

WHAT WAS CONSIDERED TO BE APOSTASY BY THE CHRONICLER, AND HOW DOES IT RELATE TO DEUTERONOMIC LAW?

Louis Jonker

Department Old & New Testament, Stellenbosch University

E-mail: lcj@sun.ac.za

(Received 13/07/2016; accepted 02/11/2016)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25159/1013-8471/3123>

ABSTRACT

It is well-known that the Chronicler used very specific terminology to give expression to what was considered to be apostasy. The term מעל is very prominent in this regard (although it never occurs in the *Vorlage* of Samuel-Kings, and only once in Deut 32:51), as well as the expression “not to seek (with דרש or בקש) Yahweh” (which does occur frequently in Deuteronomy and Samuel-Kings). The present paper will investigate these occurrences in Chronicles in order to determine what was considered to be apostasy by the Chronicler, as well as to see how this relates to Deuteronomistic law.

INTRODUCTION: CHRONICLES AS INTERPRETER OF THE TORAH

In recent years scholars have started investigating the relationship between the Pentateuch and further textual corpora such as the Deuteronomistic History in order to determine what relationship exists between these different corpora.¹ A particular interest is to determine how later texts reflect interpretations of earlier texts. Since the Pentateuch contains numerous legal matters, an important theme in this research is to determine how later textual corpora gave reflections of earlier legal traditions, and how these traditions were (re-)interpreted in new circumstances. Recent Pentateuch scholarship² has indicated that a “hermeneutics of innovation”³ was probably at work

¹ For further discussion of this trend in biblical scholarship, see Jonker (2013b, 2014a, and 2014b).

² Bernard Levinson and Eckart Otto have focused on this aspect, in particular. See Levinson (1997, 2008a, 2008b; Otto 1994, 1999, and 2004). For an overview of further studies on the phenomenon of rewriting within the Hebrew Bible, see Levinson (2008a:6).

³ This is the term Bernard Levinson uses. See Levinson (1997).

in the reinterpretation of earlier and other legal traditions. Bernard Levinson, for example, describes this hermeneutics as follows:

The conceptual breakthrough is grounded in the text; the originality of thought is a consequence of engagement with the textual curriculum; and the break with tradition presents itself in terms of continuity with tradition. Ingenuity here takes the form of literary sophistication ... Tradition itself emerges here as a hermeneutical construction, because the citation of tradition provides a means to rework tradition. Citation does not entail passive deference to the ostensibly authoritative—canonical—source but rather critical engagement with it. (Levinson 2008a:90–91)

In Chronicles studies it is nowadays a generally accepted thesis that the Chronicler was a master in merging the Deuteronomistic and Priestly traditions in writing his history of ancient Israel.⁴ Numerous studies show that, although the Chronicler used the so-called Deuteronomistic History (mainly Samuel-Kings) as his *Vorlage*, he also employed various techniques to include Priestly perspectives, terminology, or customs in his descriptions of Israel's past. Knoppers indicates the following:

We have seen that the Chronicler employs his Vorlagen of Samuel–Kings as a base text from which to construct his own distinctive history of the monarchy. On a variety of occasions, he even corrects his Deuteronomistic source toward the standards of Deuteronomy. *Yet, the Chronicler creatively draws from other traditions as well, including the Priestly literature, to complement, correct, and complicate the Deuteronomistic version of the past.* (Knoppers 2012:331, my emphasis).

Instead of seeing the combination of traditions as “indelible marks of literary disunity”, Knoppers indicates that “these passages evince the author’s concern to mediate different perspectives within the context of the late Persian period or early Hellenistic age” (Knoppers 2003:92).

⁴ For further discussions and literature, see Knoppers (2003:92) and Jonker (2013a:13–14).

Although the book of Chronicles can therefore be seen as consensus literature (Glatt-Gilad 2011) there is no doubt that the Chronicler still regarded the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic tradition as valuable for his own time. In fact, one may assume that the Pentateuch (in whatever earlier form) must have been available to the Chronicler,⁵ and that he wanted to show respect in his rewriting of the Judahite monarchy's history to all traditions incorporated in the Torah, including the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic tradition. In some instances it seems that the Chronicler even tried to bring the Chronicler's version of All-Israel's history nearer to the Deuteronomic legal tradition, compared to the Deuteronomistic version in Samuel-Kings.⁶

The present contribution stems from a session at the 2015 European Association of Biblical Studies conference in Cordoba, Spain, at which the Deuteronomistic History was investigated in order to determine what was considered apostasy in the latter corpus, and how those indications relate to legal matters in the Pentateuch. While the same tendency has recently started emerging in Chronicles studies to investigate it in relation to the Pentateuch (as indicated above), I was asked by the organisers of the sessions in Cordoba to focus on the Chronicler's use of Pentateuchal legal traditions, and to compare that to the Deuteronomistic History's use of the same traditions.

It is within this context that my study wants to situate the question under discussion: what was considered to be apostasy through the violation of Deuteronomy's laws in Chronicles, and how does that compare to the Deuteronomistic History's use of the same traditions? It is not possible to discuss the breadth of the Chronicler's material in this article, and I will therefore rather concentrate on some terminological indications in the book. The Chronicler showed an affinity for distinctive terminology – as will be shown below – in his evaluations of Judah's past kings. This terminology can assist us in determining what was considered to be apostasy by the Chronicler and which legal tradition or traditions stand in the background of his evaluations of the kings.

⁵ See, e.g., Ben Zvi (2009); Knoppers (2012); Jonker (2013b, 2014a, and 2014b) for further motivation for this assumption.

⁶ See, e.g., Jonker (2008, 2013b).

The main part of my study below will therefore give an overview of the distinctive terminology in Chronicles, in comparison to the occurrence of this terminology in other textual corpora of the Old Testament. Thereafter, a theory will be formulated on what relationship the Chronicler's view on apostasy had with the Deuteronomic legal traditions.

THE TEXTUAL DATA: APOSTASY IN CHRONICLES

Particularly in the *Sondergut* passages of Chronicles, the Chronicler's affinity for very specific terminology becomes apparent. He follows the scheme of the Deuteronomistic History in characterising the Judahite kings as "doing what was right/wrong in the eyes of Yahweh". In addition, however, he often adds minor detail or even blocks of new material to the royal narratives in which his distinctive terminology is then employed.

Two expressions feature strongly in connection with what the Chronicler considered to be apostasy, namely "not seeking Yahweh" (לא דרש / בקש), but also "to be unfaithful to Yahweh" (with the term מעל). Specific occurrences of these terms will be investigated in the next subsections, focussing on those where Yahweh explicitly features as object of the verb and where a religious context is evident from the narrative context. This terminological investigation will assist us to formulate theories of what was considered to be apostasy through violation of Pentateuchal legal traditions in Chronicles, and how that relates to the Deuteronomistic History's views on the same.

"(Not) seeking the Lord" (לא דרש את־יהוה בקש) / [לא]

Introduction

The verb "to seek" (דרש or בקש) occurs regularly in the Hebrew Bible. It refers to "seeking and asking in the literal sense", "seeking and asking in the figurative sense", and to seeking legal advice or a judgment (Wagner 1978:295–298). However, Wagner indicates that "[i]t is striking that the theological use of *drš* is far more predominant in

the OT than its general use” (Wagner 1978:298).⁷ When a human being is the subject of the verb (the majority of cases in the Hebrew Bible), it is often used in a theological sense with “God (Yahweh), or a place or text (law, command) belonging to God, or an abstract idea (justice, peace, good) connected with man’s [sic] relationship to God” as object (Wagner 1978:298). “Seeking Yahweh/God” becomes a general concept for Yahweh worship in the Hebrew Bible (Gerleman and Ruprecht 1971:466). With reference to the many positive statements about “seeking Yahweh” in Chronicles, Wagner states: “The idea of ‘seeking God’ is so complex and so general in the Chronicler’s Historical Work that one must consider the possibility that when all is said and done it denotes nothing other than the Chronicler’s typical ideal of piety” (Wagner 1978:301).

The opposite holds true for negated statements about “seeking Yahweh”. Where the verb is negated, it refers to apostasy and failure to be dedicated to Yahweh/God. These instances may shed light on the specific quest in this article, namely to determine what was considered to be apostasy through violations of (particularly) Deuteronomic laws by the Chronicler. In order to come to some clarity on this matter, we will first have to give a broad overview of its usage in different parts of the Hebrew Bible.

דרש and בקש in Chronicles (see Appendix 1a)

There are six cases in Chronicles where the writer indicates that Yahweh/God was *not* sought by a specific king, or by the people (1 Chr 10:14 [Saul]; 13:3 [the people]; 15:13 [David and the Levites]; 2 Chr 12:14 [Rehoboam]; 15:13 [the people]; 16:12 [Asa]). In the first instance, 1 Chronicles 10:14 that belongs to the Chronicler’s own hand, the narrator’s voice indicates that Saul did not seek Yahweh (negation + verb דרש + בקש + יהוה) but rather a medium (אורף in vs. 13), that Yahweh put Saul to death, and that he turned over the kingship to David, the son of Isai.

In the second occurrence, 1 Chronicles 13:3 that forms part of David’s direct speech to the people and also belongs to the Chronicler’s hand, the king indicates that

⁷ See also Gerleman and Ruprecht (1971:462).

they should bring the “ark of our God” to them, because they have not sought “him/it” (negation + verb שׁרַר + 3 masc. sg. suffix) in Saul’s days. It is unclear whether the suffix refers to “our God” or to “the ark”,⁸ and no indication is given here of the outcome of the neglect.

In 1 Chronicles 15:13 David’s direct speech to the Levitical family heads is narrated, and it is indicated that David and the Levites did not seek “him” (negation + verb שׁרַר + 3 masc. sg. suffix) – in this case a sure reference to “Yahweh our God” (cf. vs. 12). As with the previous instance, the violation and its outcome remain unspecified in the text.

2 Chronicles 12:14 forms part of the Rehoboam narrative where it is indicated that the king “did not set his heart on seeking Yahweh” (כִּי לֹא הִכִּין לְבוֹ לְדַרוֹשׁ אֶת־יְהוָה). Although this formulation belongs to the Chronicler’s own hand, the text refers to what is also reported in the Deuteronomistic version in 1 Kings 14:22–24. Unlike the Chronicles version, the text in 1 Kings specifies the apostasy of not seeking Yahweh as follows:

²³For they also built for themselves high places, pillars, and sacred poles⁹ on every high hill and under every green tree; ²⁴there were also male temple prostitutes in the land. They committed all the abominations of the nations that the LORD drove out before the people of Israel. (NRSV)

The fifth reference to “not seeking Yahweh” in Chronicles is in 2 Chronicles 15:13. This text, which also belongs to the Chronicler’s *Sondergut*, forms part of the people’s oath-taking during the reign of Asa. Although it is not specified what “seeking Yahweh” would entail, it is specified that those who did not do it, would be put to death.

The last instance of “not seeking Yahweh” in Chronicles is also in the Asa narrative (2 Chr 16:12). Although this king’s career started positively with him relying on Yahweh, it turned negative in the end when he did not seek Yahweh (לֹא־דָרַשׁ אֶת־).

⁸ Most commentators are of the opinion that the suffix refers to the ark. See, e.g., Knoppers (2004:580) and Klein (2006:331).

⁹ The Hebrew term is אֲשֵׁרִים.

יהוה), but rather consulted doctors on his poor health. This part of the narration also belongs to the Chronicler's *Sondergut*. The narrator directly relates Asa's death to this neglect.

There are two further examples of *דרש* in Chronicles which are not negated statements about "seeking Yahweh", but are rather indications that king Amaziah (and his people) sought the gods of Edom (see 2 Chr 25:15, 20). The first of these forms part of a prophetic accusation against the king, while the second is in the voice of the narrator. The outcome of this apostasy was that Amaziah was defeated by King Joash of Israel.

בקש occurs 13 times in Chronicles, of which eight are used in a religious connotation.¹⁰ In all these eight cases (1 Chr 16:10, 11; 2 Chr 7:14; 11:16; 15:4, 15; 20:4 [twice]) the verb is not negated, and the expressions all refer to pious conduct. There are therefore no occurrences referring to apostasy using the verb *בקש* in Chronicles.

דרש and *בקש* in the Pentateuch (see Appendix 1b)

The verb *בקש* is used only twice in the Pentateuch with a religious connotation. The first of these, Exodus 33:7, forms part of the enigmatic section in Exodus 32–34. The pericope in verses 7–11 is normally seen as a later insertion (probably of non-Priestly origin) in which the tradition of the Tent of Meeting outside the camp is reflected. Verse 7 indicates that everybody who wanted to seek Yahweh had to do it in the tent outside the camp. *בקש* is furthermore used in Deuteronomy 4:29 (together with *שדר*), a case which will be discussed below.

In contrast to *בקש*, *דרש* is used frequently in a religious connotation in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. It is used once in the Holiness Code, but occurs frequently in the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic literature, with four occurrences in Deuteronomy¹¹ and fourteen in Samuel-Kings.¹²

¹⁰ The other occurrences not used in a religious connotation are 1 Chr 4:39; 14:8; 21:3; 2 Chr 9:23; 22:9.

¹¹ Deuteronomy 4:29, 12:5, 12:30, and 18:11. There are further occurrences in Deuteronomy, but they are not used in a religious sense. See Deut 11:12, 13:15, 17:4, 18:19, 19:18, 22:2, and 23:22 (twice).

The text in the Holiness Code, Leviticus 19:31 also (like in Deut 18:11 with דרש) prohibits anybody from consulting mediums or magicians.

The four cases in Deuteronomy all seem to be programmatic in nature, that is, they set out within the narrative context of the desert wandering the parameters of piety when entering the promised land. The first instance, Deuteronomy 4:29, which is part of the Deuteronomistic introduction to the book, explicates that the Israelites should not serve the gods of the nations in the land, but should rather seek Yahweh their God with their heart and soul (with both בקש and דרש).¹³ Deuteronomy 12:5 stands near the beginning of the Deuteronomic core of the book. It indicates that other sanctuaries and cultic objects (including the altars, pillars, and אשרים) should be destroyed, and that the Israelites should rather seek Yahweh at the place that he will choose for his name to live. That is also the place where they should bring their burnt offerings and sacrifices, as well as their offerings for the cultic place. Deuteronomy 12:30, which forms part of the same unit as 12:5, contains a prohibition not to seek the gods of the other nations, while Deuteronomy 18:11 prohibits the seeking of oracles from the dead

¹² 1 Sam 9:9, 28:7; 1 Kgs 22:5, 7, 8; 2 Kgs 1:2, 3, 6, 16 (twice), 3:11, 8:8, and 22:13, 18. There are further occurrences in the Deuteronomistic History, but they are not used in a religious sense. See Jdg 6:29; 2 Sam 11:3; 1 Kgs 14:5.

¹³ The well-known phenomenon of *Numeruswechsel* occurs in this verse, with the first verb (בקש) in a plural form, while the second (דרש) stands in the singular form. Many commentators in the past have seen this change in number in 4:29 as an indication of a *Nahstelle* which is – in some cases – interpreted as indication of literary disunity. Another important issue is the relationship of this text in Deuteronomy to Jeremiah 29:13–14. See Otto (2012:573–577) for a good summary of the different positions in these debates. Otto is of the opinion that the change in number serves the following purpose: “Der Numeruswechsel in Dtn 4,29*-39 dient der Perspektivabgrenzung zwischen dem Abschnitt Dtn 4,23-28, der als prophetische Unheilsankündigung den Gebotsbruch mit der Konsequenz von Vernichtung und Exilierung aufzeigt, und dem Abschnitt Dtn 4,29*-39, der als prophetische Heilsankündigung die Rettung und Rückkehr eines Restes zu JHWH ankündigt” (Otto 2012:574–575). With regard to the terminology used in 4:29, Otto remarks, “Die Sprache von Dtn 4,29 ist als Zitat aus Jer 29,13 charakteristisch für späte Prophetentexte. *bqš* (Piel) JHWH (»JHWH suchen«) ist sonst im Deuteronomium nicht belegt, wohl aber in exilischen und vor allem nachexilischen Prophetentexten wie Jes 45, 19; 51, 1; 65, 1; Sach 8,21-22 und späten Psalmen, im Pentateuch aber priesterschriftlich-postpriesterschriftlich wie in Ex 33, 7. *drš* JHWH (»JHWH suchen«) ist ebenfalls im Deuteronomium nicht, wohl aber in prophetischen Texten wie Jes 9, 12; 31, 1; 55,6 u. ö. belegt” (Otto 2012:577).

like the other nations do. As will be seen in the discussion below (and in App. 1d), it seems that these instances in Deuteronomy were influential in some formulations in the Deuteronomistic history.

דַּרַשׁ and בַּקַּשׁ in the Deuteronomistic History (see Appendix 1c)

In 1 Samuel 9:9 we find an addition by some editor who wanted to explicate that prophets were formerly (in the time of Saul) called “seers”. The remark forms part of the narrative about Saul and the servant’s search for Saul’s father’s donkeys. The servant indicates to Saul that they should go to the seer (or, man of God) to enquire (with דַּרַשׁ) of God about where the donkeys might be. This episode prepares the way for Saul meeting the prophet Samuel.

The second occurrence of דַּרַשׁ in Samuel is in 1 Samuel 28:7. Saul wants to seek advice from the medium of Endor before going into battle with the Philistines. As we have seen above, this episode resonates in the condemning of Saul by the Chronicler in 1 Chronicles 10:14.

1 Kings 22 narrates the encounter between Ahab of Israel and Jehoshaphat of Judah in which Ahab urged Jehoshaphat to join forces with him to invade Ramot-Gilead. Jehoshaphat recommends that they should first seek a word from Yahweh (vs. 5). After Ahab had brought about four hundred prophets who gave him the green light for the invasion, Jehoshaphat again asks whether there is no prophet of Yahweh who may seek Yahweh for them (vs.7). Ahab then unwillingly mentions the name of the prophet Micaiah ben Yimlah who may seek Yahweh for them (vs. 8), but who in the past always had condemning messages for Ahab.

The four occurrences of דַּרַשׁ in 2 Kings 1 all refer to king Ahaziah’s consultation of Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron, in order to heal him from an injury. This seeking of another god than Yahweh results in his death, according to the word of Yahweh that Elijah had spoken. The next two occurrences (2 Kgs 3:11 and 8:8) that stand in contrast to the apostasy of Ahaziah, both form part of the Elisha narrative cycle. In 3:11 Jehoshaphat asks to consult Yahweh through a prophet, and in 8:8 Ben-Hadad of Damascus sends Hasael to Elisha to seek Yahweh through him. The last two

occurrences of **דרר** with a religious connotation can be found in 2 Kings 22:13 and 18 where Hilkiah is sent by King Josiah of Judah to seek or consult Yahweh about the book that was found during the temple restoration.

There are three occurrences of **בקש** in Samuel. The first, in 1 Samuel 28:7, relates to Saul again who consulted a medium. In 2 Samuel 12:16 the narrator indicates that David sought God for his child with Bathsheba who became very ill, and in 2 Samuel 21:1 it is indicated that David inquired of Yahweh about the famine that was in the land.

Synthesis on **דרר** and **בקש**

From the above overview it becomes clear that the religious use of **דרר** and **בקש** mainly occurs in Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic literature, apart from Chronicles.¹⁴ It is often connected to the life orientation (of individual kings, or the collective of the people of Israel) of not fully and exclusively relying on Yahweh for help, but rather to pursue other parties (i.e., other gods, a medium, or doctors) for assistance in poor health, in battles, or other life matters.

VIOLATING AGAINST THE LORD (מעל)

Introduction

According to HALOT the meaning of the verb **מעל** is “to be untrue, violate one’s legal obligations” (Koehler and Baumgartner 2001).¹⁵ This term that occurs 35 times as verb and 29 times as noun in the Hebrew Bible,¹⁶ can be used to refer to unfaithfulness

¹⁴ Our concentration in this contribution is on the Pentateuch and historiographical literature (including the so-called Deuteronomistic History). However, the term **דרר** also occurs abundantly in the rest of the Hebrew Bible, with concentrations in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Psalms. The verb never occurs with a religious connotation in the Priestly corpus of the Pentateuch. Although the instances in Lev 10:16 occur in the narrative context of cultic offering, the verb rather connotes “seeking information, enquiring” in this context, and does not have a religious connotation.

¹⁵ See also Whitaker et al. (1906) and Swanson (1997).

¹⁶ If the inf. abs + *Perfektum* in 2 Chron. 28:19 are counted as separate occurrences, the total number of verb occurrences is 36.

toward human beings,¹⁷ but it is mostly employed to express unfaithfulness toward God (Ringgren 1997:461–463). Knierim even calls it “ein explizit theologischer Begriff” (Knierim 1971:921). He also indicates that this term occurs in a variety of *Gattungen* in the Hebrew Bible. He concludes from his study of the different occurrences:

Der direkte Bezug auf Jahwe in den verschiedenen Gattungen zeigt ein vorgerücktes Stadium theologischen Denkens, in dem an sich schon disqualifizierte Vergehen noch ausdrücklich unter dem Blickpunkt des mit Jahwe bestehenden Treueverhältnisses gewertet werden. Mit anderen Worten: die theologische Eigenart des Begriffes »Treulosigkeit« besteht darin, daß die rechtliche Implikation des Gemeinschaftsverhältnisses mit Gott auf die Ebene des ethischen Kriteriums der Treue, und zwar der personalen Treue gegen Gott selbst, verlagert wird. (Knierim 1971:921–922)

The following subsections provide a detailed discussion of the occurrences of מעל in the different parts of the Hebrew Bible. We start this discussion again with a focus on Chronicles.

מעל in Chronicles (See Appendix 2a)

It is noteworthy that all fifteen instances of מעל in Chronicles (either as verb, or as noun) occur in the Chronicler’s *Sondergut*. This indicates that the term is a unique expression of the Chronicler’s view on apostasy. The first occurrence is in the genealogy of 1 Chronicles 2:7 where a short narrative intervention is made to remind of the incident where Achan has acted unfaithfully with the ban. This short remark recalls the episode that is narrated in Joshua 7:1–26. Two further short narrative interventions in the genealogies occur in 1 Chronicles 5:25 and 9:1. In 5:25 the tribes east of the Jordan are indicated to have acted unfaithfully against the God of their fathers by prostituting themselves after other gods. In 9:1 it is stated that Judah was

¹⁷ See, e.g., Num 5:12, 27.

taken into exile by the Babylonians because of their unfaithfulness. However, the unfaithfulness remains unspecified in this context.

The first occurrence in the Chronicler's royal narratives is in 1 Chronicles 10:13 where Saul is accused of having been unfaithful to Yahweh (with noun and verb). The unfaithfulness is specified as "because of the word of Yahweh that he did not keep".

The next occurrences are all in the narratives about various kings of Judah. It is noteworthy that the term *מעל* is never used in connection with David and Solomon. It is used in connection with Rehoboam (2 Chr 12:2), indicating that he and the people of Judah did not keep the Torah; twice in connection with Uzziah (2 Chr 26:16, 18) with the accusation that he acted unfaithfully against Yahweh by unlawfully bringing incense offerings like a priest in the temple; three times in connection with Ahaz (2 Chr 28:19, 22; 29:19), stating that he made Baal images and sacrificed his children in the Hinnom valley, and in addition sacrificed to the gods of Damascus and violated in the temple; and once in connection to Manasseh (2 Chr 33:19) with the accusation that he built heights and erected *אשרים* and idols.

In three further cases some collectives are accused of unfaithfulness. In 2 Chronicles 29:6 Hezekiah refers in his speech during his reforms that "our fathers" acted unfaithfully by not caring for the temple. In 2 Chronicles 30:7 it is again Hezekiah, this time in a letter to the people of Israel, who indicates that their fathers and brothers acted unfaithfully against Yahweh, but the transgression is not specified in this case. The last occurrence is in 2 Chronicles 36:14 where the narrator indicates that all the leaders and the priests surely (with Inf. Abs.) acted unfaithfully like the heathen nations. However, the violation remains unspecified again.

מעל in the Pentateuch (see Appendix 2b)

There are six occurrences of the term *מעל* in the Pentateuch, with explicit reference to some or other religious or cultic transgression. The first four (Lev 5:15, 21; 26:40; Num. 5:6) all occur in legal contexts where hypothetical circumstances are sketched in casuistic form, and the possible outcome of such transgressions is indicated. The first of these refers to unintentional transgressions in regard of the "holy things". Like the

case in Leviticus 26:40, the violation is not specified any further. In the other two cases, Leviticus 5:21 and Numbers 5:6, unfaithfulness against Yahweh is described in terms of deceiving, or doing wrong against a neighbour or another person. The close relationship between wrongdoing against another person and unfaithfulness against Yahweh is therefore established in this text.

The two further instances, namely Numbers 31:16 and Deuteronomy 32:51 both occur in narratives and both refer back to traditions of transgression from earlier times. In Numbers 31:16 Moses's speech to the soldiers is reported, after vengeance was taken on the Midianites. The soldiers did not exercise the ban by killing all living beings in the Midianite cities and destroying their property. They let some of the women live and took plunder from their possessions. Moses then reminds them that these people whom they did not kill were the ones who followed Balaam's advice and who led them astray to become unfaithful to Yahweh. With the reference to Balaam and Peor, the reader is reminded of the episodes narrated in Numbers 22–25 where it is indicated that the Israelites joined in to worship the Baal of Peor. Deuteronomy 32:51 also contains a back-reference to what happened earlier during the desert wandering. Moses and Aaron are reminded about their unfaithfulness to Yahweh at the Waters of Meribah Kadesh, also referred to in Exodus 17, Numbers 20 and 27. There, the people of Israel, and specifically Moses and Aaron, quarrelled with Yahweh.

It should also be noted that all these references in the Pentateuch occur in priestly material, with Leviticus 26:40 part of the Holiness Code, and the Deuteronomy text forming part of a priestly insertion in the Deuteronomistic framework.¹⁸

מעל in the Deuteronomistic History (see Appendix 2c)

Apart from four instances in two chapters in Joshua, the term מעל is totally absent in the so-called Deuteronomistic History. The four instances in Joshua are related to one another. In 7:1 it is indicated that Achan acted unfaithfully to Yahweh in regard to the

¹⁸ S. R. Driver was the first to point out that the section in Deut 32:48–52 has a priestly character (see Driver 1895:382). See also the following more recent commentaries: Mayes (1981:394); Nielsen (1981:285); Miller (1990:242–243); Nelson (2002:378–379); Lundbom (2013:911).

devoted things that were associated with the ban. After conquering Jericho, Achan kept some of the possessions for himself. This act was seen as unfaithfulness to Yahweh, and was punished by Yahweh's anger burning against Israel. In 22:20 a back-reference is made to Achan when Phinehas and the ten tribal chiefs warned the tribes of Reuben and Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, against committing the same transgression. Joshua 22:16 is also in the setting of Phinehas's and the tribal chiefs' admonition of the Transjordanian tribes, but the transgression is not specified in this case. The same applies to 22:31 where it is indicated that Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh did not make themselves guilty of being unfaithful to Yahweh.

One should take note of the fact that Joshua 22:9–34 is seen by most scholars as a priestly insertion in the Deuteronomistic material (Kloppenborg 1981; Nelson 1997:247; Goldstein 2002; Rösel 2011:345–346). The fact that this chapter refers back to the Achan incident indicates also the close connection with Joshua 7.

Synthesis on מעל

From the above overview it becomes clear that the term מעל (as verb or as noun) has a close affinity with the priestly literature. It often refers to instances in history (Peor, Waters of Meribah Kadesh, and the Achan incident) where some individuals or the collective of the Israelites or some tribes acted unfaithfully against God by not dedicating everything in victory to him.

In the following section I will try to bring these observations together in terms of the Chronicler's usage of the different terminology.

THE CHRONICLER'S VIEW ON APOSTASY

From the terminological study above we may conclude that "seeking Yahweh" (mainly with מעל) and "not violating against Yahweh" (with מעל) were seen as the ethical standards for All-Israel in the postexilic phase. They form a golden thread throughout the book of Chronicles. In some cases these expressions function without any specification of what transgression of these standards would entail. In most cases,

however, examples from the past were used by the Chronicler to admonish his contemporaries towards a lifestyle and cultic practices that would rely exclusively on Yahweh the God of Israel and would express their total dedication to Yahweh.

In doing so, the Chronicler employs literary materials from both the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic tradition and the priestly tradition. Often, in *Sondergut* passages in Chronicles it becomes clear that the Chronicler employed terminology from both these traditions in his own independent way. We have seen that the reference to violation by means of the expression “not seeking Yahweh” is typical of the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic tradition. However, the Chronicler’s use of this terminology almost always occurs in passages where he himself typified situations of the past by means of this terminology and in his own words, without merely quoting from earlier texts. The same applies to his use of the priestly term מעל. Although the term is exclusively associated with priestly passages in the Pentateuch, the Chronicler’s use of the term is not through mere quoting of these literary materials, but rather through his own *Sondergut* constructions. One could therefore assume that the Chronicler did not merely merge existing literary materials from both traditions in order to come up with his own historiography of ancient Israel, but he rather made use of typical Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic and priestly terminology in an independent way and in his own formulations.

The themes being addressed in the Chronicles passages where these expressions are used are quite clear, and these clearly set the ethical standards for the restoration community through the Chronicler’s historical narratives. The following list gives a summary of the issues referred to in deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic terminology:

- 1) All-Israel should not seek other gods of other nations (e.g., the Edomites), but should seek Yahweh alone;
- 2) All-Israel should not seek help in illness from other humans (like Asa did), but should rather rely on Yahweh; and
- 3) All-Israel should not consult the dead (like Saul did), but should rather consult Yahweh, the living God of Israel.

These relate well to the themes mentioned in the Deuteronomy texts where the terms *דָּרַשׁ* and *בָּקַשׁ* are used, namely Deuteronomy 4:29; 12:5; 12:30; and 18:11. It seems that the admonitions mentioned in those texts served as a program according to which the Chronicler evaluates Israel's (mainly Judah's) past and by implication sets the standards for his own postexilic community in Jerusalem.

However, there are further themes being addressed in the passages in Chronicles where priestly terminology is employed:

- 1) It was considered a violation when Israel did not dedicate everything they plundered when entering the land, to Yahweh/God.
- 2) It was considered a violation when Israel sought other gods, and not Yahweh alone.
- 3) It was considered a violation when somebody would consult a medium.
- 4) It was considered a violation when somebody would not keep the word/Torah of Yahweh.
- 5) It was considered a violation when somebody would bring unlawful offerings (including child sacrifices), or when somebody would unlawfully act as priest.
- 6) It was considered a violation when somebody would bring offerings to gods of other nations.
- 7) It was considered a violation when Israel did not care for the temple.
- 8) It was considered a violation when somebody built heights or erected *אֲשֵׁרִים* or idols.

From this list it becomes clear that the violations specified with priestly terminology are much more of a cultic nature. However, there is also an amount of overlap between the two theme lists. Both emphasise that other gods should not be worshipped, and that mediums or the dead should not be consulted, but rather Yahweh.

CONCLUSION: HERMENEUTICS OF INNOVATION?

My analysis of specific terminology in this contribution has confirmed the view in scholarly literature that the Chronicler was a master in merging the Deuteronomic-

Deuteronomistic and priestly traditions. This was not only done by quoting and merging passages from both these literary strands, but rather by employing terminology from both traditions creatively in his own literary construction. We therefore see a Chronicler who is drenched in the (divergent, but also overlapping) theological traditions that were known to him and his contemporaries (priestly and Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic), but also a creative writer who selects and applies material from both traditions in order to show his own perspective.

In this creative use of terminology of earlier traditions the Chronicler reveals his hermeneutics! The Chronicler's hermeneutics is however not so different from those who compiled the Pentateuch. As indicated in the introduction, recent Pentateuch scholarship has indicated that a hermeneutics of innovation was probably at work in the reinterpretation of earlier and other legal traditions.¹⁹ The same could be said of the Chronicler's hermeneutics with reference to what was considered to be apostasy through violation of earlier legal traditions. He presents a unified view on what could be considered to be apostasy in his own time. By doing so in a sophisticated literary manner, he suggests continuity with both the priestly and Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic traditions, but by doing so, forges something new from these traditions in order to address the context of the late Persian period. The Persian period of the second temple was characterized by different cultic factions who had affinity to different earlier cultic and legal traditions.²⁰ The Chronicler, writing his work in the late Persian period, seems to act as merger of these traditions, and as facilitator between the different cultic factions in the Jerusalem temple community. This context provided the bedding within which the Chronicler's hermeneutics of innovation could flourish.

¹⁹ See e.g. Otto 1994; Otto 1999; Otto 2004. For an overview of further studies on the phenomenon of rewriting within the Hebrew Bible, see Levinson 2008a:6.

²⁰ See Jonker 2016 (section 3.4.4).

Appendix 1a
(Negation + object יאהים/יאהוה דרש +)

Reference	Text (BHS)	Verb	Noun	Paral.	Violation		Comm.
					By whom	Violation	
1 Chron 10:14	וְלֹא־יָרַשׁ בְּיָמָיו וְיָמֵי־יָהוּהוּ וַיִּסַּב אֶת־הַמְּלֻכָה לְדָוִד בְּרִי־לְשׁוֹנֵי־	Perf.	--	Sond. (Cf. Deut. 18:11 and 1 Sam. 28:7)	Saul	Not seeking Yhwh, but a medium	Voice of narrator
1 Chron 13:3	וַיִּסַּב אֶת־אֲרוֹן אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ כִּי־לֹא דָרְשְׁנוּהָ בְּיָמֵי יִצְחָקִי:	Perf + Sf.	--	Sond.	We (the people)	Not seeking him ('Elohim or, the ark) - unspecified	David's direct speech to the people
1 Chron 15:13	כִּי לִמְבַרְאֵינוּהָ לֹא אָתָם פָּרַץ יָהוּהוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ כִּמוֹ כִּי־לֹא דָרְשְׁנוּהָ כַּמִּשְׁפָּט:	Perf + Sf.	--	Sond.	We (David and the Levites)	Not seeking him (Yhwh our God) - unspecified	David's direct speech to the Levitical family heads
2 Chron 12:14	וַיַּעַשׂ הָרַע כִּי לֹא־הָכִין לְפָנָיו לְרֹשׁ אֶת־יָהוּהוּ:	Inf. Cstr.	--	Cf. 1 Kgs 14:22-24	Rehoboam	Did not set his heart on seeking Yhwh - not specified like in 1 Kgs	Voice of narrator
2 Chron 15:13	וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָרַשׁ לִיתְהוּהוּ אֱלֹהֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל יָוִמָת לְמַד־קָטָן וְעַד־גָּדוֹל לְמַאֲיֵשׁ וְעַד־אֲשֶׁר:	Imperf.	--	Sond.	All who did not seek Yhwh	All who did not seek Yhwh, the God of Israel, had to be put to death - unspecified	Voice of narrator - part of oath-taking during Asa's reformations
2 Chron 16:12	וַיִּזְמַל אֲסָא בַשְּׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וַחֲשֵׁה לְמַלְכוּתוֹ בְּרַגְלָיו עַד־לְמַעְלָה מִלִּוּוֹ וְגַם־בְּקָלְיוֹ לֹא־יָרַשׁ אֶת־יָהוּהוּ כִּי בָרַפְאִים:	Perf.	--	Sond.	Asa	Asa consulted doctors, and not Yhwh	Voice of narrator

Reference	Text (BHS)	Verb	Noun	Paral.	Violation		
					By whom	Violation	
2 Chron 25:15	וַיִּתְּרֵם אֶת־יְהוָה בְּאֲמִצְיָהוּ וַיִּשְׁלַח אֱלֹהֵי גְבִיָּא וַיֹּאמֶר לֵאמֹר לְמַדּוֹת וְרִשְׁתֶּם אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי קַעֲמֹת אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הִצִּילוּ אֶת־עַמִּים יְהוָה:	Perf.	--	Sond.	Amaziah sought the gods of Edomites, and not Yhwah	Direct speech of prophet accusing Amaziah	
2 Chron 25:20	לֹא־יָצִיֵּעַ אֲמִצְיָהוּ כִּי מָהֵאֱלֹהִים הֲיֵא לְמַעַן תִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד כִּי וְרִשְׁתֶּם אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי אֲדָוָם:	Perf.	--	Sond.	Amaziah and the people	Amaziah sought the gods of Edomites, and not Yhwah	Voice of narrator

Appendix 1b דָּרַשׁ (with religious connotation) in Pentateuch

⁷Now Moses used to take the tent and pitch it outside the camp, far off from the camp; he called it the tent of meeting. And everyone who sought [בָּקַשׁ] the LORD would go out to the tent of meeting, which was outside the camp. (Exod. 33:7 NRSV – non-P)

³¹Do not turn to mediums or wizards; do not seek [רָשׁוּ] them out, to be defiled by them: I am the LORD your God. (Lev. 19:31 NRSV – H)

²⁷The LORD will scatter you among the peoples; only a few of you will be left among the nations where the LORD will lead you. ²⁸There you will serve other gods made by human hands, objects of wood and stone that neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell. ²⁹From there you (pl.) will seek [בָּקַשׁ plural] the LORD your God, and you (sing.) will find him if you search [רָשׁוּ singular] after him with all your heart and soul. ³⁰In your distress, when all these things have happened to you in time to come, you will return to the LORD your God and heed him. ³¹Because the LORD your God is a merciful God, he will neither abandon you nor destroy you; he will not forget the covenant with your ancestors that he swore to them. (Deut. 4:27–31 NRSV – Dtr)

²You must demolish completely all the places where the nations whom you are about to dispossess served their gods, on the mountain heights, on the hills, and under every leafy tree. ³Break down their altars, smash their pillars, burn their sacred poles [*Asherim*] with fire, and hew down

the idols of their gods, and thus blot out their name from their places. ⁴ You shall not worship the LORD your God in such ways. ⁵ But you shall seek [דרש] the place that the LORD your God will choose out of all your tribes as his habitation to put his name there. You shall go there, ⁶ bringing there your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, your tithes and your donations, your votive gifts, your freewill offerings, and the firstlings of your herds and flocks. ⁷ And you shall eat there in the presence of the LORD your God, you and your households together, rejoicing in all the undertakings in which the LORD your God has blessed you. (Deut. 12:2-7 NRSV – Dtn)

²⁹ When the LORD your God has cut off before you the nations whom you are about to dispossess them, when you have dispossessed them and live in their land, ³⁰ take care that you are not snared into imitating them, after they have been destroyed before you: do not inquire [שׁוּא] concerning their gods, saying, “How did these nations worship their gods? I also want to do the same.” (Deut. 12:29-30 NRSV – Dtn)

⁹ When you come into the land that the LORD your God is giving you, you must not learn to imitate the abhorrent practices of those nations. ¹⁰ No one shall be found among you who makes a son or daughter pass through fire, or who practices divination, or is a soothsayer, or an augur, or a sorcerer, ¹¹ or one who casts spells, or who consults [שׂוֹא] ghosts or spirits, or who seeks [דרש] oracles from the dead. ¹² For whoever does these things is abhorrent to the LORD; it is because of such abhorrent practices that the LORD your God is driving them out before you. ¹³ You must remain completely loyal to the LORD your God. ¹⁴ Although these nations that you are about to dispossess do give heed to soothsayers and diviners, as for you, the LORD your God does not permit you to do so. (Deut. 18:9-14 NRSV - Dtn)

Appendix 1c
דרש/בקש (with religious connotation) in the Deuteronomistic History

Reference	Text (BHS)	Verb	Noun	Strand	Violation	
					By whom	Violation
1 Sam 9:9	לְקַנְיָם בְּיַשְׁרָאֵל כִּהְיֵאמֶר הָאִישׁ בִּלְקַחְתָּ לְדָרוֹשׁ אֶל־יְהוָה לְכוּ וְנִלְקַח עַד־יְהוָה כִּי לְקַנְיָא הַיּוֹם יִשְׁרָאֵל: לְקַנְיָם הָרְאָה:	Inf Cstr	X	Dtn	Hypothetical person	Consult a medium Background information by the narrator

1 Sam 28:7	וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂאוֹל לַעֲבָדָיו בְּקִשְׁוּי-לִי אֲשֶׁת בַּעֲלַת-אֹב וְאִלָּהּ אֵלֶיהָ [אֲדַרְשֶׁהּ-בָּהֶן] וַיֹּאמְרוּ עֲבָדָיו אֵלָיו הִנֵּה אֲשֶׁת בַּעֲלַת-אֹב בַּעֲדוֹ דָּוִד:	Waw Cop + Impf	X	Dtr	Saul	Consult a medium	Direct speech by Saul
1 Kgs 22:5	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשָׁפָט אֶל-מְלָךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל [רַשְׁמֵא בָיִם אֶת-דָּבָר יְהוָה]:	Imp.	X	Dtr	Jehoshaphat	No violation – command to seek the word of Yahweh	Direct speech by Jehoshaphat
1 Kgs 22:7	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשָׁפָט הֲאִינוּ פֹה נִבְיָא לַיהוָה עוֹד [נְדַרְשָׁה מֵאֲחֵינוּ]:	Waw Cop + Impf	X	Dtr	Jehoshaphat	No violation – asking for a prophet to seek a sign	Direct speech by Jehoshaphat
1 Kgs 22:8	וַיֹּאמֶר מְלָךְ-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל-יְהוֹשָׁפָט עוֹד אִישׁ-אֶמֶד לְדַרְשׁ אֶת-יְהוָה מֵאֲחֵינוּ [וְאֲנִי שְׂנֵאתִיו כִּי לֹא-יִתְנַבֵּא עָלַי טוֹב כִּי אִם-רָע מִיְכַדְוֵי בְרִימְקָה וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשָׁפָט אֶל-יְהוֹשָׁפָט הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּנֹ:	Inf Cstr	X	Dtr	Ahab	No violation – recommending the prophet Micaiah ben Yimlah	Direct speech by Ahab
2 Kgs 1:2	וַיִּפֹּל אֲחִזְיָה בְּעַד הַשִּׁבְכָה בַּעֲלֵתוֹ אֲשֶׁר בְּשִׁמְרוֹן וַיַּחֲזֵל וַיִּשְׁלַח מַלְאָכָיו וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֲלֵהֶם [כֹּה דַרְשׁוּ בַּבַּעַל זְבוּב] אֲלֵהֶי עַמְרָתָיו אִם-עֲמָתָה מִקְּבֵל זָה: ס	Imp	X	Dtr	Ahaziah	Consulting Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron	Direct speech by Ahaziah
2 Kgs 1:3	וַיִּמְלְאוּ יְהוָה דָּבָר אֶל-אֵלֶיהָ הַמַּשְׁפִּי קוֹם עֲלֵה לְקַרְאֵת מִלְאָכֶי מְלָכֵי-שִׁמְרוֹן וְדַבֵּר אֲלֵהֶם הַמִּקְּבֵל אִישׁ-אֵלֶיהֶם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל [אֲתֵם הַלֵּלִים לְדַרְשׁ בַּבַּעַל זְבוּב אֲלֵהֶן עַמְרָתָיו]:	Part	X	Dtr	Ahaziah	Consulting Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron	Direct speech of messenger of Yahweh to Elijah about what he should ask

2 Kgs 1:6	<p>וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו אִישׁ עָלָה לְקַדְמֹתֶיךָ וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו לָכוּ שׁוּבוּ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־שָׁלַח אֹתְכֶם וְדַבְּרֶם אֵלָיו כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה הַמִּבְרָךְ אִין־אֱלֹהִים בִּישְׁרָאֵל אֲמַתָּה שְׁלַח לְדָרֶשׁ בְּבַעַל וּבָבִי אֱלֹהֵי עַקְרוֹן לָכוּ הַמַּטְשָׁה אֲשֶׁר־עָלֶיךָ שָׁם לֹא־תִכְרַד מִשְׁנֵה בְּיַמּוֹת תַּמּוּזִית:</p>	Part	X	Dtr	Ahaziah	Consulting Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron	Direct speech by Elijah
2 Kgs 1:16	<p>וַיִּדְבֹר אֵלָיו פֶּה־אֶמֶר יְהוָה נַעַן אֲשֶׁר־שָׁלַחְתָּם מִלְּאֲבִיבִים לְדָרֶשׁ בְּבַעַל וּבָבִי אֱלֹהֵי הַמִּבְרָךְ אִין־אֱלֹהִים בִּישְׁרָאֵל לָכוּ הַמַּטְשָׁה אֲשֶׁר־עָלֶיךָ שָׁם לֹא־תִכְרַד מִשְׁנֵה בְּיַמּוֹת תַּמּוּזִית:</p>	Inf Cstr	X	Dtr	Ahaziah	Consulting Baal-Zebub, the god of Ekron	Direct speech by Elijah
2 Kgs 3:11	<p>וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשָׁפָט הֲאִין פֶּה נָבִיא לַיהוָה וְנִדְרָשָׁה אֶת־יְהוָה מֵאֹתוֹ וַיַּעַן אֶחָד מֵעַבְדֵי מֶלֶךְ־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר פֶּה אֱלִיָּשָׁע בֶּן־שֹׁפָט אֲשֶׁר־יִיחַזֵּק מֵיָד עַל־יְדֵי אֱלֹהֵינוּ:</p>			Dtr	Jehoshaphat	No violation – asking for a prophet	Direct speech of Jehoshaphat
2 Kgs 8:8	<p>וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל־חֹזֵה־אֵל חָזַק בְּיָדְךָ מִנְּהִי וְלֵךְ לְקַרְאֵת אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים וְדַרְשֵׁם אֶת־יְהוָה מֵאֹתוֹן לֵאמֹר הֲאִתְּהָ מִקִּדְוָה:</p>	Waw cop + Impf	X	Dtr	Ben-Hadad	No violation – Ben-Hadad wants to consult Yahweh through prophet Elisha	Direct speech of Ben-Hadad
2 Kgs 22:13	<p>לָכוּ וְדַרְשׁוּ אֶת־יְהוָה בְּעַד־יְהוֹשָׁפָט וּבְעַד־כָּל־הַיְהוּדָה עַל־דְּבַר־הַסֵּפֶר הַנִּסְפָּר הַנִּמְצָא הַזֶּה בְּיַד־הַיְהוּדָה וְהָיָה אֲשֶׁר־הָיָא נִצְחָה בָּנוּ עַל־אֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׁמַעְנוּ אֲבֹתֵינוּ עַל־דְּבַר־הַסֵּפֶר הַזֶּה לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּכָל־הַמְּצֻוִים עָלֵינוּ:</p>	Imp	X	Dtr	Josiah	No violation – Josiah wants to consult Yahweh	Direct speech of Josiah

2 Kgs 22:18	וְאֵלֵּי מַלְאָכָי יִהְיֶה הַשְּׁלֵחַ אֲתֶכֶם לְרֹשׁ אֶת־יְהוָה כִּי הָאֲמֹר אֲלֵי כֹה־אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתֶּם:	Inf Cstr	X	Dtr	Josiah	No violation – Josiah wants to consult Yahweh	Direct speech of Huldah, the prophetess
1 Sam 28:7	וַיֹּאמֶר שָׂאִיל לַעֲבָדָיו בְּקֹשְׁרוֹ לֵי אֲשַׁת בַּעֲלַת־אֹב וְאִלְמָה אֵלַי וְאִדְרָשֶׁהָ כִּי וַיֹּאמְרוּ עֲבָדָיו אֵלָיו הֲנֵה אֲשַׁת בַּעֲלַת־אֹב בְּעֵין דָּוִד:	Imp	X	Dtr	Saul	Consulting a medium	Direct speech of Saul
2 Sam 12:16	וַיִּבְקֹשׁ דָּוִד אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים בַּעַד הַנֶּעֱרַר וַיֵּצֵא דָוִד צִוִּים וַיָּבֵא וְגַל וַיִּשְׁכַּב אִתָּהּ:	Waw Cons + Impf	X	Dtr	David	No violation – consulting God	Voice of narrator
2 Sam 21:1	וַיְהִי רָעַב בְּיַמֵּי דָוִד שְׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים שָׁנָה אַחֲרֵי שָׁנָה וַיִּבְקֹשׁ דָּוִד אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר וַיְהִי כִּי אֶל־שָׂאִיל וְאֵל־בָּיִת הַדְּלִימִים עַל־אֲשֶׁר־הָמִית אֶת־הַגִּבְעֹנִים:	Waw Cons + Impf	X	Dtr	David	No violation – consulting the face of Yahweh	Voice of narrator

Appendix 2a
 מַעֲלֵי בַּעַל בְּכֹרֵת

Reference	Text (BHS)	Verb	Noun	Paral.	Violation	
					By whom	Comm.
1 Chron 2:7	עֵבֶר (עֶבֶר) עֵבֶר יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר מִצְרַיִם בְּהָרָם:	Perf.	--	Sond. (cf. Josh 7:1)	Achan	Acted unfaithfully with the ban Short narrative intervention in genealogy; voice of narrator

1 Chron 5:25	<p>וַיִּמְעַלְוּ בְּאֵלֵהֶם אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם וַיִּזְנוּ אֶתְרֵי אֱלֹהֵי עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר-יְהִי שְׂמִיד אֱלֹהִים מִפְּנֵיהֶם:</p>	Waw Cons. + Imperf.	--	Sond.	Tribes east of Jordan	Acted unfaithfully against the God of their fathers by prostituting themselves after other gods	Short narrative intervention in genealogy; voice of narrator
1 Chron 9:1	<p>וְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל הִתְקַשְׁפוּ וְהָנִסּוּ כַחֲנֻבִים עַל-סֶפֶר מִלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּהְיֶה הָגִל לְבָבָל בְּמַעֲלָם:</p>	--	X	Sond.	Judah	Judah went into exile because of their unfaithfulness (unspecified)	Short narrative intervention in genealogy; voice of narrator
1 Chron 10:13	<p>וַיָּמָת שָׂאוּל בְּמַעֲלָוֹ אֲשֶׁר מָעַל בֵּיתוֹהָ עַל-דָּבָר יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא-שָׁמַר וְגַם לִשְׂאוּל בָּאוּב לְדָרוֹשׁ:</p>	Perf.	X	Sond.	Saul	His unfaithfulness that he committed unfaithfully against Yahweh by not keeping the word (<i>dbr</i>) of Yahweh, and by consulting a medium	Voice of narrator
2 Chron 12:2	<p>וַיְהִי כִשְׁנֵה הַתְּמִישִׁית לַמֶּלֶךְ רְחַבְעָם עָלָה שִׁיעָק מֶלֶךְ-מִצְרַיִם עַל-יְרֵדוֹשָׁם כִּי מָעַלְוּ בֵּיתוֹהָ:</p>	Perf.	--	Sond.	Rehoboam and people of Judah	Acted unfaithfully against Yahweh by not keeping the Torah of God	Voice of narrator
2 Chron 26:16	<p>וַתִּקְוָאוּ גְבוּהַ לְבוֹ עַד-לְהַשְׁחִית [מַעֲלָו] בֵּיתוֹהָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲלֵי-הַכֶּלֶל וַיְהִי לְהַשְׁטִיר עַל-מִזְבֵּחַ הַקָּטָן הַזֶּה:</p>	Waw Cons. + Imperf.	--	Sond.	Uzziah	Acted unfaithfully against Yahweh his God by bringing incense offerings on the incense altar in the temple (cf. 2 Kgs 15:4 the people brought animal and incense offerings on the heights)	Voice of narrator

2 Chron 26:18	<p>וַיַּעֲמִידוּ עַל-עֲצֵי הַיָּדָה הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ לֹא-לָךְ עֲזָיָהוּ לְהַקְטִיר לַיהוָה כִּי לַכֹּהֲנִים כְּגַיִי-אֲהֲרֹן הַמִּקְדָּשִׁים לְהַקְטִיר צֵא מִן-הַמִּקְדָּשׁ כִּי מִעֲלֹתָ וְלֹא-לָךְ לִכְבֹּד מִיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ:</p>	Perf.	--	Sond.	Uzziah	For you have acted unfaithfully by bringing offering in temple like a priest	Direct speech of Azariah and 80 other priests directed to Uzziah
2 Chron 28:19	<p>כִּי-יִהְיֶה עַיִן יְהוָה אֶת-יְהוָה בַּעֲבוּר אֲחִינוּ מִלִּד-יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי הִרְרִיעַ בְּיְהוּדָה וּמִעֲלֹת מִצְרַיִם בְּיְהוָה:</p>	Inf. Abs. + Perf.	--	Sond.	Ahaz	He surely (inf. estr.) acted unfaithfully against Yahweh by making Baal images, sacrificing his children in the Hinnom Valley, and bringing animal and incense offerings on the heights (cf. 2 Chron 28:2-4 2 Kgs 15:3-4)	Voice of narrator
2 Chron 28:22	<p>וַיַּעַתְתָּ הָעָר לֹא וַיִּסָּר לְמַעַן בְּיְהוָה הִיא הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲחִינוּ:</p>	Inf. Cstr.	--	Sond.	Ahaz	He continued acting unfaithfully against Yahweh by sacrificing to the gods of Damascus	Voice of narrator
2 Chron 29:6	<p>כִּי-מִעֲלֹת אֲבֹתֵינוּ וַעֲשׂוּ כַעַס בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וַיַּעֲזֹבוּ וַיִּסְפּוּ פְנֵיהֶם מִמִּשְׁפַּחַי יְהוָה וַיִּתְנַבְּרוּ-עִירָה:</p>	Perf.	--	Sond.	Our ancestors	Our fathers acted unfaithfully by not caring for the temple	Direct speech by Hezekiah directed to the priests and Levites
2 Chron 29:19	<p>וְאֵת כָּל-הַכֹּהֲנִים אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲחִינוּ בְּמִלְכוּתוֹ בְּמִצְרַיִם הִכְנוּ וְהִקְדָּשְׁנוּ וְהָיָם לִפְנֵי מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה:</p>	--	X	Sond.	Ahaz	Through his unfaithfulness re. the temple	Direct speech by Priests and Levites directed to Hezekiah

2 Chron 30:7	וְאֵלֵי־הַתְּהוֹמוֹתַי בָּאֲבוֹתַיכֶם וּבְאֲחֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר לְמַעַלְהוֹ בֵּיתָהּ אֲלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתַיכֶם וַיִּתְּנֶם לְשִׁמְהָ בְּאֲשֶׁר אָתָּם רֵאִים:	Perf.	--	Sond.	Your fathers and brothers	Do not act as your fathers and brothers who acted unfaithfully against Yahweh the God of their fathers (unspecified)	Letter from Hezekiah to people of Israel
2 Chron 33:19	וַיִּתְּקֵנוּ וַיַּעֲמֵרוּ־לוֹ וְכָל־חַטָּאתוֹ [מַעַלְהוֹ] וַיִּמְקְמוּת אֲשֶׁר בָּנָה בָהֶם בְּמֹת וַיַּעֲמִיד הָאֲשֵׁרִים וַיִּפְסְלוּ לִפְנֵי הַכְּנָעַן הַנֶּחֱם כְּחֹזְקִים עַל דְּבַר־יְהוָה:	--	X	Sond.	Manasseh	All his sins and unfaithfulness through the building of heights and the erection of sacred poles and idols	Voice of narrator
2 Chron 36:14	גַּם בְּלִישְׁרֵי הַפְּתָנִים וְהַעַם הָרַב־וּ [לְמַעַלְהוֹ] בָּקָל הַתְּעֻבוֹת הַגּוֹיִם וַיִּשְׁמְאוּ אֶת־בֵּית יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הִקְדִּישׁ בְּיַד־יְהוָה:	Inf. Abs. + Perf.	--	Sond.	All the leaders of the priests and the people	They increasingly and surely (inf. estr.) acted unfaithfully like the heathen nations (unspecified)	Voice of narrator

Appendix 2b
Violations in the Pentateuch

Reference	Text (BHS)	Verb	Noun	Strand	Violation		Comm.
					By whom	Violation	
Lev. 5:15	לָקַח פִּי־תַמְעַל מַעַל וְהִטָּאָה בְּשִׁגְגָה מִקֹּדֶשׁ יְהוָה וְהֵבִיא אֶת־אֲשָׁמוֹ לִיהוָה אֵיל תָּמִים מִן־הַצֹּאן בְּעֶרְבֹה בְּסִרְי־שִׂקְלִים בְּשִׂקְל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְאֲשָׁם:	Impf.	X	P	Hypothetical person	Unintentional transgression in connection with the holy things of Yahweh	Legal context (casuistic)

Lev. 5:21	<p>וְהָיָה כִּי תִשָּׂא וּמַעֲלָה מַעַל בִּיתְוָהּ וְהָיָה בְּעִמְיֹתָהּ בְּפָקֻדָיו אֹרְבֵת־שׁוֹמֵרֹת יָד אֹרְבֵתֹת אֹרְבֵתֹת אֶת־עַמְיֹתָהּ: וְהִתְנַחֵם אֶת־עֲוֹנוֹ וְאֶת־עֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם בְּמַעֲלָם אֲשֶׁר מַעֲלָה בְּיָדָהּ וְלֹא אָשֶׁר־הִזְכִּירוּ עִפְיָי בְּקָרִי:</p>	Unfaithfulness against Yahweh by deceiving the neighbour	Legal context (casuistic)
Lev. 26:40	<p>וְהִתְנַחֵם אֶת־עֲוֹנוֹ וְאֶת־עֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם בְּמַעֲלָם אֲשֶׁר מַעֲלָה בְּיָדָהּ וְלֹא אָשֶׁר־הִזְכִּירוּ עִפְיָי בְּקָרִי:</p>	Unspecified	Legal context (casuistic)
Num. 5:6	<p>וְכִּי יִשָּׂא אִישׁ אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ כִּי יַעֲשֶׂה מַכְלָל חֲטָאוֹת הָאֵלֶּם לְמַעַל מַעַל בִּיתְוָהּ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ הִנְפִישׁ הַהוּא: וְהִתְנַחֵם אֶת־עֲוֹנוֹ וְאֶת־עֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם בְּמַעֲלָם אֲשֶׁר מַעֲלָה בְּיָדָהּ וְלֹא אָשֶׁר־הִזְכִּירוּ עִפְיָי בְּקָרִי:</p>	Wrong another person	Legal context (casuistic)
Num. 31:16	<p>וְהִתְנַחֵם אֶת־עֲוֹנוֹ וְאֶת־עֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם בְּמַעֲלָם אֲשֶׁר מַעֲלָה בְּיָדָהּ וְלֹא אָשֶׁר־הִזְכִּירוּ עִפְיָי בְּקָרִי:</p>	Those who followed Balaam's advice	Moses's speech to soldiers
Deut. 32:51	<p>עַל־אֲשֶׁר מַעֲלָתָם כִּי בָחוּרָהּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמִי־קָרִיבָתָהּ קָנַשׁ מִדְּבַר־אֵל עַל־אֲשֶׁר לֹא־קִשְׁטָם אוֹתִי בְּחֹדֶי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:</p>	Aaron and Moses	Yahweh's speech to Moses

Appendix 2c
 מַעַל in the Deuteronomistic History

Reference	Text (BHS)	Verb	Noun	Strand	By whom	Violation	
						Violation	Comm.
Josh. 7:1	וַיִּמְעַל בְּנִי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַל בְּחֶרֶם וַיִּלָּחֶם עִמּוֹ בְּרִיכָה מִן־מֵי יַרְדֵּן וַיִּבְרָחֵם יְהוָה לְמַשָּׁה לְמַדְבָּר בְּרִיכָה מִן־מֵי יַרְדֵּן וַיִּבְרָחֵם יְהוָה לְמַשָּׁה לְמַדְבָּר יִשְׂרָאֵל: יְהוָה בָּגַד יִשְׂרָאֵל:	Waw Cons. + Impf.	X	Dtr/P?	Israelites	Achan's transgression with the ban	Narrator's voice
Josh. 22:16	כֹּה אָמְרוּ בְּלוּ עֲזַת יְהוָה מֵהֵּ טִפְעַל הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר מִעַלְתֶּם בְּאֵלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לָשׁוּב הַיּוֹם מֵאֲחֵרֵי יְהוָה בְּקִוְיֹתֵיכֶם לָכֵם מִזֶּה לְמַדְבָּר הַיּוֹם בַּיּוֹם: כֹּה אָמְרוּ בְּלוּ עֲזַת יְהוָה מֵהֵּ טִפְעַל הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר מִעַלְתֶּם בְּאֵלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לָשׁוּב הַיּוֹם מֵאֲחֵרֵי יְהוָה בְּקִוְיֹתֵיכֶם לָכֵם מִזֶּה לְמַדְבָּר הַיּוֹם בַּיּוֹם:	Perf.	X	P	Reuben, Gad, half-tribe of Manasseh	Unspecified	Direct speech of Phinehas and ten tribal chiefs
Josh. 22:20	קִלְאוּ עִמּוֹ בְּרִיכָה מֵעַל בְּחֶרֶם וְעַל־קִלְעֵת יִשְׂרָאֵל הַזֶּה קָצַף וְהוּא אִישׁ אֶמֶת לֹא גָנַע בְּעֵינָיו: פ	Perf.	X	P	Reuben, Gad, half-tribe of Manasseh	Back-reference to Achan's transgression with the ban, indicating that punishment of death did not only come on him, but on the whole community of Israel	Direct speech of Phinehas and ten tribal chiefs
Josh. 22:31	וַיֹּאמֶר פִּינְחָס בְּרִאֲלֶעָזֶר הַכֹּהֵן אֶל־בְּנֵי־רְאוּבֵן וְאֶל־בְּנֵי־גָד וְאֶל־בְּנֵי מְנַשֶּׁה הַיּוֹם לָעֵנֹה בִּי־חַוִּיתִיכֶם יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־מִעַלְתֶּם בְּיְהוָה הַמַּעַל הַזֶּה אוֹ הַצִּלְתֶּם אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּד יְהוָה:	Perf.	X	P	Reuben, Gad, half-tribe of Manasseh		Direct speech of Phinehas

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ben Zvi, E, 2009. Are there any bridges out there? How wide was the conceptual gap between the Deuteronomic History and Chronicles?, in Knoppers and Ristau 2009:59–86.
- Ben Zvi, E and Edelman, D V (eds) 2011. *What was authoritative for Chronicles?* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Botterweck, G J and Ringgren, H (eds) 1978. *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Cornelius, I and Jonker, L C (eds) 2008. *From Ebla to Stellenbosch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Driver, S R 1895. *Deuteronomy*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Fabry, H-J and Jüngling, H-W (eds.) 1999. *Levitikus als Buch*. Bonner biblische Beiträge. Berlin: Philo.
- Gerleman, G and Ruprecht, E 1971. שרר דרש fragen nach, in Jenni and Westermann 1971:459–467.
- Glatt-Gilad, D A 2011. Chronicles as consensus literature, in Ben Zvi and Edelman 2011:67–76.
- Goldstein, R 2002. Joshua 22:9-34: a priestly narrative from the Second Temple period, *Shnaton* 13:43–81.
- Jenni, E and Westermann, C (eds) 1971. *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. München: C. Kaiser.
- Jonker, L C 2008. The disappearing Nehustan: the Chronicler's reinterpretation of Hezekiah's reformation measures, in Cornelius and Jonker 2008:116–140.
- _____ 2013a. *1 & 2 Chronicles*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- _____ 2013b. Was the Chronicler more deuteronomic than the Deuteronomist? Explorations into the Chronicler's relationship with Deuteronomic legal traditions, *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 27/2:191–203.
- _____ 2014a. From paraleipomenon to early reader. The implications of recent Chronicles studies for Pentateuchal criticism, in Maier 2014:217–254.
- _____ 2014b. Within hearing distance? Recent developments in Pentateuch and Chronicles research, *Old Testament Essays* 27/1:123–146.
- _____ 2016. *Defining all-Israel in Chronicles. Multi-levelled identity negotiation in Late Persian-Period Yehud*. FAT 106. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Klein, R W 2006. *1 Chronicles: a commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Kloppenborg, J S 1981. Joshua 22: The Priestly editing of an ancient tradition, *Biblica* 62/3:347–371.
- Knierim, R., 1971. מלל מ'ל treulos sein in Jenni and Westermann 1971:920–922.
- Knoppers, G N 2003. *1 Chronicles 1-9: A new translation with introduction and commentary* 1st ed. New York: Doubleday.
- Knoppers, G N 2004. *1 Chronicles 10-29: a new translation with introduction and commentary* 1st ed. New York: Doubleday.
- _____ 2012. The relationship of the Deuteronomic History to Chronicles: was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist?, in Nissinen 2012:307–341.
- Knoppers, G N and Ristau, K A (eds) 2009. *Community identity in Judean historiography*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Koehler, L and Baumgartner, W 2001. מלל. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill. (HALOT)

- Levinson, B M (ed.) 1994. *Theory and method in biblical and Cuneiform law: revision, interpolation and development*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____ 1997. *Deuteronomy and the hermeneutics of legal innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ 2008a. *Legal revision and religious renewal in ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____ 2008b. *“The right chorale” : studies in biblical law and interpretation*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lundbom, J R 2013. *Deuteronomy. A commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Maier, C M (ed.) 2014. *Congress volume Munich 2013*. Leiden: Brill.
- Mayes, A D H 1981. *Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Miller, P D 1990. *Deuteronomy*. Louisville: John Knox.
- Nelson, R D 1997. *Joshua*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- _____ 2002. *Deuteronomy. A commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Nielsen, E 1981. *Deuteronomium*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Nissinen, M (ed.) 2012. *Congress volume Helsinki 2010*. Leiden: Brill.
- Otto, E 1994. Aspects of legal reforms and reformulations in ancient cuneiform and Israelite law, in Levinson 1994:160–196.
- _____ 1999. Innerbiblische Exegese im Heiligkeitsgesetz Levitikus 17-26, in Fabry and Jüngling 1999:125–196.
- _____ 2004. The Pentateuch in synchronical and diachronical perspective: prorabbinic scribal erudition mediating between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code, in Otto and Achenbach 2004:14–35.
- _____ 2012. *Deuteronomium 1,1 - 4,43*. Freiburg: Herder.
- Otto, E and Achenbach, R (eds) 2004. *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ringgren, H 1997. מַעַל ma`al in Jenni and Westermann 1971:460–463.
- Rösel, H 2011. *Joshua*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Swanson, J 1997. *Dictionary of biblical languages with semantic domains : Hebrew (Old Testament)*. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc.
- Wagner, S 1978. דַּרַשׁ darash in Botterweck and 1978:293–307.
- Whitaker, R et al. 1906. *The abridged Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew-English lexicon of the Old Testament: from a Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament by Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and Charles Briggs, based on the lexicon of Wilhelm Gesenius*. New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.