COLLECTANEA
THEOLOGICA

Bartosz Adamczewski

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
ORCID: 0000-0001-7847-0203

The End of Source Theories? The Genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 and Their Reworking in the New Testament[1]

Abstract: A thorough analysis of the genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 has shown that they are the result of a highly creative (hypertextual) and at the same time strictly sequential reworking of an older text of Deut 2:9–23. This means that the theories postulating the genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 as having come from various hypothetical sources of the Pentateuch (J, P, etc.) are no longer necessary to explain their origin and function. Similarly, detailed analysis of the genealogies presented in Luke 3:23–38 and Matt 1:1–17 has demonstrated that the Matthean genealogy is the effect of a deliberate reworking of the earlier genealogy composed by Luke. That, in turn, means that the theory of the "Q source," intended to serve as an explanation of the origin of the Matthean–Lucan materials that had not come from the Gospel of Mark, is also exegetically superfluous.

Keywords: biblical genealogies, book of Genesis, *Apocalypse of Weeks*, Gospel of Luke, Gospel of Matthew, Pentateuchal sources, Q source

Biblical genealogies are not among the texts frequently examined by exegetes. They are considered to have been a relic of bygone cultures, at the time when identity of persons and communities could be founded on the basis of references to the preceding generations.

Nevertheless, a thorough analysis of biblical genealogies may lead to intriguing and consequential exegetical conclusions. For

---

[1] This article is a translation of the article originally published in Polish: Bartosz Adamczewski, "Koniec teorii źródeł? Genealogie Rdz 4,17-5,32 i ich przepracowanie w Nowym Testamencie," *Collectanea Theologica* 83 (2013) no. 4, 47–74.

instance, a detailed analysis of the genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 and of their use in the New Testament (Luke 3:23–28; Matt 1:1–17) poses a challenge to the theory of the sources of the Pentateuch (J, E, D, P, etc.), and the theory of the "Q source" in the Synoptic Gospels, both almost universally accepted by exegetes.

The Genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32: Common Traits and Differences

Following the account of the fratricidal sin of Cain (Gen 4:1–16), a substantial passage in the Book of Genesis is devoted to genealogies (Gen 4:17–5:32). There is nothing out of the ordinary in the fact that they are featured in the Genesis, for not only the lists of kings, but also royal, mythological, and personal genealogical lists are relatively widely used in the literature of the ancient Near East.[2]

However, the genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 are in fact very atypical – most of all because they overlap both in terms of their form and their content. To the readers of the Genesis they give an impression of unnecessary repetitiveness. In spite of decades of research, biblical scholars have not been able to satisfactorily explain the reasons behind and the functions of this literary redundancy.

The text in Gen 4:17–5:32 comprises three genealogies: Cainites (Gen 4:17–24), Adamites (Gen 4:25–26), and the descendants of Adam once again (Gen 5:1–32). Even at first glance, the second and third of these seem to coincide thematically (Adam–Seth–Enosh: Gen 4:25–26 and Gen 5:1–8).

Besides, the first and third genealogy, i.e., of the Cainites (Gen 4:17–24) and of the descendants of Adam (Gen 5:1–32), display marked common traits but at the same time numerous differences.

The first genealogy features the name of Cain (קין: Gen 4;17, cf. also 4:24–25), meanwhile the third – a similar name of Cainan (קינן:

---

[2] Cf. R.R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*, (New Haven–London 1977), 56–136; W.W. Hallo, K.L. Younger, Jr., eds., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1, *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, (Leiden–New York–Cologne 1997), 68–73, 199, 356, 391, 461–5; vol. 3, *Archival Documents from the Biblical World*, (Leiden–New York–Cologne 2002), 158, 161, 164, 191, 193–4.

Gen 5:9–10.12–14), which differs from the former by ending in the reduplication of the final consonant *nun*. Apart from that, in the first genealogy Cain is the son of Adam, that is, of "man" (האדם: Gen 4:1); however, in the third he is the son of Enosh, also meaning "man" (אנוש: Gen 5:9, cf. Deut 32:26; Ps 8:5, etc.). Still, whereas the name Cain is clearly related through its etymology to metallurgy (Aram.: "blacksmith")[3], his later counterpart Cainan ("nestle-dweller": cf. Ezek 31:6, etc.) rather points to being settled in a certain place.

Both genealogies feature the name of Enoch ("dedicated": Gen 4:17–18; 5:18–24). In this case, they also share a distinct place that Enoch has within the genealogical list: in the first genealogy Enoch is featured in third position (Adam–Cain–Enoch: Gen 4:1.17), whereas in the third – he is seventh (Adam–Seth–Enosh–Cainan–Mahalle'el–Jored–Enoch: Gen 5:1–18). However, in the first genealogy the father of Enoch is Cain (Gen 4:17), while in the third one it is Jored (Gen 5:18–19).

The latter name also appears to be shared by both genealogies. The first genealogy features 'Irad (עירד: Gen 4:18), meanwhile the third – Jored (ירד: Gen 5:15–16.18–20). Similarly to the first pair of names, Cain (Gen 4:17.24–25) and Cainan (Gen 5:9–10.12–14), the name Jored differs from its counterpart in the first genealogy ('Irad) by a single letter, i.e, the missing initial consonant *ayin*. Besides, much like in the case of Cain and Cainan, the first name ('Irad) has an etymological association with a technical construction (עיר: "city"; cf. also Gen 4:17: Cain building a city named after 'Irad's father)[4], whereas the name Jored ("the descending one")[5] is related to that of the River Jordan (Ps 42:7, etc.).

Another pair of names clearly related to one another, yet still different at the same time, is that of Mehujael in the first genealogy (מחויאל: Gen 4:18), and Mahalle'el in the third (מהללאל: Gen

---

[3] Cf. J. Blenkinsopp, *Creation, Un-creation, Re-creation: A Discursive Commentary on Genesis 1-11*, (London–New York 2011), 87.
[4] Cf. P.N. Tarazi, *Genesis: A Commentary*, Chrysostom Bible, (St Paul, Minn. 2009), 75; J. Lemański, *Księga Rodzaju, rozdziały 1–11. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz*, NKB ST 1/1, (Częstochowa 2013), 298–300.
[5] Cf. K.A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, NAC 1A, [s.l.], (Nashville, Tenn. 1996), 313.

5:12–13.15–17). In this case, the differences between the names are greater, but one can clearly recognise the analogies in their structure: the initial consonant *mem,* followed by the pharyngeal *chet* or laryngal *he*, and the final two-letter stem: *'el*. However, whereas the first name has a strongly negative etymology ("annihilated by God": cf. Gen 7:23, etc.), the etymology of its subsequent equivalent is largely positive ("one praising God": cf. Ps 150:1).[6]

One more pairing of similar but concurrently different names is that of Methusheol in the first genealogy (מתושאל: Gen 4:18), and Methushalah in the third (מתושלח: Gen 5:21–22.25–27). The two six-letter words differ only in the two final consonants. In both versions, the person bearing the name is the father of Lamech (Gen 4:18; 5:25). Still, whereas the first name (Methusheol) is etymologically associated with the dead in Sheol, the name Methushalah should rather be associated with someone who was allowed to depart in peace through his death (שלח: cf. Gen 19:29).

The name of Lamech recurs in the first (Gen 4:18–19.23–24) and third genealogical list (Gen 5:25–26.28.30–31). Moreover, in both enumerations it is featured as second to last, identified as the father of either Jabal, Jubal, Tubal-cain, and Naamah (Gen 4:19–22), or of Noah (Gen 5:28–29). In both lists, he is associated with a number divisible by seven. While the first genealogy mentions a torturous seventy-seven-fold vengeance (Gen 4:23–24), its context in the third indicates a blessed lifespan of seven hundred seventy-seven years.

The Origin of Gen 4:17–5:32: The Traditional Hypothesis of the Sources of the Pentateuch

The majority of contemporary exegetes have attempted to solve the problem of the origin and function of the three partly overlapping—but at the same time differing—genealogies featured in Gen 4:17–5:32 by adopting the theory of the sources of the Pentateuch. According to this theory, the literary repetitions found in the Pentateuch are to be attributed to the various sources that these partly overlapping passages originated from. The final editor of the Book of Genesis, and of the other books of the Torah, would have

---

[6] Cf. ibid.

been the one who put together these materials, drawn from various sources, into a single whole, without removing the resulting obvious repetitions.

Traditionally, in line with the hypothesis put forth by Julius Wellhausen over a century ago, the two genealogies in Gen 4:17–24.25–26 are combined and ascribed to the Yahwist source (J), whereas the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 is attributed to the Priestly source (P).[7] The issue of the interrelation between these sources has been the subject of discussion among exegetes. For instance, contrary to the traditional hypothesis, positing the Yahwist source (J) as being older than the Priestly source (P), the American biblical scholar, Joseph Blenkinsopp, believes the opposite to be true. Because the fragmentary, segmented genealogical material attributed to the J source of Gen 4:17–26 (Cain and Enoch: Gen 4:17; Lamech: Gen 4:20–24; Seth and Enosh: Gen 4:25–26) is associated with the preceding narrative of the fratricide (Gen 4:2b–16)—and usually it is genealogies that serve as bases for stories, and not the other way around—this part of the material was created later than the formally pure genealogy in Gen 5:1–32.[8]

Even though today the theory of the sources of the Pentateuch is almost universally accepted by biblical scholars (with the exception of Evangelical biblical scholars, who are trying to prove that the entire Pentateuch historically originated with Moses), it has some obvious flaws.

First of all, there is no external evidence to support this theory. None of the manuscripts, including the rather numerous manuscripts discovered several decades ago near the Dead Sea, provides even a trace of the hypothetical sources or traditions in their "pure" form, and thus independent from one another. The only thing transferred in those manuscripts is the continuous text of the Genesis and of

---

[7] Cf. for instance C. Westermann, *Genesis*, vol. 1, *Genesis 1-11*, BKAT 1/1, (Neukirchen–Vluyn 1974), 442, 470; D. Dziadosz, *Genealogie Księgi Rodzaju: Pomiędzy historią, tradycją i teologią*, Biblical Annals 1 (2011): 28, f.n. 30.

[8] J. Blenkinsopp, *A Post-exilic Lay Source in Genesis 1-11*, in J.C. Gertz, K. Schmid, M. Witte, eds., *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion*, BZAW 315, (Berlin–New York 2002), 55. Cf. also F. Giuntoli, *Alcune osservazioni sull'origine post-esilica di Gen 1-11*, Ricerche Storico Bibliche 24, fasc. 1–2 (2012): 73–4.

other books of the Torah. Therefore, all the postulated sources and traditions are merely hypothetical intellectual constructs, intended to serve biblical scholars in solving the problem of repetitions, literary incongruence, and non-uniformity in the text of the Pentateuch. Young practitioners of biblical scholarship learn of these sources as academic certainty, and over time start to take their existence for granted. Meanwhile, from scientific point of view the theory of sources is practically unverifiable. Biblical scholars may posit an arbitrary number of sources, their variants, various editorial layers, etc., but there is no way to objectively confirm the actual existence of any such hypothetical entities. The observed repetitions, incongruence, and the lack of uniformity in the biblical text can be explained in various ways – not necessarily by postulating the existence of some hypothetical, pre-literary sources.

Secondly, the hermeneutical basis of this theory is of very questionable value. It is a known fact that Julius Wellhausen—because of his idiosyncratic religious reflection, entailing a criticism of the formalised cult of the Protestant Church—esteemed the texts presenting man's individual responsibility before God (attributed by him to the J, E, and D sources) much higher than the cultic ones (attributed to the P source).[9] Therefore, being hermeneutically biased in its assumption and evidently non-Catholic, the tendency to separate from one another the lay narrative about a relatively simple relationship with God (J) on the one side, and the priestly cultic precepts (P) on the other must be treated as cognitively problematic.

Thirdly, a detailed analysis of the texts ascribed to the respective sources indicates that they are very closely interrelated in their content. So it is with the account of creation of inhabitable earth, and the introduction of humans thereto (Gen 1–2), with the stories of the deluge – its causes and effects (Gen 6:1–9:19), and the narratives of the privileged status of the predecessors of Israel among the idolatrous nations of the world (Gen 10–11).

---

[9] Cf. M. Weinfeld, *The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel*, VTSup 100, (Leiden–Boston 2004), 3–5, 15; P. Machinist, *The Road Not Taken: Wellhausen and Assyriology*, in G. Galil, M. Geller, A. Millard, eds., *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*, FS B. Oded, VTSup 130, (Leiden–Boston 2009), 475–7, 481–2.

Such is also the case of the genealogies analysed here, which, as indicated above, clearly differ from one another, at the same time remaining obviously interconnected in many places. Had they originated from various sources, as suggested by many contemporary exegetes, it would be difficult to account for the numerous similarities between them, particularly because these similarities pertain, among other things, to certain features of their literary structures (emphatic position of Enoch, identical position of Lamech, the association of Lamech with the motif of the number seven, etc.).

On the other hand, a thorough analysis of the text in Gen 4:17–5:32 has shown that the differences between the genealogies are not of accidental, uncoordinated character, that could be attributed to, say, imprecision of oral transmission, but rather give an impression of a deliberate literary structure, reflecting an internally coherent, logical pattern (negative connotations of the names' etymology and their associations with the technique of metallurgy and city planning in Gen 4:17–24, positive connotations of the names' etymology and their associations with settling near the River Jordan in Gen 4:17–24, etc.).

The above arguments indicate that the traditional solution to the problem of apparently redundant genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32, that is, the attribution of Gen 4:17–26 to the Yahwist source (J) and of Gen 5:1–32 to the Priestly source (P), remains plainly unsatisfactory.

A New Paradigm: Sequential Hypertextuality in the Pentateuch

Instead of reiterating once more the hypothesis of the sources of the Pentateuch, which is, as demonstrated above, objectively unverifiable, hermeneutically doubtful, and most of all exegetically unsatisfactory, the origin and function of the genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 may be explained in another manner; namely, on the basis of a phenomenon recently discovered by the author of this article, that is, a sequential hypertextual elaboration of earlier works within biblical texts. This approach does not assume any hypothetical

sources, as it is founded solely on a careful comparison between the biblical texts known to us, and other literary works.

The notion of literary hypertextuality was introduced to literary theory in the 1980s, by a well-known French literary theorist, Gérard Genette. By developing the theory of intertextuality, originated by the Bulgarian literary scholar working in France, Julia Kristeva, as well as the notion of hypo-text, introduced by the Dutch scholar, Mieke Bal, Genette was able to define literary hypertextuality[10] as any relation connecting a given text B (referred to in this case as a hypertext) to a given earlier text A (referred to on that occasion as the hypertext), upon which the subsequent text is embedded in such a manner that it does not constitute a commentary thereof.[11]

To simplify the matter, one may conclude that hypertextuality consists in a highly creative reworking of an earlier text in a later one. Because hypertextuality by definition does not constitute a commentary of the previous text, it is not in principle based on direct quotations from the earlier text featured in the later work. Hypertextual processing is founded on various allusions, common motifs, aligned trajectories of character development, similar presentation of time and space, similar patterns of the relation between structural elements of the text, etc.

Thus, the existence of a hypertextual relation between two texts may in fact be rather difficult to discover and prove objectively. It is clearly indicated by the two "model" instances of hypertextuality provided by Genette himself. For inasmuch as the hypertextual relationship between Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer's *Iliad* [12] is relatively easy to detect and analyse for a reader familiar with these classic works, the hypertextual relationship between *Ulysses* by James Joyce and Homer's *Odyssey*[13], clearly suggested in the very title of the Irish writer's work (Ulysses = Odysseus), turned out to be very difficult to trace even for experienced literary scholars. Several years after its publication, to help critics perform an

---

[10] It has to noted that we are not dealing here with the later but much better-known idea of hypertextuality in its understanding within information technology; that is, as a method of creating websites on the basis of the HTTP protocol.

[11] G. Genette, *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*, [s.l.], (Paris 1982), 13.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

adequate hypertextual analysis of his novel, Joyce was forced to provide one of his friends with an interpretative key, demonstrating the associations between his work and the Homeric hypotext.[14] One may, of course, read Joyce's modernist masterpiece without any references to Homer's epic poem, but such a reading of the *Ulysses* would prove much less complete than that intended by the Irish author.

However, does it mean that, faced with the lack of direct borrowings in the form of quotations, easily recognisable allusions, etc., we are merely left with subjective conjectures put forth by contemporary exegetes as to the potential hypertextual, highly creative literary processing between biblical texts? Leaving aside the general issues pertaining to ancient and modern literature, we may conclude that in biblical texts hypertextuality generally features the particular quality of sequentiality. It consists in a highly creative reworking not only of selected motifs, elements of the narrative, prophetic oracles, etc., drawn from various passages of the hypotext, but it is the entire works that are subject to such a process, which consistently preserves their internal order of motifs, images, precepts, similes, transferences of characters, details in descriptions, etc.

In such circumstances, the weak form of purely linguistic indications of borrowings (such as clearly marked citations of sentences, characteristic phrases, etc.) is counterbalanced by the precision of sequential processing of the elements of one literary work in another. The comparison of sequences of literary elements in both works also enables one to discover hypertextual connections of such kind that they most likely would not have been discovered by exegetes if their position in the sequence had not been taken into consideration.

In the case of the Pentateuch, one can notice that the entire Book of Ezekiel was reworked ca. 500 B.C.[15] in a creative, hypertextual

---

[14] See R. Ellmann, *Ulysses on the Liffey*, (New York 1978), xvi-xvii, 186–7.

[15] Such dating is suggested not only by the general interest expressed in Deut in transferring the religious experience of the exilic period to subsequent generations, but also by the recognisable allusions to the defeat of the Egyptian pharaoh in the battle of Pelusium, near the Sea of Reeds, in 525 B.C.

manner—but one preserving the internal sequence of themes, motifs, etc. (precise dating: year, month, and day of the month; the words of Yahweh addressed by an intermediary called "someone's son" to the sons of Israel in the land of their exile; the historical sin of the entire people; the subsequent forty years of exile, etc., all the way to the final image of the ideal Israel composed of the twelve tribes)—in the Israelite Book of Deuteronomy (focused around the mountains of Gerizim and Ebal as well as the tribe of Joseph), taking the form of the "new covenant," heralded by Jeremiah and Ezekiel (in Deut: rhetorically made in the land of Moab), entailing strict monotheism drawn from Deutero-Isaiah, but also illustrated with detailed legal content, adopted during the exilic period from the milieu of Mesopotamian culture.[16]

Meanwhile, the entire Book of Deuteronomy, with its internal sequence of themes, notions, images, motifs, etc., (introduction to the good land prepared by God; not being lonely; the original sin "of the knowledge of good and evil"; the punishment of exile from the good land into the dust of the wilderness; the announcement of the innocent generation to come, etc., all the way to the final blessings for the twelve tribes of Israel; and the death of the protagonist in exile), was ca. 400 B.C.[17] reworked in a highly creative, universalising, deliberately irenical manner within the narrative and again Israelite Book of Genesis (focused on Shechem, and the tribes of Joseph and Ephraim), with the use of motifs drawn from the Mesopotamian mythology, the Book of Hosea, and other prophets, as well as Palestinian folklore.[18]

In a similar way, perhaps roughly in the same period, once more using Mesopotamian literature and legislation, and applying the

---

[16] Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Retelling the Law: Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings as Sequential Hypertextual Reworkings of Deuteronomy*, EST 3, (Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2012), 25–33.

[17] Such a dating is suggested, among other things, by the very far reaching, clearly Persian range of the "table of nations" in Gen 10; the ideology of the fall of Babylon and its famous ziggurat in Gen 11:5–9; advanced polemics between the Israelite town of Shechem (with its new sanctuary, inaugurated in the fifth century B.C. on Mount Gerizim), and the Judean Jerusalem (condemned in the Israelite Book of Genesis to complete obliteration), etc.

[18] Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Retelling*, 35–181.

procedure of sequential hypertextual reworking of ideas, motifs, etc., drawn from the Book of Deuteronomy, the collection of books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers [19] was created, which—combined with the previously composed, Israelite Books of Joshua and Judges—led to the establishment of the Israelite para-historical heptateuch (Gen–Judg), which was to be, besides the Prophetical Books, the main collection of religious and social notions of the post-exilic Israel.[20]

The Origin of Gen 4:17–5:32: Sequential Hypertextual Reworking of Deut 2:9–23

In the hypertextual structure of the Book of Genesis, resulting from a highly creative and concurrently strictly sequential reworking of the Book of Deuteronomy, the genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 are the effect of a sequential hypertextual reworking of the text in Deut 2:9–23.

The genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 appear in the Book of Genesis after the mention of Cain, who is the type of sinful but strong Israel (Deut 2:4–7), leaving and settling in the land of Nod ("homelessness": cf. Gen 4:12, etc.), east of the land of Eden, which had been chosen by God (Gen 4:16), a passage that in universal, quasi-mythological terms illustrates the earlier—purely national and thus in principle understandable exclusively for Israelites—thought of sinful Israel expelled from Edom and its temporary stay in the land of Moab, situated east of Edom, and of the God-chosen land of Israel (Deut 2:8).

The very idea of introducing a literary genealogy following the mention of the Land of Nod (Gen 4:16; cf. Deut 2:8) reflects the main theme of the text found after Deut 2:8; namely, the enumeration of the olden peoples who once lived in the territories of Moab and Edom. The intriguing, semi-mythological genealogy of the ancient Canaanites (Gen 4:17–22) thus constitutes a hypertextual reworking of the semi-mythological narrative of the ancient

---

[19] Cf. ibid., 183–223.
[20] Cf. ibid., 278, 281.

inhabitants of the lands transversed by the sinful Israelites on their way to Canaan (Deut 2.9–12).

It is Enoch that comes as the first element in the genealogy of the Canaanites (Gen 4:17). The author of the Genesis associates his name with the Moabite tribe of Midianites (Gen 25:4; cf. 36:35), and with the territory of Reuben in Transjordan, at the borderland of Moab (Gen 46:9). Besides, his name has the etymological meaning pointing to someone "dedicated" (cf. Deut 20:5), and thus remaining in a special relationship with God. For that very reason, it illustrates the idea expressed at the outset of the text of Deut 2:9–12, where the land of Moab is presented as remaining in the special relationship with God (Deut 2:9a–d).

The next enigmatic elements brought by the Canaanite genealogy include the surprising mention of building a city (עיר: Gen 4:17d), and the puzzling fact of it having been named after the son, Enoch, hence "dedicated" (Gen 4:17e), and subsequently of the birth of Enoch's son, given the "urban" name of 'Irad (עירד: Gen 4:18a), as this name is also etymologically associated with the city (עיר). All these elements illustrate in an intelligent, interrelated manner the subsequent thought from the text of Deut 2:9–12, namely, the mention of the city with a typically "urban" name of 'Ar (ער: hence the idea of building a city in Gen 4:17d) having been given to the sons of Lot, and not to Israel (hence the idea of dedication in Gen 4:17e), as the formers' legacy (hence the link between the notion of the city and the subsequent generations in Gen 4:17d–18a).

The following section of the genealogy of the Canaanites comprises the three mysterious names: Mehujael, Methusheol, and Lamech (Gen 4:18b–d). They result from a hypertextual reworking of the next element in the text of Deut 2:9–12, i.e., the mention of olden peoples inhabiting the territories of Moab (Deut 2:10–11).

The first of the three names: Mehujael ("annihilated by God"; Gen 4:18bc) illustrates the passage concerning the Emites, mentioned also at the beginning of Deut 2:10–11 (Deut 2:10a; cf. 2:11b). As opposed to the ancient inhabitants of Edom and Israel (Deut 2:12), they were not vanquished (at least the text of Deut 2:10–12 is silent on the matter) by the Moabites, who would later inhabit their land; nevertheless, the Moabites did somehow take it over (Deut 2:10–11). From the lack of mentions of the Emites

having been driven out by the Moabites, and concurrently from the indication of their land being inhabited by the Moabites, the author of the Genesis must have inferred that Emites had been vanquished by God – hence to represent them, he chose the name of Mehujael: "annihilated by God."

The second name in the group is Methusheol (מתושאל: Gen 4:18cd). The name comprises two elements: "died" (מתו: cf. Gen 7:22, etc.), and "Sheol" (שאל: cf. Job 17:16). The term Rephaim (רפאים), used in Deut 2:11a, often appears in paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations with both these words; it means the shadows of the dead (cf. for instance Isa 26:14), inhabiting Sheol (cf. for instance Isa 14:9; Prov 9:18). Thus, the name of Mehusheol echoes the mention of the Rephaites (Deut 2:11a).

The final of the three, Lamech (Gen 4:18d), refers, as indicated by the analysis of Gen 4:19–22, to the frightful (Gen 4:23–24) father of both the Edomites and the Israelites. Due to that, it illustrates the mention of the mighty and frightful Anakites (Deut 2:10b–11a), who inhabited the land of Israel, at the border with Edom (Deut 1:28; 9:2). Therefore, the sequence of the three names: Mehujael–Methusheol–Lamech (Gen 4:18b–d) mirrors the interrelated mentions of the Emites, Rephaites, and Anakites (Deut 2:10–11).

The name of Lamech, the seventh in the list (Adam–Cain–Enoch–'Irad–Mehujael–Methusheol–Lamech: Gen 4:1.17–18), clearly concludes the linear genealogy of the semi-mythological Canaanites (cf. also Gen 4:23–24), which in that respect is reminiscent of the Mesopotamian list of seven semi-mythical, pre-diluvial wise men (*apkallū*).[21]

Following this name, there is a mention of the two wives of Lamech, along with their children (Gen 4:19–22), in a passage which extends beyond the symbolic seven, and breaks the pattern of linear genealogy; it serves to illustrate the notion of Edomites and Israelites as two closely-related nations, that were able to drive out the former inhabitants of those territories (Deut 2:12).

---

[21] Cf. R.R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*, (New Haven–London 1977), 149–54; G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, WBC 1, (Waco, Tex. 1987), 110; J. Blenkinsopp, *Creation*, 87.

The name of Lamech's first wife: Adah (עדה: Gen 4:19b.20a.23a) may also be found in the genealogy of the Edomites. Adah was the first wife of the primogenitor of the Edomites: Esau (Gen 36:2). Apart from the above, in the joint mention of the Edomites and Israelites (Deut 2:12), it is the Edomites who are featured first. Accordingly, Adah is the first wife of Lamech in Gen 4:19b.20a.23a. Additionally, Esau is presented in the Genesis, in line with the thought expressed in Deut 2:4–8; 23:8ab, as the older twin of the primogenitor of Israel: Jacob (Gen 25:25–26). Therefore, also the children of Adah are introduced in Gen 4:20–21 as the older half-brothers of the children of Zillah (Gen 4:22). Also, the children of Adah (Jabal and Jubal: Gen 4:20–21) bear intentionally "twin" names, not only with one another, which already directs the reader's thought to twin-brothers, but also with their half-brother Tubal-cain (Gen 4:22), the fact evokes the idea of his "twin-like" relation to Jabal and Jubal.[22]

The references to the pastoral lifestyle of the sons of Adah, namely Jabal (יבל) and Jubal (יובל: Gen 4:20–21), reflect the Edomites' description as the inhabitants of semi-desert mountains, inferior in their civilisation to the warmongering Israelites (Deut 2:4–5). Apart from the above, they correspond to the name (הבל) and the pastoral qualification of Abel ("weakling": Gen 4:2.4)[23], the less powerful, but protected by Yahweh, brother of Cain ("blacksmith"). In the narrative of the—interdicted by Yahweh—murder of the weaker brother, a shepherd (Gen 4:1–12), Abel is the counterpart of Esau, the less powerful brother of Israel, who Israel has no right to vanquish in any way (Deut 2:4–6).

Meanwhile, both the name of Zillah's son, Tubal-cain, and the mention of his occupation, it being the sharpening of bronze tools (Gen 4:22b), clearly link him to Cain cultivating the land (Gen 4:2–3), who in Gen 4, much like in Deut 2:1–12, embodies the wicked but powerful Israel, heading to his fertile land (Deut 2:12e). Similarly, the mention of the two specific metals, bronze and iron (Gen 4:22b), instead of, say, gold and silver, corresponds to the Deuteronomic description of the land of Israel as rich in iron and

---

[22] Cf. K.A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 287.
[23] Cf. ibid., 288.

copper ores (Deut 8:9). The name of Tubal-cain's sister, Naamah
(נעמה: "pleasant, charming" – Gen 4:22c), also metaphorically refers
to the land of Israel (cf. Gen 49:15).

The final structurally surprising element in the genealogy of
Cainites is a passage situated after the subsequent (eighth)
generation, comprising the children of Lamech's both wives (Gen
4:19–22), that is, the threatening utterance of Lamech, heralding the
utter destruction of his foes (Gen 4:23–24). Again, the utterance
evokes the motif of Cain's crime (Gen 4:2–15), concluding the
whole genealogy of the Cainites (Gen 4:17–24) with a tone of
unjustified, unquenchable, and thus sinful violence.[24] At this point,
the genealogy of the Cainites "fades," for Lamech, in spite of having
been a dangerous warrior, failed to ensure the continuity of his
family (Gen 4:19–24), thus making way for the new clan of the
Adamites (Gen 4:25–26).[25] All these literary devices serve to
illustrate the fact that before the crossing of the Wadi Zered (Deut
2:13) Yahweh had removed from the Israelite camp all the sinful
"men of war" (Deut 2:14–16), who had a burning desire to vanquish
their enemies, contrarily to Yahweh's will (cf. Deut 1:41–46;
2:4–7.9).

Introduced at this juncture, this surprisingly brief three-item
genealogy of the new line of Adamites, suggesting the idea of
humanity's new beginning (Gen 4:25–26), mirrors the thought that
there emerged a new, innocent generation in the vicinity of the Wadi
Zered, to replace the former sinful "men of war" (Deut 2:13–16).
The idea is further illustrated by the fact that the genealogy in Gen
4:25–26 is introduced commencing with Adam, i.e., the "man" (Gen
4:25), in place of the sinful Cain (Gen 4:17), the image of the
Deuteronomistic "men of war."

The names of Adam (Gen 4:25a) and Enosh (Gen 4:26b), used in
this short list, quite simply mean innocent "men," and hence
no longer the wicked "men of war" – murderers of the kind of Cain,
and his unswerving imitator Lamech (Gen 4:1–24.25e; cf. Deut

---

[24] Cf. ibid., 282; B.T. Arnold, *Genesis*, NCBC, (Cambridge 2009), 81;
J. Blenkinsopp, *Creation*, 88.
[25] Cf. K.A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 279–80, 282; J. Lemański, *Księga Rodzaju,
rozdziały 1-11*, 305, 310.

2:14–16). The name of Seth (שֵׁת: Gen 4:25c.26a) metonymically points to the land of Moab, that is, Seth's property (Num 24:17ef), where in the vicinity of the Wadi Zered this new, innocent generation had emerged (Deut 2:12). Meanwhile, the final indication that it was at that point that the name of Yahweh started to be invoked (Gen 4:26c) illustrates the thought that this new generation, as opposed to the previous generation of sinners (Deut 2:14–16), came to be obedient to the will of Yahweh, as suggested by Yahweh's command, formulated in the plural, and a confirmation of it having been fulfilled by the Israelites immediately afterwards: "Proceed to cross . . . – so we crossed . . . " (Deut 2:13).

Another long genealogy of the descendants of Adam (Gen 5:1–32), also headed by Adam's new son, i.e., Seth (Gen 5:3–8), illustrates the idea of a new, innocent generation of Israelites, who once more become the subjects of Yahweh's command in the land of Moab (Deut 2:17–18). The baffling repetition, with a concurrent modification of the literary form of genealogy of the ancient generations in Gen 5:1–32 (cf. 4:17–26), mirrors the reiteration of the literary form of the command of not causing any harm, now by the new generation of Israelites, to their peacefully disposed neighbours, who inhabit the land granted to them by Yahweh in place of its ancient indwellers (Gen 2:19–23; cf. 2:9–12).

The genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 introduces numerous intriguing features. First of all, once again the descendants of Adam were described here, much like before the original sin (Gen 1:26), as having been created in the image of God (Gen 5:1). In a universal manner, intelligible for anyone, along with the image of the son as the natural image and likeness of the father (Gen 5:3), it illustrates the concept that the Israelites are the children of Yahweh, their God (Deut 1:31; 8:5; 14:1, etc.). The author of the Genesis alluded in this manner to the idea of a new generation of the Israelites, born in the land of Moab, who returned to be obedient to Yahweh (Deut 2:17–18), thus once more becoming his children (cf. Deut 8:5; 14:1, etc.).

The second interesting aspect of the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32, rendering it markedly different from the preceding ones (Gen 4:16–26), is the introduction therein of calculations of the years passed since the begetting of the firstborn son, the period of life after

his birth, as well as the complete lifespan of a given person, both provided in years. These calculations serve a significant hypertextual function, serving to reflect specific ideas drawn from the Book of Deuteronomy.

For instance, the rather puzzling passage indicating that Adam was 130 years old, when his son Seth was born (Gen 5:3), is another instance illustrating the thought of the wicked generation of "men of war" being replaced by a new, innocent generation of Israelites, begotten in the land of Moab (Deut 2:17–18). For the number of 130 years means that, when Seth was born, Cain must have already died; thus, the new, innocent generation of Seth had had no contact with the older, sinful generation of "men of war," epitomised by Cain, the murderer. Now, the number 130 was calculated using a very simple procedure. The author of the Genesis assumed that Cain could have been born at the latest, when Eve reached her maximum age of fertility, that is, when Eve and Adam alongside her were fifty years old. Meanwhile, the uppermost limit of Cain's lifespan was that of eighty years (cf. Ps 80:10). Therefore, when Adam was 130 years old, Cain must have already been dead. Adam's new son, Seth, had had no contact with the latter. However, how could Adam and Eve have a new son at the age of 130? The answer is simple: Seth was not Adam's naturally begotten son, similarly to Isaac, who was not a naturally begotten son of Abraham (Gen 18:10–14; 21:2), Jacob, who was not a naturally begotten son of Isaac (Gen 25:21), and so on. However, all of them truly were the sons of Yahweh (cf. Deut 1:31; 8:5; 14:1, etc.).

At the same time, the incredibly long lifespan of the persons enumerated in the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 presents Yahweh's Deuteronomic blessing for the Israelites who obey him, and hence also for the new generation, born in the land of Moab (Deut 2:17–18). The blessing constituted a promise of a long life and of being able to get to know one's children and at least adolescent grandchildren (Deut 4:9; 6:2), and consequently of an overlap in the lifespans of subsequent generations. This thought was imaged in Gen 5:1–32 both through the—surprising from a literary standpoint—repeated indication of God's blessing for the "newly created" descendants of Adam (Gen 5:2), as well as through the references to the extended lifespan of subsequent generations. Now,

because Adam, as demonstrated above, must have had his new son, Seth, at the age of 130, in order to be able to see the following generations of the Sethites (until Lamech – according to MT; until Noah – according to SP), he must have reached an age unthinkable from the natural point of view, several times that of even the perfect lifespan of Moses (120 years: Deut 31:2; 34:7).

On the other hand, the author of the Genesis wanted to avoid the idea that this new, innocent humanity (Gen 5:1–32; cf. Deut 2:17–18) would be punished by the deluge. Therefore, the lifespans of the respective persons were calculated in such a manner that also the final generations before Noah, namely, the righteous Enoch, Methushalah, and Lamech, could still live out their lives on land (Gen 5:26–28. 30–31), before it was flooded by the diluvial waters (Gen 7:6).[26]

The third quality of the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 is the presentation—in contrast to the genealogy of the Cainites until Lamech (the direct common ancestor of both the Edomites and the Israelites: Gen 4:17–22)—of the fertility of all generations, clearly blessed by God. Each of the patriarchs listed in the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32, besides a firstborn son, also had other sons and daughters (Gen 5:4.7.13.16.19.22.26.30).[27] This way the author of the Genesis wanted to demonstrate God's blessing for the new generation, obedient to him (Deut 2:17–18), as opposed to the "men of war," who were condemned to perish (Deut 2:14–16).

Another interesting quality of the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 is, as already underscored, the use therein of names that serve as positive images of the idea of a new generation, faithful to Yahweh, born on the other bank of the Jordan River, in the land of Moab, land that was not given to the Israelites (Deut 2:17–18). Adam (Gen 5:1.3–5) is simply a "man" (Cf. Gen 5:2). Seth (Gen 5:3.4.6–8) metonymi-cally connotes Moab (cf. Num 24:17). Enosh (Gen 5:6–7.9–11) is another "man" (cf. Deut 32:26, etc.). Cainan means "nestle-dweller" (cf. Ezek 31:6, etc.). Mahalle'el (Gen 5:12–13.15–17) means someone "praising God" (cf. Ps 150:1). Jored (Gen 5:15–

---

[26] Cf. A. Schüle, *Die Urgeschichte (Gen 1-11)*, ZBK, (Zürich 2009), 106–7; J. Lemański, *Księga Rodzaju, rozdziały 1-11*, 320.

[27] Cf. K.A. Mathews, *Genesis 1-11:26*, 308.

16.18–20) is someone "descending" like the Jordan River (cf. Josh 3:13, etc.). Enoch, walking with God, the seventh in the genealogy, who reached a relatively short, but symbolically complete number of 365 years of age (5:18–19.21–24), is the "dedicated" one (cf. Deut 20:5, etc.). Methushalah (Gen 5:21–22.25–27) means the one, who God "sent away through his death" (cf. Gen 19:29) directly before the doom of the deluge (Gen 5:26.28; 7:6).[28] Lastly, Lamech (Gen 5:25–26.28–31) reached the blessed, symbolically complete lifespan of 777 years (Gen 5:31).[29]

One more feature of the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 is its universality. Contrary to the previous, seven-item—and hence typically Semitic—genealogy of the Cainites, the new genealogy of the descendants of Adam comprises ten elements (7 + 3), which allows for it being read within a non-sacred, universally human paradigm. Furthermore, the number of years lived by Enoch, who walked with God, is 365 (Gen 5:23), another illustration of the typical Israelite notion of a friendship with God (Gen 5:22.24) conveyed through the commonly understandable idea of a full solar year. In the reinterpretation of Deut 2:17–18 performed by the author of the Book of Genesis, the new Israel, born in the land of Moab, thus constitutes the prototype of entire humanity, intuitively striving towards God.

As can be inferred from the above analysis, the succession of different but at the same time similar to one another genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 does not stem from the text of the Book of Genesis being based upon materials drawn from various sources (J, P, etc.), but from the theological thought of the author of the Genesis, who wanted to illustrate in this literarily surprising manner one of the crucial theological notions of the Book of Deuteronomy, i.e., the idea of overcoming the sinful generation of the Israelites, through the begetting of innocent children, who would not imitate the wicked

---

[28] The symbolic meaning of the name Methushalah, "sent away" through his death in the year of the deluge, indicates that the Masoretic version of the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 is closer to the origin than the Samaritan one, in which not only Methushalah, but also Jored, and Lamech die precisely in the year of the deluge, even though the two latter names are in no way related to the fact.

[29] Cf. D. Dziadosz, *Genealogie Księgi Rodzaju: Pomiędzy historią, tradycją i teologią*, Biblical Annals 1 (2011): 36.

behaviour of their parents, but instead would be granted an opportunity to submit themselves to the voice of Yahweh, expressed in his covenant and law. At this stage, sins were not yet proclaimed to one day be cleansed away by Christ, hence the only hope for the purification of the heaviest sins of Israel would be the begetting and proper upbringing of children – of a new and innocent generation. Meanwhile, the old, wicked generation had to perish entirely (Deut 2:13–16).

To make this theological picture complete, one has to bear in mind that the idea is not exclusive of the Old Testament. It will reemerge in the Pauline and post-Pauline letters, but there it will not pertain to generation change, but to the death and reawakening to life of the same person – the converted Christian. According to the Apostle of the Nations, conversion is a real death "of the old generation," whose counterpart in Pauline theology is the "old man," and the appearance in his place of the "new generation," corresponding to the "new man" (2 Cor 5:17; Rom 6:6–11; Col 3:9–10; Eph 4:22–24).

The Genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*

The genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 was subjected to reinterpretation in a Judaistic work known as the *Apocalypse of Weeks*. It represents a wider literary genre of "rewritten Scripture." The genre, constitutive for numerous biblical writings, brings together literary works whose main theme is a clearly recognisable reinterpretation of earlier biblical writings.

Until recently, the *Apocalypse of Weeks* was only known from its translation to Ethiopic, as a part of the Enochian cycle (1 En. 91:10–17; 93:1–10). However, among the Dead Sea Scrolls, a manuscript with an Aramaic rendition of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (4Q212) was found, which was paleographically dated to mid-first century B.C., and thus enabled scholars to establish the original literary structure of that work.[30]

---

[30] Cf. P. Muchowski, *Komentarze do rękopisów znad Morza Martwego*, 2nd ed., Judaica i Hebraica 1, (Poznań 2005), 270.

The *Apocalypse of Weeks* presents the history of Israel and humanity described with the use of a literary framework of "weeks," symbolically corresponding to the respective eras of the biblical and post-biblical history.[31]

The history until the author's present day was divided into seven eras, hence the seven "weeks." Such a heptadic concept of periodisation of history, based on the notion of the sacral jubilee $(7 \times 7 = 49)$ marks an expression of deliberate opposition to the instances of periodisation of time in the neighbouring cultures: the four "eras" in the history of humanity, the epochs counted after the dominant ruling dynasties (e.g., the Seleucides), etc. In contrast to these, the *Apocalypse of Weeks* presents time, and the main events within it, as entirely in the control of God, and counted from the moment of the world having been created by an act of God.

In the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, the subsequent epochs, that is, the "weeks" in the history of Israel and humanity, are marked by biblical texts, including the genealogy of the descendants of Adam (Gen 5:1–32).

The first "week" in the history of mankind, according to the genealogical data provided in Gen 5:1–24, ends with Enoch (4Q212 col. 3:23–24; 1 En. 93:3).

The second "week" is the time of the deluge and of Noah (4Q212 col. 3:24–25; 1 En. 93:4). Admittedly, in the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 Noah is listed as the tenth, and not fourteenth patriarch, but the author of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* decided that he is a figure of such importance that it is he who has to constitute the key element of the second "week."

The third "week" ends with Abraham, accompanied by either his father or his son (1 En. 93:5).

The fourth "week" ends with the introduction of the law, implicitly – performed by Moses (1 En. 93:6).

The fifth "week" has its climax in the erection of the temple and the establishment of the kingdom, implicitly – during the times of David and Solomon (1 En. 93:7).

---

[31] Cf. B. Adamczewski, *"Ten jubilees of years": Heptadic Calculations of the End of the Epoch of Iniquity and the Evolving Ideology of the Hasmoneans*, Qumran Chronicle 16 (2008): 20.

The sixth "week" is the time of the sins committed by the Israelites, the assumption of Elijah, lastly the burning of the temple, and the dispersion of the Israelites (1 En. 93:8).

The seventh "week" again marks the time of sin but ultimately also of the emergence of the chosen few just men, enlighten by God, who would combat the sin of the Israelites (4Q212 col. 4:11–14; 1 En. 93:9; 91:10–11).[32]

The following weeks—the eighth, ninth, and tenth—are the time of the judgement of Israel, and of pagans, and of the entire universe (4Q212 col. 4:15–25; 1 En. 91:12–16), and hence, from our point of view, they constitute the messianic age. These will be followed by infinite "weeks" of goodness and justice (4Q212 col. 4:25–26; 1 En. 91:17).

The data drawn from the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 was thus weaved in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* into a holistic, heptadic scheme of the history of Israel and humanity, spanning from the creation of the world to the messianic age, and the everlasting rule of goodness and justice.

Luke's Reworking of the Genealogy in Gen 5:1–32 and of the Scheme from the *Apocalypse of Weeks* in the Genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3:23–38)

The Lucan genealogy of Jesus is the result of his reworking of the genealogy in Gen 5:1–32, and other biblical genealogies, with the use of the heptadic chronological scheme drawn from the *Apocalypse of Weeks.*

As opposed to typical genealogies in the Bible, the Lucan genealogy is of an ascending nature (from Jesus to Adam, son of God: Luke 3:23.38), for his task is to reveal, after the public revelation of Jesus' divine sonship at the Jordan (Luke 3:22), Jesus' divine sonship of the seed of David according to the flesh (cf. Rom 1:3), in contrast to the divine sonship according to the Spirit of

---

[32] Cf. ibid., 20–2.

holiness (cf. Rom 1:4), revealed in the following account of the temptation (Luke 4:1–13).[33]

The genealogy in Luke comprises seventy-seven generations, which may quickly bring to the reader's mind the thought that it should be interpreted according to some heptadic scheme. This scheme is indeed quite easy to decipher if we take into considerations the positions attributed in this lineage to its key figures.[34]

When one traces the Lucan genealogy in a reversed, descending order (from Adam to Jesus), then—according to the data of Gen 5:1–32—Enoch can be found as seventh in order (Luke 3:37), whereas Noah as tenth (Luke 3:36). Meanwhile, Abraham is in the twenty-first position (Luke 3:34)[35], and hence, in line with the scheme drawn from the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, he concludes the third "week" in the history of mankind (cf. 1 En. 93:5). The twenty-eighth position, unlike in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, is not attributed to Moses – that is because he hailed from the tribe of Levi, and not from the tribe of Judah, and besides, in the Lucan, post-Pauline theology the giving of the law at Mount Sinai no longer played as significant a role as in Judaism.

Luke places David as thirty-fifth in his genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3:31), also according to the scheme drawn from the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (cf. 1 En. 93:7). However, for David's ordinal number to be "divisible by seven," Luke was forced to artificially add a generation in the section of the genealogy from Abraham to David. The Evangelist achieved that by introducing in place of a single biblical figure of Aram/Arran (1 Chr 2:9–10; Ruth 4:19 LXX) an otherwise unknown pair, Arni and Admin (Luke 3:33), preserving the alliterative pattern of names commencing with A, which he adopted from Ruth 4:19 LXX.

---

[33] Cf. idem, *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels*, (Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 281–4.

[34] Cf. I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1978), 160; R.H. Stein, *Luke*, NAC 24, (Nashville, Tenn. 1992), 140.

[35] We do not consider here the complex issues related to the textual variants of the Lucan genealogy, for these exceed the possibility of being discussed within this paper.

Another important character placed on a numerically "septenary" position is Shealtiel, at fifty-six (Luke 3:27), that is, the figure marking the end of the Babylonian captivity (cf. Ezra 3:2.8, etc.). Adapting the scheme of the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, which comprised seven "weeks," and thus presumably forty-nine "generations," to his envisaged framework of seventy-seven generations[36], Luke extended the sixth "week" so that it would last three "weeks," spanning twenty-one generations in total, from David (thirty-fifth on the list) to Shealtiel (fifty-sixth on the list). This device enabled Luke to achieve the total of seventy-seven (instead of forty-nine) generations from the creation of the world to the messianic age, concurrently allowing him to preserve an equal ratio of the two final eras: from David to the Babylonian exile (the sixth "week" in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, twenty-one generations in Luke), and from the return from the Babylonian exile to the messianic age (the seventh "week" in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, another twenty-one generations in Luke).

The sections of the lineage: from David to the Babylonian exile, and from the Babylonian exile to Jesus (Luke 3:23–31), Luke filled with such names as to render the genealogy salvation-historical, and at the same time markedly universalistic in nature.

In the Lucan genealogy, David's son is not Solomon, for he epitomises the sin and the division of Israel of the monarchic period, which goes against Luke's post-Pauline theology of renewal of the entire Israel in Christ (cf. Rom 11:26; Luke 1:54; 2:25–38; 22:30, etc.). It is for that reason that Luke delineated the list of descendants of David with one of his "lesser" sons: Nathan (Luke 3:31; cf. 2 Sam 5:14), whose name is additionally associated with a positive, messianic oracle for the offspring of David (2 Sam 7:2–17).

Similarly, the Lucan genealogy does not include any of the pre-exilic kings of Judah, for the biblical tradition tends to evaluate their rule negatively, with their reign being furthermore marked by the stigma of the division of Israel. Therefore, in their place Luke introduced many names, at least some of which possess a symbolic meaning.

---

[36] The Lucan scheme comprising seventy-seven generations illustrates the Pauline idea of the "fullness of time" (Gal 4:4) more clearly than the Judaistic concept of forty-nine generations, 490 years, etc.

The triad of names: Melea, Menna, Mattatha (Luke 3:31) is clearly composed according to the alliterative scheme (cf. Luke 3:33) – on that occasion starting with the letter M.

Four names: Levi, Simeon, Judah, Joseph (Luke 3:29–30) are, of course, the names of Jacob's sons; however, they are featured here not as brothers, but as descendants (sons and fathers). It is significant that the juxtaposition of these very names entails, according to the post-Pauline theology of Luke, the entire Israel (cf. Rom 11:26; Luke 2:25–38; 22:30, etc.): the priesthood (Levi), and the kingdom (Judah), the periphery (Simeon), and the centre (Judah, Joseph), the South (Simeon, Judah), and the North (Joseph).

The name Melchi (Luke 3:28), through an allusion to the Hebrew word *melek* ("king"), symbolically evokes all the pre-exilic kings of Judah and Israel without mentioning their names, which, as indicated above, tend to have negative connotations in the biblical tradition.

The pair of names: Josech and Joda (Luke 3:26), as variants of the names Joseph and Judah, once again allude to the entirety of Israel – this time of the post-exilic era. The shared initial section of these modified names of both main post-exilic tribes (Jo-) suggests the closeness between the post-exilic communities from the North and from the South, as advocated by Luke. The name Semein (Luke 3:26), placed in this context, may be a deformed version of the name of another son of Jacob, Simeon (cf. these three names together in Luke 3:30).

The names Amos and Nahum (Luke 3:25) are the names of two prophets, obviously. From the point of view of Lucan theology, it is important that, at least Amos hailed from the Northern Kingdom. Once more, the Lucan genealogy endorses the idea of Israel as a whole—comprising both the northern and the southern territories—restored in Christ.

The names: Matthat, Levi, Melchi, Jannai (Luke 3:24), situated in the lineage in the vicinity of the name of Jesus (Luke 3:23), constitute an allusion to the Hasmonean dynasty, ruling in the second and first centuries B.C. The name Matthat may be a reference either to Mattathias, the father of Judah Maccabeus, and thus indirectly the founder of the Hasmonean dynasty (1 Macc 2:1–5), or to Antigonus II, bearing the Hebrew name Mattathias, who ruled

in Judea in the period of 40–37 B.C. The names Levi and Melchi illustrate the priestly-royal character of the Hasmonean dynasty in the times of Aristobulus II or Alexander Janneus. The name Jannai, is an obvious allusion to the mightiest representative of the Hasmonean dynasty: Alexander Janneus (cf. *A.J.* 13.320).

The name Eli, used as the name of Jesus' grandfather (Luke 3:23), may be an allusion to the priest Eli (1 Sam 1:3), the predecessor of Samuel, and thus in a sense the "grandfather" of the first king of the whole Israel: Saul.

The name second to last: Joseph (Luke 3:23) again points to Jesus' connection not only to Judea, but also to the northern tribes of Israel.

The Lucan genealogy of Jesus (Luke 3:23–38) is, therefore, the effect of an adjustment of the genealogy from Gen 5:1–32 and other biblical genealogies to the heptadic scheme of weeks, drawn from the *Apocalypse of Weeks*. The pattern from the *Apocalypse of Weeks* was also used in the next pericope; namely, in the description of the temptation of Jesus (Luke 4:1–13), in which the theme of three temptations corresponds to the final three "weeks" in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, pertaining to the history of the people of Israel: the period of the wandering through the wilderness with Moses (Luke 4:3), the period of the Davidic kingdom (Luke 4:5), and the period of the restored temple in Jerusalem (Luke 4:9).

The genealogy in Luke 3:23–38, by means of a specific selection of names used therein, conveys the Pauline-Lucan vision of Christ as the Saviour of the entire humanity, combined with an also Lucan, post-Pauline idea of the restoration of the entire Israel in Christ. A thorough analysis of the genealogy composed by Luke has demonstrated that this apparently typically "Greek" Evangelist was perfectly versed in the Judaistic theology, also in its form presented in the writings from the Dead Sea, which had not been included in the biblical canon of the Old Testament. It attests to Luke's contacts with the early, pre-rabbinic Judaism.

Matthew's Reworking of the Lucan Genealogy of Jesus in Matt 1:1–17

The Matthean genealogy of Jesus (Matt 1:1–11) constitutes a reworked, deliberately "biblicised" version of the Lucan genealogy (Luke 3:23–38).

The heading: book of genealogy (βίβλος γενέσεως: Matt 1:1) was drawn from the heading of the genealogy of the descendants of Adam (Gen 5:1; cf. 2:4 LXX).[37]

The general form of the lineage, that is, a descending genealogy (from Abraham to Jesus) had also been adopted from biblical templates, especially Gen 4:17–5:32; 1 Chr 1:34; 2:1–15. The formula used by Matthew and repeated numerous times throughout: "and X begot Y" (X δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Y: Matt 1:2–16), also has its origin in Gen 4:18; 5:3.6.22; 10:8.15.24.26, etc. LXX. Meanwhile, the ascending formula—surprising against the backdrop of a consequently descending genealogy—used in the heading: "the son of David, the son of Abraham" (Matt 1:1) is a trace of Matthew's application of the ascending genealogy composed by Luke (Luke 3:23–28).

The first part of the Matthean genealogy, spanning the generations from Abraham to David (Matt 1:2–6; cf. 1:17a), is a result of a reworking of an appropriate section in the Lucan genealogy (Luke 3:31–34), adapted by Matthew to biblical data (especially 1 Chr 1:34; 2:1–15 LXX). Importantly, the evangelist, to align it with 1 Chr 2:9–10 LXX (cf. Ruth 4:19 LXX), removed the two artificial names introduced by Luke: Admin and Arni (Luke 3:33), and replaced them with the single name Aram (Matt 1:3–4). Thus adjusting his genealogy to the biblical data, however, Matthew compromised the rather "far-fetched" Lucan calculation of fourteen generations from Abraham to David, a development he attempted to conceal with his concluding declaration that there are fourteen generations from Abraham to David (Matt 1:17a).

---

[37] Cf. R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT, (Grand Rapids, Mich. 2007), 26, f.n. 1; M. Crimella, *Βίβλος γενέσεως: la cornice letteraria di Matteo e di Gen 1-11*, Ricerche Storico Bibliche 24, fasc. 1–2 (2012): 257, 262–3, 265–8, 277–8.

In a similar vein, Matthew corrected the name of Sala (Σαλά: Luke 3:32), introduced by Luke, with the biblical name of Salmon (Σαλμών: Matt 1:4–5), drawn from 1 Chr 2:11 LXX.

In the process, however, Matthew did leave a trace of his reworking of the Lucan text in the form of the Lucan, instead of taken directly from the Septuagint, forms of the names Esrom (Ἑσρώμ: Matt 1:3; cf. Luke 3:33; diff. 1 Chr 2:5.9; Ruth 4:18–19 LXX) and Jobed (Ἰωβήδ: Matt 1:5; cf. Luke 3:32; diff. 1 Chr 2:12; Ruth 4:21–22 LXX).

The second part of the Matthean genealogy, comprising the generations from David to the Babylonian exile (Matt 1:6–11; cf. 1:17b), was also "biblicised" through the introduction in place of a series of Lucan names without counterparts in biblical genealogies, of the names of the kings of Judea, drawn from 1 Chr 3:5–16 LXX. In order to reach the number of fourteen generations between David and the Babylonian exile, Matthew left out of in his genealogy the names of Joash, Amaziah, and Azariah (1 Chr 3:11–12 LXX).[38]

Apart from the above, Matthew used in his genealogy the Lucan version of the name Solomon (Σολομών: Matt 1:6–7; cf. Luke 11:31; 12:27; diff. 1 Chr 3:5, etc., LXX). Most likely also influenced by the prophetic name Amos, used in the Lucan genealogy (Luke 3:25) for salvation-historical reasons together with the name Nahum, Matthew changed the biblical name of the king Amon (1 Chr 3:14 LXX) to Amos (Matt 1:10).[39] Additionally, at the end of this section of the genealogy, Matthew simplified the data from 1 Chr 3:15–16 LXX, leaving out the name Jehoiakim and rendering his bothers (1 Chr 3:15 LXX) as the brothers of his son, Jechoniah (Matt 1:11).[40]

Thus adjusting the Lucan genealogy to biblical data, Matthew managed to thwart Luke's idea of the integrity of the entirety of

---

[38] Cf. W.D. Davies, D.C. Allison, Jr., *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 1, *Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*, ICC, (Edinburgh 1988), 176.

[39] Cf. U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7)*, 2 ed., EKK 1/1, (Düsseldorf–Zürich–Neukirchen–Vluyn 2002), 128, f.n. 14; A. Paciorek, *Ewangelia według świętego Mateusza, rozdziały 1-13. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz*, NKB NT 1/1, (Częstochowa 2005), 84.

[40] Cf. R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 27, f.n. 6, 30, 38.

Israel, liberated from divisions caused by sinful kings (Luke 3:29–30), introducing instead the standard genealogical data pertaining to the pre-exilic kings of Judah, according to the lineage that included Solomon and his descendants.

The third part of the Matthean genealogy, presenting the generations from the Babylonian captivity to Christ (Matt 1:12–16; cf. 1:17c), is at the outset, from Jechoniah to Zerubbabel (Matt 1:12–13), based on the data drawn from 1 Chr 3:17.19 LXX. The following seven names were either in their entirety, or majority (Abiud, Eliakim, Azor, Zadok, Achim, and Eleazar)[41] derived from other books of the Bible.[42]

The name Matthan (Ματθάν) as that of Jesus's great grandfather (Matt 1:15) is Matthew's version of the Lucan name Matthat (Μαθθάτ: Luke 3:24).

Meanwhile, the fact that Matthew replaced the name Eli, as referring to the grandfather of Jesus (Luke 3:23), with the name Jacob (Matt 1:15–16) reflects Matthew's programme of "biblicising" the entire genealogy of Jesus. For the sentence "Jacob beget Joseph" (Matt 1:16) has its biblical connotations, evoking the paradigm of the generations of patriarchs: Jacob and his son Joseph (Gen 30:24–25).[43]

The second to last name, Joseph, as the name of the putative father of Jesus (Matt 1:16), was adopted from Luke 3:23. At the same time, it was Matthew who explained in more detail Luke's general claim that Jesus had only been thought to have been the son of Joseph (Luke 3:23).

In the conclusion of his genealogy, Matthew declared that it comprises three parts, each composed of fourteen generations (Matt 1:17). However, his claim is untrue, for the first and the third

---

[41] Matthean name Eliud (Ἐλιούδ: Matt 1:14–15) may be a variant of the Biblical name Elihu (Ελιου: 1 Chr 26:7 / Ελιους: Job 32:2, etc., LXX).

[42] The initial (Abiud = Abihu), central (Zadok), and final (Eleazar) of the seven names are clearly priestly names. This fact is most likely a reflection of Matthew's understanding of the post-exilic period as the time of Judea having been ruled by high priests.

[43] Cf. P.N. Tarazi, *Matthew and the Canon*, The New Testament: An Introduction 4, (St Paul, Minn. 2009), 112.

part of the linage only count thirteen generations, as a result of the adjustment of the Lucan genealogy to biblical data.

The Matthean scheme of three times fourteen generations (Matt 1:17) is indeed a trace of his use of Luke's heptadic scheme, drawn from the Judaistic *Apocalypse of Weeks*. However, insofar as in Luke the scheme of seventy-seven generations, divided into periods corresponding to "weeks" of the Judaistic work (21 to Abraham + 14 to David + 21 to the captivity + 21 to Christ), clearly reflected the "septenary" scheme of Judaism, the Matthean scheme of three times fourteen proves far removed from the initial heptadic scheme of periodisation of time.

These Matthean "fourteens" (Matt 1:17) are not justified by biblical data, for according to 1 Chr 1:34; 2:1–15 LXX (and in consequence also Matt 1:2–6) there were thirteen generations from Abraham to David, whereas according to 1 Chr 3:5–16 LXX there were eighteen generations from David to Jechoniah. Neither are these "fourteens" motivated by the heptadic calculations, common for the Judaism of the Second Temple period, for due to the importance of the biblical Jubilee ($7 \times 7 = 49$ years), Judaistic calculations were founded on dividing periods of time in sevens and not fourteens.[44] It is apparent that Matthean "fourteens" mirror the Lucan artificial calculation of fourteen generations from Abraham to David, which, in turn, resulted from Luke's omission of the Levitical figure (and the "week") of Moses, as one certainly belonging to the Davidic, and hence royal lineage of Jesus.[45]

Another piece of evidence pointing to Matthew's reworking of the Lucan genealogy is the use of the name Matthan (Ματθάν: Matt 1:15) as a reference to Jesus' great grandfather, clearly corresponding to the Lucan name Matthat (Μαθθάτ: Luke 3:24). However, insofar as in the Lucan genealogy the name served an

---

[44] Cf. B. Adamczewski, *"Ten jubilees of years,"* 19–36.

[45] Suggested by many biblical scholars, the hypothesis that the number fourteen has a gematric justification, as it refers to the numeric value of the Hebrew name David, is in fact inadequate for the data of the Matthean genealogy, for he places the emphasis of being Jesus' primogenitor rather on Abraham than David (Matt 1:1.17). In the Matthean genealogy, David is merely an intermediate link between Abraham and Jesus. Cf. J. Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NIGTC, (Grand Rapids, Mich. 2005), 72.

important function of alluding, alongside names such as Levi, Melchi, and Jannai (Luke 3:24), to the reign several generations before Jesus of the priestly-royal Hasmonean dynasty, represented i.a. by Alexander Janneus, in the Matthean genealogy this name was taken out of context and did not play any significant role. Thus, it is a trace of a specifically Lucan idea, lost due to the Matthean reworking.

A major proof of Matthew's reworking of the Lucan genealogy is also his use of the name Jacob instead of Eli (Luke 3:23), as referring to Jesus' grandfather (Matt 1:15–16). As indicated above, the Matthean name Jacob is the effect of deliberate "biblicising" of the Lucan genealogy aimed at the effect of imitating biblical genealogies of patriarchs: "Jacob begot Joseph" (Matt 1:16). Conversely, Luke would not have had a valid reason to change the Matthean formula, had it been the original one.

These and other arguments provided above demonstrate that the Matthean genealogy of Jesus (Matt 1:1–17) resulted from a not entirely consistent process of "biblicising" the earlier Lucan lineage.[46]

This assertion carries a lot of weight for the interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels, and for the history of the text of the New Testament. So it is, because if, as demonstrated above on the example of the genealogies of Jesus in the Gospels, Matthew did use in his literary work the Gospel of Luke, it completely undermines the key argument for applying the theory of the "Q source" in the exegesis of the Synoptic Gospel. This theory posits an existence of a hypothetical, lost "Q source," as the source of the material shared in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke but missing in the Gospel of Mark, which they both used.

The main assumption in this theory, almost commonly accepted among biblical scholars, is the mutual independence of the Gospels

---

[46] Contrary to the suggestion of G. Häfner, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium und seine Quellen*, in D. Senior, ed., *The Gospel of Matthew at the Crossroads of Early Christianity*, BETL 243, (Leuven–Paris–Walpole, Mass. 2011), 44–5, a bare acknowledgment of the differences between the Matthean and Lucan genealogies turns out to be insufficient for proving that Matthew did not use Luke's work. In fact, we are able to elucidate the cause of these differences. Furthermore, the cause is in line with Matthew's general theology.

of Matthew and Luke.[47] Only in such circumstances there is a need of a hypothetical "Q source" – as an explanation of the material used both by Matthew and Luke in their Gospels, that they concurrently had not drawn from the Gospel of Mark. If, however, as demonstrated above, Matthew did use the Gospel of Luke, the problem disappears altogether, for this shared – non-Marcan material found in Matthew and Luke would have quite simply come from Luke. The hypothetical "Q source" is no longer required.

Conclusion

A careful analysis of the genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 has shown that they are the effect of a highly creative (hypertextual) and at the same time sequential reworking of an older text of Deut 2:9–23. Consequently, the theories positing the genealogies in Gen 4:17–5:32 as having originated from various hypothetical sources of the Pentateuch (J, P, etc.), are no longer required to clarify their origin and function.

A similarly detailed analysis of the genealogies presented in Luke 3:23–38 and Matt 1:1–17 has demonstrated that the Matthean genealogy is the effect of a deliberate reworking of the earlier genealogy composed by Luke. That, in turn, also means that the theory of the "Q source," intended to serve as an explanation of the origin of the Matthean–Lucan materials that had not come from the Gospel of Mark, is exegetically superfluous.

Now, if there are no exegetical grounds for using the theory of the sources J, P, etc. in the Pentateuch, and the theory of the "Q source" in the Synoptic Gospels, one must conclude that modern biblical scholarship has to be built anew.

---

[47] In its original form, this assumption results from an *a priori* rejection of the suggestion put forth by St. Augustine, that the later evangelists used the Gospels already written in linear order.