

ECHOES OF GENESIS IN THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES: THEIR INCIDENCE AND SIGNIFICANCE*

Scholars continue to ask about the *Vorlage* at the Chronicler's disposal in his historical rewriting. One of the key questions is: Where did the Chronicler get the additional material ¹ found in the book? Several hypotheses have been raised:

1. The Chronicler had at his disposal early independent sources (such as the Qumran scrolls) ² or, alternatively, an earlier and expanded version of the Books of Samuel and Kings ³.
2. The additional material is written by the author himself (*Sondergut*) ⁴.
3. The material that the Books of Samuel and Kings have in common with Chronicles is from an early source; that which they do not share is derived from expansions and additions from the Hellenistic period ⁵.

* My thanks go to Prof. Michael Avioz for reading the first draft of this article and helping improve it via his constructive comments.

¹ The phrase "additional material" refers to material found in Chronicles that is not found in the Bible generally or in the Books of Samuel and Kings in particular. As Macy pointed out in his PhD thesis, over 60% of the Book of Chronicles — not including the first nine chapters — is comprised of additional material. See H.R. MACY, *The Sources of the Books of Chronicles. A Reassessment* (PhD diss., Harvard University 1976) 32-37.

² Cross argues that the *Vorlage* for the stories in the Books of Samuel was the Qumran Scrolls and not necessarily the Masoretic text of the Book of Samuel; see F.M. CROSS, "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries", *IEJ* 16 (1966) 81-95. McKenzie, his student, continued this line of reasoning; see S.L. MCKENZIE, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM 33; Atlanta, GA 1985). See also W.E. LEMKE, "The Synoptic Problem of the Chronicler's History", *HTHR* 58 (1965) 349-363, here 362.

³ See A.F. RAINEY, "The Chronicler and his Sources Historical and Geographical", *The Chronicler as Historian* (eds. M.P. GRAHM – K.G. HOGLUND – S.L. MCKENZIE) (JSOTSup 238; Sheffield 1997) 30-72. Cf. Z. TALSHIR, "The Advantage of the Book of Kings over the Book of Chronicles", *OR LE-MAYER. Studies in Bible, Semitic Languages, Rabbinic Literature, and Ancient Civilizations Presented to Mayer Gruber on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. S. YONA) (Beer Sheva 2010) 159-182, here 159-161 (Hebrew).

⁴ See C.C. TORREY, *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* (BZAW 2; Berlin 1896) 52; P. WELTN, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern* (Neukirchen 1973) 205-206; K. STRÜBIND, *Tradition als Interpretation in der Chronik. König Josaphat als Paradigma chronistischer Hermeneutik und Theologie* (BZAW 201; Berlin 1991) 204-206.

⁵ This outlook is attributed to Auld; see A.G. AULD, *Kings without Privilege. David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh 1990). This opinion has been almost universally rejected; see S.L. MCKENZIE, "The Chronicler as Redactor", *The Chronicler as Author. Studies in Text and Texture* (eds. M.P. GRAHM – S.L. MCKENZIE) (JSOTSup 263; Sheffield 1999) 70-90; Z. TALSHIR, "The Reign of Solomon in the Making: Pseudo-Connections between 3 Kingdoms and Chronicles", *VT* 50 (2000) 233-249. Knoppers, however, has identified some important facets in Auld's work; see G.N. KNOPPERS,

This question need not be answered through an all-or-nothing approach. I believe we can assume that the Chronicler combined material of his own composition with material from sources that did not reach the Deuteronomist (or, alternatively, that the Deuteronomist preferred not to use), and therefore, each case must be examined on its own merits. Even where there is reason to believe that a particular section of text is *Sondergut*, we should not presume that the Chronicler operated in a vacuum. The style of these additions was not necessarily the Chronicler's free invention, but rather relied in large measure on the sacred writings to which he had access. Steven Schweizer, for example, counts dozens of cases where the Chronicler adopts the style of various biblical books, mainly from the Pentateuch⁶. David Glatt-Gilad believes that the stylistic borrowing, not to mention the duplication of the content, from these books (particularly the Pentateuch) is intended to impart authoritative weight to the invented material⁷. In this way, the material for which no earlier source text could be found could nonetheless acquire authority. Through the new material's style and language, the reader would instinctively sense its kinship with other sacred writings, or at least would feel that the new material should be given due consideration.

Here I would like to ask: Was the borrowing from other books a mere stylistic strategy employed to establish the authoritative weight of the additions, or was it also thematic? In other words, did the Chronicler quote from source material for aesthetic purposes, or did he, through the use of these texts, endeavor to transmit to the Book of Chronicles the meaning the texts bore in their original context?

I will seek to answer this question through an examination of the connections between the Books of Genesis and Chronicles⁸. An investigation of the Book of Chronicles (especially 1 Chronicles) will reveal that there is a solid basis for assuming that the Chronicler had access to Genesis,

1 Chronicles 1–9. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB; New York 2004) 66–67.

⁶ See S.J. SCHWEITZER, "Judging a Book by Its Citations: Sources and Authority in Chronicles", *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles?* (eds. E. BEN-ZVI – D. EDELMAN) (Winona Lake, IN 2011) 37–65, here 53–54. The terms "biblical" and "Pentateuch" are somewhat anachronistic since we cannot assume that these terms were prevalent or even in use during the time of the Chronicler. Of course, this depends largely on the dating of the book. See Schweizer's important remarks regarding this issue ("Judging a Book by Its Citations", 38).

⁷ See D. GLATT-GILAD, "Chronicles as Consensus Literature", *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles?* (eds. E. BEN ZVI – D. EDELMAN) (Winona Lake, IN 2011) 67–76, here 68.

⁸ Up to now, scholars have discussed mainly the thematic and terminological relationships between the books of Numbers and Chronicles; see H.P. MATHYS, "Numeri und Chronik: Nahe Verwandte", *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. T. RÖMER) (Leuven 2008) 555–578; L.C. JONKER, "Numbers and Chronicles: False Friends or Close Relatives?", *HeBAI* 8 (2019) 332–377.

or at least large parts of it, and that he often used it, especially in his free writing, that is, in those portions of Chronicles that do not reflect any part of the *Vorlage*. I would like to show that the quotations from and references to the Book of Genesis are not merely aesthetic, but were used with the intention of imparting to the new composition the meaning they bore in their original context in Genesis. In this way, the Book of Chronicles would become a platform that reverberates with the covenants and promises given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, thereby providing encouragement and inspiration to the people of Yehud.

Before I expound on the scope and significance of the Chronicler's use of material from Genesis, I will address a few methodological issues. First, how can we distinguish between affinities that are intentional, those that are coincidental, and those that result from the strategic use of a particular style? Another issue relates to the canonical status of Genesis in the Persian period. Did the Chronicler have access to a canonized form of Genesis? If so, was this book identical to the Book of Genesis we have today, or did the Chronicler have a different version ⁹?

The subject of affinity between two biblical texts has received considerable attention from scholars in recent years ¹⁰. Many have tried to offer clear guidelines to address the question of whether textual affinities are the result of authorial intention, chance, or technique. Below I will seek to follow in the footsteps of Yair Hoffman, who differentiated three levels of affinity between two texts. The first and most important measure is citations, the second is references, and the third is allusions ¹¹. Hoffman believes that the second and third levels (reference and allusion) are relevant only after it has been proven that an affinity of citations exists between two texts.

⁹ VanderKam, for example, argues that the Chronicler used the Samaritan version of the Book of Genesis; see J.C. VANDERKAM, "The Textual Affinities of Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon", *JBL* 97 (1978) 45-55, here 47.

¹⁰ See S. MOYISE, "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament", *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (ed. S. MOYISE) (Sheffield 2000) 14-44.

¹¹ See Y. HOFFMAN, "The First Creation Story (Gen. 1,1 – 2,3): Canonical and Diachronic Aspects", *Samaritan, Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*. Presented to Professor Abraham Tal (eds. M. BAR-ASHER – A. TAL) (Jerusalem 2005) 135-158 (Hebrew). Hoffman's decision to use only three terms helps to simplify the great confusion involved in the use of terms of inner-biblical interpretation. Porter, for example, lists no fewer than fifteen terms: "Citation, direct quotation, formal quotation, indirect quotation, allusive quotation, allusion (whether conscious or unconscious), paraphrase, exegesis (such as inner-biblical exegesis), midrash, typology, reminiscence, echo (whether conscious or unconscious), intertextuality, influence (either direct or indirect), and even tradition, among other terms"; see S.E. PORTER, "The Use of Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology", *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scripture of Israel* (eds. C.A. EVANS – J.A. SANDERS) (Sheffield 1997) 79-97, here 80.

We must now discuss which version of Genesis was in the hands of the Chronicler. By its nature, this question combines the problem of the composition date of Chronicles with the problem of the composition date of Genesis. With regard to the composition date of Chronicles, opinions vary, ranging from the end of the sixth century (520-515 BCE) to the middle of the second century (160 BCE). The currently predominant view among scholars is that the book was written at the beginning of the Hellenistic period but before the influence of Greek culture on the country's inhabitants intensified (328-300 BCE) ¹².

The nature of the composition process of the Pentateuch in general and the Book of Genesis in particular is an immensely complex subject that need not be addressed in the framework of this article. In short, many models have been presented over the years striving to describe the development of the Pentateuch, starting from the four-source hypothesis (J, E, D, and P) and ending with modern approaches that have almost completely abandoned this hypothesis and presented alternative theories in its place ¹³. Despite the variety and details in these approaches, it can be said that in the opinion of the vast majority of scholars there is a solid basis for assuming that at the end of the late fourth century BCE (the time of the composition of the Book of Chronicles), the Pentateuch (including Genesis) was sufficiently established such that the Chronicler was able to study it and borrow its style and content ¹⁴.

¹² For an extensive discussion with regard to the dating of the book, see K. PELTONEN, "A Jigsaw without a Model? The Dating of Chronicles", *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period* (ed. L.L. GRABBE) (Sheffield 2001) 225-271. See also the brief review in R.W. KLEIN, *1 Chronicles. A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2006) 13-16.

¹³ A complete review of the vast literature on this topic is beyond the scope of this article; a brief but particularly helpful overview is found in R. ALBERTZ, "The Recent Discussion on the Formation of the Pentateuch/Hexateuch", *Beit Mikra* 55 (2010) 5-38 (Hebrew).

¹⁴ KLEIN, *1 Chronicles*, 16; K. SCHMID, "The Late Persian Formation of the Torah: Observation on Deuteronomy 34", *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (eds. O. LIPSCHITZ – G.N. KNOPPERS – R. ALBERTZ) (Winona Lake, IN 2007) 236-245, here 237 n. 1; R.G. KRATZ, "The Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate", *The Pentateuch. International Perspectives on Current Research* (eds. T.B. DOZEMAN – K. SCHMID – B.J. SCHWARTZ) (Tübingen 2011) 31-62, here 33-34; L.C. JONKER, "From Paraleipomenon to Early Reader: The Implications of Recent Chronicles Studies for Pentateuchal Criticism", *Congress Volume*. Munich 2013 (ed. C.M. MAIER) (Leiden 2013) 217-254, here 220-225 — all agree that the completion of the Pentateuch preceded the completion of Chronicles. Shaver, however, differs, claiming that the canonization of the Pentateuch had not yet occurred by the Chronicler's time; see J.R. SHAVER, *Torah and the Chronicler's History Work. An Inquiry into the Chronicler's References to Laws, Festivals, and Cultic Institutions in Relationship to Pentateuchal Legislation* (Atlanta, GA 1989). Compare this with the latest work of Maskow who claims that "die post-chronistische Transformation

My point of departure, then, is that the Book of Genesis (in some form or other) was accessible to the Chronicler. Below, I would like to show how the Chronicler in his *Sondergut* often relies on and alludes to it. For the sake of clarity, and following Hoffman's remarks above, I will divide the examples below into three groups:

1. All the examples in which the Chronicler cites from Genesis.
2. All the examples in which the Chronicler relates to an event from the Book of Genesis, but to which he has made linguistic-stylistic adaptations.
3. All the examples that show that the Chronicler received inspiration to write them from Genesis.

This group includes all the examples in which the Chronicler cites from Genesis:

- Out of the 35 verses from the Pentateuch that the Chronicler cited verbatim, 33 were from Genesis¹⁵. Nearly all of these citations are concentrated in the first chapter of Chronicles¹⁶, which serves as a kind of introduction to the genealogical lists in chapters 2–8. The Chronicler summarizes briefly (though not always systematically)¹⁷ the list of nations from Adam to Abraham (vv. 1–27), and from Abraham through Isaac, Jacob, and their descendants (vv. 28–37). Alongside these lists are two others: the genealogical list of the seven sons of Se'ir (vv. 38–42) and the list of the kings of Edom (vv. 43–50)¹⁸. As a rule, the Chronicler draws all the data in this chapter from the Book of Genesis. Although he omits certain details and his system of citation is not always consistent, we can conclude that despite the lacunae that characterize these lists, the *Vorlage* used in writing this chapter was the Book of Genesis.

der Orterwählungs-Formel des Deuteronomiums" shows that "die Grenze zwischen Chronik und Pentateuch offenbar in beide Richtungen durchlässig war. Die Chronik greift in erheblichem Maß auf die späten Texte des Pentateuchs zu [...] In diesem Sinne ist die Chronik wohl als ein Komplement zu den spät-priesterlichen Texten des Pentateuchs aufzufassen"; see L. MASKOW, *Tora in der Chronik. Studien zur Rezeption des Pentateuchs in den Chronikbüchern* (FRLANT 274; Göttingen 2019) 549.

¹⁵ For a detailed list of the verses, see Y. KILL, *The Books of Chronicles* (Da'at Mikra; Jerusalem 1997) 50 n. 5 (Hebrew). See also L.C. JONKER, "Reading the Pentateuch's Genealogies after the Exile: The Chronicler's Usage of Genesis 1–11 in Negotiating an All-Israelite Identity", *OTE* 25 (2012) 316–333.

¹⁶ See S. JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville, KY 1993) 52.

¹⁷ See KNOPPERS, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 287.

¹⁸ Regarding this list in Genesis and in Chronicles, see J.B. BARTLETT, "The Edomite King-List of Genesis 36:31–39 and 1 Chr 1:43–50", *JTS* 16 (1965) 301–314.

- Apart from the names of the people and nations in this chapter, which were cited almost verbatim from Genesis, there are also short prose citations. For example, it is written of Nimrod that “he was the first to be a mighty one on the earth” (v. 10). This is taken from Genesis 10, where the matter is expressed more fully: “Cush became the father of Nimrod; he was the first on earth to become a mighty warrior. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord; therefore, it is said, Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before the Lord” (vv. 8-10). In addition, the Chronicler cited Gen 10,25 precisely. This verse mentions the story of the Tower of Babel and the ensuing punishment as related in Peleg’s name: “For in his days the earth was divided”. As in the previous case, it is not clear what led the Chronicler to quote this particular verse ¹⁹.

This group includes all the examples in which the Chronicler relates to an event from Genesis, but to which he has made linguistic-stylistic adaptations:

- With the phrase “Abram, that is, Abraham” (1 Chr 1,27), the Chronicler refers to the change of the name of Abraham and the covenant between God and Abraham that appears in Gen 17,3-8. Another reference, less significant, occurs with the name of Jacob. The Chronicler, according to the Masoretic text, refrains from calling him Jacob and instead calls him “Israel” (v. 34) ²⁰. This consistent use of the name “Israel” is a reference to the changing of Jacob’s name after his struggle with the “man” (Gen 32,29), but here it serves mainly to confirm that the name change came from the mouth of God (35,10-12).
- The genealogical list of the sons of Jacob opens with the enumeration of Leah’s six sons in the order of their birth as described in the Book of Genesis 29–30 (1 Chr 2,1-4). Afterwards there is a certain confusion: two sons of Bilhah (Dan and Naphtali) appear out of birth order ²¹, and Rachel’s two sons (Joseph and Benjamin) appear together, as do two sons of Zilpa (Gad and Asher), who complete the list. Next,

¹⁹ See M. OEMING, *Das wahre Israel*. Die “genealogische Vorhalle” 1 Chronik 1–9 (BWANT 128; Bonn 1990) 95-96.

²⁰ In LXX^b it is written “Esau and Jacob”, while in LXX^a the order is reversed: “Jacob and Esau”. However, as Williamson has already pointed out, the Chronicler preferred to use the name “Israel”, and hence the change in the LXX is inconsistent with his general *tendenz*; see H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *Israel in the Book of Chronicles* (Cambridge 1977) 62.

²¹ JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 54.

the Chronicler turns his attention to the sons of Judah. The list of Judah's sons, "Er, Onan, and Shelah", the remark, "Now Er, Judah's firstborn, was wicked in the sight of the Lord, and he put him to death", and the mention of Judah's sons that his daughter-in-law Tamar bore him, "Perez and Zerah", are clearly drawn from the story of Judah and Tamar which appears in Genesis 38 and the genealogy list of Judah that appears in Gen 42,12. In this context of our Book, the Chronicler chooses to cite one verse from the story in Genesis 38: "But Er, Judah's firstborn, was wicked in the sight of the Lord, and the Lord put him to death" (v. 7) ²².

- Reuben's sin first appears in Genesis 35: "While Israel lived in that land, Reuben went and lay with Bilhah, his father's concubine; and Israel heard of it" (v. 22). The Chronicler also refers to the sin: "The sons of Reuben, the firstborn of Israel (He was the firstborn, but because he defiled his father's bed his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph, son of Israel)" (5,1). In this parenthetical remark, the Chronicler explains why Reuben's descendants do not appear at the beginning of the genealogical lists in 1 Chronicles 2. Reuben's status, given to him by virtue of his birthright, was undermined after he sinned, and his birthright was transferred to Joseph, and finally was placed in the hands of Judah by virtue of his moral character and leadership abilities. The Chronicler chooses not to use the explicit description of Reuben's sin — "Reuben lay with Bilhah" — preferring instead the more refined phrasing, "he defiled his father's bed", as was stated by Jacob himself in his words to Reuben: "Reuben, you are my firstborn, my might, and the first fruits of my vigor, excelling in rank and excelling in power. Unstable as water, you shall no longer excel because you went up onto your father's bed; then you defiled it — you went up onto my couch" (Gen 49,3-4).
- The book the Chronicler cites most often after Genesis is the Book of Psalms ²³. Psalm 96 was brought in its entirety; the first part of Psalm 105 was also cited with only minor changes to its original form (1 Chr 16,15-21). Psalm 105 presents a historical review of the wonders and kindnesses of God from the time of the patriarchs until the people's entry into the land, but the Chronicler chooses to cite only those verses that

²² This is the first time God's name appears in the book. See W. RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher* (HAT; Tübingen 1955) 15; T. WILLI, *Chronik (1,1 – 10,14)* (BKAT; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2009) 83.

²³ See H.N. WALLACE, "What Chronicles Has to say about Psalms", *The Chronicler as Author*. Studies in Text and Texture (eds. M.P. GRAHAM – S.L. MCKENZIE) (JSOTSup 263; Sheffield 1999) 267-291.

deal with events from the Book of Genesis. He omits the slavery in Egypt, the Ten Plagues, the stories of the quails and the manna, and the story of the entry into the land ²⁴, choosing instead to mention the “covenant of the pieces” (Genesis 15), the affirmation of the oath that God swore to Abraham (Genesis 26), and God’s promise to Jacob that he would be granted the land of Canaan. In the psalm, the poet emphasizes Israel’s “being few in number”, likely alluding to the words of Jacob: “my numbers are few” (Gen 34,30), and the Chronicler brings this phrase as well. He goes on to describe the fact that the patriarchs were forced to migrate from place to place, referring to the departure of Abraham from Ur-Kasdim and the migration of his descendants among various nations. He also mentions the story of the quarrel between the shepherds of Gerar and Isaac regarding the well dug by Isaac’s shepherds, relying on the literary connection between the phrase, “He allowed no one to oppress [לעשקם] them”, and the description that appears in the story itself: “So he called the well Esek [עשק] because they contended [התעשקו] with him” (Gen 26,20) ²⁵. The reference to kings — “he rebuked kings on their account” (105,14) — apparently refers to Pharaoh (Gen 12,10 and further) and Elimelech (Gen 20,26) ²⁶.

This group includes examples that involve events from Genesis that inspired the Chronicler’s composition of various stories, an inspiration that is expressed both linguistically and thematically:

- A first example is the story of Sheshan. In the framework of the description of the genealogical lists of the tribe of Judah, the Chronicler refers to the sons of Jerahmeel (vv. 25-33). Regarding Sheshan, one of the descendants of Jerahmeel, we are told that one of his daughters married Jarha, an Egyptian servant: “Now Sheshan had no sons, only daughters; but Sheshan had an Egyptian servant, whose name was Jarha. So

²⁴ It should not be inferred from this that these events were inconsequential in the eyes of the Chronicler. On the contrary, he repeatedly mentions the Exodus on several occasions. See R.B. DILLARD, *2 Chronicles* (WBC 15; Waco, TX 1987) 47. With regard to the omission of verses 16 and following, see the various opinions in S. ZALEWSKY, “*Now Rise up, O Lord, and Go to Your Resting-Place*”. A Literary Study of the Ark Narrative in the Book of Chronicles (Beer Sheva 2008) 206-208 (Hebrew).

²⁵ See G. GALIL, “The Pre-Davidic Period in Chronicles”, *Zion* 55 (1990) 1-26, here 4-6 (Hebrew).

²⁶ For details of these references, see E.L. CURTIS – A.L. MADSEN, *The Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1910) 222-223.

Sheshan gave his daughter in marriage to his slave Jarha; and she bore him Attai” (vv. 34-35). Evidently, the marriage between one of Sheshan’s daughters and his Egyptian servant alludes to the joining of Abraham and Hagar the Egyptian through the mediation of the barren Sarah (Gen 16,1-5) ²⁷. Sheshan and Sarah are analogous to each other: they both take initiative to establish an heir for the family father who lacks male offspring, and they both use an Egyptian servant for this purpose. Through this story, the Chronicler expresses the importance he sees in the continuation of the line of Judah, even at the cost of intermarriage with an Egyptian servant ²⁸.

- This is how the story of Jabez is told:

Jabez [יעבֶז] was honored more than his brothers; and his mother named him Jabez saying, “Because I bore him in pain [בעֶצֶב]”. Jabez called on the God of Israel, saying, “Oh if you would bless me and enlarge my border, and that your hand might be with me, and that you would keep me from hurt and harm”. And God granted him what he asked.

The story of Jabez consists of three parts. The first part mentions as a side note that Jabez was more honored than his brothers ²⁹. The second part describes his birth and provides an explanation for the name given to him by his mother. The third part relates the vow and accompanying request that Jabez makes with God. It seems to me that sections of this story are reverberations of events told in the Book of Genesis.

- (1) The description of the birth of Jabez and the circumstances for which he is named are reminiscent of the birth and naming of Noah, which are tied to the circumstances surrounding God’s curse after Adam’s sin ³⁰.

²⁷ This similarity was discussed earlier; see JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 84; KNOPPERS, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 310.

²⁸ Within the framework of the genealogy lists of Judah, there is considerable reference to intermarriage: see 2,3,17,34-35; 4,18. Except for the first case, which contains an expression from Genesis (see OEMING, *Das wahre Israel*, 121-123), the rest of the cases are unique to the Chronicler. It is worthwhile to note that the approach to intermarriage in the research is related to the scholarly debate regarding the status of the Chronicler: inclusive (Japhet and Williamson) or exclusive (von Rad and Mosis). With regard to this, see J.E. DYCK, *The Theocratic Ideology of the Chronicler* (Leiden 1998) 25-43. For a more complex view of the Chronicler’s position regarding intermarriage, see L.C. JONKER, “‘My Wife Must Not Live in King David’s Palace’ (2 Chr 8,11): A Contribution to the Diachronic Study of Intermarriage Traditions in the Hebrew Bible”, *JBL* 135 (2016) 35-47.

²⁹ The phrase “honored more than [מ + נִכְבַּד]” is found in one other place in the Bible, Gen 34,19, in the story of Dina; see E. BERTHEAU, *Die Bücher der Chronik* (KHAT; Leipzig 1873) 36.

³⁰ The “inverted quotation” — “in sadness I gave birth [בֶּעֶצֶב תִּלְדִּי]” vs. “I gave birth in sadness [יִלְדֵתִי בֶּעֶצֶב]” — is a well-known characteristic of intertextuality according to Beentjes; see P.C. BEENTJES, “‘Give Thanks to YHWH Truly He is Good’: Psalms and

<i>Birth of Noah (Gen 5,29)</i>	<i>God's curse after Adam's sin (Gen 3,16)</i>	<i>Birth of Jabez (1 Chr 4,9)</i>
He named him Noah, saying , "Out of the ground that the Lord has cursed this one shall bring us relief from our work and from the toil [עֲצָבוֹן] of our hands".	To the woman he said, "I will greatly increase your pangs [עֲצָבוֹן] in child-bearing; in pain [בְּעֵצָב] you shall bear [תִּלְדִּי] children".	And his mother named him Jabez, saying , "Because I bore him in pain [בְּעֵצָב] יִלְדֵתִי".

Of course, the relationship between Noah's and Jabez's name stories is one of contrast: Noah's parents called him a name that was unlike the current situation and looked entirely to the future, while Jabez's mother gave him a name that reflected her present condition ³¹.

(2) The third section includes the vow Jabez made to God, a vow that is reminiscent of the vow made by Jacob ³²:

<i>Jacob's vow (Gen 28,20)</i>	<i>Jabez's vow (1 Chr 4,10)</i>
Then Jacob made a vow, saying , " If [אם] God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and clothing to wear, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then the Lord shall be my God".	Jabez called on the God of Israel, saying , "Oh if [אם] you would bless me and enlarge my border, and that your hand might be with me, and that you would keep me from hurt and harm". And God granted what he asked.

Although the verbal connections between these two vows are not unambiguous, commonalities between them can still be found:

- (i) Both vows reflect a heartfelt desire (expressed in the word "if" [אם]) for a better reality: Jacob asks for protection, sustenance, and a safe return to his father's house, and Jabez asks for a blessing and for wider borders.
- (ii) Both vows consist of four requests. With Jacob: that God will be with him, preserve him along the way, give him food and clothing,

Prayers in the Book of Chronicles", *Tradition and Transformation in the Book of Chronicles* (Leiden 2008) 141-175, here 144. The comparison between the two stories was already noted by JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 109; WILLI, *Chronik*, 126.

³¹ I assume here that her words were said in response to the difficulty of Jabez's birth and not to the pregnancy, as some scholars have suggested; see, for example, R.C. HEARD, "Echoes of Genesis in 1 Chronicle 4:9-10: An Intertextual and Contextual Reading of Jabez's Prayer", *JHS* 4 (2002-2003) § 2.7.

³² See BERTHEAU, *Die Bücher der Chronik*, 36.

and return him safely to his father's house. With Jabez: that God will bless him, enlarge his borders, and that God's hand will be with him and preserve him from hurt and harm.

- (iii) Both vows are made in a state of distress: Jacob is in a state of loneliness, and Jabez fears for his future ³³.

Unlike Jacob's vow, Jabez's vow lacks the second part of the vow structure, which is usually comprised of the obligations on the part of the one making the vow. Furthermore, Jacob's vow lacks God's immediate response, which Jabez receives. In this indirect analogue, the Chronicler grants Jabez a status similar to Jacob's ³⁴: just as Jacob received God's blessing, so did Jabez, and just as Jabez's borders were expanded, so were Jacob's.

- It appears that the Chronicler derived the story of the cause and results of the wars of the sons of Simeon from specific events in the Book of Genesis:

They journeyed to the entrance of Gedor, to the east side of the valley, to seek pasture for their flocks, where they found rich, good pasture, and the land was very broad, quiet, and peaceful; for the former inhabitants there belonged to Ham. These, registered by name, came in the days of King Hezekiah of Judah, and attacked their tents and the Meunim who were found there, and exterminated them to this day, and settled in their place, because there was pasture there for their flocks. (1 Chr 4,39-41)

The vastness of the number of sons in the tribe of Simeon ("their clans increased greatly") caused some of them to go "seek pasture for their flocks". They do find "rich, good pasture" in a "very broad, quiet, and peaceful" land, and they slay the sons of Ham and settle there. This story appears to have drawn its style and content from the stories of Genesis. For example, the journey to a place with "rich, good pasture" due to a shortage of grazing space recalls Lot's journey to Sodom because of the land's inability to support the flocks of both Abraham and Lot. As a result, Lot turns to Sodom: "Lot looked about him, and saw that the plain of the Jordan was well watered everywhere" (Gen 13,10) ³⁵. The story of the sons of Simeon is also reminiscent of the story of Dina (Genesis 34). Both stories contain the phrase "the land is large [וְהָאָרֶץ רַחֲבַת יָדַיִם]" (Gen 34,21; 1 Chr 4,40), both involve the slaying of the land's inhabitants by people from outside the land, and in both places the killings are related to the tribe of Simeon.

³³ His vow ends in this manner; see KLEIN, *1 Chronicles*, 124.

³⁴ The name "Jacob" (יַעֲקֹב) somewhat resembles the name "Jabez" (יַעֲבֵז) in Hebrew; this fact lends additional weight to the parallel.

³⁵ See KLEIN, *1 Chronicles*, 152.

- The text describes the failure of the sons of Ephraim to retain the Ayalon Valley area (1 Chr 7,20-24) ³⁶. According to the text, the sons of Ephraim were killed by the people of Gath, “who were born in the land [...] because they went down to raid their cattle” (v. 21). Following this, Ephraim’s brothers come to comfort the grieving father. The description of Ephraim’s consolation corresponds in large measure with the description of the consolation of Jacob after the brothers’ news of Joseph’s death ³⁷.

<i>The consolation of Jacob</i> (Gen 37,35)	<i>The consolation of Ephraim</i> (1 Chr 7,22-23)
Then Jacob tore his garments and mourned his son for many days All his sons and all his daughters sought to comfort him but he refused to be comforted.	And their father Ephraim mourned many days [ויתאבל ימים רבים] and his brothers came to comfort him [לנחמו]. Ephraim went in to his wife, and she conceived and bore a son; and he named him Beriah because disaster had befallen his house.

Both cases describe the mourning of a father who lost his sons (Ephraim) or his son (Jacob), and in both cases there is an attempt on the part of those around the father to comfort him ³⁸. But here the story lines diverge: Ephraim had lost all his sons, so his brothers were the ones who came to comfort him, and not his other sons or daughters as we find with Jacob. Moreover, whereas Jacob remained in mourning and refused to be comforted, Ephraim and his wife created a new generation. The son that is born to Ephraim, Beriah, is indeed a reminder of Ephraim’s tragic past, but at the same time his birth symbolizes a change in the family fortunes. From then on, the clan grows, prospers, and expands in the land: “His [Ephraim’s] daughter was Sheera, who built both Lower and Upper Beth-Horon, and Uzzen-Sheerah” (v. 24).

³⁶ Scholars discuss the question of whether this is Ephraim, son of Joseph, since according to Genesis he was born in Egypt and did not enter the land. Galil believes that this is not the case, while Knoppers claims that the Ephraim in question is the son of Joseph. See G. GALIL, “The Chronicler’s Genealogies of Ephraim”, *BN* 56 (1991) 11-14; KNOPPERS, *1 Chronicles 1–9*, 464-465. See also WILLI, *Chronik*, 259.

³⁷ See BERTHEAU, *Die Bücher der Chronik*, 75.

³⁸ The death of the sons of Ephraim raises the question of the sin that preceded the punishment, in keeping with the Chronicler’s doctrine of personal and immediate retribution. According to Sparks, the resemblance to the story of Jacob shows that just as Jacob’s sons sinned in selling Joseph, so did Ephraim’s sons sin in an attempt to seize the land of Gat’s residents. See J.T. SPARKS, *The Chronicler’s Genealogies. Towards an Understanding of 1 Chronicles 1–9* (Atlanta, GA 2008) 206.

- The sin of the census in the Book of Chronicles (1 Chronicles 21) is taken almost entirely from the *Vorlage* in the Book of Samuel (2 Samuel 24) with relatively few changes³⁹. An examination of these changes reveals that they bear a strong similarity to certain events in the Book of Genesis, some of which have already been discussed by Amit⁴⁰.

Verses 22-26 of this chapter allude to the purchase of the Cave of the Patriarchs by Abraham (Genesis 23). Although this resemblance can be deduced from the *Vorlage* in the Book of Samuel, the version in Chronicles contains new elements that do not appear in the *Vorlage*. For example, the root נתן is repeated five times by the Chronicler and appears seven times in Genesis. However, in Samuel it appears only once. Similarly, the expression “for the full price [בכסף מלא]” appears only in the versions of the Chronicler and in the Book of Genesis. Furthermore, the text in Genesis states that Abraham bought the Cave of the Patriarchs from Ephron the Hittite, and then adds that the purchase included both the field of burial and the grave itself: “So the field of Ephron in Machpelah, which was to the east of Mamre, the field with the cave that was in it, and all the trees that were in the field, throughout its whole area, passed to Abraham” (v. 17). Similarly, the story of Aravna relates that David bought everything that was on the threshing floor: “Then Ornan [Aravna] said to David, ‘Take it; and let my lord the king do what seems good to him; see, I present the oxen for burnt offerings, and the threshing sledges for the wood, and the wheat for a grain offering. I give it all’” (v. 23).

In verses 22 and 25 the word “place [מקום]” is mentioned. This word is repeated throughout the Bible as an expression for a holy site. The first time is in the Book of Genesis (12,6); it is especially prominent in the story of Jacob’s dream, in which it appears six times (Gen 28,11 [three times].16.17.19).

Another allusion to the story of Jacob’s dream appears at the end of the census event. David declares, “Here shall be the house of the Lord God and here the altar of the burnt offering for Israel” (22,1).

³⁹ See JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 371. Admittedly, some of these changes may represent a different *Vorlage*, and not necessarily a deviation from the Masoretic Text; see A. ROFÉ, “Writing, Interpolating and Editing: 2 Samuel 24 and 1 Chronicles 21 as a Case Study”, *HeBAI* 3 (2014) 317-326. See also the volume by U. BECKER and H. BEZZEL (eds.), *Rereading the relecture? The Question of (Post)chronistic Influence in the Latest Redactions of the Books of Samuel* (FAT II 66; Tübingen 2014).

⁴⁰ Y. AMIT, “Araunah’s Threshing Floor: A Lesson in Shaping Historical Memory”, *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles?* (eds. E. BEN-ZVI – D. EDELMAN) (Winona Lake, IN 2011) 133-144, here 137-141.

This statement resembles the words of Jacob after his dream: “And he was afraid, and said, ‘How awesome is this place. This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven’” (28,17).

Apart from these links, which Amit has already pointed out, two additional connections indicate that the Book of Genesis was used. The Chronicler refers to the story of the binding of Isaac (Genesis 22). Abraham is asked to take his son Isaac to the “land of Moriah” (v. 2) and offer him up as a burnt offering upon one of the mountains. The connection between the land of Moriah and the story of Aravna does not appear in the Chronicler’s account of the census, but later, when Solomon begins to build the temple, he writes, “Solomon began to build the house of the Lord in Jerusalem on Mount Moriah, where the Lord had appeared to his father David, at the place that David had designated, on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite” (2 Chr 3,1) ⁴¹. In the entire Bible, the place name “Moriah” appears only in these two episodes ⁴².

In 1 Chr 27,23-24 the Chronicler deals (indirectly) with the sin of the census. The background of the reference to the census is the appointment of captains to the tribes of Israel. In this concluding section, the Chronicler remarks, “David did not count those below twenty years of age, for the Lord had promised to make Israel as numerous as the stars of heaven” (v. 23). The use of the stars of heaven as a metaphor for the multiplicity of the people of Israel comes only in Genesis: “He brought him outside and said, ‘Look toward heaven and count the stars, if you are able to count them’. Then he said to him, ‘So shall your descendants be’” (15,5) ⁴³.

⁴¹ The fact that the place name “Moriah” is only documented in Gen 22,1 and 2 Chr 3,1 is often used as an argument for a late dating of Genesis 22; see T. VEIJOLA, “Das Opfer des Abraham: Paradigma des Glaubens aus dem nachexilischen Zeitalter”, *ZThK* 85 (1988) 129-164, here 153-155; S. RUDNIG-ZELT, *Glaube im Alten Testament. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Jes 7,1-17; Dtn 1-3; Num 13-14 und Gen 22,1-19* (BZAW 452; Berlin 2017) 326-331. I follow the view that the date of composition of Genesis is earlier than the Persian or Hellenistic periods. Cf. G. RENDSBURG, “Some False Leads in the Identification of Late Biblical Hebrew Texts: The Cases of Genesis 24 and 1 Samuel 2:27-36”, *JBL* 121 (2002) 23-46; F. POLAK, “Development and Periodization of Biblical Prose Narrative”, *Beit Mikra* 43 (1997-1998) 30-52 (Hebrew), and the literature cited in I. YOUNG – R. REZETKO – M. EHRENSVÄRD, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts. A Survey of Scholarship, A New Synthesis and A Comprehensive Bibliography*, Vol. 2 (London 2008) 6-8. I believe, therefore, that if indeed the Book of Chronicles had an effect on the Book of Genesis, it was very limited.

⁴² See I. KALIMI, “The Land of Moriah, Mount Moriah, and the Site of Solomon’s Temple in Biblical History”, *HTR* 83 (1990) 345-362; JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 550-552.

⁴³ See JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 468-474, and KLEIN, *I Chronicles*, 500, 505, who believe that the two verses are later additions because they address an aspect other than the appointment of the captains.

- After the description of the reformation of Jehoshaphat, the text relates: “The fear of the Lord fell on all the kingdoms of the lands around Judah, and they did not make war against Jehoshaphat” (2 Chr 17,10). This wording bears a strong resemblance to the story of Jacob’s journey from Shechem after Simeon and Levi’s revenge attack on the men of Shechem. Such a journey, which is in fact an unplanned escape, exposes Jacob to the vengeance of the surrounding peoples, and therefore the text states: “As they journeyed, a terror from God fell upon the cities all around them, so that no one pursued them” (Gen 35,5).

<i>Jehoshaphat (1 Chr 17,10)</i>	<i>Jacob (Gen 35,5)</i>
The fear of the Lord fell on all the kingdoms of the lands around Judah, and they did not make war against Jehoshaphat.	A fear from God fell upon the cities all around them, so that no one pursued them.

- The conclusion of the Book of Genesis is analogous to the conclusion of the Book of Chronicles and the declaration of Cyrus:

<i>Gen 50,24-25</i>	<i>2 Chr 36,23</i>
Then Joseph said to his brothers, “I am about to die, but God will surely come [פקד יפקד] to you, and bring you up [העלה] out of this land to the land that he swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob”. So Joseph made the Israelites swear, saying, “When God comes to you [פקד יפקד], you shall carry up [והעלהם] my bones from here”.	Thus says King Cyrus of Persia: “The Lord, the God of heaven, has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has charged [פקד] me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Whoever is among you of all his people, may the Lord his God be with him! Let him go up [ויעל]”.

These two endings mention the return to the land of Israel using the root עלה: at the end of Genesis, it is said that the people of Israel will go up (“and bring you up”) as will also go up the bones of Joseph (“carry up my bones”) to “the land that he swore”, and in Chronicles, the exiles are called to go up (“let him go up”). Another similarity is the root פקד which is used in Genesis to remind the people that God will come for them and in Chronicles to command Cyrus to redeem Israel from Babylon ⁴⁴.

⁴⁴ Dempster has already noted this comparison; see S.G. DEMPSTER, *Dominion and Dynasty. A Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 15; Leicester – Downers Grove, IL 2003) 48-49.

- Along with the examples listed above, various combinations that appear throughout the Book of Chronicles are either found exclusively in the Book of Genesis or were arguably taken from the Book of Genesis.
 - (1) Only two places in the Bible use similar language in descriptions about people who did not remember a kindness done for them. The first is in Genesis regarding Pharaoh's chief cupbearer: "Yet the chief cupbearer did not remember Joseph, but forgot him" (40,23), and the second is in Chronicles, regarding Joash: "King Joash did not remember the kindness that Jehoiada, Zechariah's father, had shown him, but killed his son" (2 Chr 24,22).
 - (2) It is said explicitly of only two people in the Bible that God tested them. It is written of Abraham: "After these things, God tested (נסה) Abraham" (Gen 22,1), and about Hezekiah: "God left him to himself, in order to test him (לנסותו) and to know all that was in his heart" (2 Chr 32,31).
 - (3) It is said of two people in the Bible that God punished them directly "with a plague", that is, with some physical disease. God punishes Pharaoh, King of Egypt, with "great plagues [בנגע]" because he took Sarah, Abraham's wife (Gen 12,17), and in the same way God punishes Uzziah ("because the Lord had struck him [נגעו]") after he burnt incense on the altar in the Temple (2 Chr 26,20).

The review above demonstrates the extent of the Chronicler's use of the Book of Genesis in his *Sondergut*. Now the question arises: Of what specific value to the Chronicler was the Book of Genesis? What did the Chronicler seek to achieve from the quotations from, and references and allusions to, the Book of Genesis?

It seems to me that by using a historical discourse that was familiar to his readers, the Chronicler sought to relate his composition to the present and the future, rather than to describe the past⁴⁵. Of course, the question immediately arises, what is that "present" in which the Chronicler lived and acted? And if the Chronicler's present is unclear to us, even more so is the future he envisioned. Nonetheless, even if we cannot construe precisely the Chronicler's present, we can say that from 587 BCE, Yehud had

⁴⁵ See P.B. DIRKSEN, "The Future in the Book of Chronicles", *New Heaven and New Earth — Prophecy and the Millennium*. Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston (eds. P.J. HARLAND – C.T.R. HEYWORD) (VTSup 77; Leiden 1999) 37-51; S.J. SCHWEITZER, *Reading Utopia in Chronicles* (LHB/OTS 442; New York 2007) 30 n. 88.

not been able to recover economically, demographically, or socially from exile and destruction ⁴⁶. In fact, it had become what some scholars call a “post-collapse society” ⁴⁷. The great theological rift that befell the people after the destruction of the Temple and the exile, together with the economic crisis that was upon them, motivated the Chronicler to stand up and take action. He chose to use a well-known historical platform, pouring messages of hope into it for the people of Yehud among whom he lived. Whether the book was written for the simple people in the villages ⁴⁸, for the literate Jerusalem elite (*literati*) ⁴⁹, or for both of these groups together, the Chronicler saw that the history of Israel in general and of David’s kingdom in particular offered an opportunity to provide his contemporaries with tools to deal with their current challenges. These tools can be divided into three groups: (A) the theme of chosenness; (B) the promise and the covenant; (C) the concept that “the deeds of the patriarchs are a sign for the sons”.

The Book of Genesis proves that God’s choice is inherent in the historic chain from Adam to Jacob’s descent into Egypt: God chooses Abraham, God chooses the land of Israel, and God chooses Isaac over Ishmael, Jacob over Esau, and Judah over Reuben. Throughout his composition, the Chronicler also emphasizes the concept of divine election, or chosenness ⁵⁰. The quality of being chosen characterizes the offspring of Abraham from among all the peoples (1 Chronicles 1), the tribe of Judah (1 Chr 2,3 and onwards), David (1 Chr 28,4-5), Jerusalem (2 Chr 6,5-6), and the

⁴⁶ For example, at its peak, Yehud had no more than thirty thousand residents. See O. LIPSCHITS, “Demographic Changes in Judah between the Seventh and the Fifth Centuries”, *Judah and Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (eds. O. LIPSCHITS – J. BLENKINSOPP) (Winona Lake, IN 2003) 323-376; A. FAUST, “Settlement Dynamics and Demographic Fluctuations in Judah from late Iron to Hellenistic Period and the Archaeology of Persian-Period Yehud”, *A Time of Change. Judah and its Neighbors in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods* (ed. Y. LEVIN) (New York 2007) 23-51. Furthermore, the economic situation was stark. On this issue, see E. AMBER-ARNON – A. KLONER, “Archeological Evidence of Links between the Aegean World and the Land of Israel in the Persian Period”, *A Time of Change. Judah and its Neighbors in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods* (ed. Y. LEVIN) (New York 2007) 1-21. Regarding the social and demographic circumstances, see C.E. CARTER, *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period. A Social and Demographic Study* (JSOTSup 294; Sheffield 1999).

⁴⁷ See FAUST, “Settlement Dynamics”, 23-51.

⁴⁸ See Y. LEVIN, “Who Was the Chronicler’s Audience? A Hint from His Genealogies”, *JBL* 122 (2003) 229-245.

⁴⁹ T.D. GOLTZ, “The Chronicler as Elite: Establishing an Atmosphere of Perpetuity in Jerusalemite Yehud”, *The Function of Ancient Historiography in Biblical and Cognate Studies* (eds. P.G. KIRKPATRICK – T.D. GOLTZ) (New York 2008) 91-110; E. BEN-ZVI, “A House of Treasures: The Account of Amaziah in 2 Chronicle 25 — Observation and Implication”, *SJOT* 22 (2008) 63-85, here 64-70.

⁵⁰ See JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 56.

Levites and priests (1 Chr 15,2; 2 Chr 29,11). These objects of divine election — both those in Genesis and those in Chronicles — share a common attribute: they are arbitrary, as no specific reason is provided for their selection. We do not know, for example, why Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were chosen. We do not know why David was chosen and why his son Solomon, in particular, was crowned his successor⁵¹. We do not know why Mount Moriah was chosen for the binding of Isaac, and we do not know why Solomon chose to build the Temple precisely in the place his father David bought from Aravna the Jebusite.

Just as no explanations were given for God's choices in Genesis, so too the reader of Chronicles is not told why God chose Israel, Jerusalem, or David. Furthermore, because these choices did not depend on any particular cause or quality, they are eternally valid. No special reason was required for the election of Abraham, David, or Israel; therefore, no reason can ever invalidate or undercut this election.

The first choice in both Genesis and Chronicles is that of Abraham over all the surrounding nations, a choice that was not explained, as stated. The first chapter of Chronicles emphasizes that Abraham, followed immediately by Isaac and Israel, were divinely elected both in relation to the family itself (Ishmael and Esau) and to the surrounding nations⁵². The purpose of this quality of chosenness is first to create a separation from others and then designate the mission of the chosen ones⁵³. As Johnson has indicated, the three patriarchs are joined by additional objects of election during the first nine chapters: the tribe of Judah, the tribe of Levi, and the land of Israel⁵⁴.

The first nine chapters of Chronicles, which serve as an introduction to the entire book, illustrate how a direct line connects the patriarchs and

⁵¹ The reasons behind choosing David are obscure in both Samuel and Chronicles. The reasons for choosing Solomon, on the other hand, differ between Samuel, where a specific concept is given for the choice (2 Sam 12,24), and Chronicles, where no reason for the choice is given.

⁵² See OEMING, *Das wahre Israel*, 79, 90.

⁵³ See WILLIAMSON, *Israel*, 63 and further. For a contrasting view, see SPARKS, *Genealogies*, 321-322. In the opinion of Sparks, the book does not mention the choice of Israel at all. Cf. GALIL, *1 Chronicles*, 25; S. JAPHET, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (Winona Lake, IN 2009) 70-76.

⁵⁴ See M.D. JOHNSON, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies. With Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus* (Cambridge 1969) 69-77. See also R.R. WILSON, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (New Haven, CT 1977). See further the discussion in R. BRAUN, "1 Chronicles 1-9 and the Reconstruction of the History of Israel: Thoughts on the Use of Genealogical Data in Chronicles in the Reconstruction of the History of Israel", *The Chronicler as Historian* (eds. M.P. GRAHAM – K.G. HOGLUND – S.L. MCKENZIE) (JSOTSup. 238; Sheffield 1997) 92-105. Common to all those scholars is the idea that the genealogy lists are used as a political or religious tool, not necessarily a historical one.

Judah to the first returnees — the Levites and priests who reside in Jerusalem during the Persian period — with whom the genealogical chapters end (1 Chr 9,1-34). Abraham and his descendants, God's chosen among all the peoples of the world, return after the exile. They settle in Jerusalem, the chosen city, and they work in the Temple, the chosen place. In keeping with his theme of election, the Chronicler chooses to conclude the introduction to his book with a reference to the exile: "So all Israel was enrolled by genealogies; and these are written in the Book of the Kings of Israel. And Judah was taken into exile in Babylon because of their unfaithfulness" (1 Chr 9,1). After stating the reason for the exile ("because of their unfaithfulness"), the Chronicler introduces a rejoinder that has no equal in the entire Bible in terms of identifying to whom the chosen city, Jerusalem, belongs: "Now the first to live again in their possessions in their towns were Israelites, priests, Levites, and Temple servants" (v. 2). Anyone who suspected that the "unfaithfulness" that had caused the destruction of the nation and its Temple had also caused the loss of the chosen status of Israel and its land received an immediate and unequivocal rebuttal: God's choices remain exactly the same as they were in the first chapter of the book. The chosen people of Israel return to settle in the chosen land, in the chosen city, and to serve in the chosen place. The divine election was not shaken for a single moment ⁵⁵.

The theme of election in the Book of Genesis includes other components in conjunction with the choices themselves. God's choice of the patriarchs was accompanied by three promises that are repeated frequently in the Book of Genesis: a promise that the patriarchs would have many descendants, a promise that the patriarchs would have divine protection, and a promise that the patriarchs and their descendants would be given the land of Israel as their dwelling place ⁵⁶. The three promises — numerous offspring, divine protection, and securing the land of Israel ⁵⁷ —

⁵⁵ In this regard, the fate of the Babylonian exiles differed from that of the Assyrian exiles, especially those on the Transjordanian. See I. AMAR, "Expansion and exile in the Chronicler's narrative of the two and a half tribes (1 Chr. 5.1-26)", *JSOT* 44 (2020) 357-376.

⁵⁶ The promise of numerous offspring, together with the promise of the land, is repeated in the revelations of God to the patriarchs throughout the Book of Genesis: see 12,2; 13,15-16; 15,5.7; 17,2.8; 22,17-18; 26,3-4; 28,13-14; and 35,11-12. While von Rad believes that the promises to the patriarchs were already before the time when the J author composed the earlier traditions, Van Seters argues that they were added by J at a later date. See G. VON RAD, *Genesis* (OTL; London 1963) 22; J. VAN SETERS, *Prologue to History. The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville, KY 1992) 268-269.

⁵⁷ Regarding the relationship between the geographical borders in the Pentateuch and the genealogical lists that apparently reflect them, see JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 74; cf. T. WILLI, "Late Persian Judaism and its Conception of an Integral Israel according to

constituted objects of hope for the Chronicler. Just as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were given these promises, so too does the Chronicler envision them for his people as well ⁵⁸.

A clear expression of this vision is found in the partial yet tendentious selection from Psalm 105 made by the Chronicler. As stated previously, the Chronicler brought only 15 verses of the psalm's 45 verses into his text. It should be noted that the selected verses correspond to two of the three aforementioned promises: securing the land and divine protection ⁵⁹.

Remember his covenant forever, the word that he commanded for a thousand generations, the covenant that he made with Abraham, his sworn promise to Isaac, which he confirmed to Jacob as a statute, to Israel as an everlasting covenant, saying, to you I will give the land of Canaan, as a portion for an inheritance. When they were few in number, of little account, and strangers in the land, wandering from nation to nation, from one kingdom to another people, he allowed no one to oppress them; he rebuked kings on their account, saying, "Do not touch my anointed ones; do my prophets no harm" (1 Chr 16,15-22).

The subject of the promise of the land to Abraham and his descendants is repeated in Jehoshaphat's speech, which is unparalleled in the *Vorlage*: "Did you not, O our God, drive out the inhabitants of this land before your people Israel, and give it forever to the descendants of your friend, Abraham?" (2 Chr 20,7).

It should be noted that in addition to including explicit references to the promises given to the patriarchs, the Chronicler is careful to allude to stories in the Book of Genesis that feature God's covenant with the patriarchs. For example, it seems unnecessary at first glance for the Chronicler to point out that Abraham's name was previously "Abram". However, a component more important than a mere name change is involved. The reference to Abraham's previous name requires that the Chronicler mention the literary context of the name, and that section in Genesis includes

Chronicles: Some Observations on Form and Function of the Genealogy of Judah in 1 Chronicles 2:3-4:23", *Second Temple Studies. Temple Community in the Persian Period*, Vol. 2 (eds. T.C. ESKENAZI – K.H. RICHARDS) (Sheffield 1994) 146-162, here 152, 157; J.W. WRIGHT, "Remapping Yehud: The Borders of Yehud and the Genealogies of Chronicles", *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (eds. O. LIPSCHITS – M. OEMING) (Winona Lake, IN 2006) 67-89.

⁵⁸ See E. BEN-ZVI, "The Memory of Abraham in Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Yehud/Judah", *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian & Early Hellenistic Periods. Social Memory and Imagination* (eds. D.V. EDELMAN – E. BEN-ZVI) (Oxford 2013) 3-37, here 10-12.

⁵⁹ See H. VAN GROL, "1 Chronicles 16: The Chronicler's Psalm and its View of History", *Rewriting Biblical History. Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honour of Pancratius C. Beentjes* (eds. J. CORLEY – H. VAN GROL) (DCLS 7; Berlin 2011) 97-122.

God's promise to Abraham that he would inherit the land and that he would have numerous offspring (Gen 17,5). Significantly, the change of Jacob's name to "Israel" also contains a promise for the inheritance of the land and for numerous offspring (Gen 35,11-12) ⁶⁰.

Moreover, the Chronicler is well aware that God promised Abraham that his descendants would be as numerous "as the stars of heaven". He finds the opportunity to include this promise in the conclusion of the narration of the officers' appointment (1 Chr 27,23), though he could have omitted it without attracting the slightest attention from the reader. Particularly noteworthy are the Chronicler's allusions to the story of the binding of Isaac. By mentioning the name "Moriah" he links the place of the altar upon which Isaac was bound to the place of the Temple, thereby providing another reference to the promise of "offspring as numerous as the stars of heaven" that appears at the end of the binding narrative (Gen 22,17).

The connection made previously between the vows of Jabez and Jacob also contributes to our case here. As stated above, the two vows each contain four components. But while Jacob's vow is entirely concerned with the theme of divine protection, Jabez's vow is more complex and contains more than one request. It seems to me that the first three parts of Jabez's vow correspond to the three promises to the patriarchs:

1. Bless me = numerous offspring ⁶¹;
2. Enlarge my border = expanding the inheritance;
3. Your hand be with me = divine protection;
4. Keep me from hurt and harm = general conclusion of the first three parts.

The story of Jabez, already exceptional in its literary context, acquires a broader meaning when its linguistic and thematic connections to the Book of Genesis are considered. Grief, sadness, and loneliness receive an immediate response in Jabez's vow, which is an exact thematic duplication of the three promises made to the patriarchs in Genesis. And yet there is one difference: while in the Book of Genesis the direction of the contact is from God to the patriarchs, in Chronicles it is incumbent upon man to cry out to God for these promises to be fulfilled. Even if the

⁶⁰ Within this framework, I accept Levin's assertion that every reference of the Chronicler was predicated on the assumption that the reader knew the reference's literary background as it appeared in its source; see Y. LEVIN, "From Lists to History: Chronological Aspects of the Chronicler's Genealogies", *JBL* 123 (2004) 601-636, here 609.

⁶¹ See S.J. DE VRIES, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (FOTL; Grand Rapids, MI 1989) 47. Evidence for his opinion can be found in the blessing of Obed-Edom (26,4-5). For an opposing opinion, see JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 110, who claims that the first component serves as the opening for the entire vow. See also WILLI, *Chronik*, 127-128.

chosenness of the people of Israel has never been revoked, it is necessary to call on God in order to make that chosenness manifest, to bring it from power in the potential to action. Indeed, the theme of making and relying on appeals to God is a fundamental element in the doctrine of the Chronicler, who expects man to turn to God for help without requiring external factors ⁶². The Chronicler's expectation that the promises given to the patriarchs will be fulfilled even in his own lifetime depends, therefore, on the people of Yehud and their desire to depend on God completely, calling to God as Jabez did and, like Jabez, receiving an answer ⁶³.

Another dimension of the connection between the two books is revealed by examining the actions of the patriarchs and the significance they hold for the sons' generation or, according to the phrase: "מַעֲשֵׂה אֲבוֹת סִימָן לְבָנִים" ⁶⁴. Radak's phrasing puts it: "What the forefathers do will be done by the sons" ⁶⁵. The descendants of the returnees and the remnants of the exiles must be reminded how the history of the people of Israel began: with Adam and Abraham. Despite the fact that Abraham arrived into an alien land as the head of a single family from Ur-Kasdim, his foreignness did not prevent him from growing and flourishing. Despite the troubles that befell him and his family, Abraham was able to expand in the land ⁶⁶. The difficulties that Abraham suffered were also visited on his son Isaac and his grandson Jacob; yet, these two also managed to be fruitful in the land and widen their borders. The promise God made to Abraham before he came to the land, "And I will make you a great nation" (Gen 12,2), came to fruition in the past, and, in the eyes of the Chronicler, it would be fulfilled in the future as well. The miraculous reality by which a small foreign family managed to thrive in the land despite adversity provides the Chronicler with a vital strategy to teach his people how to rise from the rubble and build themselves anew.

⁶² See 1 Chr 5,20; 19,13; 2 Chr 12,6; 13,18, and 14,10.

⁶³ The word that concludes the story, "request [שָׁאַל]", conveys the meaning of prayer to and reliance on God; see B.E. KELLY, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (JSOTSup 211; Sheffield 1996) 54-55.

⁶⁴ This phrase is usually attributed to Nachmanides, but his formulations are mainly methodological. This formulation first appears in the glosses of the *Maharsha* on *Tractate Abodah Zarah* 8b. The formulation and its meaning, especially in the writings of Nachmanides, are further discussed in: A. FUNKENSTEIN, "Nachmanides' Typological Reading of History", *Zion* 45 (1980) 35-59 (Hebrew); R. BEN-MEIR, "'The Actions of the Patriarchs Herald those of their Children' — Historical Interpretations within Nachmanides' Commentary to the Pentateuch", *Studies in Bible and Exegesis* 8. E. Touitou Jubilee Volume (eds. M. GARSIEL et al.) (Ramat-Gan 2008) 533-552 (Hebrew).

⁶⁵ Radak, Hosea 9,10.

⁶⁶ See VEIJOLA, "Das Opfer des Abraham", 156; BEN-ZVI, "The Memory of Abraham", 14-15.

The hope for construction and renewal also finds expression in the story of Ephraim's grief and its links with the story of Jacob's grief. Ephraim's sons try to retain the land, but are defeated and killed by the men of Gat. Their father, Ephraim, does not give up. Although he has lost all his sons, he manages to recover and produce offspring who help him forget those who have died. His descendants return and maintain their hold on the land by building within it. The failed first attempt by the sons of Ephraim to possess the land succeeds the second time at the hands of the sons born after the disaster. The ability to rise from the ruins and build anew underlies Ephraim's story, and serves the Chronicler's contemporaries as a call to action. Despite setbacks, even tragedies, returning and rebuilding the country are not only possible, but necessary. Jacob, in his refusal to be comforted after Joseph's disappearance, reflects the present reality. Ephraim, who continues his life and merits expansion, reflects the hope for a better future.

Along with the expectation of economic prosperity and rebuilding the ruins, the Chronicler conveys to his contemporaries the message that God has not abandoned them forever. Four times in the book, the Chronicler repeats the fact that "the fear of the Lord" fell on the surrounding nations and therefore "they did not dare to attack Israel". The description of the fear with which the nations were stricken alludes, as stated above, to the story of Jacob after the revenge of Simeon and Levi in the city of Shechem. The Chronicler implies to his contemporaries that just as their ancestor Jacob merited the watchful protection of God, by which the nations around him were afraid to pursue and harm him, so too would the generation of the returnees merit God's vigilant protection.

Finally, the closing scene of the book, in which Cyrus calls on the exiles to emigrate to Yehud and rebuild the Temple, echoes the closing of the Book of Genesis, in which Joseph exhorts the people to return his coffin "to the land that he swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob". Despite their essentially positive nature, both of these endings are shadowed by uncertainty: they do not include the response to and performance of the injunctions. Readers cannot know the fate of Joseph's bones, nor do they know whether the exiles returned to the land and rebuilt the Temple. The two books' open endings emphasize the idea of choice. This time, however, the choice is not God's but one that lies squarely in the hands of human beings: Will they fulfill the resounding call of Joseph and Cyrus, or will they choose to ignore it? Will they rise up and determine their fate, or will they disregard the resounding call to build again?

Let us conclude. This article reveals the extent of the significance of the Book of Genesis to the Chronicler. Not only does he quote more verses (33) from it than from all of the other books of the Pentateuch, he also makes numerous allusions to it. We have seen that the Chronicler's allusions relate to many passages from Genesis and concern three central subjects: the theme of chosenness (election), the promises to the patriarchs, and the concept that "the deeds of the patriarchs are a sign to the sons". The theme of chosenness begins with Adam (1 Chr 1,1) and continues through the list of people living in Jerusalem in the Persian period (1 Chronicles 9). This election is not merely technical; that is, its main purpose is not to explain the direct ethnic connection between Adam and the people of Yehud. Rather, it is an election that encompasses all the promises to the three patriarchs: that they would be blessed with numerous offspring, that they would merit divine protection, and that they would secure the land of Israel. From the life stories of the three patriarchs, we see that they succeeded in establishing themselves within the land, growing and flourishing in spite of their isolation and foreignness. The Chronicler asks his contemporaries to believe that just as Abraham received the blessing that his descendants would be as many "as the stars of heaven", this blessing would also exist in the present or near future. Just as the land of Israel "from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates" (Gen 15,18) was promised to Abraham, so too would the shrunken borders of Yehud expand. Finally, just as God had preserved and protected Jacob, so too would God preserve and protect them.

Department of Bible
Bar-Ilan University
Ramat-Gan, Israel

Itzhak AMAR

SUMMARY

This article exposes the extent of the significance of the Book of Genesis for the Chronicler. It attempts to explore how the Chronicler's allusions relate to many passages from Genesis and concern three central subjects: the theme of chosenness (election), the promises to the patriarchs, and the concept that "the deeds of the patriarchs are a sign to the sons".

License and Permissible Use Notice

These materials are provided to you by the American Theological Library Association, operating as Atla, in accordance with the terms of Atla's agreements with the copyright holder or authorized distributor of the materials, as applicable. In some cases, Atla may be the copyright holder of these materials.

You may download, print, and share these materials for your individual use as may be permitted by the applicable agreements among the copyright holder, distributors, licensors, licensees, and users of these materials (including, for example, any agreements entered into by the institution or other organization from which you obtained these materials) and in accordance with the fair use principles of United States and international copyright and other applicable laws. You may not, for example, copy or email these materials to multiple web sites or publicly post, distribute for commercial purposes, modify, or create derivative works of these materials without the copyright holder's express prior written permission.

Please contact the copyright holder if you would like to request permission to use these materials, or any part of these materials, in any manner or for any use not permitted by the agreements described above or the fair use provisions of United States and international copyright and other applicable laws. For information regarding the identity of the copyright holder, refer to the copyright information in these materials, if available, or contact Atla using the Contact Us link at www.atla.com.

Except as otherwise specified, Copyright © 2023 Atla.