-pada, who is known to be a son of Meš-Anne-pada (iii 40), and whose name has been restored in the critical editions of SKL (iii 41 a-c). A-Anne-pada appears in no SKL text except "N", where in rs. 2', 4' the name appears in its abbreviated form "na-an-n(e')" as the name of the first king of Ur I and the father of Meš-kigig-Nanna(k). In the other editions of SKL

---

1 See Wilson, GHOT, pp. 141-143 for details.


Meš-Anne-pada is the first ruler of Ur I and father of Meš-kiš-Nanna. Thus the names have replaced each other.¹

Telescoping is also caused by the polemic of a text not allowing certain names to be included. This occurs in several king lists. One example is AKL-A which omits the names of a tainted lineage. Three names were omitted because Išme-Dagan, king of Assyria, concluded a treaty with Zaziiia, the chief of the Turukku tribe, as a result of which Išme-Dagan's son, Mut-Aškur, married the chief's daughter. The compiler of the king list evidently considered the names tainted and omitted them.²

Another type of fluidity is the addition of names. Though known examples are uncertain because they may have been the result of textual error, the following example may be a case in point: in Kish III Su₁ the name šu-i-lí-šu appears before the name Simu-dâr (SKL vi 15); this king is not otherwise known in this portion of the list.³

The shifting of genealogical relationships is another type of fluidity which can be identified in the ancient Near East. A genealogy of Aššur-uballit I in a royal inscription reads as follows:

¹Wilson, GHOT, pp. 95-96; Jacobson, SKL, p. 93, n. 145, where he discusses this problem.

²See Wilson's discussion GHOT, pp. 113-114. A similar case occurs in AKL-C and omits all the usurpers found in AKL-A; Ibid., pp. 124-125.

³Wilson, GHOT, p. 96.
When this is compared with AKL-A, it is seen that the genealogy of Assur-uballit has been changed so that it would fit the father-son sequence used in the king list.\(^2\)

A final type of fluidity which occurs quite frequently is the shifting of the order of names. One reason for this is that the names no longer had any function in the context in which they appear. An example is found in the genealogy of the Lagaš rulers (RL).\(^3\) The names in the genealogical order at the end of the list appear as follows:

\[
\text{Sur-Nin.kimaraka} \ldots \text{Sur-Nin.Girsu, son of Sur-Nin.kimaraka} \ldots \text{Sur-Bawa, scribe of Sur-Nin.Girsu} \ldots \text{Gudea, younger brother of Sur-Bawa (II. 192-198).}
\]

From other sources it is known that Sur-Nin.kimaraka reigned much later than Gudea; in fact, in the time of Šulgi. Sur-Nin.Girsu was not the son of Sur-Nin.kimaraka but rather the son and immediate successor of Gudea. Sur-Bawa was the immediate predecessor of Gudea, and it is not likely he was a scribe of Sur-Nin.Girsu. Lastly, Gudea was the son-in-law of Sur-Bawa and not his younger brother.\(^4\) All this

\(^{1}\) IAK xviii, 3, vs. 11.1-18; 5, 11.1-12.
\(^{2}\) AKL-A 11 38-iii 13.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., p. 286, n. 76, 77, 79.
confusion may indicate that the names are immaterial to
the function of the list, seeing that it is a polemic against
the SKL which omits the Lagaš rulers in its dynastic scheme. 1

A second reason for this type of fluidity is the fact
that the function of a genealogy changes when it is moved
into another context. In SKL viii 10-15, the order of
names is Šulgi, son of Ur-Nammu; Amar-Suen, son of Šulgi;
Šu-Sin, son of Amar-Suen. From two other sources Šu-Sin
is known to have been the son of Šulgi and not of Amar-Suen. 2
The reason for the apparent contradiction is that the func­
tion of the genealogy changed when it was incorporated into
SKL, which is rather concerned with the sequence of the
rulers in each dynasty as well as with the proper sequence
of the dynasties. Consequently the SKL calls Šu-Sin the
son of Amar-Suen because kingship passed from Amar-Suen to
Šu-Sin. 3

A third reason for the occurrence of this type of
fluidity is that a variant order of names appears more
natural to a scribe than the existing order. There are
many editions of SKL which preserve a certain order of the

1 Ibid., p. 279; Cf. Wilson, GHOT, pp. 107-108.

2 T. Jacobsen, "Ibbi-Suen," JCS 7 (1953): 36, n. 3;
Adam Falkenstein, "Eine Hymne auf Susin von Ur," NO 1 (1947):
43, 11.8, 18, and p. 45. Cf. C. J. Gadd, "Babylonia, c.
2120-1800," in CAH (Cambridge, 1965), vol. 1, ch. 23, p. 15;
E. Sollberger, "Sur la chronologie des rois d'Ur et quelques
problèmes connexes," Archiv für Orientforschung 17 (1954-6):
10ff. or better, 20f.

3 This is the explanation of Wilson, GHOT, p. 94.
dynastic arrangements. In the different tablets referred to as WB, L₁, P₂, and Su₁, there is a certain Ku(g)-Baba ruling for one hundred years. At the end of her reign the kingship passed from Kish to Akshak, where six kings reigned for a total of ninety-nine years. At this point kingship again passed back to Kish. The first ruler is Puzur-Sin, the son of Ku(g)-Baba. The variance occurs in S and Su₃₊₁. Ku(g)-Baba is placed immediately before her son at the beginning of the Kish IV dynasty, with the result that Kish III is omitted from these texts. It is interesting to note that the omission of the Kish III dynasty caused no concern to the scribes.¹

When several genealogies were used to compile the king lists of the ancient Near East, many strange examples of fluidity occurred. The second section of AKL-A has several examples which will be simply listed and not discussed:² 1) Aminu and his brother Samši-Adad were separated by the names of nineteen other kings; 2) their father Ila-kabkabi was listed twice; 3) Sulili, the son of Aminu, was separated completely from his father's genealogy and placed in a separate section of the list; 4) the names of the last two tent kings were duplicated (19, 19-20); 5) the names of the entire second section were put in reverse order.

¹Wilson, GHOT, pp. 97-98; see T. Jacobson, SKL, pp. 53-54 for a detailed discussion.

²For a discussion see Wilson, GHOT, pp. 115-121, also his notes in "Old Testament Genealogies," pp. 102-184.
As in oral societies, the function of the genealogies in the ancient Near East has a direct bearing on their form. Most of the known genealogies are linear which indicates that some functions found in oral societies will not be found in the centrally governed societies of the ancient Near East. However, functions are found in the three spheres previously outlined: domestic, politico-jural, and religious.

The domestic sphere is evident in the genealogical names. The patronymic "PN₁ son of PN₂" is the most common, although three-unit names do occur frequently. In these genealogical names the second and third are often ancestral names. Sometimes the name of a celebrity in a certain guild was used in a genealogical name to give a person greater prestige and thus an advantage in the exercise of

---

1 The only segmented genealogies available are the partial ones found in the king lists, and they have no function in their present contexts (Wilson, GHOT, pp. 164-165). The exception are the classical Arab texts, where the attempt was made to relate all the independent Arab tribes into a political unit.

his trade. In cases such as these, it is sometimes difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether the holder of a position is or is not legitimizing his claim to the office he desires to hold. If this is the case, the function of the genealogy will fall into another sphere. Genealogical names are also found in Ugarit, Phoenician, Punic, Aramaic, and pre-Islamic Arabic.

The political sphere has the most impressive function. It is found most readily in those countries which have a known literary heritage. The royal genealogies link the latest person in the genealogy with his ancestors who reigned before him, and thus legitimize the present ruler and give him political sanction. The longer genealogies

---


3 Segmented genealogies, KAI 34, 40, 117; linear genealogies of two generations, KAI 1.1, 6.1 (cf. 5.1, 8, 11); three generations, KAI 7.1-3, 10.1, 14.13-14; others, 18.1-2, 41.1-4, 55, 52. The formula bn bn may mean descendant (Wilson, GHOT, p. 150).

4 KAI 68.1-4, 78.6-11 are seventeen generations; 77 is five generations; 96 is about eight generations and 63, 70, and 90 are four generations.


6 Wilson, GHOT, p. 159.
were used in periods of political stress or in an era of political expansion.

Similarly, the king lists also were used to legitimize political positions: SKL served to legitimate the kingship of Isin, and BKL appears to have had a similar function. AKL-A may have had more than one function through its long history even apart from the original functions of its several parts. In its complete form, its first function was to present the correct sequence of the kings who exercised legitimate royal authority throughout the history of


4 Wilson, GHOT, pp. 128-130.
Assyria. It has also been suggested that the later portions of the list, which contain some chronological data, may have been used as a royal chronicle. The function of AKL-B is similar.

The religious sphere is the least documented. There are indications of an ancestor cult in Egypt, Punic, Ugarit, and Phoenicia. The clearest example is the genealogy of the Hammurapi dynasty. Finkelstein thinks that it was probably used as part of the ritual of a kispu offering, which involved gifts of food and drink to the dead. It is also clear that this is not the original function of the list.

Other examples of the religious function of genealogies are the instances where priests legitimize their positions by their use. During the time of the Kassite king Nazimaruttaš (1323-1298 B.C.), a priest gives a genealogy

---

1 Wilson, GHOT, pp. 121-122.
2 Ibid., p. 125.
3 Borchardt, Mittel, p. 93.
4 Wilson, GHOT, p. 151 though there is no hard evidence.
5 Ibid., p. 148.
6 Ibid., pp. 150-151.
8 Ibid., pp. 113-116.
9 Wilson, GHOT, pp. 137-139.
listing only ancestors who held priestly offices. ¹ The priestly genealogies of the 22nd dynasty of Egypt were used to support the priests' claims to power. They may also have been used to assert political power. ²

A Comparison Between Oral and Written Genealogies

In the above surveys of the genealogies of living tribal cultures and of those of the ancient Near East, many similarities may be observed. First both exhibit a limitation on the depth of a genealogy. In segmented genealogies the maximum is fourteen generations, but five generations or less is the norm. Very few segmented genealogies exist in the ancient Near East for two reasons. The first is that the societies which have left epigraphic evidence had centralized governments, and second, if segmented genealogies did exist, they were not written down because the genealogy would no longer be capable of mirroring the changes which is demanded by a society which uses segmented genealogies. ³ The only segmented genealogies found are in the king lists, but they are likely to be considered as artificial or incomplete because of the function of the lists. ⁴

² Wilson, GHOT, p. 155.
³ Wilson, GHOT, pp. 165-166: some societies today which have written segmented genealogies also have another set of genealogies which are used on the oral level.
Linear genealogies occur in both types of societies though they are more numerous in the ancient Near East. Although the norm is from ten to fourteen generations, modern tribes have linear genealogies which reach a depth of nineteen generations, while in the ancient Near East the norm is three generations and the maximum length is usually ten generations. It must be remembered, however, that the function of a genealogy influences its depth. It is clear from the evidence gathered that there is no standard depth connected with genealogies.

The second area which shows a common feature is in the occurrence of fluidity. Addition of names, omission of names, changes in kinship relations, and telescoping have been noted. Telescoping, the most frequently seen in the ancient Near East, may be a result of the loss of function of the names used in the genealogies.

The third area is in function. Although exact specific functions cannot be duplicated, the general categories of domestic, political-jural and religious functions are found. The fourth area is the relationship between form and function. The implication is that genealogical fluidity must be analyzed to determine its significance although "It may not automatically be assumed that each genealogical change indicates a corresponding political or geographical change . . . ."¹ The exegeter must therefore be careful to

---

understand the genealogy in its original context and in its later contexts (for example, in a king list) and to be aware of the relationships between form and function in genealogies.
CHAPTER FOUR: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE STUDY
OF THE GENEALOGIES OF 1 CHRONICLES 1 THROUGH 9

Israelite Social Structure

Before a satisfying examination of Biblical genealogies can commence, a proper understanding of their form and nomenclature must be achieved. A study of the existing works on this subject reveals considerable confusion, because of the prevalent misconceptions about genealogies, especially where their terminologies are concerned.

The starting point is Joshua 7:14-18. In verse 18 a genealogy is given in ascending order: "Achan, son of Carmi, son of Zabdi, son of Zerah, from the tribe of Judah."


In the preceding verses the occasion for this verse is given. The "troubler" of Israel is being searched out. In doing this each social unit of the nation of Israel is being tested, from the largest unit to the smallest.

The whole nation is involved in this investigation, and therefore the term נַע (nation) is assumed. The first named group and the largest is וֹוָו (tribe); Judah is chosen. The next group to be tested is the second largest and is called נַפְס (phratry). The fourth group is called נַלַח נַו (extended family). Although the term appears here only as נַלַח, its occurrence elsewhere makes the intent clear. The term corresponding to Carmi is missing, because Carmi is considered part of Achan's name. This form is called a patronymic and refers to the smallest family unity, the parents and the siblings. The last unit is the individual, who is called לַל or אֹא, which is the person's given name.

The above use of these terms can also be found in segmented genealogies by comparing Genesis 46:6-27 with Numbers 26:4-62 and other genealogies.

1 Andersen, "Israelite Kinship Terminology," pp. 30-31.
3 Numbers 1:18, נַלַח נַו.
First, in Genesis 46:6-27 the nomenclature used does not agree with either Joshua 7 or Numbers 26. The kinship term used throughout this genealogy is "sons of," because all the individuals listed are represented as living. It has no tribal overtones; it is simply a list of seventy men, their wives, and one sister who had journeyed into Egypt. The genealogy extends to a depth of three generations.

In Numbers 26 the historical situation is quite different. The Israelites are about to enter Canaan, and a census is ordered so that the land to be conquered may be divided fairly among them. The people are counted and the results are tabulated in genealogical form.

There are several things to be noted in a comparison between this genealogy and the one in Genesis 46. First, it represents a period four hundred years later.  

---

1Gen. 15:13; Exod. 12:40. The LXX appears to divide the period between the Abrahamic age in Palestine and the bondage period in Egypt. Cf. Louis Ginsberg, The Legends of the Jews, 7 vol. (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1909-1925, Index 1936): 1:237, 2:318, 3:18, 5:420, n. 126. This reading is suspect for the following reasons: a) Canaan appears after Egypt, whereas the opposite would seem more likely; b) the wording in the Samaritan Pentateuch is quite different, although it means the same thing; the Vulgate and the Syriac agree with the Mt; Ralph W. Kline, Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From Septuagint to Qumran (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), pp. 18-19; c) Abraham and Isaac were not "children of Israel" but ancestors of Israel, and so their time in Canaan could not be included in the sojourn of Israel and his descendants in Egypt. See K. A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and Old Testament (Chicago: InterVarsity Press, 1966), p. 53, n. 95. Leon J. Wood, A Survey of Israel's History (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), pp. 83-84; d) this reading appears to be an attempt at harmonization. Abraham had been in Canaan 25 years when Isaac was born (Gen. 12:4, 21:5), Isaac was 60 when Jacob was born (Gen. 25:26), and Jacob was 130 when he went down
a comparison of the names used in each is made, they are
found to be remarkably similar.¹ Second, the individuals
are also all deceased. Third, the relationship between the
names is still genealogically that of sons. Yet after each
son is named, the statement "the family of PN" occurs in a
gentilic form, showing that the tribal structure is charted
within the genealogy. Israel (Jacob) is the nation, his
sons are the tribes, and each of the sons' sons is a phratry.
In the places where these sons have sons they are also
phratries.² A clear example of this is the case of Judah.
After each tribe is enumerated, a closing formula is given
which states, "These are the phratries of PN."

To study the term 57|7X 57|7 in segmented genealogies,
the census list of Numbers 1 and the genealogy of Exodus
6:14ff. must be examined. In the former, only the name of
the tribe is given, but interestingly enough, each tribe is
registered by phratry and by extended family. Furthermore,

into Egypt (Gen. 47:9); total 215 years. It would appear
that the LXX was troubled by this chronological material.
Nor did they understand the nature of genealogies and were
perhaps unduly influenced by Exodus 6:14-27, as have been
several modern commentators, for example, C. Gordon,
"Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery," Biblical
and Other Studies, ed. Alexander Altman (Cambridge: Harvard
to Joshua (London: The Schweich Lectures of the British
Academy, 1948), pp. 70-73.

¹The order of Israel's sons and the generation depth
differ but not the names themselves which coincide. The one
exception is Reuben, but this appears to be an added state-
ment. See Noth, Numbers, Old Testament Library (Philadelphia:

²The fluidity of these genealogies is discussed below.
Numbers 1 also fits this description.
a new term is introduced based on the term for extended family, יִשְׂרָאֵל שֵׁם. What is unique is that the term is explained. The first part of the verse says that each "head of the extended family" shall be a man of each tribe. Following this is a list of twelve men, one from each tribe. Verse 16 states that each man was a leader of a tribe, and all collectively are "heads of the thousands of Israel." Thus they are the most important military figures in Israel and heads of their extended families. The context of the list makes it quite clear that it concerns the military structure of Israel.

In Exodus 18:23 the term occurs again along with three other terms. Moses is dividing the tribes into units preparatory to the establishment of a judiciary. Four levels of judges are named in descending order: heads of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens. It is doubtful that these designations are meant to be taken literally. They should be considered as technical terms used to describe the various legal positions in ancient Israel.

What is interesting is that each level corresponds to the social structure of Israel as the following chart shows:

1 For a discussion see De Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 1:7-8.
2 Johnson, The Purpose of Biblical Genealogies, pp. 60-68.
3 Noth, Numbers, p. 150 feels that this section reflects an early period in the settlement.
In the same way this may indicate that the military structure was also organized along similar lines, although perhaps it may be taken more literally.¹

In Exodus 6:14-25 more light is shed on the tribal structure. The importance of this genealogy lies in the completeness of its delineation of the tribe of Levi.

The genealogy is abbreviated in form. It begins with the tribes of Reuben and Simeon but lists only their sons as they are given in Genesis 46. After this the tribe of Levi is given in detail, and then the genealogy ends.² The genealogy of Levi has a depth of seven generations and includes both living and deceased members of the tribe, and herein lies its importance. The term נֵעָה is used only with deceased individuals except in the case of the clan of Korah.³ In verse 25 the term "heads of the fathers" is used in relation to נֵעָה.⁴ The term in this case seems

---


³Why this is the case is unclear. It may be that the genealogy dated from a later time and the author adapted it here, perhaps for stylistic purposes, so that the lineage of Aram would be clearly emphasized.

⁴The construction is elliptical.
to be political and as such it would mean the rulers of the tribes of Israel. Each ruler is the head of the phratry represented.

This is also shown by the superscription in verse 14 which states "these are the heads of their fathers' households." Following this the sons of Reuben are given with a closing formula stating "these are the families of Reuben," i.e., phratries. Thus the two terms are connected even though the heads are not listed.¹

In summary, we have shown that נִבְרָי is used quite consistently as phratry in the genealogies of the Old Testament. The name of a phratry is always the name of a deceased person who is closely related to Israel.² Furthermore, a phratry is a very important part of the tribal structure since it is clearly related to the political, judicial, and military spheres of the tribes. It also shows the close relationship between the extended family and the phratry. Two of the titles of the highest positions in the tribal structure use the extended family nomenclature preceded by the word "head of." In the political sphere the extended family is connected directly to the phratry. When the term is used in a military sense, it means the leader "of the thousands," a position occupied by one man in each tribe. There seems to be no reason to think that the

¹ Childs, Exodus, pp. 116-117.
² This is further seen in the genealogies of 2 Chron. 1-9.
judicial positions were much different in structure. To sum up, the nomenclature of Joshua 7:14-16 agrees with that used in segmented genealogies.

The Genealogies of Genesis 46:8-27 and Numbers 26:4-62

As this study proceeds, it will be seen that the Chronicler depends upon Genesis 46 and Numbers 26 as a source with the help of which the genealogy of each tribe may be introduced. It is necessary, then, to have a proper understanding of their form and function in their literary context.

The occasion for the genealogy of the twelve sons of Jacob is their migration (including the third generation) into Egypt, where they were reunited with Joseph. The

1 Among fourteen possible tribal units (Joseph, Levi, Ephraim, and Manasseh are here units) Genesis and Numbers are used nine times in 1 Chron. 2-7. Reuben, Levi, and Joseph agree in all three references; 1 Chron. and Numbers agree in Issachar and Simeon, though the only difference from Genesis is the spelling; 1 Chron. and Genesis agree in Naphtali and Asher. If Dan is restored to the text, he also would fall into this group. Some feel that Benjamin belongs here because of the reference to Becher even though the name Jedidiel is in neither Genesis nor Numbers. Gad, Ephraim, and Manasseh fall into a category by themselves since the source is unknown. Zebulun is entirely missing from 1 Chron. Zebulun and Gad agree with each other in Gen. and Numbers. The case of Judah is different. The source is definitely Gen. 38:2-30, and yet in all three genealogies the relationship between the names is different.

2 Though it may be argued that these genealogies had an existence apart from the present context, this would be irrelevant to the discussion at this point. The Chronicler took them from the context in which they now appear.

3 Judah and Asher reach four generations.
genealogy is divided into four sections according to the mothers—Leah, Zilpah, Rachel, and Bilhah—and is primarily in list form. It opens with the formula "Now these are the names of the sons of Israel, Jacob and his sons, who went to Egypt." Each son of Jacob is introduced into the text with the formula "and the sons of PN." After each section, a formula states the mother's name, the sons' relationship to Jacob, and their total number. However, each formula differs a little in form. The most drastic difference is the inclusion of Dinah at the conclusion of Leah's section.\(^1\) After all the sections have been enumerated, there is a statement explaining that all the direct descendants of Jacob who went into Egypt totaled 66 persons and that Joseph who was already in Egypt had two sons. A final total of all the men of the house of Jacob who came down to Egypt is 70.\(^2\)

There are two cases where the names of persons are mentioned twice. At the end of the opening formula the note "Reuben the firstborn" occurs, and he is referred to a second time when his sons are introduced. The other case is Rachel. Special attention is given to her by the inclusion of an additional introductory formula when her sons are about to be introduced; it reads "The sons of Jacob's wife Rachel." She is referred to a second time

\(^1\) In the Targum, Syriac, and Samaritan Pentateuch the formula in verse 22 is exactly parallel to the one in verse 15.

\(^2\) Jacob himself made the total 70.
at the close of the list, which is the normal procedure after each section. The purpose of this special mention of Rachel is to cast an aura of distinction around her.1

Although the genealogy is quite regular in its form, there are a few fractures in it. Among the sons of Simeon, Shaul is said to be the son of a Canaanite woman. In the list of the sons of Asher, their sister Serah is given the same place as a son, and she is counted in the subtotal.

Numbers 26 has a different function from Genesis 46. The people of Israel are in Moab preparing to enter Canaan. They are a new generation and are about to be numbered. This process is displayed in its final form in a genealogy cast into a segmented list. Each tribe is listed by "their father's households, whoever is able to go out to war in Israel," being over the age of nineteen years.

The opening formula is "and the sons of Israel who came out of the land of Egypt were." This is followed by the secondary formula "the sons of PN according to their phratries." This is followed by the formulaic pattern "of PN the phratry of the PNites" down through all the phratries of that particular tribe. Each man mentioned in the genealogy is the head of a phratry unless someone is introduced for a special purpose. This happens with the

1 The narrative about Rachel in Genesis 29 shows that she is the wife loved by Jacob (verse 19), a fact necessary to interpret the following genealogy there. See Wilson, GHOT, p. 231. This fact is made clear in this genealogy by the double reference to Rachel as noted above.
Reubenites. After the total of fighting men is given, an historical note is attached which concerns those who participated in Korah's rebellion and were destroyed. In the tribe of Judah, Er and Onan are still included in the genealogy even though they are not a phratry.¹

The census list finds its origin in the military sphere of Israel. This is evident from the military vocabulary used and from our knowledge of the census lists found in Mari.² It is assumed that the census lists were used for purposes of military mobilization, but this is not the only purpose. Once these lists were compiled, they could be adapted to many situations.³ Numbers 26 is no exception. The context clearly states that the census was used as a basis according to which Canaan was to be partitioned among the tribes. The reasoning would seem to be that the more fighting men a tribe could muster, the larger would be the area of land they would conquer and control.

Although the examples of fluidity in these two genealogies will be discussed in their appropriate places in the section on fluidity, there is an item that is not covered there. This is the division of the tribe of Joseph

¹This shows crystallization of particular forms in the genealogies of the sons of Jacob.

²See George Mendenhall, "The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26," JBL, LXXVII (1958): 52-66 for a discussion of parallels, their function, and an explanation of the high numbers involved.

³W. F. Albright, ARAB, p. 124.
into two tribes. This served as a method of maintaining the twelve tribe system, made necessary by the elevation of the Levites to a special position, as well as a means to resolve the problem of the large number of Josephites.
CHAPTER FIVE: THE FORM AND FUNCTION OF THE GENEALOGIES OF 1 CHRONICLES 1 THROUGH 9

1 Chronicles 1:1-4; 24-28

In 1 Chronicles 1:1-4 and 24-28 two lists of names appear which are found also in Genesis 5 and 11:10-26 in the form of genealogies. There is no introductory formula, nor are there any kinship terms connecting the names in either list. In the first list there are thirteen names. It begins with Adam and ends with Noah's three sons, still presented in list form. If it were not for other sources such as the Genesis genealogies, no one would know that the last three named were brothers, nor is this made clear subsequently in Chapter 1. The second list has ten names starting with Shem and continuing through Abraham. The absence of kinship terms in these lists was a direct result of the Chronicler's purpose and to a lesser extent was inherent in the pattern of his literary model, if indeed he did follow the form of the AKL.

The Chronicler's purpose was to show the election of the line of David by directly linking him with Adam. Any genealogy not directly part of the line is quickly dropped from the main flow. Yet, these subsidiary genealogies highlight the election of the individuals who are ultimately featured in the Davidic line. In this section the Chronicler chose to omit the data and the kinship terms between the names because all the names would be familiar to the
reader.\(^1\) None of this information would add anything to the function of the list, and its absence conformed perfectly to the pattern of the AKL.\(^2\) And finally the theological purpose of the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11 pertain to those special individuals through whom God worked, so no explanation was necessary for the people to understand the Chronicler's intent.

The most unsettling result of this technique is the loss of the brother relationship among Adam's three sons. As noted above, the LXX supplies the missing kinship terms at this point, even though they are irrelevant to the purpose of the list. The method the Chronicler used in copying these names caused this small inconsistency. He simply removed all the names from Genesis 5 and put them in a list. When he added the next section of the genealogy from Genesis 10 he did not attempt to reconcile the problem raised, ostensibly because the reader would understand perfectly well the intent of the author.\(^3\) In copying the names in


\(^{2}\) This is especially true since his interest is not chronology. Edward Curtis and Albert Madsen, *Chronicles*, pp. 58, 70; U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (tr. Israel Abrahams) vol. 3 (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), pp. 250-272 discusses different views of the chronology here and proposes the sexagesimal scheme.

\(^{3}\) That the Chronicler copied 1 Chron. 1:4 from Gen. 5 rather than from Gen. 10:1 is seen by the order of the names. In the latter verse the order is Shem, Ham, Japheth, Noah.
Genesis 11, the Chronicler used the same method, except that when he reached the name Abraham, he abandoned the list.¹

As stated earlier, the list of names in 1 Chronicles 1:1-4, 24-27 is evident when it is compared with the famous genealogies found in Genesis 5:1-32 and 11:10-26. Genesis 5 is a linear narrative genealogy for the first ten generations, whereupon it becomes segmented by the mention of Adam's three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The genealogy opens with a toledoth formula, "This is the book of the generations of Adam." Following this is a theological statement based on Genesis 1 that man was created in the image of God, was blessed, and was named "man" by Him. This serves to introduce Adam as the first man and the father of mankind, so that he deserves the right to head the ensuing genealogy. The structured formulas describing Adam's life vary slightly from those which follow, and consist of a statement to the effect that man produces man in his own image and the new man is named Seth. All these data recall the just mentioned fact that God created man in His image and named him. Thus biological and theological unity is established, since God is blessing Adam. The birth formula here and in the rest of the genealogy is the "begot formula." The history of Adam closes with the length of his life after Seth was born, followed by the length of his total life.

¹It is curious that Lot was not included. It may be that Lot had no importance to Israel itself so the Chronicler omitted him. The case of Esau, Ishmael, etc. is just the opposite for they played an important role in Israel's history.
The remainder of the genealogy is quite consistent as it gives the biographical history of each person. The form is

When PN₁ had lived x years, he begot PN₂.
And PN₁ lived after he begot PN₂ y years,
and he begot other sons and daughters.
And all the days of PN₁ were z years, and he died.

Variants occur in the biographies of Enoch and Lamech. In the former (Genesis 5:21-24), the place of the phrase "and PN₁ lived" has been preempted by "and Enoch walked with God," and the phrase "and he died" has been replaced by "for God took him." The variation in the case of Lamech (Genesis 5:28-31) explains the etymology of Noah's name.

The genealogy concludes with the birth of Noah's three sons. The prevailing formula is not followed here for literary reasons, no doubt because only Noah's age is given along with the mention of the names of his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. This does not necessitate the interpretation that the three sons were born in the same year, namely when Noah was 500. Rather, the stage is set for the ensuing narrative about Noah and the repopulation of the earth.

This genealogy has also a theological function. It stresses the idea that divine blessing is given to certain individuals. From creation to the flood, a certain line of individuals carried on God's covenant community. The genealogy marks the end of one epoch and the beginning of another, and serves as a summary of the past and an
introduction to the future.  

The genealogy of Shem in Genesis 11:10-26 is generally based on the same structure as Genesis 5: a linear narrative genealogy for the first nine generations, and then it becomes segmented in the tenth generation when it mentions Terah's three sons, Abram, Nahor, and Haran. Beginning with the toledoth formula, "These are the generations of Shem," it then follows his biographical history. He was 100 years old when he begot Arpachshad (two years after the flood); next comes the stereotypical formula, "PN_1 lived x years after he begot PN_2, and he begot sons and daughters." The difference in this genealogy from Genesis 5 is that there is no summary statement giving the total number of years each person lived or a statement of his death. After

---

1The idea of Wilson, GHOT, p. 195 that the function is to trace a list of first-born sons cannot be maintained, since Seth is not a first-born son. Nor are any of the other names identified as first-born sons. His thought also that the theological function is to show the ongoingness of the divine image in God through the first-born cannot be maintained, since it seems to assume a continual line. The very symmetry of the genealogy should make us suspect that telescoping had taken place. If this is true, and the genealogy in Ruth 4:18-22 indicates that it is, a selection process was used that emphasized election and not inheritance, a view supported by Wilson. (Cf. Johnson, Biblical Genealogies, p. 27). It must also be remembered that the dates and the years lived are not chronological. If they were, Abraham at fifty would have been living with Noah. Also Shem, Shelah, and Eber would have outlived Abraham. (Francis Schaeffer, Genesis in Space and Time, [Inter-Varsity Press: Downers Grove, Ill., 1972], p. 124.)

2If Cainan is added to the text after Arpachshad, as it is in the LXX and Luke 3:36, there will be ten generations in all, as there are in Genesis 5.
Shem is introduced, the introductory formula for each new name is, "When PN$_1$ lived x years he begot PN$_2$." The genealogy concludes with the birth of Terah's three sons. Again the pattern is broken by segmentation. Since the genealogy's structure is so similar to that of Genesis 5, its function must also be similar. As a literary function it forms a historical transition from the flood to Abraham.$^1$ Furthermore, the mention of the three sons prepares the way for the narratives of Abraham. The theological function continues God's selective blessing upon mankind until it falls upon Abraham.$^2$

1 Chronicles 1:5-23

The genealogy of 1 Chronicles 1:5-23 consists of the three sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Though Shem is listed first, it is the descendants of Japheth that are enumerated first, followed by Ham and concluding with Shem.$^3$

Verses 5-7 give the genealogy of Japheth. The formula used is consistent throughout the genealogy: "son of PN$_1$, PN$_2$, ..." with all the sentences being nominal.$^4$ Normally

---


$^2$Genesis 12:1-3.


$^4$The ellipsis refers to a sequence of names which are usually those of brothers.
the names have a connective between them instead of the straight list form noted in the discussion above. The genealogy is in the form of a segmented list and has a depth of three generations.

The first subdivision has seven names. Two of these, Gomer and Javan, are further subdivided. The former is divided into three names and the latter into four names, thus giving the second genealogical level a "seven name total" also.

The Chronicler's source for the genealogy is Genesis 10:2-5. Everything is identical as concerns formulas, names, and depth, except that the name Riphath is here Diphath and Dodanin is Rodanim. This is most likely a simple matter of orthography. It is also concluded with a

1Zöcker, LC, p. 33. It is an abridgement leaving out opening and closing notes and omitting vv. 5, 9-12, 18-20. See also Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, p. 60.

2Diphath is the inferior reading. The LXX vorlage is Ἰκρέσα = Ἰξὴν, an error for Ἰξὴν which is generally read in "ca. 30 MSS G (sic) V Gn 10, 3" (BH). Allen, The Greek Chronicles, 2:114.
a. In agreement with the Rodanim of 1 Chron. 1:7 is the LXX and the SP. Scholars who choose this reading do so on the basis of equating ῥδνυμ with the Rhodians of Greece.
   c. Dodanim and Rodanim to ῥδνυμ = Danuaneans, Dodonoi. David Neiman, "The Two Genealogies of Japhet," in Orient and Occident: Essays Presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday, ed. Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., Alter Orient und Altes Testament (Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1973), p. 121, n. 14 keeps Dodanim because Dodonoi, the people of Dodona was a most significant name in ancient Hellas. He feels the Hebrew compiler of the Table of Nations knew the Greek traditions. L. C. Allen,
closing formula not used by the Chronicler.

The next section of the genealogy concerns the lineage of Ham (1:8-17). The genealogy is a segmented list and reaches four generations at its deepest level. The formula used is "sons of PN₁, PN₂, PN₃ . . . ," with this pattern continuing through verse 9. Suddenly in verse 10 the formula switches to the form "PN₁ begat PN₂," with the mark of the accusative. Since this formula is usually found in linear genealogies, it may be used here for emphasis.

Ham's four sons are Cush, Egypt, Put, and Canaan. Cush has five sons and the lineage of the fourth son, Raam.a, is continued: he has two sons, Sheba and Dedan. This is the place where Nimrod is introduced into the genealogy along with the "begat" formula, and a short note is added concerning him, "He began to be a mighty one in the earth." This formula is continued through verse 16. Egypt is the second son of Ham and has seven sons, of which Put, the third son, is the only one who is not the father of any

The Greek Chronicles, 2:112-115 lists all the Ἐ/Ἑ confusions in the books of Chronicles. He concludes that the LXX is in error 35 times for the substitution of Ἐ for Ἑ while the MT is in error only three times: 1:6, 4:39, 8:12. The reverse is in a ratio of 9:2. The Greek is correct in 9:42 and 24:27.

1 This formula will be noted as "begat" from now on, the verbal form in the third person masculine singular hiphil of ἔγατ (ἔγατ).

2 This is an abbreviated form of its counterpart in Gen. 10:9, as "The mighty hunter" is omitted. It is not clear whether Nimrod should be a hunter or a tyrant, since the LXX prefers the former. J. Myers, I Chronicles, Anchor Bible (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974), p. 3. Hereafter referred to as ICAB.
nations. Canaan is listed as the last son of Ham, and yet is called the first-born. He is represented as being the father of eleven sons. The parallel and source genealogy is Genesis 10:6-8, 13-18a.¹

The third section of this genealogy, verses 17-23, concerns Shem.² Much of the genealogy is in a narrative form which is segmented and reaches six generations at its deepest level. The formula opening the genealogy is "son of PN₁, PN₂ . . . ," with nominal sentences. But after the nine children of Shem are listed, the formula changes to the "begat" style.³ It is the son Arpachshad whose lineage is listed next. His son is Shelah, who begat Eber. Eber has two sons, Peleg and Joktan. There is an etiological note concerning Peleg's name, "The earth was divided in his time." Joktan has thirteen sons. There is a closing formula.

The parallel and source genealogy is Genesis 10:21-29.⁴

¹Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, p. 63.

²17a-24a is omitted in the LXX because of homoioteleuton; Goettsberger, Die Bücher der a Chronik order Paralipomenon Dei Heilige Schrift des Alten Testament (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbüchhandluag, 1939), p. 30.

³Many feel that the formula "and the sons of" has fallen out of the text before the name Aram (cf. Gen. 10:23) although Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, p. 69, say it is more likely that its omission was deliberate. Do not add it as Keil & Delitzsch, Chronicles, p. 51 and Zöcker, LC, p. 34 do. See the discussion below.

⁴Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, p. 65, Keil and Delitzsch, Chronicles, p. 51; Zöcker, LC, p. 34.
Because there are differences, the form of this section of Genesis needs to be discussed. The section opens with the formula "and also to Shem, the father of all the children of Eber and the older brother of Japheth, children were born."

The listing of the names starts with the formula "sons of PN₁, PN₂ . . . ." Aram has four children, Uz, Hul, Gether, and Mash, who are listed as the children of Shem in Chronicles. It is not clear whether this difference in Chronicles should be regarded as a textual error or an example of fluidity, and if the latter, whether it has a function or not.¹ Perhaps a textual error may be ruled out, since the well-known "Table of Nations" would tend to make a persistent error difficult. It may be that the Chronicler wanted to emphasize the lineage of Arpachshad by ignoring the lineage of Aram. Another reason may be that by this time in history the earlier divisions of the nations at this level had lost their significance. The next verse reverts to the "begat" formula and is used throughout the rest of the genealogy, as is also true in 1 Chronicles. There is a variant in the spelling of the names, Meshech for Mash and Ebal for Obal.² The remainder of the genealogy corresponds

¹The LXX-A adds "And the sons of Aram: Uz . . . ."

to Chronicles except for several omissions of the connective "and" in the latter. This is merely a convenience on the part of the Chronicler. The genealogy closes with a geographical statement concerning Joktan's territory. Following this is a general concluding formula concerning the sons of Shem and then a final formula wrapping up all of Genesis 10 as a unit.

In 1 Chronicles 1:5-23 the "Table of Nations" is repeated. With regard to its function in Genesis 10:1-32, several things must be pointed out. First, the number of nations is 70, a schematization which indicates that the listing of the nations is not exhaustive but selective. Apparently those nations that were either most important or best known in Israel were chosen. It is a well known fact that the order is political and territorial.¹ Second, each of the formulaic summaries following Noah's three sons follows the form, "these are the sons of PN by their families, by their languages, by their lands, by their nations."² Third, one man is the ancestor of all these nations. On the basis of this it appears that the contextual function of this genealogical presentation is to show that one man was the progenitor of all nations even though they are widely

¹Aharoni, The Land of the Bible, p. 6. The view of J. Simons presented in his article "The Table of Nations," Oudtestamentische Studien 10 (1954): 155-84 cannot be accepted because of his arbitrary use of literary criticism. He concludes that the form is geographical.

²Verses 5, 20, 31.
dispersed and speak different languages. ¹

It may be that this genealogy had a prior history and was used to relate the people of Mesopotamia to each other. Indications of this are seen in the different relationships among the nations. Canaan was related to Ham even though his language was Semitic, probably because of Egyptian influence in the area. The Philistines are also associated with Egypt even though historically they are known to have originated from the region attributed to Japheth.

The settlement of the Philistines in the area of Palestine later known as Philistia, after the Egyptians had repelled them in the fifth year of Merneptah (1233), is well known. ² But the earliest known Sea Peoples (Philistines) appear in the fourteenth-century Amarna letters of the Egyptians, Hittites, and Cypriots. Hence they were an international force. They even fought on both sides at the battle of Kadesh. The origins of these people are obscure. The four groups named are the Venyen, Lubba, Shardana and Shekelesh—all of them tentatively located in the Aegean region of the Mediterranean Sea. The Sea Peoples attacked Egypt again in the eighth year of Ramses III.

¹Gen. 11, the Tower of Babel story, gives the reason for the dispersion of mankind and their many different languages.

²For the discussion of the Philistines from this period on, see W. F. Albright, The Amarna Letters from Palestine: Syria, the Philistines, and Phoenicia, in OAP² (Cambridge: Eng.: University Press, 1960), vol. 2, chapters 20, 33.
Though Egypt resisted them, the Egyptians were so weakened that they lost control of Palestine and never again did Egypt establish herself in this land. It was not until Shishak's attack in Canaan and Syria that Egypt controlled this area again. It was shortlived, however, for by that time the Assyrians under Tiglath-pileser entered the area.

In light of these facts, it is difficult to see how the Sea People (Philistines) could ever be genealogically connected with Egypt from the time of Merneptah onward as they were settled in the coastal plains of Palestine and thus it would be more logical for them to be associated with Canaan. On the other hand, if this document were composed by an Israelite, the placement of the Philistines may be ideologically motivated since the Israelites and Philistines disliked each other.

The new evidence of widespread trade between the Aegean area and Egypt on the one hand and Mesopotamia on the other makes it quite possible for a people related to the later Sea People to be present under the sons of Mizraim. Apparently the only reason why they are not included with Japheth or Shem is that the list is Canaan-centered.

Other examples of ethnic mixing other than the Philistines also exist. Heth, the ancestor of the Hittites who were Indo-Europeans, is listed as related to Ham. The history of the Hittite people presents two different eras when they could be genealogically connected with Israel. In patriarchal times they were found in the hills of
southern Judah, probably as enclaves of immigrants. During the time of the United Kingdom Hamath was one of seven Hittite cities which remained after the downfall of the Hittite Empire around 1200 B.C.E., and these cities were referred to as the "Land of the Hittites." They remained strong, as demonstrated by the siege of Samaria. The Assyrian and Babylonian documents of this time often refer to Syria and Palestine as "Hatti-land" which shows the respect and strength accorded these Hittite cities.

This ethnic mixing is a well known phenomenon among the Arab clans. When associations shift, the genealogical charter also shifts to reflect the new alignment. Further mixing is reflected in the mention of Hazarmaveth, Sheba, and Havilah in Genesis 10:26-29 and 10:7. Whether this indicates the fission of nations because of feuds, ecological reasons, or marriage, is unknown, but the duplication of names among split tribes is well known. A familiar example is the tribe called "Sons of the Right" in the Mari tablets which seems to be equivalent to Benjamin (sons of the right). The time of the composition of this list cannot be

1 Gen. 23:5, 10; 27:4b.
2 2 Sam. 8:9ff.; 26:6.
3 2 Kings 6:24-7:8; especially 7:6.
pinpointed since the evidence is mixed. On the one hand, the mention of the South Arabian tribes fits best the United Kingdom period\(^1\), since the Arabian tribes mentioned in Assyrian documents do not correspond to those in Genesis 10. The same is true of the Sabaean and Minaean inscriptions. Aharoni feels also that before the eighth and seventh centuries Israel would not have been involved enough in international trade and commerce to give them the expertise with which to compose such a list.\(^2\) This view, however, assumes that the list was an original Israelite document. The most that can be said, however, is that it is Palestinian-centered. The evidence that the list has a literary and theological function suggests that the genealogy may have been a literary creation, since it is a well known custom of the so-called P document to place the emphasis on the last genealogical segment, which in this case is Shem.

On the other hand, the political affiliations in the list easily fit the conquest and settlement period.\(^3\) This would best accord with the presence of the Philistines as well as with the gentilic emphasis on the tribes displaced by the Israelites.\(^4\) Also, the use of Eber as the eponymous


\(^2\) *The Land of the Bible*, p. 8.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 8.

\(^4\) It cannot be ruled out that there were already Sea People living in Southern Palestine before the 13th century B.C. See Harold Steigers, *A Commentary on Genesis* (Grand
ancestor of the Hebrews would be more in line with this date, since later Israel usually referred to Jacob (Israel) as the founder of the nation. Whatever the origin of the list, it does not detract from the use made of it in Genesis.

1 Chronicles 1:28-42

This passage is easily divided into two separate sections. The first concerns the sons of Abraham and the second, the sons of Seir. The first section can be divided into three subsections according to Abraham's three wives: 1:28-31, 32-33, and 34-37. The second subsection seems to interrupt the flow of the genealogy because it does not follow the announced pattern suggested by 1:28, where Abraham's sons are Isaac and Ishmael.

The genealogy begins with the formula, "The sons of Abraham are Isaac and Ishmael."¹ The formula used is the typical "son of PN₁, PN₂ . . . ." Rather than presenting Isaac's lineage first, the lineage of Ishmael is developed in a segmented genealogy which uses the toledoth formula for the first time.² Nebaioth is listed as the first born

¹ Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), pp. 181-83 where he argues that international connections make it possible for enclaves of Philistines to be in Southern Palestine; see also The New Bible Dictionary s.v. "Philistines," by T. C. Mitchell.

of Ishmael, and his eleven brothers follow, apparently in descending age. The genealogical depth is two generations.

The specific source for the first subsection is Genesis 25:12-18, with minor differences. It begins as a "toledoth of Ishmael, Abraham's son whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's handmaid, bore to Abraham." It continues with the formula "These are the sons of Ishmael, according to their generations, the first born Nebaioth." It is easy to see the summary which has taken place in Chronicles. The closing formulas in both accounts are the same, although 1 Chronicles omits some geographical information as well as the years of Ishmael's life.

The second subsection gives the sons of Abraham by Keturah, his concubine to two generations. Note should be made of the fact that the children are called Keturah's sons and not Abraham's. The formula used at this point is "bore." After this it reverts back to the form "son of PN, PN . . . ." The concluding formula is "All these are the sons of Keturah."

The source of this subsection is Genesis 25:1-4. The form of this genealogical narrative required an opening


1 Zöcker, *LC*, p. 35.

2 The Hebrew is the third feminine singular qal of ㄥ첩, with the mark of the accusative.
formula different from the one in Chronicles. Verse 1 describes the taking of Keturah as Abraham's wife. Verse 2 uses the feminine, qal imperfect of \( T\bar{y} \) in its birth notice while Chronicles uses the feminine qal perfect of \( T\bar{y} \).

Another difference between the two is the omission of the sons of Dedan in Chronicles. Genesis also uses the verb \( n\, n\, n\) while Chronicles follows the nominal sentence pattern. They conclude with the same closing formula.

The third subsection concerns the genealogy of Abraham's son Isaac in verses 34-37. The "begat" formula is used at this juncture, "Abraham begat Isaac." After this the typical "son of PN1, PN2; ..." formula is used with the nominal sentence. The two sons of Isaac are Esau and Israel with the emphasis falling on Esau. Here as above the genealogy follows the pattern of naming two sons, but deviates in that the first son listed, Esau, has his genealogy developed first. Esau's sons are then listed, Eliphaz, Reuel, Jeush, Jalam, and Korah. Of these sons, Eliphaz and Reuel also have sons. The former's sons are Teman, Omar, Zephi, Gatam,

\(^1\)Keil - Delitzsch, p. 52.

\(^2\)LXX reads Jacob and Esau. Since the Chronicler uses the name Jacob only once, in 1 Chron. 16:17 // Ps. 105:10, the M reading is correct; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 8.

\(^3\)LXX Ιεοὺς is the result of assimilation from Παύγυα. Ιεος is correct. Allen, The Greek Chronicles, 2.3.

\(^4\)The Greek has Ἠφαίστειον which is borrowed from the Gen. 36:11 LXX and is a corruption of \( \delta \, \delta \, \delta \), Podechard, "Le premier chapitre des Paralipomenes," RB 13 (1916): 363ff.
Kenaz, Timna, and Amalek; the latter's are Mahath, Zerah, Shammah, and Mizzah. The closing formula used in the other two subsections is omitted here. The source for this four-generational genealogy is Genesis 25, although minor differences do occur. One important difference is the role of Abraham's wives and the position of Keturah, as well as the fact that Keturah is described as Abraham's wife in Genesis 25, not as his concubine as she is in 1 Chronicles 1:32.

The source of the third subsection is Genesis 25:19-24 and 36:10-13. The Chronicler received his opening formula for the birth of Isaac from Genesis 25:19b. The next genealogical statement of Chronicles has no known counterpart: "The sons of Isaac are Esau and Israel." This most likely suggested itself to the Chronicler from the material in Genesis 26:20ff. which gives the narrative of the birth of Esau and Jacob (Israel). From this point on the material is drawn from Genesis 36:10-14. The striking thing about this source, when it is compared with the Chronicler's

---

1 Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, p. 71; Keil - Delitzsch, Chronicles, p. 71.

2 Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, pp. 71-72; cf. Gen. 25:6, which may indicate that Keturah was a concubine; Keil - Delitzsch, Chronicles, p. 52.

3 Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, p. 74, are incorrect when they say that there is no parallel for Chronicles 1:34a. Their statement to this effect is true for 1:34b which is what they probably meant. Zöcker, LO, p. 35, gives Gen. 25:19 as the source for the former.
rendering of it, is its complexity. Especially significant is the way in which Genesis 36 involves the wives of Esau in the genealogy, similar to the way Abraham's wives were used above. However, once the core of the genealogy is isolated, the genealogical formulas correspond to those which the Chronicler used to construct his genealogy.¹

One major difference occurs in the form of the genealogy. In Chronicles Timna is called a son of Eliphaz, but in Genesis she is a concubine of Eliphaz who bears Amalek.²

The only other difference occurs in the spelling "Zepho" in Genesis as against "Zephi" in Chronicles.³

The second section begins with a segmented genealogy of the sons of Seir (1 Chronicles 1:38-42). The formula "sons of PN₁, PN₂ . . ." appears throughout the genealogy and covers three generations.⁴

The source for this section is found in Genesis 36:20-28

¹Curtis - Madsen, Chronicles, p. 74, are incorrect in using Gen. 36:4, 5a. J. Myers, ICAB, p. 3 agrees with the reference given above.

²Zöcker, LC, p. 35 says that the proper kinship term should be supplied as in 1:4ff. and 1:17. The LXX supplies it.

³Zepho is probably original, Curtis - Madsen, Chronicles, p. 76.

⁴It is normal to maintain the plural "sons" since it has a formulaic use. See 2:1, 8, 31, 42; 4:13, 15. Where "son" is singular but several sons are given, it may indicate another document where "son" was formulaic. See 3:19, 21, 23. This is the view also of Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 8. The AKL also has a plural in these instances.
which is a segmented genealogy of four generations in list form. As normal, the introductory formula is longer than that of Chronicles, "These are the sons of Seir, the Horite, the dwellers of the land." The key evidence which shows that Chronicles is using this as its source is the reference to "Anah the sons of Seir." When his sons are listed, the genealogy uses the plural "sons" even though only one son is listed (leaving out Oholibamah). The statement in Genesis is "And these are the sons of Anah, Dishon and Oholibamah, the daughter of Anah."

The list of the chiefs is identical except for spelling, formulas, and some narrative notes which are left out. The overall purpose of the Chronicler in this section is to stress the election of Isaac and Israel (Jacob). The genealogies of Ishmael and Esau (Edom) are briefly given because of their kinship to Isaac and Israel and to emphasize the latter's election. The secondary genealogies are always given first because the development of the important name last enhances the continuous development of the lineage.

There are several examples of fluidity in these two sections. This becomes evident when it is compared with the genealogies in Genesis 25, where the segmented genealogies of Abraham's children are found. The order of his children is given according to the position of his wives:

---

1This is the source; Curtis - Madsen, Chronicles, p. 74; J. Myers, IOAB, p. 3.
Keturah's children, Hagar's children, and Sarah's children. In Chronicles the order is quite different: the genealogy begins with only Isaac and Ishmael as the sons of Abraham. This is followed by the genealogies of Ishmael, of Keturah, Abraham's concubine, and last of all, of Isaac, even though his name appears first in the lineage of Abraham. As we have stated earlier, this placing of the most important person last is typical of the Chronicler, in order that the important lineage may be displayed as continuously as possible.¹

It appears that the shift in the position of Keturah was purposeful.² The first fact to note in this regard is that the mothers of Ishmael and Isaac are omitted in Chronicles. Second, Keturah is put on the same genealogical level as Ishmael and Isaac, though still classified as Abraham's concubine instead of as his wife as she appears in Genesis.³ This positioning puts her children on a lower genealogical level than Abraham's other sons.⁴

¹ Cf. 1:4 with 1:17; 1:34 with 2:1; see Ackroyd, TBP, p. 31. This holds true only for the lineage which leads directly to Israel.

² Curtis - Madsen, Chronicles, p. 72 imply this.

³ For a similar example see Gen. 36:9-14 and the discussion of Wilson, GHOT, p. 218.

⁴ Curtis - Madsen, Chronicles, p. 72 state that the reason she is called a concubine is not that she is not as closely related as the other two tribes. He does not attach any significance to the absence of the other wives. It should be noted here that in Gen. 25:6 Abraham gives gifts to all his concubines' sons and sends them away. Since only the sons of Sarah are allowed to remain, this
Related to this demotion of Keturah and her sons is another example of fluidity. The Chronicler's genealogy omits the names Asshurim, Letushim, and Leummin who belong to the lineage of Dedan. Perhaps the Chronicler thought them to be of little importance for his purpose, and in order to keep the symmetry of the genealogy (the three-generation depth) he omitted them.\(^1\)

It may be that the function of this genealogy in Genesis 25 is to show that Keturah's family as well as those of other concubines were sent away to the East.\(^2\) This presents the idea that only Isaac is subject to the covenant promise given to Abraham, even though they are all his progeny.\(^3\)

The presence of Keturah's name would support such an idea, may signify that Keturah was a concubine. If this is so, it means that in some social situations a concubine had the same rights as a wife while in others she was reduced to a lower status and called a concubine.

\(^1\)Myers, ICAB, p. 8 suggests that since the situation was different by this time, they were omitted. The LXX A, N, a, c, e, g, h, n, 74, 144, 236, 321, 346, d, p, q, t, z, and 44 add the sons of Dedan from Genesis 25:3 LXX by assimilation. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles*, 1.99, 185.

\(^2\)Gen. 25:6.

\(^3\)Meredith Kline, "Genesis," in *New Bible Commentary* (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), pp. 100-101. Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-1925, Index 1938), 1.298-99; 5.264, n. 309; 266, n. 316 relates the position that Keturah = Hagar and that Abraham sent his concubines' sons away because they were idolaters. This also kept him from blessing Isaac, since he would have had to give an inheritance to these idolaters and bless Esau as well.
since it would put that lineage on a lower level than that of Isaac.

It has been suggested that this genealogy had a separate existence even though there are no literary reasons to support it. This has been thought because many of these names can be traced to Northwest Arabian tribes or locales. Examples of this are Sheba, identified with Saba in the area of Mārib and Sirwāh; Ishbak and Shuah, possibly the same as Yasbug and Sūbu, found in the Assyrian inscriptions. Of the five sons of Midian, two are identified: Ehah with Gewāhfak situated on the Hismah Plateau, and Abida with Bad' near the Gulf of Aqabah. It has been suggested that these names present a sort of "Table of Nations," since many of them are similar to those found in Genesis 10. Indications of this are Jokshan paralleling Joktan and the presence of Dedan and Sheba.¹ If this is the case, one might assume that a larger genealogy was in existence, but only that portion which led back to Abraham was utilized by the so-called J document. However, a different origin could be suggested based on our knowledge of tribal genealogies. It has been shown that genealogies change their configurations according to their functions. If this is a table of tribes, the presence of Keturah is abnormal. It appears much more likely that this genealogy functioned in the domestic sphere where status position played an important role. In the

¹Johnson, Biblical Genealogies, p. 5.
context of Genesis 25:1-11 the domestic question is one of the inheritance which was given to Isaac. It may then be that this genealogy is an accurate reflection of domestic status.

The case of Ishmael (1 Chronicles 1:28) is also instructive. Although he is the son of Hagar, Sarah's handmaid, there is no mention of this here, and both Isaac and Ishmael are considered brothers but Isaac is listed first. No doubt this is due to his early association with Abraham at their circumcision and also to the promise that Ishmael would be a great nation through his twelve sons. Furthermore, Esau, Isaac's son, marries one of the daughters of Ishmael, Mahalath. In addition, David's sister, Abigail, married an Ishmaelite. All these examples point to an acceptance of Ishmael that was never awarded Esau.

The genealogy of Ishmael in Genesis 25:12-18 has a different function from that of Keturah. Verse 12 serves as a literary connection with the following independent genealogy, as is shown by the formula, "and these are the names of the sons of Ishmael." It serves to remind the reader that Ishmael is not the inheritor of Abraham's promise, since Hagar was only Sarah's handmaid. The present function of the genealogy is to show that the promise made to Hagar

---


2In later Jewish history, Ishmael was used as a first name but not Esau.
and Abraham regarding Ishmael as a nation was fulfilled.\(^1\)

The context requires a political genealogy, as is the case:
twelve sons are listed and are called  \(\chi \nu \iota\), a political
term as evidenced by its application to the leaders of the
tribes of Israel and to the leaders of Midian.\(^2\)

In 1 Chronicles 1:34-37 the wives of Esau are omitted.
In the genealogies of Genesis 36 concerning Esau (this
chapter has six genealogies and lists about Edom) the wives
play an important role in the form of the genealogy. This
example of fluidity appears to be similar to the one just
discussed.\(^3\) The main intent of the Chronicler is to
continue the line of Abraham which leads to Israel, because
the pattern of the genealogy continues the line of Abraham
--"And Abraham begat Isaac." Immediately afterward Isaac's
sons are listed as Esau and Israel. Since Esau is so
important in the Old Testament and since there is so much
genealogical material on him in Genesis 36, the Chronicler
is once again interrupted in his main purpose which is to
trace Israel back to Adam. Furthermore, because it is

\(^1\) Gen. 16:10ff., 17:20, 21:13.


\(^3\) Esau and Jacob were often at odds with each other
even though they were ostensibly reconciled (Gen. 33,
Num. 20:18-21, 1 Kings 11:14ff., Ps. 137:7). Perhaps
the most important concept concerning Esau in the theology
of the Post-exilic period was the idea that Esau is a
symbol of the non-elect (Mal. 1:2ff.).
important that the tribal relationship between Esau and Isaac be maintained, we have some genealogical material given about Esau, Seir, the kings of Edom, and the chiefs of Edom. The wives of Esau are omitted from the genealogy, since it appears that the Chronicler is not interested in the social setup of the Edomites. Another facet of this example of fluidity is that Oholibamah, who is the granddaughter of Zibeon whose father was Seir the Horite, is present in the parallel genealogy in Genesis because she is one of the wives of Esau. However, she is omitted in Chronicles because the names of Esau's wives are also omitted in Esau's genealogy.

Another example of fluidity concerns the position of Timna when 1 Chronicles 1:35-36, Genesis 36:9-14, and Genesis 36:15-19 is examined. To make this fluidity easy to see, the relevant genealogical material is diagramed below:

1 Chronicles 1:35-36

```
Esau
   ┌──────────┐
   │ Eliphaz  │ Reuel    │ Jeush    │ Jalem    │ Korah    │
   └──────────┘
       Teman  Omar  Zephi  Gatam  Kenaz  Timna  Amalek
```

Genesis 36:9-14

```
Adah ──── wife ──── Esau ──── wife ──── Oholibamah
   │ concubine  Eliphaz             │
   ┌──────────┐                     │
   │ Timna    │                     Jeush    │ Jalan    │ Korah    │
   └──────────┘                     └──────────┘
       Amalek  Teman  Omar  Zepho  Gatam  Kenaz
```

1Gen. 36:2; 1 Chron. 1:35-37.
A quick glance at the diagram shows the fluidity: Timna occupies a different position in each genealogy. In Chronicles she is numbered among the seven sons of Eliphaz. In the second chart she is a concubine of Eliphaz and has a son named Amalek. Eliphaz has five other sons whose mother is unnamed. In the third chart Timna is omitted and Amalek is listed with Eliphaz's other sons, among whom appears a new name, Korah. This genealogy thus has two Korahs: Korah the son of Esau, and Korah the grandson of Esau.

As has been pointed out before, this type of genealogical fluidity is found in other cultures which have segmented genealogies.¹ The last genealogy mentioned above purports to be a list of the "chiefs" of Edom. The word used is 'allup and it appears to designate some sort of political leader.² This genealogy then was used to demonstrate the configuration of the Edomite lineage functioning in the

¹See the section on fluidity in tribal societies.

political sphere. The presence of the two Korahs can be explained in two ways. It may represent what would be the natural assumption, i.e., that a son of Eliphaz named Korah became a "chief." Or it may be that the Korah lineage of Oholibamah was split, and that one of the two segments attached itself to the lineage of Eliphaz and gained enough influence to be designated a "chief."

The fluidity of Genesis 36:9-14 seems to function in the social sphere, and may also express the status relationships among the Edomite lineage segments. It appears to express exactly the relationship among the various people listed. Amalek is assigned a status inferior to the other sons of Eliphaz since he is designated as the son of a concubine. It should be noted also that social mixing has taken place, since Timna is also Lotan's sister who is a Horite. Oholibamah, a Horite, has a lower status, since she is discussed genealogically on the level of Esau's grandsons. This indicates that the Horites are considered socially inferior to the Edomites. 1

The date of these two genealogies may be preconquest. The Horites are generally thought to be the original inhabitants of the Mt. Seir region. Their mention in the genealogies indicates they were still distinct from the Edomites although the Edomites dominated the area. 2 The presence of

1 Wilson, GHOT, p. 218.

Amalek in these genealogies further corroborates an early date since they were also early inhabitants in the western Negeb. By the time the Israelites were in the Negeb during the Exodus, the Amalekites were acting independently of the Edomites.

This brings us to the function of Timna in the genealogy of Chronicles 1:35-36. The names in this genealogy are the same as the names in the genealogy of Genesis 36:9-14. Further, it is quite assured that this is the source the Chronicler used in reconstructing this genealogy. The question to be answered then is: why is Timna called a son of Eliaphaz when we know she was his concubine and the mother of Amalek? Wilson has suggested that the Chronicler is continuing the method of omitting the kinship terms at this point. Surely this suggestion bears some weight. The reason for this may be that the Chronicler simply wishes to continue his practice of deemphasizing women. He felt he could not leave Timna out because of the antagonistic history between Israel and the Amalekites. Israel never attacked the Edomites during their wilderness wanderings, but did attack the Amalekites several times then as well as

---

2 Exod. 17:1-13; Judges 3:13, 6:3-5, 7:12, 10:12, 12:15; 1 Sam. 27:6, 30:1-20; 1 Chron. 4:43.
3 Wilson, GHOT, p. 219; also Ackroyd, TBP, p. 31.
during the monarchy. Because the readers of the genealogy would know who she was, he could include her name among Eliaphaz's sons without stressing the matrilineal aspect of this lineage. In the light of this case, the function of fluidity continues to be domestic, to emphasize the nonrelationship between the Amalekites and the Israelites. It would seem to reflect also the political consequences of the fact that the Amalekites were condemned to destruction by God.

In summary, the genealogies of Esau in 1 Chronicles 1:34b-54 are based upon those found in Genesis 36, and were included in order to show the fulfillment of God's promise to Esau. The original purpose in Genesis 36:9-14 and 36:15-19 was to function in the domestic and political spheres.

The function of the genealogy in Genesis 36:20-28 now needs to be examined. It is a segmented genealogy in list form which reaches three generations. It begins with the introductory formula, "These are the sons of Seir the Horite, the inhabitants of the lands," following which seven names appear: Lotan, Shobal, Zibeon, Anah, Dishon, Ezer, and Dishan. Before the sons of these seven are listed, a summary

1 Exod. 17:8-13; Judges 3:13, 6:3-5, 7:12, 10:12, 12:13; 1 Sam. 27:6, 30:1-20; 1 Chron. 4:43.
2 Deut. 25:19; 1 Sam. 15:2-3.
formula characterizes the seven as chiefs (א שם חותם) of the Horites: "these are the chiefs of the Horites, the sons of Seir in the land of Edom." Since this is unexpected, it may be a dittography from verse 29 which repeats the same thing. The genealogy continues by listing the sons of each chief, each one introduced by the formula, "the sons of PN." It seems unlikely that the original function of this genealogical configuration can be recovered; one can only suggest that it may be political.

The list of Horite chiefs in Genesis 36:29-30 repeats the names of the seven sons of Seir from the preceding verses with the formula, "these are the chiefs of the Horites." Each name is listed with the title "chief" (א שם חותם). A closing formula states, "these are the chiefs of the Horites according to their clans in the land of Seir." If the formula which characterizes the names in the genealogy of Seir discussed above is original, it indicates that this list is operative in the political sphere. If not, Wilson is justified in stating that the list may have been composed on the analogy of Genesis 36:15-19 by using the names found in 36:20-28, since the expected fluidity is absent.¹

¹Wilson, GHOT, p. 222.
the history of the tribal system of the Israelites, only four of these passages relate the sons of Jacob within a genealogical framework. ¹ These are 1) Genesis 29:31-30:24, 35:16-20; 2) Genesis 35:22-26; 3) Genesis 46:8-27; and 1 Chronicles 2:1-2. Each passage presents a genealogy which differs slightly from the others. Each one will be discussed below in the same order as above.²

Genesis 29:31-30:24; 35:16-20

Genesis 29:31-30:24 is a complex segmented genealogical narrative. It names eleven of Jacob's sons and one of his daughters. Each birth announcement follows the formula, "PN₁ conceived and gave birth to PN₂."³ Following this formula an explanation of the son's name is given which is usually introduced by "and she said."⁴ The last element of


²The following discussion parallels that of Wilson, GHOT, pp. 224-230, 234-237.


⁴So in 29:33, 34, 35; 30:6, 8, 11, 13, 18, 20, 23. The only deviation occurs at 29:32 where the verb "וַיְלָל" is the third feminine perfect instead of the third feminine imperfect.
the narrative is the naming of the son, which is done with the formula "and she called his name PN,"\(^1\) or "therefore he was named PN."\(^2\)

By using the procedure outlined above the following genealogy of the sons of Jacob was created: The sons of Leah: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah (29:32-35),\(^3\) Issachar and Zebulun (30:17-20); the sons of Bilhah, the maid of Rachel: Dan and Naphtali (30:5-8); the sons of Zilpah, the maid of Leah: Gad and Asher (30:10-13); and the son of Rachel: Joseph (30:22-24).

It is clear that the genealogy is subdivided into four groupings. The significance of these divisions would be unclear if the genealogy were removed from its narrative context. It is in Genesis 29:1-30 that one discovers that Rachel was Jacob's favorite wife, and this provides the clue for the genealogy's proper interpretation. As stated before, the mention of mothers in a genealogy denotes different status levels. Therefore, in spite of the fact that Reuben is Jacob's first-born, he and his five brothers hold an inferior position because they were born to Leah who was not Jacob's favorite wife. Similarly, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher are in a subordinate status because they are the

\(^{1}\)Gen. 29:32, 33; 30:8, 11, 13, 18, 20, 21 (modified), 24.

\(^{2}\)Gen. 29:34, 35; 30:6.

\(^{3}\)Dinah's birth occurs here.
sons of maidservants rather than the sons of Jacob's wives. Yet within this group Dan and Naphtali occupy a position superior to the other two because they are the sons of the maidservant of Jacob's favorite wife. If there is a distinction between the first four of Leah's sons and the last two, who are treated separately in the genealogy, it has not been possible to determine why a distinction was made.¹ The birth of Benjamin, the last son of Jacob and Rachel, is recorded in Genesis 35:16-20.

Genesis 35:22-26

The genealogy in Genesis 35:22-26 is a segmented genealogy in list form. It begins with an opening formula, "And these are the twelve sons of Jacob." The genealogy is then divided into four subdivisions according to the mothers of the sons. Each group is introduced by the formula, "the

¹Wilson, GHOT, p. 225. It appears that the passage supplies a legitimate ancient Near Eastern example of the ancient custom of a barren wife giving a handmaid to her husband to father children. See B. A. Speiser, "New Kirkuk Documents Relating to Family Law," AASOR 10 (1928-9): 31ff. If this is correct, it is a strong argument for the belief that the account represents an accurate sequence of their birth within each subsection. Otherwise it is difficult to understand why Joseph appears so far down the list when he is not only the favorite son but also, in the Exodus, the most numerous. If Reuben was represented as the first-born because at some point his tribe was superior politically or in some other way, there is absolutely no evidence for it. Therefore, it seems quite unnecessary to propose that the genealogy had a prior existence and that it was inserted into its present location by an editor or by the Yahwist, as does Wilson, GHOT, pp. 230ff. and J. Liver, Judges, pp. 202-203; M. Noth, The History of Israel, rev. ed. (Harper & Row: New York, 1960), pp. 85ff. and especially pp. 88-90.
sons of PN" and listed as follows: 1) the sons of Leah: Reuben, the first-born of Jacob, Simeon, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun (35:23); 2) the sons of Rachel: Joseph and Benjamin (35:24); 3) the sons of Bilhah, the maid of Rachel: Dan and Naphtali (35:25); the sons of Zilpah, the maid of Leah: Gad and Asher (35:26). The genealogy closes with a summary formula, "these were the sons of Jacob who were born to him in Paddan-aram" (35:26).

When this genealogy is compared with the one examined above, it is clear that they are very similar, except for two differences. First, all of Leah's sons are linked together, which obliterates the distinction preserved in the other genealogy. Since the purpose of this distinction was nonfunctional, there was little purpose in keeping it.1 Second, this list inserts the sons of Rachel immediately after the sons of Leah, whereas in the preceding list they occur last. This happened because the list places the names in logical order. The children of the two wives are given first and then the children of the two maids.2

Genesis 46:8-27

This genealogy has already been analyzed above, so that it is not necessary to discuss its form again.

---

1 Wilson, GHOST, p. 227.

2 Ibid.; this lack of function occurred also in RL; see above in the section on the ancient Near East.
Concerning the sequence of the names in the genealogy, the one substantial change which occurs seems to be the result of a logical arrangement. The children of each maidservant are listed immediately after the children of each wife. \footnote{1}{Ibid.}

1 Chronicles 2:1-2

In 1 Chronicles 2:1-2 the Chronicler presents a list of the twelve sons of Israel. It begins with the formula, "these are the sons of Israel." The twelve sons are then listed: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, Dan, Joseph, Benjamin, Naphtali, Gad and Asher. The arrangement of the names follows the order of Genesis 35:22-26. The one exception is Dan who has been inserted in the seventh position instead of the ninth where he is usually paired with Naphtali. The purpose of this move is unclear. \footnote{2}{Ibid.}

It should be noted that abandonment of subdivisions has occurred, which is logical, since the Chronicler follows Numbers 26. For practical purposes the Israelite genealogies exhibit no formal fluidity. \footnote{3}{Wilson, GHOT, p. 230.}

As was seen in the analysis of this section, above, there is no formal fluidity in the order of the names of the sons of Israel. It appears as though the twelve tribes

\footnote{1}{Ibid.}

\footnote{2}{Ibid. It is doubtful whether this is to be regarded as a textual error. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, pp. 65-66.}

\footnote{3}{Wilson, GHOT, p. 230.}
motif had crystallized into a set number of tribes and phratries early in the history of Israel.\(^1\) When did this happen? Although there cannot be any definitive answer, some hints can be discovered.

According to the Old Testament account of the Exodus, the first time Israel and Edom had contact with each other after the former's bondage in Egypt was when Moses requested permission to pass through Edom's land on the way to Canaan. The thrust of the account as it relates to the above question is that Edom controlled a land which had a definite border. Edom was thus a political entity. Israel must also have had a political organization or else Edom would not have been afraid.

The date for Israel's request to Edom is woven into the time of the conquest. This whole subject is complicated by a number of different views regarding the conquest.\(^2\) Fortunately, there is extra-Biblical evidence which gives a *terminus ad quem* for the political independence of these two countries. An Egyptian document mentions the existence of Edom during the period of the nineteenth dynasty, was

---

\(^1\) The crystallization does not include the chronological order of the phratries—-they change. Also the splitting of Manasseh shows that tribes could split. It is the number of tribes and phratries that is important. Function will be discussed in another place.

\(^2\) Num. 20:14-21, Judges 8:24; this passage is very meager but it does show interaction between the Ishmaelites and the Israelites during the time of the Judges.
ca. 1200 B.C.E. Similarly, the Merneptah stela dated ca. 1230 B.C.E. mentions Israel. Helck identifies the Hapiru with the Shosu and thus also with the Hebrews and notes that most likely it was in the time of Ramses II that the Hapiru/Shosu peoples were formed into the nations of Moab, Edom, and Israel. Another study finds a strong similarity between the Shosu geographical locations and the exodus wanderings. The last mention of the Shosu occurs during the reign of Ramses III. That they were politically important groups is evident.

It is not known when these countries became recognized as definable entities. For Edom it probably happened during a time when political circumstances left a power vacuum in Transjordan, so that the Edomites were able to develop a state enjoying political independence.

---

1 An inscription of that period says, "... (We) have finished letting the Bedouin tribes of Edom pass the fortress of ... .", ANET, p. 259.

2 ANET, p. 376; see comments of K. A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and Old Testament, p. 59, n. 12 where he defends this reading.


5 So the surveys of Transjordan indicate. N. Glueck, "The Civilization of the Edomites," BA 10 (1947): 77-84. Thus Edom was not settled until the 13th century, "The Age of Abraham in the Negev," BA 18, No. 1 (1955): 2ff. shows that the settlements stopped 1700 B.C.
It is very difficult to determine the general time period when Israel may have developed an independent tribal system, which would have had time to crystallize into a set number of tribes and phratries. How much further can the date be pushed back before Merneptah? From the genealogy of Achan which was discussed above, it was seen that the social structure of Israel was well entrenched by the time of the conquest. Though Noth tends to date this account of Achan in the tenth century, it must really be earlier, because the tribal structure was already breaking down at that time in consequence of the rising monarchy. Since in this story the tribal structure is complete in its form, it is best to date it in the conquest period.

Another bit of important evidence for the antiquity of the crystallization into a set number of tribes and phratries comes to light when it is compared with modern oral genealogies. As noted, the upper level of a genealogy is

1Wilson's dating of this crystallization in the period of the Judges is a result of his failure to recognize that the political function of a genealogy takes place in the middle units and does not affect every level (GHOT, pp. 235-237).


3DeVaux, Ancient Israel, 1: 12, 13.

often incapable of taking on new names because the old names have been fixed. In the case of the genealogy of Israel and his sons, a minimum of two generations is fixed, sometimes three. At the bottom of the genealogy there must be room for three or four living members, so that the genealogy can function or at least have a reason to function.\textsuperscript{1}

If twenty-five years per generation are allowed, a minimum of 150 years is needed to reach this depth. If this is added to the date of the Merneptah stela, the latest date when the crystallization could have possibly occurred is 1380 B.C.E., and it probably was much earlier.

It is certain that the genealogies do not function in the political realm. The Joseph tribe would seem to be the tribe most likely to have been listed first if political status was involved in the genealogy, since he was Egypt's number two man. Yet Reuben is always listed first and called the first-born even though he lost his birthright. What can one conclude except that the order of the names in the genealogies represents nothing but the grouping of the tribes according to a logical arrangement which may have been frozen in form and does not reflect political or domestic alignments? It was probably found that the content of these genealogies remained fixed though the arrangement

\textsuperscript{1}K. Elliger, Leviticus, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, 1966), p. 239 says there are normally four generations.
of the names varied. These variations had no discernible function, but were rather the result of various logical arrangements. As suggested previously, this appears to indicate a common source for the genealogical information. The narrative genealogy of Genesis 29:31ff. was this source, and was rearranged to suit different literary and theological functions. ¹ Genesis 46:8-27 states that these were the sons of Jacob who went down into Egypt, and of course later their descendants participated in the Exodus; it thus serves a literary purpose by recording these names. ² The genealogy of Genesis 35:22b-27 serves as a genealogical conclusion to the long Jacob narrative which described his marriage and the birth of his sons, and is thus a summary of Jacob's history. ³ The narrative genealogy found in Genesis 29:31-30:24 and 35:16-20 has both a literary and a theological function. It introduces and relates persons who appear later in the narrative and also confers upon them the right to inherit the Promised Land since they are related to Jacob. ⁴

¹ Johnson, Biblical Genealogies, p. 7; Wilson, GHOT, p. 234.

² The view that this has also a theological function which serves to express the idea that all the tribes went down into Egypt and came out of Egypt, depends upon one's reconstructed picture of Israel's history. If one accepts such a reconstructed picture, that only a few tribes were actually in Egypt and that the others joined them later after the Exodus, this theological function would appear logical.

³ Wilson, GHOT, p. 234.

⁴ Ibid.
None of these functions, however, expresses the original function, because they do not take into account the presence of the children's mothers. As previously shown, their inclusion indicates a status position. Although Leah and her children are listed first, it is always clear that the children of Rachel are considered superior. Since the narrative genealogy of Genesis 29:36ff. appears to be the source for the other genealogies, the center of attention must focus here. The theory has been advanced that the Jacob narrative originated in two separate traditions. One was the list of twelve tribes and the other was the so-called "East Jordan Jacob" tradition of Jacob's wives. At some time they were joined together.¹ This theory lacks credibility since no logical reason for it can be discerned within the sequence of names, which is neither geographical nor political, since according to Noth's tribal history some tribes were politically defunct before others came into existence.

Wilson has suggested that this genealogy had originally a political function and that the special position of Rachel indicates a time when the Joseph tribes, and especially Ephraim, were politically superior to the rest of the tribes. He suggests the period just before the monarchy, since

Ephraim was then the most politically significant person. If the suggested time necessary for the crystallization of the tribal genealogies is accepted, this period would be impossible. It is much more likely that the genealogy reflects the time when Joseph was politically important in Egypt. However, one may well ask whether the Israelite tribes ever had any special political status there. They were always under Egyptian authority and had no separate political power. Later, during the time of bondage, there would be little chance for political activity under their Egyptian masters. If any function is suggested by the arrangement of the tribes, it would be in the domestic sphere, and would in that case accurately reflect biological unity, since Joseph is never put in the list as the first-born. If this is so, the genealogy is historically trustworthy.

1 Chronicles 2:1-2 and the Order of the Genealogies of the Twelve Tribes

This introductory statement of the twelve tribes of Israel is often assumed to be the Chronicler's literary blueprint, but the genealogical listing starts with Judah instead of Reuben because the Chronicler is concerned with

---

1 Wilson, GHOT, pp. 233-235.
2 Gen. 47:1-12.
3 C. H. DeGeus, The Tribes of Israel, pp. 164-165 believes that the Israelite unity was ethnic in nature.
the Davidic ideal and the nation of Judah. This deviation is significant because it reveals the order of the names found in 1 Chronicles 2:1-2 is not intended by the Chronicler to serve as the paradigm for his genealogical listing of the tribes of Israel.

This is further seen in 1 Chronicles 5:1-11 where Reuben's genealogy is actually given in the third position which is where Levi's genealogy would occur if 1 Chronicles 2:1-2 was normative. Immediately following is Gad, who in the so-called "literary pattern" occupies the eleventh position and who is now elevated to the fourth position. This promotion of Gad is obviously forced in order to demonstrate his closeness to Reuben, as is shown by the adventure with the Hagrites, Tetur, Naphish, and Nodab. The half-tribe of Manasseh is also involved in this war, but no genealogy for them is given. The reason for this will be seen shortly. It is obvious that the arrangement of these three tribes, even though the half-tribe of Manasseh has no genealogy, is geographical.

The case of Simeon occupying the second position in both arrangements of the tribes is coincidence. It is well known that in addition to being geographically close to Judah, Simeon is also politically dependent upon him and is

---

1 Rothstein, Chronik, p. 133; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, pp. 65-66; Myers, TOAB, pp. xxx-xl; Ackroyd, TBP, pp. 28, 48.
finally absorbed by him. No doubt this is the significance of the second position of Simeon's genealogy rather than the following of the "pattern sentence."

As a glance at a map will show, the remaining tribes to be delineated do not follow a geographical plan. This may be why Levi occupies his present position. Logically, it would be understandable if Levi were put exactly between the tribes or even in third position as would be expected according to the "sentence pattern."

It is now obvious that 1 Chronicles 2:1-2 is not authoritative with regard to how the genealogies of the twelve tribes of Israel are to be grouped. This single fact clarifies somewhat the main problem of the order of the tribes in the second half of these genealogies, namely, the omission of Zebulun and Dan. It is because of the "pattern sentence" that it is so often proposed that Zebulun originally stood before Benjamin, although in the present text there is no trace of his genealogy.¹

The view usually held is that traces of an original Benjamite genealogy are to be found in 1 Chronicles 7:12a, and that the present genealogy of Benjamin in 7:6-11 is a secondary addition as proven by its orderliness. It replaced the lost Zebulun genealogy some time during the

¹ Rothstein, Chronik, p. 135; M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I (Hall: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1943), pp. 118-122. This is followed by Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 66. Myers, ICAR, p. 53 is silent concerning the omission of Zebulun.
process of textual transmission. Others have gone so far as to reconstruct the genealogy of Zebulun here by using the method of textual criticism, with Numbers 26:26-27.

To go on, verse 12b appears to contain traces of an original Danite genealogy. The name Hushim is the clue, according to critics (cf. Genesis 46:23). Supporting evidence is found in the reference to Bilhah in verse 13, where the genealogy of Naphtali, the brother of Dan, is given. The name Aher is usually emended to read 'ehad (one). In a recent article by Williamson this view has been strongly challenged on textual grounds. He points out that Hushim is a Benjamite name (see 8:8, 11) and that Dan is not very likely to be confused with Ir. He suggests that Aher be read Ard, who follows Hushim in Genesis 46:21 and Numbers

1Rothstein, Chronik, pp. 133-135; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, pp. 65, 67.

2Curtis-Madsen, Chronicles, pp. 146-149 follow this. The reconstruction would read as follows, "The sons of Zebulun: Sered and Elon and Jahle'el, three; and the sons of Sered: Ezbon, and Uzzi and Uzziel and Jerimoth, and Irrive. . . . And the sons of Elon, Zemirah, and Jo'ash, and Eliezer, and Elion'elai and Omri and Jeremoth, and Abijah. All these were the sons of Elon . . . 9 . . . . 10. And the sons of Jahle'el: Bilhan. And the sons of Bilhan: Je'ush, and Chenan'ah and Zethan and Tarshish and Ashshahar. . . . 11. All these were the sons of Jahle'el."

3E. Klostermann, Realessykyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie u. Kirche, IV, (1898), p. 94 suggested this reading and Rudolph prefers it to all the other suggestions; Chronikbücher, p. 68.

26:39-40. Though he does not mention it, Aher could be Ahiram who is found in Numbers 26:38.

There is a clear reason why Zebulun and perhaps also Dan should not be restored in the text. In our discussion of crystallization it was pointed out that the ideology of twelve tribes was a constant principle. In the "pattern sentence" the number twelve was retained by once again restoring Joseph as a tribal name to replace the two tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. However, in citing the genealogies of the tribes of Israel, the Chronicler had to make adjustments because the listing of Ephraim and Manasseh was causing the traditional number twelve to be violated. Though this problem could have been solved in other ways, it suited his theological method to omit Zebulun and Dan. First, as will be seen, he wanted to present his special form for the genealogy of Ephraim, and this necessitated a separate genealogy for both Manasseh and Ephraim. Second, he desired a second Benjamite genealogy which would fit his theological purpose, as will be seen later. The mention of the half-tribe of Manasseh does not negate the twelve tribes principle, because no genealogy was cited in that instance. Thus it would appear that the omission of Zebulun and Dan was a deliberated act by the Chronicler. But why did he choose to omit these two tribes? There is no satisfactory answer. For the Danites there may be some
justification for their omission.¹ There is no real genealogical material for them in the Old Testament. The problematic phrase, "Dan shall judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel," may suggest that this tribe was late in being accepted into the covenant of Israel. Along with this is the uncomplimentary description of Dan as a serpent.² There is the further problem of the shifting boundaries of Dan from southwestern Canaan to the Lake Huleh region. Perhaps the Chronicler had this in mind when he omitted Dan. But what of Zebulun? He is considered highly patriotic.³ There is, however, one link between Zebulun and Dan, which should be stated although it does not seem to be a sufficient basis for their omission. Both of these tribes are associated with ships which is enigmatic in itself since there is no evidence that they were ever seafarers.⁴ Was the seafarer somehow considered to be a tainted occupation? There is no evidence to support this. Those tribes which are given genealogies are Judah, Simeon, Reuben, Gad, Levi, Issachar, Benjamin (I), Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, Asher,

¹In Rev. 7:5-9 the tribes of Israel are listed and Dan is omitted.
²Gen. 49:16-17.
³Judges 5:14, 16; 6:35; 1 Chron. 12:33.
and Benjamin (II)—a total of twelve.  

1 Chronicles 2:3-4:23

The block of material which describes Judah is very lengthy, so that it must be divided into two sections:  

2:3-3:24 and 4:1-24. The first section delineates the tribe of Judah through his two important sons: Perez and Zerah. The genealogy is a segmented list in its primary form. It also has two examples of linear genealogies within its confines. These include a genealogy of the house of David and a genealogy of Sheshan. Both of these should be considered as supplements to the main genealogy as also should 2:51b-55. As will be seen, separating these supplements from the main body of the genealogy results in deforming its structure. 

A key to the proper understanding of the structure of this genealogy is found in the depth of each lineage. 

---

1 The problems present in chapter V will be discussed in their proper places.

2 There is no agreement about how this material should be divided. Zöcker, LC, p. 38 feels there is no order or unity in it. Curtis-Madsen, Chronicles, pp. 82-83 say the core of the genealogy has the order Ram, Caleb, Jerahmeel, and that the supplementary material is added in reverse order as in chapter 1. To maintain this order it is necessary for Ram to be transposed from the middle position in our text to the first position. The displacement occurred when the name fell out of the text and was reinserted at its present location.

3 This shows that the genealogy of the kings of Judah is not secondary as so many scholars are prone to say.

4 Curtis—Madsen, Chronicles, p. 87 note that Ram is never isolated as a lineage as are Jerahmeel and Caleb. He says the reason for this is that Ram was a son of Jerahmeel and the Chronicler adopted this in order to use it in the
genealogical depth of the lineages of Jerahmeel and Ram is eleven generations. The depth of the lineage of Caleb (verse 42-50a) is ten generations.\footnote{This assumes that Rudolph is correct in his emendation, to the effect that this section of 2:42 should read, "Mesha his first born, who was the father of Ziph, and his second son Mareshah, the father of Hebron." ChronikbUcher, p. 18.} This indicates that these three sections hang together as a unit and that verses 42-50a should not be considered as a supplement to verses 13-20. A further indication of this is the fact that both genealogies of Jerahmeel and Caleb have closing formulas.

If the above reasoning is correct, there appear to be interruptions in the genealogy. The first occurs in 2:18-24, which contains two sections, the genealogy of Caleb and the further genealogy of Hezron. Each has a definite purpose apart from the structure of the genealogy. The former emphasizes the position of Bezalel and the latter emphasizes intertribal connections between Judah and Manasseh and the genealogy of the house of David. However, the true reason that Ram is never used as the founder of a lineage, as Jerahmeel and Caleb are, lies in their history. The latter two men are adopted tribes or "sons," while Ram is a direct descendant of Perez. Looked at in this manner, it is no accident that Jerahmeel named one of his sons Ram and that Caleb married Ephrathah after Hezron died. For the correct reading of 2:24 see note 5 on page 222. Also, Curtis & Madsen overlook the genealogy of Elihu in Job 32:2. It is a four unit name involving the given name, the patronymic, the gentilic (possibly a clan name) and the (phratry) of Ram. Cf. this with Num. 16:1, the genealogy of Korah. The first unit is the given name, then the subphratry, the phratry, and the tribe. The purpose is to differentiate clearly the subphratry involved in the rebellion.
loss of Manasseh's cities to Geshur and Aram. That this was a deliberate diversion by the Chronicler is easily seen. It follows the same scheme as the lineage of Zimri which emphasized Achar and the wise men.

The next interruption occurs at 2:34-41, which is the supplement of Jerahmeel immediately following the core of his genealogy. After this comes the core of the genealogy of Caleb which is also followed by its supplement (2:50b-55). The next supplement is chapter three which is related to the core of the genealogy of Ram. The reason why this supplement does not occur immediately after its core is clear: if the lineage of the house of David occurs both at the beginning of the genealogy and at the end, it is put in relief and its importance is enhanced. That this is correct is further shown by the pattern of chapter one where the core of the section of the genealogy—i.e., Adam, Seth, Abraham, Isaac, and Israel—is emphasized in a similar manner. Surely it is no accident that there the sons of Israel follow the genealogy of Esau, which is the last non-Israelite genealogy to be included by the Chronicler.

The genealogy begins with the formula, "The sons of PN." The kinship terms necessary for the proper interpretation of the relationship between the names are given. This is the pattern used for the segmented portions of the genealogy. Judah's first sons were Er, Onan, and Shelah.

1See below in this section.
This is followed by a note identifying their mother as Bath-shua, the Canaanitess, which shows that these sons were lower in status than Judah's other sons. A second note is added which gives the reason for the death of Er, Judah's first-born. Following this Tamar, Er's wife, is introduced. She had two sons (לֹא נֶפֶשׁ) by Judah, Perez and Zerah. A statement giving the total of Judah's sons as five closes the section. In the continuation of this genealogy only the pedigrees of Perez and Zerah are important.

The first genealogical unit is 1 Chronicles 2:3-8, which is taken from several sources. The children of Judah are listed in two birth narratives; the short one in Genesis 38:1-5 concerns the birth of Judah's sons by Shua, the Canaanitess, while the long one in 38:6-30 records Judah's two sons, Perez and Zerah, his son's concubine, by Tamar, with whom he had illicit relations. It is unclear whether the status of the women involved is important in the genealogy since they are socially equal. Divine choice is at work here, since Genesis 38 states that the Lord took the life of both Er and Onan, thus bestowing divine blessing on Tamar's children.

---

1See Wilson, GHOT, p. 218 for a discussion on status in Gen. 9:14.

2Gen. 38:3ff.

3Shelah appears to be insignificant in Judah's tribal history.
1 Chronicles 2:6-7

The second section of this genealogy begins with the formula, "The sons of PN." Perez has two sons, Hezron and Hamul. The section then shifts attention to Zerah and lists his five sons, Zimri, Ethan, Heman, Calcol, and Dara. A new generation level is added at this point, but the necessary kinship term is not given by which it might be connected with the preceding level. However, Joshua 7:1 gives the genealogy of Zimri in linear form, and thus supplies the needed information by which the data here can be interpreted. The son of Zimri is Carmi, and his son is Achar. A note is given about Achar: he violated the ban and was the troublor of Israel. The lineage of Ethan is also continued: his son was Azariah.

---

1 This lack of kinship terms may indicate that the names Ethan, Heman, Calcol, and Dara belong to a different time span. The reader would naturally link Zimri with Carmi because he would recall the correct relationship from his knowledge of Joshua 7:1. Cf. Zöcker, LC, p. 39; NBC, p. 372. The identification of Zimri with Zabdi is widely recognized; this is the opinion of R. J. Coggins, I and II Chronicles, The Cambridge Bible Commentary (London: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 21; Zöcker, LC, p. 39; Curtis & Madsen, Chronicles, p. 85. J. Alberto Soğgin, Joshua, Old Testament Library (Westminster Press: Philadelphia, 1970), p. 93 says that and were confused. Darda, I Kings 5:11, is correct since the combination of and would easily cause one of them to fall out.

2 See reference above.

3 P. Ackroyd, TBP, p. 33 says that the name change from Achan (Joshua 7:1) to Achar is a play on words by the Chronicler intended to cause reflection on the trouble he brought to Israel (cf. 1 Kings 18:17ff.).
1 Chronicles 2:6-7 is a clear example of telescoping. Zerah is said to have had five sons, Zimri, Ethan, Heman, Calco, and Dara. Although the kinship relation between Zimri and Carmi is not given, Carmi is the son of Zimri and Achan is the son of Carmi.\(^1\) The four-generational depth of this lineage extends to the time of the conquest. However, the next four names, which are represented as the sons of Zerah, do not appear until the reign of Solomon.\(^2\) At least two were associated with the temple singers in the time of David.\(^3\) Consequently, there is a time span of several hundred years between these four men and Zimri. In 1 Kings 5:11 (Hebrew) these four men are called the "sons of Mahol," which may be the name of a guild of musicians.\(^4\) The function of this example of fluidity will become evident if we consider what these men were, wise men and musicians.\(^5\) It would appear that these two positions were

---

\(^1\) Joshua 7:1, 18.

\(^2\) In Joshua 7 the name appears as Achan. The reason for the change seems to be a pun meaning "the troubler." See the commentaries.

\(^3\) 1 Kings 5:11 (Hebrew); 1 Chron. 15:19.

\(^4\) W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and Religion of Israel* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1968) shows that these names are Canaanite and are plant and flower names which were often applied to musicians.
associated. Heman was a Levitical singer, and a seer, and they both wrote psalms and appear in the Levitical genealogies. As for Calcol, the name occurs on an Egyptian seal which was found at Meggido, where it refers to a female musician; suggesting the Calcol in this genealogy was also a musician. In light of this evidence, it would appear that these four men were Levites, who belonged to the lineage of Zerah. In Psalms 88 and 89 Heman and Ethan are referred to as Ezrahites, and in 1 Kings 5:11 (Hebrew) Ethan is again called an Ezrahite. Although a firm decision cannot be made the Chronicler assumed that the terms Ezrahite and Zerahite were synonymous. Heman and Ethan are both called Zerahites and Levites—it seems that a Levite would become closely associated with a tribe, or with the lineage of a tribe, to which he was assigned so that he would be considered part of it. It would seem safe to conclude that

---

1 Kings 5:11 (Hebrew); Psalms 89, 88; 1 Chron. 15:19; 25:2-5; 2 Chron. 5:12. Asaph is also called a seer in 1 Chron. 29:30.

2 Chron. 6:33, 44.

3 Albright, ARI, p. 127; YGC, p. 251.

4 The Hebrew root is the same in both cases, נזר. Albright feels it is the name for guilds. See ARI, p. 127. Another view is that it is a term used to separate the Levites from the Zerahites, because they were attached to the Zerahites' cities. Oswald Ellis, The Old Testament: Its Claims and Its Critics, (Austlen, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing House, 1972), pp. 307-310.

5 Judges 17:7; cf. 1 Sam. 1:1 with 1 Chron. 6:33-35. Some feel that Samuel was adopted into the Levitical order. See J. Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), p. 148; but they must first prove that one
the function of this fluidity was to show the primacy of the Judahite Levites and their close association with the Davidic kingdom. The result appears to be a close association between the political and religious realms. Further evidence of this is apparently indicated in the lineage of Achan: his influence upon Israel was negative but it still involved the political and religious fortunes of the nation.¹

The genealogy now returns to the lineage of Hezron. The usual formula is given but a note is added, "Who were born to him."² The significance of this phrase seems to be that the names listed, Jerahmeel, Ram, and Kalubāi, are really to be regarded as sons of Hezron.³ First the lineage of Ram is listed. The kinship formula changes at this point to "PN₁ begat PN₂" to form a linear section.⁴ When it reaches the seventh generation, it becomes segmented. Here it lists the seven sons of Jesse, and each is given an


¹Judges 16 and 17.

²The verb is in the third masculine singular niphal perfect of ׀́ה כןān.

³Kalubāi = Caleb; see Zöcker, LC, p. 4; NBC, p. 353.

⁴Wherever the form "begot" is used, it is followed by the mark of the accusative.
ordinal designation. A note at the end names two daughters of Jesse, Zeruiah and Abigail. Zeruiah's three sons; Abshai, Joab, and Asahel, played an important role in David's rise to power.⁴ Amasa, the son of Abigail, commanded the army of the sons of Judah.²

There are at least three examples of fluidity in 1 Chronicles 2:9-17. The first concerns the number of the sons of Jesse. In the narrative which tells of David's anointing by Samuel, four of Jesse's eight sons are named, but in the genealogy of the Chronicler only seven sons are given.³ Perhaps the name of one son was forgotten since they were not all written down.⁴

The next example of fluidity concerns the addition of names to the genealogical level which lists Jesse's sons. The names added are Zeruiah and Abigail who are David's sisters. The sons of Zeruiah, Abshai, Joab, and Asahel, joined David's army and distinguished themselves as men of valor.⁵ The son of Abigail is Amasa, and he became recognized as an able commander of Absalom's rebel army and

---

¹ 2 Sam. 2:12ff., 8:16; 1 Chron. 11:6, 8 (Joab). 2 Sam. 23:24; 1 Chron. 11:26 (Asahel). 2 Sam. 23:18; 1 Chron. 11:20, 21 (Abishai).
³ 1 Sam. 17:12.
⁴ In 1 Chron. 27:18 the missing son is named Elihu.
⁵ 2 Sam. 2:12-18; 23:18, 24.
later of David's army before he was killed by Joab.  

The third example of fluidity found in this passage involves the linear portion of verses 10-13. A parallel genealogy is found in Ruth 4:18-22. The introductory toledoth formula reads, "And these are the generations of Perez." The kinship formula is "PN₁ begat PN₂, PN₂ begat PN₃, . . . ." Scholars generally doubt whether the genealogy was an original part of the story of Ruth, because the ten generational pattern indicates that it was contrived.² As stated before, this pattern is not as universal as was supposed.³ In this genealogy the number of generations are too few to cover the time span implied since it was calculated that each generation listed must represent fifty years.⁴ This indicates that telescoping has taken place just as happened in the linear genealogies of the ancient

¹2 Sam. 17:25; 18:13; 20:9-12.


⁴Edward Campbell, Jr., Ruth, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, N. J.: Doubleday & Co., 1975), pp. 24-28. Amminadab is the father-in-law of Aaron. This makes Nanshon a contemporary of Moses and Aaron. From this point to David there is a span of 250-350 years.
Near East.

The function of this genealogy becomes clear once the historical context is examined. Although the date of the composition of the genealogy is difficult to determine, most recent scholars think the date of both the genealogy and the book of Ruth is between 950 and 700 B.C.E. Some scholars favor the earlier date, because if the book had been composed later than Solomon's time, one would expect his name be included. If this is true, it follows that the genealogy and the story of Ruth are related in purpose. Since the story shows the complicated continuance of David's line at just the point where it might cause the most confusion, it would appear that the story is a political apology meant to legitimize David's kingship. Why this was necessary will become clear below.

In comparing the Davidic genealogy in Chronicles with the one in Ruth, the question rises, are they the same genealogy? At first glance it appears that they are not: the toledoth formula is not used in Chronicles, Amminadab is omitted in Chronicles, and Salmon is spelled differently.  

---


3 Many of the names differ from the spelling in Chronicles. Also the LXX is confused on the spelling of Ram and Salmon; Salma is to be preferred; Campbell, Ruth, p. 171.
When the approach of the Chronicler is considered, these differences may not be so radical. He gives segmented genealogies wherever he can, and has segmented sources through the children of Hezron which are adequate to that level. ¹ At this point in the Chronicler's genealogy, he fixes his attention on the Davidic line and attempts to show the superiority of this lineage by abandoning all segmentation until he reaches the family of Jesse. The segmentation serves to highlight David's election. When the Chronicler reaches this genealogical level, he seems to use the genealogy in Ruth. Any telescoping in the two genealogies is probably due to the unimportance of the omitted names. The fact that Nahshon is emphasized by being called the prince of Judah further heightens the importance of the lineage and gives David greater legitimacy as king. These genealogies emphasize the right of David to be king by stressing the purity of his lineage. ² In the genealogy of Chronicles, it seems that the stress falls on the lineage of Perez. It is his three sons who appear to be the leaders of Judah, yet only Ram is his natural son. David, although he has Canaanite affinities, is directly related to Judah through the patrilineal genealogy. ³

¹ Perhaps the writer of Ruth also used the genealogical material in Gen. and Num. to form his genealogy.

² See remarks on 1 Chron. 5:27-41 below, in the section on fluidity.

³ Legitimacy plays an important role in the genealogies of Ezra and Nehemiah. Johnson, Purpose of Biblical
After dealing with the lineage of Ram, the Chronicler focuses on the lineage of Caleb. This section is a genealogical narrative which starts out as segmented but changes into a linear form. The kinship formula is \( PN_1 \) begat \( PN_2 \)." We are told that Caleb is the son of Hezron. This would seem to indicate an identification with Chelubai who had previously appeared as the son of Hezron.\(^1\) He had several sons and a daughter by Azubah, his wife.\(^2\) Her sons are then given in list form after being introduced by the formula, "These were her sons:" Jesher, Shobab, and Ardon. Next a note states that Azubah died and Caleb married Ephrath, who gave birth to a son named Hur.\(^3\) The kinship term, "begat," is now used for two generations. The genealogy ends with Bezalel, who was included because he was a craftsman who played an important role in the construction of the tabernacle in the wilderness.\(^4\)

---

Genealogies, p. 10. 1 Sam. 22:3-4 may show David's family ties with Moab.

\(^1\) See above, note 3, page 215.

\(^2\) So Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 12, whose emendation reads, "And Caleb the son of Hezron begot by his wife Azubah, Jerioth and her sons were . . . ." Jerioth is thus a daughter. I. W. Slothi, Chronicles (London: Soncino Press, 1952), p. 11 prefers to make Jerioth a concubine. The Vulgate and the Pershitta read, " . . . begat with Azuba his wife, Jerioth and these are her (Jerioth') sons." Fortunately, the structure of the genealogy does not depend upon the correct reading.

\(^3\) The verb is the third feminine singular Qal imperfect 17\(^7\) with the mark of the accusative.

\(^4\) Exod. 31:2. Ackroyd, TBP, p. 20 thinks that this points forward to the building of the temple.
However, the genealogy of Bezalel is from Exodus 31:2 where Bezalel is not connected with Ephrat. In its original context Bezalel is a genealogical designation which specifically names Judah as his tribe. Caleb is omitted. Its original function, then, is one of identification.

At this point there are two genealogical excursuses. Each is linear in form with a depth of two generations. The narrative starts with the word "afterward," which indicates a temporal sequence and suggests that the following event happened after Caleb had married Ephrat. After Hezron was sixty years old, he married a daughter of Machir. Machir, the founder of Gilead, also gave his name to a clan of the tribe of Manasseh. ¹ Hezron's wife gave birth to Segub and then to Jair whose birth is announced with the formula "PN₁ begat PN₂." A historical note is added stating that Jair had twenty-three cities in the land of Gilead. ² Jair lost nearly sixty cities in a war against

¹ \(571\) indicates the founder in most cases, though it sometimes means the local governor. See I. Mendelssohn, "Guilds in Ancient Palestine," BASOR 80 (Dec., 1940): 19; Zöcker, LC, p. 41. There are exceptions to this rule. In Num. 26:29 Machir begat Gilead, and Num. 27:1 seems to confirm that there was a person named Gilead. Judges 5:14; 1 Chron. 7:16-17.

² For a discussion of the significance of Jair see W. F. Albright, "Beth-shan Stele of Sethos I (1309-1290 B.C.E.)," BASOR 125 (Feb., 1952): 30. See also Num. 32:41; Judges 10:3. In the former reference Havvothehem is usually emended to Havvothzim; A. Bergman, "Israelite Occupation of Eastern Palestine in the Light of Territorial History," JAOS 54 (1934): 176.
Geshur and Aram.¹ A closing formula states, "All these were the sons of Machir, the father of Gilead."² After Hezron dies, Caleb married his widow Ephrathah, and they had a son,³ whose name was Ashshur and who was the founder of Tekoa. This line of Hezron is not mentioned again, perhaps because they were absorbed by Machir.

Verse 24 is corrupt. Most scholars follow the suggestion of Wellhausen who reads צ'כ נל.⁴ The reason for the corruption may be the abbreviated spelling נ.⁵

Attention is focused again on the main genealogical line of Perez and on the lineage of Jerahmeel. A segmented genealogical list in narrative form reaching a depth of eleven generations, it uses the kinship formula, "the sons of PN₁, PN₂, . . . ." Jerahmeel is described as the .

¹Geshur is to be located in the Bashan area if the cuneiform Gari = Geshur. Y. Aharoni, The Land of the Bible, trans. A. F. Rainey (London: Burns & Oats, 1966), pp. 67, 130, 163, 166, 171, 216 and 191. This shows the increase in the clan's power.

²LXX reads, "All these belonged to . . . ." It is best to keep the MT, on the analogy of 1:23b and 1:33b. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 14.

³See the text on page 176 for the form of the birth notice. The corrected verse reads, "After the death of Hezron, Caleb went into Ephrathah . . . ." See the RSV Bible.

⁴J. Wellhausen, De gentibus et familis Judaeis quae I Chr. 2:4 enumerantur, 1870. See for example Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 16. Zöcker, LC, p. 42.

⁵Allen, The Greek Chronicles, 2:87. For his discussion on other abbreviations of ו, see 2:82.
first-born of Hezron, and of five sons his first-born is Ram.¹ Jerahmeel had a second wife Atarah, who had one son, Onam. The genealogy continues the lineage of Ram by mentioning again that he was the first-born of Jerahmeel. Immediately following this, his three sons are mentioned, Maatz, Jamin, and Eker.² The lineage of Onam and his two sons, Shammai and Joda, is listed next.³ Shammai also had two sons, Nadab and Abishur. Abihail, wife of Abishur, gave birth to Ahban and Molid. This is the only formulaic deviation in the genealogy. The sons of Nadab are Seled and Appaim, and a note states that Seled died without leaving sons. Appaim had a son Ishi who had a son named Sheshan who in turn had a son called Ahlai.⁴ In these last three generations the formula continues its plural "sons" even though only one son is listed in each case.⁵ At this point the genealogy returns to Jada who was Onam's son. Jada's brother is Shammai and Jada's sons are Jether and

¹ For the place of Ram, see above, note 4, page 208.

² LXX B, A: Ἀκηρ; L: ἡκηρ. The consonants in the name agree.

³ LXX οὐφοῦ. This is a confusion between τ and ι. LXX A and MSS have Οὐφοῦ, L has Αὐχ. It is likely that the Hebrew is correct since the LXX B can also be explained by assimilation from /χιοφοῦξ(2:19).

⁴ This seems to conflict with verse 34. Some commentators make Ahlai a daughter, Zöcker, LC, p. 43; Curtis & Madsen, Chronicles, p. 94; others make Ahlai a grandson, NBC, p. 372.

⁵ This is a formulaic custom. See n. ⁴, page 178.
Jonathan. A note explains that Jether died without sons, while Jonathan had two sons, Peleth and Zaza. The section closes with a formula, "These are the sons of Jerahmeel." No clear statement about the function of this genealogy can be made although the mention of the wives of Jerahmeel may indicate a domestic purpose.

The genealogy now takes an interesting turn. Sheshan is said to have only daughters. He also had an Egyptian manservant whose name was Jarha, who was given to one of Sheshan's daughters for a husband. What follows is a long linear genealogy which uses the kinship formula "PN₁ begat PN₂." The only exception is when the wife of Jarha gives birth to Attai. The depth of the genealogy is thirteen generations and it ends without a closing formula.

This section of the genealogy is perplexing because there is no outside information concerning the names contained in it. The obvious problem is, why is Ahlai called the son of Sheshan when it is explicitly stated that he had only daughters? In light of the Chronicler's tendency to emphasize the tribe of Judah, it may be suggested that Ahlai was one of David's officials who supported him politically though not militarily, for he would have been too old, and made his resources available to him. In support of this --though the evidence is meager and uncertain--is the mention

1 Nothing is known about these descendants.
of Zabad, the son of Ahlai, who is one of David's mighty men. In the linear portion of the genealogy, there appears a Zabad who may be the one who is David's mighty man. Any attempt to date the names by generational spans is speculative. It would be safer to assume that this lineage played an important political function in David's government. Since their geographical location was in the Negeb, perhaps they were David's emissaries to the local nomads.

The next section (verses 42-50a) is the main genealogy of Caleb. The opening formula is, "And the sons of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel." The name Jerahmeel is most likely a later explanatory addition.

1 Chron. 11:41.

Some feel that Ahlai is a female name representing one of the daughters of Sheshan. But there is no known female of this name. Also the name means "brother of my God" (KB) and may be a Hurrian male name. Ginsberg, "Semitized Hurrians in Syria and Palestine," JPOS 14 (1934): 262ff.

Noth, "Eine siedlungsgeographische Liste in I Chr. 2 und 4," ZDPV (1932): 104. This may be so since it seems incongruous that he is called the "son of Hezron" in v. 18 while here he is the brother of Jerahmeel. However, if the name is original, it does not reflect the position that several Calebs are involved. For views on Caleb and Jerahmeel, see J. Liver, Encyclopaedia Biblica, 3:861-863; 4:106-110. This verse appears to have suffered corruption. Curtis & Madsen, Chronicles, p. 95 restore it to read, "The sons of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel and his first-born, the father of Ziph and the sons of Mareshah the father of Hebron." They feel that Mesha and Maresha (LXX) are due to dittography. Noth, op. cit., p. 107 emends the text to read, "The sons of Caleb (the brother of Jerahmeel), Mesha his first-born, who was the father of Ziph and the sons of Mareshah the father of Hebron." Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 18 reads, "Mesha his first-born, who was the father of Ziph, and his second son Mareshah the father of Hebron."
Following the opening formula, Mesha's name appears with the note that he was the first-born.\(^1\) From this point on the genealogy is difficult to analyze because many of the names are geographical. How can personal names be differentiated from geographical names? This problem is amplified when it is known that ten of the names are known to be those of cities, and yet some of the other names which occur next to known cities are not known as cities. A clue to unraveling part of the problem is found in the change of formulas. The "son of PN\(_1\), PN\(_2\) . . . " changes at several points to "PN\(_1\) the father of PN\(_2\)." Does this have some special significance? As previously noted, kinship or birth notices indicating a father-son relationship use the "begat" pattern. It would seem, therefore, that here this "father formula" indicates the name of a town and the proper meaning of this formula is, "PN\(_1\), founder of GN\(_1\)."\(^2\) The main exception to this appears to be Hebron, who has four sons and appears as a personal name, and perhaps should be so regarded here.\(^3\) However these names are sorted out, the

\(^1\)LXX ΒΑ Μαρήσα assimilated to Maresha in the same verse. Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 13. Rothstein, Das Erste Buch der Chronik, p. 29 prefers the LXX.

\(^2\)Zöcker, LG, p. 41.

\(^3\)1 Chron. 5:28; Exod. 6:18. Rekem is one of his sons, Num. 31:8, though Tappuah is known only as a city. Korah is a fairly common name and Shema is said to have begotten a child. M. Noth emends the text to read, "And the father of Hebron: Korah . . . . "Eine siedlungsgeographische Liste," p. 106, but this does not seem to clarify the text.
result causes little change in the form of the genealogy.¹

The next son of Caleb is Hebron. He has four sons, Korah, Tappuah, Rekem, and Shema. Shema begets Raham the father of Jorkeam.² Rekem begets Shammai. The son of Shammai is Maon, the founder of Beth-zur. This marks the deepest limit of the genealogy, nine generations.

Caleb's concubine, Ephah, is the next concern of the genealogy. She gives birth to three sons, Haran, Meza, and Gazzez. Haran begets Gazzez.³ The next name is Jahdai, but there is no kinship term to interpret his relationship to the other names in the genealogy. He is listed as having six sons. Another concubine, Maacah, concerns the Chronicler now and gives birth to Sheber and Tirhanah, and also to Shaaph, the founder of Madmannah, and to Sheva, the founder of Machbena and of Gibea. Caleb next has a daughter Achsah. The genealogy has a closing formula, "These are the sons of Caleb."

The next unit, an appendix, reverts back to the line of Hur who, according to an earlier genealogy, is the son of Chelubai (Caleb). It begins with a coupling of the formula,

---

¹The verb is masculine but the subject is feminine. Perhaps one should read " länger" instead of " länger".

²The Greek is very confused in the transmission of the name: LXX A, [ερκαντη]; B, [κκαντη]; L, [ερκαμ]. In Joshua 15:56 the MT = "장 장"; while Joshua 5 reads [ερκαμ] = MT of Chronicles 2:44; Allen, The Greek Chronicles, 2.112.

³In B the form " 장 장" is incorrect since the ε is a corruption of the final θ. No doubt the ν was an error for ο which arose after the ε error. C₂ has " 장 장" and L has " 장 장". These indicate MT is correct.
"The son of Hur," and a note that Hur is the first-born of Ephrathah. The genealogy is a segmented list which appears to give names of persons, cities, and families. After indicating the kinship term and the lineage of the genealogy, three sons are named, and after each one the city founded by him is given. Shobal founded Kiriath-jearim; Salma founded Beth-lehem; Hareph founded Beth-gader. At this point the genealogy states that Shobal, the founder of Kiriath-jearim, had sons, namely, Haroeh; then comes the name of a tribe, one half of the Manahathites; then the families who lived in Kiriath-jearim, the Ithrites, the Puthites, the Shumanites, and the Meshraites. Following this is a note that the Zorathites and the Eshtaolites came from these families.

The genealogy then returns to Salma. His sons are Beth-lehem, the Netophathites, Atroth-beth-joab, one half of the Manahathites and the Zorites. Following this is a note about the families of the scribes who came from Hammath, the father of the house of Rechab. There is no closing formula.

1 Chronicles 3

The second block of material in 1 Chronicles 3:1-24 is an appendix to the house of David. It is here that the

---

1 Read the plural "sons" instead of the singular.

2 M. Noth, "Eine siedlungsgeographische Liste," pp. 103, 106 emends to read, "the sons of Salma the father of Beth-lehem . . . ."

3 Many commentators think that this is a later addition. So J. Meyer, ICAB, p. 19; Ackroyd, TRP, pp. 34-35. This view
and Solomon was crowned instead.  

The formula used for the names of these kings is "PN₁ son of PN₂." When the name of Josiah is reached, segmentation occurs. He has four sons and each is designated by the proper ordinal number according to the sequence of birth. The formula now changes to "son of PN₁, PN₂ . . . ." Although Jehoiakim seems to have only one son, Jeconiah, who also has a son Zedekiah, in light of verse 17 it is best to consider Zedekiah as a second son of Jeconiah. ² The confusion occurred because the singular "son" is used to introduce Jehoiakim's two sons. The lineage of Jeconiah is given next and he has seven sons. Of these it is Pedaiah and his two sons, Zerubbabel and Shimei, who are of concern to the Chronicler. ³ The genealogy continues with Zerubbabel,

¹ Kings 1-2.

² Myers, ICAB, p. 20 gives three different interpretations but prefers the one given above. Cf. 2 Chron. 36:10. Also see Zückers, LC, p. 50.

³ There is a problem here. In Haggai 1:12, 14; 2:2, 23; Ezra 3:2, 8; 5:1, 2; Neh. 12:1 Shealtiel is the father of Zerubbabel. There are several explanations: 1) The LXX changes Pedaiah to Shalatiel (Σαλατιὲς). 2) Goettsberger believes that Shealtiel died early and Pedaiah became head of the family; quoted by Myers, ICAB, p. 21. 3) Rudolph suggests that Pedaiah married the childless widow of Shealtiel. Thus Zerubbabel would be Shealtiel's son according to the law of Levirate marriage; ChronikbUcher, p. 29. 4) Elmslie believes that Zerubbabel was a grandson to both men because a daughter of Pedaiah was married to a son of Shealtiel; The Books of Chronicles (London: Cambridge University Press, 1916), p. 23. 5) Kimchi regarded the last six sons of Jeconiah as sons of Shealtiel, and Zerubbabel appears in Haggai 1:1, 12, 14 and in Ezra 3:2 as his grandson. 6) Curtis-Madsen, Chronicles, p. 101 suggest that Zerubbabel succeeded Shealtiel and it is in this sense that he was his son. There seems to be no information available.
who has two sons and one daughter, Meshullam, Hananiah, and Shelomith. After this five more names appear. It is uncertain where the next five names should be connected to the family line because no kinship term is provided. It may be that they are additional sons of Zerubbabel, or else they are sons of Meshullam, since Hananiah is listed in verse 21 as having sons. After the names of Hananiah's sons, four names appear in the sequence, the sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, the sons of Obadiah, and the sons of Shecaniah. These names have caused much controversy over their "proper" interpretation. The most natural interpretation would seem to be that these are other Davidic families in the time of Zerubbabel, or more likely in the time of his grandsons Pelatiah and Jesaiah. It seems it is reading too much into the text to say that these names add four more generations to the genealogy of Zerubbabel. Further proof of this is found in the list of families in Ezra 2:3ff. and Nehemiah 7:8ff. They have the same form as the four names here. Thus the genealogy of Zerubbabel continues for

1 The total is given as five. This indicates that the statement is out of place, since Hananiah's sons are not totalled while those sons in verses 22-23 are totalled. Anyway, since no total is given, it would seem that if they are to be connected to any preceding name, that of Meshulam is the most likely candidate--so the Jerusalem Bible.


3 So those scholars who follow the reading of the LXX.
only two generations and not for six or eleven as is often thought.

The genealogy of the kings of Israel functioned in the political realm by naming the legitimate kings of Judah. After the monarchy was destroyed by the Babylonians, the descendants of David continued to maintain political authority. In the post-exilic age, Shenazzar and Zerubbabel exercised such authority. ¹ Since the Davidic family had such outstanding influence, other families within that clan were also recorded, hence the rationale for their inclusion at the end of 1 Chronicles 3:20-24. Quite likely the Chronicler recorded the kings from the account in the Book of Kings, although a separate list may have existed. The list of Davidic families at the conclusion of the genealogy may have been constructed from first-hand knowledge.

1 Chronicles 4:1-23

The third block of material is found in 1 Chronicles 4:1-23. The chapter is a collection of fifteen fragmentary genealogies of two to six generations which center on the Calebite clans and on the clan of Shelah. Even though this is certain, it is difficult to link them to the genealogy of chapter 2. Even if this could be done, it may not be desirable to do so since it would obscure the intentions of the Chronicler.

¹Ezra 1:1-5:17.
1 Chronicles 4:1-2 gives the first genealogy, with opening formula "the sons of Judah." It lists five sons, 1 Perez, Hezron, Carmi, Hur, and Shobal. It then develops the lineage of Shobal in a linear narrative for three generations, after which it is divided into segments at its final genealogical level. The kinship term necessary for interpreting the genealogy is "PN₁ son of PN₂." This formula connects Reaiah with Shobal. The formula used after this is "PN₁ begat PN₂." There is a closing formula, "These were the phratries of the Zorathites."

1 Chronicles 4:3 is a segmented genealogy of two generations in list form. The first generation has the name Etam. The wording of the genealogy gives the impression that Etam had three fathers, since the verse reads, "And these were the father of Etam: Jezreel, Ishma, and Idbash, and the name of their sister was Hazzelelponi." Some of the ancient versions read "son" instead of "father." ² This makes it easier to interpret, but it is obviously wrong since the more difficult reading is to be preferred and the uses of "father" is continued in verses 4, 12, 14, 18, 19, and 21-23. M. Noth emends the introductory formula by adding the name Hareph, on the analogy of Shobal (2:50-52) and

1 Carmi may be a mistake for Caleb, since in 5:3 the sequence Hezron and Carmi appears. Also, no descendants seem to be connected with Carmi, the son of Zerah, in any of the genealogies given in this chapter. Cf. Elmslie, Cambridge Bible, p. 25.

²LXX A, B.
the continuing explication of the sons of Hur. He then makes the other names geographical. There seems little doubt that they are place names but it does not seem necessary to interject the name Hareph. Perhaps the whole verse should be read as enumerating the cities which the Zorathites founded.

1 Chronicles 4:4 gives a segmented genealogy of four generations in list form and in ascending order. These are Penuel and Ezer who are the sons of Hur. Hur is the son of Ephrathah. Each name is said to be the founder of a city: Gedor, Hushah, and Beth-lehem. There is no opening formula, but in the middle of the verse the formula, "These were the sons of PN," leaves little doubt that these names are to be linked together.

1 Chronicles 4:5-7 gives a segmented genealogy in list form, reaching a depth of two generations. There is no opening formula. Following the name Ashhur, who belongs to the phratry of Hezron, is a geographical note which says that he founded Tekoah. Another statement declares that he

---


2 Read 'IN instead of 'JN as do some of the ancient versions.

3 2:51 gives Salma as the founder of Bethlehem. The Chronicler is basically saying that Bethlehem belongs to the lineage of Hur. Cf. Myers, IGAB, p. 28.

4 Myers, IGAB, p. 28 says that the connection with Caleb (2:19) points to an amalgamation of the southern elements with Judah.
had two wives, Helah and Naarah. The next genealogical level concerns the sons of the wives, and Naarah's segment is listed first. The birth notice uses the "begat" formula in the feminine piel form. She has four sons, Ahuzzam, Hepher, Temeni, and Haahashtari. This level is closed with the formula, "These were the sons of Naarah." A secondary formula introduces Helah's sons, "And the sons of Helah were Zereth, Izhar, and Ethnan." There is no closing formula.

1 Chronicles 4:8 gives two genealogies in list form, both reaching a depth of two generations. Whether they are connected or not is unclear. The birth notice uses the "begat" formula, "Koz begat Anub and Zobebah." The other genealogy, on the other hand, simply says, "The families of Aharhel, the son of Harum." There is no closing formula.

1 Chronicles 4:9-10 is not a genealogy but a short narrative about Jabez showing that he was highly regarded and that God blessed him.  

1 Chronicles 4:11-12 is a genealogy of three generations which begins in a linear form, but becomes segmented at the third generational level. Some of the relationships represented are in doubt. Shuhah is called a brother of

---

1 I. Mendelsohn, "Guilds in Ancient Palestine," BASOR 80 (Dec., 1940): 19 says that Jabez was head of the three families of scribes who originally came from the three cities, Ter'ca, Sem'ca, and Sokho.
Ohelub but the LXX changes the names and makes Caleb the father of Achnah. This can hardly be correct as this is a Greek correction from 1 Chronicles 2:49.\(^1\) Another problem is the status of Eshton since he is represented as a geographical name and also has three children, one of whom founded Ir-nahash. The attempt of the LXX to explain this by the addition of \(\alpha\delta\varepsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\upsilon\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\chi\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\) is best explained as two separate glosses which were misplaced from verse 15. If it is included in the MT text, it makes \(\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon\lambda\alpha\omicron\nu\) the son of two fathers, Tahinnah and Kenaz. It is likely that \(\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon\lambda\alpha\omicron\nu\) is a Greek corruption for Hezron (1 Chronicles 2:18; LXX B, C\(_2\) and R [74, 144, 236, 321, 346, d, p, q, t, z, 44] have corrupted Hezron to \(\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon\lambda\alpha\omicron\nu\)) for the \(\tau\) and \(\tau\) are easily confused in Hebrew and the \(\Delta\) is easily confused with \(\Lambda\) in Greek. The \(\alpha\delta\varepsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\upsilon\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\) (Hezron) then was placed with verse 12 because \(\pi\nu\chi\) \(\pi\nu\chi\) (verse 15) is similar to \(\pi\nu\chi\) \(\omicron\nu\chi\omicron\nu\gamma\omicron\) (verse 12). \(\tau\omicron\chi\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\iota\iota\) was also a gloss (cf. Numbers 32:12, Joshua 14:6, 14) used to link verse 12 with the earlier verses.\(^2\)

All these names are known as cities, and yet the formulas allow only Eshton and Ir-nahash to be interpreted as such. This has led M. Noth to change the kinship terms to "father" at all the trouble spots.\(^3\) This textual correction

\(^1\)Allen, The Greek Chronicles, 1:168; Curtis – Madsen, Chronicles, p. 108 first pointed this out.

\(^2\)Allen, The Greek Chronicles, pp. 2:141-142.

\(^3\)Noth, "Eine siedlungsgeographische Liste," p. 106.
is doubtful, however, since the last phrase here is "these are the men of Racab," which is a place name. The paradox in this section, which probably led Noth to his emendations, is the double reference to Eshton, once as to a man and once as to a city. Both could be true. In this case it appears that the man was named after the city. But for the other names the reverse could be just as true. 1 Chronicles 2:42 has the family names Tappuach and Pelet, but in Joshua 15:53 and 27 the names are given to locales—Beth Tappuah and Beth-Pelet—which indicates that the genealogy in 2:42ff. is older than the list of towns in Joshua.

The date of the list in Joshua has been subject to wide variance. The German scholars Alt and Noth reversed the earlier post-exilic dates for these lists and made them pre-exilic, by showing that they were independent documents. Alt dated them in the time of Josiah. Aharoni suggested the time of Jehoshaphat, while Cross and Wright believe that the list goes back to the ninth century, because it reflects

---

1 The LXX $\beta \tau \chi \alpha \beta$ is not the result of assimilation from $\beta \tau \chi \alpha \beta$ in verse 8, as Allen, The Greek Chronicles, 2.34, believes, but rather from 2.55 and is the correct LXX; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 34; MT has Racah.


an older system of social organization. Albright thinks that it reflects pre-monarchical conditions, and Harrison suggests that this is closer to the actual situation, since the partition of the land among the tribes... constituted the logical extension of the theory of land tenure as enshrined in the Torah... As such the conquering heroes of the settlement period received inalienable grants of territory in perpetuity, in return for which they acted as the ruling and administrative class in Canaan and served the nation in a military capacity in times of crises.

The implication is that the genealogies in chapter 2, especially those using the "PN father of GN" formula, are pre-monarchical also.

Rudolph is correct in suggesting that the genealogies elsewhere in 1 Chronicles reflect a later period than those of chapter 2, since it demonstrates a more northerly settlement of the Calebite tribes. However, his post-exilic date cannot be accepted. First, there is no evidence for such a

2 ARI, p. 123f.
3 Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 671. Closely aligned to the date of this list is the date of the book. The later the suggested date of the book, the later the list. Y. Kaufmann, The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Palestine, (Jerusalem, 1953), p. 97f. felt that it was written at the beginning of the Judges period. Harrison, op. cit., pp. 672-73 suggests the beginning of the monarcy, perhaps 1045 B.C.E.
4 Chronikbücher, p. 13.
type of genealogy either in the later time of the monarchy or in the post-exilic period. ¹ His post-exilic date for 1 Chronicles 8:29 is incorrect, since the genealogy in question starts in the monarchical period.² As shall shortly be seen, the time of the early monarchy is the correct date for the Caleb genealogies in chapter 4 of Chronicles.

Further 4:13-23 lists several short segmented genealogies of Kenaz, Caleb, Ezrah, Hodiah, Shimon, and Shelah. Two of these, 4:13-14 and 19, lack the kinship terms needed to relate all the individuals with each other and two others are associated with various guilds (4:13-14 and 21-23) which are possibly to be dated during the monarchical period.³ The only linear genealogy in this group is 4:19 and it has the unusual formula, "and the sons of the wife of Hodiah, the sister of Naham." There is no formal relationship between this genealogy and the preceding one in 4:17-18, but the former may have been included in its present position because of the prominence of Mered’s wives in the latter. One,

¹ 11 Sam. 30:14 is the last reference to Caleb in the Deuteronomist.


³ H. Mendelsohn, "Guilds in Ancient Palestine," p. 19. Much discussion has taken place regarding the true nature of verses 21-23. First, on the basis of the jar handles, McCalister attempted to emend the text to "the craftsmen's guild of the tribe of Judah," PEFS (1905): 243ff. Driver rejected this; see also Albright, "The Administrative Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim," AASOR 21-22 (1943): 74, 112; Myers, IGAB, pp. 29-30.
Bithiah, a daughter of Pharaoh, is given a higher social position than his Jewish wife who is left unnamed.\(^1\) In the genealogy of Caleb (4:15) the LXX reads "\(\alpha\delta\alpha\)" suggesting the Hebrew \(\pi\upsilon\chi\upsilon\upsilon\) be read \(\varphi\) and \(\varepsilon\lambda\alpha\).\(^2\)

A brief comparison of 1 Chronicles 4:1 with the genealogy of the sons of Judah in 1 Chronicles 2:3ff. shows some major examples of fluidity. In 4:1 the sons of Judah are listed quite differently from the previous list. They are given as Perez, Hezron, Carmi, Hur, and Shobal on the same genealogical level. It is easy to see that Perez was the originator of the lineage, followed by Hezron, and then Carmi (Caleb).\(^3\) Hur and Shobal belong to the clan of Caleb and Hur was the father of Shobal at least genealogically if not in actual fact. The result is that all five names could be represented linealy as well as horizontally.

The other examples of fluidity are not as striking as the one above. They consist basically of names added to various lineages which had not appeared heretofore. In 4:4 two sons of Hur are given, Penuel and Ezer. In 4:5-7 Ashur, who is a son of Hezron, has his genealogy expanded. It

\(^1\) To provide a feminine antecedent for \(\pi\upsilon\chi\upsilon\upsilon\), it is assumed that verse 18b was displaced. An alternative is to follow the LXX \(\kappa\upsilon\varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\nu\gamma\sigma\varsigma\nu\) \(\iota\varepsilon\beta\rho\) which assumes a parablepsis of the word after \(\pi\upsilon\chi\upsilon\upsilon\). Rothstein, Chronik, p. 59.

\(^2\) Allen, The Greek Chronicles, p. 106. The "\(\alpha\)" suggests an original \(\kappa\upsilon\varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\nu\gamma\sigma\varsigma\nu\) \(\iota\varepsilon\beta\rho\) which should read \(\alpha\lambda\alpha\).

\(^3\) Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 30.
4:13-15 there are more sons of "Caleb ben Jephunneh," and Kenaz has his genealogy listed through Elah. Finally, in 4:21-23 Shelah, the youngest son of Judah's first wife, Bathshua, has two sons who founded some cities.

An understanding of the function of the fluidity in 4:1 provides the key to the other examples of fluidity.

As was seen, the genealogies of the other tribes (except Levi) are characterized by references to the military structure. In all the genealogies of chapter 4, there is no such explicit or implicit reference. This indicates that a source other than the census lists was used for the compilation of these genealogies.

A second interesting observation is that except for a few unknown names which have no kinship connectives, the names and their geographical references can be linked to the opening genealogical statement in 4:1. The first group of names is concerned with the clan of Shobal (4:2-3), the second with the clan of Hur (4:4, 9-10, 16-18), the third with Caleb (4:5-7, 8, 11-15), and the fourth with Shelah (4:21-23). Although Shelah may be associated with both Perez and Hezron, the absence of Shelah's name in the leading sentence has caused some scholars to think that his inclusion is the result of a later addition. 2

---

1 The term clan in this section of the discussion signifies a large group of people who for various reasons are uniquely isolated from other groups in the same region.

2 Curtis & Madsen, Chronicles, p. 104; M. Noth, "Die Ansiedlung des Stammes Juda auf dem Boden Palastinas,"
What is remarkable about this listing is that all the names are closely associated with the native Canaanites. It is known that Caleb was originally from this area, and Hur and Shobal are his sons. Shelah is a son of Judah's Canaanite wife. Although it is not clear why the names of the clan of Hur and Caleb should be so intermixed, it appears that all the names may be associated with the opening sentence.

To further understand this section, an investigation of its date is needed. It is unclear whether the author who compiled these genealogies had used one source or more than one, but in spite of this, the lists indicate a time period which generally fits the total scheme. The most striking evidence in this regard is the practice of giving a man's name along with the name of the town in which he settled. Though this occurs also in chapter 2, no names are duplicated between the two chapters, which suggests a different period of expansion.¹ There is no mention of any settlements along the Philistine border, except Zorah, which may indicate a lack of stability in the area. In conjunction with this, the Danites were no longer in the area as a political unit.

¹ Bethlehem is an exception, since it seems to be shared by several families. See 1 Chron. 4:4, 23, 2:51-52, 54. Jabez is a town in 2:55.

---

PJB XXX (1934): 31-34; see summary in Myers, ICAB, p. 27. The above subdivisions also follow this study as well as "Eine siedlungsgeographische Liste," pp. 97-124.
since Judah occupied their territory. Also indicative of the date are the references to the antiquity of the records, to the role of Moab, and to the workers for the king. This has led Myers and Rudolph to suggest a date during the United Kingdom. A hypothesis that the list reflects a time when the Philistines were still a threat to Israel early in the United Kingdom period does not seem out of order. Thus a date toward the end of Saul's reign, or early in David's reign, is suggested as tenable.

In view of this evidence, it is possible that the genealogical sentence in 4:1 reflects the military alignment of the Shobal unit. It has already been noted that Shobal is the lowest unit in the sentence genealogically speaking, since he is a son of Hur. It should be further pointed out that the location of the Shobal unit is in the area of Zorah (4:2), which was the border region often threatened by the Philistines during their period of expansion along the Sorek valley. If the "Shobalites" were unable to protect themselves, the next unit in the genealogy --in this case, Hur--was to furnish help; if this failed, the next unit was mustered, and this process would continue until finally the whole tribe of Judah would be involved. Schematically, the system may be viewed as a series of concentric circles:

---

1 Cf. 1 Chron. 2:53, 4:2, with Joshua 19:41.
2 ICAB, p. 27; Chronikbücher, p. 35.
This is not unlike the systems used in other tribal societies. It may be that the alarm process functioned on such a basis also within the Old Testament. When the Midianites and the Amalekites threatened the Israelites in the Jezreel valley, Gideon blew the trumpet and local inhabitants (the Abiezerites) were called up to follow him. He then sent

---

1 See Cole, Nomads of the Nomads, pp. 91-93 for a military system which works on such a plan even though the mechanism is unique.
messengers all through Manasseh and later to the tribes of Asher, Zebulun, and Naphtali. Eventually, Ephraim also was included.  

The campaign of Deborah against the Ammonites mentions the alarm process: Zebulun, Naphtali, Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir, and Issachar all responded.  

The men of Jabesh were allowed to send the alarm throughout Israel.  

There must have been a well organized method of calling out the warriors and perhaps such a system as described above was used.

The geographical references in the genealogies following 4:1 would explain the total system so that no questions would arise concerning whose territory was threatened. Thus the intermingling of the Hurites with the Calebites is not contradictory, since a systematic presentation is not essential to the function of the genealogy.

The natural question concerning the Chronicler's purpose for including this material remains to be answered. As is often observed, this material supplements chapter 2 of 1 Chronicles. More important is the connection between this material and the post-exilic community. Zorah, found also in Nehemiah 11:29, is linked to the post-exilic period (2

3 1 Sam. 11:1-11.  
4 For example, see Rudolph, Chronikbücher, pp. 11-14 for his attempt to show the literary dependence between the two sections.
Chronicles 11:10). 1 Chronicles 4:5-8 mention the Tekoites who helped rebuild the walls of Jerusalem in Nehemiah 3:5, 27. Jabez is included by the Chronicler to cite another theological concept of blessing. Ge-harashim (verse 14) is important to the post-exilic time, as may be seen in Nehemiah 11:35.¹ This close connection with the exile suggests that the Chronicler hoped these lists could be used as an authoritative document by which the geographical claims of the exiles could be judged. Of the identifiable cities contained in these lists only Mereshah occurs outside the Persian province of Judah.² It is true that the settlements mentioned here are not those of the known restoration settlements, but this is hardly to be expected. Only as the restoration community prospered and the Davidic ideal was realized would these lists be of value.

1 Chronicles 4:24-43

1 Chronicles 4:24-43 lists two genealogies of Simeon.³ The first is segmented in list form with a depth of seven generations. The opening formula is "the sons of Simeon." Immediately following this are the names of Simeon's five

¹Myers, ICAB, pp. 27-30.

²Because of these facts, Rudolph thinks that some of these lists actually came from the post-exilic period. Chronikbücher, pp. 31-37.

³The source for the first section is Num. 26:12-14, as is seen from the omission of Ohad.
sons, Nemuel, Jamin, Jarib, Zerah, and Shaul.\(^1\) The three names listed in linear form in verse 25 may be connected with Shaul even though the kinship term is lacking. If the Chronicler is following a consistent pattern, the three names listed in linear form in verse 25 may be connected with Shaul even though the kinship term is lacking because only the last name of a particular genealogical level is listed as having descendants. This is true in the case of Mishma and Shimei.\(^2\) Shimei has many children listed, sixteen sons and six daughters.\(^3\) The next several verses list the towns they occupied until the reign of David. The list closes with the formula, "these were their settlements, and

---

\(^1\)Gen. 46:10 and Exod. 6:15 say that Shaul is the son of a Canaanite woman. Perhaps this is why he is in the last position. At least he is regarded as socially lower than the rest of the sons of Simeon.

\(^2\)Two of these names, Mibsam and Mishma, are also names of the sons of Ishmael. It cannot be determined whether some Ishmaelite elements attached themselves to Simeon, or rather whether the Simeonites named some of their sons after Ishmaelites. The structure of the genealogy, i.e., linear instead of segmented, suggests the latter. For a discussion of the Ishmaelites and their relationship to Israel see R. Dussaud, La Penetration des Arabs en Syrie avant l'Islam (Paris: Geuthner, 1955), p. 175; A. Musil, Arabia Deserta (New York: American Geographical Society, 1927), p. 479. If "sons" in verse 26 is regarded as a formulaic habit, it is possible to regard the genealogy as continuing its linear descent for four more generations. The problem here is that the genealogy interrupts itself with the secondary formula, "and the sons of Mishma." It would be natural to skip this formula if the linear descent were to be continued, since the genealogy already has Mishma in linear form. Of course, the formula could be a dittography of verse 24. The interpretation in this dissertation takes the kinship formula "his son" as a dittography.

\(^3\)The best LXX mss have "three daughters."
they have their genealogy."

The second list of names contains several genealogies and is not easily interpreted because the kinship indicators are not always present. Also, this is the only known occurrence of the names. This problem is easily seen in verse 34, where three names are listed, each preceded by the conjunction "and." After the third name the formula, "the son of PN" occurs. It is singular, seemingly referring only to the last name of the three. This would seem to indicate that the name immediately preceding the formula is somehow related to the name following the formula, and the other two names are not genealogically connected to each other or with the father-son combination. The longest genealogy is the one of Ziza, which is linear in form, with the names in ascending order. The formula used between the names is "sons of PN." Next comes the genealogy of Jehu which has a depth of four generations, with the names given also in ascending order.

The names in verses 34-37 are identified further by the Chronicler. They were leaders (יָשִּׁיאֲלֵי‎) in their phratries, their names were recorded in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and they fought the Amalakites. In connection with this last fact, it is interesting that the military leaders here are referred to as chiefs (יָשִּׁיאֲלֵי‎).

The list of names in 1 Chronicles 4:24-43, which are represented as the sons of Simeon, vary from the lists found in Genesis 46:10 and Exodus 6:15 in two respects. The first list has a Jarib and a Zerah while the second set of
lists has a Jachin and a Zohar. This is probably an example not of fluidity but merely of a variant in the spelling of the names.¹

The second variance is the omission of Ohad in 1 Chronicles 4:24-25 and in Numbers 26:12-14, which yet retain the spellings of the Genesis and Exodus lists. Unfortunately, nothing is known about these names. Quite possibly something happened to the Ohad phratry and it was forgotten and dropped out. It is doubtful whether the reason for this fluidity will ever be discovered.

The expansion of Shaul's lineage reflects that this was the most influential lineage of Simeon simply because they were the most populous.² Because of this they were probably very influential politically and were close to David's government.³

1 Chronicles 5:1-10

1 Chronicles 5:1-10 is a genealogical narrative describing the tribe of Reuben. The genealogy must be divided into two parts because the kinship tie between Joel and the

¹Elmslie, Chronicles, p. 30.
²1 Chron. 4:27.
³This appears all the more likely when one considers the prominence of Shelumiel the son of Zurishaddai in Num. (see 1:6; 2:12; 7:36; 10:19), and yet here he is not mentioned at all. Further, the genealogy of this lineage is basically linear and thus reflects political function. Also it must be assumed that telescoping took place and that the genealogy was a dynamic one, since it reaches a depth of only five generations.
preceding sons of Reuben is omitted. The first two generations of the first genealogy are segmented and in list form. The opening formula is "and the sons of Reuben." Reuben is described as the first-born of Israel, and then there is a note concerning his loss of the birthright to Joseph. This in turn requires a further explanation, because Judah and not Joseph is the most prominent tribe in Israel's history. Therefore, the Chronicler states again that Joseph has the birthright. Following these notes, a secondary formula which duplicates the main formula above is given; it is followed by a list of Reuben's sons, Hanoch, Pallu, Hezron, and Carmi.

The second genealogy is linear and uses the brief kinship notation, "his son." It reaches a depth of eight generations, beginning with Joel and ending with Beerah. The opening formula is The sons of PN." A note is added at the end of the genealogy which gives the fate of Beerah. He was carried into exile by the king of Assyria, Tilgath-pileser. Further information given is that Beerah was carried into exile by the king of Assyria, Tilgath-pileser.

---

1 The commentators note the missing link between the names Carmi and Joel. Curtis Madsen, Chronicles, p. 118; Zöcker, LC, p. 63. Ackroyd, TBP, p. 36 mentions that the second list of names appears to be in Edomite areas; likewise Myers, ICAB, p. 37. This suggests that the name was not linked specifically with the sons of Reuben because it was unknown with which phratry the names should be linked.


3 That is, Tiglath-pileser.
the leader of the Reubenites. This suggests that the
genealogy in its original context functioned in the poli-
tical realm.

The account of the family of Reuben continues with
a list of names which contains a linear genealogy in ascend-
ing order of four generations. The formula opening the
section gives the reason for the list, "And his brothers by
their phratries, in the genealogy [toledoth] of their
generations." The first name given is Jeiel who is described
as the chief (ψχγ). The second name is Zechariah, and
the third is Bela, who begins the second genealogy. The
kinship term "son of" connects the names. The top name
in the genealogy is Joel who is described as living "in
Aroer, even to Nebo the Baal-meon." There is no indication
whether this Joel is the same one as above, in the geneal-
ogy of Beerah. On the basis of depth it would seem not
to be the case, but telescoping could have occurred. A
geographical note about Bela's wanderings follows. It is
stated that he went to the river Euphrates which would
seem to take him outside of Gilead. Another note tells us
about a war with the Hagrites during the reign of Saul.
The result of the Reubenites' victory was the right to
graze their herds in the land east of Gilead.

1 Chronicles 5:1-10 offers two examples of fluidity.
In the parallel genealogy in Numbers 26:5-11, the lineage
of Pallu is expanded to three generations. The three sons
of Eliab--Nemuel, Dotham, and Abiram--were among those
killed in the earthquake, which was their punishment for participating in Korah's rebellion against Moses. The reason they were included in the genealogy in Numbers was to show how God deals with the wicked. This genealogy does not appear in 1 Chronicles 5:1-10. One would gather that the occasion was not contemporary enough to be included by the Chronicle, even though it would have suited his theological purpose to do so. Instead he chose the example of Beerah who was a military leader of the Reubenites and was taken captive by Tiglath-pileser ca. 732 B.C.E. This example shows God's dealings upon Israel. Fluidity here is thus a deliberate one used to give a more contemporary theological example.

The second example of fluidity involves Joel (5:4-6). He appears as the head of two genealogies in this section, in each one of which the names following his are different. The two genealogies reflect close association with the military since is used in the first list and in the second list. It is not clear whether all the names in the first list refer to a or not. The most that can be said is that they seem to be related through

1 Num. 16:20, 35.
2 That they are the sons of Joel may be seen from the note in verse 7 which indicates that the second group of names represents brothers of Beerah. The third name traces itself back to Joel in an ascending genealogy of four generations.
3 The of Reuben in Num. 7:30 is not mentioned.
Joel. If so, both are lists of military men of some type. 1
By implication telescoping also may have occurred.

1 Chronicles 5:11-17

1 Chronicles 5:11-17 is a genealogical narrative
describing the tribe of Gad. The opening formula starts with
the usual "and the sons of Gad" but the similarity stops
here. 2 Immediately following this, there is a geographical
note which says that the Gadites lived opposite the Reuben-
ites in the land of Bashan as far as Salecah. Following
this, a list of four names designates them as leaders of the
tribe of Gad. Joel is the first one listed and is called
the chief ( instructors). The next three names are Shaphan 3 the
second, Jenai, and Shaphat. 4 The geographical name Bashan
appears again, but whether it refers to the complete list
or just to the last name in the list is not clear. There
are no kinship terms between these names.

Next is a list of seven names with the explanatory note
that they are "brothers of their fathers' households."

1 Johnson's suggestion that these positions were
inherited needs more evidence than just the analogy of the
"marianu." Biblical Genealogies, p. 66ff.
2 Myers, ICAB, p. 37.
3 LXX: is an example of assimilation from
the Hebrew which occurs three words later; Allen, The
Greek Chronicles, II: 90.
4 LXX: = the scribe or judge or
official. and are synonyms in Par. See Par
26.11, 34.13 and I Par 23.4, 26.29; Allen, The Greek
Chronicles, I: 128.
After this is a linear genealogy of Abihail in ascending order, introduced by the formula, "these are the sons of PN." Just who the sons are is unclear. It cannot refer to the names following the formula because the kinship terms needed to interpret these names are here present. It may refer to the seven names of the previous list, but one cannot be confident of this. The remainder of the genealogy used the formula "sons of" until the name of Buz occurs eight generations earlier. The next name to occur is Ahi and there is no kinship term with which to interpret its relationship with the other names. It could be assumed that the term should be supplied on the analogy of the names in chapter one which are known to be genealogically connected. If this were the case, the genealogy would reach eleven generations. But this interpretation would leave unclear the antecedent of the phrase "chief to the house of their father." After this comes a geographical note about the people enrolled in genealogies in the days of Jothan, king of Judah, and in the days of Jereboam, king of Israel.  

In this genealogy of Gad there is a radical example of fluidity. The other genealogies of Gad show that he has seven sons. In this one he has four sons and not one of the names corresponds to those in the other genealogies. A certain Joel occurs in it and it is tempting to associate  

1Chron. 5:18-22 will be discussed later. It contains no genealogies.

2Gen. 46:16; Num. 26:15-18.
him with the Joel found in the genealogy of Beerah above. If the scholars are right in assuming that by the time the Mesha stone was made Reuben had been absorbed by Gad, this may well be true. 1

Joel is called ,json, as above, and is thus connected with the military. Also there is a Shaphat the son of Adlai who had charge of the cattle in the time of David. 2 The Joel of the tribe of Reuben could fit in chronologically if telescoping had taken place. However, the reason why the Chronicler omitted the early records from the genealogy is unclear. What is clear is that this list of names is associated with David, and they seem to be predominantly military, as is seen from the phrases used to describe them. In fact, there is even an account of a military operation which further hints at this aspect.

There seems to be little doubt that this genealogy is filled with theological overtones. God was with the tribe of Gad and they won. Clearly, the lesson to the Reubenites is that disobedience brings punishment while repentance and obedience bring blessing. From all appearances the Chronicler carefully selected his names and omitted the original sons of Gad so all would be sure to understand his intent.

The list of names in 1 Chronicles 5:23-24 is not a


2 1 Chron. 27:29.
genealogy. Rather, the reference above which connects Reuben and Gad with this segment of Manasseh in their battle against the Hagrites and others prompted the Chronicler to give the names of these connected with the battle, is shown by the military formulas used in their identification.

At this point the Chronicler moralizes again. It is their treachery (יָֽרְדָּן) against God which caused them to be exiled. They did not continue in their faith which previously had led them to victory.

1 Chronicles 5:23-24

1 Chronicles 5:23-24 gives a listing of the half-tribe of Manasseh similar to that of the tribe of Gad. The chief difference is that there is no type of genealogy listed. There is only a list of names which have no kinship relation expressed between them. This section opens with the usual formula, "and the sons of." The next part, which usually has the proper name following it, substitutes the "half-tribe of Manasseh" instead. The geographical limits of habitation is then given and it is noted that they are numerous. Following this is the formula, "these were the chiefs of their fathers' households." A list of seven names follows, each one preceded by the conjunction "and." They are described as "mighty men of valor, famous men, heads of their fathers' households."
This section of the genealogies concerns the priestly line of Israel. The genealogies show some segmentation, especially between the first three to five generations, i.e., the sections borrowed from Genesis 46:11, Numbers 26:57ff., and especially Exodus 6:16-25 which is the most complete source. After these levels, the genealogy becomes linear in form. As is normal, the segmented section of the genealogies uses the kinship formula "sons of PN" followed by a list of names. When the linear genealogy commences, the "begat" formula is used. The genealogies will be divided into three natural divisions in the analysis which follows.

1 Chronicles 5:27-41 gives the first genealogy. The first five generations are in segmented list form. The linear section has twenty-one names in it and is a genealogical list. It starts with the formula "sons of PN." The first name is Levi, followed by his three sons, Gershom, Kohath, and Merari. The Kohathite phratry is listed first. His sons were Amram, Izhar, Hebron and Uzziel. The phratry of Amram is next. His sons were Aaron, Moses, and Miriam—the last name being Moses' sister. (This last statement is not in the genealogy.) The lineage of Aaron is listed as Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar. Following these names the genealogy is linear in form.

The lineage of Eleazar traces the high priests down to the time of the exile. The pattern is quite regular throughout the length of the genealogy except for two
points. The first is a textual addition which says Azariah was the high priest when Solomon built the house in Jerusalem. The second concerns Jehazadak. It is noted that he was exiled with the rest of Judah in the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

1 Chronicles 6:1-15 gives the second genealogy of this section. The first three generations are segmented and the remainder of the genealogy is a linear list. It commences with the formula "sons of PN." The first name is Levi and his sons are Gershom, Kohath, and Merari. The next genealogical level is introduced by the formula, "and these are the names of the sons of PN." Gershom's name is given and his sons are Libni and Shimei. The sons of Kohath are listed next as Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel. The last son is Merari and his sons are Mahli and Mushli. The form of this genealogy is developed more fully than the previous one. After the sons of Merari are given, a closing formula occurs, "And these are the families of the Levites according to their fathers." This section follows the Exodus 6:16-25 passage, and although it interrupts the flow of the Chronicler's genealogy, he has kept it intact.

The genealogy starts abruptly since the usual secondary introductory formula is missing, "of Gershom." Each uses the kinship formula "PN his son." The listing of the sons of Kohath is similar except the usual secondary introductory
formula is used.  

Next the genealogy of Elkanah is listed by the Chronicler. Since there are several Elkanahs, it is unclear which one is referred to here, but according to the structure of the genealogies in this section, this is the Elkanah in the lineage of Kohath. He has two sons, Amasi and Ahimoth. Another genealogy of Elkanah is then given introduced simply by his name, "Elkanah, the sons of Elkanah were . . . ." It starts and ends with the name Elkanah. Following this there is a short genealogy of Samuel, introduced by the formula "the sons of PN." Two sons are listed, Joel, the first born, and Abijah, the second.

The genealogy now returns to the lineage of Merari. The secondary introductory formula is "the sons of PN." The kinship formula between the names in this genealogical list is "PN his son, PN . . . ." The names listed are Mahli, Libni, Shimei, Uzzah, Shimea, Haggiah, and Asaiah.

1 Chronicles 6:16-33 gives a linear genealogy in list form of each of the sons of Levi in ascending order with the kinship formula being, "PN₁, son of PN₂, son of PN₃ . . . ." The genealogy commences with a long introduction explaining that these are the men David appointed over the service of song. The opening formula is, "and these are those who served with their sons." Each lineage is introduced separately. The Kohathite lineage is the center one and the

---

1 The names listed are Libni, Jahath, Zimmah, Joah, Ido, Zerah, Jeatherai. "The sons of Kohath: Amminadab, Korah, Assir, Elkanah, Ebiasaph, Assir, Tahath, Uriel, Uzziah, and Saul."
formula, "from the sons of the Kohathites," introduces them.
The next lineage is that of the Gershomites. They are intro-
duced by the formula, "and his brother Asaph who stood at
his right hand, even Asaph . . . ." The lineage of Merari
is last. It is introduced by the formula, "and on the left
hand were their brothers, the sons of Merari." The whole
section closes with the statement that "their brothers the
Levites were appointed for all the service of the tabernacle
of the house of God."

1 Chronicles 6:34-38 gives the genealogy of twelve
generations of the sons of Aaron ending with Ahimaaz. The
introduction states that Aaron and his sons were responsible
for the sacrifices. The genealogy, a linear list, with
the kinship formula being "FN his son," has the opening
formula of "and these are the sons of Aaron."

The remainder of the chapter lists the cities given
to the Levites by the various tribes of Israel.

1 Chronicles 5:27-41 (English 6:1-16)

The most complete genealogy of the high priests is
found in 1 Chronicles 5:27-41.¹ The function of this gene-
alogy is clear. The Chronicler wished to give an official

¹Before the exile the term "high priest" rarely is used.
See R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions
(1961), p. 397f.; J. R. Bartlett, "Zadok and His Successors
at Jerusalem," JTS n.s. 19 (1968): 11f. The genealogy does
not say these names are those of the high priests. This
is known from the names themselves. See Exod. 6:25, Num.
for Phinehas, see Judges 20:28.
list of the high priests from Eleazar until the exile which was used to determine the legitimate priestly families.\(^1\) As has been noted by many commentators, this list contains twenty-three names and is easily divided into two groups of twelve generations each.\(^2\) The first twelve generations represent the 480 years between the erecting of the tabernacle tent during the exodus and the dedication of Solomon's temple (cf. 1 Kings 6:1). In this scheme one priest represents a generation of forty years.

The second group of twelve generations incorporates the span from Ahimaaz to the restoration of the temple over which Joshua the priest presided.\(^3\) This last generation is simply called the exile by the Chronicler. Thus the whole structure of the genealogy is stylized. As such, examples of missing names, and possibly examples of kinship relations which are not father and son, may be found throughout the extent of the genealogy.\(^4\) In the first category there are four priests who are not included in the genealogy:

---

\(^1\) So also Ackroyd, TBP p. 38. Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, p. 129 see the purpose of the genealogy as connecting Jehozadak with Aaron and thus to legitimize his priesthood. He fails to explain the presence of the note about the exile and what it adds to this suggested purpose. In fact, it would seem to disprove this purpose.


\(^3\) Haggai 1:1.

\(^4\) The promise to Phinehas in Num. 25:11-13 does not say it is to be a father-son sequence but that his descendants will be priests.
Jehoida, Azariah, Uriah, and another Azariah. If one compares the names of the priests included in the genealogy with those identified in the historical sections of the Old Testament, no principle of selection or exclusion can be found. The validity of the kinship relations will be discussed later in the paper. A third irregularity may be telescoping. A likely place for this to occur would be after the time of Hilkiah because the instability of the government after Josiah would affect the ruling priest as well as the kings.

Concerning the relationships between the names in the list, there is very little information. The biblical sources say that Phinehas was a son of Eleazer who was a son of Aaron. Eleazer became the priest after Aaron died. The next example of a father-son relationship is in the exile. Jehozadak is the last name in this genealogy. From Haggai 1:1 it is known that he had a son Joshua who became priest at the time of the restoration.

Another example is Zadok, the priest of David and Solomon. Before David ruled over all Israel, Abiathar was David's priest. During his reign as king, David had two

---

1 Kings 12:2, 16:10; 2 Chron. 26:17, 20; 31:10, 13.
2 We know that Seraiah was taken captive and was killed by the king of Babylon (2 Kings 25:8; Jer. 52:24). If every king meant a new priest, then we may expect many names that are not included here.
4 1 Sam. 22:20-33; 23:9; 30:7.
priests, Zadok and Abiathar. ¹ When David died, Abiathar supported Adonijah for king. When Solomon gained control, he banished Abiathar to Anathoth which was Abiathar's family city. ² Zadok then became Solomon's only priest. Throughout the relevant historical material, genealogical information is used to identify both Zadok and Abiathar. A comparison of 1 Samuel 14:3 with 22:20 gives evidence that Abiathar is related to the house of Eli, the latter apparently contradicting 2 Samuel 8:17 which suggests that Ahimeleck is the son of Abiathar. To harmonize this contradiction 2 Samuel 8:17 is to be corrected to read, "Abiathar the son of Ahimeleck." ³ In the first part of this verse, there also is a genealogy of Zadok, "Zadok the son of Ahitub." Because there is no other reference to the pedigree of Zadok except in the genealogies of Chronicles which are said to reflect later polemic, this genealogical material cannot be trusted. ⁴ Ahitub must be part of the pedigree of Abiathar, i.e., he is the father of Ahimeleck—thus agreeing with the other passages which concern the family of Abiathar. ⁵

Can this proposed textual change of the scholars be

¹ 2 Sam. 8:17.
² 1 Kings 2:26.
³ The Syriac makes this correction. See BH.
⁴ De Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 376, 394f.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 127, 373.
justified? A review of the genealogical material concerning Abiathar seems to be in order. As noted, the family of Levi is given in 1 Samuel 14:3 in the following order: Eli, Phinehas, Ahitub, his brother Icabod, and Ahijah. In 22:20 a linear genealogy appears with the names Abiathar, Ahimeleck, and Ahitub in ascending order. Observing the positions of Ahijah and Ahimeleck in the genealogies above, many scholars have concluded that Ahijah and Ahimeleck are the same person. The "jah" (lord) has been replaced by "meleck" (king). It may be that too much has been assumed. An indication that this is so may be found in Chronicles where Ahimeleck is called Abimeleck and not Ahijah.\(^1\)

An alternative suggestion to the proposition that Ahijah and Ahimeleck are the same person is that telescoping has occurred in these genealogical references. In other words, Abiathar would be a grandson of Ahijah instead of Ahitub. The resulting four generations would be too long a span for Ahitub who is the father of Zadok to be identical to the Ahitub in the ancestry of Abiathar. If this is true, it may be concluded that Zadok has an Israelite ancestry.\(^2\) Another aspect which must be investigated is the time lag involved. Since Ahimeleck was the head priest at

\(^1\) 1 Chron. 18:16.

\(^2\) The theory that Zadok was the priest of the Jebusites rests on the assumption that Ahitub is a textual corruption in 2 Sam. 8:17 and the references in 1 Chron. 18:16, and 24:3, 6, 31 are unreliable.
Nob, he would have been fairly old when Saul killed the priests. At the same time Abiathar would have been a young man since he was a priest for approximately sixty years during the reigns of David and Solomon. ¹

Furthermore, it may be asked in what way was Abiathar a son of Ahimelech? Since there were eighty priests at Nob, they were no doubt all considered sons of Ahimelech. ² In the light of this discussion it may be suggested that Ahitub was the father of Zadok which gives us another example of the father-son succession in the office of the high priest.

The next two priests to be considered in the genealogy of 1 Chronicles 5:27-41 are the brothers, Ahimaaz and Azariah, sons of Zadok. ³ There is a small segmented genealogy in the list and a group of four names which can be related to each other. ⁴ For the remainder of the names there is no evidence that any direct relationship exists. Therefore these family links may indicate priestly dynasties related to Phinehas. The priestly family in power was

¹ This assumes that Abiathar joined David ca. 1010 B.C.E. and died shortly after the completion of the temple ca. 950 B.C.E.

² The phrase "your father's household" (1 Sam. 22:11f.) seems to indicate the household of Ahitub even though Ahimelech was the priest in charge of the community at Nob. Thus all the priests of Nob belonged to the household of Ahitub. Cf. the use of "son" in 2 Sam. 15:27.

³ 2 Sam. 15:36; 1 Kings 4:2.

⁴ For a view that makes Azariah's relation to Zadok doubtful see Bartlett, "Zadok," pp. 8-9. However, pay heed to his note 2 on page 8.
justified? A review of the genealogical material concerning Abiathar seems to be in order. As noted, the family of Levi is given in 1 Samuel 14:3 in the following order: Eli, Phinehas, Ahitub, his brother Icabod, and Ahijah. In 22:20 a linear genealogy appears with the names Abiathar, Ahimeleck, and Ahitub in ascending order. Observing the positions of Ahijah and Ahimeleck in the genealogies above, many scholars have concluded that Ahijah and Ahimeleck are the same person. The "jah" (lord) has been replaced by "meleck" (king). It may be that too much has been assumed. An indication that this is so may be found in Chronicles where Ahimeleck is called Abimeleck and not Ahijah.¹

An alternative suggestion to the proposition that Ahijah and Ahimeleck are the same person is that telescoping has occurred in these genealogical references. In other words, Abiathar would be a grandson of Ahijah instead of Ahitub. The resulting four generations would be too long a span for Ahitub who is the father of Zadok to be identical to the Ahitub in the ancestry of Abiathar. If this is true, it may be concluded that Zadok has an Israelite ancestry.² Another aspect which must be investigated is the time lag involved. Since Ahimeleck was the head priest at

¹ 1 Chron. 18:16.

² The theory that Zadok was the priest of the Jebusites rests on the assumption that Ahitub is a textual corruption in 2 Sam. 18:17 and the references in 1 Chron. 18:16, and 24:3, 6, 31 are unreliable.
Nob, he would have been fairly old when Saul killed the priests. At the same time Abiathar would have been a young man since he was a priest for approximately sixty years during the reigns of David and Solomon.

Furthermore, it may be asked in what way was Abiathar a son of Ahimelech? Since there were eighty priests at Nob, they were no doubt all considered sons of Ahimelech. In the light of this discussion it may be suggested that Ahitub was the father of Zadok which gives us another example of the father-son succession in the office of the high priest.

The next two priests to be considered in the genealogy of 1 Chronicles 5:27-41 are the brothers, Ahimaaz and Azariah, sons of Zadok. There is a small segmented genealogy in the list and a group of four names which can be related to each other. For the remainder of the names there is no evidence that any direct relationship exists. Therefore these family links may indicate priestly dynasties related to Phinehas. The priestly family in power was

---

1 This assumes that Abiathar joined David ca. 1010 B.C.E. and died shortly after the completion of the temple ca. 950 B.C.E.

2 The phrase "your father's household" (1 Sam. 22:1ff.) seems to indicate the household of Ahitub even though Ahimelech was the priest in charge of the community at Nob. Thus all the priests of Nob belonged to the household of Ahitub. Cf. the use of "son" in 2 Sam. 15:27.

3 2 Sam. 15:36; 1 Kings 4:2.

4 For a view that makes Azariah's relation to Zadok doubtful see Bartlett, "Zadok," pp. 8-9. However, pay heed to his note 2 on page 8.
allowed to occupy the office of the "priest" as long as the
dynasty was an able and efficient contribution to the king's
government.¹

The Chronicler's source material is not extant today. 
However, from the evidence isolated from the list and the 
source material present in the Old Testament, the compila-
tion of the material appears to be similar to the method 
used in compiling the SKL and the AKL.² That is, the Chron-
icler borrowed from several sources and altered them at 
will to fit the purpose for which he wanted to construct 
the list.³

So far two types of fluidity have been isolated. One 
is the omission of names of some priests. These were 
omitted for some unknown reason. Perhaps they did not fit 
the Chronicler's purpose. The other is the change in 
kinship terms which gives the family relationships between 
Ahimaaz and Azariah from brothers to father-son. The intent 
of the list was to give the line of legitimate priesthood 
from Aaron and not family relationships.

A post-exilic rivalry between the priests of Ithamar 
and the priests of Eleazer caused the compilation of this

¹Ibid., pp. 7, 13-15. He states that there was no continuous father-son sequence of succession in the priestly 
office and the king's choice for the office rested upon the 
man's ability. His argument is only partially successful.

²Wilson, GHOT, pp. 117f., especially pp. 119, 120.

³This in no way casts any doubt upon the validity of 
the list in its present function.
list. Each lineage struggled to show its legitimacy as priests and probably the right to be chief priest, making the function of this list political as well as religious. Much the same can be said for the genealogical list found in 1 Chronicles 6:34-38 (English 6:49-53). It covers the same names as 1 Chronicles 5:27-41 from Aaron to Ahimaaz. It may be that this list also played a role in this rivalry by relating the Zadokite line right back to Aaron. They are legitimate priests because they made atonement to God.

In Ezra 7:1-5 there is a genealogy similar to the one in 1 Chronicles 5:27-41. There are two examples of tele­scoping in it. The first concerns the group of names from Amariah to Johanan in the Chronicles passage. Ezra omits them. The second is found at the end of the genealogy. At least two names have been omitted after Seraiah is mentioned as can be seen from Haggai 1:1. These are Jehozadok and Joshua. The function of this genealogy is to legitimize Ezra as priest. In light of this the two examples of fluidity would seem to have a specific function. The first block of omitted material occurs during the period when Abiathar was banished from his position as priest. That four of the six names excluded are actual kinship relations

1 De Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 376, 396.
2 Ezra 2:61ff. gives an example of some priests who could not establish their legitimacy as priests.
3 See verse 34.
and are Zadokites reflects the religious-political position of Ezra. It seems evident that he wanted to come to Jerusalem having the support of both the priests of Eleazar and Ithamar. He desired to minimize the Zadokite-Abiathar rivalry so he omitted the troublesome dynasty from his genealogy.¹

Furthermore, Ezra 8:2 depicts Ezra with his returning exiles as incorporating two priestly families. One is the family belonging to Phinehas (Zadokites) and the other is Ithamar (Abiatharites). It is curious that these names are used rather than the other usual nomenclature. This is usually interpreted as indicating a change in priestly structure. Both Abiatharites and the Zadokites now had the designation of "priests." Therefore Ezra played the role of conciliator by not emphasizing his direct Zadokite ancestry, as well as personally sanctioning the union of priestly families by giving the two groups equal status upon their return from Babylon.² Ezra was also aware that he would need all the support he could muster when he banned the mixed marriages and enacted his other programs.³

The omission of the names between Seraiah and Ezra serves to legitimize the position of Ezra as priest. He was a

¹Perhaps Amariah and Johanan were in that dynasty also since they are omitted.


³Ezra 9:2-3, 10-15, 18-44.
direct descendant of Seraiah. The other omitted priests would be his cousins. The telescoping would not hurt Ezra's claim because it was not necessary to give all the priests' names to show his legitimacy.

In Chronicles 9:10-11 and Nehemiah 11:10-11 there are two more genealogies which relate to the matter of these priest lists because they duplicate some of the names already present in these genealogies.

First, the function of the genealogies will be discussed and how they differ from each other. The genealogy in Nehemiah 11:10-11 occurs in a section which gives the heads of the provinces who lived in Jerusalem along with their kinsmen who either volunteered or were chosen by lot to live in Jerusalem.1 The Chronicles' genealogy purports to give the first residents of post-exilic Jerusalem. The need to give a genealogy reflects the concern for lineage purity. The only difference between the genealogies concerns the names Seraiah and Azariah.2 Each list omits the other, causing a telescoping which has no apparent function. The purpose of the genealogy is to give the legitimate line of Jedaliah. The name Meraioth seems out of place according to the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 5 and 6 and Ezra 7. Perhaps this strange positioning of Meraioth can be reasoned as an

---

1 See verses 1, 2.

2 There is a slight difference in the spelling of names and this may indicate different histories of transmission. Neh. 11:11; 1 Chron. 9:11.
explanatory marginal note which was written into the list at the wrong place. When this genealogy is compared to the larger ones, it is easy to see that radical telescoping has occurred. This reflects a living genealogy; thus the telescoping has no function.

1 Chronicles 6:1-15

In this section the name Amminadab in verse 7 has caused much discussion. Rudolph has reconstructed the emendation for Izhar instead of Amminadab through a very complicated process. His reason for emending the text is that "Amminadab is impossible because of verse 3 and 22f," where Izhar heads the list of the Levites of the lineage of Asaph and Korah follows him. Others feel it is an artificial substitute for Amram, since the seven-name lineage of Gershon and Merari passes through their first-born sons, and it would be expected that the original seven-name lineage of Kohath would also pass through his first-born son. In spite of the merit of these suggestions, the possibility of fluidity in the form of a substituted name must be considered. As with the second suggestion above, the name Amminadab is a deliberate addition,

1 Bartlett, "Zadok," p. 4.
2 Chronikbücher, p. 54.
and as with the first suggestion, Amminadab replaces Izhar. The lineage of Izhar must be the correct one because the lineage of Amram was considered in the genealogy of the high priests. The purpose of this fluidity is not hard to discover. In the genealogy of Levi in Exodus 6, Aaron married Elisheba who was the daughter of Amminadab and the sister of Nashon. From the lineage of David in Ruth 4:18-22, it is known that this family was in the tribe of Judah and of the lineage of David. The addition of this name Amminadab was used to demonstrate David's connection with the tribe of Levi. It was a political move. There are two reasons why Amminadab could not supplant Amram. One was noted above. The second is that it would cause too much consternation among the purists of the Chronicler's age. Amminadab was thus put in a less prominent position.

The next example of fluidity involves the shifting of genealogical relationships. In 1 Chronicles 6:7-8 a linear genealogy occurs with the names Eliasaph, Elkanah, Assir, Korah. These names are in ascending order. Each is represented as the son of the following name. In Exodus 6:24 these men are positioned in a segmented genealogy in the form of Korah and his three sons. The function of Exodus 6 is clear. It expresses the relationships between the sons of Levi and gives the dogma that Kohath and the

---

1 David's sons were priests, 2 Sam. 8:18. Also the Davidic kings may have done priestly duties. Uzziah may be an example (1 Kings 15:25-27; 2 Chron. 26:16).
lineage of his son Amram is politically the most dominant. The proof of this is seen by the inclusion of details about the family and the naming of the wives of the men. Finally, Phinehas occupies the deepest genealogical level. His name, therefore, is the most significant. This genealogy may have been used also to show the succession of the high priests since this is the line from which they came. The purpose of the linear genealogy is obviously different. Therefore the relationships between the names have changed because the function of the genealogy is different from the one in Exodus 6.

The function of the genealogy in 1 Chronicles 6:1-15 is hard to determine. As seen in the analysis, the lineage of Kohath contains three genealogical fragments, verses 25, 26-27, and 28. They apparently interrupt the flow of the genealogy as a unit to such an extent that the Chronicler felt obliged to start the lineage of Merari over again. The reason for these genealogical fragments is not clear although they are repeated in 6:16-23. This may indicate that these fragments, and perhaps the whole genealogy, were a grouping of names used to create the genealogy in 6:16-34. There may be another reason for its existence. It has been noted that each linear segment of the genealogy lists seven generations.¹ This symmetry and the inclusion of

¹ Assir appears twice so he is to be counted only once. See Lefèvre, "Note d'Exégèse," pp. 289-290 for his suggestions which differ slightly from those above especially concerning the interpretation of the genealogical fragments.
Amminadab may prove to be a strong indication that Lefevre is correct when he says that this type of genealogical construction can be considered the product of a kind of midrashic activity.¹

1 Chronicles 6:16-34

This genealogy with its three linear segments has similar examples of fluidity as the one above. In the phratry of Merari (verses 29-32), his two sons, Mushi and Mahli, are represented as father and son. Again, this kinship shift denotes a new function of the names in a new genealogy. The nature of the function will become clear below.

The next type of fluidity is difficult to classify. The names from Kohath to Joel (vv. 16-21) may be a duplicate of 6:7-9.² The most obvious problem with this idea is the identifying of Izhar with Amminadab, and Uriel with Zephaniah. Another difficulty is the identification of Azariah with Uzziah. It is true the names are the same concerning the kings of Judah, but not so certain that every time the name Uzziah appears the name Azariah may be substituted for it. The telescoping, i.e., the omission of Saul, also counts as evidence against this assumption. The


most likely interpretation of the phratry of Kohath is that several independent groups of Levites are joined together. Consequently, some are contemporary and overlap in time although most likely they are all related to Kohath. First, it should be observed that his genealogy differs from the one in 6:7-8 by omitting Elkanah at this point and reverses the order of the names of Ebisaph and Assir. The names from Kohath to Tahath form the first group of Levites. Apparently, Zephaniah belongs with Azariah and Joel. The next two names are related and they are taken from 2 Chronicles 29:12. That these two names are not in chronological sequence is of no consequence to the function of the genealogy. The next genealogy is the names from Mahath to Elkanah which is a combination of 2 Chronicles 29:12 and 1 Chronicles 6:10. The names from Mahath through Zephaniah are therefore contemporaries. It also indicates telescoping has taken place but it has no function. The next name,

1 The Chronicler does not seem to feel it necessary to incorporate a genealogy into his work just because it is available. He has had opportunity to do this with the genealogies of Cain and Elihu (Gen. 4, Job 32:2). Further, in the ancient Near East there is no evidence that a genealogy was used just because it was available. The genealogies used in composing the kings' lists had to be consistent to the compiler's purpose; Wilson, GHOT, p. 103.

2 As previously seen, the three-unit name was fairly common. Even so, it cannot be used as strong evidence. Thus Zephaniah's place is unclear though his presence is much less of a problem in the above interpretation than with other interpretations of these lists.

3 Cf. the composition of the SKL. Wilson, GHOT, pp. 115ff.
Elkanah, is believed by Mohlenbrink to be a mistake. ¹

Another explanation is that it was taken from 1 Chronicles 15:23. The next six names are taken from 1 Samuel 1:1 or 1 Chronicles 6:11-13.² The relationship of Joel with Samuel or Heman is problematic. Both have a Joel in their lineages, but there is no direct evidence connecting all three names together other than this genealogy.³ In favor of their family relationship is the time element. Both of Samuel's sons were old enough to have children before they died and Heman's Levitical position would coincide with David's reign.⁴ There are three generations in each group: Samuel, Saul, David and Samuel, Joel, Heman. If this analysis is correct, there are five separate genealogies in this list which were joined together. At least four of them are roughly contemporary and may somehow be linked to the others.⁵

¹Mohlenbrink, "Die levitischen," p. 202. Obviously, he has been influenced in making this judgment because of his preconceived notions that all the linear segments must be symmetrical.


³1 Sam. 8:2, 1 Chron. 6:13 which was taken from 1 Sam. 8:2; 1 Chron. 15:17. Sometimes in anthropological genealogies the same name may occur twice in a row in reality, but in reciting the genealogy it is only said once. It is possible that this has happened here.

⁴1 Sam. 8:2ff.

⁵This same phenomenon was observed in the SKL and the BKL. Wilson, GHOT, pp. 115, 127ff.
It is unfortunate that there is not more information on the makeup of the lineages of Gershom and Merari to see if the same pattern is true. There are some who feel the names in 1 Chronicles 6:26-28 and the names in 6:5-6 are the same although it does seem difficult to demonstrate this. However, the function of the genealogy seems clear: to authenticate Heman, Asaph, and Ethan's place among the Levites and to legitimize the Levites of the restoration.

Another example of fluidity is a shift in the order of the names of the sons of Levi. For the first time Kohath heads the list instead of Gershon. Even though this is the only time, the dominance of Kohath has long been apparent. It is always the line of Kohath that has the most detail in the genealogies and which provides the leadership for Israel. Finally, it expressed itself in this genealogy of the Chronicler, perhaps because he was not relying upon his sources. He correctly shows the dominance of the Kohathites in the history of Israel in both the pre-exilic and the post-exilic period. Probably the shift in the names was psychologically induced rather than purposeful.

1 Shimei and Jahath are related in 1 Chron. 23:11, 12 but the names should be reversed to express the correct relationship in the present form of the genealogy. Zimmah may be the one found in 2 Chron. 29:12 though his son Joah should also be present.

2 Curtis - Madsen, Chronicles, p. 130.

1 Chronicles 7:1-5

1 Chronicles 7:1-5 gives a segmented genealogy of Issachar, mainly in list form, reaching a depth of five generations through the lineage of Tola. The opening formula is "and of the sons of Issachar." The names of the sons follow this formula: "Tola, Puah, Jashub, and Shimron, four." The next generation has an opening formula, "and the sons of Tola." This is followed by six names: Uzzi, Rephaiah, Jeriel, Jehmai, Ibsam, and Samuel. They are described as "chiefs of their fathers' households." Following this is the description that "the sons of Tola were mighty men of valor in their generations," numbered during the time of David at 22,600.

The next genealogical level introduces the sons of Uzzi, listing only Izrahiahu. Again the formula, "and the sons of PN," is used to introduce him, followed by four names: Michael, Obadiah, Joel, Isshiah. They are described as "chief men" over 36,000 men. Grouped by their generations, all the men of Issachar totaled 87,000.

---

1Gen. 46:13 has מֹשֶׁה but the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Syriac read מֹשֶׁה which is correct. Curtis & Madsen, Chronicles, p. 494.

2Also spelled Jashib. See the kere and the Kethib. Gen. 46:13 reads מֹשֶׁה, the LXX reads 'Ιασούς and the Vulgate concurs. Read 'Ιασούς as Num. 26:24 does. Ibid., p. 494.

3Only four names are listed though the sum is given as five.
1 Chronicles 7:6-12

1 Chronicles 7:6-12 gives a segmented genealogy of Benjamin primarily in list form reaching a depth of five generations if Ir (verse 12) may be equated with Iri (verse 7).¹ The opening formula is missing. The name Benjamin simply appears followed by his three sons: Bela, Becher, and Jedediah² and the sum of three. Each son’s lineage is expanded and summarized with a sum and the description that they are "mighty men of valor, heads of the house of their fathers." In one case they are said to be registered by genealogy and in two cases the number of the muster is given.³ The genealogy closes with two more notices. Two men, Shuppim⁴ and Huppim, are the sons

¹ Ar (verse 7) = Ar (verse 12).

² Some commentators desire to make Jedediah and Ashbel the same person. See Curtis-Madsen, Chronicles, p. 149; Zöcker, LC, p. 76, but Rudolph, Chronikbücher, pp. 66-67 disagrees.

³ Greek, Ἀμετες, Omri is a result of assimilation to Zamascha. Ἀμετες is the correct Greek form. Allen, The Greek Chronicles, 2:34. Greek Ἑμεθ, Alemeth, dropped Λ because of its similarity to Κ. Other Greek variants closely correspond to the Hebrew.

⁴ In Gen. 46:21 the text reads יִבְנֵי עֲנָיִים וְעַרְלָיִים, which is corrupt. It should read יִבְנֵי עֲנָיִים as Num. 26:38b, 39a reads. The יִבְנֵי עֲנָיִים here should read יִבְנֵי עֲנָיִים as the following gentilic shows. Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1896), p. 35 suggest three errors occurred in Gen. 1) A wrong division of words, 2) a repetition of י was read the second time as י, 3) a confusion of ע with כ and ש. The variant pronunciation of יִבְנֵי cannot be explained. The consonants remain constant. The LXX has Ἐνημαι (v is incorrect since v is commonly confused) and Ἐνημαι (v in original).
of Ir, and Hushim is the son of Aher. ¹

The question of the absence of Dan was discussed above, but a further comment is needed. Klostermann's widely accepted textual correction reads, "The sons of Dan were Hushim, his son, one." The repetition of son(s) is obviously incorrect since it does not conform to other known genealogical patterns. Further, the word "one" occurs neither in Genesis 46:23 nor in Numbers 26:39. Hushim is a Danite name,² but from all evidence part of this family was incorporated into Benjamin, perhaps at the time of Dan's Northward migration.³ ¹ Chronicles 8:8 supports this idea since here Hushim appears as a Benjaminitine family name. All this testifies against such a reconstruction.

²Gen. 46:23 // Num. 26:42. The spelling variation is a misplacement of letters.

³Judges 17; 18.
The problem now remains on how to interpret this verse. Perhaps it is best to consider Shuppim and Huppim as a further recounting of the sons of Benjamin.\textsuperscript{1} If the words "son of" were restored to the text before Hushim, then the next three names are to be taken in the same manner as those appearing in the lists of Nehemiah 7:10ff. Thus they must be read as sons of Ir, sons of Hushim, sons of Aher.

I Chronicles 7:6-12 shows major fluidity in the genealogy of Benjamin\textsuperscript{2} because only three sons are listed.\textsuperscript{3} On the other hand, Genesis 46:21 has ten sons for Benjamin, and Numbers 26:33 lists five sons as direct descendants and two names as grandsons, Ard and Naaman. This is the first place where these two lists have differed so greatly, an indication of the varied functions of the genealogies. Genesis 46:21 gives the sons and grandsons of Israel, expresses the domestic ties between them. Numbers 26 is a census list, used to determine how the shares of the promised land were to be divided among the Israelites.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{See Jerusalem Bible} (New York: Doubleday, 1966).

\textsuperscript{2}\textit{See also our comments on I Chron. 3:17ff.; also Hushim could be taken like Shuppim and Huppim.}

\textsuperscript{3}\textit{Some scholars would link this genealogy with Zebulun, but there is little evidence for this. Rudolph does not adopt this view. He feels Zebulun has dropped out, but also Benjamin was originally present, and the present Benjaminite genealogy in I Chron. 7:6-11 is a later addition. Chronikbücher, p. 67.}

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Many commentators want to give a military function to this list, but that is not the avowed purpose in verses 52-56. It is true that only those capable of warfare are numbered, but nothing else indicates a military purpose.}
The Israelites were gathered together and counted by phratries, and their political status was revealed. Thus Bela, Ashbel, Ahiram, Shephupham (Shuppim), and Hupham (Huppim) were numbered. An additional comment indicates that two of the sons of Bela had acquired status enough to be counted separately although they were still in Bela's phratry. The total impression is that many of the original sons of Benjamin did not increase enough to have political authority and thus were incorporated into larger and more powerful tribes militarily.

The genealogy of Benjamin in 1 Chronicles 7:6-12 shows even more changes and appears to be drawn up with a military purpose in mind as shown by the many references to it, though at a later time than Numbers 26. Its structure has three clans, each subdivided into households of various numbers. It is interesting to note that Bela is the only name to appear in all three sources. Becher did not appear in the Numbers' genealogy, and Jedaiel is entirely new. Becher's reappearance may indicate a realignment in Benjamin's military organization. The position of Bilhan is also interesting. He must have had a special relationship with Jedaiel since he is a lone link between Jedaiel and the other members of the group. Perhaps Jedaiel was too old to fight so Bilhan was the field commander. The use of "son" in these census lists is merely a social mechanism, as previously noted.

In 1 Chronicles 8:1-40 there is another genealogy of the tribe of Benjamin. It is a segmented list genealogy,
summary as has been characteristic of the genealogies thus far (7:40, 11, 9, 7; 5:24). In the light of these facts, it seems safe to assume that a block of material has been omitted either because the source the Chronicler was using was broken or effaced or because of some scribal omission.

Verse 8 through 28 give the lineage of Shaharaim. The kinship formula is missing so how he should be connected with the previous names is unknown. The lineage reaches a depth of four generations in this segmented narrative genealogy. While in Moab he sends away his two wives, Hushim and Baara, and begets two children by his wife Hodesh. A list of seven sons is given: Jobab, Zibia, Mesha, Malcam, Jeuz, Sachia, and Mirman. A closing formula follows these names which states that, "these were his sons, chiefs of the fathers' [households]." After this his descendants by one of his estranged wives is given, Abitub and Elpaal. Elpaal has three sons who were responsible for the building of "Ono and Lod with its towns." The next two names, Beriiah and Shema, may best be interpreted as further sons of Shaharaim through the wife Hushim. This is based on the overall pattern of the genealogy. They are said to be "chiefs of the fathers' [households]" and there

---

1Verse 8 also has textual problems. See the discussion of Myers, ICAR, p. 59.

2Elpaal, who is definitely given as a son of Shaharaim by the wife Hushim, is placed between Beriiah and Shema when their children are listed.
is a historical comment that they lived in Aljalon and
defeated the Gathites. The nine sons of Beriah, the seven
sons of Elpaal, the nine sons of Shimei (Shema),¹ the eleven
sons of Shashak, and the six sons of Jeroham appear in that
order in the next several verses. After each list, the
formula "sons of PN " is given to identify the preceding
list of names. This section of the genealogy closes with
the formula, "these were the chiefs of the fathers' [house­
holds] by their generations, chief men who lived in Jeru­
salem."

This genealogy is quite different from the others
because it explains their settlements in the Shephelah.
Bela is again the constant, Ashbel reappears, and Ahirah
may be Ahiram. Nohah and Rapha are new names in the list.
Unfortunately, the confusion in verses 6 and 7 makes the
whole interpretation of the genealogy uncertain. If the
genealogy of Shaharaim is to be linked with Ehud, [then]
there may be clues which point to the right interpretation
of the genealogy. First, there are several references to
a military structure.² Second, there are several references
toward tribal movements. Verse 6 mentions those who were
exiled. Shaharaim is then found in Moab, head of a large
family. He sends his wives away, and his sons appear in

¹Shema equals Shimei. See Zöcker, LC, p. 82.
²Verses 6, 10, 13, 28.
Ono and Lod in the northern Shephelah. The households of Beriah and Shema settle in the Aijalon valley and another group in Jerusalem, organized in military groups.

How is the presence of two Benjaminite genealogies in chapter 7 to be explained? Attempts to make one a genealogy of Zebulun are no longer viable since Rothstein and Rudolph find an original Benjaminite genealogy in 7:12a. It would appear that the Chronicler is actually reflecting historical reality by including both genealogies. Judah was alone when the United Kingdom was split since Ahijah's words to Jeroboam only mention Judah as remaining loyal to Rehoboam. At the same time, he gave Jeroboam only ten tribes. Benjamin was omitted even though he was historically united with the northern tribes. Later Benjamin became joined to Judah though it is questionable whether Judah ever controlled all of Benjamin's territory. Realizing all these facts, the Chronicler included Benjamin with the northern tribes and then united him with Judah.

---

1 Two more recent authors who still hold the Zebulun theory are Robert North, "I & II Chronicles," in Jerome Bible Commentary and Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses sources," p. 485. For the existence of an original Benjaminite genealogy in verse 12, see Rothstein, Chronik, p. 135 and Rudolph, Chronikbücher, pp. 65, 67.

2 I Kings 11:30-36.

3 2 Sam. 2:9; 20:1-22.

4 1 Kings 12:21-23; Woods, A Survey of Israel's History, p. 335; Bright, A History of Israel, p. 213. Bethel was on the border of Benjamin and Ephraim. Baasha controlled Raamah which was only four miles north of Jerusalem.
the phrase "heads of the house of the fathers" is used almost exclusively in a military sense in these genealogies and are often designated by military terms such as "mighty men of valor," "famous men," "units of the army for war," "going out with the army to war," and "for service in war."¹

The inclusion of the census numbers in many of these genealogies verifies that they were originally a part of a military census.² The remainder of the genealogies omit the census figures and thus can be grouped separately.³ All the names, however, seem to denote military leaders. Johnson goes beyond the Biblical evidence in stating that the positions are hereditary, similar to the mariannu.⁴

In the Old Testament, the leaders of Israel were most often chosen by merit. Moses, a Levite, had to prove himself. Joshua, an Ephraimite, was chosen for his ability as Moses' successor. In Judges, the leaders of war were men of ability. In David's army the leaders of military units were chosen for their reputations as men of special military skills. Even in the genealogy of the high priest, it was

¹ Chron. 5:24, 7:2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 40, 1:6, 10, 13, 28; places where it does not denote a military position are Num. 7:2, 31:25ff., 1:3b-4, 32:28ff., 36:1, Josh. 22:13ff., 14:1, 19:51, 21:10ff.
² Chron. 7:2, 3, 7, 8-9, 10-11, 30-40.
⁴ Biblical Genealogies, p. 66.
suggested that other factors than heredity governed the choice of the next priest. Also in the most hereditary of the official positions, kingship, the first-born was often not chosen to rule. Thus it appears that the names of military leaders were genealogically represented and the kinship terms are nonfunctional which may account for the omission of the kinship terms between the advent of a listing and previous ancestors of the tribe.\(^1\) It may be that there was no certain connection. Though it cannot be proven, it is possible that the first name in such a listing was the highest ranked individual in that military unit.\(^2\) In places where he is listed as having a son and no other names appear, perhaps the additional name represented a change of command.\(^3\) Each new level which lists more than one name represents another division of the military hierarchy.

Chapter 8 continues with a genealogy of the Gibeonites. It reaches a depth of three generations. The first one is introduced as the father of Gibeon, who, although he is not named, we know to be Jeiel.\(^4\) His wife's name is Maacah.

\(^1\) 1 Chron. 5:7, 12, 13, 15, 7:35, 38.

\(^2\) Albrecht Goetze, "Diverse Names in an Old Babylonian Pay-List," BASOR 95 (Oct., 1944): shows that in a pay roster the first man named appears to be a foreman since he receives twice that of the others in the list. The same principle may apply in the military organization of Israel. The first person named has the higher rank.

\(^3\) For example, Izrahiah replaces Uzzi in 7:3.

\(^4\) Jeiel occurs in 9:35. See Myers, ICAB, p. 59.
Abdon, the first-born, is the first listed followed by eight more names. They include Mikloth, necessary because of his inclusion in the list of 1 Chronicles 9:38. He had a son named Shimeah. All those in the list lived in Jerusalem.

The genealogical lineage of Saul is given next. Primarily in linear form and segmented in three places, it reaches a depth of seventeen generation. There is no opening formula; it simply begins with the name Ner. The kinship connection is "begat."

The first segmentation occurs with the listing of the sons of Saul. The lineage of Jonathan is continued with the kinship formula "sons of." Two generations later, segmentation occurs again when the four sons of Micah are listed. The "begat" formula is then used for the next five generations. At this point the son of Binea is listed according to the formula "his son," and this formula is continued for the next two generations. Segmentation is repeated when the sons of Azel are listed. Then Eshek, Azel's brother, is introduced into the genealogy. He had three sons who are numbered, but only his first-born, Ulam, had sons and grandsons, one hundred and fifty in all. Left unnamed, they are described as "men of valor, archers."

The genealogy closes with the formula, "all these were the sons of Benjamin." Finally, a concluding formula is given,

---

1 The problem of Ner and Kish will be discussed in the appropriate section under fluidity.
for chapters 1 through 8: "so all Israel was registered by genealogies" (9:1a).  

1 Chronicles 7:13

1 Chronicles 7:13 gives a segmented genealogical list of Naphtali with a depth of two generations. The opening formula is "the sons of PN." Naphtali is the father of Jahziel, Guni, Jezer, and Shallum. Following this is the closing formula "the sons of Bilhah."

1 Chronicles 7:14-19

1 Chronicles 7:14-19 gives a segmented narrative genealogy of Manasseh which is obscure and beset with difficulties. It seems to have a maximum depth of six generations. It opens with the formula "the sons of PN." The first son of Manasseh is listed as Asriel. After his name is given, a note intrudes which reports that Manasseh's Aramean concubine bore to him this son. She also bore to him Machir, the founder of Gilead. Machir is next described as taking

---

1 So Zöcker, LC, p. 86; Ackroyd, TBP, p. 43.

2 Curtis-Madsen, Chronicles, p. 150 and Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 68 are incorrect in regarding Asriel as displaced on the grounds that his position in Num. 26:30ff. is the correct one. As now should be evident, genealogies are very fluid.

3 The function of Gilead in the genealogy is in doubt. The formula indicates it is a city and yet the closing formula for the genealogy indicates that the name should be regarded as a person. Perhaps it serves a dual purpose—both as a place and a person, as sometimes occurs in tribal societies.
"a wife from Huppim and Shuppim and the name of their 
sister was Maacah."¹ The next statement is totally unclear. 
"The name of the second was Zelophehad and Zelophehad had 
daughters." Zelophehad is known from the genealogy in 
Numbers 26:29-33 where he is listed as a son of Hepher who 
in turn is a son of Gilead. The problem is that there is no 
antecedent of "second." Where is the first?² 

Maacah, the wife of Machir, gave birth to two more sons: 
Peresh and Sheresh. Sheresh had two sons: Uram and Rakem. 
The lineage continues through Uram who had a son named Bedan. 
This genealogy closes with the formula which contains within 
itself a linear genealogy of three generations, "These are the 
sons of Gilead, the son of Machir, the son of Manasseh." 

Two further genealogies are given after this closing 
formula appears. The first concerns a sister of Gilead named 
Hammolecheth who had three sons, Ishhod, Abiezer, and Mahlah. 
The second is of another son of Gilead, Shemida.³ He had 
four sons, Ahian, Shechem, Likhi, and Aniam. 

The genealogies of Manasseh exhibit major fluidity. These 
genealogies include three segmented lists found in Numbers 
26:29-33, Joshua 17:1-2, and I Chronicles 7:14-19, and two 

¹Reading ḫ as "from" and ספפ as having a plural suffix; 
thus Huppim and Shuppim need not be considered as a gloss but 
rather as an indication of intertribal relations. 

²This section on Zelophehad may be out of place. See 
Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 69. 

³Though the connecting formula is missing, this kinship 
connection is inferred from Numbers 26:29-33.
linear genealogies emphasizing Zelophehad are found in Numbers 27:1-11 and Joshua 17:3. In addition to these sources, there is one non-Biblical source from the Samarian ostraca which dates from the end of the ninth century. Of the thirteen known phratries and subphratries of the tribe of Manasseh— including Machir and Gilead— seven are found in the ostraca. These are Shemida, Abiezer, Helek, Asriel, Slechem, Hoglah, and Noah.

In Numbers 26:29-33 the genealogy reaches a depth of six generations when Zelophehad, and his daughters are included (verse 33). At this point in the history of Manasseh, none of the daughters of Zelophehad are considered as subphratries or as representatives of a clan.

The genealogy in Joshua 17:1-2 is basically identical to the one in Numbers 26. However, when the daughters of Zelophehad request their inheritance (verse 3), a linear genealogy of five generations leading back to Manasseh is cited. The links are Zelephehad, Hepher, Gilead, Machir, and Manasseh. After Manasseh's name, the seven daughters of Zelophehad are listed. It appears that the full genealogy of Zelophehad is listed to give undisputed evidence for his position. The linear genealogy in Numbers 27:1-11 is identical to this one except it continues one more generation to include Joseph.

An interesting detail of Numbers 26:29-33 is that Gilead

---


2Ibid., p. 322.
is the name of a phratry and the son of Machir. Further, Gilead has seven sons which are also phratries. The resulting genealogy is diagramed as follows:

```
Manasseh
  Machir
    Gilead
      Iezer  Helek  Asriel  Shechem  Shemida  Hepher
          |          |          |          |          |        
          Mahlah  Noah  Hoglah  Mikeh  Tirzah
```

Important to the study is the fact that the tribe of Joseph was divided to form two tribes: Ephraim and Manasseh. Therefore, whatever alignment existed before this among the Jodephites was abolished to some extent and reorganized, as seen in this genealogy. Machir and his son Gilead form the phratries living in Transjordan. The sons of Gilead form phratries living in Cesarjordan.

The function of Numbers 26 is political as previously stated, since it concerns the inheritance due the tribes which are subdivided into the phratries. From the genealogy it is seen that Machir is the most important phratry of Manasseh. This is also revealed in other places of the Old Testament where Machir appears to be a tribe.¹ One step further down

¹Judges 5: 14; E. Taubler, *Biblische Studien: Die Epoche der Richter* (Tübingen: V. H. J. Zobal, 1958), pp. 190-203 thinks Machir was a tribe which was later incorporated into Manasseh. This appears rather farfetched. Rather, the names Manasseh and Machir should be considered interchangeable similar to the way Dan is called a phratry in Judges 13: 1; 18: 2, 11, 19. In the last two cases Dan is called both a tribe and a phratry.
is Gilead, and even further down are the seven sons of Gilead.

The genealogy in Judges 17: 1-2 differs in structure as the diagram shows:

```
Joseph
   Manasseh
      Machir  Abiezer  Helek  Asriel  Shechem  Hephern  Shemida
      Gilead
```

The children of Gilead have been elevated in status and are called "sons of Manasseh." Gilead is still second to Machir. Though scholars often feel that this genealogy is dependent upon Numbers 26: 29-33, this major fluidity suggests that it is not the case at all. Clearly in this genealogy the situation has changed. No longer is it in the format of a census list. Rather, it seems to be more governmental—in other words, divided into administrative districts. This may be deduced from the districts found in the Samarian ostraca and is further seen in the linear genealogy of Zelophehad in verse 3. It reaches a depth of six generations including his daughters. Its appearance with the segmented genealogy of verses 1-2 is illuminating because it shows the true relationship between Hephern and Manasseh. The function of this linear genealogy is to identify exactly Zelophehad and his daughters according to true family relationships. This being

---

1 See the comments of DeGeus, The Tribes of Israel, p. 77 for the secondary nature of this genealogy.

2 The only difference between this genealogy and the linear one of Zelophehad in Num. 27: 1-11 is the omission of Joseph which has no functioning significance.
the case, Hepher is actually four generations from Manasseh.

If this genealogy in Judges 17: 1-2 is compared with the Samarian ostraca, which gives an indication of the political districts, it is clear that Judges 17 must be dated earlier than the ostraca. That the names of at least two of Zelophehad's daughters are used for political districts proves this.

The genealogy in 1 Chronicles 7:14-19 also shows major fluidity, and many commentators consider it hopelessly corrupted.1 This conclusion, however, can no longer be held as certain. Most likely much of the strangeness in this genealogy can be explained on the basis of fluidity.

The genealogy can be diagramed as follows:

```
Concubine ——— ——— Manasseh
   
   Asriel Machir-(Maacah) Zelophehad Hammolecheth Shemida
   
   Gilead Ishhod Abiezer Maklah

   Peresh Sheresh Ahiam Shechem Likhi Aniam

   Ulam Rakem

   Bedan
```

Several items must be noted concerning this genealogy. First, women play a dominant role. Manasseh has a concubine who has sons and Maacah is called both the sister-in-law and the wife of Machir. This is reminiscent of the oral

1 So Rothstein, Chronik, pp. 139-144; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, pp. 69-70. He proposes a reconstruction on the basis of Num. 26:29-33 because he feels it represents the truer picture. In view of the above discussion, the function of the genealogy casts doubt on that assumption. Myers, ICAB, pp. 54-55 is somewhat more conservative in his analysis of the genealogy.
genealogies studied above, and as such it cannot be called an error. The significance of this phenomenon is unclear, though it may be connected with the reference to Huppim and Shuppim who are phratries of Benjamin.\(^1\) Another women, Hammolecheth, has three sons, one which is known from the other genealogies to be a daughter of Zelophehad. It may be that she is a sister of Gilead, although the kinship term present cannot be definitely linked to him.

Second, four of Gilead's sons, Asriel, Abiezer, Shemida, and Shechem, who have always been linked together as brothers, are named at various depths throughout the genealogy. Shechem is called a son of Shemida. Abiezer is a son of Hammolecheth. Asriel is a son of Manasseh. Zelophehad (replacing Hepher) is also a son of Manasseh though the textual problem here may give reason to believe he was the second son of Gilead. The third concerns the daughters of Zelophehad. Only Mahlah is mentioned and she is considered as a son of Hammolecheth. The identity of Hammolecheth is unclear, and it is equally unclear whose sister she is. It may be either Machir or Gilead.

Though the original function of the genealogy is very obscure, it is obvious that the emphasis is on the family of Machir, since here the genealogy reaches its greatest depth however it is reconstructed. Because of the prominent place of women in it, the genealogy may have been concerned with the social status of the various families named. This would explain the several groupings of the sons of Gilead and

\(^1\) Chron. 7:12; Gen. 46:21; Num. 26:39.
also the association of Machir with Benjamin. It would elevate Machir's social status above the other important social units since it would give him greater intertribal influence.

1 Chronicles 7:20-28

1 Chronicles 7:20-28 gives a segmented narrative genealogy of Ephraim in linear form which reaches a depth of nine generations through two separate lineages. The method here is different from that in the previous genealogies given by the Chronicler in that this one deals completely with one lineage before listing the other. The effect is that there are two linear genealogies connected by one occurrence of segmentation through Ephraim at the beginning of the genealogy.

The opening formula is "and the sons of PN." Ephraim's first son is Shuthelaha (I). This is followed by the kinship formula "PN his son . . . ," for six generations. At this point the two names Ezer and Elead are given without the kinship formula by which they properly can be interpreted. By analogy of the genealogical structure, it seems that they are brothers and the sons of the last name given, Shuthelaha (II). A historical note is attached to their names which explains their death at the hands of the men of Gath. Ephraim, i.e., Shuthelaha (II) is distressed by this misfortune. Subsequently, his wife bears another child which is named Beriah. At this juncture a note is given about a daughter whose name is Sheerah. She founded
both lower and upper Beth-horen and also Uzzen-sheerah.

The genealogy now returns to the segmented portion of the genealogy of Ephraim and lists a son named Rephah. This section of the genealogy reaches a depth of eight generations by using the kinship formula "PN his son." After the genealogical information is given, the geographical limits of their borders are listed, and then the closing formula is "in these lived the sons of Joseph, the son of Israel."

The genealogy of Ephraim in 1 Chronicles 7:20-28 differs from the one found in Numbers 26:35-37. Whereas the former is basically linear, the latter is a small segmented genealogy and only the names Shuthelah and Tahan occur in both genealogies. The intent of 1 Chronicles 7:20-28 is clearly theological. The first linear genealogy ends with the death of Ezer and Elead because they conducted a raid against Gath. Evidently the Lord was not with them since the name of the next son was Beriah which means misfortune. The other linear segment gives the concept of blessing. It ends with Joshua, the general of the Israelites during the conquest of Canaan. God was with him and he prospered. Both genealogies are of equal length thus giving further support to the intent of the

---

1 The genealogy in Gen. 46:20 of Joseph simply gives Manasseh and Ephraim as his sons.

2 The order of the names, Tahath, Eleadah, and Tahath, may reflect the practice of papponymy.
author. No doubt the events of the first linear segment reflect an event sometime later than the conquest. Presumably then, there is some telescoping occasioned by the symmetry of the two linear portions, but the information to demonstrate this is lacking.

1 Chronicles 7:30-40

1 Chronicles 7:30-40 gives a segmented genealogy of four generations of Asher in list form. It opens with the formula "the sons of PN" who are listed as Imnah, Ishvah, Ishvi, Beriah, and Serah, their sister. Using the same formula, the lineage of Beriah shows that he had two sons, Reber and Malchiel. Using a relative grammatical construction (X·ln), the Chronicler relates that Malchiel founded Berzait.

The genealogy next considers the lineage of Heber who begat three sons, Japhlet, Shomer, and Hotham and one daughter, Shua. On the next level the formula for Japhlet is "the sons of PN." His sons were Pasach, Bemhal, and Ashvath. There is a closing formula, "these are the sons of Japhlet." The Chronicler next considers Heber's son Shemer (Shomer) whose sons are listed as Ahi, Rehgah, Jehubbah, and Aram.

The sons of Helem's brother follows the same pattern as the above names. How he fits into the genealogical scheme of the entire passage is unclear since the kinship term is lacking. Four of his sons are listed: Zophah,
Imna, Shelesh, and Amal. Of these sons only the sons of Zophah are considered: Suah, Harnepher, Shual, Beri, Imrab, Rezer, Hod, Shamma, Shilshah, Beera, and Ithan.

At this juncture a number of names are given which are not connected with the others by a kinship formula. Jether has three sons, Jephunneh, Pispa, and Ara. Ulla also has three sons, Arah, Hanniel, Rizia. The closing formula for the complete genealogy is, "all these were the sons of Asher." Those named are also described as, "chief of the house of the fathers, choice and mighty men of valor, heads of the princes." They were enrolled by genealogy for service in war and numbered at 26,000 men.

The genealogy of Asher in 1 Chronicles 7:30-40 corresponds to the one in Genesis 46:17 for the first three generations. In Numbers one name, Ishvah, is omitted. Since the Chronicler is using the Genesis form here, the genealogy of Asher in Numbers simply reflects the cessation of one phratry because it was not important in this situation. The genealogy gives the military leaders during some undetermined period. Its structure is similar to the genealogy of Issachar.
1 Chronicles 9:1b-44

The genealogies of the post-exilic inhabitants of Jerusalem are ascending, linear, and of various depths. The only exception is the genealogy of the Gibeonites, segmented, and that of Saul which is in descending order. These genealogies serve to identify the families belonging to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Levi, although in actuality no families of the Joseph tribes are mentioned. After the genealogical listing of Judah and Benjamin, the total number of men in each is given. The number of Levites are not given except in the case of the gatekeepers. Also the priests are listed in their category, being separated from the Levites.

The last genealogy listed concerns the house of Saul and it shows one example of fluidity, by the omission of Ner in 9:36 (cf. 8:30) which some scholars feel is occasioned by haplography due to its proximity to Nadab. Although

---

1 Chron. 9:35-38, 39-44.
2 Chron. 9:6, 9, 13.
3 Chron. 9:22.
4 Chron. 9:10-13.
5 The omission of Jeiel in 8:29 is most likely a textual error. See Aaron Densley, "The Genealogy of Gibeon (1 Chronicles 9:35-44): Biblical and Epigraphic Considerations," BASOR 202 (April, 1971): 17, n. 3. Examples of haplography do occur in 8:31. Mikloth is omitted because of 8:32. In 9:41 the same is true of Ahaz and for the same reason.
forced its inclusion there since it emphasized their military power. Eshek's sons were not needed in Chronicles 9 since the function there was to focus attention upon Saul.

In 2 Chronicles 9:11-12, there are two genealogies of priests given which are paralleled in Nehemiah 11:12-15. The kinship formulas in these ascending genealogies of Nehemiah are "PN₁, son of PN₂, son of PN₃ . . . . " The one in Nehemiah 11:12 corresponds with the one in 1 Chronicles 9:12a with the difference being in their depth. The former genealogy contains seven names while the latter has four. The genealogies are similar in purpose: to name the heads of the families of Israel who settled in Jerusalem.₁ In Chronicles the genealogy legitimized their claim on their rightful possessions.² The short time span between the two lists would not warrant any great changes. The telescoping evident between the two lists apparently has no function. It simply means that in 1 Chronicles 9:11, the names absolutely necessary were used while in Nehemiah 11:12 a fuller, more complete genealogy is given.³ It may also be that there are gaps in Nehemiah's rendering of the genealogy if Malchijah is to be associated with David.⁴

---

₁Nehemiah 11:3.
₂Ackroyd, TBP, p. 44; see 1 Chron. 9:2.
₃As was seen in oral genealogies, names in the middle of a genealogy have no particular function toward explaining the purpose of a genealogy.
₄₁ Chron. 24:9 gives a Malchijah, but most commentators feel it reflects conditions existing in the post-exilic period.
this cannot be absolutely ruled out, these two names are not similar enough to warrant this conclusion and further, Ner is omitted in the genealogy of Saul (1 Samuel 9:1).

1 Samuel 14:51 gives the real position of Ner when it states Ner is the father of Abner, the brother of Kish, and the uncle of Saul. If this omission is considered a case of fluidity, what caused it? No doubt it is the great influence of Kish, who was head of Saul's lineage, that caused the omission of Ner, for he was no longer important (1 Samuel 9:1ff.) as to the function of the genealogy.¹

When Ner is included on the same genealogical level as Kish in 9:36, it is because the Ner lineage later became influential, no doubt through the successes of Abner as Saul's commander-in-chief. Ner is included in the linear genealogy of Saul in 8:33 and 9:39 because he represented a clan who still had some political importance in the time of the exile. The second reciting of the list serves as a literary introduction for the narrative concerning the downfall of Saul and why his descendants did not continue his dynasty.

Another example of fluidity is found in the omission of Eshek's sons in chapter 9 (cf. 8:39-40). Perhaps it would appear that the function of the genealogy in chapter 8

¹Malamat dates the list of chapter 9 later than that of chapter 8 because he feels the list in chapter 9 shows evidence of being tampered with by someone. JAGOS, p. 171. See Rothstein, Chronik, pp. 165ff. Rudolph, Chronikbucher, pp. 80ff. Myers, ICAB, p. 62. For the opposite view, see Dempsy, "The Genealogy of Gibeon," p. 17.
Much of the above applies to a comparison of Nehemiah 11:13 and 1 Chronicles 9:12b. The major difference between the lists is spelling.\(^1\) In Nehemiah the name Meshullam is omitted. It may be that it was erroneously inserted by a copier in Chronicler since the LXX omits it. However, this may be an attempt at harmonization on the part of the LXX.\(^2\) If it is not, then this is another example of telescoping which has no function.

There are several differences between Nehemiah 11:15-13 and 1 Chronicles 9:14-16. A minor one which appears to be a textual problem is the presence of Bunni in Nehemiah 9:15 for Merari in 1 Chronicles 9:14.\(^3\)

The other problem is that three heads of family are missing in Nehemiah: Heresh, Galel (I) and Berechiah. Of these three, only Berechiah is listed with a genealogy. The final name is Elkanah. Why this genealogy should be lacking in Nehemiah's listing is unclear since an Elkanah does appear among the earlier Levites and a proper linkage is demonstrated.\(^4\) In the case of Heresh and Galel (I) a

---

\(^1\) Commentators feel that the lists are recensions of a prototype which was in the temple archives. Myers, ICAB, pp. 67ff. Ackroyd, TBP, p. 43.

\(^2\) There seems to be no way to prove or disprove it except on the past performance of the LXX.

\(^3\) BH suggests that Merari has dropped out and \(\text{Wk}\) should be read as \(\text{Wk}\), i.e., as a son of Merari. Myers, ICAB, p. 70 follows this suggestion.

\(^4\) Three other families, Shemaiah, Mattaniah and Obadiah trace their ancestry back to Merari, Asaph and Jeduthum (Heman) respectively. As is the case in most of these
proper linkage is not demonstrated so it is possible that by
the time of Nehemiah's journey to Jerusalem, they lost their
legitimacy. Bakbakkar is listed also without a genealogy
and if Bakbukiah, who appears in the Nehemiah enumeration,
is not the same man, his omission may be for the same reason.
Mattaniah suggests Mattithiah (1 Chronicles 9:31); Bakbukiah
is the name of one of the Levites (1 Chronicles 9:15);
Meshullam suggests Shallum. Talmon and Akkub are the con-
stants in all the lists. Obadiah is the only completely new
name. However, to equate Meshullam with Shallum is very
dangerous since this name was very common\(^1\) and likewise,
the two Bakbukiahs should not be equated since they had dif-
ferent duties and their positions are hereditary. Matt-
taniah has no manuscript support to identify him with
Mattithiah. It is likely that this new list of gatekeepers
reflects a new generation of clan heads who may or may not
live in Jerusalem, since the population of the city would
be secure by this time and tribal quotas would not be
needed to ensure stability. The list itself does claim to
reflect a new period of post-exilic history.

Of the four gatekeepers named in Chronicles, only
Shallum is given a genealogy. Korah is the oldest gener-
ation named. It would appear that this Korah is the one

---

\(^1\) 1 Chron. 3:19; 5:13; 6:17; 9:7-8, 11, 12; 2 Chron.
34:12; 2 Kings 22:3; Ezra 8:16; 10:15, 29; Nehemiah 3:4,
6; 10:7; 11:7; 12:13, 16, 25. If some of these are
duplicates, the remainder of the names are still impressive.
who is in the line of Kohath since Eliasaph appears next. If this is correct, radical telescoping has occurred between Eliasaph and Kore. Kore himself is mentioned as living during the reign of David. The genealogical material here is Korahites, Asaph, Kore, and Meshelemiah. Meshelemiah seems to be head of an extended family since eighteen people are present in it. This would make Kore head of a clan. If this is correct, there is a second large omission between Kore and Shallum. But the legitimate names are present. Shallum is connected to the Davidic gatekeepers through Kore and to the line of Kohath by Korah.

In verse 31 there is another genealogy involving Shallum which has a three generation depth: Korah, Shallum, and Mattithiah. Again, radical telescoping has occurred between Korah and Shallum. Mattithiah is apparently the real son of Shallum. Once more there is no specific function for the telescoping, but the genealogy establishes the legitimacy of Mattithiah.

A very short genealogy of Meshelemiah and Zechariah is found in verse 21. Meshelemiah is connected with the gatekeepers in David's reign. So also is a Zechariah, but this is not the one in 9:21. If telescoping of five hundred years between them is postulated, it would be highly

---

1 Chron. 26:1, 19.
2 Chron. 25:9.
unusual for a two-generation genealogy.\textsuperscript{1} It may be better to say that they are father and son during the time of the Chronicler, and therefore it should be considered a patronymic name.\textsuperscript{2}

The mention of Phinehas and Eleazer has the purpose of linking the present Korahites with the past Korahites. Phinehas' position appears to be ruler of all the Levites as was Eleazer.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} There are a few cases of this phenomenon, however.

\textsuperscript{2} It seems unlikely that the Chronicler arbitrarily joined the two names.

\textsuperscript{3} Num. 3:23; 4:16.
Oral Transmission of the Genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9

In tribal societies, the genealogy of a tribe is not learned by all. Only that section relevant to an individual's position is known by him. These genealogies are not learned systematically by tribal members, but rather in a piecemeal fashion as the need arises. Often some genealogical knowledge of their ancestors is preserved in tribal tales of various sorts. This implies that a unified genealogy is not orally transmitted, but rather it must be reconstructed if such a genealogy is desired.

However, some genealogies are systematically handed down orally. This is most prevalent in Arab societies. In these cases, only genealogical fragments relating to the individual and the founder of the lineage are learned.

Linear genealogies are longer than segmented genealogies because they are usually concerned with a political position of some sort. In such cases, an oral transmission for the whole succession of leaders in that particular social context is necessary.

It is necessary to distinguish between the various types of oral genealogies if they are to be understood. There are those that are needed for the life span of an individual or his social configuration, but after he dies the genealogy is forgotten. These genealogies are never

transmitted to succeeding generations. Then there are those which are intertwined into oral tribal narratives. These are transmitted orally but only because they are a part of a narrative. Finally, there are those genealogies passed on to succeeding generations because their knowledge is functional or because of some particular genealogical interest inherent in a culture.

Wilson has shown in his study that of the formal characteristics of oral tribal genealogies—segmentation, depth, and function, only the first can be used as an indication of an oral Vorlage. Ultimately, other evidences must be used to settle such a question.¹

From the start, several of the genealogies in this study could not have functioned orally. They are the genealogies of the high priests, the Levites, and the sons of Jacob. All the evidence shows that they originated from other literary sources where they are intertwined in the narratives. The genealogies which outline the military organization and the census lists also seem to be taken from administrative lists since their existence in an oral form would be non-functional to later generations. The king list in 1 Chronicles 3 also falls within this category though the latter part may have come from first-hand knowledge. Some sections in chapter 2 also come from literary

¹GHOT, pp. 90, 102, 108, 123, 130, 137, 156, 163, 165. An example of other proof is the conflation of names in GHOT, p. 137.
sources such as 1 Chronicles 2:6. The obscurity of the names in 2:34-41 suggests that they are also drawn from a literary source as are the historical narratives connected with those found in 4:24-43. The Table of Nations in its present form was no doubt a literary creation based upon the historical knowledge of the author. This would seem correct since no other such Table of Nations has appeared in ancient Near Eastern literature.

Many genealogies would appear to fit the category of oral genealogies which were intended for a specific purpose. They should have faded into oblivion except that they were written down and preserved. These include the genealogies of Ishmael, Esau and Seir, Achan, Caleb, Jerahmeel, and Hur, as well as those found in 4:1-22 and chapter 9. This can be seen by the various functions which have been assigned to them as well as the fact that they are tribal genealogies. They could not have been transmitted orally from generation to generation since then they would have become non-functional. Their preservation can be accounted for by their being written down during their functional period. The linear genealogy of Saul's house may be an example of a genealogy which was transmitted orally. The motive for its continuation was probably family pride since they were heirs of the first king of Israel. A similar case may be the genealogical name of Samuel found in 1 Samuel 1:1. Before Samuel's career, there seems no reason to preserve his genealogy. It seems probable that it was preserved
locally because he was a Levite and thus it was transmitted orally.

In summary, it has been seen that the very fluidity of genealogies makes a prolonged oral transmission impossible. Most of the genealogies originating in a tribal atmosphere were written down during their temporal existence, or else they would have been lost. The other genealogies are literary creations based on other narrative traditions. Also, it was seen that perhaps two of the many genealogies had an oral existence over a period of many generations.
CHAPTER SIX: THE LITERARY STRUCTURE OF THE GENEALOGIES OF CHRONICLES 1 THROUGH 9:1a: AN OVERVIEW

Though at first glance the material used to create this block of genealogies appears to be structured according to the natural unfolding of the content and thus is un literary, this is not the case at all. It may be said with all assurance that the genealogies do follow a definite literary pattern. 1

There are several items which point toward this conclusion. 1) There is no introduction. 2) For the first thirteen names there is no kinship term used by which the relationships between the names can be interpreted. 2 3) Following this division—which is merely a list—there

1 To this author's knowledge, no scholar has ever pointed this out. Malamat came closest in his article, "King Lists of the Old Babylonian Period and Biblical Genealogies," JAOS 88 (1968): 163-173. He attempts to demonstrate that the Amorite genealogies have a four part structure. However, as Wilson remarks in "Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research," pp. 187-188, Malamat overlooks the fact that the GHD and AKL are not genealogies. Wilson further says it is questionable whether the GHD can be divided in such a way. His most telling criticism is that most likely the original form of the AKL's sections were quite different before they were molded into their present form.

2 The LXX\(^3\) breaks up the section by introducing the formula "the sons of Noah" immediately after his name. This is an attempt at harmonization and it casts doubt upon the validity of any correction made by the LXX where it effects the structure of the genealogies, because this correction shows that the LXX does not understand the function of the genealogy or the purposes of the Chronicler. Rothstein feels compelled, however, to include it in his text; likewise Rudolph, Chronikbücher, p. 6. The recurrence of Shem in verse 24 connects this list with the one in verses 1-4.
is a section of genealogy in verses 5-15 which uses the proper kinship terms so that the names may be properly interpreted. 4) In verses 24-27 another section of the genealogy is actually a list since the crucial kinship terms are omitted. 5) Throughout the remainder of the genealogy, the necessary kinship terms are used. 6) This last section disperses various types of notes among the genealogies. 7) Both segmented and linear genealogies are included in the text.

Point number four of the above items is the most striking. It is obvious that the proper kinship terms were known. In fact, it is for that very reason that they are omitted. It also should be noted that the names in these two lists proceed from Adam directly to Abraham.

It may be suggested that the structural pattern used by the Chronicler is copied from the Assyrian King List. The formal structure of the AKL-A is due to the method of the scribe who copied it. It is divided into four sections by lines scratched across the tablet. The rest of its

---

1 There are sections throughout the first nine chapters where individual kinship terms are omitted. Some seem to assume that the proper connection can be made by the reader, while others seem to be omitted because the Chronicler himself did not know the proper connection.

characteristics follow those listed for Chronicles:
1) There is no introduction. 2) There is no kinship term used between the first seventeen names so that the names can be properly related to each other. 3) A short second section of ten names has those kinship terms needed to form a genealogy. 4) The third section gives six names which have no kinship terms between them. 5) The remainder of the AKL usually uses the kinship terms. 6) Random notes are dispersed throughout this fourth section. 7) Both linear and segmented genealogies occur.

It is clear that the lists are similar in form even though minor differences do exist. Certainly it must be agreed that no one can demonstrate that the Chronicler actually knew of the existence of the AKL or that he ever saw a copy of it. There are, however, three interesting possibilities. The most recent copy of the AKL-A known is the one labelled SDAS. It ends with the reign of Shalmaneser V (726-722 B.C.E.). This indicates that Sargon II or a

---

1The first two of these names are genealogically connected.

2The genealogies which are linear range from a depth of five generations (i 27-38, ii 9-13, 28-34, 36-43; iii 1-9, 11-16, 34-35; iv 1-8) to ten generations (iv 9-27). Very short segmented genealogies occur at ii 20, 24, 28, 36, 45; iii 11, 25, 43; iv 1, 9, 32, 31.

3Gelb, "Two Assyrian King Lists," pp. 209-230. This copy is termed the "Seventh Day Adventist Association List," because a private owner left it with the Seventh Day Adventist Seminary on permanent loan where Dr. Siegfried Horn eventually examined it. He loaned it to Dr. Gelb for one year. It was requested that it be designated "SDAS List."
later Assyrian king had it published. Samaria fell in 722 to the Assyrians and the surrounding territory became an Assyrian province. Perhaps a copy of it was sent there and even found its way into Judah? Another possibility is that the compiler of the genealogies had contact with a copy while in exile in Babylon.

The other two alternatives are 1) that the Chronicler created his own scheme and it is only by chance that the two are so closely structured, or 2) he followed a known literary pattern which is yet to be verified.
CONCLUSION

The genealogies found in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 show great variety in terms of form and fluidity. It is not always easy to determine the characteristics of these genealogies, and therefore opinions vary on certain of the details. Even so, the main characteristics of the genealogies are clear.

The average depth of a segmented genealogy is approximately 3.5 generations. By far the most numerous are those having a depth of two generations. The deepest is ten generations, and the next is eight. This agrees with that of the tribal societies of today.

The depth of the linear genealogies also agrees with the results found in both modern tribal societies and the ancient Near East. The average is a depth of eight generations. The deepest one has twenty-three names, but it is not a pure linear genealogy. The genealogy of the high priests in Chronicles has twenty-one names. However, most of these multi-named genealogies are either stylized or created by the joining together of various separate genealogies. Chapter nine (which probably reflects the usual practice in Israel in its use of genealogies) has an average of about five names in each genealogy.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) For the two generation genealogies see 2:50b-55, 54-55, 4:1-2; 4:3, 5-7, 8, 16, 19, 20; 5:3; 7:13; 6:25; for the ten generation see 2:42-50; for the eight see 2:25-33. These segmented genealogies include those which appear to be census lists.

\(^2\) For the longest uninterrupted linear genealogy see 5:27-41.
The occurrence of fluidity in these genealogies also follows the practice of the tribal societies and the ancient Near East. The three categories are amply represented: addition of names, omission of names, and changes in relationships between names.

The genealogical formulas used in 1 Chronicles 1 through 9 are of four types. The most prevalent type, and the one occurring only in segmented genealogies, is "sons of PN: PN₁ . . . ." Another common formula is "PN₁ begat PN₂". This usually occurs in linear genealogies, but also exceptions occasionally do occur.¹ A variant of this is when a woman is said to give birth to children, though in actuality it is only a difference of verbal forms.²

The last two types also occur in the ancient Near Eastern genealogies. These are "PN₁, son of PN₂" and the pronominal suffix form "PN₁, his son PN₂, his son PN₃ . . . ." Both of these are used only for the purpose of identification, and they are always in ascending order.³

The immediate implication of this material is two-fold. The first is that the presence of both segmented and linear genealogies indicates a tribal society at the foundation of Israelite social structure and thus the genealogies should

¹ See 4:11, 12; 7:32; 8:1-5, 8, 11.
² Examples are 1:32; 2:4, 24, 46, 48-99; 4:6, 18; 7:14.
³ See 9:4, 7, 8, 11 for examples.
reflect the same wide variety of functions as other genealogical societies do. This suggests that a genealogy may be historical for a particular situation in a particular time or circumstance. The second implication is that many of the these genealogies may have existed originally in an oral form.

Through the above analysis of these genealogies, much information has been shed on the structure of these nine chapters of 1 Chronicles. First, the external structure resembles the AKL. This fact casts doubt upon the older theories of interpolation often found in chapter one.¹

The second concerns the internal structure. The first observation is that the prevalent idea that 2:1-2 is a "pattern sentence" for the listing of genealogies of the tribes of Israel was found to have no support, and the absence of Zebulun and Dan was purposeful, since a textual error cannot be hypothesized. The two genealogies of Benjamin in chapter seven and eight were deliberate also. The second is that the genealogies of the tribe of Judah are an original unit. It was found that the function of the first genealogy of Caleb was not to delineate his tribal people but rather to emphasize certain personages and to make a theological point. The core of the material is 2:9-17; 25-33 and 42-50a while each has a supplement found respectively in 3:1-24; 2:34-41 and 51b-55. The main

emphasis falls on the lineage of Ram because his core genealogy is first and his supplement occurs last. Chapter four is a separate block of material and should not be related to the material of chapters two and three.

The third idea advanced with regard to the internal structure of 1 Chronicles 1-9:1a is the position of Levi. The first four tribes are arranged geographically and the rest have no discernable order. Levi may occupy the fifth position in order to divide the two groupings, since it is the tribe lacking territory and central to the cult.

Another is the delineation of Judah in the first position and that of Benjamin in the last. As noted this structure was crucial in explicating the "all Israel" theme.

The purpose of the genealogical section is theological. The numerous incidences where the Chronicler carefully used genealogical material in order to emphasize "all Israel," election, cultus, salvation, or Davidism demonstrate this. These themes also serve to support a unity between the genealogical and narrative sections of 1 and 2 Chronicles even though no dogmatic decision on this matter could be declared.

Finally, in the area of the original functions of the genealogies, no definitive statements can be made since there is little corroborative material nor in every case was there a prior function. As other scholars have stated, the military genealogies were used for mustering
troops and listing officers. The genealogy of 1 Chronicles 5:27-41 was the standard by which all the other priestly genealogies were confirmed as well as individual priests. 1 Chronicles 4 may reflect the alarm system used in Judah.
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