

A CALEB HYPOTHESIS

An Exegetical Study of I Chronicles 2–4

Charles Paulson, MA 1966, MDiv 1982, Em 2011

2361 Appellation

New Braunfels, TX 78132

ckpaulson11@gmail.com

Word count 9941 July, 2022

My thanks to Professors Andrew Bartelt, CSL retired, Andrew Steinmann, CRF, and Joseph Blenkinsopp, ND for their advice and encouragement. This paper conforms to the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th ed.

“Genealogy is the backbone of history”; and “Christianity (*cf. Judaism*) is rooted and grounded upon something that God did for man in history. It is a religion that is historical throughout, and if this historical basis goes, Christianity goes with it.”¹ One unnamed rabbi dared surpass the great Akiba offering: “These are the generations of Adam” as the greatest principle of the Torah.² This paper hopes to add a small footnote to biblical genealogical research.³

Biblical genealogy is founded upon: “I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob;” and: “Before Abraham was, I am.” Genealogy establishes the legitimacy of any claim to biblical authority. Biblical exegesis is defined by Jesus, John 5:39. Luther’s principles of interpretation – **The Analogy of Scripture**, Scripture must interpret Scripture; and **The Analogy of Faith**, Salvation depends on Faith, **of** and **in** Jesus Christ – rest upon the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. Guided by these principles we seek to understand the motive behind the record of the Chronicler.

THE PROBLEM

Certain anomalies in the genealogy of David recorded in Chronicles conflict with that of Ruth 4, long the subject of Textual Criticism.⁴ The line of Jacob through sons Levi, Judah and Benjamin

¹ Edwin Thiele, *A Chronology of the Hebrew Kings* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977), 7.

Edward J. Young, *My Servants the Prophets* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1978), 191.

² C. G. Montefiore, H. Lowe, *A Rabbinic Anthology* (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), Intro. xl, expressing the unity of all mankind. Akiba (d. 132) had declared: “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”

³ For OT genealogical research see Gleason Archer, *A Survey of OT Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), 81–176; R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the OT* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 3–82. Marshall D. Johnson in the preface to his 2nd ed. of *The Purpose of Biblical Genealogies* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 2002) gives an excellent summary of scholarship done in genealogy since the 1969 publication of his first edition. Among those he discusses are: Abraham Malamat’s *King Lists*, Robert Wilson’s *Between Azel and Azel*, Claus Westermann’s *Commentary on Genesis*, Sven Tengstrom’s *Toledoth Bak*, Thorkild Jacobsen’s *Eridu Genesis*, Ralph Klein’s *Archaic Chronologies*, H. G. M. Williamson’s *I–II Chronicles*, Roddy Braun’s *I Chronicles*, Herman Waitjen’s *Genesis: the Key to Matthew*, and Raymon Brown’s *Birth of the Messiah*. See also, Robert Wilson, “OT Genealogies in Recent Research,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1975), 169–189 points to Malamat’s work on comparative genealogical form and function in establishing its historiographical value.

Our interest in this area extends to well over 60 years, as time has permitted, and has resulted in 60 pages of genealogical/chronological charts from Adam to Jesus, as well as a detailed analysis of the Ezra–Nehemiah–I Chronicles 9 lists. A sample is included here as an addendum which graphically illustrates the anomalies and hypothesis proposed in this paper. The others are available upon request.

⁴ See R Laird Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1969), 95–103; and Harrison, *Intro.*, 254, 279 for brief discussion of this issue.

form the very framework for the narrative of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. Surely if there is one line held to be complete and unadulterated, it must be that of Judah. His line holds the promise of the *Messiah* and an everlasting Kingdom, Psalm 145. However, the anomalies in I Chronicles 2–4 present major problems with what appear to be unnecessary, yet intentional alterations that simply beg for explanation. Why does the Chronicler not simply leave the record of Ruth 4 untouched, or if he must, simply add Caleb *ben* Jephunneh and go on? We propose that he knew there was a problem with David's ancestral line that he could not ignore, but he could not accept.

Simple comparison with Levi shows the line of David from Ruth 4 missing at least three generations. While leaving David's mother unknown and his line a mere outline, the Chronicler inserts seven lines and six wives for a surreptitious *Caleb ben Hezron*, making him the virtual basis for Judah's post-exodic line, yet recording no solid connections with post-exilic refugees in Ezra, Nehemiah or I Chronicles 9, despite his alleged purpose. Of his six wives, two have the same name *Ephrath-ah* (*unprecedented!*), one disturbingly his own father's widow.

Note: While the authorship of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah (and Esdras) is subject to great debate, the generally held view of both Source and Traditional Critics still seems to favor the purity of the Judaic line and Levitical Temple worship for the exilic refugees as the Chronicler's purpose and plan.⁵ The names of *Moses*, *Samuel*, and *Ezra* as *the Chronicler* are used here for the sake of convenience, not argument. The number, not length, of the **10 Generations** of Ruth 4 from Perez to David is the central chronological issue here.⁶ Most work done on I Chronicles 1–9 relates form and function to the structure and purpose of the entire opus.⁷ The

⁵ J. Barton Payne, "1, 2 Chronicles" pt. 2; and Edwin Yamauchi, "Ezra-Nehemiah" pt. 3, vol. 4 *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, 12 vols. (hereafter cited *EBC*), Frank Gaebelin, gen. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 4:303–320; 566–591; Andrew Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah* (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 2010), 2–22; and see William J. Dumbrell, "The Purpose of the Books of Chronicles," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 27 3 (Sept. 1984), 257–266 for a conservative point of view. Sara Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah," *VT* 18 3 (July 1968), 330–371 argues for separate authors based on linguistic-stylistic evidence. David Talshir, "A Reinvestigation of the Linguistic Relationship between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah," *VT* 38 2 (1988), 165–193 questions Japhet's conclusions; Peter R. Ackroyd, "Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah: The Concept of Unity," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100 3 (1989), 189–201 questions both for any conclusions based on literary, linguistic or ideological grounds.

⁶ Ruth 4 counts **10 G.'s**, but Gen 46 and Num 26 count Judah, Perez and Hezron among the **1st G.** 70 to enter Egypt, and I Chr 6 counts **14 G.'s** for Levi's lines of Gershon, Kohath (Amram, Izhar) and Merari in the same time frame (see charts). For discussion of chronology see I. E. S. Edwards et al., gen. eds., *Cambridge Ancient History* (hereafter cited *CAH*) 14 vols. 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Univ. Press, vol. I 1, 1970), I 1:173–247; and see William Foxwell Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1940, 2nd ed. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957), 200–201; and Flavius Josephus, "Antiquities," *Complete Works*, William Whiston, trans. 1737 (Edinburgh: William P. Nimmo, 1867; repr, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977), II xv.2 with Whiston's own "Dissertation V," 62, 678–709 contrasting the chronology of Josephus and the MT.

Henry B. Smith Jr., "MT, SP or LXX?" *Bible and Spade* 31 1 (2018), 18–27 pits the MT vs. Josephus, the LXX, and Sam Pent, arguing that the Masoretes followed the Tanna'im cutting 100 years per generation from the lines of Adam and Noah to fit the time-frame of the book of Jubilees, without citing Whiston. (See charts.)

⁷ For example: Yigal Levin, "From Lists to History: Chronological Aspects of the Chronicler's Genealogies," *JBL* 123 4 (2004), 601–602; Jonathan Dyck, "Dating Chronicles and the Purpose of Chronicles," monograph by *Διδασκαλία* (1997) argues for a late Persian or Ptolemaic composition of Chronicles apart from Ezra-Nehemiah, based on his definition of "purpose" refined by "intent, motive and context."

Literary Criticism of Robert Alter is refreshingly candid.⁸ The scribal penchant for regularity with the numbers 10 and 14 may lay behind the rabbis' solution; but it does not solve these anomalies.

Tannaitic Rabbis (Talmud: *Sanhedrin* 69b; *Sotah* 11b, unattested by the Torah, Samuel or the Chronicler) have the foreign Caleb *ben* Jephunneh in David's line and brother-in-law to Moses by marriage (though 40 years younger!) to Moses' sister Miriam, called *Ephrath* who bore him Hur, father (*sic*) of Bezalel.⁹ Source Critics, dismissing traditional authorship, posit multiple, hypothetical *Sources* for solution and motive.¹⁰ The numerous extra-biblical sources (prophets and chroniclers) known from the Hebrew Bible itself leave only hints of any evidence they might contain.¹¹

THE HYPOTHESIS

The hypothesis of this paper contends that the anomalies in the Chronicler's record reveal a hidden connection with the lines of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh and David. Evidence for source and motive centers on the segmented lines of I Chronicles 2 and 4 and the word *ephrath*. Moses uses *ephrath* as a blessing in Genesis and the location of Rachel's burial. Samuel with no ties to Bethlehem labels his own and David's clans *Ephrathites*.¹² Ezra's two female *Ephraths* are unique to the biblical record.

Note: *Ephrath* אֶפְרַת, אֶפְרַתָּה, אֶפְרַתִּי is from *aphar* אֶפֶר "ashes," yet related to *parah* פָּרָה, both having to do with *fertility* or *fruitfulness*,¹³ and united in Rachel's *death* amid her *fertility* with the birth of Benjamin. Genesis 41:52 *Ephraim* אֶפְרַיִם, tribe of Joshua and hill country home of Samuel, has the same derivation. Von Rad follows the LXX calling Ophrah of Benjamin *Εφραθα* Joshua 18:23;¹⁴ and 15:9 Mt. Ephron הֶרֶם עֶפְרוֹן is on

⁸ Robert Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative* (Philadelphia: Basic Books, 1981, 2011), 13–40 offers a critique of all the Source and Historical-Critical hypotheses proposed over the last 100 years. Where they find disparate sources, he finds stylistic unity. His view evaluates biblical literary art to be at a level not approached until the likes of Shakespeare, comparable to calling it *inspired*. In his translation of *The Hebrew Bible* (3 vols. New York: W.W. Norton, 2019), 3:865–866 he concurs regarding the Chronicler's purpose.

⁹ Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, Henrietta Szold, trans, (4 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Society, 1909; repr, 1 vol. San Bernardino: Pantianos Classics, 2018), 289, 410 rumors David's mother a slave; bolstering the idea of David as *Priest-King* with the Chronicler having him reorganize the Priests and Levites. And see S. Galil, "The Sons of Judah and the Sons of Aaron in Biblical Historiography," *Vetus Testamentum* 35 4 (1985), 489–495 accepts Hur in the line of David, but as companion of Aaron he ignores their generational disparity.

¹⁰ Cyrus Gordon, *Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations* (New York: Norton Library, 1965), 160 argues: dual names such as *Yahweh-Elohim* have "nothing to do with the blending of literary sources;" Robert Graves, *Greek Myths*, 2 vols. (London: Folio Society, 1996), I:24 begins extensive notation of the *Triple-Moon Goddess*: Selene(maiden), Aphrodite(nymph), Hecate(crone), among others; and see Antti Laato, "Levitical Genealogies in I Chronicles 5–6," *Journal for the Study of the OT* 62 (1994), 77–99.

¹¹ Harrison, *Intro*, 669, 725 for discussion of *Book of Jashar* and *Chronicles of Kings of Israel* and *Judah*. Note that the Torah accepts no authorship except that of Moses; vs the Source Critical JEPDL hypotheses.

¹² Does Samuel know more than he reveals? 1:1 S concludes his own line with Zuph, an אֶפְרַתִּי (of Ramah in Ephraim, not Benjamin), and 17:12 calls Jesse "an אֶפְרַתִּי of Bethlehem" (meaning?); but Ezra in I Chr 6 ties Samuel's line to Levi, knowing: (1) Either Samuel's and David's clans had ties to Ephraim perhaps through an *Ephrathah* "an Ephrathite woman;" or (2) the name *Ephrath* holds a more controversial significance! Indeed, Ruth 1, Elimelech the "Ephrathite" seeks shelter in Moab, and violates Moses' directive against marriage, Num 25! Why not to the fertile Jordan valley and near kinsmen Reubenites or Gadites? Is he a foreigner after all?

¹³ Benjamin Davidson, *Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1848, 2nd ed., 1850; repr, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 41 cites Gen 41:52 and Hos 13:15.

¹⁴ Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis A Commentary*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 340. Here he points out that Bethlehem was not originally considered the burial site of Rachel.

the Judah-Ephraim border, but begins with -ע. Cf. **Αφροδιτε** with **אֶפְרַיִם**. Though the ancient Greeks guessed her name was from **αφρος** “foam,” they knew she was an oriental goddess of fertility, equated with Ishtar, Astarte, and Isis. Cf. also: **Ἥφαιστος**, lame god of fire, with **פֶּסַח** (ה) “lame, skip, hop” the Paschal Lamb; and **Ερεβος** with **עֶרֶב** “evening, darkness;” or **Αδωνις** with **דָּוִד** “Lord” from “rule, judge;” or **Καδμος** from **קָדְמ** “east,” legendary king of Cadmean Thebes, who brought writing from Phoenicia to Minoan Crete.¹⁵ Genesis 15 lists Kenites among Kadmonites “Easterners.” (See Note 52 regarding Joshua 15:59.) Was *Ephrath* a foreign pre-exodic name of Bethlehem?¹⁶ If so, this adds *foreign* fuel to the intrigue surrounding David’s clan.²⁴ below

Caleb and the Chronicler, whoever he was, represent two opposite poles of Hebrew faith and practice. Caleb was a “foreigner” **נָכְרִי** whose faith and freedom Ezra the priest and scribe could not ignore. Ezra espoused traditional authority which sought to exclude foreigners from among the Babylonian refugees, demanding absolute obedience to Mosaic Law. Samuel, prophet, statesman, Levite, *Nazirite*, supreme negotiator for David, and fellow *Ephrathite* understood both extremes.

Caleb *ben* Jephunneh (Numbers 13:6; 32:12) as a **הַקֵּינִי** *Kenite* (**הַקֵּינִי** *Kenizzite*) “smith” was most likely descended from Esau of Edom in north Arabia, a *foreigner* more faithful to God than God’s own people, a free and independent spirit.¹⁷ Moses must have found him where he fled as a refugee in Midian at the Mountain of God, also Kenite territory.¹⁸ “When he was grown up” of Exodus 2:11 reads as “40” Acts 7:23 (rabbis disagree), so Moses lived in Midian at least 40, if not 60 years.¹⁹ Jethro, and perhaps even the younger Caleb, could have taught Moses something of their common ancestor Abram, and the mysterious “Melchizedek king of (Jeru-)Salem...priest of God

Graves, *Myths*, 1:90, 108, 76; J. B. Bury, *History of Greece* (New York: Random House Modern Library, repr ¹⁵ of 1913, no pub), 34; H. J. Rose, *Handbook of Greek Mythology* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1959), 122, 165, 19, 124.

¹⁶CAH, I 2:720 connects *Efrath* with the Semitic (Old Assyrian) fertility god Ilaprat, and 766 Beth-*lekhem* with the Amorite god Lakhmu. The ‘*Apiru* of the Amarna Age and the letters of the terrified Abdi-Kheba, Jebusite K. of Jerusalem, are discussed with differing views in CAH, II 2:107–116; and David Rohl, “Pharaohs and Kings” vol. 1, *A Test of Time* 3 vols. (New York: Crown Pubs, 1995), 1:195–225 has Saul and David as A-K’s enemies.

¹⁷ Walter Beltz, “Die Kaleb-Traditionen im Alten Testament,” *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament* 98; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer (1974), pp. xii, 1–155. Paper DM 32. In the Source critical tradition of Wellhausen he relegates Caleb’s character to a nomadic (non-Kenite), “southern Israelite tradition: ‘L.’” W. Gunther Plaut, *The Torah* (New York: Union of Am. Hebrew Cong.’s, 1981), 1114 cites George Gray’s *Critical and Exegetical Commentary* of 1903 pitting the “J/E” tradition favoring Caleb against the “P” tradition favoring Joshua. See his Intro.; and CAH II 2 (1975), 307–337, 537–40 for review of Documentary Hypothesis.

¹⁸ Robert Cornuke and David Halbrook, *In Search of the Mountain of God* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000). Cornuke’s (et al.) identification of Jabal al Lawz “mountain of almonds” is mistaken for Jabal Maqla “burnt mountain” by geologists (Trent and Johnson, US Geological Survey, 1967), and disputed by scholars such as James Karl Hoffmeier. The location of Mt. Sinai remains a matter of great popular and scholarly dispute: CAH, II 2:324–325; and see Colin Humphreys, *The Miracles of Exodus* (New York: Harper Collins, 2003), 319. Albright’s *Stone Age*, 262 is probably correct: The God of Israel is not limited to one sacred mt.

¹⁹ Scripture quotes are taken from the English Standard Version unless otherwise noted.

Most High.”²⁰ Numbers 12:1 Miriam and Aaron’s accusation of Moses’ wife Zipporah *bath* Jethro being a “Cushite” (Kassite/Midianite) is a virtual charge of treason.²¹ Caleb could also be so charged.

Genesis 36:10 has Re’uel *ben* Esau by Basemath. Exodus 2:16, 18 רְעוּאֵל "shepherd of El" priest of Midian, is a possible paronomasia common to the Torah with the thieving *shepherds* driven away by Moses. 3:1; 4:18 and 18:1 first identify יֶתְרוֹ Jethro הֵתֵן “father-in-law” of Moses. If he is descended from Re’uel *ben* Esau, he could be priest to Midian of the Canaanite god El אֵל without being himself a Midianite. 18:11 Jethro seems to be brought to a new understanding of the Hebrew God יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים.

Numbers 10:29 מֹשֶׁה לְחָבֵב בֶּן־רְעוּאֵל הַמִּדְיָנִי הֵתֵן Moses pleads with “Hobab son of Re’uel the Midianite his father-in-law” to act as “eyes” for their trip to the Promised Land. He refuses. Most take *Hobab* to be MS error for *Jethro*.²² However, *Hobab* has no orthographic relation to *Jethro*, but it is closer to *Caleb* כָּלֵב. Ronald Allen argues Hobab to be Jethro’s son and therefore Moses’ brother-in-law יָבֵם.²³ Hobab could well be, not son, but son-in-law to Jethro and brother-in-law twice removed to Moses. The *Kenite* of Judges 1:16 and *Hobab* of 4:11 show obvious scribal *lapsus mentis* for *Jethro* and the logical source for the redacted mistake of Numbers 10:29. Notice הֵתֵן is “father-in-law,” חָתָן is “son-in-law.” Allen’s argument for Hobab is in fact the very role played by Caleb as spy for Israel. Did Caleb marry one of the seven daughters of Jethro? Although Zipporah is Jethro’s only daughter named, one of Caleb’s concubines, *Ephah* עִיפָה I Chronicles 2:46, is also a Midianite name, Genesis 25:4. Either way Caleb, not Jethro (*Hobab*), goes with Moses. Exodus 18 Jethro advises Moses to appoint elders to help him, and Numbers 11 God (through Caleb?) repeats the same advice.

Caleb and Joshua alone gave the advice to enter Canaan and are the only leaders of the **4th G.** to survive the Wilderness. Deuteronomy 1 Moses contrasts the faithful Caleb with Israel’s “evil (4th) generation.” Joshua (14) suitably rewarded him with Hebron, patriarchal home and burial site (Genesis 13; 23) south toward the territory of his ancestral Kenites, then held by the Anakim whom

²⁰ וּמִלְכִּי־צֶדֶק מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֵם...כֹּהֵן לֵאלֹהֵי עֵלְיֹן Both Jethro and Melchizedek as *priest-king* predate the Levitical priesthood being outside the lines of Judah and Levi, yet precursors of David. M is likely behind the idea of Two *Messiahs* (Zech 9; 14). The Essenes take each from Levi and Judah; Ginzberg’s rabbis take each from Judah and Ephraim, *Legends*, 175, 453; and James VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmann’s, 1994), 52, 177. Luther agrees with Nicolaus von Lyra (from rabbinic tradition?: Ginzberg, 74) calling him the still very much alive patriarch Shem, “Genesis 6–14” vol. 2, *Luther’s Works*, Jaroslav Pelican, ed. (55 [now 77] vols. St Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1960), 2:381–383.

²¹ Young, *Prophets*, 38–41. Our opinion: This is a racial slur against Zipporah, not a second wife.

²² Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Midianite-Kenite Hypothesis,” *Journal for the Study of the OT* 33 2 (2008), 136 agrees with a majority equating Hobab with Jethro.

²³ Ronald Allen, “Numbers,” Pt 4, Vol 2 *EBC*, 2:783.

he would conquer with Othniel, nephew and future first Judge.²⁴ David the *Ephrathite* set up his base of operations, took three wives from the territory of Caleb and made Hebron his first capital, Joshua 13:2; I Samuel 25; 27:8, 10; II Samuel 2:11. Of course Caleb belongs in the line of David.

The Kenites: Archaeologists agree that both Assyro-Babylonian and Sumerian ancestral nomads migrated down from the Zagros Mts. between the 9th and 7th millennia BCE.²⁵ Genesis 10 lists the Elamites, Assyrians, Lydians (of western Turkey) and Arameans (of Syria and north Arabia) all as Semites (cf. *Sumer* from *Shem*), including the proto-Hebrew Arphachshad ancestor of Abram.

Joseph Blenkinsopp reviews a very compelling southern, “proto-Arabian” hypothesis for the origin of Judahite religion and its “Midianite-Kenite” connection. Unless Genesis 15:19 is MS error, the Kenites known to Abraham must have predated him.²⁶ The LXX (from the Hebrew *Vorlage*?) has **Καιναν** *ben* Arphachshad for 11:12 (cf. Luke 3:36). Genesis 5:9 lists *Kenan* קֵינָן as great-grandson of Adam when “people began to call on the name of the Lord.” 4:22 *Cain’s* קַיִן descendant Tubalcain, both elements meaning “smith,” is the virtual ‘inventor’ of bronze and iron.²⁷ This implies that Cain’s descendants survived the Flood. Cain and Kenan are both posited as eponymous ancestors of the Kenites. But Genesis 36 cannot be ignored listing *Kenaz* קֵנָז *ben* Eliphaz *ben* Esau of Edom by his Hittite wife Adah. (Cause for the Chronicler to include him in chapter 1?) No distinction is made between Kenites and Kenizzites. Negeb territory of Ziklag is attributed to Caleb, I Samuel 30:14.

Blenkinsopp and Johnson draw interesting territorial and cultural parallels between Semitic Rechabites, Midianites, Horites, Jerahmeelites, Edomites and Kenites, as well as Hebrew Nazirites.²⁸ In brief they pitted the pastoral rules of the Torah against the temptations of city life and Levitical Temple rules of worship, espoused by Ezra. They kept to the desert, living in tents and caves, precursors of the Essenes of Qumran.²⁹ Elijah the *Tishbite*, from *yashav* יָשַׁב “to dwell” unknown as a town, may simply be a descriptive term for Elijah living on the edge of the desert in Gilead, territory

²⁴ Note Gen 23 Abraham purchases the cave of Ephron the Hittite עֶפְרוֹן הַחִתִּי at Hebron for Sarah’s burial. Is it mere coincidence that Caleb’s ancestry traces back to one of Esau’s two Hittite wives? *Ephron* may or may not be related to *ephrath*, but the Rephaim, Anakim and Hittites’ contact with Abe, Samuel and Caleb is intriguing.

²⁵ *CAH*, I 1:377–420; I 2 (1971), 71–92; II 1 (1973), 437–443; and see David Rohl, “Legend, The Genesis of Civilization” vol. 2, *A Test of Time* 3 vols. (New York: Century, Random House, 1998), 2:129–140.

²⁶ Blenkinsopp, “Hypothesis,” 131–153. Originating with F. W. Ghillany in 1862, it was followed, not always with credit, by several scholars well into the 20th c. (Abram Sachar, *A History of the Jews* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962], 21 singles out Karl Budde). It is based upon four textual foundations: (1) narratives of Moses and his Midianite in-laws, (2) poetic texts, (3) Egyptian topographical texts, and (4) Cain as the eponymous founder of the Kenites; and see *CAH*, II 2:324–327, 552–554; and Plaut, *Torah*, 513.

²⁷ Davidson, *Lexicon*, 657; and see Blenkinsopp, “Hypothesis,” 140. Jane Harrison, *Themis* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1912, 1927; repr, World Pub Meridian Books, 1962), 26: to “primitive people metallurgy is an uncanny craft, the smith is half medicine man;” Rohl, “Legend,” 2:199–200.

²⁸ Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews* (New York: Harper and Rowe, Perennial Library, 1988), 52, 84.

²⁹ Josephus, “Antiquities,” XIII v.9; XV x.4; XVIII i.5; etc.

of the Rechabites. From this same word *toshab* “resident alien, sojourner” describes Abraham Genesis 23:4. The name of the God of Israel was known if not worshiped from ‘Havilah to Shur.’ Samuel the Nazirite surely knew of the rustic faith of the Kenites, I Samuel 15:6; Judges 3:7; 4:11.

The Judahites/Ephraimites: Judah as fourth son of Leah shares common heritage with the northern tribes; but Jacob blesses an alliance with his two favorite sons Genesis 48–49, giving Reuben’s birthright to Joseph (Ephraim) and power to Judah.³⁰ After the Exodus Joshua gives Judah virtually unlimited territory to the south, sharing the hill country with Ephraim and Benjamin.³¹ Saul of Benjamin should have been a good mediate choice for king, but failed. Samuel, Levite of Ephraim, may label his own and David’s clans *Ephrathites* 1:1, 17:12 both for being *blessed to be fruitful* and for common heritage with Ephraim.³² Ezra reflects back on this alliance I Chronicles 9:3. Isaiah 11:1 and Ezekiel 36:8; 37:19 foresee a *fruitful* reunion under a future “David.”

Summarizing the Chronicler’s anomalies from selected verses: In I Chronicles 2: **9–11** the Chronicler copies the line of David from Ruth 4, but to Ram he subtly adds Jerahmeel and Chelubai “born to” **הזרן** Hezron.³³ He also adds two women named *Ephrath* and turns two of three *Hurs* into an *Ashhur* and *Hur*. **19** Chelubai, now *Caleb* (whom the rabbis equate with Caleb *ben* Jephunneh), marries a third wife Ephrath, who “bears” **המלך** him Hur grandfather of the same Bezalel artificer of the Tabernacle, all unattested by the Torah! If this is not problem enough, **24** Caleb *ben* Hezron marries the widow of his father, also called *Ephrathah*, who bears him Ashhur, “father (settler) of” **אֲבִי אֶבְי** Tekoa (north of Hebron).³⁴ Then **25** Jerahmeel has four sons, the first of which is **another Ram**.

³⁰ Doug Petrovich, “Brief History of Alphabetic Script,” *ABR Bible and Spade* 35 1 (2022), 14–15 posits Manasseh and Ephraim devising the first proto-Hebraic script from Egyptian hieroglyphs, based on Gen 48.

³¹ Josephus II vii.4, 83; V ii.3 includes Jethro in Judah’s inheritance. I Chr 5:1–2 gives Ezra’s take on Gen 48–49.

³² The supreme irony of God’s ‘chosen’ but unfaithful people is illustrated by Moses applying this word Gen 41:52 and 49:22 to both Ephraim and Joseph. Samuel applies it to David’s clan Ruth 4:11, fulfilled in Jesse and his 7 sons. Here he pictures his own and David’s clans being among the *Am ha-Aretz*, living a pastoral (*fruitful*) life in their villages, struggling to make ends meet, concerned about their male progeny. Yet finding “redemption” in a foreign Ruth hints at a background Samuel knew was far from innocent and solid. Is it not curious that the Chronicler repeats the names of royal matrons from Rehoboam to Hezekiah, but no mention of David’s; reason for the rabbis to rumor her a slave? Or does this point to a greater problem with his line?

³³ Josephus, “Antiquities,” II vii.4 calls **Ῥαμ** (Ram) the brother of Hezron.

³⁴ Nothing is as it seems in the Hebrew Bible, driven by its all-embracing irony: namely, God choosing the least and last to accomplish the first and foremost. Paul summarizes this irony I Cor 1:27–28. **This raises the critical issue of motive:** No matter its source or accuracy, why and how could such a lurid detail as even the possibility of incest get into the record of the Chronicler? Condemned by the Torah in no uncertain terms (Lev 18 illustrated by Gen 9:22; 19:32), which even if true could simply be ignored, as the rabbis do; why was the Chronicler not content to leave Samuel’s record of Ruth 4 simply as is? This record compares to the likes of Oedipus-Jocaste and Amram-Jochebed (both wives’ names meaning “glory of [Greek moon goddess *Io* and Hebrew *Yah* name of] God;” and suggests *Yahweh*’s name was known before Moses). Our hypothesis suggests the *ephrathah* “fruitfulness,” the very survival, of the line of David must be at stake here! Samuel betrays his innocence by his use of *ephrath* with his homage to Ruth. Whatever his source, it leaves the Chronicler caught on the horns of a triangular dilemma: (1) He either must admit that David’s line legitimately ceased with a

Finally **50b** the first-born of Ephrathah, Ashhur now called *Hur*, has sons *Salma* שלמה (here called *בֵּיתֶלְהֶם* *Bethlehem*), Shobal and Hareph, *settlers* of towns centered on Kiriath-jearim mixed in with Kenite clans from Jabez **55**. **Chapter 4** will be addressed later in detail.

Ezra could not just ‘invent’ this convoluted record without a reputable source and motive. Scholars agree that it looks too intentional for MS error or later redaction, causing them to accept it at face value, attributing it to variant sources and dismissing any agreement on a possible motive.

Our hypothesis suggests that the Chronicler’s use of the name *Ephrath* is key to unlocking these anomalies: that he finds her name (in Samuel’s record?) for a woman whose marriage, not to Caleb *ben* Hezron, but to Caleb *ben* Jephunneh the Kenite places him in the line of David.

EVIDENCE FOR THE PROPOSED HYPOTHESIS

Reviewing chapter 2 in detail: **2:1–4** records Judah’s marriage to *bath*-Shuah, a Canaanite by whom he has three sons, two put to death for their unfaithfulness and the third the Chronicler now ignores, but whose descendants he pejoratively calls *Shilonites* 9:5; then his disturbing encounter with his own daughter-in-law by whom he has Perez and Zerah, from the latter of which (**6–8**) will come Achan, “the troubler of Israel,” and perhaps the Zorathites of Carmi 4:1–2 (q.v.).³⁵ This record foreshadows a more disturbing cloud hanging over the ‘purity’ of the line of David.

2:5, 9–15: Samuel (if he is the author of Ruth) casts Perez’s sons *הַזָּרֹחַ וְהַמּוֹל* *Hezron and Hamul* (Gen 46; Num 26) into a ‘trouble free outline’ for David’s clan.³⁶ But **2:9** the Chronicler adds sons for Hezron, Jerahmeel and Chelubai to Samuel’s Ram, whom the rabbis ignore and Source critics ascribe to alternative traditions.³⁷ At least one Samaritan MS equates Hamul with Jerahmeel.

Note: This MS for Genesis 46:12 uses *הַמּוֹל*.³⁸ LXX MSS (from the Hebrew *Vorlage*?) use *Ιαμουηλ* here and 2:5 equating **1st Generation Hamul** with **2nd G. Jerahmeel**, perhaps supplying two missing **G.’s** with the linear line of Caleb *ben* Ram *ben* Hamuel *ben* Perez!³⁹ *Jerahmeel* יֵרָחְמֵאל derives from רָחַם “to pity.” Interestingly, *Hamul* from הָמַל also means “to pity.”⁴⁰ *Ram* (LXX: *Ῥαμ*) derives from רָם “lift up, high, exalted.” It is found in *Ramah* Jeremiah 31:15, *Ramathaim-zophim* I Samuel 1:1, the home of Samuel (and Joseph of Aramathea). It is tempting to transcribe כְּלִיכִי as *Cal(u)(e)bite*, with MS error for the *waw* ו inserted for the *tsere* pointed *lamed* ל of *Caleb*. (Cf. *Zuph* צֹפִי of I Samuel 1:1 and *Zophay* צֹפִי of I Chronicles 6:26 [MT:

female only generation; or (2) it was ‘rescued’ either by an incestuous or (3) by a foreign relationship. We suggest, (1) must be covered by: (2) admitting to a ‘Caleb,’ while (3) separating him from David.

³⁵ Gordon, *Common Background*, 95 a practice acceptable under Hittite Law.

³⁶ No matter the Source for this and all other lists (e.g. whether a priestly source copied by the Chronicler or vice versa), we address it as is. Payne and F. B. Huey, “Ruth” pt. 4, vol. 3 *EBC* (1992), agree that it has “gaps.”

³⁷ H. G. M. Williamson, “Sources and Redaction in the Chronicler’s Genealogy of Judah,” *JBL* 98/3 (1979), 351–359, citing sources since Wellhausen, attributes the disparities and anomalies here to unknown sources; and see Levin, “From Lists to History,” 627 for discussion of these lines with Source Criticism as hypothesis.

³⁸ See *Biblia Hebraica* (Rudolph Kittel, ed. [1929]); rev. ed. *BH Stuttgartensia*, Karl Elliger, Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1967/77), apparatus criticus for 2:5 and Gen 46:12.

³⁹ *The Septuagint*, Charles Brenton, ed. (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1851; repr, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), for I Chr 2:5.

⁴⁰ Davidson, *Lexicon*, 264.

11].)⁴¹ *Caleb* כָּלֵב “dog” (κύνας) Davidson calls onomatopoeic for clapping or barking, Exodus 11:7; used pejoratively in I Sam 17:43; 24:14; II Sam 3:8. But 4:11 *Chelub* כְּלִיב Amos 8:1 is “fruit-basket!” (cf. *ephraim*)

Who were the Jerahmeelites? Quite clearly Samuel or (since chapter 25 reports his death) the writer of I Samuel 27:10, 30:26–31, or the Book of Jashar (II Sam. 2:18) was quite familiar with the Jerahmeelites. They and the Kenites were rewarded by David with his other friends of the Negeb when he avenged the capture of his family upon the Philistines at Ziklag. David had at least one wife from among these people. There may be an even closer family connection.

Are there one or two *Rams*? Williamson accepts one, Payne two, but by Payne’s reckoning he is forced to concede at least 300 years between Ram *ben* Hezron and the unattested Amminadab *ben* Ram, or one if not three missing generations.⁴² 16–17: The daughters of Nahash King of Ammon, “David’s sisters” (more likely cousins, II Samuel 2:18; 17:25), mothers of four of David’s greatest warriors; but Samuel makes no such foreign connection, but he must know the truth!⁴³

Note: Davidson translates *Amminadab* עַמִּינָדָב as “kindred (people) of the prince” from עַמִּי “my people” (נָדָב “willing, noble, prince”), and *Nahshon* נַחֲשֹׁן “enchanter” from נָחַשׁ “serpent,” from whence also *Ir-nahash* (4:11–12 below) and *Nahash* the king just noted.⁴⁴ **What is going on here?** Does Ezra purposely misinterpret (10) Nahshon’s name as “prince נָשִׂיא of the sons of Judah” from נָשָׂא, because he knows his foreign connection should prevent him being in David’s line and should be replaced with Caleb!?

Premise I: **We suggest** that something happened to Ram’s line which Ezra discovered from Samuel. Amminadab *ben* Ram is not attested. Nahshon *ben* Amminadab is but not in David’s line. Contrary to his alleged purpose, Ezra ignores Ram *ben* Hezron and David’s line, focusing on Caleb’s

⁴¹ Ibid. 148 for discussion of this troublesome *qamats-yod* ending in regard to אֶדְיָי. This is not a construct ending. The *yod* must be a *mater lectionis* in a diphthong used often by Ezra for foreign names, and properly transliterated -ay, from Thomas Lambdin’s *Intro. to Biblical Hebrew* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1971), XVII; and see our *Ezra-Nehemiah Lists*.

⁴² Williamson, “Genealogy of Judah,” 357. Elisheba’s marriage to Aaron links Judah to Levi, but with a two generational disparity Ex 6:23; Num 1:7.

See Payne “Chronicles,” *EBC* 4:332, 334 for comments on 10–11.

⁴³ Ibid. 335. Most likely Zeruiah and Abigail’s mother was Jesse’s sister. Payne calls them David’s step-sisters. However, it is clear that their sons must be of the same generation as David. That makes them David’s aunts, not sisters or cousins. But David deals with both their father Nahash and his son and their brother Hanun, who must be one and two generations older than David; which shows that David’s line has complications.

⁴⁴ Yamauchi, *EBC* 4:582 *Amminadab* is a recurring royal Ammonite name. Davidson, *Lexicon*, 545, 563, 604.

and Jerahmeel's lines.⁴⁵ The four relationships of Caleb *ben* Hezron **18–24** serve to divert attention from the possible disappearance of Ram's line or connection to Caleb *ben* Jephunneh.⁴⁶

a. First, **2:18**: Caleb marries Azubah "forsaken" by whom he has Jesher, Shobab and Ardon.

b. Second, he marries Jerioth "fearful". No further progeny or refugee descendants recorded.

c. Third, **2:19**: Caleb marries a certain **Ephrath** of unknown origin by whom he has **Hur**.

Bezalel *ben* Uri *ben* Hur *ben* Caleb (by Ephrath) *ben* Hezron makes five generations. But Bezalel "shadow of El" worked on the Tabernacle (with Oholiab "tent" maker of Dan). They must be **4th G.**, making Hur a **2nd G.** contemporary of Caleb, not son.⁴⁷ Moses calls Hur a Judahite with no mention of any *Caleb* or *Ephrath* Exodus 31:2. **Caleb *ben* Hezron cannot be this Hur's father.**

Note: Davidson and Steinmann agree that *Hur* means "to dig" (related to 'cave dwellers,' troglodytes?), but is also foreign sounding, related to Horites of Edom, from הָרָר "mountain."⁴⁸ The Horites may be equated with the Hurrians, Indo-Europeans from the Hindu-Kush area in the third millennium BCE.⁴⁹ They migrated into Syria and established the Kingdom of Mitanni in the second millennium, a people feared for their bronze and iron weapons. The name *Uri* may be related to the ancient city of Ur, but more likely a hypocoristicon of *Uriel*, *Uriah* or *Urijah*, all from אִיר "light, fire." Bezal(e)l was a metalsmith (note ²⁷). Foreign craftsmen commonly worked on the Temple, if not the earlier Tabernacle. Besides the *Hur* grandfather of Bezalel, Moses lists another his 'right hand man' Exodus 17:12; 24:14, and a third as prince of Midian Numbers 31:8; Joshua 13:21. The foreign connections here are unmistakable.

d. Fourth, **2:21**: Hezron "went in to" *bath-Machir abi* Gilead, who bears him Segub, *ancestor of* Jair, 8th Judge of Israel. Besides the 500 year period between Segub and Jair, Hezron *ben* Reuben's clan took the territory of Gilead.⁵⁰ Ezra (or a redactor) tries to explain this in 5:1–2.⁵¹ Joshua 17 attests the line Zelophehad *ben* Hephher *ben* Gilead *ben* Machir *ben* Manasseh; but neither Numbers 26, Judges 10:3 nor even I Chronicles 7 attest to what appears to be a very contrived generational connection for Judah with the line of Manasseh. (See 4:12 below for our posited alternative.)

e. Fifth, **2:24**: Emendation is required no matter how this verse is translated. But we must note Ezra has a *second Ephrath* marrying Hezron **1st G.** and then his own son Caleb *ben* Hezron **2nd**

⁴⁵ Pentateuchal Source critics have no problem equating the Chronicler's *Caleb* with that of the Pentateuch. Interesting are the hypothetical motives behind the JEPDL sources, but which dismiss the possibility of such motives behind traditional authorship. Excellent examples of this thinking are found with James W. Flanagan, "History, Religion and Ideology: The Caleb Tradition," *Horizons* 3 2 (Fall 1976), 175–185, relegating the character of Caleb to literary-historical traditions of southern Judah; and Ithamar Kislev, "Joshua (and Caleb) in the priestly spies story..." *JBL* 136 1 (2017), 39–55. No matter how detailed the scholarship behind such hypotheses, there are always counter theories leaving no definitive answers.

⁴⁶ Williamson, "Genealogy of Judah," 353–355 with a thorough analysis of the problems here (citing Wellhausen, et multos alios) attributes them to variant *tribal* sources.

⁴⁷ Ginzberg, *Legends*, 289–290. The rabbis recognized this discrepancy by omitting Uri. Bezalel's knowledge of "secret lore" hints at foreign heritage, but covered by five Judahite names from **2 & 4**; and they (with Josephus) have Jethro's descendants settling in Judah, also connecting him with Jabez, 266.

⁴⁸ Davidson, *Lexicon*, 251; Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 181.

⁴⁹ Johnson, *History of the Jews*, 12; and see *CAH*, II 1:422.

⁵⁰ Gen 42:37 Reuben has two sons, but 46:9 only a short time later adds Hezron and Carmi.

⁵¹ And see Gen 48. This is a very interesting combination of the inheritance of Judah and Ephraim.

G.; but Caleb's 'son' Ashhur could not be "settler of Tekoa" unless he is **5th G.** Calling him a descendant does not fit the narrative here. Rabbinic tradition and scholars do not call this MS error. **Caleb ben Hezron cannot be this Ashhur's father.**

The LXX, based on (the Hebrew *Vorlage*? for) Joshua 15:59, eliminates this disturbing *ménage à trois* by having Caleb going to (Bethlehem) **Εφραθα**; and after Hezron's death his wife **Αβια** bore him **Ασχω** (Ashhur), father of Tekoa.⁵² The Vg, KJV, NKJV and NIV (Payne) have Hezron dying in *Caleb Ephrathah* (unknown) after which *Abijah* bears him Ashhur. The RSV, NEB and ESV follow the MT:⁵³ **וְאַחֵר מוֹת־חֶזְרֹן בְּכֶלֶב אֶפְרַתָּה וְאִשְׁתּוֹ חֶזְרֹן אֲבִי תְקוּעַ** "After Hezron's death to Caleb Ephrathah, the wife of Hezron *his father* (alt. **אביו**), bore him Ashhur settler of Tekoa" (this writer's trans.; and see Williamson citing Wellhausen's emended trans.³⁷ above). Even if *Ephrath* was a foreign, pre-exodic name of Bethlehem, then Samuel calling his own and David's clans *Ephrathites* amounts to labeling them foreigners, the very thesis of this paper. Here *Ephrathah* is either an unknown woman of Ephraim or her name is Abia. *Abia* "her father" is a hypocoristicon of *Abijah*. The Chronicler's record here really satisfies no one.

Premise II: **The identity of Ephrath is key to the hypothesis of this paper: c and e** center on Ephrath and Hur; **a** has no progeny, **b** is unattested; **c** is illogical; **d** is contrived, **e** is incestuous. **We suggest** that **Ephrath** and **Hur** were mother and son discovered by the Chronicler (in Samuel's record?), related to Caleb *ben* Jephunneh.

Genesis 35 Moses is clearly playing on the meaning of *parah*. Jacob is returning to Canaan with Leah and Rachel carrying along certain household (fertility and ancestral) gods. God tells Jacob to get rid of them, renews his promises to Abraham and blesses Jacob: **11 פְּרֹה וּרְבֵה** *pereh-voo-reveh* Kal imperative "(you shall) be fruitful and multiply." (This is a virtual motif for Genesis, repeated for Adam, Noah, Abraham and Ishmael, as well as for Ephraim 48:4, 16 and Joseph 49:22 by Jacob. Samuel has good reason so to label David's clan Ruth 4:11.⁵⁴) Jacob has passed Shechem and Bethel,

⁵² See *BHS* app. crit. for 15:59. If the Greek translation here (of the Hebrew *Vorlage*) is older than Hebrew MSS, then Joshua is the first to equate *Ephrathah* with Bethlehem. However, the whole list from LXX 15:48–62 is troublesome. If Bethlehem is missing from Joshua's list, 10 unknown villages for v. 60 add no legitimacy. But **Εφραθα, αυτη εσσι Βαιθλεμ** is an obvious scribal emendation. Moses knows nothing of this town.

⁵³ *Clementine Vulgate*, Aloisius Gramatica, ed. (Rome: Vatican, 1959); *English Standard Version*, Crossway Bibles (Wheaton: Good News Pubs.; repr, St. Louis: Concordia, 2003); *The King James Version*, *New Chain Reference Bible*, Frank Thompson, ed. (Indianapolis: B. B. Kirkbride Bible Co., 1964); *The New English Bible*, *Oxford Study Edition*, Samuel Sandmel, ed. (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976); *New International Version*, *Concordia Self-Study Bible*, Robert Hoerber, ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, International Bible Society, 1984); *The New King James Version* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983); *The Revised Standard Version*, *Harper Study Bible*, Harold Lindsell, ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978); and LXX.

⁵⁴ Ruth 4:11 displays the irony we find crucial to the motive of both Samuel and the Chronicler. While David's clan is implied to be among the least of Judah, yet Samuel expands upon Moses' use of **אָפַר**. Key words here are: **וְעָשִׂה חֵיל בְּאֶפְרַתָּה**, an imperative which Davidson trans. "acquire riches, be prosperous in E". We posit: The

nearing *Ephrath* on what would become the border of Benjamin/Ephraim and Judah, which Samuel calls Zelzah 10:2 (cf. Zelah of Joshua 18:28; II Samuel 21:14) and Jeremiah 31:15 equates with Ramah in Ephraim, not Benjamin. Suddenly Rachel goes into labor, delivers Benjamin, dies in childbirth and Jacob buries her there (*Bethlehem* obviously edited); hence to *migdol Eder*, site unknown.⁵⁵

Sailhamer joins historical-critical commentators who use this text to argue that Genesis was written after the reign of David.⁵⁶ Samuel 10:2; 17:12 (cf. 1:1; 16:1), the Psalmist 132:6, and Jeremiah 31 contradict Genesis 35:19 and 48:7. Moses reflects no knowledge of Bethlehem or Ezra's Caleb *ben* Hezron or Ephrathites, nor does Ezra tie Rachel's tomb to Bethlehem. After the Exodus **5th G.** Salmon settled his family in Bethlehem, but Samuel calls them *Ephrathites* (Ruth 1:1; 4:11), not for where they lived, but for their family ties. Before he died Samuel, Judge of Saul of Benjamin, anointed David. He must not appear to be a usurper. Since his marriage to Michal was a failure, Samuel must find a Benjaminite/Ephrathite connection for him. Instead, he very likely discovered another connection. Indeed, David forcibly takes Michal back II Samuel 3 after Samuel's death!

Premise III: **We suggest** that these convoluted relationships serve to deflect attention away from **Caleb *ben* Jephunneh's** possible connection to David's line. The Chronicler could not 'eliminate' him. Moses and Joshua attest to him. Samuel probably knew more than he revealed. His refugee heirs deserved the heritage of their faithful ancestor, despite Ezra's alleged purpose.

a. Two alternatives: (1) If indeed Ezra wished to eliminate him, he could have used Joshua 14–15 to connect him to the Edomites. It appears he was preparing to do just that in I Chronicles 1. Or (2) in order to secure the heritage of his adoption, he could have listed a Judahite wife for him and the sons she bore him. If that were so easy, why did he not do so? Because her name is Ephrath! Instead, he diverts his attention to the lines of Jerahmeel and Caleb *ben* Hezron.

b. **2:25–41:** The *bine* Jerahmeel by his unnamed first wife, Ram and his four brothers **(26)**, all have no further progeny beyond Ram's **3rd G.** sons Jamin, Maaz and Eker.

Note: Cf. *Jamin* יָמִין "right hand, south" (facing east) Kenite territory, cf. the current nation of *Yemen*. The names Maaz and Eker are unique, but with Jamin (also *ben* Simeon) curiously *Ben-jaminites* "sons of the south" were a powerful nomadic tribe of the area of the Arabian Desert co-habited by the Kenites.⁵⁷

Bethlehemites bless Boaz and his new foreign wife: "and may you (Boaz) be successful (prosperous) in her fertility," which they poetically define in v. 12. Thus, Samuel may well label this clan *Ephrathites* both for this blessing and for its foreign connections described in Ruth. So also Micah 5:2: Bethlehem is called *Ephrathah* by a synecdoche for the clan of David, not vice versa. Indeed, this word is a perfect cover for a man whose complex origins derive from the wilderness of rebellion, guerrilla warfare and foreign women of the Negeb.

⁵⁵ Von Rad, *Genesis*, 341 meaning *cattle tower*.

⁵⁶ John Sailhamer, "Genesis" pt. 1, vol. 2, *EBC* (1990), 2:219, which if true nullifies Ruth in this issue.

⁵⁷ Von Rad, *Genesis*, 341; *CAH*, II 1:24–28.

Jerahmeel's other line with his second wife Atarah's son Onam אֹנָם (also a Horite name) 'fills in' three missing **G.'s (28)**. This line has ten **G.'s** to Zabad (36) contemporary with David (cf. Levi's fourteen lines). But Ezra says **7th G.** Sheshan (**34**) had only daughters; so he 'innocently' gave his daughter (Ahlay) to his Egyptian slave Jarha, **legitimately ceasing this line**; yet Ezra is determined to extend it three generations to Zabad and ten to the Exile with Elishama. But the towns and territory given to this line linked only with "Jerahmeel's brother" point to another Caleb (42–50).

Note: Jeremiah 36 does identify a certain Elishama, scribe to king Jehoiakim *ben* Josiah, one of the last kings of Judah, and a certain Jerahmeel, described as the king's son. Elishama may be the source for this record. **Nevertheless, Jerahmeel's line goes nowhere.**⁵⁸ (See charts.)

c. **2:42–50a: The *bine* Caleb go all over the map.** Caleb, not called *ben* Hezron, but "brother of Jerahmeel" (cf. **4:16**) is not the same Caleb of 18–19. This list consists of **5th G.** toponyms which Ezra picks for Caleb and Jerahmeel. **4th G. Caleb *ben* Jephunneh** is the only *Caleb* Ezra can be referring to here. (**42**) Mareshah, Ziph and Hebron, key towns within his territory, are mixed into others from Jerahmeel's line (Shammai and Jadai). Seven lines result for Caleb: Two by concubines Ephah (**46**) (a Midianite name, Jethro's daughter?) and Maacah (**48**) (also *bath* Nahor). (**50**) Ephrath bears him **Ashhur** whose (3) sons are Shobal, Hareph, and Salma *settler* of Bethlehem; and (**4:5**) concubines Helah and Naarah (2). (**49**) Caleb's daughter Achsah of Joshua 15:16 and Judges 1.

Premise IV: **2:50b–55: We suggest two *Ephraths* and *Ashhur/Hur*** are one and the same wife and son of either Caleb *ben* Hezron or Caleb *ben* Jephunneh, making David a descendant of either a Judahite or a Kenite foreigner. (**20**) **Hur** son of Caleb is unattested and contrived. **Ashhur** IS the firstborn **24** and **Hur** IS CALLED "the firstborn son of Ephrathah" **50** whose sons are Shobal (another Horite name), Salma and Hareph, **5th G. fathers** of towns settled after the Exodus. See note for **2:54**.⁵⁹ (Later 4:4 he again calls Hur "the firstborn son of Ephrathah...the father of Bethlehem," surely skipping Salma [another scribal *lapsus mentis*?].) This Hur must be **4th G.** Although Ash-hur *ben* Caleb of 2:24 is **5th G. father** of Tekoa, **we suggest the only Caleb who can be father to Hur or Ashhur is 4th G. Caleb *ben* Jephunneh.** Who is his wife?

The multiple possibilities for Ephrath's identity display how easy it would have been for Ezra to identify the correct one. Four times this name occurs in this record, unattested by the Torah. Both Ezra and the Torah use female names only for important reasons. If in 2:19 she is Caleb's wife,

⁵⁸ If the rabbis could ignore both Jerahmeel's linear line and Caleb *ben* Jephunneh's convoluted, segmented line, why could not the Chronicler? Because he knew that David's line was dependent upon something far more complicated than "Bezalel *ben* Uri *ben* Hur."

⁵⁹ The Chronicler could have once and for all cleared up any confusion in **2:54**. He has already identified Salma as the father of Bethlehem in **2:51** along with his brothers and their towns. Now he lists the clans associated with those towns, but for Bethlehem, just when we would expect to see *Ephrathites*, he repeats *Bethlehem*. This is a glaring omission. He knows *Ephrathite* has nothing to do with the town's name.

2:24, 50 and 4:4 add doubt and confusion to this already unattested relationship. As wife of **1st G.** Hezron *ben* Perez (**2:9**) she could have been mother of Jerahmeel, Ram and Chelubay, with an apparent risk of incest. Samuel did not call his own and Boaz's clans *Ephrathites* for this reason; nor could he call them *Calebites*; but if *Ephrath* were a *Judahite* this frees David's stature from Benjamin.

a. We suggest: The lines of Caleb *ben* Hezron ended quickly, but Ram *ben* Hezron or Ram *ben* Jerahmeel could have had a daughter Ephrath as part of a 'lost' female only generation in Payne's 300 years, either one of which married Caleb *ben* Jephunneh, making her a Judahite, not Ephraimite.

Ezra could have stated plainly that **4th G.** Caleb *ben* Jephunneh married an Ephraimite, but that gives him no added stature in the heritage of Judah. Ezra could not state that Caleb's progeny by a Judahite woman named *Ephrath* includes the very clan of the future King David. Instead, Ezra gives a final reason for such speculation by **closing chapter 2** with reference to Judges 4:11 and Joshua 19:35 and Heber the Kenite from Hammath of Naphtali and the house of Rechab of Jabez.⁶⁰ The connection with Caleb *ben* Jephunneh here is undeniable, having nothing to do with David, unless...?

b. Our hypothesis suggests: The *ménage à trois* Ezra describes in 2:24 between Ephrath and Hezron and Caleb *ben* Hezron was actually between Amminadab and Caleb *ben* Jephunneh. As sister or daughter of **3rd G.** Amminadab, or even as daughter of Ram *ben* Jerahmeel, Ephrath could have married **4th G.** Caleb *ben* Jephunneh (not *ben* Hezron) making her the mother of **5th G.** Ashhur by Caleb, as recorded by Ezra. **This hypothesis leaves open the possibility of Ephrath being the mother of either Nahshon נחשון or Ashhur אשחור. No clan can be named for a woman or a foreigner, except for a compelling reason!** That appears to be just how Ezra wanted to leave it in order to protect the purity and 'fruitfulness' of David's line.

c. To state plainly: Nahshon *ben* Amminadab (by an *Ephrathah* of Ephraim/Benjamin) may be in the line of David. Moses does not attest to it, but this could explain Samuel calling his own and David's clans *Ephrathites* for their rising political influence succeeding Saul. However, if they are bypassed by Ashhur *ben* Caleb (by Ephrath of Judah) *ben* Jephunneh, then Caleb is the grandfather of Salma settler of Bethlehem and full ancestor of David! Then Samuel's homage to Ruth displays how important foreigners are to David's line, enough to call their clans *Ephrathites* rather than *Calebites*. Ezra has Salma *ben* Ashhur son of the unattested Caleb *ben* **Hezron**. But the wives and progeny for Ashhur which Ezra expands upon in chapter 4 make it certain that **Ashhur** settler of Tekoa is after all **5th G. ben** Caleb *ben* **Jephunneh**, as well as father of Shobal, Hareph and **Salma**

⁶⁰ C. H. Knights, "Kenites – Rechabites: I Chronicles 2:55 Reconsidered," VT 43 1 (1993), 10–18. A thorough exegesis of 2:55 to show that Rechabites are not Kenites, with which we agree.

settler of Bethlehem. Moses could not have known the consequences of adopting this Kenite into the clan of Judah; but God calling Caleb “my servant” Numbers 14:24 pays him his highest tribute.

EVIDENCE FROM CHAPTERS 3 AND 4

Chapter 3, tracing David’s royal line through Zerubbabel, is followed by the troublesome **Chapter 4**. Payne puts the matter succinctly: “None of the genealogies of Judah in 4:1–23 appear elsewhere in Scripture.”⁶¹ If Ezra’s purpose is to verify true refugees returning from Exile, then chapter 4 logically follows 1–3 by laying the foundation for the lists recorded in Ezra and Nehemiah. Instead, the numerous unanswerable gaps here display the failure of his alleged purpose.

The key to chapter 4 is 1: Shobal, 4: Hur, and 5: Ashhur. Payne finds MSS errors in **4:1–3** which do not match the Chronicler’s own lines;⁶² but this is a linear genealogy omitting Caleb. **4:1**, from 2:50 Shobal is *ben* Hur and Hur’s mother is Ephrath. His father is not Carmi, it is Caleb (from 2:24). **4:4** quietly and subtly takes up Hur’s line, now with Ephrath and Bethlehem tied together. But suddenly **4:5** Hur’s line becomes that of **Ashhur**, and everything which follows is from the line of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh. Ashhur has two wives and sons **5–7**. **4:8** picks up where 2:55 left off with *Koz* “thorn” and the touching story of Jabez **9–10**, the settler of a village of Rechabite scribes dedicated to the Torah. **4:9** his mother called him *Jabez* “painful,” because she bore him in pain (vs. his brother Koz, ‘a thorn in the flesh’?). We can only guess his mother is Helah, the second wife of Ashhur **7**, who in 2:24 is the son, not of Caleb *ben* Hezron, but of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh by his wife Ephrath; and Jabez, holding a personal relationship with God esteemed by Ezra, prays for *fruitfulness* related at least in spirit to the blessing given the *Ephrathites*.⁶³

Chelub כְּלוּב (“fruit-basket” Amos 8:1) brother of Shuhah **4:11–12** may hold the solution to the problem of **2:21** and Machir *ben* Manasseh. Chelub is father of Mehir and his progeny extends to Ir-nahash (see 2:10–17), an Ammonite town in the Arabah, Kenite territory. It is possible that Hezron “went in to,” not *bath*-Machir בַּת־מַכִּיר by whom he has Segub (an unattested scribal emendation), but rather *bath*-Mehir בַּת־מְחִיר by whom he has Chelubay, Caleb, or Eshton. (Cf. *Ashhur ben Caleb* אֲשַׁחֲוִי בֶן־כָּלֵב and *Eshton ben Chelub* אֲשַׁתָּוִן בֶּן־כְּלוּב.) The derivation of *Eshton* is unknown. The Chronicler hints at this connection by calling Mehir’s line “men of Recah,” tying them to Caleb *ben* Jephunneh **15**. (Note that the LXX here calls Caleb “πατερ Αχσα” to clear up any confusion!)

Aside from the obvious MSS omissions, **4:13–22** begins with the noted Othniel, nephew of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh and first Judge of Israel. Then follows the *foreign* (Edomite) lines of Caleb and

⁶¹ Payne, “Chronicles,” 4:340.

⁶² Ibid. 341; our posited solution to **4:2–4a** requires another entire paper, illustrated by our Judah charts.

⁶³ The personalized detail of this whole section displays the glaring omission of any connection. The logical source must point to the Chronicler, since rabbinic tradition has no problem connecting Caleb with David.

his numerous towns and territory, now centered farther south around Eshtemoa. This displays a complete separation of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh's line from the spurious line of Caleb *ben* Hezron, thus preserving the Davidic line and Levitical worship. But this record is so faulty it raises more questions than it answers. **4:15–20**, Caleb's 'sons' **15** are listed as *chiefs* in 1:52–53, from Genesis 36:41. **16** is a key link to 2:42. There "brother **אָהִי** of Jerahmeel" here by MS error becomes "sons **בְּנֵי** of Jehallelel." Both verses list Ziph as the first son. **17–20**, *Ezrah* could be MS error for *Zerah*, since **21–22** completes Judah's line with Zerah's half-brother Shelah's embarrassingly short listing of "Shilonites," no doubt for his mother's Canaanite ancestry. (See Durant's insightful description of "the Jewish stock" in his delightful prose.⁶⁴)

CONCLUSION

The Chronicler's record makes it impossible to prove whether or not Caleb was in the line of David. But his scribal integrity prevented him from simply ignoring all the evidence he discovered from Samuel, and which he was then compelled to obfuscate, but which the rabbis ever since have taken for granted. Caleb *ben* Jephunneh must be in the **10th G.** prior to David, contemporary with Eleazar *ben* Aaron. Caleb married Ephrath *bath* Ram *ben* Jerahmeel. (Jerahmeel may equate with *Hamuel* brother of Hezron.) Their son was Ashhur father of Salma the *Ephrathite* settler of Bethlehem and one of the significantly numbered *seven* lines of Caleb. (See charts.) It may well be that Ezra was in fact subtly inserting Caleb into David's line knowing the foreign connections of Nahshon *ben* Amminadab.

Genesis 15:13–21 God promised Abraham that after spending 400 years in a foreign land his offspring would return when "the iniquity of the Amorites is complete." This *Promised Land* included Kenite territory and stretched "from Havilah to Shur" 25:18, virtually the whole world between Babylon and the Sinai of Egypt known to Abraham! What if one of the Amorites, "foreigners" **עַמֵּי הָאֲרָצוֹת, נִכְרִים** "peoples of the lands" Ezra 9:2; 10:11, entered into the very blood line of David! Could this "complete their iniquity" in a way not understood before?⁶⁵

Numbers 22–24 Balak, king of Moab, commands Balaam to prophesy against Israel, but God compels him instead to do so against Israel's enemies, including Moab itself. But then 24:21 "(God) looked on the Kenite...and said, 'Enduring is your dwelling place and your nest is set in the rock. Yet, Kain shall be burned when Asshur takes you away captive.'" As Israel's distant relatives they receive a special blessing in spite of their impending doom. The rabbis welcome Caleb into David's

⁶⁴ Will Durant, "Our Oriental Heritage" vol. 1, *The Story of Civilization* 12 vols. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), 1:302–3.

⁶⁵ Ezekiel 16 appears to give a realistic view of Jerusalem's origin among the Amorites.

line as a full-fledged Judahite despite Ruth 4, Ezra (and Matthew 1).⁶⁶ As a final reward they have the Kenites appointed as heralds at the coming of the *Messiah*!⁶⁷ Messengers of the Gospel!

Abraham was “a sojourner and a foreigner,” Genesis 23:4. His descendants were to be Keepers of the Word, but the message was intended to free all men’s consciences. The *Messiah* to be born Son of Man and Son of God still remains the son of Abraham, son of David and *Messiah* for all mankind.⁶⁸ The rabbis connect the blood line of David with both Levi and Judah, while ignoring the Kenites. Jesus declared in John 8 that Abraham’s faith counted, not his physical ancestry, which Paul affirms in Romans 4. Caleb lived under the Law of Moses, but with a faith freed from physical and spiritual bondage, which the Chronicler could not accept. Israel’s two greatest prophets, Moses and Elijah, also represent the same two opposite poles of Hebrew faith and life: (1) obedience to Mosaic Law, and (2) a personal relationship with God beyond the bounds of Law. The free spirit of Elijah and Caleb versus the authority of the Law of Moses and Ezra are both exhibited in the life and faith of David, in the persecuted lives of the prophets, in the promise of the *Messiah*, in the trial of Jesus, in the long and torturous tradition of the Talmud, and lastly in the life and faith of every believer, Jew or Gentile, in Christ.

⁶⁶ Yet it is curious that Luke 3:33 adds another generation to Ruth 4 with ...**Αμιναδαβ** (‘υιος) **του Αδμιν του Αραμ (Ραμ)**... See *The Greek New Testament*, Kurt Aland, et al. eds. (3rd ed., New York: United Bible Societies, 1975), app. crit. for the numerous MSS variations for what should be a relatively simple copy of Ruth 4. One notable variation is **Ιωραμ** instead of **Αδμιν**, which markedly resembles *Jerahm(eel)*.

⁶⁷ Ginzberg, *Legends*, 358.

⁶⁸ Eusebius, *History of the Church*, G.A. Williamson, trans. (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965; Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1975), 55, 123, 127 for his comments on the “*Desposyni*” as mixed or aristocratic blood connected to Jesus’s family, which gnostic authors use to attach to legends of the Holy Grail: Laurence Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail* (Gloucester, MA: Fair Winds Press, 2002), 1, 96, 198–9.