

# Reading the Pentateuch’s Genealogies after the Exile: The Chronicler’s Usage of Genesis 1–11 in Negotiating an All-Israelite Identity

LOUIS C. JONKER (UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH)

## ABSTRACT<sup>1</sup>

*From the first nine chapters of Chronicles it becomes clear that not only Samuel-Kings were used as sources by the Chronicler, but also the Pentateuch. The Chronicler was certainly one of the earliest readers of the Pentateuch (in whatever form) after the exile. The peculiarity of the Chronicler’s version of Israelite history starting with “Adam” has been noted by many scholars. It seems as if the Chronicler particularly found the genealogies in Gen 1–11 useful to legitimize a universal context for negotiating the identity of All-Israel in the late Persian Period. This contribution will examine some of the Chronicler’s genealogies in synoptic comparison with the genealogies of the Urgeschichte in order to determine how and why this exilic literature was used in Chronicles at a later stage in the literary history of the Hebrew Bible, as well as to establish what we can learn about the literary history of the Pentateuch from the Chronicler’s usage.*

## A INTRODUCTION

Although the Cinderella of biblical scholarship,<sup>2</sup> Chronicles studies, has developed into a blossoming princess in the past few decades, the value of this book for the studying of the literary history of earlier literature has as yet been underestimated. In the historiography debate Chronicles is still being relegated to the status of “tertiary evidence,” that means, it is regarded as a re-interpretation

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was first presented at the ProPent meeting of 2009 organised by Prof. Jurie le Roux of the University of Pretoria. I hereby express my gratitude for the invitation to take part in this annual Pentateuch conference, as well as for the critical engagement with my views of fellow conference participants during the discussion. This contribution already appeared in Norwegian translation in a *Festschrift* for Magnar Kartveit, cf. Louis C. Jonker, “Kronistens etter-eksilske lesning av Pentateukens genealogier,” in *Jerusalem, Samaria og jordens ender: Bibletolkninger tillegnet Magnar Kartveit, 65 år, 7. oktober 2011* (ed. Knut Holter and Jostein Ådne; Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2011), 33–46. I hereby thank the publisher for granting permission to publish the original English version. I also thank my assistant, Helen de Wet, for the formal-technical preparation of the manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> See Thomas Willi, “Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an Chronik und Esra-Nehemia,” *TRu* 67 (2002): 61–104. He provides a useful overview of developments in Chronicles research over the previous two decades.

tion of earlier biased biblical literature, and is therefore not attributed any value for the reconstruction of Ancient Israel's history.<sup>3</sup>

However, when it comes to the reconstruction of the literary history of earlier biblical material, a strong argument can in my opinion be advanced that the Chronicler is sitting in the front seat. Scholars are generally in agreement that the early versions of the Hebrew Bible texts can teach us a significant amount of their literary history. These versions, such as the early translations, Qumran *etcetera*, are considered to be in closer temporal proximity, and it is assumed that they might reflect something of the initial stages of the earlier biblical literature.

The same argument can be advanced with reference to Chronicles. The Chronicler (whoever he was, a singular writer, or a collective of some sorts) was one of the earliest readers of the Pentateuch. If one would assume that the final touches to the Pentateuch were made in the late Persian era, the Chronicler's work (which is normally dated at the end of the Persian era or beginning of the Hellenistic period) originated in close temporal proximity to this monumental literary work. The same holds true for the so-called Deuteronomistic History. The Chronicler made extensive use of this history, taking the courage to adapt, omit and even add to his source materials.

In this contribution I therefore want to address the question: What can the Chronicler's usage of Pentateuchal material teach us about the literary history of the latter? Let me admit in advance that I am not going to offer bold and final answers to this question! However, through this study I would like to prompt Pentateuch scholars to – at least – consider the question for a moment. The background of this challenge is that the Chronicler's usage of the Pentateuchal material is often (if not mostly) ignored in Pentateuchal debates.

Before embarking on the venture of this contribution, a methodological remark should be made. One should of course be aware of the following considerata:

- (i) The Chronicler often took the freedom to adapt his source materials in order to fit his own ideological plan. One should therefore not assume that the source materials resembled exactly the form they take in Chronicles. The implication for this investigation is then that one should work on both fronts simultaneously, namely to investigate the Chronicler's own purpose of adapting the source materials on the one hand, but on the other hand to reflect on what this usage of the source materials teach us about the source materials.

---

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the various perspectives on the historical value of Chronicles, see M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund and Steven L. McKenzie eds., *The Chronicler as Historian* (JSOTSup 238; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1997).

---

(ii) One should not assume that the Chronicler necessarily made use of source texts that were exactly the same as the Hebrew texts we are using today—in my case, the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* based on the *Codex Leningradensis*. In some cases it could well be that the Chronicler made use of a different or earlier form of the source texts.<sup>4</sup> Text-critical studies therefore should form an integral part of any synoptic comparison.<sup>5</sup>

Samuel-Kings were evidently the main sources of the Chronicler. However, the Pentateuch (in whatever form) was also used extensively. Since all references to Pentateuchal material occur in the genealogical introduction to *Chronicles* (1 Chr 1–9) this study will dwell on these nine chapters. Special attention will be given to the Chronicler's usage of the so-called *Urgeschichte*, Gen 1–11.

One should clarify at this point what I mean with the "usage" of earlier source materials. I make the distinction here between the strategy of including an exact or adapted version of the source material into the Chronicler's text on the one hand and the allusion to earlier textual traditions on the other. Whether earlier material was included or used should be determined on account of clear arguments that would relate the wording of the Chronicler's text to a source text. This relationship should be clear not only on a word level, but also on the level of more extensive literary units. Even when only a few words of a text (particularly in the case of genealogies) have been taken over, but it is completely clear that the new text follows the literary structure of the older text, direct usage can be assumed. One prominent example will suffice to explain this point: 1 Chr 1:1–4 offers a genealogy consisting of a mere list of names. Although we do not find this exact text in the Pentateuch, it becomes clear that the Chronicler used Gen 5:1–32 since the same names in the same order appear there. Although the majority of the material of Gen 5:1–32 was omitted by the Chronicler and only a few names have been taken over, there is no doubt that he made use of this Pentateuchal genealogy.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Auld and Ho are the main proponents of this view. See e.g. A. Graeme Auld, "What Was the Main Source of the Book of *Chronicles*?", in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture* (ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 263; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 91–100; Craig Y. S. Ho, "Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel XXXI 1–13 Really the Source of 1 *Chronicles* X 1–12?", *VT* 45 (1995): 82–106; Craig Y. S. Ho, "The Stories of the Family Troubles of Judah and David: A Study of Their Literary Links," *VT* 49 (1999): 514–31.

<sup>5</sup> See Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9* (AB 12; New York: Doubleday, 2003), 52–65.

<sup>6</sup> An alternative theory could be that both the Pentateuchal material and *Chronicles* could be traced back to a common source text.

Allusion functions more on a thematic level. Another example will explain this strategy. It is evident in 2 Chr 36:20–21 that the text of Lev 26:34–35, 43 is in the background. The notion of the exile being a time of Sabbath rest and the theme of desolation are clearly taken over from the text in Leviticus. However, in this case there is no direct usage in terms of wording, but rather a thematic allusion to the earlier text.

In the present study my focus will be on those cases where one can argue with a fair amount of certainty that the Pentateuchal texts (in whatever form) were directly used.

## B THE TEXTS IN SYNOPTIC COMPARISON

It is abundantly clear from 1 Chr 10 to 2 Chr 36 that the Chronicler made extensive use of the books Samuel and Kings. Another part of the so-called Deuteronomistic history, namely the Levitic city list in Josh 21 features in the Chronicler's description of these cities in 1 Chr 6.<sup>7</sup> The selective usage of the Deuteronomistic material by the Chronicler has led biblical scholars to reflect on which form of the Deuteronomistic history was used/available to the Chronicler. Reading the books of Chronicles has therefore become an important cross-checking exercise for studying the literary formation of the Deuteronomistic history.

Could the same exercise be performed for the Chronicler's usage of the Pentateuch? The Chronicler's usage of the Pentateuch is concentrated in the genealogical part, that is, in 1 Chr 1–9, with the last instance already in 8:1. Although the final judgment on this exercise will have to come from the side of Pentateuch specialists (which I am not!), I am of the opinion that this exercise can, at least, serve as another cross-checking mechanism for theories about the pre-life of the Pentateuch.

A synoptic comparison reveals the following with reference to the different sections of the Chronicler's genealogies:

### 1 From Adam to Abraham (1 Chronicles 1:1–27)

The first genealogy bridges the period from the first human, Adam to the proto-ancestor of Israel, Abraham. The introduction of the history of Israel according to the Chronicler with an intricately constructed set of genealogies in chs. 1–9 is in itself very interesting. Although the compilation of genealogies was nothing strange in Ancient Mesopotamia and Classical Greece, the introduction of a history with genealogies occurs infrequently, the historiographic work, The

---

<sup>7</sup> For a synoptic comparison of these texts, see Klein's discussion in Ralph W. Klein, *1 Chronicles* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 183–93.

*Troika* authored by Hellanicus, being one example.<sup>8</sup> What is special about the first genealogical list in 1 Chr 1:1-27 is the fact that it starts with the proto-human, Adam. The Deuteronomistic history (whose historical account is broadly followed by the Chronicler) begins with the figure of Moses. The Chronicler, however, situates the history of Israel within the context of the origin of humanity.

To achieve this peculiarity, the Chronicler made extensive use of (a selection of) the genealogies in the *Urgeschichte*. Close study of vv. 1-4 reveals that the same names in the same order were used compared to the genealogy provided in Gen 5:1-32. Although the Chronicler omitted all the detailed age indications and narrative information provided in the Gen 5 account, there is no doubt that this text was used by him. The same linear format (that is, where one representative of each generation forms the progression of the genealogy) was used compared to Gen 5.<sup>9</sup> It is also clear that the same construction (namely ten generations from Adam to Noah, which is most probably a literary creation and not a reflection of reality) was taken over from the *Vorlage*. This first part ends with the branching out into the three sons of Noah, namely Shem, Ham and Japheth, which also forms the conclusion to the Gen 5 genealogy.<sup>10</sup>

The next part in vv. 5-23 switches over to a segmented format (that is, where two or more children—normally sons—are mentioned per generation, and where one of these sons is selected for the progression to the next generation in the genealogy). In this case, the so-called Table of Nations in Gen 10:1-32 was used and the segmentation was adopted from this genealogy. Verse 1 of the Table of Nations was omitted by the Chronicler, probably in order to avoid the repetition of the names of Noah's three sons. The reference to the flood in v. 1 was also redundant for the Chronicler's purpose. Apart from the omission of the narrative information in Gen 10 (vv. 5, 9-12, 18b-21, 30-32), the Chronicler took over the three subsections of the Table of Nations unchanged and presented them in the same order (namely, Japheth, Ham, Shem). One small change, which is probably the result of some scribal error, occurs in 1 Chr 1:17 where the descendants of Shem and Aram were conflated.

<sup>8</sup> See the discussion in the excursus on genealogies offered by Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1-9*, 246-65 (particularly 259-60).

<sup>9</sup> This distinction was first made in the seminal work by Robert R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (Yale Near Eastern Researches 7; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).

<sup>10</sup> See Gary N. Knoppers, "Shem, Ham and Japheth: The Universal and the Particular in the Genealogy of Nations," in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Festschrift for Ralph W. Klein* (ed. M. Patrick Graham, Gary N. Knoppers and Steven L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 284; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 13-31.

The last part of the Chronicler's first genealogy returns to the linear format in vv. 24–27. Again, like in the first part, only the names are picked out from the fuller account in Gen 11:10–26. And again, like in the first part, ten generations are presented (in the same order than in the *Vorlage*). It is obvious that the Chronicler, by combining the three genealogies from the *Urgeschichte*, wanted to focus on the Shemite line that reaches Abraham in v. 27, without ignoring the interrelationship between the postdiluvian descendants of Noah's three sons.

Since our discussion will return to a more detailed interpretation of the Chronicler's usage of the *Urgeschichte* below, we now move on to the following genealogy.

## 2 Abraham's Descendants (1 Chronicles 1:28–2:2)

1 Chronicles 1:28 introduces a section which takes the genealogical history from Abraham to Jacob, or rather Israel as he is consistently called by the Chronicler, and his twelve sons. The format is again segmented, but the order of presentation clarifies the line of preference. Ishmael is first introduced (in vv. 29–31). After an insertion about Abraham's offspring with Keturah (vv. 32–33) the Isaac's line is presented shortly (v. 34). The fact that Isaac is mentioned after Ishmael places the emphasis on Isaac. The same strategy of presentation is followed in the remainder of the genealogy. The offspring of Esau are presented first (vv. 35–42), and Israel's sons only follow thereafter (2:1–2) to build the climax of this particular genealogy, and to provide a bridge to the next very extensive genealogy.

One can be fairly sure that the Chronicler used Pentateuchal material again for the construction of this particular genealogy. Two parts of the Pentateuchal patriarchal traditions feature prominently here. For the list of Ishmael's offspring, the Chronicler probably made use of Gen 25:13b–16a, and for the namelist of Abraham's children with Keturah Gen 25:1–4 were probably used (although Keturah was changed from a wife to a concubine, and the names of the sons of Dedan were omitted from the *Vorlage*).

For the genealogy of Esau the Chronicler probably relied selectively on Gen 36. However, one gets the impression from the names and order in Chronicles that this text could have been the *Vorlage* of the Chronicler. When it comes to the strange name list of Edomite kings and the clans of Edom represented in 1 Chr 1:43–50 and 51b–54 respectively, the impression that Gen 36 was used is confirmed. The Chronicler follows Gen 36:31–39 and 40–43a very closely.

For the bridge verses linking this genealogy to the next, 1 Chr 2:1–2, one of two different Pentateuchal sections (or both) could have been the *Vorlage*. The same twelve names are mentioned in Gen 35:23–26a and Exod 1:1–

5, although in both these cases Dan follows after Benjamin, whereas the Chronicler mentions Dan before Joseph.

### 3 Israel's Descendants (1 Chronicles 2:3–9:1a)

The most extensive and complex genealogy, namely that of the sons of Israel/Jacob, now follows in segmented format after the bridging passage in 2:1–2. The sons of Israel (although then in another order and different combination from 2:1–2 with Ephraim and Manasseh substituting Joseph, and Dan being omitted) are introduced in distinct subsections of the genealogy that extends from 2:3–9:1a, concluding with the remark in 9:1a that "all Israel was enrolled by genealogies." Some scholars are of the opinion that these subsections are structured in such a way that Judah (in the first position) and Benjamin (in the last position) are highlighted, and that emphasis is also placed on Levi (occupying the middle position in this extensive genealogy).<sup>11</sup> The other parts of the segmented genealogy include the other tribes (from the Transjordan and the north) into the family of Israel. These aspects of the genealogical construction are certainly quite significant, but our focus in the present discussion is to indicate how the Pentateuch was used here.

Two Pentateuchal sections stand out in a synoptic comparison, namely Gen 46 and Num 26. Although the material was used very selectively and the order of presentation was mostly changed, one could argue fairly confidently that Gen 46:8–25 and Num 26:5–57 (in whatever form) must have been available to the Chronicler. The majority of material included in this extensive genealogy belongs to the Chronicler's *Sondergut*, but names taken from these Pentateuchal chapters were employed by the Chronicler in all subsections of the genealogy of Israel's sons.

Two other Pentateuchal passages feature in this genealogy. In the subsections dealing with Simeon (1 Chr 4:24–43) and Reuben (in 5:1–26) it is obvious that the Chronicler must have had Exod 6:14–15 at his disposal. The parallel between 1 Chr 4:24 and Exod 6:15 (Simeon) might be somewhat precarious, but a comparison between 1 Chr 5:3 and Exod 6:14 reveals an almost exact parallel. Exodus 6 also features in another subsection, namely the very complex genealogy of Levi in 1 Chr 6:1–81 (MT: 5:27–6:66). The fact that verbal similarities exist for the basic structure of the Levite family list, that is, for Levi and each of his three sons, Gershon/n, Kohath and Merari, leaves the impression that at least Exod 6:16–19 must have been available to the Chronicler. These texts also find a parallel in another Pentateuchal text, namely in Num 3. However, there the parallel is limited with only Num 3:17 paralleling 1 Chron 6:1 (MT: 5:27).

<sup>11</sup> See Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 260–265; James T. Sparks, *The Chronicler's Genealogies: Towards an Understanding of 1 Chronicles 1–9* (Academia Biblica 28; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 29–31.

#### 4 Jerusalem's Post-Exilic Inhabitants and Cultic Officials (1 Chron 9:1b–34) and Saul's Descendants (1 Chron 9:35–44)

The last two sections in the Chronicler's genealogical introduction to his book contain no references to the Pentateuch. The list in 1 Chr 9:1b–34 contains the names of the post-exilic community and inhabitants of Jerusalem. By including this information in the genealogical introduction the Chronicler created a sense of continuity between the Israel of the past and the post-exilic community in Yehud. The last section (9:35–44) deals again with Saul who was already mentioned in the Benjaminite genealogy. However, this last section leads over to the narrative section where the history of Saul opens the Chronicler's account in 1 Chr 10. Although these last two sections of the genealogical introduction are quite significant in Chronicles studies, they can be ignored for the purpose of our discussion here, since no Pentateuchal references occur here. Let me now summarise our observations on the texts:

From the *Urgeschichte* there is no doubt that the genealogies in Gen 5 and 11:10–26 were used by the Chronicler. Also the Table of Nations (at least the following selection: vv. 2–4, 6–8, 13–18, 22–29) must have been available to the Chronicler. The following list summarizes the other Pentateuchal texts that were—in all probability—used by the Chronicler:

Gen 25:1–3a, 4, 13–16a

Gen 35:23–26

Gen 36:10–13a, 20–28, 31–39, 40b–43a

Gen 46:8–9, 10–13, 17, 21a, 24–25a

Exod 1:1a, 2–4

Exod 6:14a, 15–19

Num 3:17

Num 26:5–6, 12–13, 19–25, 29a, 35a, 38a, 40a, 44–45, 48–49, 57

#### C DISCUSSION

The question is now whether these references show any patterns. Of course one could argue (according to some theories about the Pentateuchal origin)<sup>12</sup> that

<sup>12</sup> For an overview of the history of Pentateuchal scholarship, see Jean-Louis Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (trans. Sr. Pascale Dominique; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006): particularly chs. 6 and 7. For a theory taking the Henneteuch as point of departure, see Jan C. Gertz, "I. Tora und Vordere Propheten," in *Grundinformation Altes Testament* (ed. Jan C. Gertz, with Angelika Berlejung, Konrad Schmid and Markus Witte; 3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009):

the Pentateuch in its final form was available to the Chronicler, and that the Chronicler merely quoted selectively from certain genealogical sections. However, such a view would presuppose certain opinions on the relative dating of the final form of the Pentateuch and Chronicles. There is a growing consensus among Chronicles scholars that this book originated most probably around the middle of the 4th century B.C.E., that is, the final years of Persian imperial domination.<sup>13</sup> Most Chronicles scholars would not deny that some finishing touches to Chronicles could have taken place in the early Hellenistic era, that is, the period following the conquest of Alexander the Great. However, Chronicles probably reflects the social-political dynamics of the late Persian era. If one assumes that the Chronicler had a fairly final form of the Pentateuch at his disposal, this would presuppose an earlier dating (probably by a century or so) for the finalization of the first books of the Hebrew Bible.

When one considers the whole spectrum of theories about the Pentateuchal formation and finalisation, however, it could be a useful exercise—as a cross-checking mechanism—to determine whether the Chronicler's later usage of Pentateuchal material reflects anything about the presumed pre-stages of the Pentateuch. The multiplicity of Pentateuchal theories of course complicates this exercise. However, certain patterns emerging from our textual observations might be interesting.

The following table gives an indication of the materials from the *Urgeschichte* that were used by the Chronicler, and how these materials are categorised by Noth and Westermann:<sup>14</sup>

---

193–311. For still other views, see Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach, eds., *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004); Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson, eds., *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007).

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of the debate about the date of Chronicles, see Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 101–117.

<sup>14</sup> See Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions: Translated with an Introduction by Bernard W. Anderson* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981); Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (vol. 1 of *Genesis*; 3rd ed.; BKAT I/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983).

Pentateuch material		Noth	Westermann
Gen 5	1-28	P	P
	29	J	P
	30-32	P	P
Gen 10	2-4	P	P
	6-7	P	P
	8	J	J
	13-18	J	J
	24	P	P
	22-23	P	J
	25-29	J	J
Gen 11	10-26	P	P

There is general agreement among Genesis scholars that the genealogies in Gen 5:1-32 and 11:10-26<sup>15</sup> should be attributed to the Priestly Writing (P).<sup>16</sup> There are minor differences among scholars on the origin of this material. One small difference is, for example, that Westermann differs from Noth with reference to Gen 5:29 in attributing this verse also to P (like the rest of the genealogy).

The situation is more complicated with regard to the Table of Nations in Gen 10.<sup>17</sup> Scholars agree that this list was composed from different source materials. Although a P version of this list forms the backbone, some non-priestly material was also included by the final redactor. The Chronicler probably quotes from a version of the Table of Nations which already includes both

<sup>15</sup> See Travis R. Freeman, "A New Look at the Genesis 5 and 11 Fluidity Problem," *AUSS* 42/2 (2004): 259-286.

<sup>16</sup> For an overview of studies on P, see Eckart Otto, "Forschungen zur Priester- schrift," *TRu* 62/1 (1997), 1-50. See also Naomi Steinberg, "The Genealogical Framework of the Family Stories in Genesis," *Semeia* 46 (1989): 41-50; Avi Hurvitz, "Once Again: The Linguistic Profile of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch and its Historical Age. A Response to J. Blenkinsopp," *ZAW* 112/2 (2000): 180-191; Susan Boorer, "The Paradigmatic and Historiographical Nature of the Priestly Material as a Key to its Interpretation," in *Seeing Signals, Reading Signs: The Art of Exegesis. Studies in honour of Anthony F. Campbell for his seventieth birthday* (ed. Mark A. O'Brien and Howard N. Wallace; London: T & T Clark, 2004), 45-60; Menachem Haran, "Ezekiel, P, and the Priestly School," *VT* 58 (2008): 211-218.

<sup>17</sup> See the study on Gen 10 by Bustenay Oded, "The Table of Nations (Genesis 10) – A Socio-cultural approach," *ZAW* 98/1 (1986): 14-31. See also Thomas Staubli, "Ver- ortung im Weltganzen: Die Geschlechterfolgen der Urgeschichte mit einem Ikonogra- phischen Exkurs zur Völkertafel," *BK* 58/1 (2003): 20-29; Israel Knohl, "Nimrod, Son of Cush, King of Mesopotamia, and the Dates of P and J," in *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism presented to Shalom M. Paul on the occasion of his seventieth birthday* (ed. Chaim Cohen; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 45-52.

priestly and non-priestly material, and which therefore reflects a later stage in the literary history of this specific section.

Let us now consider the materials coming from other parts of the Pentateuch (with the categorisations of Noth, Westermann and Blum):<sup>18</sup>

Pentateuch material		Noth	Westermann	Blum
Gen 25	1–3a, 4	Sec.	Sec.	P?
	13–16a	P	P	P
Gen 35	23–26	P	P	P?
Gen 36	10–13a	P	P	P?
	20–28	Ext. P	P	P?
	31–39, 40b–43a	Ext. P	Ext. P	P?
Gen 46	8–13, 17, 21a, 24–25a	P	P	P
Exod 1	1a, 2–4	P	---	P
Exod 6	14a, 15–19	P	---	P
Num 3	17	P	---	??
Num 26	5–6, 12–13, 19–25, 29a, 35a, 38a, 40a, 44–45, 48–49, 57	Ext. P	---	Ext. P

It seems that some pattern is emerging here (depending of course on whose theory of Pentateuchal composition is accepted). From the table it becomes clear that representatives of different Pentateuchal theories (such as the theory of a more or less independent P source advocated in classical form by Martin Noth and approximately followed by Claus Westermann in his *Genesis* commentary, as well as the theory of a priestly composition advocated by Erhard Blum) agree that it was mostly materials with a priestly character that were used by the Chronicler. The disputed verses at the beginning of Gen 25 are seen as secondary additions to the text by Noth and Westermann, but not as non-priestly material. Other sections are regarded as postpriestly extensions, but are still priestly in character.

After considering these two tables could one then speak of a priestly preference by the Chronicler? The composition of the Table of Nations of

<sup>18</sup> See Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*; Claus Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (vol. 2 of *Genesis*; 2nd ed.; BKAT I/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989); Claus Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (vol. 3 of *Genesis*; 2nd ed.; BKAT I/3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1992); Erhard Blum, *Die Komposition der Vatergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984); Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990).

course cautions us not to be too quick to come to such a conclusion. However, it seems at least that there was a very strong tendency with the Chronicler to make use of priestly material.

One should ask why the Chronicler treated the priestly material preferentially. The answer to this question might be very simple, namely, the Chronicler was looking for genealogical material to include as an introduction to his history work, and the priestly writings happened to provide this kind of material. However, we also know of non-priestly genealogical material, such as Gen 4 (the Cain genealogy) that was not included by the Chronicler.

There might also be a more ideological reason (which will be taken up in a section below in more detail): The Chronicler wanted to merge two traditions in his work, namely the Deuteronomistic tradition (which formed the main source for his historical work) and the priestly tradition. Priestly material from the Pentateuch was then selected in order to achieve this aim.

But could the literary history of the Priestly writing present us with another possible theory of why the Chronicler gave preference to priestly material? Does the pattern we observe in the Chronicler's usage of Pentateuchal material shed any light on the burning questions about (particularly) the dating and ending of the Priestly Writing?

These questions should rather be left to Pentateuchal specialists to answer. It would be wiser for me—a non-specialist in Pentateuchal matters—to now turn to a discussion of the Chronicler's intention with the inclusion of these genealogies. In the following section I will dwell particularly on the Chronicler's usage of the genealogies from the *Urgeschichte*.

#### **D A CLOSER LOOK AT THE CHRONICLER'S USAGE OF THE URGESCHICHTE**

It has already been hinted at above that the inclusion of Priestly genealogies in the Chronicler's construction might have had an ideological motivation. A thorough analysis of Chronicles reveals that there is a strong tendency in the book to harmonize the Deuteronomic and Priestly traditions with one another. This can be observed on terminological and thematic levels. For example, the Chronicler's description of the Passover celebrations of Hezekiah (2 Chr 30) and Josiah (2 Chr 35) reveals that he made a deliberate attempt to reconcile the Priestly and Deuteronomic traditions concerning Passover. The indications of the sacrificial animals as well as the method of preparation of the sacrifices show signs of both these traditions.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> See my discussion in Louis C. Jonker, *Josiah in the Chronicler's Mirror: Late Stages of the Josiah Reception in II Chr 34f.* (TSLKHB 2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2003), 64–70. Bernd Janowski comes to a similar conclusion: "... der

Chronicles scholars normally relate this harmonization tendency to the Chronicler's view on the Levites and the priesthood. The Chronicler apparently argued for equity among the different parts of the Second Temple priesthood. Knoppers, for example, indicates: "There is no question that one encounters both pro-Priestly and pro-Levitical passages in Chronicles. Nor is there any doubt that the work draws from Priestly tradition in certain contexts, but from Deuteronomistic tradition in others. Rather than an indelible mark of literary disunity, these passages evince the author's concern to mediate different perspectives within the context of the late Persian or early Hellenistic age."<sup>20</sup>

For Knoppers and other Chronicles scholars this is an indication of the Chronicler's "ability to acknowledge and negotiate different ideological perspectives, and his capacity for pursuing his own agenda as he engages in a variety of earlier biblical traditions."<sup>21</sup>

Could this also be true for the Chronicler's inclusion of the (mostly) Priestly material from the Pentateuch? Could the tendency we observe on a terminological and thematic level also be observable in the macro-structure of the book? The Chronicler used the Deuteronomistic version of the past (mainly from Samuel-Kings) to present his version of this history (or, to be more specific, of the United Kingdom and the Kingdom of Judah). However, this Deuteronomistic version of history was placed in a priestly macro-context by the insertion of mostly priestly material in the genealogical introduction.

What difference does this make to the interpretation of the past? The Deuteronomistic version of the past starts with the conquest of the land with a period of tribal existence following the entering of the land. Thereafter follows the development of the monarchy and its manifestation in the United Israel as well as in the division of the kingdom. This version ends with both kingdoms in exile.

The usage of the *Urgeschichte* by the Chronicler creates another context for the history of Israel. The Chronicler's version starts with the proto-human, Adam. With this introduction a universal framework for the understanding of the past is immediately opened. This universal framework does not exclude the family line of Israel. The universal genealogy in fact runs from Adam to Abraham to Israel and his twelve sons. And from there it continues into the post-

Chronist (ist) in 2 Chr 35,1–19 bestrebt, die dtm Passaüberlieferung (Dtn 16,1–8) mit der nachexilischen Praxis, in der sich bereits priesterschriftliche Elemente durchgesetzt hatten ..., in Einklang zu bringen und so eine Kompromisslösung zu schaffen," cf. Bernd Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (WMANT 55; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 249.

<sup>20</sup> Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 92.

<sup>21</sup> Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 92.

exilic community during the Chronicler's time. But the line of Israel which enters the Chronicler's own time in 1 Chr 8 is placed within the universal context of humanity.

The closing section of Chronicles confirms this interpretation of the book. The last two verses (2 Chr 36:22–23) introduce Cyrus, the Persian king in a prophet-like manner: "Thus says Cyrus, the king of Persia: The Lord has told me ...." (own translation). The Chronicler's version of history does not end in exile, but rather opens new perspectives on the post-exilic reality of Persian domination. The universal framework provided by the *Urgeschichte* genealogies in the introduction finds its continuation in this last passage where the reader of the Chronicler's history breaks out of the confinement of an inner-Israelite understanding. The "All Israel" of the Chronicler is a community which certainly stands in continuity with the past, but is firmly situated in the socio-political context of his own time.

#### **E "PENTATEUCH AND EXILE" COMPARED TO "CHRONICLES AND EXILE"**

In a recent article Pamela Scalise<sup>22</sup> distinguishes eight different understandings of what "exile" could mean in the OT:

- (i) Exile as part of the canonical story of the Hebrew Bible;
- (ii) Exile as seventy years;
- (iii) The exile of the temple vessels;
- (iv) Exile before and after "the Exile";
- (v) Exile as ideology;
- (vi) Exile as a desirable identity;
- (vii) Exile as condition of marginality;
- (viii) "Exile" as a theological identity.

With this distinction in mind one could reflect on which view on "Exile" can be found in the Pentateuch and Chronicles respectively. Although one may assume (on account of the various scholarly theories about dating) that the Pentateuch as well as the so-called Deuteronomistic History were finalised in the post-exilic era, I would like to argue that an "exile after the exile" or an "exilic identity" is still reflected in these literary constructions. If the pending

<sup>22</sup> Pamela Scalise, "The End of the Old Testament: Reading Exile in the Hebrew Bible," *PRSt* 35 (2008): 163–178. See also Bradley C. Gregory, "The Postexilic Exile in Third Isaiah: Isaiah 61:1–3 in Light of Second Temple Hermeneutics," *JBL* 126/3 (2007): 475–96.

conquest of the land is considered to be a metaphor for an envisioned return to the land after the Babylonian exile, the desert existence could equally be seen as a metaphor for the exile itself. The final construction of the Pentateuch leaves the reader in the desert. The desert existence is certainly the place which reveals Yahweh's will for his people (Sinai), and it is certainly this existence that creates the expectation and hope of the occupation of the promised land. But the Pentateuch ends in the desert with Moses dying in Transjordan.

The Deuteronomistic History (in its final construction) starts with the conquest of the land, but the initial expectations accompanying this conquest and the Davidic-Solomonic kingship gradually fade until the narrative leads the reader into the Babylonian exilic existence, with no indication of liberation.

On account of these macro-thematic lines in both the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History I want to argue that the post-exilic communities finalising these literary constructions worked from a mindset which was still captivated by the exilic experience. Although the liberation from Babylonian captivity has already taken place, both these literary constructions still grapple with this experience.

Chronicles is different! We have already seen above that the Chronicler, with the inclusion of the mostly priestly genealogies from the Pentateuch, and with the addition of the ending with Cyrus speaking on behalf of God, has created a universalistic context for understanding the history of Israel. This history is in continuity with the past, but simultaneously breaks out of the confines of the past.

It should be noted that the Chronicler skips over the desert existence in his reconstruction of history. Although Moses, Aaron and their descendants are mentioned in the genealogies, and although genealogical material was taken over from the census list in Num 26, the Chronicler's genealogical introduction which summarises the Pentateuchal traditions (the priestly material in particular) does not reflect the existence in the desert.

Could this be another indication that the mindset of the Chronicler was not an "exilic" one? The Chronicler is not primarily reflecting on the past in order to establish what went wrong so that Israel landed up in exile. He is rather reflecting on how Israel's past would situate the people in a new dispensation—a dispensation which became a reality because they were liberated from exilic bondage by the Persians.

Could one perhaps say that the Chronicler led both the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History "out of exile" into a new existence which necessitated a renegotiation of their self-understanding?<sup>23</sup>

## F CONCLUSION

In this contribution I offered a detailed analysis of the Chronicler's usage of Pentateuchal material as well as an interpretation of the universalistic framework created by the Chronicler with his inclusion of the priestly genealogies from the *Urgeschichte*. In doing so I posed certain questions from the Chronicler's side to those scholars studying the literary history and composition of the Pentateuch. Should anybody still consider to ignore the Chronicler's material, let me conclude then with a quote from St. Jerome:<sup>24</sup>

The book of things omitted or epitome of the old dispensation is of such importance and value that without it any one who should claim to himself a knowledge of the scriptures [or, of the Pentateuch, for that matter—L.C.J.] would make himself a laughing stock in his own eyes.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auld, A. Graeme. "What Was the Main Source of the Book of Chronicles?" Pages 91-100 in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. Edited by M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Blum, Erhard. *Die Komposition der Vatergeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 57. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984.

—. *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 189. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990.

Boorer, Susan. "The Paradigmatic and Historiographical Nature of the Priestly Material as a Key to its Interpretation." Pages 45-60 in *Seeing Signals, Reading Signs: The Art of Exegesis*. Edited by Mark A. O'Brien and Howard N. Wallace. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Freeman, Travis R. "A New Look at the Genesis 5 and 11 Fluidity Problem." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 42/2 (2004): 259-286.

Gertz, Jan C. "I. Tora und Vordere Propheten." Pages 193-311 in *Grundinformation Altes Testament*. Edited by Jan C. Gertz, with Angelika Berlejung, Konrad Schmid and Markus Witte. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.

<sup>23</sup> I hereby acknowledge the interesting contribution of Eckart Otto in our discussion at the mentioned conference. According to Otto, the Pentateuch has already led P and D out of exile, and the Chronicler is continuing this trend.

<sup>24</sup> *The Letters of St. Jerome* 53 (NPNF<sup>2</sup> 6.53.8), n.p. [15 August 2009]. Online: [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Nicene\\_and\\_Post-Nicene\\_Fathers:\\_Series\\_II/Volume\\_VI/The\\_Letters\\_of\\_St.\\_Jerome/Letter\\_53](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Nicene_and_Post-Nicene_Fathers:_Series_II/Volume_VI/The_Letters_of_St._Jerome/Letter_53).

---

Graham, M. Patrick, Kenneth G. Hoglund and Steven L. McKenzie, eds. *The Chronicler as Historian*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 238; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1997.

Gregory, Bradley. C. "The Postexilic Exile in Third Isaiah: Isaiah 61:1-3 in Light of Second Temple Hermeneutics." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126/3 (2007): 475-96.

Haran, Menachem. "Ezekiel, P, and the Priestly School." *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 211-218.

Ho, Craig Y. S. "Conjectures and Refutations: Is 1 Samuel XXXI 1-13 Really the Source of 1 Chronicles X 1-12?" *Vetus Testamentum* 45 (1995): 82-106.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Stories of the Family Troubles of Judah and David: A Study of Their Literary Links." *Vetus Testamentum* 49 (1999): 514-31.

Hurvitz, Avi. "Once Again: The Linguistic Profile of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch and its Historical Age: A Response to J. Blenkinsopp." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112/2 (2000): 180-191.

Janowski, Bernd. *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnethеologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Monografien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 55. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982.

Jonker, Louis C. *Josiah in the Chronicler's mirror: Late stages of the Josiah Reception in II Chr 34f*. Textpragmatische Studien zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte der Hebräischen Bibel 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Kronistens etter-eksilske lesning av Pentateukens genealogier." Pages 33-46 in *Jerusalem, Samaria og jordens ender: Bibletolkninger tillegnet Magnar Kartveit, 65 år, 7. oktober 2011*. Edited by Knut Holter and Jostein Ådna. Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2011.

Klein, Ralph W. *1 Chronicles*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.

Knohl, Israel. "Nimrod, Son of Cush, King of Mesopotamia, and the Dates of P and J." Pages 45-52 in *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Chaim Cohen. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Shem, Ham and Japheth: The Universal and the Particular in the Genealogy of Nations." Pages 13-31 in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Festschrift for Ralph W. Klein*. Edited by Patrick M. Graham, Gary N. Knoppers and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 284. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_. *1 Chronicles 1-9*. Anchor Bible 12. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

Knoppers, Gary N. and Bernard M. Levinson, eds. *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions: Translated with an Introduction by Bernard W. Anderson*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981.

Oded, Bustenay. "The Table of Nations (Genesis 10) – A Socio-Cultural approach." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98/1 (1986): 14-31.

Otto, Eckart. "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift." *Theologische Rundschau* 62/1 (1997): 1-50.

---

Otto, Eckart and Reinhard Achenbach, eds. *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 206. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

Scalise, Pamela. "The End of the Old Testament: Reading Exile in the Hebrew Bible." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 35 (2008): 163–178.

Ska, Jean-Louis. *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Translated by Sr. Pascale Dominique. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Sparks, James T. *The Chronicler's Genealogies*. Academia Biblica 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Staubli, Thomas. "Verortung im Weltganzen: Die Geschlechterfolgen der Urgeschichte mit einem Ikonographischen Exkurs zur Völkertafel." *Bibel und Kirche* 58/1 (2003): 20-29.

Steinberg, Naomi. "The Genealogical Framework of the Family Stories in Genesis." *Semeia* 46 (1989): 41-50.

St. Jerome. *The Letters of St. Jerome*. In vol. 6 the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Series II. Edited by Philip Schaff. 1886-1889. 14 vols. [15 August 2009]. Online: [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Nicene\\_and\\_Post-Nicene\\_Fathers:\\_Series\\_II/Volume\\_VI/The\\_Letters\\_of\\_St.\\_Jerome/Letter\\_53](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Nicene_and_Post-Nicene_Fathers:_Series_II/Volume_VI/The_Letters_of_St._Jerome/Letter_53).

Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1-11*. Vol. 1 of *Genesis*. 3rd ed. Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament I/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Genesis 12-36*. Vol. 2 of *Genesis*. 2nd ed. Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament I/2: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Genesis 37-50*. Vol. 3 of *Genesis*. 2nd ed. Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament I/2: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1992.

Willi, Thomas. "Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an Chronik und Esra-Nehemia." *Theologische Rundschau* 67 (2002): 61–104.

Wilson, Robert R. *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*. Yale Near Eastern Researches 7. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Prof. Louis Jonker, Discipline Group Old & New Testament, Faculty of Theology, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa. *Email:* lcj@sun.ac.za