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This dissertation is an examination of the MT and LXX versions of Nehemiah 11-12. Nehemiah 11-12 includes material that focuses on the people who settled in Jerusalem, a catalog of settlements around the region of Judah, and lists of temple personnel in Jerusalem. These chapters in Nehemiah also contain a narrative of the dedication of the walls as well as a description of the people connected to the dedication ceremony in Jerusalem. Scholars have noted that the lists in Nehemiah 11-12 are particularly problematic when compared to other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah, such as Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, and Nehemiah 3, since much of the material is unique to these two chapters. Thus, several scholars have attempted to reconcile the textual discrepancies between Nehemiah 11-12 and other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah.

Little is said, however, concerning the textual divergences that are present within Nehemiah 11-12. The material is preserved in the Hebrew Masoretic Text (MT) of Nehemiah and the Greek Septuagint (LXX) of 2 Esdras, of which the MT preserves the longer version. These textual divergences are significant since Nehemiah 11-12 contain names and positions of temple personnel, areas of settlement, and a narrative of the events surrounding the rededication of the walls, which are commonly used in modern scholarly discussions of Jerusalem during the Persian period. In fact, any discussion of the cultic institutions in Jerusalem, during this important period in Judean history, must consider the lists in Nehemiah 11-12.

In this study, I examine the lists in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12 for the purpose of ascertaining the base lists, or what reflects the earliest traditions of these different
types of lists and genealogies. This investigation has two main components: A detailed study of the texts and a detailed study of the archaeological sites. As a result of this analysis, I argue that the various lists within Nehemiah 11-12, as fully developed in the MT, reflect a Maccabean reality retrojected into Persian Period Judah. The LXX retains aspects of late-Persian and Hellenistic period lists since key genealogies continue for several generations. But ultimately, the LXX preserves the earlier material. This research is significant for any scholars studying lists in Ezra and Nehemiah. It is also significant for any scholarly examination attempting to reconstruct the composition of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDan&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>4QJer&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
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<td>Second series of Jeremiah scrolls found in Qumran Cave 4</td>
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1. Background

In recent decades, the Achaemenid period (538-332 B.C.E.) has become a key area of research in biblical studies. This is particularly evident in the growth of studies dealing with two main texts set within the context of this period: Ezra and Nehemiah. These two books are generally thought to represent the richest biblical texts concerning the Achaemenid period of postexilic Judah. Ezra and Nehemiah owe their status in modern scholarship to their subject matter. Both discuss the leaders of the returnees from the Babylonian exile to Jerusalem and the surrounding towns, as well as the rebuilding of specific cultic and civic institutions in Jerusalem.

Some of the richest information concerning the people and their places of settlement within Ezra and Nehemiah are found in several lengthy lists and genealogies are outlined in Table 1-1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-1: Lists and Genealogies in Ezra and Nehemiah:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezra 2// Nehemiah 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra 7:1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra 8:1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra 10:18-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh 3:1-32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Several scholars, including Pakkala (2004: 1) and Kessler (2006: 91), have observed this trend in scholarship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neh 10:2-28</th>
<th>Covenant signers during the time of Nehemiah.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neh 11:4-24</td>
<td>List of the settlers of Jerusalem by the Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, Levites, gatekeepers, Netînim, sons of Solomon’s servants, and advisor to the king. Also, these lists contain genealogies of certain settlers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh 11:25-36</td>
<td>Catalog of the Judahite, Benjaminite, and Levite towns of resettlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh 12:1-9</td>
<td>Priests and Levites who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh 12:10-11</td>
<td>Jaddua’s genealogy, beginning with Jeshua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh 12:12-21</td>
<td>Priests and their patronymics in the time of Joiakim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh 12:22</td>
<td>Jaddua’s genealogy, beginning with Eliashib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh 12:23-26</td>
<td>Levites and gatekeepers during the time of Joiakim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an attempt to determine the size and scope of the postexilic community in and around Jerusalem, scholars have focused on the lists of settlers and/or places of settlements, most commonly the lists in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, and Nehemiah 3, as well as the lists of Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, Levites and other temple personnel. Lists are found throughout the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, but the largest section may be found in Nehemiah 11-12. Nehemiah 11-12 includes material that focuses on the people who settled in Jerusalem, a catalog of settlements around the region of Judah, and lists of temple personnel in Jerusalem. These chapters also contain a narrative of the dedication of the walls as well as a description of the people connected to the dedication ceremony in Jerusalem.

Scholars have noted that the lists in Nehemiah 11-12 are particularly problematic when compared to other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah since much of the material is unique.

---

to these two chapters. Thus, several scholars have attempted to reconcile the textual discrepancies between Nehemiah 11-12 and other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah. Little is said, however, concerning the textual divergences that are present within Nehemiah 11-12. The material is preserved in the Hebrew Masoretic Text (MT) of Nehemiah and the Greek Septuagint (LXX) of 2 Esdras, of which the MT preserves the longer version.

The differences in the length of material are all the more striking in the case of Nehemiah because the MT and LXX largely correspond in form and content in chapters 1-10.

These textual divergences are significant since Nehemiah 11-12 contain names and positions of temple personnel, areas of settlement, and a narrative of the events surrounding the rededication of the walls, which are commonly used in modern scholarly discussions of Jerusalem during the Persian period. In fact, any discussion of the cultic

---

3 These differences in the MT and LXX have been observed by Alt (1953: 289-305); Myers (1965); Tov (1997: 257; 2003: 127); Williamson (1985: 344); Blenkinsopp (1988: 330); Knoppers (2000: 141-168); and Klein (2006).

4 The Masoretic Text (MT) is the Hebrew version of the Tanakh. The Septuagint (LXX) is an early translation of the Tanakh, as well as other texts, into Koine Greek between the third and first c. B.C.E. This process probably took place in Alexandria and was necessary for the growing Jewish Diasporic communities whose chief language was Greek. This is one of the classic achievements in antiquity because it made the biblical material accessible to Greek reading groups around the Mediterranean world.

5 This is with the exception of MT Neh 3:33-4:17 when compared to 2 Esdras 14:15:23. The events relayed in the MT and LXX are connected to the wall building activities and Sanballat’s attempts to halt construction. For a discussion of the differences between MT and LXX, especially the events in MT and LXX Neh 4:7-24, see Wooden (2008: 248-257). He argues that in Nehemiah 4 there are intentional changes on the part of the LXX translator, who departed from the thematic considerations, followed in chapters 1-3. Earlier, Howorth (1902: 151) observed this concerning 2 Esdras: “As it occurs in the Greek Bibles it is a very low and servile translation of the Hebrew, or Masoretic, text. It follows it in eccentricities of diction and otherwise.” Wooden’s comment, in response to this assessment that, “2 Esdras has not fared well in scholarly assessments” (2006: 121), is a fitting rejoinder to Howorth’s statement.
institutions in Jerusalem, during this important period in Judean history, must consider the lists in Nehemiah 11-12.

Outlining the discrepancies between MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12 necessitates outlining the history of scholarship concerning these two chapters. In this introduction, I summarize previous scholarship that has focused on a number of different subjects, including Nehemiah 11-12 and their placement within the larger work of Nehemiah, as well as how the construction of Nehemiah may have affected the composition of Ezra. Next I evaluate text critical differences found throughout the Hebrew Bible, offering comparisons and contrasts to the study of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12 with other biblical examples. Third, I provide an outline of my project, offering a guideline to the dissertation. Finally, I summarize the differences between the Cambridge and Göttingen editions of 2 Esdras.

2. The History of Scholarship of Nehemiah 11-12

Previous studies have conceptualized Nehemiah 11-12 in a variety of ways, revealing how difficult these two chapters are to situate within the broader compositional framework of Nehemiah. One area of study tends to highlight the place of MT Nehemiah 11-12 within the broader context of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The composition of Ezra and Nehemiah has been examined and reexamined in order to understand the

---

sources that were used to construct these texts. Contemporary studies seek to understand the multiple compositional layers and stages of editing that went into the final form of Ezra and Nehemiah. Most scholars argue that fundamental to the composition of Ezra and Nehemiah are the first person narratives, referred to as the Ezra Memoir (EM) and the Nehemiah Memoir (NM), as well as the sources that were used to compose Ezra 1-6.

The EM includes the activities of Ezra, written in a first and third person account. Many scholars argue that Ezra was responsible for the first person narratives (7:27-9:15), while a later editor put together the third person material on the person of Ezra (7:1-26; Neh 8; 9:1-5). Pakkala (2004), in his detailed study of Ezra, argues that the EM (Ezra 7-10, Nehemiah 8) and also the account of the rebuilding of the Temple (Ezra 5:1-6:15) developed independently, and that a later editor concerned with the rebuilding of the

---

7 Origen, in the third century C.E., first attests that the texts were originally one and then separated. This separation is also found in Jerome’s Sacra. The Hebrew texts were not separated, however, until the 15th century. See Eusebius Hist Eccl 6.25.2 for a reference to this attestation. Recently, Boda and Redditt’s (2008) edited volume is dedicated to the question of unity between the books of Ezra and Nehemiah as well as to the compositional process behind these two books.


9 Williamson (1983:1-30; 1985: xxiii-xxiv) argues there are several different sources within these chapters: the decree of Cyrus (1:9-11), the list of the Temple vessels (2:1-3:1), the catalog of the people who returned from exile (4:6 and 7), Aramaic letters from Rehum and Artaxerxes (4:8-16), Artaxerxes’ response (4:17-22), a letter to Darius from Tatteni (5:6-17), and Darius’s response (6:3-12), which also included an Aramaic copy of Cyrus’s decree. See also Clines (1984: 43-47); Blenkinsopp (1988: 43-47); and Halpern (1990) for a further discussion of the composition of Ezra 1-6.

10 Several scholars argue for the historical reliability of the EM material, particularly Albright (1940: 248); Yamauchi (1990: 256-58); Klein (1992: 733); Hoglund (1992: 207-42); Frei (2001: 11-12); Cross (1998: 188-92); and VanderKam (2001: 3-4). See Pakkala (2004:4-6) for a discussion of the differing opinions on the historical reliability of this material, particularly scholarly reactions to Torrey’s interpretation (1896: 57-60), that the EM was mostly invented by the Chronist.
Temple, combined them in the postexilic period. A later editor added Ezra 1-4, and priestly groups concerned with the position of the Temple later reworked these chapters. Through this editorial process, Pakkala argues that Ezra’s position as a priest was stressed over his role as a scribe, and the position of the Babylonian returnees was stressed over the people who remained in Judah during the exile. And finally, Levitical editors combine Ezra and Nehemiah into the final form of the book, where they stressed the importance of the Torah as well as the position of the Levites (2004: 4-6). Pakkala also concludes in a later study (2008: 200-215) that the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah was a complex process, which, at its heart, has three independent sources, but through a series of editions, these sources were placed together into one larger text.

Scholars commonly assert that the NM is an older source preceding the book of Nehemiah, probably written by Nehemiah himself. The sections that are most often credited to the NM are 1:1-2:20; 4:1-7:5a; 12:31-32, 37-41; and 13:4-31. The original texts of the NM are debated, however, as seen in the work of scholars, such as Kratz (2005: 68-74), who argue that much of Nehemiah 1, 4-7, and 11-13 should not be

---

13 Certain scholars, such as Williamson (1985: xxiv-xxviii) also place Neh 5:14-19 into a secondary edition of the NM. Also, Neh 7:5b-72a—a list of returnees from the Exile—is placed within the NM by scholars such as Clines (1984) and Williamson (1985). Kellerman (1967: 23-26) argues that the list in Nehemiah 7 is not a part of the NM, but rather is from the hand of a later redactor. Reinmuth (2002) argues for two layers: The Mauerbau-Erzähling (Neh 1:1-4:17; 6:1-7:5; 12:27-43) and the Nehemia-Denkschrift (Neh 5:1-19; 13:4-31), which is the later layer.
considered part of the NM. Reinmuth (2002: 156-59) offers a different interpretation of the NM, asserting that Nehemiah 5 and 13 account for the original layer. More recently, Wright (2004) has undertaken a detailed study of the compositional layers of the NM, emphasizing the weaknesses of some of the earlier scholarly arguments. Wright’s work represents the most radical departure from earlier studies of the NM, distilling it down to a matter of some 15 verses. In the example of Nehemiah 11-12, he largely ignores these texts, with the exception of 12:27-47. Wright argues that Neh 12:27-47 was added after Ezra 1-6, and is one of the later strata to be added to Nehemiah. While his study draws attention to problematic areas that may relate to the compositional processes behind the book of Nehemiah as well as develops patterns within the text, his model has yet to supplant the more traditional view of the role of the NM in relation to the composition of the book of Nehemiah.

All of these various proposals highlight difficulties in reconstructing the composition of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, especially since lists interrupt the narrative several times. The most dramatic case of lists interrupting the narrative flow is

---

14 Fensham (1982: 4-5) is on the other end of the interpretation spectrum and argues in favor of including 11:1-13:31 as part of the NM.
15 These 15 verses are: 1:1a, 11b; 1:1-6 (not including, v. 4b “I prayed to the God of Heaven” and in v. 6 “the consort was sitting beside him” and “I gave him a time”); 11, 15 (not including “I came through the Valley Gate and returned”), 16a, 17, 18b, 3:38 (not including “it was completed until the half of it”); 6:15.
16 He (2004: 331) asserts that 11:3-12:26 were inserted into the larger composition, but it is hard to determine when this occurred. He does, however, place 12:27-47 into his sixth stratum and 12:1-26 within his seventh stratum (340).
17 Contra Williamson, who argues that only after the composition of Nehemiah 7-13 had taken place, was Ezra 1-6 added (1985: xxxiv).
18 Albertz (2006: 199-200) observes this problem, pointing out that 1:1-7:3 is interrupted by a list of wall builders in 3:1-32 and again at the beginning of chapter 5. The bigger problems, according to Albertz, are found in the rest of the NM material, since it is
found in Nehemiah 11-12. In this example, Neh 11:1-12:26 interrupt the narrative from chapter 10, which deals with the people who signed the covenant to abide by the law during the time of Nehemiah. Chapters 11-12 are highlighted as the most difficult section to reconcile within the larger framework of Ezra and Nehemiah. The placement of chapters 11-12 following chapter 10 of Nehemiah is often questioned, as it is believed that the literary style of 11:1-12:26 is most closely related to Nehemiah 7. Certain studies examine how the materials within Nehemiah 11:1-12:26 were arranged into a unit since they comprise such different kinds of lists and genealogies. Nevertheless, chapters 11-12 are not a seamless unit because the material within these chapters is so heterogeneous (lists, genealogies, first-person narratives, third-person narratives). Thus,

interrupted by Neh 7:5b-12:30. Nehemiah 12:31-32 and 37-40 are removed and also “heavily reworked by the editor” (2006: 200). In Boda’s study (2008: 51) he adds that 12:27 is problematic since it is different in style from the first-person account in 1-7:5. Thus, according to Boda, it represents the use of a different document from the time of Nehemiah’s second residency in Judah, when he may have served as a governor.

19 To solve the problem of difficulties with this material, certain scholars argue that Nehemiah 11-12, as well as 9-10, were constructed from younger material that were originally independent of each other, and not part of the NM. See Mowinckel (1964: 50-59, 135-57); Kellerman (1967: 32-56); Kratz (2000: 73-74, 92); Pakkala (2004: 3); and Wright (2004: 330-31).

20 The continuity in style and content between Nehemiah 7 and 11 has been widely recognized in scholarly discussions for over a century, beginning with Meyer (1896: 94-102). See also Batten (1913: 266-67); Rudolph (1949: 186); Fensham (1982: 242); Clines (1984: 211); McConville (1985: 136); and Grabbe (1998: 59-60, 168). Williamson argues MT Neh 11:1-2 is a reworking of the NM (1985: xxxii-xxxiii, 345; 1999: 283 n. 17). See also Clines (1984: 211); Gunneweg (1987: 140-4); and Blenkinsopp (1988: 322-23). Lipschits (2002: 427) agrees with Williamson, arguing that a later editor created the continuity between chapters 7 and 11, in order to “place his own interpretive stamp on these materials and to stress to his readers the message he wished to convey to them.” Kellerman (1967: 41-44, 103-5) argues for continuity between Nehemiah 7 and Neh 12:27-43, but this view has not gained wide acceptance.
the material is commonly divided based on compositional style, specifically lists and narratives.  

Other studies examine the dates for composition of the lists. Since it is commonly argued that the lists in chapters 11-12:26 interrupt the NM, scholars debate when these chapters were added to the larger work of Nehemiah. Other studies, such as Scolnic, seek to explain the use of lists throughout the Hebrew Bible, offering a basic classification system for the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah. Other studies, such as those of Wilson (1977) and Johnson (1988), have examined the use of genealogies within the biblical context, highlighting their common appearance in Ezra and Nehemiah. The list of the priests in MT and LXX Neh 12:10-11 has garnered the most attention, particularly in relation to reconstructing the high priesthood in Jerusalem during the Persian period. Since most scholars view Neh 12:10-11 as a list of high priests in genealogical dress, several reconstructions of the tenure of the priesthood have been offered. Other studies have examined the entire corpus of lists in Ezra and Nehemiah.

In depth studies by scholars such as Rudolph (1949), Myers (1965), Fensham (1982),


22 Japhet (2006: 250) argues that since the lists do not make up a complete unit, they form their own independent history, and are their own “literary phenomenon.”

23 Scolnic (1995) offers a taxonomy of all of the major lists in the Hebrew Bible. His study offers a basic classification system and, as such, his work is a good starting point for any examination of biblical lists.


25 For a classification of these lists, see pages 1-2.
Clines (1984), Williamson (1985), Blenkinsopp (1988), Lipschits (2005), and Edelman (2005) have examined the lists in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, Nehemiah 3, Neh 11:25-36, as well as several others, in an attempt to contextualize each one as well as to understand a general chronology for the material. In the case of Nehemiah 11-12, scholars have offered a wide range of dates for their composition, including the Persian, Hellenistic (331-63 B.C.E.), and even the early Roman period (ca. late first century B.C.E.-first century C.E.). In certain cases, some lists are contextualized in the Persian period, while others date to the Hellenistic or even the early Roman periods. In the example of Nehemiah 11, many scholars believe that the series of catalogs of people found in MT Neh 11:4-19 point to real historical circumstances, dated to events after the building of the wall of Jerusalem.26

The catalog of settlements in MT Neh 11:25-36 has drawn much attention within studies of Nehemiah. The list of Judahite, Benjaminite, and Levite settlements is examined in order to elucidate the history of postmonarchic Judah. Studies attempt to establish whether these settlement lists represent real Persian era activities. If they do not, then studies hypothesize where these lists may be placed (i.e. the Hellenistic or Roman periods). Scholars such as Myers (1965: 191), Clines (1984: 220), Weinberg (1992: 49-61), and Janzen (1999: 499) champion the Persian period date, reconciling the text with the political situation of the time. Others argue for a later date, such as Böhler (2003: 48), who sees the settlement list in 11:25-36 as belonging to the Maccabean period

---

26 Lipschits (2002: 427-28) comments that most of the scholars who assert the historical reliability of Neh 11:25-36 place the lists within the context of the population who settled Jerusalem after the reconstruction of the walls. For this position, see Batten (1913: 267); McConville (1985: 136); Williamson (1985: 346-49); Grabbe (1998: 59-60).
In fact, Böhler argues for a second century B.C.E. redaction to Nehemiah 11, during what he terms a “Hasmonean renaissance.”

A final position asserts that the lists, particularly MT Neh 11:25-36, were idealized images of the Persian period settlement. Thus, the lists cannot fully be contextualized historically since they depict an idealized portrait of settlement, and not a realistic one. Scholars such as Lipschits (2002: 427-40) most clearly champion this opinion.

Archaeological evidence may provide a physical means of supporting certain historical claims. Of particular importance are the surveys that have been conducted throughout the highlands, the Shephelah, and the Negev. Scholars such as Carter (1999), Lipschits (2002; 2005), and Edelman (2005) have examined the lists in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, and Nehemiah 3 in light of the archaeological survey data. These studies generally highlight certain continuity with Iron II settlement sites, but also point out that compared to the late Iron II, there was a dramatic decrease in population during the Persian period. Most recently, Finkelstein entered into the debate, offering his interpretation of these specific lists (2008; 2010). Yet the settlement list, found in Neh 11:25-36, has not drawn as much attention in the archaeological reconstructions of the region of Judah since it is believed that many of the sites mentioned in the list could not have been within the political borders of Persian period Judah.

---


28 See Kochavi (1972); Dagan (1992); Ofer (1993); Finkelstein et al. (1993); Zertal (1999; 2001); Lehmann (2001; 2003); Lipschits (2005); and Faust (2007).

29 Finkelstein offers a Hasmonean date for the different lists, based on his interpretation of the archaeological data. See chapter 6 for a discussion of his analysis and conclusions.
In MT Neh 12:1-26, several studies have focused on the different lists since they discuss the priests and Levites, set in the context of the return. Nehemiah 12:1-26 focuses on several generations of priestly returnees, and thus represents several generations within the elite temple community. As previously mentioned, the most significant studies of Nehemiah 12 discuss the supposed high priestly genealogy in Neh 12:10-11 and 22-23. Nehemiah 12:27-46 shifts the focus, in narrative form, to the reinstitution of cultic activities, as the Jerusalem community gathers and parades around Jerusalem. The shift back to a narration of public cult has drawn much attention. This line of research is used for multiple purposes, including a discussion of the NM, as well as a reconstruction of both the physical space of Jerusalem and also the temple community.\(^\text{30}\) And, as previously mentioned, the literary and historical questions are particularly intriguing since Nehemiah suddenly reappears in MT Neh 12:31.\(^\text{31}\)

Moreover, MT Nehemiah 12:27-47 is further divided on the basis of first, versus third person narratives. Within chapter 12, MT Neh 12:31-32, and 37-41, are often considered part of the “Nehemiah Memoir” (NM), since they are a first person account written by Nehemiah himself. Clines (1984: 9-12) argues that the Chronicler, whom he views as the final editor of this material, was responsible for the composition of Neh 12:27-30, 44-47, and 13:1-3. He is unsure whether 11:1-3, 13-19 were part of the NM. Both Clines (1984: 12-14) and Williamson (1985: xxxv) agree that 11:20-36 and 12:1-26 were part of a later redaction of this material.

\(^\text{30}\) Studies by scholars such as Fullerton (1919: 171-79), Burrows (1935: 29-39), Kraft (1954: 240), and Myers (1965: 112-20), have used Neh 12:27-43 to reconstruct the geography of Jerusalem.

\(^\text{31}\) Nehemiah’s first person accounts end in 7:5, and begin again in MT 12:31. In the LXX, Nehemiah’s first person account begins in v. 25.
All of these studies, however, fail to consider the differences between the MT and LXX texts of Nehemiah. When one is exploring any of the subjects that have been discussed previously in relation to MT Nehemiah 11-12 (formation, style, composition, geopolitical as well as local political events, and modern archaeological studies), it is imperative that these studies take into consideration the large-scale text critical differences that may inform or affect their studies.

3. The Implications to the Divergences in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12

There have been many different kinds of studies that have taken MT Nehemiah 11-12 into consideration, yet the textual divergences in the book of Nehemiah (LXX 2 Esdras) are the focus of very few scholarly studies. To be sure, scholars have noticed certain textual variants.32 But with the exception of Knoppers’s work on MT and LXX Neh 11:3-19 and Klein’s response to Knoppers (2006), few studies have spent time exploring the divergences between MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12.33 This is exceptional considering the number of text critical studies on biblical texts, such as Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, which have shown that textual criticism is important for providing information on the sources and compositional processes behind their creation. The differences in length (shorter versus longer), content, and order among textual witnesses are important to consider when examining any text.

32 See Rudolph (1949: xx); Alt (1953); Myers (1965); Williamson (1985); Blenkinsopp (1988); Tov (1992; 1997; 2003); Ulrich (1996); Knoppers (2000); Klein (2006); and Wooden (2006; 2008).
33 See chapter 2 for a discussion of these differing perspectives.
In his study of the relationship of the MT and LXX, Tov (2003: 121) states, “When comparing the LXX evidence with that of the other sources, we find that beyond the MT, the LXX is the single most important source preserving redactionally different material relevant to the literary analysis of the text, often earlier than MT.” Ulrich also notes the importance of the LXX for informing studies on the MT, particularly when the Qumran material is considered (1996; 1999: 100-103), which may favor one tradition over the other. Moreover, De Troyer’s work on the relationship between the MT and LXX texts of Joshua highlights the importance of different textual traditions for informing modern scholarly studies of the composition of these texts.34 In her examination, De Troyer observes that the MT of Joshua should be viewed “as a late rewritten version of an older text that is ‘visible’ through the Old Greek.” She also adds that the later MT version of Joshua should be regarded as “a sacred rewritten text.”35 De Troyer’s primary observation of the MT and LXX differences in Joshua may be applied to the differences between MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12.

In the example of 1 Samuel, there are divergences between the MT and LXX in a few key places, namely chapters 1-2 and 17-18. There are other witnesses to the material, such as 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, 4QSam\textsuperscript{b}, 4QSam\textsuperscript{c}, and Josephus. These different texts reflect the compositional growth that this particular text underwent over a period of time. In 1 Samuel 1-2 (the story of Hannah), Ulrich argues that the MT preserves the older edition, and the LXX constitutes a reworked edition (1999: 66). In Samuel 17-18 (the David and

---


Another book that has many textual divergences is Jeremiah. It is preserved in many witnesses, including the MT, 2QJer, 4QJer\(^a\), 4QJer\(^c\), as well as the LXX and 4QJer\(^b\). Jeremiah is also preserved in a different order, according to the MT and LXX witnesses. Ulrich and Tov both argue that there are two stages, or editions, to the text of Jeremiah. These editions are classified by Tov as “edition I,” represented by the form found in the LXX and 4QJer\(^b\), and a later expanded edition, called “edition II,” characterized by MT, 4QJer\(^a\), and 4QJer\(^c\). The different textual witnesses reflect a complex textual process, in which the text was edited and reedited over a period of time.

In the example of Daniel, there are several witnesses: The MT, LXX, and fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls, including 1QDan\(^b\), 4QDan\(^a\), 4QDan\(^d\), 4QDan\(^e\), pap6QDan. Unlike Jeremiah, in which there are two editions of a single textual tradition, independent textual growth is evident in both the MT and the LXX (Ulrich 1999: 72). In chapters 4-6, a number of divergences exist between the texts. Chapters 4 and 6 are shorter in the MT, whereas chapter 5 is shorter in the LXX. In fact, Collins notes that both the OG and MT underwent secondary developments to the text (1993: 6). Thus,

---

36 This interpretation is debated, and scholars such as Halpern maintain that the LXX attempts to “harmonize apparent contradictions” found in the MT tradition (2001: 7). Thus, the MT preserves the older material.
unlike Jeremiah, which only has two versions, Daniel underwent changes from its Vorlage.

A final example that is important to consider, particularly in light of Nehemiah-2 Esdras studies, is the comparison between Ezra and 1 Esdras. In this case, the situation is complicated by the fact that 1 Esdras overlaps with Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, as well as contains its own unique material. Thus, each text reflects a later reworking of earlier material. A comparison of MT Ezra and LXX 1 Esdras, 4:7-11 shows that the LXX preserves the older material, and the MT is a later reworking and elaboration of this much shorter text (Fulton and Knoppers 2011). In other examples, the MT preserves older material and the LXX preserves a reworked text.

Tov and Ulrich observe the importance of the LXX for informing MT and DSS studies, yet few scholars have focused on the implications of this in light of Ezra and Nehemiah studies. In fact, in comparison to the attention the composition of 1 Esdras has received, there are fewer studies that focus on the book of 2 Esdras.39 Wooden highlights the language and style of 2 Esdras in comparison to MT Ezra and Nehemiah. Wooden (2006: 133-143) argues that the language of 2 Esdras is very closely related to the Hebrew-Aramaic word order, and when there is an occasional variant reading, it is noteworthy. He highlights the close connection between the MT and LXX texts, pointing to the high number of transcriptions, particularly the appearance of κατ to translate the conjunctive wāw. He dates 2 Esdras to the middle or end of the second century C.E..

39 Noteworthy studies on the book of 2 Esdras include: Howorth (1902; 1903); Swete (1902, repr. 1968); Jahn (1909); Batten (1913); Gwynn (1930); Allgeier (1941); Janz (1997); Hanhart (2003); and Wooden (2006; 2008).
Wooden’s studies offer valuable insight into the compositional style and grammar of, what he refers to as, the “translation of 2 Esdras.”

Wooden’s observations on the overall texts of MT Nehemiah versus LXX 2 Esdras are important to consider when examining the large-scale discrepancies in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12. There are basically two possible explanations to the differences in the texts: The LXX is shorter because it omitted material from the earlier MT list, or the MT reflects additions to the older LXX list. In these specific instances, I propose that the LXX reflects an earlier series of lists than those of the MT, which typically is considered the older of the two texts in every circumstance. Thus, these discrepancies are unlike MT and LXX Nehemiah 3-4, since the LXX does not appear to take liberties with its translations.

4. Dissertation Outline

In this study, I examine these lists in Nehemiah 11-12 for the purpose of ascertaining the base lists, or what reflects the earliest traditions of these different types of lists and genealogies. This investigation has two main components: A detailed study of the texts and a detailed study of the archaeological sites. As a result, I argue that the various lists within Nehemiah 11-12, as fully developed in the MT, reflect a Hellenistic reality retrojected into Persian Period Judah. The LXX retains aspects of late-Persian and Hellenistic period lists since key genealogies continue for several generations. But ultimately, the LXX preserves the earlier material.

In chapter two, I focus on Neh 11:1-24 which relays the settlement of Jerusalem,
cataloging the heads of the families who settled in Jerusalem and, in some cases, their genealogies. Nehemiah 11:1-24 represents a discrete unit that is separate from the resettlement of the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites, found in 11:25-36. Moreover, these settlers to Jerusalem are listed as having cultic and civic importance and thus, represent different religious and political institutions. These issues are compounded when text critical issues are considered since the MT and LXX preserve divergent texts. The LXX charts a much smaller settlement regarding certain, numbers, people, positions, and names in the genealogies. A third divergent tradition is preserved in 1 Chr 9:2-18. An analysis of the textual divergences between the MT and LXX material allows for a better understanding of these lists; that is, how they were constructed and for what purpose.

In chapter three, I examine the settlement lists in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. Following the elite (re)settlement of Jerusalem in Neh 11:1-24, Neh 11:25-36 records the Benjaminite, Judahite, and Levite settlement of certain towns throughout Judah and its surrounding territories. This material is unique among the lists in Nehemiah 11-12 because it focuses specifically on settlement outside of Jerusalem. Scholars have observed that other lists contain differences in the area of Judean settlement compared with what is found in MT Neh 11:25-36, namely Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 (the list of returnees) and Nehemiah 3 (the list of wall-builders). Consequently, it is common for

scholars to exclude MT Neh 11:25-36 from possible areas of settlement because this list has the most outlying towns in relation to the proposed territorial boundaries of the province of Judah when compared to other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah. A detailed comparison of the form, function, and content of the MT and LXX versions of Neh 11:25-36 reveals that the shorter LXX version is a select register of settlements in which certain Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites settled, whereas the longer (and later) MT register is much more comprehensive in nature. While both are settlement lists, the MT and LXX appear to have different goals in the presentation of the material. Thus, although both make specific settlement claims, MT Neh 11:25-36 is by far the more comprehensive and ambitious of the two.

In chapter four, I examine the settlement lists in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 as compared to other lists that show similarities and differences in settlement area, specifically Ezra 2:20-33//Neh 7:25-38 and Nehemiah 3. When examining the differences between post-monarchic settlement lists, it is necessary to explore how the MT and LXX differences have an effect on the perceived size and scope of the region of Judah during the Achaemenid Period, particularly in light of other settlement lists. Yet there are even earlier lists, such as the settlement list of the tribe of Judah in Joshua 15 and the settlement list of the tribe of Benjamin in Joshua 18 that are necessary to consider when examining possible influences to the list in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. Moreover, the Levitical settlements in Numbers 34-35 and Joshua 21 have overlap with MT and

---

41 See, for example Stern (1982: 249; 2001), Carter (1999), and Lipschits (2005).
LXX Neh 11:36.\textsuperscript{42}

In chapter five, I present a final text critical case study: MT and LXX Nehemiah 12. Among the biblical accounts of the Persian period settlement and occupation of Judah, Nehemiah 12 is noteworthy because it focuses on the priests and Levites who came out from the exiled Jewish community in Babylon with Zerubbabel and Jeshua during the kingship of Darius I (12:1-9). This account presents a list of the priests and Levites during the time of Joiakim (12:12-26), certain priestly genealogies, and also a list of cultic personnel associated with the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (12:27-47). These diverse lists of priests and Levites focus on the elite cultic peoples associated with the return from Babylon, as well as subsequent generations of priests and Levites. Nehemiah 12 is important for understanding certain aspects of the Jerusalem cult during the Persian period. Thus, it is noteworthy that MT and LXX Nehemiah 12 reveal several differences in form and content, particularly with regard to the names and number of people who left with Zerubbabel from Babylon as well as the narrative about the procession and dedication of Jerusalem. In order to understand the nature and scope of the return to Judah within the context of Nehemiah, it is necessary first to examine the variances between MT and LXX Nehemiah 12 and next to compare them to other lists that overlap with MT and LXX Neh 12:1-11, such as Neh 10:3-9, 12:12-21, and 1 Chronicles 24.

In chapter six, I return to the issue of settlements. Authors of historical and archaeological studies of the period of Persian dominance in the Near East make many

\textsuperscript{42} The very detailed Levitical town lists in Numbers 34-35 and Joshua 21 are important to consider in light of Levites settling outside of Jerusalem, referred in Neh 11:36.
assumptions related to Persian identity and control and how this affected the southern Levant. Many of these assumptions, however, are hard to substantiate, based on the historical and archaeological record. In order to approach the Persian period in a new way, three lines of inquiry are examined. The first seeks to understand what demarcates the Persian period as a distinct slot of time, a project requiring us to ask, “Who are the Persians?” and “What does Persian period mean?” in the discourse of historical and archaeological studies. In an attempt to understand the history of the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E., one must turn to the ancient sources, both biblical and extra-biblical, and identify how they construct the Persians as a group and how they explain dominance over various subject peoples. A second line of inquiry required to explore the Persian period is to examine how material culture and other archaeological finds attest (or do not attest, as the case may be) to any presumed political domination. The third line of inquiry explores settlement, particularly in the physical distribution of the Judahites and Benjaminites. This third inquiry leads directly to MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. A comparison between the MT and LXX is very useful in considering such larger questions.\footnote{This is particularly true with regard to MT Neh 11:25-36. There are no discussions on the connection between archaeology and LXX Neh 11:25-36.} To attempt any kind of periodization of the lists in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, it is necessary to deconstruct many assumptions concerning context, identity, and the use of material culture to delineate boundaries.
5. Cambridge Versus Göttingen Critical Editions

Finally, it is necessary to address the differences in critical editions of the Greek text of 2 Esdras//Esdras B. The two most well known editions of 2 Esdras//Esdras B are found in the Cambridge Septuagint series, by Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935) and the Göttingen series by Hanhart (1993). The differences between these two critical editions of 2 Esdras 20-21 are dramatic, considering the general unity of these critical editions prior to Nehemiah 11-12.\(^{44}\) In examining both editions, it is clear that the Cambridge critical edition closely follows the LXX B, A, S, consistently privileging the B tradition.\(^{45}\) The outlook of the Cambridge LXX project is to construct a text based on the best and earliest manuscript evidence. A third tradition is Rahlfs, *Septuaginta editio altera* that was first published in 1935 and reedited in 2006.\(^{46}\) In his version, Rahlfs prefers the texts of the B, A, and S, oftentimes showing preference for the S.

Hanhart’s Göttingen edition of 2 Esdras takes Rahlfs work into consideration, but then incorporates more manuscript traditions, although seemingly favoring late Greek manuscript traditions and Latin traditions that closely correspond to the MT, when Greek textual divergences exist. Rahlfs’s version notes the readings of later miniscule and miniscule manuscripts, but he rarely incorporates them into his text. This is also true for the Syriac, Sahidic, and Bohairic traditions, which Rahlfs notes, but rarely prefers their readings. Hanhart, on the other hand, appears to favor Syriac and Ethiopic traditions

\(^{44}\) This is with the exception of Neh 3:33-4:17//2 Esd 14:1-15:23.
\(^{45}\) The B codex and the S are most often dated to the fourth century C.E., but the A codex dates to the fifth century C.E..
\(^{46}\) Hanhart edited a new version of Rahlfs work, published in 2006. 2 Esdras 20-21 remains unchanged from Rahlfs’s original version.
when they follow MT traditions, even when the earliest Greek manuscripts differ from them. Following the general approach of the Göttingen edition, the goal is to organize a critical edition based on the oldest known texts in order to get back to the original compositions in Greek, or translations from the Hebrew and Greek. In line with this approach, Hanhart carefully considers multiple textual traditions. In fact, he reads with post-B, A, and S traditions more often than Rahlfs’s work ever considered. In doing so, Hanhart’s edition appears to conform the LXX text, which has surely evolve from the Hebrew text(s) underlying the LXX, MT, and Vulgate traditions. The B, A, and S are considered in LXX studies to most often be the earliest and the best.\(^{47}\) For this study, I am searching for the earliest and best reading. For this reason, I am more closely following the Cambridge edition. Each divergence between Hanhart and Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, however, is considered separately throughout this work. I have provided my own Greek edition, based on the Cambridge and Göttingen editions in the Appendix.

\(^{47}\) B, A, and S are believed to be based on Origen’s critical text of the biblical material, called the *Hexapla*. His critical text consisted of six versions, or six columns of the biblical material. The six columns consisted of the Hebrew text, the Hebrew text translated into Greek, Aquila’s translation of the Hebrew text, Symmachus’s translation of the Hebrew text, Theodotion’s recension, and finally Origen’s recension of the Greek text. See Nautin (1977: 303-61) and Jellicoe (1968: 100-133).
Chapter 2

The Cultic and Civic Settlement of Jerusalem: MT and LXX
Nehemiah 11:1-24

1. Introduction

An important theme in the book of Nehemiah is the relationship between the cultic and civic communities from among the returnees to Judah.\textsuperscript{48} In Nehemiah 11-12, the different relationships are made explicit through the use of genealogies and lists of settlers and temple personnel. As a means of emphasizing the connection between the cultic and civic communities, Nehemiah 11 centers on the settlement of Jerusalem (vv. 1-24) as well as the people who settled in other regions in and around Judah and Benjamin (vv. 25-36). Nehemiah 11:1-24 also catalogs the heads of the families who settled in Jerusalem, and in some cases, their genealogies. The connection between the land and the people in the book of Nehemiah is essential for establishing those who are considered important and in what capacity they functioned within the community.

Nehemiah 11:1-24 represents a discrete unit that is separate from the resettlement of the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites, found in 11:25-36. The settlers to Jerusalem have cultic and civic importance and thus, represent different religious and political institutions. When enumerated, the lists of cultic personnel appear to have a wide range of duties associated with activities in and around the Temple. An examination of the

\textsuperscript{48} This is in contrast to what appears to be a negative relationship with people outside the community in Nehemiah and also in Ezra.
different positions within the cultic community, indicates that there are a number of temple personnel unique to Nehemiah 11, when compared to other post-exilic lists. Thus, the exclusive nature of Neh 11:1-24 reveals its importance as a source for considering post-exilic cultic institutions and their members.

Yet Nehemiah 11 is problematic because scholars have noticed certain form critical issues, particularly in vv. 1-24. These issues are compounded when text critical issues are considered, since the MT and LXX preserve divergent texts. The substantially shorter text of the LXX charts a much smaller community with regard to certain genealogies, people, positions, and group totals. Further, 1 Chr 9:2-18 also preserves a list that has parallels and divergences to the list of returnees found in MT and LXX Neh 11:3-19, as has been noted previously, and the parallels between MT Neh 11:3-19 and 1 Chr 9:2-18 are well studied. But there has been relatively little focus on the text critical differences between MT and LXX Nehemiah, with the exception of Knoppers (2000:141-168) and Klein (2006). These discrepancies in text are particularly noteworthy when trying to reconstruct the composition of the book of Nehemiah as well as when understanding the larger compositional processes at work in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

Further, the lists of temple personnel and political institutions in MT and LXX

---

Neh 11:1-24 raise several questions that are significant for understanding issues concerning the form, structure, and historical circumstances for the creation of the material. An analysis of the textual divergences between the material preserved in the MT and LXX allows for a better understanding of these lists, that is, how they were constructed and for what purpose. In this chapter, I begin with the MT text, focusing on literary and form critical issues that are particularly relevant in Neh 11:1-24. I also examine the LXX text, first as a unit, and then for the purpose of investigating the same questions concerning literary and form critical issues that are asked of the MT. Additionally, I examine the similarities and differences in the MT and LXX material of Neh 11:1-24 in order to ascertain whether these discrepancies are due to scribal errors, such as *homoioarkton* or *homoioteleuton*, or other processes at work. The study of MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24 reveals that the textual discrepancies between the different versions appear to be largely not accidental mistakes in the long history of textual transmission. Rather, the MT preserves a later edition of the settlement of Jerusalem, taking into consideration the changing cultic community that resided in the city. Although repetitious material such as genealogies and lists are common places for copyist errors, one has to question why other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah did not face the same magnitude of problems as that of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12.\footnote{There are some differences between 1 Esdras and Ezra and Nehemiah (particularly in the lists in Ezra 2), but the lists do not contain nearly as many text critical divergences.} The texts of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 allow for an examination of the people who are the cultic and civic elite, according to the writer(s) of Neh 11:1-24 and how these people and positions vary between these two traditions. Through this careful analysis, we are provided a window
into the changing nature of certain cultic and civic institutions, as well as changing family lines, and how certain positions gain prominence within the context of the Persian period.


In order to introduce the material in Neh 11:1-24, it is necessary to offer a short discussion of the kinds of lists present in the texts. The broader classification for MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24 is a list of the settlement of Jerusalem, though form critical sub-categories within these lists also exist. In Scolnic’s taxonomy of biblical lists, he groups all of Neh 11:3-36 together and categorizes it as a “Name-Personnel” list (1995: 16).52 He provides three general categories for this designation: ruler lists, state personnel, and cultic officials (1995: 17-18). Scolnic, however, does not separately consider the material in 11:25-36, which should be classified as a settlement list.53 Nehemiah 11:3-24 includes state personnel and cultic officials. While Scolnic’s categories focus on the position of the lists within a broad classification system, in the case of Nehemiah 11, these two

---

52 Scolnic’s (1995: 16-17) other examples of “Name-Personnel” lists are Num 3:14-39 (Levites), 4:21-49 (Levites), 13:4-16 (scouts); 2 Sam 8:15-18 (David’s ministers), 20:23-36 (David’s ministers); 1 Kgs 4:1-19 (Solomon’s officials); 1 Chr 9:17-34 (Levites), 11:10-47 (David’s warriors), 12:1-23 (followers of David), 15:4-10 (priests/Levites), 15:17-24 (Levite Musicians), 18:14-17 (David’s ministers), 23:1-32 (Levites for Temple), 24:1-31 (priests and Levites), 25:1-31 (Temple musicians), 26:1-28 (Temple gatekeepers/officials), 26:27-29:34 (state officials); and 2 Chr 17:14-19 (Jehosaphat’s men).

53 Scolnic states that his classification is “tentative.” He adds, “Many of the categories that I have created will “collapse” under the pressure of close scrutiny…in terms of content, many of the categories overlap when we move from the abstraction of typology to the correctness of specific texts” (1995: 14). My interpretation of his material only seeks to fine-tune his categories for lists that are relevant to my study. His work presents one of the only systematic studies on lists in the Hebrew Bible. For a discussion of the lists in 1 Chronicles (i.e. ch 2-9 and 23-27), see De Vries (1989)
classifications should be broken down into more discrete units. With regard to the
category of cultic officials, the discreet units are arranged into primary and secondary
positions within the Temple. Scolnic’s basic taxonomy aids in clarifying the types of

3. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of MT Nehemiah 11:1-24

MT Neh 11:1-24 catalogs the people who settled in Jerusalem. These groups
include the Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, Levites, gatekeepers, 
Netînîm, and an advisor to the king. The introduction to the material (vv. 1-3) offers a basic summary of the
groups that are outlined in the following verses.54

MT Nehemiah 11:1-2455

1. The chiefs of the people resided in Jerusalem; and the rest of the people cast
lots to bring one out of ten to live in the holy city Jerusalem, while nine-tenths
remained in the other cities.
2. And the people blessed all those men who willingly offered to reside in
Jerusalem.
3. These are the leaders of the province who resided in Jerusalem and in the cities
of Judah the people dwelt on his property in their cities:56 Israel, the priests, the
Levites, the Netînîm, and the sons of Solomon’s servants.
4. And in Jerusalem resided some of the Judahites and some of the Benjaminites.
From the Judahites: Athaiah son of Uzziah

54 The introduction of the different groups (11:3b) diverges from the following groups
that are outlined (11:4b-24), since the sons of Solomon’s servants are never enumerated.
See further for a discussion of this discrepancy.
55 I am using the BHQ text of Nehemiah (Marcus: 2006).
56 I have chosen to translate כָּמָה as "city" in the context of settlements outside of
Jerusalem, in order to maintain consistency in my translation. The size of the settlements
better reflects towns, however, during the Persian period.
One would expect a total for Shelah’s family if Perez has one. The absence of a total for Shelah’s family may be due to the historical circumstances during the time of the list, meaning that the family of Perez may have risen in prominence as a tribal group.

Literally, it says “and nine hands in the cities” (דְּנָעִים נַעֲשָׂה בְּתֵיתֵי).

The Netînîm are usually translated “temple servants.” See below for a discussion of this term.

Oftentimes translated “Shilonite,” Rudolph (1949: 182), Blenkinsopp (1988: 320), and Williamson (1985: 343) emend this to be “Shelonite” (שִׁלְוָלִית) because as Williamson points out, Shiloh is in Ephraim and not Judah. This emendation also harmonizes with other genealogies because Shelah was one of the sons of Judah (Num 26:20; 1 Chr 2:3 and 9:5) along with Perez and Zerah. This is the same Perez mentioned in v. 4. Williamson also emends ר to ר, following 1 Chr 9:5. Since ר is a matter of vowel pointing, and Shelonite fits well into the context of this list, I support Williamson’s emendation for this name. For a contrary opinion, see Sparks (2008: 335-37), who argues for the MT tradition of Shilonite.

Rudolph (1988: 182-83) and Blenkinsopp (1988: 322) emend “after him” (יוֹתֵר מֵאֵל) to “with his brothers” (יִוחָל) following the Lucianic recension of the LXX. Williamson (1985: 343) also follows the LXX, revising יהוֹרָאֵל to יהוֹרָאֵל as well as the following words, where the MT mentions a Gabai and Sallai (גַּבָּא וֹסַל). He argues that Gabbai (גוֹבָא) and Sallai (סְלָא) break the established pattern of listing names in Nehemiah 11, and thus he emends 11:8a to, “and his kinsmen, men of valor” (וֹסַל וּגוֹבָא וּעָנָם וּשְׂאָל). He compares this proposed emendation to 11:6, 12, 13, 14, and 19. When compared with Nehemiah 11, namely v. 14, Williamson's emendation appears to be correct.

While Jachin changes the established patterns of “x son of y” in Neh 11, there is no need for emending the text, since 1 Chr 9:10 provides a similar style of listing genealogies. That is, the genealogies do not always explicitly say, "son of" after every name in a genealogy. For a discussion of suggested emendations, see Williamson (1985: 343).

Haggedolim, or “the great ones” (בְּכָל הַעַטְרֵה), is not attested anywhere else as a proper name. The Vulg records, filius potentium, or "son of the mighty". Although there have been several suggested emendations, including possible dittography (פ suffix), and also changing the name to Giddel or Gedeliah (Williamson 1985: 343), which are names both attested in Ezra (Giddel cf. 2:47; Gedaliah cf. 10:18), Rudolph (1949) suggests that this could be a title for the high priesthood. See Williamson (1985: 343) and Blenkinsopp (1988: 322). See further for a discussion of why Rudolph's suggestion is untenable.

The ketib reading is לַעַטְרֵה. I am following the qere reading, לַעַטְרֵה based on other attestations of this name, namely 1 Chr 9:16.

MT literally states, לַעַטְרֵה “the Levitical priests” which is only used in a few places in post-exilic literature (2 Chr 23:18; 1 Esd 5:56, 56). This term is more often found in Deuteronomy (17:9, 18; 18:1; 24:8; 27:9), Joshua (3:3; 8:33), and in a few other places (cf. Jer 33:18; Ezek 43:19; 44:15). In Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, the phrase
son of Zechariah son of Amariah son of Shephattiah son of Mahalalel, from the descendants of Perez;
5. And Maaseiah son of Baruch son of Col-hozeh son of Hazaiah son of Adaiah son of Joiarib son of Zechariah son of the Shelonite.
6. All the descendants of Perez who lived in Jerusalem were 468 mighty men.
7. And these are the Benjaminites: Sallu son of Meshullam son of Joed son of Pedaiah son of Koliah son of Maaseiah son of Ithiel son of Jeshaiah.
8. And his brothers, men of valor: 928.
9. Joel son of Zichri was their overseer; and Judah son of Hassenuah was second in charge of the city.
10. From the priests: Jedaiah son of Joiarib, Jachin,
11. Seraiah son of Hilkiah son of Meshullam son of Zadok son of Meraioth son of Ahitub, officer of the house of God,
12. and their associates who did the work of the house, 822, and Adaiah, son of Jeroham, son of Pelaliah, son of Amzi son of Shephatiah son of Mahalalel, from the descendants of Perez;
15:14; 23:2; 28:21; 2 Chr 5:5; 8:15; 11:13; 23:4; 24:5; 29:4; 30:15, 25, 27; 31:4, 9; 34:30; 35:18; Ezra 1:5; 3: 8; 3:12; 6:16, 20; 7:7; 8:29, 30; 9:1; Neh 8:30; 11:3; 12:1, 30, 44; 13:29-30; 1 Esd 1:7, 10, 21; 2:8; 7:9-10; 8:5, 10, 59-60, 69; 9:37). Gunneweg (1965: 207-8) concludes that in these post-exilic examples, the author intentionally copied the Deuteronomistic phrase. Williamson (1985: 342) emends this to “the priests (and) the Levites” whereas Blenkinsopp (1988: 321-22) argues this is intrusive to the text and 11:20 should be translated, “The rest of Israel were in all the towns of Judah, each on his own ancestral plot,” leaving out the Levitical priests. I am following Williamson’s emendation because it appears to be a case where a scribe missed the conjunctive waw. If one were to accept Blenkinsopp's proposal, then one would remove a reference to the priests and Levites settling in the towns. But Neh 7:72a (LXX 73a) clearly agrees that they settled in the towns, and thus, this reference should not be removed.
66 For a discussion of the term see below.
67 The term generally means “agreement” or “regulation.” In v. 23, it appears that the king (i.e. the Persian monarch) had some form of agreement with the Levites concerning their daily work. also appears in Neh 10:1, describing the “agreement” signed by certain cultic and tribal families. This unusual term is significant in both cases. See below for a discussion of this term.
of Zechariah son of Pashhur son of Malchijah,

13. and his brothers, heads of ancestral houses, 242; and Amashai son of Azarel son of Ahzai, son of Meshillemoth, son of Immer.

14. and their brothers of the men of valor, 128; their overseer was Zabdiel son of Haggedolim.


16. And Shabbethai and Jozabad were overseers on the outside work for the house of God, from the leaders of the Levites;

17. And Mattaniah son of Mica son of Zabdi son of Asaph, who was the leader to begin the thanksgiving in prayer and Bakbukiah, the second among his associates; and Abda son of Shammua son of Galal son of Jeduthun.

18. all the Levites in the holy city, 284.

19. The gatekeepers, Akkub, Talmon and their associates, who stood watch at the gates, 172.

20. And the rest of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, in all the cities of Judah, each man to his inheritance.

21. And the Netînîm were residing on the Ophel; and Ziha and Gishpa were over the Netînîm.

22. The overseer of the Levites in Jerusalem was Uzzi son of Bani son of Hashabiah son of Mica, of the descendants of Asaph, the singers, over the work of the house of God.

23. For there was a command from the king concerning them, even a regulation for the singers, as was required every day.

24. And Pethahiah son of Meshezabel, of the descendants of Zerah son of Judah, was at the king’s hand in all matters concerning the people.
3.1. The Literary Critical Analysis

Several different types of lists exist within the work of Ezra and Nehemiah.68 Nehemiah 11-12:26 is unique, however, in that the lists are not integrated into the narrative.69 Japhet notes that various lists are found in the “narrative continuum” of each section of Ezra-Nehemiah and designates the different sections as Ezra 1-6, Ezra 7-10, and Nehemiah 1-13, based on style, content, and narrative technique (2006: 246-51). While different lists are found in each of Japhet’s divisions of Ezra and Nehemiah, it is clear that Nehemiah 11-12:26 stands on its own and has its own compositional history, originally independent of the previous material.70 This unique placement is evident in its style, content, and form. Although there is overlap with other sections, particularly the names and places of settlement evident in Ezra2//Nehemiah 7, and Nehemiah 3, Nehemiah 11-12 represents the largest block of lists in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

The larger literary unit of MT Neh 11:1-24 incorporates several smaller lists that are necessary to analyze. The material may be organized as follows:

**MT Neh 11:1-24**

11:1-18: The settlement of Jerusalem:
11:1-2: Introduction, the returnees to Jerusalem
11:3a: Heading of the settlement of Jerusalem for vv. 4-18.
11:3b: The cultic officials settling outside of Jerusalem

68 These include: Items returned to Jerusalem (Ezra 1:8-11); Returnees (Ezra 2; 8:1-14; Neh 7:4-73; 12: 1-26); Genealogies (Ezra 7:1-9; Neh 11 and 12); City Builders (Neh 3:1-32); Covenant Signers (Neh 10:1-28); Settlers to Jerusalem (11:3-24); Geographical Settlement (11:25-36); and the priests and Levites who were present at the wall dedication (Neh 12:27-42). Some of the material on these lists is not exclusive to one type of list.
69 Japhet notes that Neh 11:3-12:26 comprises a “different sort of literary phenomenon” since these verses are not part of the narrative (2006: 250).
70 It is commonly argued that Nehemiah 11 is a continuation of the material in Nehemiah 7 (cf. Duggan 2001: 68-69). Based on style and content, this connection makes sense. See chapter 7 for a discussion of the connection between Nehemiah 7 and 11.
11:4a: Introduction of the Judahites and Benjaminites.

4b-18: The names and titles of (re)settlers

11: 4b-6: The Judahites
11: 7-9: The Benjaminites
11:10-14: The priests and their associates
11:15-17: The Levites
11:18: Total of the Levites in Jerusalem

11:19-21: Lists of other settlers

11: 19: The gatekeepers
11: 20: The summary and remnant of Israel, the priests, and the Levites living in Judah.
11: 21: The Netînîm

11:22-24: Temple personnel, and governmental officers living in Jerusalem

11:22-23: The Levitical overseers
11:24: The Judahite advisor to the king

Nehemiah 11 focuses on the people who settled in and around Jerusalem. This focus on the settlement of Jerusalem and the larger area of Judah is a characteristic concern found in post-exilic literature. As Ackroyd observes, an important element in post-exilic literature is the occupation of Judah. Ackroyd's observation is clearly seen throughout chapter 11, in which there is a concern for the settlement of Jerusalem as well as the wider settlement area of the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites.\textsuperscript{71} Hence, an understanding of the settlement of Jerusalem and surrounding areas in Nehemiah 11 is important for ordering and reorganizing people as well as the landscape in which they inhabit.

MT Neh 11:1 opens with a statement regarding the elite who were living in Jerusalem while also presenting the (re)settlement of Jerusalem by a tenth of the population. The focus on settlement carries into vv. 2-24, with a few verses referring to

\textsuperscript{71} Ackroyd 1973: 310. This concern for the occupation of Jerusalem is the focus of vv. 1-24. The concern for Judah is not as important, but mentioned in vv. 3b and 20. See chapters 3, 4, and 6 for a discussion of the settlement of the areas outside of Jerusalem, referred to in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36.
the settlement of areas around Jerusalem (vv. 3b and 20). Nehemiah 11:4-24 records the names of specific cultic and civic leaders, and in several cases, their genealogies. Although records of genealogies are common in the post-exilic period, in the larger framework of Ezra and Nehemiah, this is only the second appearance of a lengthy pedigree.72 There are several genealogies in a row, including, the Judahite lineages of Perez and Shelah, the Benjaminites of Sallu and also his associates, short lineages of Joel and Judah, several priestly genealogies, Levitical genealogies, and also Pethahiah’s Judahite genealogy.73 Thus, genealogies are a dominant feature in vv. 4-24.

Further, the focus on the people who settled Jerusalem highlights a critical step in the rebuilding of the community and how, for the writers of Nehemiah, they were the center of activity within the larger community. The primacy of Jerusalem as the center of settlement is emphasized in MT Neh 11:1 and 18, which contain the epithet “holy city” (יִרָמָה). This is an unusual term for Jerusalem, found only in a few other references (MT and LXX Deutero-Isa 48:2; 52:1; Dan 9:24). “Holy city,” a purely post-exilic epithet for Jerusalem, brackets the Judahite, Benjaminite, priestly and Levitical pedigrees found in Neh 11:1-18.74 The literary unit in vv. 1-18 presents the image of a holy

73 Both Perez and Shelah are mentioned among the Judahite phratries in 1 Chr 2:3-6 and also in the genealogies of the resettlers of Judah in 1 Chr 9:4-5. A conspicuous absence to these genealogies in Nehemiah is Zerah, who is mentioned in 1 Chr 2:6 and 9:6. For a discussion of this absence, see Williamson (1985: 351) and Blenkinsopp (1988: 321-24). Klein (2006: 269) argues that a genealogy for Zerah (and also Jeuel) probably was original to the list, but was lost due to a haplographic error. He does not offer a convincing reconstruction, however, for the loss of this material.
74 Eskenazi (1988: 114-115) argues that, “The connection between these pedigrees and holiness is emphasized by the repetition of “the holy city” (Neh 11:1 and 11:18), surrounding the pedigrees, literally, with a frame of holiness.”
community settling the holy city, thereby emphasizing the importance of the entire community, both lay population and cultic, with Jerusalem as the center of the people.\textsuperscript{75}

Moreover, Neh 11:1 and 18 emphasize the importance of “the holy city” and thus create a bracket around the Judahite, Benjaminite, priestly, and Levitical settlement of Jerusalem; yet the theme of settlement continues through the entire chapter. Indeed, the settlement of Jerusalem does not conclude in v. 18, but continues into v. 24, which also principally focuses on the holy community inhabiting Jerusalem—the center of this resettlement.\textsuperscript{76} Accordingly, the order of the material is important because it outlines the central members of this activity and their role within the community.\textsuperscript{77} While vv. 1-3 serve as an introduction to the lists, vv. 4-24 are ordered in such a way that highlights the Judahites because they are the first group mentioned in v. 4 and the last genealogy provided in v. 24. This circular (or chiastic) list returns to the Judahites and places the

\textsuperscript{75} Duggan (2001: 69) observes that when the term city (\begin{scriptsize}7\end{scriptsize} \begin{scriptsize}b\end{scriptsize}) is used in the singular in Ezra and Nehemiah, 10 out of 14 times it refers to Jerusalem (Neh 2:3, 5, 8; 3:15; 7:4; 11:1, 9, 18; 12:37; 13:18).

\textsuperscript{76} Lipschits (2002: 433) identifies Neh 11:3-24 as a literary unit, designed to emphasize the importance of Jerusalem as the center of the community.

\textsuperscript{77} Lipschits asserts that Neh 11:3-24 contains two “circles” that enclose, or “wrap” the main list, found in 11:4-19. The first circle (11:3a and vv. 21-24) discusses the settlement of the leaders to Jerusalem before and after the repopulation, found in 11:3a and the ending in 11:21-24. This circle is meant to “stress the continuity of rule in Jerusalem, and perhaps also its strengthening with the city’s repopulation” (2002: 433). The inner circle, wrapping around 11:4-19, focuses on the 11:3b material that is the Israelites, priests, Levites, Netînîm, and descendants of Solomon’s servants before and after the repopulation of Jerusalem. This theme is also seen in 11:20, which takes place after the repopulation of Jerusalem, when Israel, the priests and Levites are mentioned. There are several advantages to his model, including the fact that it removes emphasis from that of simply a list of people and places to the overall structure of Nehemiah 11. He interprets this material, along with 11:25-36, as both a continuation of the revitalization of Jerusalem (vis-à-vis Nehemiah 7) and also the “climax of the period” (2002: 440). Thus, the past and future in the book of Nehemiah are linked together within this chapter. Oftentimes, the focus of the material has been on the disjointed nature of the lists, but both Eskenazi and Lipschits astutely observe that the overall structure is key to the message of Nehemiah 11.
priests within the center of the list (similar to 1 Chr 2-9). Additionally, the material covers the past and the present through the use of genealogies. Although many of the genealogies draw the reader back to the distant past, the actual settlement is clearly the concern of the lists, which is evident in the use of ascending genealogies that telescope links between the present generation and the ancient past. Even though the genealogies draw the reader back to the past—that is, to certain ancestral family roots—the lists are firmly rooted in the post-exilic period based on the particular delineation of groups such as the Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, Levites, and also secondary groups such as the gatekeepers, *Netînim*, and an advisor to the king. Thus, the past and present are tied together through genealogies and certain positions.

In addition, Nurmela (1998: 171) contends that in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, or as he terms it, the “Chronistic history,” there is a division of the priesthood into more than two classes: The first class includes the priests and the Levites, and the second class is comprised of the singers (Ezra 2:41; Neh 7:44), the gatekeepers (Ezra 2:42; Neh 7:45), the temple servants (Ezra 2:43; Neh 7:46), and the sons of Solomon’s servants (Ezra 2:55; Neh 7:57). Yet, the divisions in Chronicles are different in significant ways. Most evident

---

78 See Johnson (1977) for a general discussion of biblical genealogies, and particularly for the use of telescoping one's genealogy.

79 Several of these groups are found in the pre-exilic period, such as the Judahites, Benjaminites, priests and Levites, but the order and manner in which they are presented is purely post-exilic.

80 Nurmela states that he uses this term to encompass Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah because “no decisive differences can be demonstrated between them as regards worship and priesthood” (1998: 165-66). For a discussion of the different classes within the priesthood, see also Gese (1963: 223). See further for a discussion of each group.
is that in Ezra and Nehemiah, there are no clear divisions of the priesthood into classes. In the book of Chronicles, the sons of Solomon's servants are not mentioned at all, and Ezra and Nehemiah are the only sources to mention these groups in this manner. Thus, the material in Nehemiah 11 is firmly rooted in post-exilic traditions, particularly with regard to titles and positions of certain members tied to the post-exilic (re)settlement of Jerusalem and the surrounding areas, but differs from other post-exilic literature such as Chronicles.

3.2. The Structure and Form of MT Nehemiah 11:1-24

Although the lists of people and places of settlement help create a larger literary unit that unifies Nehemiah 11 and 12, there are also noteworthy questions regarding the formation and structure of this particular material. Nehemiah 11:1-24 includes a series of lists, introduced in 11:1-2, that mention the elites residing in Jerusalem and the (re)settlement of the lay people to the city. When examining the formation of the lists in Neh 11:1-24, one question that commonly arises in modern scholarship is the context for the settlement mentioned in 11:1-2. Essentially, were these people new returnees who settled in Jerusalem or were they people who already settled in the surrounding towns? Based on the account in v. 1, which states that the leaders were living in Jerusalem and others were settled in the surrounding towns, it would appear that this settlement took place after people were living in the towns, and thus, Jerusalem was settled by the surrounding population.  

81 The settlement was not made up of a new population returning 

---

81 It is not connected to the first return, but rather the population was already settled in
from exile, but rather an established population in the province of Judah.

Moreover, the actual settlement of Jerusalem is central to 11:1, but the process of selecting the lay population who settled in Jerusalem is also a significant event. The chiefs (lit. “princes”) of the people (שאראים) already lived in Jerusalem, and thus, the “rest of the people” (שאראים) cast lots to determine who would settle in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{82} It is noteworthy that the שאר-העם, or the elite population, already lived in Jerusalem, while the שאר-העם or the common folk, lived outside the city. Scholars have argued that the city was resettled by the mid-fifth century (cf. Lipschits 2006; Ussishkin 2006), yet it is of note that within the context of Nehemiah 11, the first inhabitants in the city were the elite.\textsuperscript{83} Thus, according to 11:1, the elites were already present in the city, and

Judah. Most scholars agree on this chronological sequence, including Williamson (1985: 347), Blenkinsopp (1988: 322-23), and more recently Lipschits (2002: 429). Notable exceptions to this are Kellerman (1966: 209-27) and earlier Junge (1937) who place the settlement during the time of Josiah, based on the military references in the list. Kellerman, following Junge, argues that this material points to the defense of Jerusalem during the late monarchy. This is not the case, however, since the settlement is clearly rooted in the post-exilic period and not the late monarchy.

\textsuperscript{82} The שאר-העם are only mentioned in a few places and all within a post-exilic context (2 Chr 23:23 and Ezek 11:1; see also Esth 3:12, שאר-העם). The שאר-העם are referred to in Ezra 9:1. Williamson (1985: 130) argues that the term, שאר-העם in Ezra 9:1 is an ambiguous term, but could refer to the leaders already present in Judah and not part of Ezra’s return. He also argues they may have been district governors. While it may seem odd that the district governors all resided in Jerusalem, there is an earlier parallel. The Kuttamuwa inscription records that Kuttamuwa, who was probably a rural landholder, sets up a stele in Zincirli, because he is a servant of the king (Panamuwa). As a rural landholder, Kuttamuwa was probably required to keep a residence in Zincirli. This may be analogous to the שאר-העם who were landholders, or governors, required to keep a residence in Jerusalem. See Struble and Herrmann (2009: 15-49) for a discussion of the "KTMW stele."

\textsuperscript{83} Clines (1984: 211), in explaining this passage states, “Jerusalem as the administrative centre of Judea had attracted to itself sufficient members of the ruling class (cf. the many Jewish officials who dined at Nehemiah’s table, 5:17), and that what was needed to swell Jerusalem’s population were ordinary folk.” Clines never addresses the issue that if Jerusalem were the administrative center, why it had a population problem to begin with.
the resettlement of Jerusalem was a matter of increasing the population within the city.\textsuperscript{84}

Nehemiah 11:1 opens with a tenth of the population settling in Jerusalem. As Blenkinsopp observes the symbolic act of bringing a tenth of the population to Jerusalem was akin to bringing a tithe to the city (1988: 323). The tenth of the population also draws upon the theme of Jerusalem as the שִׁירַיָּהוּ (“holy city”), because of its religious and cultic significance. The resettlement of the lay population was an act of self-sacrifice, and the process of casting lots selected which people would settle in Jerusalem. By casting lots, the settlers were seeking the will of the divine, which is witnessed in other biblical passages (Num 26:55; Josh 7:14, 16-18; 14:2; 18:6, 8; 1 Sam 10:20-21; 14:41-42; and Prov 16:33).\textsuperscript{85} Also, the casting of lots in 11:1 is reminiscent of the casting of lots in Neh 10:35, in which it was used to determine the order for the priestly and Levitical clans to bring wood for the altar. A further issue that emerges from this resettlement is whether the chiefs of the people who dwelt in Jerusalem are the same group who made up the tithe. Were these the same people who cast lots in 11:1 and were selected to settle in Jerusalem or were they a different population? Williamson (1985: 351) argues that it seems probable that the chiefs of the people and the remnant who settled in Jerusalem are the same group who made up the tithe. Yet the chiefs of the people already settled in Jerusalem or were they the first to settle? Some scholars point to Neh 7:1-4, as the context for the elite settlement in Nehemiah 11. Although Neh 7:1-4 may be the context for the resettlement of Jerusalem, it is hard to imagine the elite settling without a support staff (i.e. the common folk) to help them immediately. Thus, it is likely that people, that is, the commoners, were living in Jerusalem before this settlement.

\textsuperscript{84} Much attention is paid to the reality of the resettlement of Jerusalem during the Persian Period (cf. Carter 1999; and Lipschits 2006: 19-52). See Ussishkin (2006: 147-166) for an overview of the scholarship on this subject. Finkelstein (2008: 501-20; 2010) and Zevit (2009) have both examined the settlement of Jerusalem in Nehemiah, particularly the walls of the city.

\textsuperscript{85} Williamson (1985: 351).
Jerusalem, as is stated in 11:1. It is the “rest of the people” who cast lots to determine who would settle Jerusalem; this is the population that constitutes the tithe. Thus, the lay people are the tithe “presented” to the cultic community already settled in Jerusalem.

It is important to note that the settlement of Jerusalem by the population selected by lot does not represent the majority of the community of Judah. It is possible that the ones chosen by lot were glad to move, but it is just as likely that this was a forced resettlement. Thus, it appears that Jerusalem was not the most desired of locations since lots were cast to see who had to move to Jerusalem. Even though the city witnessed a change in population and administration in the mid-fifth century, Jerusalem was a relatively underpopulated town.

MT Neh 11:2 takes up again the theme of self-sacrifice with the settlement of Jerusalem: “The people blessed all those who willingly offered (יְהַנֵּךְ נַחֲצָה) to live in Jerusalem.” Several scholars have questioned whether the lot-casters are the same as the people who “willingly offered” to settle in Jerusalem. Another interpretation is that ("those who willingly offered") refers to the leaders of the people who settled in Jerusalem. This is clearly not the case since the leaders are

87 Clines (1984: 179) argues that Nehemiah 11 points to the practice of, what the Greeks called, *synkoismos*, or forced resettlement. He points to the Greek practice of forcing populations to move to new areas. Clines believes that this is how Jerusalem was resettled during the fifth century B.C.E..
88 The commoners lack of interest to settle in Jerusalem is not surprising considering the relatively poor condition of the city, which is seen in both the biblical and archaeological evidence. See Lipschits (2006) and Ussishkin (2006) for a discussion of the condition of Jerusalem in the Persian period.
89 For a discussion of Jerusalem moving from a cult center to a bîrâ, see Lipschits (2006: 34-40).
mentioned independently of the lot casting activities. Hence, no evidence supports the assumption that there were two different groups. Indeed, הָדְמָנִּים ("those who willingly offered") were from the laity that were chosen by lot to move to Jerusalem.

Further, the use of the term, "those who willingly offered", הָדְמָנִּים, has additional implications. The verb בְּדָנִּין in the hithpael form can mean either to impel or freely offer (cf. Ezra 1:6; 7:15-16). It can also refer to anyone who voluntarily offers oneself for service. Clear allusions to cult practices are seen by the action of “willingly offering” something to the Tabernacle or Temple (cf. Exod 25:2; 35:21; and Ezra 2:68). A third interpretation is in connection to the tithe of people freely offering themselves, which may have military connotations. This military connection is evident in “The Song of Deborah” (Judg 5:2, 9), and 2 Chr 17:16. In the case of “The Song of Deborah” both references in Judges (5:2 and 9) mention the dedication of people for the service to Yahweh. This dedication is in the context of military service, yet it also has a cultic function as well, evident in the use of the phrase הֵרִים פְּרִיֵים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל (“when locks go untrimmed in Israel”). Additionally, the use of this term (הָדְמָנִּים) in "The Song of Deborah" appears to be an allusion to personal dedication, also found in Num 6:5.

Further, 2 Chr 17:16 cites Amasiah, a leader from Judah during the time of Jehosephat, who freely offered הָדְמָנִּים his service for Yahweh along with 200,000 mighty men

---

91 See also Conrad (1998: 219-226) for a discussion of this term.
92 See Gen 47:2; Exod 18:21, 25; Judg 3:29; 30:44, 46; 2 Sam 11:16; 2 Kgs 24:16; Isa 5:22; Neh 2:4; 1 Chr 5:25. See also Carpenter and Grisanti (1997: 31-32). A later use of בְּדָנִּין is found in the Qumran Manual of Discipline (1QS 1.7; 5.1) in the context of someone who volunteers to be part of a religious community (Clines 1984: 212).
Based on these affinities to other examples, scholars such as Kellerman maintain that the people in Neh 11:2 who “freely offered” were more than just settlers to Jerusalem, they were also meant as a military force to protect the city. 93

The theme of service continues throughout Nehemiah 11. The list of Judahite heads concludes in 11:6, stating, “All the descendants of Perez who lived in Jerusalem were 468 mighty men” (לֵאמֶנֶשׁ חוֹלֵי). 94 While the basic meaning of חֲוָלֵי is strength, power, or might, when combined with certain terms (i.e. נְבָרָה, or נְבָרָה חֲוָלֵי can refer to military service. 95 Thus, certain scholars argue that in Nehemiah 11, לֵאמֶנֶשׁ חוֹלֵי may indicate military service. 96 A variation of the term לֵאמֶנֶשׁ חוֹלֵי also appears in 11:14 as

94 The LXX renders לֵאמֶנֶשׁ חוֹלֵי as ἄνδρες δυνάμεως (“men of power”). In the Vulg, it appears as, viri fortes, possibly indicating that Jerome understood this to be a military term. This term also appears in Herodotus’s Histories as δύναμις ἄνδρον (“a military band,” 5.10). Polybius also uses a variant of this term nautikh_ du&namij (1.41.2, “a war fleet”).
95 For a discussion of this term, see Eising (1980: 348-355).
96 In Eising’s discussion of Ruth 2:1, where Boaz is called a לֵאמֶנֶשׁ חֲוָלֵי (“man of great wealth”), he points to 2 Kgs 15:20 when Menahem taxes the לֵאמֶנֶשׁ חֲוָלֵי (“wealthy men”) to pay the king of Assyria. He argues that in the case of Boaz and Saul’s father (1 Sam 9:1), “military ability and wealth go together because the warrior had to arm and maintain himself” (1980: 350-51). Kellerman also sees this term as having military connotations and connects it to the pre-exilic period (1966: 209-27). De Vaux (1997: 70) argues that לֵאמֶנֶשׁ originally referred to the “valiant men, the brave warriors, the gallant knights, like gibborîm on its own, even if they possess no property of their own (Jos 8:3; Jg 11:1).” The word לֵאמֶשׁ appears to connote a person who has enough wealth to buy weaponry. It could be compared to the Greek term Hoplite, which literally means a person who owns his own hoplon, or fighting gear. Yet this may also indicate a certain level of status, that is, one who is wealthy enough to buy military equipment. The term does not mean that they actually did own military equipment, but only that these men are within an economic class that had the ability to do so.
“mighty men”), with reference to the priests.\footnote{Certain scholars argue that this should be rendered “able men” (Batten 1913: 270; Fenshamp 1982: 245) or “men of property” (2006: 140), and cannot refer to the military. See also Oeming (1990: 197-98). Others argue this is a clear reference to the military (Kellerman 1949; Williamson 1985:342; Blenkinsopp 1988: 321-22). Williamson asserts that in certain circumstances, priests could participate in military service, citing Ex 32:26-28 and 1 Mace 5:56 as examples (1985: 351-52). The LXX renders \(\text{γυναικίς, δύνατον παρά τακίς}\) (“mighty battle line”), clearly understanding this to be a military reference. For other uses of \(\text{δύνατον}\), see also Josh 1:14; 6:2; 10:7; Judg 6:12; 11:1; 1 Sam 16:18; 1 Kgs 11:28; 2 Kgs 5:1; 24:14; 1 Chr 7:9, 11, 40; 8:40; 11:26; 12:22.\footnote{For a discussion of this, see Clines (1984: 215), Williamson (1985: 343), and Blenkinsopp (1988: 322-25).} Although the term “second in command” is somewhat unusual, it also appears in 11:17 (\(\text{חַזְיִים חָדִיָּל}\) in reference to Judah. Myers (1965: 184) argues that the Akkadian term, Amel \(\text{šanu}\), means “second in command in a series of officers” is the probable etymology behind the term \(\text{חָדִיָּל}\), which seems likely. For the use of \(\text{šanu}\), see also Gelb (1989:397-98). In the Akkadian context, it is used in military, civic, and cultic contexts, since it simply means “second.”\footnote{Clines (1984: 215) argues this is a military reference simply based on the use of \(\text{δύνατον}\). See also Blenkinsopp (1988: 324-25). For the opposing view, see Oeming (1990:198). He classifies the different uses of \(\text{δύνατον}\) as “Amtsträger mit zivilen” (cf. Gen 41:34; Judg 9:28 and Est 2:3); “militärischen” (2 Kgs 25:19=Jer 52:25) and “kultischen” (Jer 20:1, 29:26; Neh 11:14, 22; 12.42; 2 Chr 24:11; 31.13).} Again, some scholars also argue that 11:8 should be emended to “and his brothers, men of valor” \(\text{אַחַר הָעַמִּגִּים אֵלֶּה} \) instead of “and after him Gabbai, Sallai” \(\text{אַחַר הָעַמִּגִּים} \).\footnote{This emendation would, indeed, make sense in the larger context of Neh 11:1-24. While it is also argued that the Benjaminitic material in Neh 11:9 has military connotations to it, this example is ambiguous. Joel was in command \(\text{פֶּתַח הָלֶאֶה} \) while Judah was second in command over the city \(\text{תַּלָּה} - \text{הָעַמִּגִּים} \).\footnote{Certain scholars, such as Clines, also maintain that this is a reference to military service since \(\text{δύνατον}\), generally carries this meaning (cf. Gen 41:34; 2 Kgs 25:19; Jer 52:25; Neh 11:14). But in contrast, in Gen 41:34, \(\text{δύνατον}\), \(\text{παρά τακίς}\).} This emendation would, indeed, make sense in the larger context of Neh 11:1-24. While it is also argued that the Benjaminitic material in Neh 11:9 has military connotations to it, this example is ambiguous. Joel was in command \(\text{פֶּתַח הָלֶאֶה} \) while Judah was second in command over the city \(\text{תַּלָּה} - \text{הָעַמִּגִּים} \).\footnote{Certain scholars, such as Clines, also maintain that this is a reference to military service since \(\text{δύνατον}\), generally carries this meaning (cf. Gen 41:34; 2 Kgs 25:19; Jer 52:25; Neh 11:14). But in contrast, in Gen 41:34, \(\text{δύνατον}\), \(\text{παρά τακίς}\).}
appears with עלי in the context of appointing someone over the land (משריר עלי הארץ). Two verses that are parallel in content, 2 Kgs 25:19 and Jer 52:25, specifically refer to an officer who was in command of the soldiers. Second Kings 25:19 and Jer 52:25 use משריר עלי to connote military activity, whereas 11:9 is more ambiguous. Though it is difficult to ascertain what the exact nature of the positions are in Neh 11:9, Neh 11:14 calls Zabdiel the שרי עלי (“the overseer over them”), meaning that he was in charge of the שרי. In the instance of 11:14, Zabdiel is commander over the mighty men. Hence, even though the positions in 11:9 are ambiguous, Nehemiah 11 clearly employs language that may refer to military service. Certain scholars argue that the totals that are mentioned within the different groups in Nehemiah 11 could reflect census materials, directly connected to the military.

Yet it is noteworthy that the possible military references are coupled with the theme of cult. Williamson observes that in the book of Nehemiah, it is necessary for every activity to be tied to cultic practices. Even when enumerating the settlement of Jerusalem, “a political undertaking has to be justified in the first place as an act of the priestly cult and presented in its terms.” In the book of Nehemiah, this “priestly outlook” appears to be the dominant view (1999:284). Hence, the political, economic, and even the military activity of settling and protecting Jerusalem are tied into the religious

---

101 2 Kgs 25:19 and Jer 52:25 use this phrase in the context of: שרי עלי הארץ (“one overseer who was over the men”).
103 According to Williamson, this is because of Nehemiah’s sense of Jewish identity, which is created through the religious history of the people and the “paraphernalia of temple, cultic personnel and practices serve the wider goal by offering points of cohesion and focus” (1999: 282).
practice of tithing.

But are these men really connected to military service? Is Kellerman's assertion, that this list actually provides information for the military forces in Jerusalem, correct? While many of the terms may also appear in military contexts, this does not mean that Neh 11:1-24 is primarily meant as a military roster. Rather, as Williamson states, “since the movement of people to Jerusalem was largely for defensive purposes, the associated list was drawn up in terms reminiscent of the musters of the old conscript army” (1985: 348). Williamson’s observation appears to be true and thus, the numbers are not meant as military totals, but rather as tribal or familial totals.

Nehemiah 11:3 presents to the reader several issues with regard to form, content, and composition. The verse focuses on the leaders who inhabited Jerusalem and Judah, stating “These are the leaders of the province (דkeydown הַמָּהַוּ) who lived in Jerusalem and in the cities of Judah all lived on his property (בֵּיה) and in their cities: Israel, the priests, the Levites, the Netînîm (דKeyDown הַנֶּתִּינִים), and the sons of Solomon’s servants.” An analysis of this verse indicates that it has two parts to it: A brief reference to the leaders of the province living in Jerusalem and in the cities (בֵּיה) of Judah, and a list of the groups living in their own cities (בֵּיה). The beginning of the verse may function as a type of heading for the subsequent verses which are records of the families who lived

---

104 Lipschits argues that these two headings are of groups before the repopulation of Jerusalem who continued to live in their respective areas (2002: 425 fn. 5). Thus, he attempts to solve the problem of the leaders of the province all living in Jerusalem. Lipschits’s contention does not, however, solve the problem, because the leaders of the province appear to already dwell in Jerusalem, according to 11:2. See Japhet for the use of הַנֶּתִּינִים in post-exilic literature (1968: 354-55).
in Jerusalem following the resettlement as well as the groups who settled in the surrounding towns, specifically to their own property or estate (םֵאָנָּי). The verse ends with a reference to the specific groups who settled in their cities. Regarding the composition of 11:3 in relation to vv. 4-24, a number of opinions exist. The first opinion is that 11:3 (and possibly 11:4a) was a later addition to the subsequent lists. A second opinion is that only v. 3b is a later addition to the material and thus 11:3a is the introduction to the subsequent material. A third possibility is that all of 11:3 is original to the list.

105 Levine (1996: 223-52) discusses land ownership in the Hebrew Bible, highlighting three terms: יֵרוּשָׁה, nahalāh, and 'ahuẓzāh (םֵאָנָּי). Levine argues that the term 'ahuẓzāh is the latest of the three terms and is only used in the Priestly source and sources that have been influenced by it. This initial acquisition of land is clearly the focus in Neh 11:3. In Neh 11:20 the term nahalāh is used to describe settlement throughout Judah. See below for a further discussion.

106 Fensham (1982: 244) maintains that 11:3 is a redactional addition of Nehemiah for the purpose of introducing the list. Fensham argues that other examples of a redactional addition are found in Ezra 2:1; 8:1; Neh 7:6; 12:1; 1 Chr 1:34; 2:1; 3:1, 5. Clines (1984: 213) also agrees that v. 3 is a later editorial addition, “written on the basis of v. 20” by the same person who inserted 11:25-36 into the material. Williamson sees 11:3-4a as a later editorial addition. Further, he points out that “the involvement of the editor in the composition is suggested by the fact that the heading does not so much introduce the list that follows as look back to chap. 7 where the members of all these different groups are found” (1985: 348). Lipschits (2002: 425, fn 5) asserts that the editor who constructed 11:3 put together two statements, written as headings, but without any following lists. Moreover, Lipschits sees the structure of 11:3a as following an established formula for Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The formula is made up of three parts: It opens with הַלָּל (“and these are”), then it provides the title or status of the people cataloged in the list, and finally provides the historical context that the list is based on by using a conjunction of הִנְּמָלֵל followed by מַהוֹי and then מִ. Therefore, the list is created “by means of a conjunctive letter or word (…ל… מַהוֹי…ל), a verb referring to the main subject of the list, a definition of the place, and usually also a definition of the time to which the list refers.” See also Ezra 2:1; 8:1; Neh 7:6; 12:1; 1 Chr 1:34; 2:1; 3:1, and 5, for comparison.

107 See Blenkinsopp (1988: 322) and Clines (1984: 213). Batten maintains that 11:3a was an introduction to a list and 11:3b should be connected to 11:20 (1913: 266-67).
The narrative in 11:3a discusses the leaders of the province who resided in Jerusalem, as well as provides a reference to the people who settled in the cities (\textit{ןֵבִים}) of Judah. These peoples are then enumerated as the “Israelites, priests, Levites, \textit{Netînîm}, and sons of Solomon’s servants.”\textsuperscript{108} Although certain scholars assert that this list introduces the following material found in 4-24, evidence does not support this case.\textsuperscript{109} There are a number of people, such as those in administrative positions that are not mentioned in 11:3b, but found in vv. 4-24. Since differences exist in the groups mentioned in 11:3b from vv. 4-24, this list should be viewed as the settlers to Judah, not specifically Jerusalem, especially since v. 20 refers explicitly to outside Jerusalem.

Moreover, the material found in 11:3a functions as a type of introduction (or heading) to the subsequent list that really begins in 11:4b (“Of the Judahites: Athaiah son of Uzziah”). MT Neh 11:3a mentions the “leaders of the province” (דֶּקָנָי הַמַּעֲשֵׂרִים)), which appears to refer to some type of administrative unit. The Aramaic term, \textit{סְפָרים} (“provinces”), also appears in several post-exilic texts, including Esther (1:1, 13; and

\textsuperscript{108} Williamson (1985: 342-3 fn 3a) observes that “the editor realized that the previous talk had all been of people settling in their own towns; cf. chap.7. To make sure that the list he introduced will not be misunderstood, he concedes this point only in order to insist that nevertheless there were some who settled in Jerusalem.” This was done through the use of a concessive clause. He translates this as such: “These are the chiefs of the provinces who settled in Jerusalem; although Israel, the priests, the Levites, the temple servants, and the sons of Solomon’s servants settled in the towns of Judah, each in their own property in their towns.”

\textsuperscript{109} Lipschits astutely observes that Neh 11:3 is the heading of a secondary list placed into a larger list, pointing to several examples where subgroups were meant to be distinguished from the larger groups (cf. Ezra 2:61; 1 Chr 3:10, 22; 4:13, 15, 19, and also Gen 36:31). His argument, however, poses a problem when he asserts that the people mentioned in the heading include “all sections of the people detailed in the list in vv. 4-24” (2002: 425 fn 6). While the priests, Levites, and the \textit{Netînîm} are included in the MT material, the sons of Solomon’s servants are never clearly defined or delineated.
2:3), Daniel (2:48, 49; 11:24), Ezra (2:1; 4:15; 5:8; 6:2; 7:16), and Nehemiah (1:3 and 7:6). While 11:3a introduces the lists in vv. 4b-24, 11:3b-4a does not follow the same theme and appears to be a later addition. This addition is evident in the inclusio, “they resided in Jerusalem” (שֵׁבַר בֵּיתֵיהֶם) and in the inverted repetition of this phrase in 4a, “in Jerusalem they resided” (בֵּיתֵיהֶם שֵׁבַר). The later editor of the material made it clear that 11:3a is a reference to Jerusalem by adding “they resided in Jerusalem” (שֵׁבַר בֵּיתֵיהֶם). After the addition of the list preserved in 11:3b, in order to return to the subject of Jerusalem, the editor added an inverted quotation, מֵמְלָכַת, signaling the new material. In order for the list to make sense, the editor also had to make clear that theJudahites and Benjaminites were the groups who were settling.

Even though each group mentioned in 11:3b is found in different iterations in Ezra, Nehemiah, and in a few examples in Chronicles (with the exception of the sons of Solomon’s servants), the specific order and collection of the people are only attested in this verse. The groups are intentionally ordered in such a manner that begins with the lay population, and then moves to the temple personnel:

Table 2-1: MT Nehemiah 11:3b in Comparison to Other Lists in MT Nehemiah 11:1-24

110 It also appears in 1 Kgs 20:14, 15, 17 and 19; Ezek 19:8; Eccl 2:8 and 5:7; and Lam 1:1. It does not, however, appear in Chronicles. Japhet (1968: 354) argues that this omission in Chronicles is intentional, but does not offer a reason why it was done.
111 First Chronicles 9:2-3 states, “and the first to settle in their towns, on their property, were Israelites, priests, Levites, and Netînîm, while some of the Judahites, Benjaminites, Ephraimites, and Manassehites settled in Jerusalem” (והཁניחוּנ לארשא הכהנים לחנים ונתינים בן ירrelude ונתינים לארשא שמה מרבני)- First Chr 9:2-3 is almost identical to Neh 11:3, but with a few key differences, including a reference to the Ephraimites and Manassehites as well as the absence of the sons of Solomon’s servants. See Japhet (1968) for a discussion of the absence of the sons of Solomon’s servants in Chronicles.
112 This list is based off of Sparks’s (2008: 92) chart on the groups and order in which they appear in Nehemiah. He divides Nehemiah 11 as such: vv. 3-4, vv. 4-19; and vv.
The lists in Nehemiah generally begin with the lay people, who are then followed by the cultic personnel. Among the lists of cultic personnel, typically the priests and the Levites are mentioned first and when additional groups are recorded with them, they generally appear after the priests and Levites. The exception to this pattern in the book of Nehemiah occurs when the priests are mentioned after the singers and gatekeepers (13:5). Additionally, the list in 11:3b mirrors the list in Neh 11:20-21, with the exception of the reference to the sons of Solomon’s servants.

Though MT Neh 11:3b is made up of some well-known pairings, such as the leading priests and the Levites (cf. 1 Chr 13:2; 2 Chr 8:15. 23:4; Ezra 3:12; Neh 13:30; 1 Esd 1:7, 8:10), other elements of the cultic community are less common, such as the Netînîm and the sons of Solomon’s servants. Israel, the priests, and the Levites, are found grouped together in Ezra 6:17//1 Esd 7:6 and Ezra 10:15//1 Esd 8:96, but do not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neh 11:3b</th>
<th>Neh 11:4-19</th>
<th>Neh 11:20-21</th>
<th>Neh 11:22-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>Levites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Levites</td>
<td>Levites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levites</td>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>Levites</td>
<td>Levites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netînîm</td>
<td>Singers</td>
<td>Netînîm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sons of Solomon’s Servants</td>
<td>Gatekeepers</td>
<td>Levites</td>
<td>Judah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within his chart, he also includes other Nehemiah lists in this order: 7:7-60, 10:1-27, 8:13, 12:12-25, 12:1-9, 10:34, 10:28, 7:73, 9:38, 13:5, and 7:1. Sparks, presumably, orders the lists in Nehemiah in this order based on the patterns of the groups mentioned. Sparks also has generated a comprehensive chart listing the order of groups in the post-exilic community, mentioned in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah (123-24). I have added Neh 11:22-24 to Sparks’s material.


Sparks (2008: 92) provides a helpful chart of the order of groups that appear in Nehemiah.
include the *Netînîm* or the sons of Solomon’s servants.\(^{115}\) The *Netînîm* and the sons of Solomon’s servants are also catalogued together in Ezra 2:58//1 Esd 5:35 Neh 7:60.\(^{116}\) But the three most prevalent groups that are present on other lists are Israel, the priests, and Levites. The designation “Israel” in Ezra and Nehemiah is commonly used to delineate the Judahites and Benjaminites (cf. Ezra 4:1; 7:14; 10:9; Neh 11:4), specifically the Judahites and Benjaminites who were part of the *benê-hagôlâ*.\(^{117}\) In fact the classifications, Judah and Benjamin, are relatively uncommon in Ezra and Nehemiah.

Likewise, the *Netînîm* are cited in Ezra (2:43, 58, 70; 7:7, 24; 8:17, 20), Nehemiah (3:26, 31; 7:46, 60, 73; 10:28; 11:3, 21), and 1 Chronicles (9:2).\(^{118}\) This particular name for workers in the Temple, which literally means “the given ones,” only appears in the biblical material during the post-exilic period.\(^{119}\) The name *Netînîm* is derived from נֶטְיִנִים.

\(^{115}\) Although the groups are the same in the MT and LXX, there are some noteworthy text-critical differences between MT Ezra 6:17 and 1 Esd 7:6.

\(^{116}\) The totals are different in the MT and LXX. 1 Esdras preserves a total for the *Netînîm* and sons of Solomon’s servants as 372, whereas Ezra 2:58 and Neh 7:60 preserve a total for the same groups as 392.

\(^{117}\) Blenkinsopp (1988: 52). Ben Zvi (1995: 96) argues that there is both an “explicit and implicit claim that Yehudite Israel consists only of the returnees and the connoted message that Yehudite Israel is “all Israel” are well attested” in Ezra and Nehemiah. See also Grabbe (1993: 13) who argues that Israel in Ezra and Nehemiah only refers to the returnees, not the Judahites who did not go into exile.

\(^{118}\) In the case of LXX 1 Chr 9:2, the term *Netînîm* is rendered ὴὶ δὲδομένοι (“the devoted ones”). But in Ezra and Nehemiah, Netînîm is always transcribed as ὴὶ νακινοῖ (cf. Ezra 2:43; Neh 11:3), ὴὶ νακινιμ (cf. Ezra 2:58; 7:7; 8:17 [ketib], 20; Neh 3:26), or ὴὶ (naqin in (only in Ezra 2:58). Levine argues that this shows that the LXX writers of Ezra and Nehemiah did not understand who the *Netînîm* were (1973: 104). In 1 Esd 5:35, the LXX translates temple servants ὴὶ ἱερὸδουλοῖ, which may point to the later date of this text.

\(^{119}\) Many scholars argue their roots must have been in the pre-exilic period, including Weinberg (1992: 91), who asserts they were craftsmen or servants working for the crown and were deported with other Jerusalem residents. Williamson (1985: 35-36) also believes they were part of the pre-exilic community, but with clear cultic connections.
(to give), describing the position of the people who were given to serve in the Temple.\textsuperscript{120} According to Neh 3:26 and 11:21, the \textit{Netînîm} resided on the Ophel. Nehemiah 3:31 specifically mentions the “house of the \textit{Netînîm}” (דְּבַרֹת נֵטִֹנִים). Ezra 8:20 states that the \textit{Netînîm} were a group that “David and the officials appointed to work for the Levites.” Following Ezra 8:20, Williamson observes that just as the Levites served the priests, the temple servants may have served the Levites.\textsuperscript{121} Levine, however, is skeptical vis-à-vis the “servile status” of the \textit{Netînîm} to the Levites because the Levites also were in “service” to the Temple (cf. Num 8:19, 23-26).\textsuperscript{122} But service to the Temple and service to the Levites are not necessarily mutually exclusive and thus, do not preclude the \textit{Netînîm} from “serving” the Levites.

Nehemiah 10:29-30 also refers to the \textit{Netînîm} among the people who signed the covenant. The oath that they took had several aspects, but most notably it states, “We will not give our daughters in marriage to the peoples of the land, or take their daughters for our sons” (10:31). In the Neh 11:3 occurrence, they are listed as one of the “heads of the province.” Based on the references in Chronicles, Ezra, and MT Nehemiah, they are

\textsuperscript{120} Levine (1963: 208) argues that in the Near Eastern context, this term may have earlier roots in Ugaritic, \textit{ytnm}, which is a reference to a member belonging to a guild. Weinberg (1992: 79) questions this connection, pointing out that in certain examples (i.e. C115 (UT 301)) the word is used in connection to a tax on wine and states, “register of paying taxes” (\textit{spr ytnm}) which has no connection to temple servants. It is unclear, however, if the \textit{Netînîm} are collecting payments, gifts, or taxes at the Temple.

\textsuperscript{121} Williamson asserts that “even if this statement has to be read in the light of the tendency anachronistically to ascribe all the ordering of the cultic officials to David, it nevertheless stands as an incontrovertible witness to their status in the writer’s own day” (1985:35).

\textsuperscript{122} Levine (1963: 208) comments that in Ezra 8:20, the verb \textit{Ntn} “does not imply slavery here any more than it does when applied to the Levites (Num 3:9; 8:19; 1 Chr 6:33).”
clearly understood to be temple personnel and also part of the community. While they were part of the people who signed the covenant, along with the priests, Levites, gatekeepers, and singers, their order within the list in Neh 11:3 and 1 Chr 9:2, points to their secondary or tertiary status within the community. Hence, the Netînîm were included as membership of the cultic community of settlers to Judah, subject to certain purity laws such as the prohibition against intermarriage (according to Nehemiah), yet still considered a lower rank than the priests and Levites.

In later Jewish tradition, most notably the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Halakah, the Netînîm were connected to the Gibeonites who were enslaved during the time of Joshua (Josh 9:23, 27). These later traditions have directly influenced the way some modern scholars see the Netînîm in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. It is commonly argued that the Netînîm as well as the sons of Solomon’s servants were the offspring of foreign captives because of the high number of foreign names, as well as the large number of non-Yahwistic names particularly evident in Ezra 2:43-54//Neh 7:46-57. While Zadok

---

123 Contra Weinberg (1992: 88-89) who argues that the Netînîm and also the sons of Solomon’s servants were manual laborers, who lived on the Ophel along with other workers and merchants and not directly involved in cultic practices.
124 See 4Q340 (list of the Netînîm) and Yebamoth 78b-79a.
125 Influenced by the Dead Sea Scrolls and Mishnaic traditions, Haran attempts to differentiate between the Gibeonites and the Netînîm. He avers that “Gibeonite” is a term that carries a more “ethno-territorial significance” while the Netînîm is a more “functional” title, referring to a “conglomeration of ethnically heterogenous slaves who had been welded into a distinctive social entity only by the harsh necessity of their common fate.” He then argues that the descendants of the Gibeonites became part of the Netînîm during the post-exilic period (1961: 156-66). Contra Haran, Levine contends that although very little is known about the Netînîm, there is no clear evidence to imply that they were slaves (1963: 207-12; cf. Mendelsohn 1949; Williamson 1985). Rather, they were “devoted” to the Temple, but not enslaved.
has convincingly shown that even though many of the *Netînîm* and the descendants of Solomon’s servants who are listed in Ezra 2:43-54 and Neh 7:46-57 have foreign names, this does not mean they were slaves.\(^{127}\) Their presence within these lists, however, points to their importance within the cultic community. In fact, their presence within the cultic community points to their acceptance. There are no references to their foreign roots at all—only their participation in the resettlement of Jerusalem.

The appearance of the *Netînîm* in MT Neh 11:3 and 21 provides a point on the compositional horizon of this particular Nehemiah text. As previously mentioned, the *Netînîm* only appear in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. In fact, they are conspicuously absent from early Persian period material such as Haggai and Zechariah. They are, however, referred to in the Dead Sea Scrolls (specifically 4Q340) and the Talmud in negative terms.\(^{128}\) In contrast, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, never make a negative statement concerning this group. Thus, the MT text is in direct contrast to the Dead Sea Scrolls materials, based on its negative view of the *Netînîm*—a view that does not appear in Chronicles, Ezra or Nehemiah. One wonders if the appearance of the *Netînîm* in the text found in the MT dates the material to earlier than the DSS (typically dated to the third c. B.C.E.-first c. C.E.). Conversely, the writers of the DSS may have also been responding to a real situation in Jerusalem that they considered improper. In

---

\(^{127}\) Some of these names also appear in Neh 11:19-21, including Ziha and Gishpa. Zadok argues that Ziha could be related to Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic sî’ā(h)ā meaning “travelling company, or escort”. The name might point to the nomadic nature of his clan. Gishpa may be the *qîtal* formation of the Syr. *Gšap*, meaning to “touch, handle, strike, assault, consider, look at, or inspect” (1980: 111, 114). See also Noth (1928: 63-64).

\(^{128}\) For a discussion of the presentation of the *Netînîm* in later sources, see Levine (1973:101-107).
either case, a closer examination of this group may indicate that the compositional date of
11:3b-4a may date anywhere from the late Persian period to the early Maccabean period.

The final group mentioned in 11:3b, the “sons of Solomon’s servants” (םִ֖ינוֹד הַמְּלֹאָ֖ם) also appear in the post-exilic literature in Ezra (2:55, 58) Nehemiah (7:57, 60) and 1 Esdras (5:33, 35). References to Solomon’s servants (םִ֖ינוֹד הַמְּלֹאָ֖ם) are found in 1 Kgs 9:27 and 2 Chr 8:18 and 9:10. Set in the context of trade with Hiram of Tyre, however, they are paired with the מִיְּבָרֵכֶ֔ים הַיָּדִים or “men of ships who knew the sea” (i.e. sailors). Thus, it is unlikely that “Solomon’s servants” mentioned in 1 Kgs 9:27 and 2 Chr 8:18 were slaves, but may have been merchant sailors since they are paired with Hiram’s sailors who were also traders (Levine 1963: 209). Further, the descendants of Solomon’s servants appear to trace their lineage to the non-Israelite groups that Solomon forced into labor for the state (1 Kgs 9:20-21// 2 Chr 8:7-8). They are mentioned with the Netînîm, particularly in the case of their exemption from taxes (Ezra 7:24). The sons of Solomon’s servants are not cited as signing the pledge in Neh 10:29, and hence it appears that they did not have the same status as the other groups.

Blenkinsopp posits that, since they are not mentioned in the Chronicler’s material with

129 If there is a connection between Solomon’s servants and the sons of Solomon’s servants, this could mean that the post-exilic group also functioned as a merchant class, following their earlier position in 1 Kgs 9:27; 2 Chr 8:18 and 9:10. An interesting parallel to consider is the περιοικοι in Sparta, who were integral to the Spartan community, but not considered full Spartan citizens. The difference between the descendants of Solomon’s servants and the περιοικοι, however, is that the περιοικοι chose not to be Spartan citizens while the sons of Solomon’s servants were in this position based on their lineage. If the sons of Solomon’s servants are, indeed, a class of Persian period merchants, then their position may also explain the job of the Netînîm. This may also explain later Qumran reaction to these groups. My interpretation, however, is conjectural.
the *Netînîm* (1 Chronicles 9), it could be that the sons of Solomon’s servants and the *Netînîm* merged into one group by the time of the composition of 1 Chronicles 9 (1988: 91). This merger is doubtful, however, since they are mentioned independently in 1 Esd 5:35. Yet it is significant that the Chronicler never refers to the sons of Solomon’s servants, since they are part of the Temple community in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Although the exact status of the sons of Solomon’s servants during the post-exilic period is ambiguous (based on the post-exilic references to them) they occupied an important position since they are listed with the priests and the Levites in Neh 11:3. Yet, they are listed last among the cultic personnel, which may indeed reflect their secondary nature within the cultic community. Additionally, their leaders are not enumerated in Neh 11:4-24—a conspicuous absence when compared to the previous groups listed. In fact, other lists that have similar characteristics as seen in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 which mention the "sons of Solomon's servants" (טָלָֹמָה). In Ezra 2:55-58//Neh 7:57-60, they appear after a list of the lay people (Ezra 2:3-35//Neh 7:8-38), priests (Ezra 2:36-39//Neh 7:39-42), Levites (Ezra 2:40//Neh 7:43), singers (Ezra 2:41//Neh 7:33), gatekeepers (Ezra 2:42//Neh 7:45), and *Netînîm* (Ezra 2:43-54//Neh 7:56). Further, in Ezra 2:58//Neh 7:60, unlike the other groups whose numbers are totaled individually, the *Netînîm* and the sons of Solomon’s servants are totaled together. The appearance of the sons of Solomon's servants within the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah indicate that they are considered important enough to be mentioned among the people who were part of the resettlement, but not important enough to be enumerated individually.

---

130 In Ezra and Nehemiah, it is common for these two groups to be grouped together.
Additionally, the order of the groups in Neh 11:3 follows a clear post-exilic pattern, which points to an already established precedent of how groups connected to the Temple are listed. This order also delineates the members who were part of the cultic community and those who were considered part of “Israel”. Within the community connected to the Temple, the book of Nehemiah generally gives priority to the priests and the Levites, which reflects their primacy over the other members of the cultic staff who played secondary roles. This preference may be due to either the viewpoint of the writers of Nehemiah or the time period in which the lists are constructed (Sparks 2008: 93), yet it is clear that the priority of the priests and Levites over the other temple personnel was a long established tradition.

MT Neh 11:4-19 and 21-24 concentrates on the inhabitants of Jerusalem, by the Judahites (11:4-6), Benjaminites (11:7-9), priests (10-14), Levites (11:15-18), gatekeepers (11:19), Netīnīm (11:21), Levitical overseers (11:22-23), and an advisor to the king (11:24). MT Neh 11:20 moves away from Jerusalem and centers on “the rest of Israel” residing throughout Judah. In general, Neh 11:1-19 and 20-24 focus on the settlers, their positions, and in some cases, their genealogies. The genealogies are extensive in many cases, tying people back to the distant past, but they still remain focused on key families who resettled Jerusalem.

The settlement of Jerusalem begins with the Judahite lineages (11:4b-6) through the descendants of the sons of Judah: Perez and Shelah. The first Judahite lineage provides a seven-person ascending genealogy, from Athaiah to the line of Perez. This same Perez is mentioned as the son of the patriarch Judah in Gen 46:12, Num 26:20, l
Both Gen 46:12 and Num 26:20 are short descending genealogies listing Judah and his sons. In contrast, in 1 Chr 2:4-5, the genealogy of Judah uses a long, descending, segmented genealogy to make connections throughout several generations. Further, 1 Chr 4:1-23 mentions Perez (v. 1) and follows mostly a linear format with periods of segmentation. Finally, 1 Chr 9:4 parallels the material in Neh 11:4-6, utilizing an ascending genealogy, but with several differences between the two, including orthographic differences in certain names, the number of generations recorded, and also the genealogy of Zerah, who was the third son of Judah. In Neh 11:4, the seven-person genealogy telescopes Athaiah’s lineage back to the foundations of the tribe of Judah, but notably it does not mention Judah directly. The genealogy lists Athaiah, Uzziah, Zechariah, Amariah, Shephatiah, Mahalalel, and Perez. All of these names, with the exception of Mahalalel, are found in other Judahite genealogies and lists. Yet this particular genealogy is the only example linking Mahalel to these specific relatives.

The family of Shelah is also mentioned in Gen 46:12, Num 26:20, 1 Chr 2:3, 4:1, and 9:4. First Chr 2:4 also lists Tamar as the mother of Perez. Tamar was the daughter-in-law of Judah, who also bore him both Perez and Shelah, according to Genesis 38. Genesis 46:12 lists the sons of Judah (יְהוּדָה) and also the children of Perez, whereas Num 26:20 focuses on Judah’s sons as heads of different clans (יְהוּדָה). Knoppers (2003: 354), in discussing some issues of disunity in 1 Chronicles 2, observes, “When composing a highly segmented genealogy, there are advantages to establishing connections between certain rammages and failing to do so for others. It may well be that the Chronicler and later editors differentiate between elements within Judah who comprise the main body of the tribe…and those elements who were not completely integrated into the tribe.” See below for a discussion of the differences between MT and LXX Neh 11:3-19 and 1 Chr 9:2-18. Genesis 5 mentions a Mahalalel, the primordial ancestor of Cain, but this is not the same Mahalalel found in Nehemiah.
Neh 11:5 records an eight-person genealogy which spans from Shelah to Maaseiah, and also does not mention Judah. This genealogy consists of Maaseiah, Baruch, Col-hozeh, Hazaiah, Adaiah, Joiarib, Zechariah, and Shelah. Of these names, Hazaiah and Shelah are noteworthy; the former because this is the only attestation of Hazaiah and the later because of Shelah’s distant past.\(^\text{137}\)

The Benjaminitc lineage in MT Neh 11:7-9 consists of an eight-generation genealogy linking Sallu to Jeshaiah, which is the only Benjaminitc genealogy provided. This genealogy is unique since many of these names do not appear on any of the other Benjaminitc genealogies or lists, including Joed, Pedaiah, Kolaiah, Maaseiah, Ithiel, and Jeshaiah.\(^\text{138}\) When compared to 1 Chr 9:7, Sallu and Meshullam, listed as “Sallu son of Meshullam" (סַלֹּעַ בֶּן-מְשַׁלָּם), are both found in the corresponding Benjaminitc genealogy of resettlers to Jerusalem listed as father and son.\(^\text{139}\) It is clear, however, that the majority of names in Sallu’s genealogy are only recorded in this list.

The priests who settled in Jerusalem are registered in MT Neh 11:10-14. These three families include Jedaiah, Immer, and Pashur. Verse 10 records, “Of the priests: Jedaiah son of Joarib, Jachin.” While this verse does not follow the established pattern in MT Nehemiah, which is “x the son of y,” Bartlett observes that within the broader context of post-exilic literature, Jedaiah and Joiarib appear next to each other in several lists, including MT and LXX 1 Chr 9:10 (“of the priests: Jedaiah, Jehoiarib, Jachin”), MT

---

\(^\text{136}\) Shelah is also the son of Tamar and her father-in-law Judah.
\(^\text{137}\) As previously mentioned, most scholars emend the MT material from Shilonite to Shelanite. The LXX records Σηλωνι, which can be translated as Shilonite or Shelanite.
\(^\text{138}\) These names are not found in Gen 36; Num 26:38-41; 1 Chr 7:6-12; 8:1-40.
\(^\text{139}\) In Neh 11:7, Sallu is spelled סַלֹּעַ.
Neh 12:6 ("Shemaiah, Joiarib, Jedaiah") and also MT and LXX Neh 12:19 ("of Joiarib, Mattenai; of Jedaiah, Uzzi"). Jachin does not appear in 12:6 or 19, yet there are established precedents for the structure of 11:10. Further, since 1 Chr 9:10 includes Jachin, there is no reason to emend this particular verse.

MT Neh 11:11 records the lineage of Seraiah, the officer in charge of the house of God (יַעֲבֵד בָאָרָא תַּמִּים). The term appears several times in the Bible, most often in the context of people in line for kingship or who had become king. Hasel observes that every person who is called a יַעֲבֵד in Israel "was or became king" but that not every king was called, or became a יַעֲבֵד (1977: 199). In the example of post-exilic literature, יַעֲבֵד is a title for specific positions. In the case of Nehemiah and 1 Chronicles, it generally refers to people connected to temple positions in the “house of God,” תַּמִּים (cf. 1 Chr 9:11, 20; 26:24; 2 Chr 28:7; 31:12, 13; 35:8; Neh 11:11; 13:4). It is also commonly argued that יַעֲבֵד may refer to the high priest in Jerusalem. If this is indeed correct, Seraiah’s genealogy, which traces back to Ahitub, is a claim to the lineage

---

140 See Bartlett (1968: 4). MT Neh 12:6 is not present in the LXX.
141 Since this does not follow the established lineage pattern found in MT Nehemiah 11, many emend 11:10 and the beginning of verse 11 to “Jedaiah and Joiarib, the sons of Seraiah” (יַעֲבֵד בָאָרָא תַּמִּים), most notably Williamson (1985: 343), following Rudolph (1949: 184). While this emendation creates some harmony with the other material in Nehemiah 11, there is no reason this list should be changed since variant genealogies of Seraiah are found in 1 Chr 6:1-15 and Ezra 7.
143 Jeremiah 20:1 uses the term יַעֲבֵד בָאָרָא תַּמִּים ("chief of the house of Yahweh") in reference to Pashur, a priest during the time of Jeremiah. In this story, Pashur has Jeremiah flogged and imprisoned for his prophecies. He is also responsible for releasing Jeremiah from prison the next day. Thus, this may be evidence for the term "chief of the house of God" referring to the high priesthood.
of the high priesthood.\textsuperscript{144} Seraiah’s genealogy also mentions Zadok, son of Meraioth, son of Ahitub. In 1 Chr 5:27-41, there are two Zadoks (v. 34 and 38) within the Qohathite genealogy. In the first example (v. 34), "Ahitub sired Zadok, Zadok sired Ahimaaz," but in the second example (v. 38) "Ahitub sired Zadok, Zadok sired Shallum." Thus, there are three different versions present within the Biblical text.\textsuperscript{145} Hunt argues that it should not be assumed that Neh 11:11 is discussing the pre-exilic Zadok mentioned in Samuel-Kings, based on his position within the list (2006: 104).\textsuperscript{146} But this argument seems unlikely, considering the connection between Zadok and Ahitub established in this list (also 1 Chr 9:11). In MT Neh 11:12, Adaiah’s genealogy links him to Pashur the son of Malchijah through an ascending linear genealogy.\textsuperscript{147} This same Pashur and Malchijah are mentioned in Jer 21:1; 38:1; and 1 Chr 9:12.

Within the priestly genealogies, Neh 11:14 refers to a Haggedolim ("the great ones"). Since Haggedolim is a strange proper name and is a \textit{hapax legomena}, many

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{144} See, Batten (1913: 269); Bowman (1954: 775); Clines (1984: 215-16); Williamson, (1985: 351); Blenkinsopp, (1988: 325); Rooke (2000: 169). Nurmela (1998: 135 fn48) disagrees with this position, citing 2 Chr 35:8, which mentions three people contemporary to each other as מַלְכִּיָּה הַמַּלְפְּקַר the high priest and thus cannot be one high priest. See also Bartlett (1968:12-13).
\item \textsuperscript{145} Knoppers (2003: 405) notes that the placement of Zadok within a Qohathite genealogy is unique to Chronicles. In this singular example, the Zadokites are tied to Aaron.
\item \textsuperscript{146} Hunt argues that Zadok’s position, meaning his genealogy in MT Neh 11:11, is what is suspect because he is the son of Meraioth and not the son of Ahitub (following Ezra 7:1-5). Contra Rooke (2000:144), Hunt also argues that it should not be assumed that Ahitub is the same as the pre-exilic Ahitub because of the “complications” in this list. However, she does not clarify what these “complications” are (2006:104). Sparks also argues that Zadok is not the Zadok connected to David, but rather an ancestor. He adds that this genealogy, as well as 1 Chr 9:11 are significant because this is the first appearance of Zadok in post-exilic literature (2008: 74).
\item \textsuperscript{147} Also, other genealogies, such as Petahiah’s, links him back to the patriarch Judah. See Knoppers (2007: 324) for the significance of this link.
\end{itemize}
different emendations have been offered. Williamson (1985: 343) offers three solutions, including the possibility of a corruption of a name like Giddel, (Ezra 2:47 and 56) or Gedaliah (Ezra 10:18). A second interpretation argues that the term means “a leading family,” or a third option is that the ending, הגדע - may be a case of dittography under the influence of the previous word and thus הגדע is a title for the high priests. The difficulty with assuming that it is a title for the high priests is that every other attestation when it clearly means "high priest" is combined with חכמים or חכמים (cf. Hag 1:12, 14; 2:4; Zech 3:1, 8; Neh 3:1, 30; 13:28; 2 Chr 34:9). Since this is the only attestation of Haggedolim as a proper name, if indeed it is one, it seems more likely that it is an honorific title, but not necessarily for the high priesthood.

The Levitical material in Neh 11:15-18 contains several genealogies and also positions of certain families. Compared to the earlier material in Nehemiah 11, there is more detail about the positions of the people. MT Neh 11:15-16 records the people who were “overseers on the outside work on the house of God” (יִנְלֹזֹן הַמִּשְׁגָּלֶים הַחֲצִיאֵתָהוֹן), including Shemaiah, Shabbethai, and Jozabad. Out of these three leaders, only Shemaiah’s five-person genealogy is provided. MT Neh 11:17 continues with the Levites listing a certain Mattaniah, who was “the leader to begin the thanksgiving in prayer” (רָאשׁ התוֹלֵדָה יִתְהַרַדֶה לַחָפֶל), and his four-person genealogy along with Bakbukiah, his second-in-command. Abda is also mentioned along with his

---

148 Out of Williamson's three solutions, he concludes that it is impossible to know which one is correct.
149 This position could be connected to the care of the tithes and other goods mentioned in Neh 10:38-40. See Williamson (1985: 352).
four-person genealogy as a descendant of Jeduthun. This Abda seems to be connected to
temple singing.150 The Levitical list ends in 11:18 with the phrase, “all the Levites in the
holy city, 284”. This is the second time “holy city” (תֵּיכָנָה) appears in MT
Nehemiah 11. As previously noted, the reference to Jerusalem as the holy city in the MT
is meant to tie the groups together since it is placed at the beginning and the end of the
boundaries of the lists of Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, and certain Levites.

The gatekeepers are recorded in MT Neh 11:19, including Akkub, Talmon, and
their associates. This verse is somewhat redundant because it lists them as “gatekeepers”
(הַשְׁמַרֵי) and then specifies, “the ones keeping watch in the gates” (הַשְׁמַרֵי הַשְּׁמַרְיָּהוּ). The second phrase (הַשְׁמַרֵי הַשְּׁמַרְיָּהוּ) may be a later addition to the
material for further explanation, as Zadok argues (1980: 298). Interestingly, there are no
genealogies within the gatekeeper material. Hence, there is little information regarding
who worked in the gates and also little background as to who these people were.151

Moving away from the settlement of Jerusalem, MT Neh 11:20 states, “And the
remnant of Israel, and the priests, and Levites, in all the cities of Judah, each man to his
inheritance” (הֹלֵךְ הַשָּׁמֵר אֲבָנָיִם הַלֵּוֵי הַרִּרִּים הַמִּשְׁמַרְיָּתֶם)... Several
scholars view this summary statement (v. 20) as the conclusion to the lists of settlers to

---

151 This may be intentional. The writer of the material may not have known exactly what
the gatekeepers did, except for guarding the gates. It is also noteworthy that there are
several differences between the lists of gatekeepers in Neh 11:19, 1 Chr 9:17 and Ezra
2:42. While all three lists include Akkub and Talmon, 1 Chr 9:17 also includes Shallum
and Ahiman, while Ezra 2:42 also lists Shallom, Ater, Hatita, and Shobai. Thus, Neh
11:19 is the shortest of all three gatekeeper lists, and may be compared to the genealogies
of 1 Chronicles 26.
Jerusalem (vv. 3-19). Conversely, several scholars interpret this passage as an introduction to the settlement lists in 11:25-36. Although v. 20 may be thought of as interrupting the flow of the material, since vv. 21-24 return to the subject of settlers to Jerusalem, its placement is clearly intentional because it follows the listing of Israel, the priests, and the Levites. Yet v. 20 also prepares the reader for the material that is to follow. Thus, in its present form, MT Neh 11:20 is the conclusion to vv. 3-19 because it follows the established pattern from 11:3, particularly in listing the different groups settling outside of Jerusalem. Several noteworthy differences exist, however, between v. 3 and v. 20, particularly the use of הָעַזּוּז to denote possession of land (in contrast to הָעַזּוּז in v. 3). Also, only Israel, the priests, and Levites are mentioned in 11:20. Thus, is it possible that they are intentionally archaising this text in order to fit in with the earlier list? While this may simply be a case of a missing וָאָב between priests and Levites, the reference to the “rest of Israel…in their inheritance” has clear pre-exilic allusions.

---

154 As previously mentioned, Levine (1996: 223-52) argues that the term 'ahuzzāh is the latest term for land acquisition. He also adds that although yeruššāh and nahalāh are found throughout the other sources, they “share a semantic range that extends from conquest, to settlement, to legal possession, to inheritance. Although it was undoubtedly true that land owned as 'ahuzzāh would normally be inherited by the next generation, inheritance is not connected by the term 'aouzzah, in itself, which focuses attention on the initial basis of land acquisition and tenure” (236).
Moreover, MT Neh 11:21-24 focuses on other groups living in Jerusalem: the 
Netînîm, the Levitical singers, and finally the king’s advisor. First, MT Neh 11:21 
mentions the Netînîm and provides two names for the Overseers, Ziha, who is also 
mentioned in Ezra 2:43, and Gishpa, whose only reference is in Neh 11:21. MT Neh 
11:20 also states that all the Netînîm lived on the Ophel. Nehemiah 11:22 lists another 
overseer of the Levites, Uzzi, who is mentioned along with his six-person genealogy. 
This telescoped lineage links him to Asaph, who was responsible for singing in the house 
of God. The details of Uzzi and the singers continue in 11:23, connecting the singers to 
the king. By the command of the king, there was an אֲרוּם, meaning “agreement” or 
“regulation” for the singers. In Neh 10:1, אֲרוּם also appears within the context of the 
“agreement” signed by certain cultic and tribal families. This unique term is significant 
in both cases. It only appears in these two contexts in Nehemiah, pointing an official 
action agreed upon by certain parties.

155 As previously stated, Ziha is probably from Hebrew or Aramaic roots and Gishpa is 
Syr (following Zadok 1980: 111, 114). Out of the 81 names listed in the MT Neh 11:4- 
34, most contain theophoric (combined with Yahweh, El, or Bel) names and Hebrew 
names. The other names have Hebrew roots, or theophoric elements to their names. 
Fowler (1988: 31) notes that in the Hebrew Bible, the greatest number of theophoric 
names are found in the post-exilic period, particularly in the books of Ezra and 
Nehemiah. Fowler claims that this is because the point of these two books was to reform 
a new community after they returned from exile.

156 Uzzi is referred to as the “overseer of the Levites in Jerusalem” (כִפְרֵד לוֹדְיוֹן 
ביִרְשִׁית). The use of כִפְרֵד clearly is not meant in a militaristic context. Rather, this 
particular use of כִפְרֵד connotes more of a cultic function because it is not found with the 
particle preposition לְ (like 11:9 and 14).

157 Wright (2004: 214-15) compares this term to a covenant, which is “cut and then fixed 
in written form. The parties seal it with their names and bind themselves to its terms with 
a curse and an oath.” Both examples in Nehemiah appear to have legal and binding 
connotations to them.
king, found in 11:23, was a later addition, echoing the language of 1 Chr 25:1-31, in which David appointed the sons of Asaph to temple service (1988: 326-27).

Blenkinsopp’s assertion is partially correct, since הָגִּיא only appears in the material present in the MT, but is absent in the LXX.

Finally, Neh 11:24 also refers to Pethaiah, of the line of Judah, who was an advisor to the king. Since Pethaiah was “at the king’s right hand,” Williamson contends that he would have been at the Persian court and not in Jerusalem (1985: 352). If Pethaiah were not living in Jerusalem, then it would be a strange place to put this material since the settlement of Jerusalem is the theme of these verses. Contra Williamson, Blenkinsopp argues that Pethaiah lived in Judah and answered to the local Persian authorities (1988: 327). This seems more likely since the material is connected to the resettlement of Jerusalem. It is of note that this verse concludes the resettlement of Jerusalem in 11:3-24, because v. 3 begins with the tribe of Judah and v. 24 ends with this same Judah. Although many posit that 11:21-24 is a later addition to the material, it is inserted in such a way to mirror the material in 11:3a. Thus, the list is “wrapped” in a way that creates cohesion within this block of different lists.

The lists preserved in MT Neh 11:1-24 represent many different groups who were part of the resettlement of Jerusalem. These different groups highlight the importance of the settlement of Jerusalem by representatives from the entire community. The Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, Levites, gatekeepers, Netînîm, and the advisor to the king, represent the cultic and civic population. And, as Lipschits (2002: 440) points out, the

158 See also Myers (1965).
The list has a “circular” or chiastic structure, beginning with the Judahites and ending with the Judahite advisor to the king, Petatiah.


Like MT Neh 11:1-24, LXX Neh 11:1-24 focuses on the settlement of Jerusalem by the cultic personnel and lay population.\(^\text{160}\)

LXX Nehemiah 11:1-24:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The chiefs of the people resided in Jerusalem; and the rest of the people cast lots to bring one out of ten to live in the holy city Jerusalem, while nine-tenths (remained) in the other towns.</th>
<th>1. The chiefs of the people resided in Jerusalem; and the rest of the people cast lots to bring one out of ten to live in the holy city Jerusalem, while nine-tenths (remained) in the other towns.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. And the people blessed all those who willingly offered to dwell in Jerusalem.</td>
<td>2. And the people blessed all those who willingly offered to dwell in Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. These are the leaders of the province who lived in Jerusalem and in the towns of Judah each lived on his property and in their towns. Israel, the priests, the Levites, and the sons of Solomon’s servants.</td>
<td>3. These are the leaders of the province who lived in Jerusalem and in the towns of Judah each lived on his property and in their towns. Israel, the priests, the Levites, and the sons of Solomon’s servants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. And in Jerusalem lived some...</td>
<td>4. And in Jerusalem lived some...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{160}\) I have retroverted a translation into Hebrew in order to better reflect the differences between the MT and LXX text. This is based on the critical apparatus of the Greek text by Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935).

\(^{161}\) Hanhart (1993) also includes the kai oi9 naqinai=oi following the Levites. This phrase is missing from the B, S, and Aeth\(^B\) (15th century). It is present in 93-108, 74-130*-236, 248-381 (11th-15th centuries), as well as La\(^{123}\) (11th century), and Arm (17th century). All of these manuscripts, however, are late traditions. Thus, I am reading with Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935).

\(^{162}\) Hanhart (1993) includes uioj before Iwad, following the La\(^{123}\) manuscript tradition.
4. καὶ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐκάθισαν ὁπὸ υἱῶν Ιουδαὶ καὶ ἀπὸ υἱῶν Βενιαμίν ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ιουδαὶ Αδαὶα υἱὸς Αζαία υἱὸς Ζαχαρία υἱὸς Αμαρία υἱὸς Σαφατία υἱὸς Μαλεληλ καὶ ἀπὸ υἱῶν Φαρεὶς.

5. καὶ Μασσία υἱὸς Βαροῦχ υἱὸς Χαλαζα υἱὸς Οξία υἱὸς Αδαία υἱὸς Ιωρίβ υἱὸς Θεία ιὸς τοῦ Σηλώνι.

6. πάντες υἱοὶ Φαρεὶς οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ τετρακόσιοι ἔσχοντα ὀχτὼ ἀνδρῶν δυνάμεως.

7. καὶ υἱοὶ οὗτοι Βενιαμίν Σηλῶ υἱὸς Μεσουλάμ Ἰωαδ υἱὸς Φαδαία υἱὸς Κωλια υἱὸς Μασσία υἱὸς Αιθιήλ υἱὸς Ιερια.

8. καὶ ὁ πίσω αὐτοῦ Γηβί, Σηλι ἔννακσιοι ἐκκοσι ὀκτώ.

9. καὶ Ιαγὴ υἱὸς Ζεχρὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ Ιουδαὶ υἱὸς Ασανα ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως δεύτερος.

10. ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερέων καὶ ἱαδία υἱὸς Ἰωρίβ Ἰακχίν.

11. Σάραία υἱὸς Ἐλκια υἱὸς Μεσουλάμ υἱὸς Σαδδοκ υἱὸς Μαριεσυ υἱὸς Αιτίμβ ἀπευνάστη ὦκου τοῦ θεοῦ.

12. καὶ ἄδελφοι αὐτῶν

It is, however, not present in the B 107 and MT traditions.

163 Hanhart (1993) has ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως instead of ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως, correcting against the B, S, A, and 93-108, 64-728, and 119 manuscript traditions.

164 Hanhart (1993) includes the phrase καὶ ἄδελφοι αὐτοῦ, based on manuscript traditions 93-108, and 44'. It is missing, however, in B, S, A, 71, and Aeth. I am reading with Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935), based on the earliest manuscript traditions.

165 Hanhart (1993) has a variant and an addition. Instead of ἐπὶ αὐτῶν Βαδιηλ, he has ἐπὶ αὐτῶν Ζεχριελ υἱὸς τῶν μεγαλῶν. The spelling Ζεχριελ, is found in La and the MT. The addition of υἱὸς τῶν μεγαλῶν is found in La and Aeth and the MT. It is not found in the B, S, A, 71, and Aeth traditions. My text follows the tradition of Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935).
did the work of the house, Amzi son of Zechariah son of Pashhur son of Malchijah,
13. heads of ancestral houses, 242; and Amashsai son of Azarel.
14. And their associates, mighty armed men, 128; their overseer was Zabdiel.
15. And of the Levites:
Shemaiah son of Hasshub son of Azri;
16. -
17. and Mattaniah son of Mica son of Zabdi son of Asaph, and Abda son of Shammua.
18. two hundred eighty-four.
20. -
21. -
22. The overseer of the Levites, son Banni, Uzzi, of Hashabiah son of Mica, of the descendant
of Asaph, the singers, in charge of the work of the house of God.
23. For there was a command from the king concerning them.
24. And Pethahiah son of Mesezabel was at the king’s hand in all matters concerning the people.

The LXX material may be organized in this fashion:

**LXX Neh 11:1-24**
11:1-18: The Settlement of Jerusalem
11:1-2: Introduction of the returnees to Jerusalem
11:3a: The heading of the following list.
11:3b-4a: The cultic officials settling outside of Jerusalem and
The shorter LXX list presents both a coherent genealogy as well as a coherent narrative of the settlement of Jerusalem. LXX Neh 11:1 begins with the settlement of Jerusalem by a tenth of the population. The LXX text follows the same outline as MT Neh 11:1-24, with a few exceptions: In the LXX, there is no mention of the Netînîm and there are several genealogies of the priests, Levites, and temple personnel that are not as lengthy as the corresponding MT genealogies. Even though this section is notably shorter, particularly vv. 12-19, the MT the LXX material still focuses on the personnel that settled in and around Jerusalem. It is noteworthy, however, that the most substantial genealogies in the LXX concentrate on the Judahites and Benjaminites. Overall, the LXX has the same general outline as the MT, yet with several key differences in content.

5. MT and LXX Textual Divergences

MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24 both present coherent information concerning the settlement of Jerusalem and Judah, but there are several key differences:
Textual Divergences Between MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:1-24\(^{166}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Differences in Nehemiah 11:1-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The chiefs of the people lived in Jerusalem; and the rest of the people cast lots to bring one out of ten to live in the holy city Jerusalem, while nine-tenths remained in the other cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the people blessed all those who willingly offered to live in Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are the leaders of the province who lived in Jerusalem and in the cities of Judah all lived on his property in their cities: Israel, the priests, the Levites, the <em>Netînim</em>, and the descendants of Solomon’s servants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Jerusalem lived some of the Judahites and of the Benjaminites. Of the Judahites: Athaiah son of Uzziah son of Zechariah son of Amariah son of Shephatiah son of Mahalalel, of the descendants of Perez; Maaseiah son of Baruch son of Col-hozeh son of Hazaiah son of Adaiah son of Joiarib son of Zechariah son of the Shelanite. All the descendants of Perez who lived in Jerusalem were 468 mighty men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And these are the Benjaminites: Sallu son of Meshullam son of Joed son of Pedaiah son of Kolaiah son of Maaseiah son of Ithiel son of Jeshaiah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And after him Gabbai, Sallai: 928.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel son of Zichri was their overseer; and Judah son of Hassenuah was second in charge of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the priests: Jediah son of Joiarib, Jachin, Seraiah son of Hilkiyah son of Meshullam son of Zadok son of Meraioth son of Ahitub, officer of the house of God, and their associates who did the work of the house, 822, and Adaiah, son of Jeroham, son of Pelaliah, son of Amzi son of Zechariah son of Pashhur son of Malchijah,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The underlined passages indicate the material not present in the LXX text, but present in the MT. The words in (parentheses) indicate terms only present in the LXX and not in the MT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. and his associates, heads of ancestral houses, 242; and Amashsai son of Azarel son of Ahzai, son of Meshillemoth, son of Immer.

14. and their associates, mighty armed men, 128; their overseer was Zabdiel son of Hagedolim.


16. And Shabbethai and Jozabad, of the leaders of the Levites, who were over the outside work of the house of God;

17. And Mattaniah son of Mica son of Zabdi son of Asaph, who was the leader to begin the thanksgiving in prayer and Bakbukiah, the second among his associates; and Abda son of Shammua son of Galal son of Jeduthun.

18. all the Levites in the holy city, 284.

19. The gatekeepers, Akkub, Talmon and their brothers, the ones keeping watch in the gates, 172.

20. And the rest of Israel, and the priests, and Levites, in all the cities of Judah, a man to his inheritance.

21. And the Netînîm dwelt on the Ophel; and Ziha and Gishpa were over the Netînîm.

22. The overseer of the Levites in Jerusalem was Uzzi son of Bani (Uzzi) son of Hashabiah son of Mattaniah, son of Mica, of the descendants of Asaph, the singers, in charge of the work of the house of God.

23. For there was a command from the king concerning them, and a settled provision for the singers, as was required every day.

24. And Pethahiah son of Meshezabel, of the descendants of Zerah son of Judah, was at the king’s hand in all matters concerning the people.

5.1. Analysis of the Variants between MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:1-24

There are several significant differences between MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24.
Knoppers notes many of these differences in his study of the MT and LXX versions of Neh 11:3-19 in comparison to MT and LXX 1 Chr 9:2-18 with regard to the compositional history of the parallel materials. Klein opposes Knoppers text critical argument, asserting that the textual differences between MT and LXX Nehemiah are not attributed to LXX Nehemiah representing an earlier text, but rather are caused by “textual damage due to homoioarkton, homoioteleuton, or similar processes” (2006: 264). In order to comment on these two divergent positions, I will first present the differences between the MT and LXX and then discuss whether these textual anomalies are the work of scribal errors, intentional additions to the text, and the like, or whether these texts represent different traditions. In order to understand the composition of the texts, it is also necessary to examine these texts in light of 1 Chr 9:2-18 since Klein’s interpretation is built on the notion that “some form of the text in Nehemiah is the basis for the composition in 1 Chr 9:2-17 even if the present state of the text in both books is not the same as when the chapter was composed” (264-65).

First, Knoppers’s text critical arguments hold that MT Neh 11:3-19 is 32% longer than the corresponding LXX material (227 words vs. 172). The differences in length continue into 11:20-24, which is much shorter in the LXX than the MT, but does not have any other parallel material. MT Neh 11:1-24 is 284 words in length, while the LXX is 201 words. This simple word count reflects the significant disparity between the two texts simply based on the length of material. Concerning the content, one of the most significant areas of divergence is in the number of names that appear in the MT (82) compared to the LXX (61).

While many areas of convergence between MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24 exist there

---

168 The MT is approximately 50% longer than the LXX (57 words vs. 29 words).
169 This is counting every proper name, even if it appears multiple times. In the MT, there are 81 individual names and in the LXX there are 61.
are also several significant textual variants. The differences between MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24 begin in 11:3: The LXX reads, “These are the leaders of the province who lived in Jerusalem; but in the towns of Judah all lived on their property in their towns: Israel, the priests, the Levites, and the descendants of Solomon’s servants.” The LXX does not include the Netînîm (נוניים), which in the MT is listed after מִלְוַיָּהוּ.

*Homoiooteleuton* is a possibility, but this does not seem to be the case. Although *homoiooteleuton* is an error found throughout the Bible, the fact that the Netînîm are missing is notable since LXX Neh 11:1-24 never mentions the Netînîm (cf. MT Neh 11:3, 21). Klein (2006: 266) argues that the Netînîm were possibly intentionally removed from the LXX because of their later decline in status. This seems unlikely, however, since the LXX does not systematically remove them throughout the text (cf. Ezra 2:58//Neh 7:60, and 1 Esdras 5:35). It is unclear why they were selectively “removed” from Nehemiah 11:3 and 21. Moreover, nowhere else do we have an example of this kind of variation.

Another difference between the MT and the LXX is found in Neh 11:7. The LXX

---

170 As previously mentioned, many of these variances have been noted by Knoppers (2000:147-152). Klein (2006: 264) disagrees with Knoppers’ assessment that LXX Nehemiah 11 is older than the MT text. He argues that these minuses in LXX Nehemiah are due to *homoioarkton*, *homoiooteleuton*, and other processes at work. While Klein raises some important objections, he does not address the process behind so many errors in such a short text, particularly when LXX and MT Nehemiah 1-10 are, for the most part, relatively free of differences.

171 If it is due to *homoiooteleuton*, the eye may have skipped from מִלְוַיָּהוּ to מִלְוַיָּהוּ מִלְוַיָּהוּ, missing מִלְוַיָּהוּ מִלְוַיָּהוּ, which could be triggered by the conjunctive wāw at the beginning of each word or more plausibly by the wāw- at the end of מִלְוַיָּהוּ מִלְוַיָּהוּ, thereby skipping מִלְוַיָּהוּ מִלְוַיָּהוּ. The Greek phrase, καὶ οἱ νεφθηκαὶ makes it a likely candidate for haplography since καὶ οἱ + (case) is used of the Levites and the descendants of Solomon’s servants. Yet like the MT, this is not a case of haplography, since the Netînîm are conspicuously absent from MT Neh 11.

172 See McCarter (1986: 41-43) for a discussion of *homoiooteleuton*.
states, “And these are the Benjaminites: Sallu son of Meshullam, Joed, son of Pedaiah son of Kolaiah son of Maaseiah son of Ithiel son of Jeshaiah” (וֹאָלָה בְּנֵי בָנָיה). In the MT material, ב is present between Meshullam and Joed, whereas ב is absent in the LXX.¹⁷³ Thus, in the LXX, it appears as though Joed is a new ascending lineage of the Benjaminites and not part of Sallu’s genealogy.

| Table 2-2: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:7 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| MT Neh 11:7     | LXX Neh 11:7    |
| Sallu           | Sallu           |
| Meshullam       | Meshullam       |
| Joed            | Joed            |
| Pedaiah         | Pedaiah         |
| Kolaiah         | Kolaiah         |
| Maaseiah        | Maaseiah        |
| Ithiel          | Ithiel          |
| Jeshaiah        | Jeshaiah        |

In this specific example, LXX Neh 11:7 may be a simple scribal error, but there are no known mechanisms to explain this error. Since Joed is not found in any other Benjaminitite list or genealogy, there may have been some confusion as to who is listed in the Benjaminitite material. And thus, two different genealogies are represented in the LXX material.

In the priestly genealogies, the differences between the MT and LXX are most evident, beginning in v. 12.

¹⁷³ As previously noted, Hanhart (1993) inserts ב into his edition of the LXX, following later witnesses.
Table 2-3: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Neh 11:12</th>
<th>LXX Neh 11:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeroham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelaliah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amzi</td>
<td>Amzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashhur</td>
<td>Pashur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malchijah</td>
<td>Malchijah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When cataloging the priests in Jerusalem, the LXX records, “And their associates who did the work of the house, Amzi son of Zechariah son of Pashhur son of Malchijah” (אַדַּיָּה בֶּן זְצַחַר בֶּן פַּשְׁחָר בֶּן מָלְכִּיָּה). The LXX does not include “822; and Adaiah son of Jeroham son of Pelaliah son of...”. Thus, the total number of the people who worked on the house of God as well as three names from the genealogy found in the MT, are all missing. Also, the LXX does not include ב before Amzi, which makes Amzi the first name in this particular genealogy. Similar to the Benjaminitite example of Joed (v. 7), this is the only reference to Amzi in a priestly genealogy.¹⁷⁴ Finally, this is the only passage that provides a total for this particular priestly family.

Furthermore, Neh 11:13 has several discrepancies between the MT and LXX, including the number of names in the priestly genealogy of Amashai:

Table 2-4: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Neh 11:13</th>
<th>LXX Neh 11:13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amashai</td>
<td>Amashai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azarel</td>
<td>Azarel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahzai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshillemoth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁷⁴ 1 Chr 6:31 mentions an Amzi, but he is a Levite.
The LXX states, “Heads of ancestral houses, 242; and Amashsai son of Azarel” (לַאֲבָהָיו מַשְׁפִּיתֵי הוֹנִים וַעֲנָנָיו בֵּרֵאֵרֶל). Klein (2006: 273) argues that the shorter LXX text is due to homoioteleuton, and the scribe skipped from "house" to "son". According to Klein, the LXX errors occurred both in the Hebrew from which the LXX scribe was presumably copying and also from a later scribe copying the Greek text. While it is impossible to disprove this reconstruction, it is notable that the copying error could not have happened from the Hebrew text. The MT and LXX both provide the total for the associates of the priests as well as a short genealogy of Amashsai. In the MT, however, the reference to "and his associates") is missing from the beginning of the verse which is a reference to the priestly genealogy found in 11:12. Further, the MT genealogy begins with Adaiah whereas in the LXX it begins with Amzi. Amashai’s ascending genealogy also includes three more generations in length in the MT (“son of Ahzai son of Meshillemoth son of Immer”). Yet the LXX provides only his father’s name, Azarel. Although both Meshillemoth and Immer are found in 1 Chr 9:12, the MT has the only reference to Ahzai.

This pattern of missing names in the priestly genealogies continues into v. 14, where the MT records, “Zabdiel son of Haggedolim.” The LXX does not record the assumed patronymic of Zabdiel, בָּרֶכֶתָרִיהוֹל. As previously noted, several scholars have focused on whether this is a name or a title, since it literally means “the great ones.” Its absence in the earliest manuscripts of the LXX may be due to the fact that it is a later title, which was not used until the LXX list was edited, as seen in the MT.

175 Hanhart's edition (1993) includes υἱὸς τῶν μεγαλῶν, which appears that later LXX versions understood this to be a title, not a proper name. But, as previously mentioned, this is not in the earliest Greek manuscripts.
The Levitical material found in 11:15-18 is riddled with divergences between the MT and LXX, particularly concerning the genealogies:

**Table 2-5: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Neh 11:15</th>
<th>LXX Neh 11:15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shemaiah</td>
<td>Shemaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasshub</td>
<td>Hashub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azrikam</td>
<td>Azrikam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashabiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neh 11:15 begins in the same way in the MT and LXX: “And the Levites: Shemaiah son of Hassub son of Azrikam.” Yet the end of MT 11:15 is not present in the LXX: “Son of Hashbiah, son of Bunni” \(\text{ynwb Nb hyb\#x Nb}^{-}\). Thus, two generations of Shemaiah’s genealogy are missing. This pattern of absences continues into the delineation of the leaders responsible for the outside work on the Temple (11:16). The LXX does not record “and Shabbetai and Jozebad, in charge of the outside work of the house of God, from the heads of the Levites” \(\text{Myhlh tybl hncyxh hk)lmh_l(dbzwyw ytb#w Mywlh y#)rm}\). Thus, if LXX 11:15-16 is missing material because of haplography, then the eye would have skipped from \(\text{ynwb Nb hyb\#x Nb}^{-}\) to \(\text{ynwb Nb hyb\#x Nb}^{-}\). Although both of these names fall within the Levitical genealogical information, there are no clear textual processes to explain haplography based on normal scribal grounds (either in Hebrew or Greek). The missing material corresponds to the Levitical administration connected to the work on the outside of the Temple. The phrase “the outside work of the house”
(הָדָא הַגִּיטְנָה הַמָּלָאָבָה) is a late position, only found in Neh 11:16 and 1 Chr 26:29.\textsuperscript{176} Hence, when one explores possible scribal reasons for the missing material, the classic conditions for omissions attributed to human error cannot be reconstructed in vv. 15 and 16.

Nehemiah 11:17 also has several discrepancies between the MT and LXX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-7: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT Neh 11:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattaniah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asaph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LXX records: “And Mattaniah son of Mica, and Abda son of Shammua” (וַיָּשֶׂהוּ מִכָּא בַּמַּטְנַנְיָהוּ). Both sources begin with Mattaniah and list his father, Mica, but the LXX does not have “son of Zabdi, son of Asaph, who was the leader to begin the thanksgiving in prayer and Bakbukiah, the second among his associates” (בַּשְּבוֹדִי בַּזָּבְדִי בּוֹז אָסָף יוֹדֵהַ לְתֶפֶלָה בְּכַבּוֹקְיָהוּ בְּכַבּוֹקְיָהוּ מְאָשְׂא).\textsuperscript{177} The LXX then records, “Abda, the son of Shammua” and does not include, “son of Galal son of Jeduthun.” These are significant differences since the LXX does not record the

\textsuperscript{176} Knoppers (2000: 149 fn 30).
\textsuperscript{177} Klein notes (2006: 274 fn. 78), “Knoppers…observes that Nehemiah LXX omits from “son of Zabdi” to the end of v. 17 and suggests that this represents a shorter and more original form of the text. Knoppers, however, does not argue that the LXX omits the material, but rather it is an addition to the material in the LXX. It seems likely, however, that a scribe’s eye veered from הָדָא הַגִּיטְנָה הַמָּלָאָבָה (יוֹדֵהַ לְתֶפֶלָה בְּכַבּוֹקְיָהוּ מְאָשְׂא) “son of Zabdi” to the start of the next verse (homoioarkton) and accidentally omitted the words in question”. Yet this is not a case of homoioarkton because, although “Ben Mica” appears before Zabdi, this should not trigger homoioarkton (such as wāw to wāw or bêt to bêt) Further, Klein does not explain how the copyist picks up the text again with Abda.
position of Mataniah. Rather, he simply appears to be a Levite.

Finally, LXX Neh 11:18 concludes the Levitical lists, giving the numerical total, “284.” The LXX does not include the phrase before the Levitical total found in the MT: “all the Levites from the holy city” (דֵּלֶת לְוִיִּים מִבֵּית יְרוּשָׁלַיִם). The LXX has the total, 284, which in the MT is in the context of the Levites living in the city of Jerusalem. The context for this number is clear when all of the LXX Levitical verses are put together from Neh 11:15-18: “And of the Levites: Shemaiah son of Hasshub son of Azrikam, and Mattaniah son of Mica, and Abda son of Shammua: 284.” Thus, in the LXX, the total, 284, is a reference to the Levites connected to the genealogies of Shemaiah, Mattaniah, and Abda. While Klein argues that without “all the Levites from the holy city” the numerical total has nothing to modify, this is not the case. Most of the missing material is from the genealogies of Shemaiah, Mattaniah, and Abda, but other people are completely missing from the genealogies in the LXX such as Hashabiah, Bunni, Zabdi, Asaph, Galal and Jeduthun. Other names, such as Shabbethai, Jozabad, and Bakbukiah are also missing and are contemporary to the resettling of Jerusalem. In the context of the Levites, Zabdi, Abda, and Shammua are not mentioned in any other lists. This is significant since the missing names in the LXX can all be found on other lists (with the exception of Zabdi).

178 2006: 275
179 A Hashabiah is also mentioned in Neh 10:15 (MT and LXX 10:16), but this does not appear to be the same person because he is a signer of the pledge and listed among the leaders of the people, whereas in Nehemiah 11, he is the last name in the ascending genealogy and one of the Levites. There is also a difference in vocalization: In Nehemiah 11, it spelled יְהַבָּי whereas in Neh 10:15 it is יְבָאי. A יְבָאי is mentioned in MT and LXX Neh 7:44 and 11:22 as well as 1 Chr 9:15 as the ancestral head of the singers. Galal is mentioned in 1 Chr 9:16 along with Jeduthun.
180 A Shabbethai and Jozabad are mentioned in Ezra 8:33, Neh 8:7 and 10:15 with Ezra and Nehemiah. Bakbukiah could be the same person mentioned in 1 Chr 25:13. Blenkinsopp also argues that he may be Bakbakkar of 1 Chr 9:15 (1988: 326).
The differences between the MT and LXX Levitical lists in vv. 15-18 are significant. Within these verses, the LXX only has the title for one group: the Levites. There are no further explanation of positions and no long genealogies. In fact, the longest Levitical genealogy in the LXX is three generations in length. It is also significant that the connection to Asaph and his job along with Bakbukiah’s position are all missing. Thus, vv. 15-18 furnish very few details about the Levites, except for a few short genealogies as well as a total for their community.

In LXX Neh 11:19, the list moves to the gatekeepers: “The gatekeepers, Akkub, Talmom, and their associates, were 172” (חַתַּרְמִּים כַּעַבָּר וַתָּלֹמִים וַעַרְמִים מִלְּעַנְּטָר). The LXX does not include the phrase, “those standing watch at the gates” (הָנִּמּוֹן וַתָּלֹמִים מִשְׂרָיִם), which functionally eliminates the redundancy in the verse, and thus serves as a later explanatory gloss. Further, vv. 20-21 are completely missing from LXX Nehemiah 11. Like 11:3b, MT Neh 11:20 catalogs the groups who settled in the towns of Judah. MT Neh 11:20 records that “the rest of Israel, and of the priests and the Levites” lived in Judah on their own property. Further, MT Neh 11:2 gives some details on the Netînîm. Yet LXX Nehemiah 11 does not contain this verse, which briefly describes the Netînîm and their residence, nor is this group referred to in LXX Neh 11:3b. Additionally, the details concerning Ziha and Gishpa are missing in the LXX and thus, Ziha is only mentioned in the LXX in Ezra 2:43//Neh 7:46. As previously discussed, since the position is never mentioned in LXX Nehemiah 11, it is difficult to argue this is a simple case of haplography since there are no classic mechanisms pointing to subtraction.

Further, MT Neh 11:22 highlights Uzzi, the overseer of the Levites in Jerusalem. The LXX has a noteworthy variant to this genealogy: “And the overseer of the Levites, the son of Bani, Uzzi, the son of Ashabiah son of Mica, of the descendants of Asaph, the
singers, in charge of the work of the house of God.”181 The LXX switches the order of Bani and Uzzi from conventional Greek syntax. While Bani is in the genitive and Uzzi is in the nominative case, Uzzi could be seen as the subject of Bani or Ashabiah. Moreover, within this genealogy, the LXX omits “son of Mattaniah” (בָּנַיָּהוּ בָּנַיָּהוּ) which skips only one name from Uzzi’s genealogy in MT Neh 11:22. Again, this is an example when *homoiooteleuton* could be a possibility because the eye may have skipped from Hashabiah (חַשָּׁבַיָּה) to “son of Mica” (בָּנַיָּה). The LXX also lacks, "In Jerusalem" which follows "house of God" in the MT. Both of these examples may, indeed, be cases of haplography, since there are clear mechanisms (*homoiooteleuton*) that explain these absences.

LXX Neh 11:23 continues the theme of 11:22, which states in the MT: “For there was a command from the king concerning them, and a settled provision for the singers, as was required every day” (קָרְפִּי צְפֹת בַּעַל יְזָה עָמַנָה עָמַנָה הָעָשָּׁרְיָמָו הָעָשָּׁרְיָמָו). The LXX is shorter and states, “Since there was a command from the king concerning them” (כָּרְפִּי צְפֹת בַּעַל יְזָה). This would makes more sense if it were a case of the MT expanding the position in order to specify the exact nature of the job rather than the LXX editing the position. And in fact, when one considers the larger composition of the book of Nehemiah, this addition makes sense in light of Nehemiah 10.182

Finally, MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:24 both record that Pethahiah assisted the king in all matters related to the people. The major difference between these two sources is that the MT has more information concerning the lineage of Pethahiah than does the

---

181 καὶ ἐπίσκοπος Λευιτῶν οὗς Βανί Οζι οὗς Ασαβία οὗς Μιχα ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ασαφ τῶν ἀδύντων ἀπέναντι ἔργου οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ.
182 See chapter 7 for a discussion on the larger composition of the book of Nehemiah.
The MT states, “And Pethahiah son of Meshezabel, of the descendants of Zerah son of Judah, was at the king’s hand in all matters concerning the people” (וַיֵּחָדָה יִשָּׂאֵל בֶּן יִשָּׂאֵל בֶּן צְרָת בֶּן יהודה בֶּן הָאָדָם לִעַד הָעָם).

Table 2-8: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Neh 11:24</th>
<th>LXX Neh 11:24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pethahiah</td>
<td>Pethahiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshezabel</td>
<td>Meshezabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the LXX, both the “son of Zerah” (בֶּן צְרָת) and “son of Judah” (בֶּן יהודה) are missing. The two-person genealogy records, “Pethahiah the son of Meshezabel, was at the king’s hand in all matters concerning the people.” Since the missing names are part of a genealogy, they could have fallen out because of haplography. But similar to Neh 11:23, the material appears to be lengthened in order to specify who Pethahiah was and from what family line he came. Also, MT Neh 11:24 is the only genealogy that clearly lists the patriarch, Judah. Following the earlier pattern of Judahite genealogies (Neh 11:4-6), Judah is not mentioned by name in the LXX. Hence, the LXX follows more closely the developed pattern of listing the son of the famous ancestor, but not listing the ancestor himself, who in this case is Judah.

Klein argues that the differences between MT and LXX Nehemiah are caused by homoioarkton, homoioteleuton, or other scribal processes. Although it is true that in certain cases it is impossible to rule out the possibility of homoioteleuton, homoioarkton, or other scribal errors (such as in vv. 12 and 22), the sheer abundance of differences in vv. 1-24 cannot be explained this way. In Klein’s model, one must ask why the scribal copyist of the LXX material had such a difficult time copying this specific material in the

183 A Meshezabel is mentioned in Neh 3:4 among the priests who helped Nehemiah rebuild the walls and also in Neh 10:21 as one of the chiefs who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah. In all three cases, these are different people.
Although repetitious material like genealogies and lists may be fraught with the possibilities of copyist errors (cf. 1 Chronicles 9 and the Heb text of Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7), it is of note that other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah do not face the number of discrepancies. Moreover, the patterns of missing material in Nehemiah 11 shows that additions to the genealogies were necessary at a later date. We may assume this was because of the changing nature of the cultic community.

6. A Comparison with Parallel Lists

The text critical differences between MT and LXX Neh 11:3-19 and 1 Chr 9:2-18 have been examined in detail by Knoppers (2000: 141-168) and Klein (2006: 263-81). I seek to add a few comments regarding the compositional differences between these two texts, particularly in light of Klein’s critical assessment of Knopper’s observations.

Knoppers points out that MT Neh 11:3-19 includes more material regarding the different groups (227 words), while MT 1 Chr 9:2-18 has less material (191 words). Whereas several scholars have focused on whether Chronicles copied Nehemiah, or vice-versa, the discrepancies between the two textual traditions are important when ascertaining the compositional processes at work in both texts.

Despite the fact that several names and positions overlap in these texts, there are some that do not appear in the corresponding material. Also, the totals of settlers as well as the number of names differ between MT and LXX Neh 11:3-19 and 1 Chr 9:2-18. In

\[184\] Knoppers notes, “At first glance, LXX Nehemiah 11 and MT 1 Chronicles 9 appear to be more similar. MT 1 Chr 9:2-18 is only 11% (191 words) longer than LXX Neh 11:3-19 (172 words). These differences do not do justice to the disparities between Nehemiah and Chronicles, because they do not address basic differences in context, vocabulary, and diction with the respective texts” (2000: 152-3).
the example of the positions, Nehemiah 11 includes the sons of Solomon’s servants (11:3), which is not mentioned in MT and LXX 1 Chronicles 9. Other positions that are not found in 1 Chr 9:2-18 that are found in MT and LXX Neh 11:3-19 include:

“Joel…who was their overseer” and “second in charge of the city” (Neh 11:9); and also, "their associates, who did the work of the Temple” (11:12). Other differences are apparent in the numerical totals that are not found in 1 Chr 9:2-18. These include: ‘ancestral heads-242”; “468 men of substance” (11:6) “284” which is a total for the Levites (11:18); and the total for the Benjaminites, “928” (11:8). Other plusses to Nehemiah 11 are found in the people that are listed. They include: the sons of Judah and Shephatiah (11:4); Col-Hozel, Hazaiah, Adaiah, Joiariv, Zechariah, and Shelah (11:5); the sons of Perez (11:6); Joed, Pedaiah, Kolaiah, Maasaiah, Ithiel, and Jesaiah (11:7); Gabbai and Sallai (11:8); Joel and Zichri (11:9); Amzi and Zechariah (11:12), and finally Zabdiel (11:14). When looking at the intersection between MT Neh 11:1-24 and MT 1 Chr 9:2-18, without taking the LXX issues into consideration, Myers observes that 35 names are identical or very close to identical (1965b: 67). Sparks is skeptical of Myers' observation concerning the close overlap of the names, and comments that although a cursory examination may point to a great deal of overlap, this changes when one recognizes that Nehemiah 11 "contains eighty-one names and 1 Chr 9 seventy-one, that is, less than half of the names in each text are located in the other” (2008: 338). Sparks (2008: 343) further notes that there are many genealogies or individuals that only appear in Nehemiah (11:4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, and 17) and 1 Chronicles (9:4, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17).

________________________

185 For a full list of differences, see Knoppers (2000: 153-55). For a discussion of the plusses in 1 Chr 9:2-18, see pgs. 155-160.
Again, this disparity is even more pronounced when the LXX is taken into consideration.

While it is not essential to outline all of the differences in these texts, the question of the composition of MT and LXX 1 Chr 9:2-18 and the composition of MT and LXX Neh 11:3-19 centers around whether one text used the other when composing each list. One view regarding the composition of this material is that 1 Chronicles used Nehemiah for its source (Rudolph 1955; Johnstone 1997; Klein 2006). A second position is that Nehemiah used 1 Chronicles for its parent text (Hölscher 1923: 551-55). A third position is that both Nehemiah and Chronicles used a common source, which was independent from the biblical material (Curtis and Madsen 1910; Williamson 1985; Knoppers 2000). It is difficult to harmonize all of these differences and look for one parent text, yet Sparks argues that one may conclude that either the Chronicler used a different source than Nehemiah 1 or "the list in 1 Chr 9 is the product of the Chronicler himself" (2008: 349). Although Sparks highlights the difficulty of ascertaining the Vorlage of this material, it is impossible to know how far removed the parent text is from the biblical material. When speaking of a parent text, one should hypothesize multiple editions, which is particularly evident in the case of MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24. Multiple parent texts are also important to consider when trying to understand the differences between MT and LXX Neh 11:3-19 and 1 Chr 9:2-18. What is clear from the differences in the texts is that each utilized the earlier texts in different ways.

186 Sparks takes aim at this position, stating “If the Chronicler and Nehemiah utilized a common source, with each author selecting material according to their own purposes, then this list must have either been internally inconsistent in terms of numbers of people, leaders, status of individuals and groups so that as to result in the variations present in these two texts, or each author selected only a small portion of the available material” (2008:348).

187 For discussions of the difference between an Ur-text and a parent text, see Kahle (1956: 3-37). Contra Kahle, this is not an argument for an Ur-text.

Several significant differences exist between the material preserved in MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24. In vv. 1-11, there are only a few differences between the MT and LXX, yet there are major differences in vv. 12-24. In general, most of the material missing are lists of the priests, Levites, Netînîm, and other temple personnel connected to the resettlement of Jerusalem. These key differences create shorter genealogies for the priests and Levites and, in some cases, more of them, since key connections are broken. In the example of Neh 11:20-24, there is no parallel material to this unit (like Neh 11:3-19//1 Chr 1:2-18) that illuminates these discrepancies. The discrepancies between the MT and LXX, as well as the differences in 1 Chr 9:2-18, provide a window into the composition of these lists. From the text-critical discussion, some general compositional conclusions can be drawn from the comparison between the MT and LXX. There are two major compositional horizons that may be safely reconstructed:

Compositional Horizon 1:

• Phase 1: The Settlement of Jerusalem (LXX Neh 11:4b-19): The material preserved in LXX Neh 11:4b-19, that is the settlement of Jerusalem, was constructed first from an earlier list of settlers. The settlement list, as reflected in the LXX, had less material than the list in the MT with regard to:
  a) The priestly genealogies (corresponding to vv. 12 and 14).
  b) The Levitical settlers and genealogies (corresponding to parts of vv. 15, 17, and 18 all of v. 16).
  c) The gatekeepers (corresponding to part of v. 19)

  o Sub-phase 1.1: Introduction to the Settlement Lists (LXX Neh 11:1-3a): As a means of uniting the list of settlers to Jerusalem, to the larger process of settlement in Nehemiah, an introduction of the events that led to this settlement was added (1-3a). It was meant to clarify that not everyone settled in Jerusalem, but only a select few.

• Phase 2: Additions to the Settlement List (LXX Neh 11:22-24): The verses concerning certain Levites, singers, and the assistant to the king, were added
to the list of settlers to Jerusalem. It may have been written by the same author as the earlier material (11:4b-19) but was probably a secondary addition, based on its placement within the list.

• Phase 3: An Introduction to the Settlement Lists (LXX Neh 11:3b-4a): This was written as an introduction to the material found in 11:4b-19, focusing on the settlement of Jerusalem by the administrative and temple personnel and also those conscripted to settle Jerusalem. This was the final addition, in order to clarify that not everyone settled in Jerusalem, but did not include the Netînîm.

The first two phases and sub-phase 1.1 were constructed by the same author. A later author, also responsible for the material in the Vorlage of LXX Neh 11:25-12:26, added the introduction to settlers outside of Jerusalem (11:3b-4a). The list of settlers to Jerusalem (LXX Neh 11:4b-19, 22-24) was constructed in a chiastic structure, beginning with the Judahites and ending with Petatiah, the Judahite. In the center of the chiasm, the priestly and Levitical groups are enumerated. The genealogies and totals are based on earlier genealogical and census records.

Compositional Horizon 2:

• Phase 1: Additions to the lists of Jerusalem settlers (MT Neh 11:4b-24): A later editor added to the Vorlage of the LXX material, for the purpose of including many more members into the community. Material was added to the genealogies and personnel who resettled in Jerusalem. These additions include:
  a) Names, genealogies, positions, and totals, were added to the material found in 11:4b-19, 22-24 (vv. 12, 13-18, 19, 22-24).
  b) The concluding statement about the settlement of Judah (11:20) was added and at the same time, based on the material found in v. 3. The Netînîm were added to the list of settlers (11:3b) as well details concerning which Netînîm were in charge (11:21).

There are several advantages to this reconstruction. First, this reconstruction takes into consideration the compositional process behind the earlier LXX material and also offers an explanation as to why there are issues of flow from the lists preserved in 11:4b-19 to
the lists in 11:20-24. In fact, concluding material concerning the settlement of Judah
(MT Neh 11:20) was added to the older material (vv. 4b-19 and 22-24), and derived from
the material found in v. 3. And thus, the material in MT Neh 11:20 is the conclusion to
the previous series of lists. In the LXX, the material in 11:22-24 makes more sense
without 11:20 in the context of the resettlement of Jerusalem. There is also less confusion
in the LXX regarding 11:19 since it is a discussion of the gatekeepers who are part of the
Levites, and does not include any redundancy with regard to their position. Additionally,
since 11:20 and 21 (conclusion of settlement and the discussion of the Netînîm) are not
present in the LXX, the theme of the Levitical roles within the city of Jerusalem
continues into 11:22. Later additions to the material, as seen in the MT, appear to create
the confusion in 11:20-24. By adding new people and also new cultic positions, the
to the editor of the material present in the MT, attempted to be much more inclusive as to who
was part of this settlement. The addition of the Netînîm is key to understanding when this
was done. By the time of the composition of the DSS (third c. B.C.E.-first c. C.E.), this
group had fallen out of favor in certain circles. And in later Jewish tradition, the Netînîm
are considered slaves. Thus, the additions to the LXX text, as preserved in the MT,
cannot date later than the early Maccabean period.

8. Conclusion

If the shorter text of LXX Neh 11:1-24 is not the result of ancient carelessness or
mistakenly leaving out material, then two possibilities emerge that explain the reason for
these differences. First, it is possible that LXX Neh 11:1-24 has edited the material from
MT Neh 11:1-24, and intentionally cut out names and information from the MT list. The
second possibility is that LXX Neh 11:1-24 is the older text, preserving what was reflected in an earlier form of MT or a proto-Rabbinic version of Neh 11:1-24. Since there is no clear reworking of the MT, then it would seem that LXX Neh 11:1-124 could be the earlier version. Hence, it appears that LXX Neh 11:1-24 is not based on the present form of MT Nehemiah 11:1-24, but rather based on an earlier Hebrew text, which is only preserved in the Old Greek.

Important to note is that in the history of the development of LXX with regard to Nehemiah 11, later witnesses corrected towards the emerging proto-Rabbinic text, so that some of the lacunae that one finds in the earliest form of the LXX are corrected in additions that harmonize towards the proto-MT. Why do these different textual traditions continue until such a late date? Tov argues that there were “a multitude of textual traditions” that arose out of the “insertions of corrections (mainly to the Hebrew) in all known individual scrolls in the pre-Christian period, and to a lesser extent in the first century C.E.” (1977: 11). This is clearly the case in Neh 11:1-24. Since later LXX editors standardized the texts toward the developing MT, they were attempting to harmonize the MT and LXX divergences.
Chapter 3

Where did the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites Settle? An Evaluation of MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36

1. Introduction

Following the (re)settlement of Jerusalem in Neh 11:1-24, Neh 11:25-36 records the Benjaminites, Judahites, and Levites settlement of certain towns throughout Judah and its surrounding territories.\footnote{By settlement, I simply mean the act of populating an area or establishing a person or people in a new region.} This material is unique among the lists in Nehemiah 11-12 because it specifically focuses on settlement outside of Jerusalem. Scholars have observed that other lists contain differences in the area of Judean settlement compared with what is found in MT Neh 11:25-36, namely Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 (the list of returnees) and Nehemiah 3 (the list of wall-builders).\footnote{Several scholars have discussed these lists, including Avi-Yonah (1966:13-33), Stern (1982: 245-49), Aharoni (trans by Rainey; 1979: 411-19), Blenkinsopp (1988: 86-87, 231-29), Carter (1999: 75-113), Lipschits (2002 and 2005) and Edelman (2005: 226-33). Recently Israel Finkelstein (2008 and 2010) has reexamined the settlement of Yehud presented in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 and also the list of wall builders in Nehemiah 3 in comparison to the archaeological data dating from the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Zevit (2009) also offers an interpretation of the Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 material in light of the archaeological evidence, avidly disagreeing with Finkelstein’s (2008) position. Scholars such as Stern (1982: 2001), Carter (1999: 75-113), Lipschits (2002 and 2005), and Edelman (2005) have specifically focused on MT Neh 11:25-36 with regard to other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah.} Consequently, it is common for scholars to exclude MT Neh 11:25-36 from possible areas of settlement because it has the most outlying towns in relation to the proposed territorial boundaries of the province of Judah when compared to other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah.\footnote{See, for example Stern (1982: 249; 2001), Carter (1999), and Lipschits (2005). All three argue that, since there are so many towns not found on other lists, and outside the possible jurisdiction of Judah, the list of settlements in Neh 11:25-36 does not translate to actual settlements in the Persian period.}
Yet simply excluding the list based on its discrepancies with other lists does not answer why MT Neh 11:25-36 is included within the book of Nehemiah, nor does it consider certain text-critical issues that are present. Neh 11:25-36 is preserved in two traditions, as seen in MT Neh 11:25-36 and LXX 2 Esd 21:25-36.191 Few scholars, however, have focused on the differences in the number of settlements in the MT and LXX texts of Neh 11:25-36 when constructing the territory of Judah.192 The MT of Neh 11:25-36 is the longer text, listing 32 different places of settlement for the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites, while the LXX text is much shorter, listing six different settlements listed for the same groups.193 The discrepancy in the number of settlements in and around Judah has literary and historical implications as well as geographical implications with regard to the possible size and scope of the communities presented in the two lists. The MT contains a longer list than the LXX, possibly suggesting additions to the MT. This change in length of lists follows a trend in textual divergences that begins in Nehemiah 11 and continues through chapter 12. Given that scholars have cited these lists for reconstructing the history of postexilic Judah, the little-noticed discrepancies have important implications.194 A detailed comparison of the form, function, and content of the MT and LXX versions of Neh 11:25-36 reveals that the shorter LXX version is a select register of settlements in which certain Judahites,

191 Hereafter, referred to as LXX Neh 11:25-36.
192 These differences in the MT and LXX have been observed by Alt (1953: 289-305), Batten (1913: 273), Williamson (1985: 344), Blenkinsopp (1988: 330), Tov (1997: 257), and Knoppers (2000: 141-68). A systematic study of the text-critical issues present in this particular material, however, has not been undertaken.
193 In the case of the MT, this does not include the one reference to a region defined as “from Beersheba to the Valley of Hinnom” (מַחַשֶּׁבֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל נַחַת) nor does this include “the Valley of the Artisans” (הָעָרְבָּה יְרוּם). This is the second reference to Beersheba within these verses. In the LXX, Beersheba is also mentioned twice, but I have only counted it once in my LXX total.
194 Even when this material is disregarded based on divergences with other settlement lists, the text-critical variants have not been discussed. Thus, the boundaries of Judah are only considered in light of MT Neh 11:25-36.
Benjaminites, and Levites settled, whereas the longer (and later) MT register is much more comprehensive in nature. While both are settlement lists, the MT and LXX appear to have different goals in the presentation of the material. Thus, although both make specific settlement claims, MT Neh 11:25-36 is by far the more ambitious of the two.

2. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of MT Nehemiah 11:25-36

MT Neh 11:25-36 centers on the settlement of the Judahites and Benjaminites in certain towns in the central hill country, the northern Negev, and the southern and northern Shephelah.

**MT Nehemiah 11:25-36:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25. And these (are) the villages, in their fields; some of the sons of Judah resided in Kiriath-Arba and its dependencies, and in Dibon and its...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

195 שְׁם הָעָרָה, “their fields,” is defective orthography, normally rendered שְׁמַרְיָהוּ (cf. Neh 5:11). Following the Masoretic pointing, 25a is usually interpreted as beginning the settlement of the countryside. However, it may be that this is the conclusion to v. 24. And thus, it may refer to Pethiah’s jurisdiction, which included the villages in their fields. 196 Many scholars emend the ketib reading לָו (“and to”) to לו (“and these”). Lipschits (2002: 436) observes that לו never appears in the beginning or ending of lists, but לו appears as the heading of 215 lists in the Bible, many of them found in Genesis (49 times), Chronicles (46 times), and Numbers (41 times). Based on the LXX, it is clear that this possible textual corruption happened early. The LXX reads, “καὶ πρὸς,” which is a translation of לו. If it were לו then the Greek would commonly read, καὶ οὐτοὶ (“and these”). Thus, the MT text seems to reflect a case of haplography, where the final ה was skipped because of the prefixed -ה in the following word. For specific examples of the use of לו as a heading, see Gen 2:4, 6:9; 10:1; Lev 23:4; 37:2, 37; Num 1:16, 44; 1 Chr 1:29; 2:50; 3:1; 4:3; 5:14.
dependencies, and in Jekabzeel and its villages, 
26. and in Jeshua and in Moladah and in Beth-
pelet.
27. and in Hazar-shual, and in Beersheba and 
its dependencies,
28. and in Ziklag, in Meconah and its de-
dependencies,
29. and in En-rimmon, in Zorah, in Jarmuth,
30. Zanoah, Adullam, and their villages, 
Lachish and its fields, and Azekah and its 
dependencies. And they encamped from 
Beersheba to the Valley of Hinnom.
31. And the sons of Benjamin: in Geba, 
Michmash, and Aija, and Bethel and its 
dependencies,
32. Anathoth, Nob, Ananiah,
33. Hazor, Ramah, Gittaim,
34. Hadid, Zeboim, Neballat,
35. Lod, and Ono, and the Valley of the 
Artisans.
36. And some of the Levites, divisions of Judah 
to Benjamin.

197 יַכְבָּזֶאַל (Jekabzeel) is a hapax legomena. Other witnesses, such as the Syr, Vulg, LXX¹, as well as other witnesses to the MT, have יַכְבָּזֶאַל (“and in Kabzeel”). 
Kabzeel better reflects other Judahite settlement lists, such as Josh 15.
198 Interestingly, יְהוֹלָד (“village”) is built into the list with the name Hazar Shual.
199 The MT records יַכְבָּזֶאַל. Rudolph (1949: 188), following the Syr reading יַכְבָּזֶאַל); argues that in accordance with 11:25, a mēm dropped out of the word, and was mistakenly added to Geba (i.e. מִבָּה). But this emendation does not make sense, since the mēm skipped a word and then was added.
200 This may also mean, “Valley of the Woods” (נָהּרֵי הַנָּהַר). The MT text has נָהּרֵי הַנָּהַר (Valley of the Artisans) which Rudolph (1949: 188) and Williamson (1985: 344) both argue should include a wāw prefix נָהּרֵי הַנָּהַר (“and the Valley of Artisans”). Due to haplography, the wāw prefix fell out.
201 Although the exact meaning of this passage is unclear because there is no verb present, it appears to be indicating the settlement of certain Levites among the Judahite and Benjaminite settlements. Blenkinsopp (1988: 332) argues that this obscure phrase may indicate that the Levites were not just confined to the territory of tribal Judah, but rather were also settled in Benjamin.
202 The יֶם is used in this context in the partitive sense to express, “some of,” or a portion of, the Levites. This mirrors the structure in vv. 25 and 31. For a discussion of the use of יֶם in the capacity of a partitive phrase, see Waltke and O’Connor (1990: 70).
2.1. The Literary Critical Analysis

Within the book of Nehemiah, the text of 11:25-36 appears directly after the settlement of Jerusalem, outlined in Neh 11:1-3a, 4-19, and 21-24. There are two references to the settlement of Judah found within this narrative (vv. 3b and 20), but with few specific details of settlement area provided. In fact, they only state that they settled in the towns of Judah. Superficially, Neh 11:25-36, appears to supply anticipated information about this settlement. But this issue of settlement is complicated by the terms that are used, particularly in vv. 3b and 20, which are different from 25-36. What is clear, is that Neh 11:25-36 provides the final, seemingly definitive, portrait of settlement in Ezra-Nehemiah because it is the most ambitious of all of the settlement lists as well as the last one to appear. MT Neh 11:25-36 is most easily outlined by tribe, region, and town name:

MT Neh 11:25-36
11:25-35: The settlement of certain Judahites and Benjaminites
11:25a: Introduction to the settlement of the Judahites
11:25b-30: Locations of Judahite Settlement
25b-27: The Hill Country and Northern Negev
28-30a: The Shephelah

203 Neh 11:3 refers to the settlement of Jerusalem and also the towns of Judah where the heads of the families settled in their own possessions, then enumerating the settlement of Israel, the priests, Levites, Ne'tînim, and the sons of Solomon’s servants. In 11:20, the reference to the settlement of Judah is within the context of the people (including Israel, the priests, and Levites) living in all the cities of Judah on their own estates. Like Neh 11:1-24, it appears that the settlement in vv. 25-36 is situated within the literary context of the mid-fifth century B.C.E., during the time of Nehemiah.

204 Neh 11:3b mentions settlements in “the cities of Judah” (בְּכֵלֶם יְהוֹרָדָה) while v. 20 states, “in all the cities of Judah” (בְּכֵלֶם יְהוֹרָדָה). The list in 25-36 never mentions settling in cities.

205 There is no scholarly consensus on the division of Nehemiah 11. As Lipschits (2002: 424) observes, “there is no agreement among the interpreters on the subdivision of the chapter,” citing Batten (1913: 267-72), Myers (1965: 181-92), Fensham (1982: 243-48), Eskenazi (1988: 111), and Grabbe (1998: 59-60) as examples of the subjective nature of dividing this material. This observation is also true for more minute divisions such as vv. 25-36. I have chosen to subdivide vv. 25-36 based on tribal, then regional location, due to specific internal terminology within the list.
From a literary-critical perspective, by shifting focus away from Jerusalem, Neh 11:25-36 appears to highlight the geographical extent of the restored community. As Eskenazi observes, the lists and genealogies in Nehemiah 11 create a link with territory, and thus “express the book’s intent to depict expanded boundaries for the restored community, united and settled, at last, upon its land” (1988: 115). While Neh 11:25-36 depicts the community “united and settled,” it also maps the largest area of any of the settlement lists in Ezra or Nehemiah, and also draws them outside of, what is believed to be, the area of the province of Judah during the era of Achaemenid control.206 Thus, one must ask whether this is a boundary list or a settlement list. There is no clear claim that the lists of settlement (MT Neh 11:25-36) encompass a defined territory. Since there is no completion to the boundaries, that is, the list does not altogether delineate a clearly defined space but rather zones of settlement, it appears that this is a list of settlements, and not a boundary list.207

Nevertheless, the relationship between 11:25-36 and 11:1-24 is somewhat ambiguous. Indeed, Neh 11:25-36 does not distinguish among Israel, the priests, the Levites, or other groups as might be expected if it were directly related to 11:3b and 20. The appearance of the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites together only occurs in Neh 11:25-36. In fact, the tribes of Judah and Benjamin are rarely mentioned in Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezra 1:5; 4:1; and 10:9; and Neh 11:4). Rather, it is far more common to list the people as “Israel”, which are frequently referred to in relation to the priests, Levites,
and sometimes other cultic officials (cf. Ezra 2:70; 6:16; 7:7; 8:29; 10:5; Neh 7:73; 11:3; and 11:20).

Although the larger framework is focused on settlement, the precise relationship of 11:25-36 to 11:1-24 is not discernable on literary-critical grounds alone. Rather, the function of MT Neh 11:25-36 appears to be a straightforward presentation of settlements outside of Jerusalem, and indeed, when compared to other lists, many of the settlements are not within the boundaries of the political province of Judah.

2.2. The Structure and Form of MT Nehemiah 11:25-36

In order to understand what MT Neh 11:25-36 details, it is necessary to examine the structure and form of the text. While this material may be classified as a settlement list, in order to understand its exact function within the larger settlement list tradition, it is critical to examine each aspect of the text.208 Thus, an examination of the types of classifications that are provided within the list allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the structure and formation of the text.

MT Neh 11:25-36 commences with the settlement of the Judahites, shifts to the settlement of the Benjaminites, and then finishes with a reference to the settlement of the Levites, presumably amongst Judah and Benjamin (Fig. 3-1). There are several ways to analyze this material. The internal divisions of the list vary depending on certain factors, including 1) tribe, 2) region, 3) town, or 4) type of settlement. The different ways to analyze the material relate to certain compositional processes at work in the creation of the list as well as its overall function. In order to clarify the exact function of the list and

208 In Scolnic’s work on Biblical lists, he does not differentiate the settlement list in Neh 11:25-36 from the settlement of Jerusalem in 11:3-24, which he calls a “Name-Personnel” list (1995: 16). Neh 11:25-36 would fit better into a category that focuses on settlement, rather than personnel, since only tribal names are mentioned in connection to specific settlements.
its organization, it is necessary to examine the internal classifications of the material—that is, the terms that are used to define specific settlement types. When one examines MT Neh 11:25-36 with regard to settlement types, one finds a highly defined list of settlements. Namely, the settlement types in MT Neh 11:25-36 affect the overall presentation of where certain Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites settled, particularly regarding size, scope, and permanence of settlement.

Tribal Designation

Organized by pre-exilic tribal designations (Fig. 3-2), the overall settlement region for the Benjaminites is smaller than the region of settlement for the Judahites. It is notable that the settlement areas for both the Benjaminites and the Judahites are within the boundaries of the traditional tribal heritage of both groups, particularly in light of pre-exilic settlement lists. From a literary-critical perspective, Neh 11:3b and 20 claim that certain settlers returned to, what seems to be, family lands. Yet this is never clearly stated in vv. 25-36, and in fact, these verses never make the claim that the Judahites and Benjaminites are settling in areas previously controlled by the Judahites and

---

209 Specifically with regard to Joshua 15 and 18. Both Joshua 15 and 18, however, extend the boundaries farther south and north than Nehemiah 11 does.

210 MT Neh 11:3 mentions that each man was נָחַל בַּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “in his holding in their cities.” The term נָחַל, generally refers to property (cf. Gen 36:43; 48:4; Lev 25:10, 13; Ezek 45:8, 16; Ps 2:8; 1 Chr 7:28; 9:2; 2 Chr 11:4; 31:1). This term may also have theological connections to it. Levine (1989: 172) points out that in Lev 25, the land of Canaan was given as a gift to the Israelites as their נָחַל. And thus, there is a sort of lord, tenant relationship, in which God represents the owner and the Israelites are the workers. In the case of Neh 11:20, it mentions that the heads of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, settled in all the cities of Judah נָחֲל בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “each man in his own ancestral property.” This, too, may be taken as a reference to family lands (נָחַל). This term also has a connection to the land given to Israel as their inheritance (Num 32:18; Deut 19:14), and was kept within family lines (1 Kgs 21:3-4). See chapter 2 for a discussion of these property terms.
Regional Location

A second way that MT Neh 11:25-36 may be divided by region: 1) the Hill Country, 2) the northern Negev, 3) the southern and central Shephelah, 4) the Highlands, 5) and the northwestern Shephelah (Fig. 3-3). These different regions are characterized by a certain amount of diversity in the landscape and topography.212 Within the boundaries of the central Hill Country, or the heartland of traditional Judah, only Kiriath-(Ha)Arba is mentioned. In the region of the Negev, several towns are mentioned, including Dibon, Kabzeel (Jekabzeel), Jeshua, Moladah, Beth-pelet, Hazar-shual, Beersheba, Ziklag, Meconah, and En-rimmon. The area of the northern Shephelah is represented with the towns of Zorah, Jarmuth, Zanoah, Adullam, and Azekah. Additionally, the only town mentioned in the southern Shephelah is Lachish. Within the territory of the Benjaminites, to the north of Jerusalem in the Highlands, the towns of Geba, Michmash, Aija, Bethel, Anathoth, Nob, Ananiah, Hazor, and Ramah are listed.213 Finally, the last series of towns are located in the northwestern Shephelah (a.k.a. The Plain of Ono): Gittaim, Hadid, Zeboim, Neballat, Lod, and Ono.

211 It has also been suggested that these Judahite and Benjaminite settlements were never abandoned. Cf. Aharoni (1979). See chapter 6 for a discussion of settlement issues.

212 For a discussion of the differences in the landscape of each region, see Aharoni (1979) and Rainey (2006: 37-40). See chapter 6 for a discussion of the regional survey work that has been undertaken over the past several decades.

213 Aharoni (1979: 356) designates this group of towns as falling in the central and eastern regions of Benjamin, between Jerusalem and Bethel. In the case of the settlement of Hazor, based on the location of the other settlements, it seems highly unlikely to be associated with the more famous Hazor, found in the northern Galilee (cf. Josh 11:1, 10; Judg 4:2, 17; 1 Sam 12:9; 1 Kgs 9:15; 2 Kgs 15:29). Rather, it probably refers to a different Hazor, located somewhere in the Judean highlands.
Table 3-1: Settlements in MT Neh 11:25-36 according to Regional Location²¹⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hill Country</td>
<td>Kiriath-(Ha)Arba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Negev</td>
<td>Dibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kabzeel (Jekabzeel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moladah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beth-pelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazar-shual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beersheba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ziklag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meconah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En-Rimmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern and Central Shephelah</td>
<td>Zorah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jarmuth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adullam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azekah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Highlands</td>
<td>Geba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michmash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anathoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ananiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Shephelah/</td>
<td>Gittaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain of Ono</td>
<td>Hadid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeboim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neballat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley of Artisans (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This regional classification highlight the clustering of many of these towns within specific zones as well as the lack of towns mentioned in certain areas, specifically the areas in the southern Judean highland or areas to the east of Jerusalem.²¹⁵

²¹⁴ Blenkinsopp (1988: 330-32) offers a list of these settlements according to their region. See also Stern (2001: 429) and Edelman (2005: 226-8). Lipschits (2005: 156-57) provides a comprehensive chart of the different lists of “Yehud” from the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

²¹⁵ These absences are particularly intriguing when compared to other settlement lists in Ezra and Nehemiah.
Town Location

The third way one may sub-divide the list is through movement from town to town. First on the settlement list is Kiriath-(Ha)Arba, generally believed to be Hebron. The common association between Hebron and Kiriath-(Ha)Arba is attributed to the idea that when the name Kiriath-Arba appears in the Bible, it is always followed by an explanation that this is the archaic name for Hebron. The only place where the connection between Kiriath-Arba and Hebron is not made is in Neh 11:25. Why is the archaic name used and why is this connection not mentioned in v. 25? There are several possible explanations: the writer believes the reader naturally understands this connection, the writer is not concerned with whether the reader makes this connection, the writer does not know this correlation, or it is a different place altogether. Based on the ordering of MT Neh 11:25-36, however, it should be assumed that Kiriath-Arba is the same place as Hebron, located in the area of the southern Judean hill country. Moreover, even with the addition of the -ה prefix, it appears to still be a reference to the Kiriath-

---

216 See, for example Aharoni (1979: 355); Carter (1999); Stern (1982 and 2001); and Lipschits (2002: 429 fn 29).
217 There are several biblical references, asserting that Kiriath-(Ha)Arba is the archaic name for Hebron: Gen 23:2; Josh 14:15; 15:13, 54; 20:7; 21:11; and Judg 1:10. Other examples of cities that have an archaic name and are then provided with new names after the conquest include Laish (Dan), Luz (Bethel), and Kiriath-Sepher (Debir). For a discussion on the renaming of cities in the Bible, see Eissfeldt (1968: 68-79) and also Na’aman (1994: 218-281). The difference here, is that it is referred to as “Kiriath-(Ha)Arba” which is divergent from other attestations, with the exception of Gen 35:27.
218 Another difficulty arises in the generic nature of the name Kiriath-HaArba, which simply means, “city of the four”. Boling and Wright (1982: 358) argue that Kiriath-Arba, or the “city of four”, references the cities of Aner, Eshcol, Mamre, and Hebron. Another interpretation is that Kiriath-Arba is actually a divine name with Hurrian (Blenkinsopp, 1972) or possibly Babylonian aspects to it. The name, however, is fairly generic and one does have to question if it is in reference to another town or town cluster, altogether. This, however, does not seem likely because of the pattern of settlement lists in Nehemiah 11 and also, there is no other clear example of another Kiriath-Arba mentioned in the Bible. And, based on Gen 35:27, which also adds a prefix -ה to Arba (גַּרְבַּא) (יִרְיָא), it makes clear that Kiriath-(Ha)Arba is Hebron.
Arba mentioned in other texts and associated with Hebron. This connection may be made because it follows an established pattern of list movement, where Kiriath-Arba appears first, particularly when viewed in light of Joshua 15.\textsuperscript{219}

Moving from Kiriath-(Ha)Arba, the list shifts south to Dibon and Kabzeel (Jekabzeel)--both part of the northern Negev.\textsuperscript{220} The list then moves to Beersheba, the southernmost settlement mentioned. There are several towns named, including Jeshua, Moladah, Beth-pelet, Hazar-shual, Ziklag, Meconah, and En-Rimmon.\textsuperscript{221} Moving north, the final Judahite settlements are Zorah, Jarmuth, Zanoah, Adullam, Lachish, and Azekah, which are all found in the Shephelah.\textsuperscript{222}

\textsuperscript{219} MT and LXX Joshua 15, begin with Kiriath-Arba in the settlement list of the tribe of Judah. See Chapter 4 for a full discussion of this material.

\textsuperscript{220} Dibon is associated with Debir (Tel Rabud) mentioned in the towns of Judah in Josh 15:15-19 and also in the story of Othniel (Judg 1:11-15) (See Aharoni 1979; Rainey 2006). It seems less likely to be connected to Dimona (el-Qebâb) in the Negev (contra Batten 1913: 273), which is located approx 20 miles from Beersheba (Aharoni 1979; Blenkinsopp 1988: 330). Kabzeel (Jekabzeel) is associated with Khirbet Gharreh (Aharoni 1979: 355; Kallai 1986: 358) or Tel Ira/Khirbet Hora (Clines 1984: 220; Blenkinsopp 1988: 330) and is mentioned in Josh 15:21. This site, however, has not been clearly identified with any specific archaeological site.

\textsuperscript{221} Jeshua is tentatively identified with Tell es-Sa’aweh (Tel Jeshua) 15 miles east of Beersheba (Aharoni 1979; Clines 1984: 220). Moladah is identified as possibly Khereibet el-Waten (Horvat Yittan), Tell el-Milh, or Khirvet Quseifeh, which are all located near Beersheba. Mazar and Aharoni (1959: 238) and also Kallai (1986: 358) believe it should be identified with Khereibet el-Waten based on the affinities of the name. Beth-pelet has been identified as Tell es-Saqati, Tell el-Milh, and even Khirbet el-Meshash. Hazar-shual has been associated with Khirbet Watan and Khirbet el-Meshash. Ziklag is most often identified as Tel Sera’ but some, including Alt (1953: 429-35), identify this site with Tell el-Khuweilfeh. This site cannot be identified with any certainty. Meconah is associated with Madmannah/Khirbet Umm ed-Deimneh, which is located east of Beersheba (Blenkinsopp 1988: 331), but this is only a guess. En-Rimmon is commonly associated with Khirbet Umm er-Ramāmīn. Borowski (1988), noting that there are no post-exilic ruins at En-Rimmon, argues the site moved to Tel Halif. For these identifications, see Aharoni (1979), Clines (1984), Kallai (1986), Blenkinsopp (1988), and Rainey (2006).

\textsuperscript{222} Zorah is associated with Şar‘ah. Jarmuth is identified with Khirbet Yarmuk. Zanoah is thought to be Khirbet Zanu’ and Adullam, Tell esh-Sheikh Madhkur. Lachish, the only town in the southern Shephelah on the list, is associated with Tell ed-Duweir. Finally, Azekah is identified as Tell ez-Zakarîyeh, north of Lachish. The towns of
When considering the actual movement from town to town, it is intriguing that while the movement from region to region is clearly defined, within each specific region, the movement is not as well organized. To be clear, even though the list moves from north to south, up north and finally west, there is a certain amount of variability within each specific territory. This confusion is most evident when one plots the known sites on a map. A clear example of this is found in Neh 11:29-30 (Fig. 3-4). After listing towns in the northern Negev, vv. 29-30 move to the central region of the Shephelah, beginning with the town of Zorah, then moving south to Jarmuth, Zanoah, and Adullam. These four towns are recorded in such a fashion that the list, essentially, provides a sweep of the inner Shephelah, which then moves down to Lachish and up again to Azekah. The final name, Azekah, is out of place within this particular list. One would expect that Azekah would follow any of the first four towns listed (Zorah, Jarmuth, Zanoah, or Adullam) because of its relative location to these sites. Thus, it appears that, when the material was recorded, the author/redactor forgot Adullam and placed it at the end. Hence, the settlement list follows certain rules of composition on a macro-level (that is, tribe and region), but on a micro-level (that is, settlement location) there is certain variability.

The Judahite settlement concludes with v. 30: “And they encamped from Beersheba to the Valley of Hinnom” (מדא מראשא שלום נורא ניא דנה). This last statement appears to summarize the settlement patterns in a south to north manner. The depiction of settlement in the MT, if taken literally, encompasses a sizeable area, where “they encamped from Beersheba to the Valley of Hinnom” (Neh 11:30)—that is, from Azekah and Lachish are clearly politically connected in the late Iron Age, according to the Lachish letters, particularly no. 4 (See Donner and Röllig 2002). This letter appears to indicate that if one were in Lachish, one could see smoke signals from Azekah. And thus, while Lachish is a distance from Azekah, it is within communicable distance from the other sites in the northern Shephelah.

When one plots the movement through the areas, the first four towns mentioned are fairly uniform, that is, they move from north to south, sweeping east and west. This pattern is broken when Azekah does not follow Zanoah or even Adullam.
Beersheba in the south, up north to the southern boundary of Jerusalem. Thus, according to Neh 11:30, the Judahites could not claim Jerusalem since it was part of the Benjaminites settlement area. This mirrors the designation of Jerusalem as part of Benjamin, found in the territorial allotments of the Judahites in Josh 15:8 and the Benjaminites in Josh 18:16. Josh 15:8; 18:16; and MT Neh 11:30 are the only places where the Valley of Hinnom (or Valley of the son of Hinnom) is used as a boundary marker between tribal groups. But these three references to the Valley of Hinnom make it clear that Jerusalem is part of Benjamin and not Judah.

Another example of the organizational variability concerning settlement names within a given region is the list of Benjaminite towns located in the Highlands (Fig. 3-5). The list begins with Geba and then moves north to Michmash, Aija, and Bethel, then south of Geba to Anathoth, Nob, Ananiah, Hazor, and finally back north to Ramah.²²⁴ Like the location of Adullam within the list of settlements in the Shephelah, it is as though Ramah were forgotten, and only included at the end. Thus, the regional variability allows for a certain amount of freedom on the part of the compiler of the list found in the MT.

The Benjaminite settlements located farther to the west, include Hadid, Zeboim, Neballat, Lod, Ono, and the Valley of the Artisans.²²⁵ This list concludes with the

---

²²⁴ As previously mentioned, it seems very unlikely that this particular Hazor, should be associated with the Hazor located in the northern Galilee. This may, possibly, be connected to Baal Hazor, mentioned in 2 Sam 13:23, and associated with Jabel el ‘Asur, located to the northeast of Bethel (cf. Simons 1959: 390; Batten 1913: 274; Na’aman 1995: 274-75). Lipschits (2002: 259) however is skeptical of this connection, but does not offer an alternative location for Hazor.

²²⁵ The Valley of Artisans, or the Valley of the Woods, is also mentioned in 1 Chr 4:14 in the context of the Judahite genealogy. MT Neh 11:35 places it within the context of Benjaminite settlements. While Aharoni (1979: 245) conjectures that the Valley of the Artisans was located southeast of the Dead Sea, it is noteworthy that it is part of Benjamin in the list in Nehemiah. Har-El (1977: 75-86) argues that the Valley of the Artisans should not be associated with Ono, since they are in two different places. Concerning the presence of Artisan quarters, Matthews (1995: 460-61) argues that certain
statement, “And some of the Levites, divisions of Judah and of Benjamin” (מִמְּרָאתָיו). There are several syntactical and text-critical issues present in this verse. Since there is no verb present, the verse is somewhat ambiguous. It appears to refer to settlements of certain Levites among the Judahite and Benjaminite settlements (Rudolph 1949: 188; Blenkinsopp 1988: 332). MT Neh 11:36 is reminiscent of the lists of Levitical towns found in Numbers 34-35 and Joshua 21, when the Levites are granted cities within the tribal territories. But in the case of MT Neh 11:36, this reference is far less detailed. Thus, in Nehemiah 11, these settlements may be alluding to certain pre-exilic traditions, particularly with regard to Levitical settlements in Joshua 21.

Markedly, more regional variability and more settlements are described in Judah than in Benjamin. Yet, this is not surprising since both the Judahites and Benjaminites are depicted as settling into their traditional pre-exilic tribal territories. The territory of Judah, during the Iron II period, was larger than that of the territory of Benjamin.

Categories of Settlement:

Types of settlements may also be a way to classify this material. MT Neh 11:25-36 distinguishes five different categories of settlements: town name, town name with accompanying מָזוֹן ("enclosures, courtyards, villages, or farmsteads"), בַּהֲנָה ("its daughters" or "its dependencies"), לְחַנֵּים ("its fields"), or settlements where certain people, מְגֹרָה ("encamp") (See Fig. 3-6).

specialist crafts could have had specific quarters in towns, near a town, or could encompass the entire town. He cites several examples of these kinds of quarters, including Jer 37:21. Other examples of cities with specific craft quarters include Mari, Assur, and Ugarit. He also cites 1 Chr 4:14 as an example of family specialization in a craft and the practice of passing a specific craft down (463). See Knoppers (2003: 347) for a discussion of the Seraiah family connection to founding the Valley of Artisans in 1 Chr 4:14.
The term מַרְכָּזָה may be used to designate two different types of settlements within Neh 11:25-36. The term has been translated in various ways, including enclosures, courtyards, villages (specifically unwalled villages), or farmsteads. The introduction of the settlement of the Judahites and Benjaminites opens with the phrase, מַרְכָּזָה וּמַרְכָּזָה ("and these (are) the villages, with their fields"), which appears to indicate that each of the subsequent place names is thought of as a מַרְכָּזָה, based on 11:25. There are also towns with associated מַרְכָּזָה (villages). In the second usage of מַרְכָּזָה, that is a village (מַרְכָּז) with associated מַרְכָּזָה, there are examples found in vv. 25 and 30 associated with the towns of Kabzeel (Jekabzeel), Zanoah, and Adullam. The term מַרְכָּז appears several times in the Bible, including, Genesis, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Psalms, and also in the context of the Joshua settlement lists.

Following Hamp (1986) I understand מַרְכָּז, is from the protosemitic root חSR, meaning "enclosure" or "court". Faust (2009: 109) points out that חSR has two meanings: a settlement for "nomads in pastoral zones" which is seen in both Mari and the Bible, and also "habitation in agricultural zones" which he argues were farmsteads and not villages (109). Within the biblical examples, מַרְכָּז may mean either specific pastoralist zones for nomads or agricultural zones. Based on surveys and excavations of the rural areas around Jerusalem, Edelstein and Milevski (1994) simply translate מַרְכָּז as "an open place or courtyard, such as a country settlement, as opposed to an urban centre protected by fortifications (Josh 13:23, 28; 15:32; 1 Chr 11:16, 22; Neh 11:25)". I have chosen to translate these settlements as "villages," following Edelstein and Milevski’s work, meaning an unfortified settlement, which may be connected to other settlements.

Lipschits (2002: 426) uses this term to define the settlement list in Neh 11:25-36 because of the heading, מַרְכָּז וּמַרְכָּז. For other definitions of the term מַרְכָּז see Batten (1913: 273); Blenkinsopp (1988: 328); Clines (1984: 195); and Williamson (1985: 344).

Lipschits observes that the term is used a total of 45 times in the Bible: 30 times in the Joshua material, 6 times in 1 Chronicles, and 4 times in Nehemiah. He also observes that it generally appears in the plural form and in the construct state (2002:436). In the case of Joshua, it rarely appears alone (Josh 15:46), but rather is accompanied most often
Moreover, הָּדְרִים has several different nuances, but the most notable appearance is in Lev 25:31, which states, “But houses in villages that have no walls around them shall be classed as fields of the country” (הָּדְרִים אַל־אֵינָם דַמוֹחֲמָה סְבוֹכִים עלָם). This is in contrast to a house in a walled city (בֵּית־מֵאֲשָׁה יִירָה) mentioned in Lev 25:29. Faust provides an overview of the debate as to what interpreters believe the הָּדְרִים are in Lev 25:31. He argues that this term refers to settlements that are not “villages,” because the term יִירָה is used to denote cities or towns of varying size. Rather, the בֵּית־מֵאֲשָׁה are isolated farmsteads (2009: 104-107).

Faust has also questioned the interpretation of הָּדְרִים in Leviticus, pointing out that these were not simply “unwalled villages” but rather farmsteads. And thus, these settlements may or may not be directly supported by a larger city and connected to a specific territory (cf. 1 Chr 4:32, 33). Certain references also point to a settlement directly associated with a tribal region. Within the context of Nehemiah 11, the term הָּדְרִים appears to mean small settlements, which may be best classified as hamlets, with יִירָה (“cities”) (Josh 13:23, 28; 15:23, 36, 41, 44, 47, 51, 57, 59, 60; 16:9, 18:24, 28; 19:6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 22, 23, 30, 31, 38, 39, 48, 21) and twice with יִירָה (“dependencies”) (Josh 15:45, 47). Thus, in the case of Joshua, it most often appears to identify a main city with הָּדְרִים, or outlying settlements.

229 The SP, LXX, Tg., and Tg. Ps-J. preserve a variant in this text: יִדָּרָה (“it may be redeemed”), a 3rd person singular niphal verb, is understood as יִדָּרָה (“they may be counted”), a 3rd person plural niphal verb.

230 Faust makes this distinction because the jubilee law in Leviticus 29:31 specifically states that these settlements are directly connected to their fields. Thus, he argues that “they were not regarded as independent property but as part of the fields on which they stood, and it was impossible to return a field to its original owner while the house remained in the hands of the buyer” (2009: 107).
clearly connected to a specific tribal region.\textsuperscript{231} It is clear, however, that the use of \textit{מהר} as a designation for the type of settlements that the Judahites and Benjaminites were forming is intentional, and in contrast to Jerusalem, which is described as a \textit{עיר} (city). Within the larger context of Nehemiah 11, these settlements seem to be in direct contact with Jerusalem, particularly when one views every name on the list as an \textit{עיר}.\textsuperscript{232}

Hence, these appear to be unwalled towns, and in some cases, were connected to a larger town and belonging to a defined territory.\textsuperscript{233} One other noteworthy use of \textit{עיר} is found in v. 37 in the town name \textit{➔ רכש שリアル} (Hazar-shual). This town name also appears in Josh 15:28, along with \textit{➔ רכש גדיח} (Hazar-gaddah). And thus, the term “village” may also be part of a settlement name.

The third type of settlement that is also used in conjunction with certain towns is

\textsuperscript{231} Contra Batten (1961: 273), Fensham (1982: 248), and Williamson (1985: 344), Lipschits (2002: 437) believes that the heading \textit{מהר} should not simply be interpreted as referring to the kind of settlements that the Judahites and Benjaminites moved into, but rather the “essence” of the settlement. He argues that a \textit{עיר} was a “settlement supported by a major city and belonging to a defined territory. This interpretation emphasizes the central settlement, which is not mentioned in the list, namely, Jerusalem, which extends its areas of jurisdiction over the entire domain that is noted around the city.” Lipschits’s interpretation appears to be dependent on the structure of Joshua, which commonly references larger cities and their villages (\textit{עירים} \textit{➔ שטח} \textit{עיר}). For a discussion of reference to “villages” in 1 Chr 4:32-33, see Knoppers (2003: 361), who argues that v. 32 is a summary of the previously-mentioned towns, and not an introduction to the subsequent material mentioned.

\textsuperscript{232} Lipschits (2002: 437) also asserts that by providing a heading for the list, the author or editor attempted to define each settlement in Judah as a \textit{עיר} of Jerusalem. Although it is less clear in Neh 11:25-36, that each \textit{עיר} is in connection to Jerusalem, within the larger context of Nehemiah 11, indeed, this could be the case. But this is not explicitly stated in vv. 25-36. Faust points out, however, that 80\% of the time that an \textit{עיר} is mentioned in the Bible, it is mentioned in conjunction with a city (\textit{עיר}). Again, this is never made clear in vv. 25-36.

\textsuperscript{233} This is based on both archaeological and ethnographic data. See chapter 6 for a full discussion of settlement types.
The term “its dependencies” (בְּנֵיהֶן) is used in association with several towns in MT Nehemiah 11, including Kiriath-Arba and Dibon (v. 25), Beersheba (v. 27), Meconah (v. 28), Azekah (v. 30), and Bethel (v. 31). בְּנֵיהֶן is a relatively frequent term for a settlement, connected to larger towns in both pre-exilic and post-exilic settlement lists (e.g. Num 32:42; Josh 15:45, 47; 17:11, 16; Judg 1:27; 11:26; Jer 49:2: 1 Chr 2:23, 18:1). In the example of Neh 11:25-36, בְּנֵיהֶן seems to be referring to satellite settlements connected to larger towns. This connection may be based on kinship groups. When a settlement became too populated, a new settlement (daughter) would be colonized, moving people closer to the fields, in which they farmed.

A fourth type of designation is בָּשָׂר, or field. This term first appears in MT Neh 11:25 stating, “and these (are) the villages in their fields” (בָּשָׂר הַבַּיָּהָה מִשְׂרָה). Edelman (2005: 226) cites Neh 3:12 as an example of a city (namely Jerusalem) with dependencies. Neh 3:12 states (וּלְיִשְׁרָה יִשְׁרָאֵל שְׁלומָה בִּרְאָלָה וְשֵׁר הַזָּה בִּלְוַדְוָה). The reference to “he and his daughters” (וּלְיהָדֶֽליָּה) could also be translated as “it and its dependencies”. As previously mentioned, one interpretation is that the “daughters” is a reference to dependent cities of Jerusalem. A more common interpretation is that the text should be emended to “sons” and read “he and his sons” (ala some witnesses in to the Syr). Williamson (1985: 207) cautions against emending the text to “sons” because he believes this is a reference to Shallum, the ruler over a half district of Jerusalem and his daughters. Following Brockington (1969), Williamson also posits that if Shallum had no sons, then his daughters would have inherited his possessions. Blenkinsopp agrees with this position, asserting that this is a reference to Shallum and his daughters (1988: 236). The grammatical structure of the sentence favors Williamson’s interpretation. When compared with other references to “daughters,” meaning “dependencies,” the reference in Neh 3:12 is different from other references that clearly mean dependencies. The inclusion of יָדֶֽליָּה is not found in other places in the MT when “daughters” are mentioned. The other issue is that the suffix connected to “daughters” is masculine, not feminine. Since Jerusalem is generally feminine (cf. Is 3:8; 4:4; 5:14; 10:11; Jer 39:1; Ezek 5:5; 16:2; Ezra 4:12), it is hard to support that this is a reference to Jerusalem’s dependent villages.

---

234 Edelman (2005: 226) cites Neh 3:12 as an example of a city (namely Jerusalem) with dependencies. Neh 3:12 states (וּלְיִשְׁרָה יִשְׁרָאֵל שְׁלומָה בִּרְאָלָה וְשֵׁר הַזָּה בִּלְוַדְוָה). The reference to “he and his daughters” (וּלְיהָדֶֽליָּה) could also be translated as “it and its dependencies”. As previously mentioned, one interpretation is that the “daughters” is a reference to dependent cities of Jerusalem. A more common interpretation is that the text should be emended to “sons” and read “he and his sons” (ala some witnesses in to the Syr). Williamson (1985: 207) cautions against emending the text to “sons” because he believes this is a reference to Shallum, the ruler over a half district of Jerusalem and his daughters. Following Brockington (1969), Williamson also posits that if Shallum had no sons, then his daughters would have inherited his possessions. Blenkinsopp agrees with this position, asserting that this is a reference to Shallum and his daughters (1988: 236). The grammatical structure of the sentence favors Williamson’s interpretation. When compared with other references to “daughters,” meaning “dependencies,” the reference in Neh 3:12 is different from other references that clearly mean dependencies. The inclusion of יָדֶֽליָּה is not found in other places in the MT when “daughters” are mentioned. The other issue is that the suffix connected to “daughters” is masculine, not feminine. Since Jerusalem is generally feminine (cf. Is 3:8; 4:4; 5:14; 10:11; Jer 39:1; Ezek 5:5; 16:2; Ezra 4:12), it is hard to support that this is a reference to Jerusalem’s dependent villages.
The term פֶּרֶשׁ, as a geographical unit of land, generally appears to mean the cultivated land around a specific town. The latter reference is in connection to the Lachish fields (פלשׁת), which are clearly understood to be fields under direct control of the town. These fields are almost certainly thought of as the ones directly surrounding Lachish—that is, farmable zones directly under the control of the town.

The final settlement designation is found in 11:30, in which Beersheba is mentioned a second time: “They encamped from Beersheba to the Valley of Hinnom” (וַיָּקַבְרוּ מֵאָרֶץ בֵּraith בְּעֵיר הֵינִים). In fact, this is in direct contrast to the settlements where the people were residing (that is, בֵּraith versus הֵינִים). The verb בָּאָס, (“encamp”), appears over 130 times in the MT, employing a wide range of meanings, including semi-pastoralist camps (Gen 32:8, Judg 18:11), military camps (Josh 11:4; 1 Chr 12:23), and the Exodus camp (Ex 18:5). In the case of Neh 11:30, scholars such as Kellerman argue that this is a reference to military camps, in the context of the pre-exilic boundaries of Judah (late-seventh century), which were from Beersheba to the Valley of Hinnom, that is Jerusalem. But this seems unlikely since there is no conclusive evidence to support this assertion and since most of the places listed are settlements and not places of

235 Lipschits (2002: 437) provides a more nuanced interpretation of this term. He argues that there are two usages for this term: Land that is in the direct control of the government, and conversely, land that is out of the direct control of the government. For land out of the direct control of the government, Lipschits cites Gen 25:27 (Jacob and Esau story) and Jer 40:7 (a reference to military presence in the fields). For fields under the direct jurisdiction of a central government, he cites Gen 36:35 (A reference to the fields under the control of Moab). In the example of Gen 35:35, this is oftentimes translated, “country of Moab,” but it is literally referencing the fields, or land, under the control of Moab.

236 These farmable zones around the Tel of Lachish can still be seen today.

237 See Helfmeyer (1977: 4-19) for a complete list of contexts in which בָּאָס appears.

238 Kellerman (1966); See also von Rad (1930: 21-25); Williamson (1985: 350); and Lipschits (2002).
encamping. In contrast to the list of permanent settlements, these encampments may also refer to living for a short period of time in one spot to meaning something political.

It is noteworthy that the Benjaminites settlements in MT Neh 11:31-35 do not specifically mention connected to specific towns, encampments, or fields, but only mention town names. In one case “dependencies” is mentioned with reference to Bethel (v. 31). Thus, the allotment variability is much less diverse in the case of the Benjaminites than in the case of the Judahites.

What can we make of these different settlement terms and their distribution? First, it would appear that in the context of MT Neh 11:25-36, the list of should not be thought of as a list of simply small dependent settlements. While the may be dependent on larger settlements in other contexts in the Bible, this is not made explicit in the context of Nehemiah 11. In fact, MT Neh 11:25-36 is not focused on the connection between Jerusalem and the Judahite, Benjaminites, and Levite settlements, but rather focuses on the expanding settlements of the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites. Further, the list reveals a great deal of variability of settlement type. The compiler of the MT list did not attempt to make a simple assertion of settlement, but rather created a more complex picture of settlement by using different terms for settlement as well as different kinds of settlement.

And in fact, when one takes into consideration the archaeological data, Kellerman’s assertion is met with many problems. See chapter 6 for a discussion.

Helfmeyer also argues it may mean something demographic or theological (1977: 17). Williamson argues that the language is militaristic in nature, but the picture of encamping from Beersheba to the Valley of Hinnom is used to evoke memories of the wilderness period in which the people were encamped around the tabernacle (1985: 353). He disagrees with Kellerman’s conclusion (1966: 209-27) that the settlement list is a record of military fortresses from the Iron II period. While there are certain moments of military-type language (such as the use of the term “men of valor” (a.k.a. “armed men”), there is little evidence that these place names in the MT are “fortresses” as Kellerman asserts. Thus, as I argued in chapter 2, the main purpose of Nehemiah 11 is not a military register of the population, but a settlement register.
Moreover, whether one lumps the towns into tribal settlements (the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites) or divides them by region, the MT list is not simply a catalog of towns, placed together in a random sequence, but rather a structured image of settlement. Based on the sites that are located with some certainty, the list of settlement in MT Neh 11:25-36 follows a fairly defined pattern, beginning with the Judahites and their areas of settlement and moving to the Benjaminites and their settlements and finally to the Levites. After tribal considerations, the next most important point of organization in MT Neh 11:25-36 are regional locations. Within specific regions, however, there is a certain amount of variability. This variability is clarified when the LXX is taken into consideration.

3. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of LXX Neh 11:25-36

There are a series of parallels found in both the sequence and content of material between the MT and LXX. For example, there are several points of overlap in the list of settlements throughout central Judah and its surrounding regions as well as southern Benjamin.

LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36</th>
<th>25. And to the villages, in their fields, and from the sons of Judah, they resided in Kiriath-Arba</th>
<th>26. and in Jeshua</th>
<th>27. and in Beersheba</th>
<th>28. --</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25. καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἐπαύλεις | 25. kai prois tas epaulies en agri ev avtwv kai apo uio
| 28. -- | 28. -- |

\[\text{241 I have retroverted a translation of vv. 25-36 into Hebrew in order to better reflect the differences between the MT and LXX text. I am using both the Greek text of Brooke, McLean, and Thackery (1935) and the Göttingen edition of Hanhart (1993). Both critical versions render the Greek text the same (with a few minor spelling variations, which I will note in the following discussion).}

\[\text{242 The LXX reads καὶ πρὸς, here represented as קִנָּת.}\]
29. καὶ ἐπαύλεις αὐτῶν Λαχισ καὶ ἄγροι αὐτῆς καὶ παρενεβάλοσαν ἐν Βεερσαβει 30. καὶ οἱ οἱ ἤγει συνὴμαν ἀπὸ Γαβὰ Μαχαμας
31. καὶ ὁι οἱ Βενιαμίν ἀπὸ Γαβὰ Μαχαμας
32. --
33. --
34. --
35. --
36. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Λευίτων μερίδες Ιουδᾶ τῶ Βενιαμίν.

The LXX material provides a coherent settlement list, albeit more cursory, than the MT material (Fig. 3-7). LXX Neh 11:25-36 may be outlined as such:

**LXX Neh 11:25-36**

11:25-35: The settlement of certain Judahites and Benjaminites
11:25a: Introduction to the settlement of the Judahites
11:25b-30: Places of Judahite Settlement
25b: Kiriath-Arba
26-27: Northern Negev
30a: Southern Shephelah
30b: Encampments in Beerseba
11:31a: Introduction to the settlement of the Benjaminites
11:31b-35: The Places of Benjaminite Settlement
31b: The Highlands
11:36: The settlement of certain Levites in Judah and Benjamin.

The LXX list follows the same general pattern as the MT, moving from the settlement of some of the Judahites, then Benjaminites, and finally a reference to the Levites living in certain areas of Judah and Benjamin. From a text critical perspective, the lists are book-ended with similar material in the MT and LXX, beginning in verse 25a and ending in 243

---

The LXX reads, καὶ παρενεβάλοσαν ἐν Βεερσαβει “and they encamped in Beerseba” whereas the MT states, יָדָיוֹן מָלַאָר שֶׁבַע, “and they encamped from Beerseba”. This may be a case of bêt/mēm confusion. The LXX writer confused the mēm prefix (from Beerseba) for a bêt (in Beerseba). See McCarter (1986: 44-45) for a discussion of this common text-critical phenomenon. But it seems more likely that the LXX preserves an older version and the bêt/mēm confusion occurred after the LXX text was copied. See below for a discussion of this issue.
verse 36. Yet, Neh 11:25b-35 has more material in the MT than in the LXX, and no verse is identical in both versions.

Although LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36 is a much shorter text, both the MT and LXX organize the overlapping settlements in the same order. Reminiscent of the MT, the LXX can be divided by tribal designation, beginning with the area of Judah and ending with the Benjaminites (Fig. 3-8). An alternative way to examine the list is by region. The LXX mentions settlements in 1) the Hill Country, 2) the northern Negev, 3) the Shephelah, 4) and the Judean Highlands (Fig. 3-9).

Table 3-2: Settlements in LXX Neh 11:25-36 according to Regional Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Hill Country</th>
<th>Kiriath-Arba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Negev</td>
<td>Jeshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beersheba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern and Central Shephelah</td>
<td>Lachish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Highlands</td>
<td>Geba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michmash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LXX material moves from Kiriath-Arba (lit: Kiriatharbok) in the hill country, then south to Jeshua and Beersheba in the northern Negev. The only site mentioned in the Shephelah is Lachish. After referring to the encampments at Beersheba, the list moves to the settlements of the Benjaminites. There are two cities in which the Benjaminites are said to have settled; Geba and Michmash. The LXX material covers a sizeable area from north to south, but with little depth. Rather, the list creates an outline of settlement instead of clusters of settlement in any one region around Judah or Benjamin.

Similar to the parallel MT material, the LXX also provides certain internal designations regarding different types of settlement (Fig. 3-10). The LXX distinguishes three different kinds of settlement, including village name with associated villages (village with ἐπαυλείς), fields (αγρός, Heb. תַּלָּעַת), and places of encamping.

---

244 There is no corresponding material to names in the northwestern edge of the Shephelah (the Lod and Ono region).
has many definitions including, a stable or temporary dwelling of different types, farmstead, or village.\textsuperscript{245} Within the first designation—that is villages connected to outlying villages—after listing Kiriath-Arba, Jeshua, and Beersheba, the LXX also mentions “their villages” (ἐπαύλεις συτών), seemingly referring to all of the previously mentioned places. In the instance of fields connected to settlements, like the MT, the LXX only mentions Lachish as having fields associated with the town (Λαχησ και ἀγροὶ αὐτῆς).

The third designation for settlement is found in LXX Neh 11:30 in connection to the second reference to Beersheba, where the Judahites “set up camp” (παρεμβάλλω). This encampment near Beersheba parallels MT Neh 11:30, but without a reference to settlement spanning as far as the Valley of Hinnom (i.e. Jerusalem). The term, παρεμβάλλω, which corresponds to the Hebrew verb בָּ֫לַל, may mean either a temporary dwelling or military camp.\textsuperscript{246} This seems to indicate that these were not permanent settlements, but are places of “pitching tents” and thus moveable.\textsuperscript{247} Even though both lists include a Judahite settlement encamping near Beersheba, the allusion to settling around Jerusalem, the “holy city” is not clearly stated. The cultic overtones, which have

\textsuperscript{245} The term ἐπαύλεις (“villages”) appears several times in the Bible, most notably Gen 25:16, which references the towns of the sons of Ishmael with “its villages and their encampments” (τα ἐπαύλεις και τὰ τεκτονοὶ), Grk σκηναῖς συτῶν και ἐν ταῖς ἐπαύλεισιν συτῶν) in connection to the sons of Ishmael. Other examples include Lev 25:31, which refers to villages, and Num 32:16, which uses the term in reference to sheepfolds.

\textsuperscript{246} The term ἐπαύλεις is from ἂλις, meaning tent, possibly a nomadic dwelling. In Polybius, this term regularly refers to a military camp (4.4.1). Connected to this term, ἂλη means a courtyard, surrounded by the house and other buildings. See Homer (Od. 4.74; Il. 4.433, 6.274) and Herodotus (3.77), for further uses of this term.

\textsuperscript{247} The exact mobility of these pastoralist camps is unclear. In modern examples, a pastoralist group, like the Bedouins of the southern Levant, may remained camped in the same location for many months, depending on food and water supplies.
been offered as explanation for the use of ἱνχ in the MT tradition, are not apparent in the LXX and in fact, a transient or militaristic overtone is much clearer in the use of παρεμβάλω in the LXX, which is the most common context for it. Hence, there is no cultic resonance in the LXX. The encampment in Beersheba concludes the Judahite settlement material.

The settlements in Benjamin are brief, referring to the people of Benjamin in the towns of Geba and Michmash. This verse, however, is problematic for several reasons. The verse states, μὴμ ἑκεῖνοι ὑπὸ Γαβὰ Μαχαμαζ), “And the sons of Benjamin from Geba, Michmash.” Certain interpreters take issue with the μēm prefix on Geba which, they argue, seems out of place in the MT context because it appears to indicate that they settled “from Geba, Michmash”. This is generally emended “from Geba” to “in Geba.” This emendation, however, does not solve the problem of the awkwardness of the phrase. A second reason this phrase is problematic, is because in the town lists in MT Neh 11:25-36, there are towns north of Geba and Michmash. Yet In LXX Neh 11:25-36, Geba and Michmash are the northernmost towns. The LXX states, “from Geba, Michmash” (ἀπὸ Γαβὰ Μαχαμαζ) and thus, seems to have the exact same phrase as is reflected in the MT.

Another issue concerning the settlement of Benjamin is that it is not immediately

---

248 See Bauer (1979: 630). The LXX usually renders ἱνχ as παρεμβάλλω, which is found in most LXX contexts as a military term. See also Jonker (1997: 2827) for a discussion of the use of ἱνχ.
250 Williamson (1985: 344) argues that the μēm has been misplaced to ἐν Γαβὰ “from Geba” which is intrusive in this context. The μēm was originally a prefix on ὑπὸ (“ὑπὸ ἐν Γαβὰ”). Batten (1913: 274), Coggins (1976: 126), Fensham (1982: 248), and Blenkinsopp (1988: 328) emend the text to read ἐν Ἐλλήνω “in Geba” instead of ἐν Γαβὰ “from Geba”. Lipschits (2004: 357-58) preserves the MT reading, arguing that the list in MT Neh 11:30-31 was influential on the writer of Zech 14:10. It is noteworthy that the LXX preserves “from Geba” (ἀπὸ Γαβὰ) instead of “in Geba” (ἐν Γαβὰ), indicating that this textual corruption happened early.
clear whether they settled or encamped at Geba or Michmash because there is no verb indicating settlement type (καὶ οἱ ὦνοι Βενιαμιν ἀπὸ Γαβᾶ Μαχαμασ). LXX Neh 11:31 may be dependent on v. 25, as is the case in the MT, or it may be referring to the previous verse (v. 30), which states, “They set up camp in Beersheba” (καὶ παρενεβάλοσαν ἐν Βεσσαβεῖ). The MT similarly does not have a verb in v. 31. 251 What can we make of this seemingly odd structure? Although encampments are generally located on the periphery of settlement areas, it is more likely that v. 31 is dependent on v. 25. Thus, the settlements in Geba and Michmash are not encampments, but permanent settlements. The LXX settlement list concludes with an allusion to the Levites as having a portion in Judah and Benjamin.

It is of note that even though the LXX material is much shorter than the MT, the general order of the towns is the same and thus the layout of the list retains the same overall structure in both the MT and LXX. Moreover, the boundaries recorded in LXX and MT Neh 11:25-36 are similar in size from north to south. Even with the very cursory list in LXX, which only enumerates six towns of settlement, the southern boundary of Beersheba is found in both texts. Geba and Michmash mark the northern boundary where the Benjaminites are said to have settled, with the Levites granted a portion in them. 252

251 The difference between the MT and LXX is that the encampments in the MT are envisioned as stretching quite a distance in v. 30, with the addition of “to the Valley of Hinnom.”

252 Interestingly, several scholars have made a case for the list hearkening back to the boundaries found in 2 Kgs 23:8, when Josiah “brought all the priests out of the towns of Judah, and defiled the high places where the priests had made offerings, from Geba to Beersheba.” Edelman (2005: 228) adds that in Neh 11:25-36, no settlements have been clearly identified lying south of Beersheba. While there is a parallel to this one reference, it is noteworthy that MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 do not end with Geba, but push the boundaries north to Michmash. In the MT, the list moves north of Michmash to Bethel.
4. MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 Textual Divergences

Having examined the relationship between MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, and in order to understand the text-critical differences, it is necessary to examine differences between these parallel texts.

Textual Variants between MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. And these (are) to the villages, in their fields, some of the sons of Judah resided in Kiriath-Arba and its dependencies, and in Dibon and its dependencies, and in Jekabzeel and its villages.</td>
<td>נֶהוֹרָה בְּנֵיכָאוֹת חֲוֹדָה:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. and in Jeshua and in Moladah and Bethpelet.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. and in Hazar-shual, and in Beersheba and its dependencies.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. and in Ziklag, in Meconah and its dependencies.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. and in En-rimmon, in Zorah, in Jarmuth.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Zanoah, Adullam, and their villages, Lachish and its fields, and Azekah and its dependencies. So they encamped from (in) Beersheba to the valley of Hinnom.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. And the sons of Benjamin: in (from) Geba, Michmash, and Aija, and Bethel and its dependencies.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Anathoth, Nob, Ananiah.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Hazor, Ramah, Gittaim.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Hadid, Zeboim, Neballat.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Lod, and Ono, and the Valley of the Artisans.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. And some of the Levites, divisions of Judah to (and of) Benjamin.</td>
<td>בֵּית עַבְדֵּל בָּבָא שְׁנֵי בֵּית:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MT provides 32 towns for the Judahites, Benjaminites, and the Levites, while the LXX lists six towns (i.e. Kiriath-Arba, Jeshua, Beersheba, Lachish, Geba and Michmash). The question remains as to why these texts diverge so dramatically. The names that are not present in the LXX are located throughout the area of central Judah and the surrounding territories. Moreover, the additions in the MT are not found in a clear order. That is, there is no clear geographical sequence for the missing settlements.

253 The underlined passages indicate the material not present in the LXX text, but present in the MT. The (ital) terms represent words that are only found in the LXX.
such as a north-south or east-west pattern, but the differences are substantial enough to make marked changes in the scope of settlement. MT Neh 11:25-36 has much more depth regarding settlement, mentioning towns throughout the areas of Judah and Benjamin whereas the LXX supplies only a basic outline of the area of settlement, leaving out most of the area of Benjamin, and completely missing the northwest Shephelah.\footnote{In Carter’s discussion of Persian period settlement, he argues that the sites in the Shephelah and the Coastal Plain (Lod, Ono, Hadid) are particularly problematic when constructing the boundaries of Yehud because of the geological landscape that naturally forms buffers between the Shephelah and the Coastal Plain. Thus, these different regions would have formed separate districts (1999: 91). In the case of the LXX, both of these regions (with the exception of Lachish) are absent from the list.}

In order to evaluate the reasons for the textual divergences between the MT and LXX, it is essential to investigate whether the LXX is shorter because of textual corruption or conversely because the LXX is older and more original. To be sure, if the LXX were shorter than the MT because of textual corruption, then there would be signs of this corruption.\footnote{Certain types of corruption would be evident such as haplography or parablepsis (either through homoiooteleuton or homoioarkton).} Yet if the LXX is shorter than the MT because it is the older material, then there would be signs of additions to the text.\footnote{Some of these “signs of additions” include glossing, where a scribe would add material in order to explain a word or phrase. Other reasons can be additions due to the influence of similar material on the text, dittography, or explications to make implicit the explicit. See McCarter (1986) for further discussion on kinds of textual additions that commonly appear in the Bible and other ancient manuscripts.}

First, examining the text critical differences between MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, there are possible cases of haplography in the LXX text from the MT, if one posits that the MT list preserves the older material. The first case of possible haplography occurs in verse 25 after Kiriath-(Ha)Arba (הַקִּרְיָת הַאֲרָבָא). The LXX does not contain the phrase “and its dependencies, and in Dibon and its dependencies, and in Jekabzeel and its villages” (הָרַבַּת הַאֲרָבָא הַרְבַּת הַדִּבְוָן הַרְבַּת הָיֶקְבָּצֵל הָרַבַּת הַכֹּסְפִּים). The parallel text picks up again with the reference to “and in Jeshua” (יְשֻׁוָה) in v. 26. One could posit

\footnote{254}
homoioarkton, in which the LXX writer may have skipped over everything after Kiriath-Arba, leaving out the towns of Dibon and Jekabzeel, along with their dependencies or villages. Haplography may have been triggered by the prefixed wāw, in which the copyist skipped over הבניה and the subsequent material, moving to Levı.257 In MT Neh 11:26-27a, there is another case of possible homoioarkton triggered by the conjunctive wāw. After Jeshua (וַיִּשָּׁחַל) the LXX does not contain “and in Moladah, and Beth-pelet and in Hazar-shual” (הַמּוֹלָדָה והַבֵּית הַפְּלֵט וְחָצֶר הָשָׁעַל). The corresponding material again resumes with “and in Beersheba” (בֵּית הָשָׁבָע). Other possible cases of haplography may be found in vv. 27b-30a, and vv. 31b-35. Both examples may be due to homoioarkton, in which the copyist skipped over several settlements, again triggered by the prefix wāw.

A final textual divergence between the MT and LXX concerning the Judahites, is found in Neh 11:30b. The LXX states, “So they encamped in Beersheba” (יִישָׁחַל בֵּית הָשָׁבָע), but the MT states “So they encamped from Beersheba to the Valley of Hinnom” (וָיִּשָּׁחַל בֵּית הָשָׁבָע וּרְאָה הַנִּינֵה).258 Beersheba appears in both versions, yet the LXX does not mention a northern Judahite boundary for this encampment, nor does the structure necessitate a northern point to the material.259 Even so, both the MT and LXX

257 Or, homoioarkton occurred because of the wāw and bēt combination at the beginning of both הבניה and הבניה.
258 This textual difference may have been caused by haplography, where the copyist’s eye skipped over הבניה triggered by the ending of Beersheba (הַבֵּית הָשָׁבָע). But this is not a convincing argument since this does not fully explain why the rest of the phrase is omitted.
259 One could posit that the LXX retains the original reading, but through bēt/wāw confusion, the bēt prefix became a mem prefix. When this occurred, the sentence became a fragment, and thus, the addition of the “Valley of Hinnom” was added.
are in agreement concerning both dwelling in and encamping in Beersheba. But the MT creates much more freedom of movement throughout Judah.

Although all of the textual discrepancies may be triggered by haplography, this is not the best explanation for the textual divergences between MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. When considering the textual differences, there are certain terms that only appear in MT Neh 11:25-36 and not in the LXX material. The fact that certain terms only appear in MT Neh 11:25-36 and not in the LXX is evidence against random textual subtractions. Rather, a fundamental change in textual material has occurred from text to text. Aside from the discrepancy in the number of settlements, the most noticeable difference between the MT and LXX is the use of certain terms to describe settlement. In LXX Neh 11:25-36, there are several key terms used to describe settlements, including ἐπαυλεῖς (villages), αγρός (field), and places to παρεμβάλλω (encamp). Yet the term “its dependencies” (ἡτανβι) is completely absent from the LXX. In fact, this word is never found in the LXX Nehemiah material. In the MT, Kiriath-Arba, Dibon, Beersheba, Meconah, Azekah, and Bethel, are all said to have “dependencies” (ἡτανβι). Yet in the LXX, Kiriath-Arba and Beersheba are included in the list as having ἐπαυλεῖς (ὀρχώ). Indeed, after mentioning Kiriath-Arba (v. 25), the MT reads, “and its dependencies (ἡτανβι), and in Dibon and its dependencies (ἡτανβι), and in Jekabzeel and its villages” (ἡτανβι). This additional material in the MT is not found in the corresponding LXX

---

260 The use of both encamping and settling concerning Beersheba appears to be due to two issues: The first is that different kinds of settlements are represented, and second the list is a reflection of both the boundary of settlement and actual settlement. See below for differences in the list.

261 In other examples where “dependencies” (ἡτανβι) appears in the MT, the LXX most commonly uses κώμη and ἰδρήματα (e.g. Num 21:32; 32:42; Josh 15:45, 47; 17:11, 16; 21:12; 1 Chr 2:23; 6:41; 18:1; 2 Chr 13:19; 28:18) and less frequently “daughters” θυγάτηρ (Judg 1:27; 11:26; 1 Mac 5:8, 58). The larger LXX corpus is aware of both terms, but not so in LXX Nehemiah, which never mentions either κώμη or θυγάτηρ.
material. In 11:27b-30, the MT diverges from the LXX beginning with “and its dependencies” (הַבְּנֵי-זָאוֹן), then moves to Ziklag, Meconah “and its dependencies” (מֶנֶץ), and continues with En-rimmon, Zorah, Jarmuth, Zanoah, and Adullam.

Further, the LXX and MT converge again with the phrase, “and their villages (מַחֲרֶצֶים), Lachish and its fields” (v. 30). For the MT, the villages are connected to Zanoah and Adullam (and possibly other towns), whereas the LXX reference to “their villages” summarizes the list of the settlements of the Judahites (Kiriath-Arba, Jeshua, and Beersheba). The MT also includes “Azekah and its dependencies,” following Lachish and its fields in 11:30. As previously mentioned, Azekah is out of order, following geographical consideration, in the MT list because it should appear after Adullam if one is moving in a north to south direction. There are two possible explanations for Azekah’s placement within the list: either the copyist forgot to add Azekah, and remembered after copying Lachish, or the writer inserted the material in such a way so that he/she would not interrupt the pattern of settlements that he/she was constructing within the list. In other words, it is possible that the copyist did not want to add Azekah and its dependencies after “and its villages” because this disrupted the original LXX material.

Other changes to the text preserved in the MT may be tracked through the addition of certain phrases and towns of settlement when compared to the LXX. One example of an addition to the MT is including the Judahite settlement “to the Valley of Hinnom” (ֶלְעֹה הִנְנָם). This addition to the text concludes the settlement of the Judahites. In fact, the additions in the MT list create an outline of settlement from south to north, which was not a part of the original list. Thus, both lists appear to be evoking the southern boundary of Judahite settlement as Beersheba, found in the settlement list in
Joshua 20, which lists the territory from Dan to Beersheba. Yet neither the MT nor the LXX claim Dan, or the area traditionally demarcated as Israel, but the use of Beersheba as the southernmost settlement is found in other boundary lists from the late-monarchic period. And as previously noted, the connection between the encampment around the city of Jerusalem (i.e. Valley of Hinnom) to encampment around the tabernacle during the wilderness wanderings, is lacking in the LXX. With this very cursory list, the idea of encamping or pitching a tent has less of a connection to the wilderness days and more of a connection to what the author of the list saw as an impermanent settlement that was placed in Beersheba. In the LXX, the fact that the encampment is found at the southernmost periphery of the land is significant since this is where semi-pastoralists regularly lived, rather than a theological statement about settlement.

While theological claims and territorial claims are difficult to separate in Ezra and Nehemiah, in this case, it is clear that the settlement list in the LXX mainly expresses specific territorial settlements within the broader Achaemenid Empire. This settlement list is not meant to be an exhaustive list of Judahite settlements. In fact, it is mostly concerned with the specific southern settlement of the pre-exilic area of Judah, with the exception of the northern sites of Geba and Michmash. Yet it also takes into consideration the process of creating balance within the list since all of the encampments are listed last.

262 From Dan to Beersheba is also found in Judg 20:1; 1 Sam 3:20; 2 Sam 3:10, 17:11, 24:2, 24:15. From Beersheba to Dan, the reverse order of this list, is found in 1 Chr 21:2 and 2 Chr 30:5. See Kalimi (2005: 273, ff. 82) for a discussion of the expression יָנָּה לְבָשֵׁן (From Beersheba to…). This phrase places Beersheba first and Dan last. Kalimi assesses the reality of these boundaries, pointing out that it is problematic since Beersheba was out of the boundaries of Yehud during the Chronicler’s lifetime (2005). From Beerhseba to Geba appears, most prominently, in 2 Kgs 23:8.

263 The LXX preserves a translation of a Hebrew Vorlage. Thus, the writer I am referring to, penned the text in Hebrew.

264 And, in fact, there are six different places mentioned in LXX Neh 11:25-36. The fact that six also appears in three subsequent lists in LXX Neh 12:1-11 cannot be accidental. See chapter 5 for a further discussion of this issue.
In the MT, the addition of places may have been necessary when the editor of the MT material chose to add more names to the list of settlements in Benjamin. The LXX simply sketches an outline of settlements for both Judah and Benjamin, whereas the additions found in the MT list create zones of settlement with some depth, around Judah and then Benjamin. This image of settlement becomes, not simply about the regions of settlement, but also about the free movement of the interior for the Judahites, and thus, full claim to the entire area. While the editor of the MT list made changes, the changes are mostly concerned with adding more names and settlement types to fill out the list. This process dramatically altered the overall effect of the list. It was no longer, a select settlement list with people encamping in the periphery, but rather a settlement list encompassing a number of places for the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites, set within the context of the Achaemenid domination.
Figure 3-1: MT Nehemiah 11:25-36 Settlement Sites
Figure 3-2: MT Nehemiah 11:25-36. Judahite and Benjaminite Areas of Settlement
Figure 3-3: MT Nehemiah 11:25-36. Geographical Regions of Settlement
Figure 3-4: MT Nehemiah 11:25-36. Settlement Towns in the Central and Southern Shephelah

Figure 3-5: MT Nehemiah 11:25-36. Settlement Towns in the Highlands of Benjamin
Figure 3-6: MT Nehemiah 11:25-36. Types of Settlements
Figure 3-7: LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36. Settlement Sites
Figure 3-8: LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36. Judahite and Benjaminite Areas of Settlement
Figure 3-9: LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36. Geographical Regions of Settlement
Figure 3-10: LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36. Types of Settlement
Chapter 4

The Scope of Settlement: A Comparison of the Judahite, Benjaminite, and Levitical Settlement Lists

1. Introduction

Since MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 have divergent material, the purpose of the settlement of the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites is a more complicated issue than previously represented.\(^{265}\) While the list of post-monarchic settlements in MT and LXX

\(^{265}\) Scholars have debated the purpose and compositional process of the material in MT Neh 11:25-36. In debating the construction of the list, von Rad (1930: 21-25) argues that the “Chronicler” used a Josianic period list, that is Joshua 15, to construct MT Neh 11:25-36. Lipschits (2002: 427-40), in line with von Rad, contends that this list was constructed in order to depict an idealized view of Persian period Judah, building on Joshua 15 (see also Williamson 1985: 350; Blenkinsopp 1988: 329-30; Stern 2001; Edelman 2005: 228). Kellerman (1966: 209-27) argues that, since the southern boundary of Neh 11:25-36 is problematic in the Persian period, it best describes the southern boundary of Judah between the late-eighth c. until the fall of the Kingdom of Judah in 586. Myers (1965: 191), Clines (1984: 220), Weinberg (1992: 49-61), Carter (1999: 90-100), and Janzen (2002: 499) argue for an actual depiction of settlement during the Persian period. Myers asserts that since the Judahites would have been citizens of the Persian Empire, they had the right to return to their ancestral homes and resettle this region. Janzen points to fourth century B.C.E. epigraphic evidence that the settlements in some of the contested areas, particularly the Negev, would have been possible. He believes that the exiles could have returned to their ancestral homes, even if they were outside the Persian period province. Böhler (2003: 48), championing a later date, maintains that the MT reflects a Maccabean reality because the list encompasses the scope of Judah during that period of time. He also argues for a second century B.C.E. redaction of Nehemiah 11 (as reflected in the MT), because the settlement list could not have been possible before the Maccabean period. He sees a “Nehemiah renaissance” under the Hasmoneans, when an editor reworked both Ezra-Nehemiah for the purpose of
Neh 11:25-36 reflects two compositional phases in list making, there are other lists that show similarities and differences in settlement area, most notably Ezra 2:20-33//Neh 7:25-38 and Neh 3:2-19. An examination of the differences among post-monarchic settlement lists complicates the overall perceived size and scope of the region of Judah during the Achaemenid Period. These differences are also important to consider in light of Ezra 2:20-33//Neh 7:25-38 and Neh 3:2-20, which are chiefly concerned with the settlement of the areas in the traditional territory of Benjamin and northern Judah. Yet there are even earlier lists, such as the settlement list of the tribe of Judah in Joshua 15 and the settlement list of the tribe of Benjamin in Joshua 18, that are necessary to consider when examining possible influences the list in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36.

Moreover, the Levitical settlements in Numbers 34-35, Joshua 21, and 1 Chronicles 6 overlap with MT and LXX Neh 11:36. Several scholars have compared these lists with MT Neh 11:25-36 to ascertain the purpose of Neh 11:25-36. These comparisons, however, are limited in their scope since they only focus on the MT list.

In the following examination I review the divergent material in MT Neh 11:25-36 and LXX Neh 11:25-36 in relation to other settlement lists. With the connections the Maccabean government. Other scholars, such as Rudolph (1949: 189-91), Mowinckel (1964: 151), and Gunneweg (1987: 148-50) also argue for a post-Persian period context for Nehemiah 11; Alt (1953: 289-305) argues that the list is made up of Levitical settlements, based on v. 36. This final position, however, does not represent any current mainstream opinion.

266 The very detailed Levitical town lists in Numbers 34-35, Joshua 21, and 1 Chronicles 6 are important to consider in light of Levites settling outside of Jerusalem (also seen in MT and LXX Neh 11:36).

267 For a comparison of these lists, see Aharoni (1979), Blenkinsopp (1988), Carter (1999), Stern (1982 and 2001), Lipschits (2002), and Edelman (2005). All of these scholars point out the importance of considering other settlement lists, both pre and post-exilic (especially Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, Nehemiah 3, and Joshua 15 and 18), when examining MT Neh 11:25-36.
between the different settlement lists established, the compositional process in the creation of LXX and MT Neh 11:25-36 may be clarified in more detail. A comparison of Ezra 2:20-33//Neh 7:25-38, Neh 3:2-20, Joshua 15 and 18, to MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 shows that there are patterns to the organization of these different lists. The points of overlap and divergence between the lists in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 and other lists may shed light on the possibility that scribal schools developed patterns in list making that were honored throughout the late-monarchic and post-monarchic periods.\footnote{I will discuss the archaeological issues related to the Persian and Hellenistic periods in Chapter 6, and thus reserve my judgment of the historical framework for both lists until then.}

2. A Comparative Analysis of Nehemiah 11:25-36 to other Settlement Lists

2.1. A Comparison of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36 to MT and LXX Joshua 15 and 18

The settlement list in MT Neh 11:25-36 has several remarkable similarities and differences with MT and LXX Joshua 15 and 18. Although MT Neh 11:25-36 is unique within chapters 11 and 12 in its focus of settlements outside of Jerusalem, the lists of the Judahite and Benjaminite settlements found in Joshua 15 and 18 are part of a larger list of boundaries, town names, and toponyms, that are set into the context of the (re)distribution of the land under Joshua. Joshua 14-21 delineates the territories of the tribal inheritance.\footnote{Alt (1953: 193ff) and Aharoni (1979: 248) argue for two distinct sources for chapters 13-19: boundary delineations and town lists. Aharoni believes the town lists come from the “administrative divisions of Judah and Israel” while the boundary delineations were...} Within the Joshua settlement lists of the different tribes, the boundaries...
and cities of settlement are presented for both the Judahites and the Benjaminites. The lists of settlements found in Joshua 15 (MT and LXX) and Neh 11:25-36 (MT and LXX) follow the same general order. Svensson (1994: 24) notes that the town lists in Joshua 14-21 are preserved in two different versions in the LXX, namely versions A and B. The older LXX B has more divergences from the MT in chapters 14-21, whereas the younger LXX A more closely resembles the MT. The names in LXX B have many more divergences from the MT than LXX A. Auld (2005: 181) asserts that it is likely that the forms in A are closer to the MT than LXX B because at some point in time, the text preserved in LXX A was corrected towards the text preserved in the MT. Both the LXX A and LXX B are generally longer than the MT material. The only exception to this pattern is the list of the cities of refuge in Josh 20:4-6 which is longer in the MT. For the purpose of this study, it is noteworthy that LXX A and LXX B Joshua 14-21 are generally longer than MT Joshua when compared to the much more cursory list in LXX Neh 11:25-36 versus the expanded MT material. The expanded LXX Joshua material is most often interpreted as scribal additions to the older material preserved in the MT.

---

270 Within these lists, I have included references to בֵּית לֵו “cities” (c.), בֵּית לָדָי “villages” (v), בְּנַי בָּנָה “dependencies” (d.), בְּנַי סָד “fields” (f.), בְּנַי פַּד and places “to encamp” (e.). In the case of Joshua 15, I have also included settlement totals.

271 The LXX B (Vaticanus) dates to the early fourth century C.E., whereas LXX A (Alexandrinus) dates to the late fourth-early fifth century C.E.

272 The MT and LXX divergences are mostly concerning toponyms south of Jerusalem.

273 This is also significant, since the overall length of Joshua is 4-5% shorter in LXX Joshua than MT Joshua (Tov 1997: 247).
Table 4-1: Lists of Judahite Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kiriath-Arba</strong>, that is Hebron</td>
<td><strong>Kiriath-Arba</strong>, that is Hebron</td>
<td><strong>Kiriath-HaArba</strong> and v.</td>
<td><strong>Kiriath-Arba</strong> and v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debir</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debir</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dibon</strong> and v.</td>
<td><strong>Jekabzeel = Kabzeel</strong> and v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kabzeel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kaibaiseleel/Kabzeel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jekabzeel = Kabzeel</strong> and v.</td>
<td><strong>Jekabzeel = Kabzeel</strong> and v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>Adar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagur</td>
<td>Jagur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinah</td>
<td>Kinah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimonah</td>
<td>Dimonah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadah</td>
<td>Adadah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedesh</td>
<td>Kedesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithnan</td>
<td>Ithnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

274 The overlapping toponyms are in bold.
275 I have listed the toponyms, as found in LXX B and LXX A. When there are differences, the first toponym is found in LXX B followed by LXX A. I have consulted Auld (2005) for the LXX B names.
276 In Josh 15:13, Kiriath-Arba is mentioned as the city that Joshua gave to Caleb (Josh 15:13) who then drove out the three sons of Anek (Josh 15:14). After removing the sons of Anek from Kiriath-Arba, he went up against Debir (דביר rbd yb#y M#m l(yw) and promised his daughter to anyone who could conquer the city. Othniel was victorious (15:17) and married Caleb’s daughter. It is noteworthy that Kiriath-Arba and Debir are not part of the Judahite settlement list that begins in 15:21, but rather, are a prologue to the list.
277 Svensson (1994: 100) argues that through metathesis and confusion, this particular toponym went from Arad to Adar (ארד/אדול confusion).
278 LXX B has Raama and LXX A has Dimona.
279 In LXX B, two names have been confused as one toponym. In LXX A, these names do not appear. The Lucianic recension lists it as two places.
280 In LXX A, two names (Ithnan and Ziph) have been combined into one toponym. This toponym is not present in LXX B.
281 MT Neh 11:26 literally states, יוחנן יקהשבע, or “In Kiriath the Four”. As I mentioned in chapter 3, Arba also has a prefix –י in Gen 35:27, which is listed as the same place as Hebron. I will refer to Kiriath-HaArba as Kiriath-Arba.
282 The spelling of Dibon in MT Neh 11:25 is a *hapax legomena*.
283 Jekabzeel is a *hapax legomena*, and appears to be a lengthened version of Kabzeel. A yod was added to קבاظ (Kabzeel), forming קבاظאלה.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ziph</td>
<td>Mainam/-——285</td>
<td>Jeshua288</td>
<td>Jeshua and v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telem</td>
<td>Balmainan and v. /Telem286</td>
<td>Moladah</td>
<td>Moladah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bealoth</td>
<td>-----/Beeloth287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazor-hadadattah</td>
<td>Aseron</td>
<td>Beth-pelet</td>
<td>Beersheba and v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerioth-hezron (Hazor)</td>
<td>Asor</td>
<td>Hazar-shual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amam</td>
<td>Sen/Amam</td>
<td>Beerabee and v.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shema</td>
<td>Salmaa/Samaa</td>
<td>Beersheba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moladah</td>
<td>Molada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazar-gaddah</td>
<td>Serei/Hazargaddah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heshmon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-pelet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard-shual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beersheba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biziothiah284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baalah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lpm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eztotad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziklag</td>
<td>Sekalak</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ziklag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

284 Several scholars, including Soggin (1972: 161) and Boling and Wright (1982: 379) emend the MT to בֶּן-בֵיתִית “daughters” instead of “Biziothiah” בֶּן-בֵיתִית, following the LXX B textual tradition. Woudstra (1981: 245) disagrees with this emendation based on, what he argues, are established textual patterns. However, since Biziothiah is a hapax legomena in the MT, and since the Greek text offers a plausible alternative, Soggin, Boling and Wright seem to be correct.

285 This may be a rendering of Ithnan. There may be a dittography within the Greek that could explain this change in Ithnan.

286 LXX A records Telem, whereas LXX B has Balmainan.

287 LXX Joshua 15 renders villages as κόμαι. This is different from LXX Neh 11:25-36, which prefers the term ἐπαυλίς.

288 Blenkinsopp (1988: 331-32) associates Jeshua and Shema, but see below for the difficulties with this connection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madmannah</td>
<td>Makereim/Meconah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sansannah</td>
<td>Satennak/Sansanna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebaoth</td>
<td>Labos/Labaoth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shilhim</td>
<td>Sale/Shilhim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ain</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eromot/Rimmon</strong></td>
<td><strong>En-rimmon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rimmon</strong></td>
<td>Total: 29 c. with v.</td>
<td><strong>Zorah</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jarmuth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshtoal</td>
<td>Astaol/Eshtaol</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>and v.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zorah</strong></td>
<td><strong>Raa/Saraa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashnah</td>
<td><strong>Assa/Asnah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zanoah</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ramen</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zanoah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-gannim</td>
<td><strong>Tano/Zanoah</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zanoah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tappuah</td>
<td>Iloutot/Adiathaalm</td>
<td><strong>Beersheba (e.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enam</td>
<td>Maiannei/Enam</td>
<td><strong>Beersheba (e.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jarmuth</strong></td>
<td>Odollam</td>
<td><strong>Adullam</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adullam</strong></td>
<td><strong>Membra/Nemra</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adullam</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socoh</td>
<td>Saocho/Soco</td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaaraim</td>
<td>Sakarim</td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adithaim</td>
<td><strong>Gadera</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gederah</td>
<td><strong>Gadera</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gederothaim</td>
<td><strong>Gadera</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 14 c. with v.</td>
<td><strong>Senna/Zenan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenan</td>
<td><strong>Adasan/Adasa</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadashah</td>
<td><strong>Magadalgad</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migdal-gad</td>
<td><strong>Dalal/Dalan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilan</td>
<td><strong>Maspa</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizpeh</td>
<td><strong>Iakareel/Joktheel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Azekah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joktheel</td>
<td><strong>Maakes/Lachish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lachish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lachish</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lachish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lachish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lachish</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lachish</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

289 Blenkinsopp (1988: 331-32) also believes Madmannah and Meconah are the same place name. See further for a discussion of the possible correlations between Madmannah and Meconah.

290 A Beersheba appears in Joshua 15, corresponding to the first reference to Beersheba in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. However, there is no second reference to Beersheba in Joshua 15.
Josh 15:21-42 divides the Judahite settlements in the south into two districts; the towns found in the Negev (Josh 15:21-32) and towns in the Lowlands (Josh 15:33-42). In both the Negev settlements and the Shephelah, 16 of the 17 names listed for the settlement of the Judahites in MT Neh 11:25-30 are found in Josh 15:13, 15 and 21-42. Among these names, Neh 11:25-30 and Joshua 15 maintain the same order except for Jarmuth, listed after Zanoah in Josh 15:35 and Lachish, which is listed before Azekah in Neh 11:30, but after it in the Joshua list. Of note are the first two names in Neh 11:25, namely Kiriath-Arba and Dibon, which appear in Joshua 15 (with variant spellings), but not within the settlement list. Rather, they are mentioned in the prologue to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozkath</td>
<td>Basedot/Bozkath</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valley of Hinnom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglon</td>
<td>Ideadalea/Eglon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabbon</td>
<td>Kabra/Kabba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahmas</td>
<td>Makes/Lahmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chithlish</td>
<td>Maakos/Chathlos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gederoth</td>
<td>Geddor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-dagon</td>
<td>Bagediel/Bethdagon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naamah</td>
<td>Noman/Noma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makkedah</td>
<td>Makedan/Makeda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 16 t. with v.</td>
<td>Total: 16 c. with v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

291 En-Rimmon, which is found in Neh 11:29, is listed as two places in Josh 15:32, Ain and Rimmon. En-Rimmon means “Pomegranate Spring” (Blenkinsopp 1988: 331). In LXX B Josh 15:21, it simply lists a Rimmon. Hence, En-Rimmon is probably one location and not two.

292 In MT Neh 11:30, Lachish and Azekah are listed next to each other. In Joshua 15, Azekah is listed in v. 35, whereas Lachish is listed in v. 39. According to the proposed districts, Azekah is in the second district and Lachish is in the third district (Aharoni 1979: 346-47).

293 This is assuming that Debir and Dibon are the same place. Most scholars assume that the Dibon referred to in Neh 11:25 fits most closely with Debir rather than the Dibon located in Jordan. See Aharoni (1979) for a discussion of Debir and Dibon.
settlement list. This is a significant difference since these towns begin the list in MT Neh 11:25-36. Additionally, the Valley of Hinnom is the last place named in the Judahite list in Neh 11:25-30, but found before the towns of settlement (in Josh 15:8), marking out the boundaries of the tribal settlements as well as the boundaries of Benjamin in Josh 18:16.\(^{294}\) In Joshua, the tribal boundaries of Judah extend north to the Valley of Hinnom. Additionally, according to Joshua 18:16 the Valley of Hinnom is the southernmost point of Benjamin, making the city of Jerusalem a part of the Benjaminites allotment.

Moreover, the towns in MT Neh 11:25-30 that show some ambiguity as to whether there are parallels in Joshua 15 are Jeshua and Meconah, although certain scholars, such as Blenkinsopp, hypothesize that Jeshua may be the same town as Shema, and Svensson asserts that Madmannah and Meconah are the same place (1994: 111).\(^{295}\) But these connections require several possible textual corruptions, and therefore a direct correlation cannot be firmly established.\(^{296}\) Clearly the order of towns in Joshua 15 and its overlap with MT Neh 11:25-30 has affected this interpretation.

Hence, there is nearly complete overlap with the places mentioned in MT Neh

---

294 One could hypothesize that the reason why Neh 11:30 does not mention Jerusalem is perhaps due to the influence of Joshua 15 and 18 on Nehemiah. Alternatively, it could also be argued that the settlement list was not originally connected to the settlement of Jerusalem (Neh 11:1-24).

295 Blenkinsopp argues that Jeshua could be another name for Shema, presumably based on its possible correlation to Shema in Josh 15:26 (1988: 331-2). Rainey and Notley (2006: 12, 152) and Aharoni (1979) do not make this connection between Jeshua and Shema and thus believes they are two different toponyms. This is the same for Madmannah and Meconah.

296 If Jeshua (יְשֵׁUA) is a corruption of Shema (שֶׁMA), then it would require two changes to the text: First, a yôd would be added to Shema, next, a wāw replaced the mēm. In the case of Madmannah (מַדמָנָה) and Meconah (מֶקְנָה), there would also be two steps of changes: A dālet would drop out of Madmannah, and then the second mēm would become a kāp. This seems unlikely since it would require multiple stages of corruption in both cases.
11:25-30 when compared to Joshua 15 (with the exception of Jeshua and Meconah), but the reverse is not so. When prioritizing Joshua 15, the overlap with MT Neh 11:25-30 is mostly based on order of settlements and also the use of the Valley of Hinnom as a boundary marker for the area of Judah. The differences, however, are as significant as the overlap. Within Josh 15:21-42, there are 67 towns specifically mentioned, which is in conspicuous contrast to the 17 towns mentioned in MT Neh 11:25-30. In fact, one of the biggest omissions in MT Neh 11:25-36 is the larger region of the Shephelah. Josh 15:33-44 provides a list of 40 settlements in the Shephelah, while MT Neh 11:29-30 only has six, which are mostly located within the inner Shephelah. The boundaries of the tribe of Judah are much larger, particularly within the Negev and also the Arabah. In fact, Neh 11:25-30 does not include any towns found in the region of the Arabah. If the author of MT Neh 11:25-36 were using Joshua 15 as a base, then why are these regions missing? It may be that the number of settlements has gotten smaller, and thus, the list of settlements in MT Neh 11:25-36 is the extent of land that could be claimed. Or, it may be that these settlements are specifically named because of their connections to each other. Thus, MT Neh 11:25-30 may not represent every place that the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites settled outside of Jerusalem. The lack of sites in the Judean highlands supports the selective nature of this list. These settlements are tied together through their shared tribal connections, and are important for the settlers to claim.  

---

Janzen (1999:501) observes this and also comments that if the author is trying to draw a “coherent boarder” then “why did the list in Nehemiah not include all the sites on the western edge of the Shephelah in the list of Joshua?” Clearly this omission is not due to a scribal error, but rather is an intentional choice to not include the outer area of the Shephelah.  

See chapter 6 for more on the connection that binds these cities together.
Shephelah are not included because they could not legitimately be connected to these other settlements.

As previously mentioned, the composition of the settlement list in Joshua 15 is commonly placed within the context of the Iron II period.299 In Edelman’s discussion of the similarities between Neh 11:25-36 and Joshua 15, she maintains that the overlap between late-Iron II and Persian period sites is to be expected. That is, sites inhabited during the Persian period and sites from the late-Iron II would naturally be the same because of continued occupation or resettlement of Iron II sites during the Persian period.300 Thus, Nehemiah 11 would name the same towns that are found in late-Iron II lists.301 In fact, there is only partial overlap, particularly in areas such as the inner Shephelah. But, when one compares the settlements in Joshua 15 to MT Neh 11:25-30, the places of settlement have dramatically decreased. Edelman also observes, “The listing of settlements according to the natural ecological zones found within it is also logical, especially given the variety represented” (2005: 231). Therefore, according to

299 The classic study on this list is Alt’s 1925 work, which dates the list to the time of Josiah’s reforms. Mazar (1971) also offers a seventh century B.C.E. date for this list. Other scholars argue for an earlier date, including Cross and Wright (1956), who place the district divisions to the time of Jehoshaphat, and Kallai (1958; 1961), who argues for four separate lists written at different times. The earliest list is in the context of the reign of King David. Schunck (1962: 141-45) argues for a date of the composition of Joshua 15 to be around the time of Uzziah. Na’aman (1986; 2005) champions the position of Alt, pointing to the geo-political circumstances of the late-seventh and early-sixth centuries, as well as the archaeological data. For an overview of the different scholarly discussions concerning the date of composition, see Na’aman (2005: 201-202).

300 While settlement areas tend to stay the same in the southern Levant, the question still remains as to whether these sites were occupied at all in the Persian period. See chapter 6 for a presentation of the archaeological data, particularly with regard to the current discussions of Carter (1999), Lipschits (2005), Faust (2009), and Finkelstein (2008; 2010).

Edelman, settlement overlap occurs only because of the continuity of settlement or resettlement in the same areas. While it is evident that resettlement in the Persian period occurred in similar places to those of the Iron II settlements, it is also evident that none of the postexilic lists attempt to claim the settlement area of the Iron II period lists. Moreover, Edelman’s argument must be further modified when taking LXX Neh 11:25-36 into consideration. If the author of MT Neh 11:25-30 had Joshua 15, or a similar list, available for use, then the only true overlap between the lists is the pattern of listing names, with consideration to certain ecological zones. It is quite clear that the same historical considerations are not there. In other words, the reality of MT Neh 11:25-36 is quite different from Joshua 15. And thus, the only common bond that they share is the partial overlap in place names and the pattern in which places are named.

In contrast to the partial overlap between the Judahite settlement lists in Joshua 15 and MT Neh 11:25-30, the Benjaminite settlement in Josh 18:21-28 overlaps very little with the list in MT Neh 11:31-35.

**Table 4-2: A Comparison with MT and LXX Joshua 18 Benjaminite Settlement Lists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>Geba</td>
<td>Geba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-hoglah</td>
<td>Baithegliw/Bethagla</td>
<td>Michmash</td>
<td>Michmash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emek-keziz</td>
<td>Amakasis/Amekasis</td>
<td>Aija</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-arabah</td>
<td>Baithabaraba/Baitharaba</td>
<td>Besana/Bethel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemaraim</td>
<td>Sara/Semrim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Besana/Bethel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, the reality of MT Neh 11:25-36 is quite different from Joshua 15. And thus, the only common bond that they share is the partial overlap in place names and the pattern in which places are named.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avvim</td>
<td>Aiin/Auim</td>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parah</td>
<td>Para/Asar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophrah</td>
<td>Esratha/Athra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chephar-amnonah</td>
<td>Karatha/Aikaren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophni</td>
<td>Kethira/Katherammin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geba</td>
<td>Moni/-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 t. with v.</td>
<td>Gabaa/Gabaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibeon</td>
<td>Total—12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramah</td>
<td>Gaban/Gaban</td>
<td>Ramah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeroth</td>
<td>Rama/Rama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizpah</td>
<td>Beeroth/Beroth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chephirah</td>
<td>Massema/Mastha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozah</td>
<td>Miron/Chethira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekem</td>
<td>Amoke/Amosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irpeel</td>
<td>Kathan/Rekem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taralah</td>
<td>Nakan/Ierthael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zela</td>
<td>Selekan/-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleph</td>
<td>Tharela/Tharala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jebus (Jerusalem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibeath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiriath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 towns with v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 t. with v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 16 towns listed in MT Neh 11:31-35, only three towns are found in both lists.
(Bethel, Geba, and Ramah). Moreover, the three names that overlap are not found in the same order in Joshua 18. The differences in the Benjaminitc material reveal that while the Judahite settlement in MT Neh 11:25-30 have some parallels with Joshua 15, the Benjaminitc list in MT Neh 11:31-35 only has a superficial overlap with Joshua 18. From this evidence, it is clear that the author of MT Neh 11:31-35 did not use Joshua 18 as a guide to listing towns.

Expanding upon the previous inquiries concerning influences to the list in MT Neh 11:25-36, LXX Neh 11:25-36 has certain affinities with Joshua 15 and 18. Since LXX Neh 11:25-36 only lists six places, namely Kiriath-Arba, Jeshua, Lachish, Beersheba, Geba, and Michmash, there are far fewer names to compare to MT and LXX Joshua 15. Nevertheless, it appears that all of the names on the Judahite settlement list in LXX Neh 11:25-30 are also present in Joshua 15. Josh 15:21-42 lists 67 towns of settlement, and the LXX of Neh 11:25-30 only has four, which is an overlap of approximately 6%. Regarding the two towns where the Benjaminites are recorded as settling (Geba and Michmash), only Geba is found in the Benjaminitc settlement list in Joshua 18. Thus, in both the MT and LXX, it does not appear that Joshua 18 had a strong influence on the composition of the Benjaminitc area of settlement in Neh 11:31-36.

Further, when one considers the MT and LXX material in light of Joshua 15, it

---

302 While Anathoth is listed in Josh 21:18 (among the settlements of the Levites), and Hazor and Ramah are found in Josh 19:36 (among the settlements of Naphtali), most of the place names in MT Neh 11:25-36 are not found in Joshua. Lod and Ono are found in the Benjaminitc genealogies in 1 Chr 8:12. Hadid is only mentioned in Ezra 2:33//Neh 7:37 and 11:34.

303 Geba is mentioned in several places, including Josh 18:24, 21:17, 1 Sam 14:5 and 1 Chr 6:8, to name a few. Michmash first appears in 1 Sam 14:5, located near Geba.
becomes clear that the ordering of the material is the common denominator in all three lists. In other words, the lists all begin with Kiriath-Arba, then catalog place names moving south, and then catalog place names moving north. The purpose, however, is quite different. In both Alt and Aharoni’s presentation of the Judahite material, they note that there are two aspects to the lists in Joshua: the boundary lists and the settlement lists. The boundary material uses both geographical features and town names to clarify the extent of Judah. The Joshua settlement list appears to be an exhaustive list of towns that fall within the sketched out boundaries of Judah. Yet, this is not the case in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. In essence, if one imagines the towns in Neh 11:25-36 as a boundary of Judah, then in reality MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 are a sort of inverse boundary list, since the towns are generally outside what is believed to be the administrative area of Persian period Judah. This is not to say, however, that writers of the lists found in the MT or LXX thought of these towns as outside of the sphere of Judean interests or control. While MT Neh 11:25-36 is, in fact, also creating a region of Judah by listing certain towns, the boundaries are not nearly as clear when compared to Joshua 15. In fact, unlike Joshua 15, the boundaries are not listed at all. This is an important factor for interpreting Nehemiah 11. Thus, for the LXX, the overlap with the Joshua 15 material is only through simple ordering of towns in a very cursory manner. In the case of MT Neh 11:25-30, there is much more overlap with Joshua 15 because of the expanded selection of towns.

304 Alt (1925; 1953: 193ff); Aharoni (1979: 248).
305 See chapter 6 for more on this topic.
The other similarity that Joshua 15 and MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 have is the use of specific terms of settlement size. In Joshua 15, there are several areas where there are summaries of the cataloged cities (vv. 32, 36, and 41). Within these summaries, the totals for the number of towns are furnished with a reference to “their villages” (ָּבִים). The “villages,” however, are always mentioned in connection to cities (נְוֵי) which is different from MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. The only references to “cities” (נְוֵי) in Nehemiah 11, are in vv. 3 and 21, but these are not part of the Nehemiah settlement lists preserved in MT Neh 11:25-36. Moreover, “their dependencies” (ָּבִים) also appear in Joshua 15, for Ekron (15:45), Ashdod (15:47), and Gaza (15:47). In fact, these towns are said to have both “dependencies” and “villages” associated with them. Within Joshua 15, v. 46 provides the only example of an individual city listed as having just “villages” without also mentioning dependencies. Thus, vv. 45-47 are unusual within the larger list in Joshua 15. In LXX Joshua 15:28 the Greek mentions certain “towns with their dependencies” (κωμαὶ αὐτῶν καὶ άί ἐπαυλεῖς αὐτῶν). This particular phrase is used to describe the settlements of Ekron (v. 45) and Ashdod and Gaza in v. 47. “Its dependencies” or “its villages,” however, appears in other tribal lists in Joshua, particularly in 17:11 and 16. Josh 17:11-12 states, “Within Issachar and Asher, Manasseh had Beth-shean and its villages, Ibleam and its villages, the inhabitants of Dor and its villages, the inhabitants of En-dor and its villages, the inhabitants of Taanach and its villages, and the inhabitants of Megiddo and its villages

306 In Josh 15:32, the text states, “all of the cities, twenty-nine, with their villages” (הָּבִים תַּעֲשֵׂים וְהָשֶׁם תַּעֲשֵׂה). While the number may differ, the structure is virtually identical in vv. 36 and 41.
Villages, however, do not appear in connection to the tribe of Benjamin and Joshua 18 only lists a total of the cities and dependencies connected to the tribe. Hence, while town names may have some overlap when comparing Joshua 15 with MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, connected or dependent settlements are quite different.

Overall, it would appear that Joshua 15 has certain affinities with the lists preserved in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, particularly concerning the pattern in which the Judahite settlements are organized. All of the texts begin with Kiriath-Arba and follow the same general arrangement. The discrepancy concerning the number of settlements, however, reveals that if the author of the list in MT Neh 11:25-36 had Joshua 15 at his/her disposal, then he/she only used the names that were pertinent to the list within the context of what he wished to claim for the period of Achaemenid era settlement. Also, the author of Nehemiah 11 has incorporated the introduction to Joshua 15 into his list, which is significant.


Another important set of lists to consider when examining MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 is Ezra 2:20-33//Neh 7:25-38. Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 are parallel lists chronicling the Temple community and their repatriation. In Ezra 2, the settlement list

---


follows the Cyrus edict (ch. 1), allowing for the exiles to return to their homeland. In Nehemiah 7:5-68, the list of settlers follows a first person narrative from Nehemiah, describing the situation in Jerusalem and then states, “I found the genealogical records of those who came up at the first” (דאנאא טספ דוחא אולא יבראננהו). The majority of scholars argue that this list combines several different periods of immigration set within the context of Nehemiah. Following Albright, Lipschits argues that the list is a summary of multiple censuses, dating from the early period of the return to Zion onward.

309 Several scholars have offered varying interpretations regarding the composition of the lists as well as different interpretations regarding the general purpose of the lists. Galling argues that the lists were an attempt to respond to challenges by the Samaritan community and, thus, was an attempt for the gola community to make clear legal and ecclesiastical claims to the land (1951: 151). This, however, is not the dominant opinion. Concerning the composition of the list, most scholars, including Batten (1913: 71), Rudolph (1949: 26), Schneider (1959: 37), Myers (1965), Japhet (1982: 84), Williamson (1985: 29-32), Clines (1984: 45), Halpern (1990:95-96) and Edelman (2005: 175) believe that Ezra 2 borrows the parallel material from Neh 7:6-73. Scholars, such as Schader (1930: 19-24) and more recently Blenkinsopp (1988: 83), argue that Nehemiah takes the material from Ezra. Others argue for a common source that both use independent of the other, including Brockington (1969: 49) and Fensham (1982: 49).

310 Disagreeing with Torrey’s (1896: 39-50) interpretation that the lists are completely fictional in nature, Blenkinsopp (1988: 83) argues that the lists derive from a mid-fifth century census record, dating to the time of Nehemiah. Earlier scholarship tended to view the list as showing different periods of return within the context of the beginning of the return (Galling 1951: 150-151; Myers 1965:15-26; and Kochman 1980: 118. Following Batten’s interpretation (1913: 72-75), most scholars views Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 as a condensation of several periods of return, into the mid-fifth century B.C.E.. Cf. Albright (1963: 87-88); Bright (1981: 376-77); Williamson (1985: 29-32); Blenkinsopp (1988: 82-85). See Carter (1999: 775 fn 5) and Lipschits (2005: 159-160) for bibliographies and discussions of this interpretation.

311 Lipschits (2005: 160) believes there is no evidence for a “massive return at the end of the sixth and beginning of the fifth centuries B.C.E. or even during the course of the fifth century B.C.E.” He argues that the archaeological data from these periods point to the opposite phenomenon, which is a decrease in population, particularly in the area of Benjamin. Disagreeing with an early date to this material, Finkelstein (2008 and 2010)
Although there are some minor differences in the order of towns, the people who returned, and spelling variants, the lists in Ezra //Nehemiah 7 are nearly identical.

Concerning the lists of towns, the majority of places mentioned are within the pre-exilic borders of Benjamin (Fig. 4-1). It is significant that none of the names from the Judahite settlement lists in MT Neh 11:25-30 appear in the settlement list in Ezra 2:20-33//Neh 7:25-38. This lack of overlap may be due to the fact that these parallel lists are not concerned with the towns in the south but appear to be focused on the resettlement of the region around Jerusalem and in the area of Benjamin, as well as a few towns in the Coastal Plain. But this lack of overlap is significant and must be explored further.

The lists in Ezra 2:20-33//Neh 7:25-38 are identical except for one place-name: Ezra lists a Gibbar, whereas the book of Nehemiah lists a Gibeon. The overlap in cities found in Ezra 2:20-34//Neh 7:25-38, and MT Neh 11:25-36 are Anathoth, Ramah, Geba, Michmash, Bethel, Ai (Aija), Nebo (possibly Nob), Hadid, Lod, and Ono. Ten names overlap within the settlement lists in Ezra 2:20-33//Neh 7:25-38 and MT Neh 11:25-36. The order, however, is dramatically different:

---

313 Both Ezra 2:1 and Neh. 7:6 state, “they returned to Jerusalem and Judah, each to his city” (יוֹרֵשָׁם לֵיהַרְשָׁלם וּרְחוֹדָה אֶחָּד לְעַיְרָם). These settlements are centered in the Central Hill country, especially to the northwest of this region.
314 Blenkinsopp (1988: 86-87) and Stern (2001: 429) argue that Gibbar is a corruption of Gibeon, and thus emend Ezra to read Gibeon. Williamson (1985: 25fn20) and Myers (1983: 13 fn 20) argue that Gibbor is a person’s name, and should not be emended to Gibeon. I am following Blenkinsopp and Stern’s emendation, which is based on the parallel list in Nehemiah 7.
Table 4-3: A Comparison with Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 Benjaminitive Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gibeon</td>
<td>Gibeon</td>
<td>Geba</td>
<td>Geba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Michmash</td>
<td>Michmash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aija</td>
<td>Aija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netophah</td>
<td>Netophah</td>
<td>Anathoth</td>
<td>Anathoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anathoth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nob</td>
<td>Nob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azmaveth</td>
<td>Beth-azmaveth</td>
<td>Ananiah</td>
<td>Ananiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiriath-jearim</td>
<td>Kiriath-jearim</td>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td>Hazor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chephirah</td>
<td>Chephirah</td>
<td>Ramah</td>
<td>Ramah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeroth</td>
<td>Beeroth</td>
<td>Gittaim</td>
<td>Gittaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramah</td>
<td>Ramah</td>
<td>Hadid</td>
<td>Hadid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geba</td>
<td>Geba</td>
<td>Nebiom</td>
<td>Nebiom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michmash</td>
<td>Michmash</td>
<td>Zeballat</td>
<td>Zeballat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>Ai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebo^316</td>
<td>Nebo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magbish</td>
<td>Magbish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam</td>
<td>Elam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harim</td>
<td>Harim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^315 The overlapping material is in bold.
^316 Nebo and Nob are probably the same place, since they are both located in the Benjaminitive territory, near Bethel.
^317 Scholars such as Blenkinsopp (1988) argue that Nob (ܢܒܐ) and Nebo (ܢܒܐ) are the same place, located somewhere in the Hill Country. There are a few references to Nob (1 Sam 21:1, 22:9, 11, 19, and Is 10:32), but the only evidence for a town called Nebo, located somewhere in the Benjaminitive highlands is found in Ezra 2:29//Neh 7:73. Thus, this may be a case where MT Neh 11:32 retains the correct name and Nob became Nebo through the addition of a wāw ending.
There are two towns that overlap with LXX Neh 11:25-36. Both Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7 list Geba (Ezra 2:23//Neh 7:30) and Michmash (Ezra 2:27//Neh 7:31), the two settlements northeast of Jerusalem, which are located in the territory allotted to the Benjaminites. Additionally, there are several names in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 that overlap with the list in Joshua 15 as well as MT Neh 11:25-36. Conversely, Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 do not list Kiriath-Arba, Jeshua, Beersheba, or Lachish, but these cities are found in the south, which is not the concern of the authors who composed the lists in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7.

These comparisons highlight the unique character of LXX Nehemiah 11:31-35 when compared to MT Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 material. It also reveals that, while there is some overlap between Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 and MT Neh 11:31-35, the order and scope of settlement are quite different. Compositionally speaking, these lists have little to do with each another. There is also clear evidence that, when compared to Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, the list of Judahite settlements in both LXX and MT Neh 11:25-30 is completely outside of the other’s scope of settlement. The differences may be attributed to the time period each list is attempting to reflect. Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 preserve an earlier list of returnees, whereas MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 is a later list, focused on certain settlements of the

---

318 See also 1 Chr 4:14 for a reference to the Valley of Artisans.
Judahites and Benjaminites.

2.3. A Comparison of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36 to Nehemiah 3

Another list to consider when examining the Judahite and Benjaminite settlement in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, is the list of wall builders in Nehemiah 3 (Fig. 4-2). The list is oftentimes argued to be set within the context of people contemporary to Nehemiah in the mid-fifth century B.C.E., during the reign of Artaxerxes I. These were the men who were purported to have helped Nehemiah reconstruct the walls. It is not exactly clear whether they built the walls themselves or financed the work. Lipschits argues that it is most likely they were the financiers and organizers for the rebuilding, and not necessarily the ones who did the work. Within this chapter there


320 There are, however, several interpretations concerning the compositional date of this material and the original form of this material. Several scholars argue that the list in Nehemiah 3 originated during the time of the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the list was then stored in the archives. The location and type of archive is debated. Interpretations range from the temple archives (Myers 1965: 112 and Williamson 1985: 200), the city archives (Fensham 1982: 172 and Grabbe 1998: 43) or even simply originally recorded in the text (Coggins 1976: 81 and Blenkinsopp 1988: 232). For a discussion of interpretations concerning possible sources, see Edelman (2005: 210-11) and Lipschits (forthcoming, ff 3).

321 Nehemiah 3 interrupts the first person narrative found in chapters 1-2 and 4. Since the list is written in third person, even when discussing Nehemiah (3:5), many scholars believe this list is an insertion into the Nehemiah Memoir material (cf. Wellhausen 1894: 168; Torrey 1896: 37-38; Batten 1913: 206-207; Gunneweg 1987: 75-76; Blenkinsopp 1988: 231; Wright 2004: 118-20). Blenkinsopp (1988: 231) argues this is an independent source that was inserted into the NM in order to expand the “allusions” to the wall-building activities.

322 Lipschits (2005: 169) argues this interpretation, based on the use of הָעַבָּד to convey the meaning “to give support and assistance.”
are multiple lists, including genealogies, certain people and the places in which they reside, and also a list of towns detailing where some of the wall builders were from. Thus, similar to Nehemiah 11, Nehemiah 3 is not simply a list of towns, but it also lists people and their place within the larger Judean settlement.

Moreover, like Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, Nehemiah 3 is commonly used as a guide for reconstructing the size and scope of Persian period Judah, particularly in relation to the different Judean districts. The places mentioned in Nehemiah 3 are mostly located in the Judean Hill Country and Benjamin, with the exception of Jericho. In relation to MT Neh 11:25-35 the only overlap is the town of Zanoah, which is mentioned in MT Neh 11:30.

### Table 4-4: A Comparison of the Judahite and Benjaminite Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>Kiriath-Arba and v. Diobn</td>
<td>Kiriath-Arba and v. Jeshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senaah</td>
<td>Jekabzeel (=Kabzeel) and v. Jeshua Moladah</td>
<td>Jeshua and v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekoa</td>
<td>Beth-pelet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibeon</td>
<td>Hazaar-shual</td>
<td>Beersheba and v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meron</td>
<td>Beersheba and v.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizpah</td>
<td>Ziklag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meconah and v.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En-rimmon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zorah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jarmuth and v.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harim</td>
<td>Zanoah</td>
<td>Lachish and f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahat-Moab</td>
<td>Adullam and v.</td>
<td>Beer-sheba (e.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zanoah</strong></td>
<td>Lachish and f.</td>
<td>Geba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-Hakkerem</td>
<td>Azekah and v.</td>
<td>Michmash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet-Zur</td>
<td>Beersheba (e.)</td>
<td>Aija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilah</td>
<td>Valley of Hinnom</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geba</td>
<td>Anathoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michmash</td>
<td>Nob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aija</td>
<td>Ananiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Hazor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anathoth</td>
<td>Ramah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nob</td>
<td>Gazor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ananiah</td>
<td>Gittaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazor</td>
<td>Hadid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramah</td>
<td>Neboim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazor</td>
<td>Zeballat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gittaim</td>
<td>Lod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hadid</td>
<td>Ono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neboim</td>
<td>Valley of Artisans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeballat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ono</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley of Artisans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Zanoah does not appear in LXX Neh 11:25-35, there is no overlap between the LXX material and Nehemiah 3. In view of the fact that many scholars rely on Nehemiah 3 to outline the districts of Judah during the time of Nehemiah, this lack of overlap has important implications as to the purpose and date of the Nehemiah 11 material. If MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 are simply considered boundary lists of settlement, providing the extent of Persian period settlement, then the lack of overlap is problematic. Yet, if one interprets the settlements as not necessarily reflecting the same period as these earlier Ezra and Nehemiah lists (Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, and Nehemiah 3), then this would explain...
some of the differences. Also, Nehemiah 11 does not represent a boundary list, but rather a settlement list, which focuses on certain towns considered part of the population of Judah and Benjamin. The population to rebuild the walls was only drawn from the province of Judah, during the fifth century B.C.E. This is not what is represented in MT Neh 11:25-36. What is clear, is that Nehemiah 3 did not influence the composition of MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 in any direct manner.

2.4. A Comparison of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36 to other Levitical Settlement Lists

MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:36 state, “And some of the Levites, divisions of Judah and of Benjamin.” (וְקַרְבֵּנֵיהֶם מִמֵּתָּבוֹת יְהוֹרָדָה לְבָנִימָה). As I mentioned in chapter 3, this particular verse is full of syntactical and text-critical issues. There is no verb present, making the reference to Levitical settlements difficult to interpret. Scholars such as Rudolph (1949: 188) and Blenkinsopp (1988: 332) interpret this verse as meaning that the Levites settled among the Judahite and Benjaminite settlements. And thus, the Judahite and Benjaminite settlements in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-35, respectively, were also settled by Levites. Within postexilic literature, these three tribes play an important role as seen in 1 Chronicles 2-9, in which their genealogies are the most conspicuous.324 Although the order of the tribes and their settlements are different in 1 Chronicles 2-9 than in the list in Neh 11:25-36, it is significant that 1 Chronicles 2-9 and MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 do not appear to distinguish the difference between the priests and

324 In the case of 1 Chronicles, it is clear that the term “Levites” is in reference to the tribe, or descendants of Levi. In the case of Nehemiah, there is less of a focus on the Levites as descendants of Levi. See Knoppers (2004: 260-1) for a discussion of the different Levitical genealogies in 1 Chronicles.
Levites. Rather, 1 Chronicles 2-9 and MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 list the entire group as Levites.

There are several examples of Levitical town lists, particularly in Joshua 21, Numbers 34-35, and 1 Chronicles 6. Although the Levites appear in MT and LXX Neh 11:36, there is very little connection to the other, more noteworthy, Levitical town lists. From Joshua 21, two names overlap with LXX Neh 11:25-36; Kiriath-Arba (Josh 21:11) and Geba (Josh 21:17). In MT Neh 11:25-36, there are five towns that are found in Joshua 21; Kiriath-Arba, or Hebron (v.11), Debir (v. 15), Geba (v. 17), Anathoth (v. 18), and Jarmuth (v. 29). There is no overlap with regard to the pattern of settlement name. Within this material, the list is constructed with the clans mentioned first, in order of the lot they drew (i.e. the descendants of Aaron, the descendants of Kohath, the descendants of Gershon, and the descendants of Merari) and then their towns of settlement. The towns of settlement are always referred to by name, but are called

---

325 In 1 Chronicles 1-9, the order of genealogies for the tribal groups that overlap with Neh 11:25-36 is Judah (1 Chr 2:3-4:23), Levi (1 Chr 5:27-6:66), and then Benjamin (1 Chr 8:1-40). Concerning the priests and Levites, in MT and LXX Neh 11:3 the priests and Levites are mentioned individually. In MT Neh 11:20, the priests and Levites are also mentioned separately, but this verse is not present in the LXX. In the case of Neh 11:36, the Levites are briefly mentioned, but with no reference to the priests. In 1 Chronicles, the priestly genealogies are part of the Levitical genealogies, and all are descendants of Levi. While this tie is not explicitly made in much of Nehemiah, the connection between the two is made clear throughout Nehemiah 11-12.

326 Blenkinsopp (1988: 329) notes in his discussion of MT Neh 11:25-36 that this list is not copying the Levitical settlements because there are only four names that occur in both lists. This is clearly true, not just based on the city names, but also based on types of settlement designations.

327 The order differs in Joshua 21 and 1 Chronicles 6. Another point of comparison is that Joshua 21 and Neh 11:1-2 involve casting lots, but in Neh 11:1, the lots are cast to settle Jerusalem.
“cities” (מְדַבֵּריָה) in the summary of each tribal allotment. Each town is also accompanied with associated fields or “pasturelands” (מִשְׂפָּרָה). This pattern is also found in Num 35:2-5, where the Levites are given cities (מְדַבֵּריָה) and pasturelands (מִשְׂפָּרָה) for settlement. What is striking about the use of both “cities” (מְדַבֵּריָה) and “pasturelands (מִשְׂפָּרָה) in both Joshua 21 and Numbers 35 is that these terms are never used in MT Nehemiah 11:25-36. There are references to the “cities of Judah” (תֵּרוֹת יְהוּדָה) in Neh 11:3 and 20, but no references to “cities” in MT Neh 11:25-36. Thus, both the terms of settlement in Joshua 21 and Numbers 35 as well as the areas of settlement, show little comparison with MT Nehemiah 11. What is strikingly similar, however, is the pattern in which these towns are listed. The towns in Joshua 21 follow a pattern that begins with the city of Hebron in the eastern Judean hills, then moves south, then west, and finally north. This is the exact pattern of LXX Neh 11:25-36 and is found also in the MT, with the addition of certain northwestern towns.

328 An example of the city summary is found in Josh 21:17-18 which states, “From the tribe of Benjamin: Gibeon and its pasture lands, Geba and its pasture lands, Anathoth and its pasture lands, and Almon and its pasture lands. Four cities.”

329 There are no towns of settlement listed since, as E. Davies remarks, “the names of the cities are not listed here (as was appropriate in view of the fact that the land had yet to be conquered)” (1995: 363).

330 As I discussed in chapter 2, I am translating this term as “cities” in Neh 11:3 and 20 in order to differentiate it from “towns” or “dependencies”. It is highly unlikely that most settlements could be classified as “cities” in the Persian period. Rather, they more closely resembled what may be more aptly classified as towns, hamlets, or enclosures.

1 Chronicles 6 provides two towns of overlap with LXX Neh 11:25-36: Hebron (6:55, 57), and Geba (6:60). In MT Neh 11:25-36, four names overlap, including Hebron, Debir (6:58), Geba and Anathoth (6:60). Similar to Joshua 21, the Levitical list in 1 Chronicles 6 follows the same order as MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. Thus, based on the two names in the LXX list and four in the MT list that overlap with the Levitical lists in Joshua 21 and 1 Chronicles 6, the resettlement of the tribe of Levi has little in common with these other lists.

Plotting out the Levitical settlements may help explain the purpose of v. 36 in more detail. While v. 36 appears to mean that the Levites had a share in all of the settlements, it is not attempting to hearken back to the settlement areas found in earlier Levitical lists. Yet, like the other settlement lists of the Levites, the Levitical settlements in Neh 11:25-36 seem to reflect the close connection between the lay people and the cultic personnel, to the point that the Levites even settle among them. Thus, these lists have no real connection to each other. This theme of lay people and cultic personnel working together for the larger community continues into chapter 12, where the entire community dedicates the wall of Jerusalem.

2.5. Excursus: The Rehov Synagogue Inscription

As a point of comparison to MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, the inscription from a

---

332 Many scholars, observing the overlap in 1 Chronicles 6 and Joshua 21, have attempted to ascertain which text is dependent upon the other. In certain cases when there are differences between the texts, 1 Chronicles seems to follow the OG of Joshua against the MT (Nelson 1997: 237). Auld (1979: 194-206) represents one of the few scholars who considers Chronicles came first. It is more common for scholars to argue that Chronicles is dependent on a form of Joshua (esp. LXX A and B) for its list (see Albright 1945; DeVries 1989: 64-68). Nelson (1997: 238) also argues for the dependency of Numbers 35 on Joshua 21. For a discussion of the history of the debate, see Knoppers (2004: 442-48.
late-Antiquity/Early Byzantine synagogue in Israel offers a late example of a list of settlement for the returnees from the Babylonian Exile. This 29 line, 365-word inscription is exceptional since it is the longest mosaic inscription that has been uncovered in Israel (Sussmann 1982: 146).\footnote{See also Sussman (1974: 88-158; 1976: 213-257) for the original archaeological observations on the Rehov Synagogue.}

Most of the mosaic inscription appears in Talmudic literature, specifically Demai II, Shevi’it VI, and also some tannaitic sources. Indeed, the “Boundary list of Eretz-Israel (l. 13-18),” is found in other materials, specifically Shevi’it IV, Sifre-Deuteronomy 10, J Shevi’it VI, 36c (Sussmann 1982: 149). But as Sussmann notes, while this boundary list has received a lot of attention in scholarly studies of the Talmudic and tannaitic literature, textual corruptions hampered the understanding of many of the names. This mosaic, however, offers variant spellings, which provide the modern scholar with a better understanding of the names that were corrupted in the Talmudic and tannaitic sources, and most closely follows the text of Sifre-Deuteronomy 10.

The list describes the boundaries of settlement.\footnote{The Rehov Synagogue underwent three building phases, beginning in the fourth century C.E. and continuing until the seventh century C.E. The mosaic inscription dates to the last building phase, around the sixth-seventh centuries C.E. (Vitto 1982: 92-94).}

This is one of the only examples of a text specifying, what is believed to be, the borders of the area of settlement for the returning exiles. The list begins with the statement, “The boundaries of Eretz-Israel: The Territory that the returnees from Babylonia Possessed.”\footnote{Translation from Levin (1982: 152-53).}

But as Sussmann notes, while this boundary list has received a lot of attention in scholarly studies of the Talmudic and tannaitic literature, textual corruptions hampered the understanding of many of the names. This mosaic, however, offers variant spellings, which provide the modern scholar with a better understanding of the names that were corrupted in the Talmudic and tannaitic sources, and most closely follows the text of Sifre-Deuteronomy 10.

The list describes the boundaries of settlement.\footnote{See also Sussman (1974: 88-158; 1976: 213-257) for the original archaeological observations on the Rehov Synagogue.}

This is one of the only examples of a text specifying, what is believed to be, the borders of the area of settlement for the returning exiles. The list begins with the statement, “The boundaries of Eretz-Israel: The Territory that the returnees from Babylonia Possessed.”\footnote{The Rehov Synagogue underwent three building phases, beginning in the fourth century C.E. and continuing until the seventh century C.E. The mosaic inscription dates to the last building phase, around the sixth-seventh centuries C.E. (Vitto 1982: 92-94).}

But as Sussmann notes, while this boundary list has received a lot of attention in scholarly studies of the Talmudic and tannaitic literature, textual corruptions hampered the understanding of many of the names. This mosaic, however, offers variant spellings, which provide the modern scholar with a better understanding of the names that were corrupted in the Talmudic and tannaitic sources, and most closely follows the text of Sifre-Deuteronomy 10.

The list describes the boundaries of settlement.\footnote{Translation from Levin (1982: 152-53).}
The Wall of Strato’s Tower (Caesarea Maritima)
The Wall of Akko
Headwaters of Gaaton and Gaaton proper
Kabratha
[B]eth Zenitha
The fort of Galila
$qwbýyal (“peaks”?) of Aitah
$mmšyyh of Jorcatha
The fort of Kuryaim
The neighborhood (or “enclosure”) of Jatti[r]
[The brook] of $bsl
Beth-Aita
Barshata
Greater Houle
The channel (?) of Iyyon
$msb $spn$ hh
The city of Bar Sangora
Upper Tarnegola of Casearea (Paneas)
Beth-Sabal
Canatha
Reqem of Trachonitis
Zimri of the limits of Bostra
Jabbok
Heshbon
The brook of Zered
Igar Sahaduta
Nimrin
The fort of Razizah
Reqem of Giah (Petra)
The gardens of Ashqelon
The great road leading to the desert.

This list is an intriguing departure from the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah. The purpose of the Rehov Synagogue list is to record the boundaries of the area that were required to observe the agricultural laws. Thus, this was the extent of what Sussman refers to as the “Holy Land” (1982: 149). Set within the context of the return from Babylon, most of the list focuses on boundaries and towns located along the coast and the northern area of Palestine. This is not the focus of the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah. Moreover, the Rehov
Synagogue list focuses on the boundaries of the area of settlement of “Eretz-Israel,” and thus assumes that everything in the interior of the boundaries is included within the settlement. Again, this is not the focus of the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah.

The differences between the Rehov Synagogue list and the Ezra and Nehemiah lists are many. Yet, both assume a connection between the places listed and the people. Akin to MT Neh 11:25-36, the Rehov Synagogue list appears to record the reality of a settlement area of a later Jewish community or an idealized list of a community rather than a community in the Persian period. The order and focus of each list, however, are very different.


What, then, may we conclude about the composition of Nehemiah 11:25-36? From the two versions of the text, it is evident that after the original composition, the list went through at least one major transformation.

*Compositional Horizon 1:*

- **Phase 1:** The List of Settlements outside of Jerusalem (LXX Neh 11:25-36). First, the author of the Vorlage of LXX Nehemiah 11 inserted the list of Judahite and Benjaminite settlements after the settlement of Jerusalem (LXX Neh 11:1-24). The list, preserved in LXX Neh 11:25-36 was a selection of settlements, not meant to be an exhaustive list, organized by tribe and settlement type. This selection was based on highlighting one or two key settlements from each region, specifically the Hill Country (Kiriath-Arba), the northern Negev (Jeshua and Beersheba), the Shephelah (Lachish), and the northern Hill Country (Geba and Michmash). The list outlined the regions of settlements, leaving out key names of other towns that would have been settled during the Persian period. The towns mentioned in the LXX may have

---

336 I will place the composition of Neh 11:25-36 within the larger framework of the composition of Nehemiah 11 and 12 in chapter 6.
represented the chief towns of settlement for each region.

*Compositional Horizon 2:*

- **Phase 1: Additions to the Settlement List (MT Neh 11:25-36).** Material was added to the Judahite list (vv. 25-30), based on established (earlier) list-making patterns seen in Joshua 15 (or a similar, extant, list of Judahite settlements). This was done in order to bolster the size of Persian period Judah, and to possibly reflect actual settlements throughout the areas of Judah and Benjamin, retrojected into an earlier period. Material was then added to the Benjaminite list (vv. 31-35). These settlements differ from the Benjaminite settlements in Ezra 2:20-34//Neh 7:25-28. In fact, when one examines the sites from each list, it is clear that the list in MT Neh 11:31-35 does not line up with the lists of settlement in Ezra 2:20-34//Neh 7:25-28. The Benjaminite additions, as reflected in the MT, paid close attention to tribal and regional settlements, but the author of the list found in the MT did not adhere to the careful organization of settlement type, as seen in the LXX. 337

The reason why this model is useful for considering the text-critical differences is that when one takes into consideration the textual additions present in the MT, the textual discrepancies reveal certain patterns to list-making and how additions to the text had to work within the older framework of the list found in the LXX. The tradition preserved in the LXX clearly organized material based on three criteria: Tribe, region, and settlement type. The text preserved in the MT kept the tribal and regional organization, but could not or did not wish to maintain the cohesion of settlement type. This is because the author of the material found in the MT was not interested in preserving one reference to each region, but rather attempted to show coverage in specific areas. These areas may have been necessary to delineate because of competing claims. However, the lists in MT

337 One cannot assume that the editor of the material found in the MT did not recognize the organization of the LXX list. It may only be assumed that it was not the editor’s priority to keep the same typology. Rather, the priority was for including more settlements.
and LXX Neh 11:25-36 does not attempt to claim any settlements directly south of Jerusalem, corresponding to the proposed districts, 7, 8, and 9 (Aharoni 1979: 346). We will examine these issues in more detail in chapter 6.

4. Conclusion

The overlap in the lists found in Joshua 15, 18, and 21, 1 Chronicles 6, Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, and Nehemiah 3 points out the frequency with which the places in LXX Neh 11:25-36 are mentioned in other lists. Nevertheless, it also highlights the consistency with which scribes organized toponym lists, as evidenced in Joshua 15 and MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. LXX Neh 11:25-36 follows the general pattern of order, albeit a cursory version, of Joshua 15. Yet it is significant that there are only a few names found in this original list, thus indicating intentional selection of this material, not a complete exegesis of Joshua 15. What is most intriguing is the ordering of towns, which delineates how the structure is put together. While the material preserved in the LXX creates areas of settlement, it is not meant to be exhaustive. In fact, the LXX appears to focus on what the author sees as settlement types throughout the landscape of, what the author perceived as, the area of settlement for the returnees to the land of Judah.

In contrast to the earlier LXX material, MT Neh 11:25-36 represents a later redaction, in which several more names are included. The order in which they were added mostly follows the order of the towns in Joshua 15. When the additions were included into the settlement list in Nehemiah 11, the general order of the regions stayed the same (from the LXX), but the depth of the list dramatically changed with the addition
of several towns throughout Judah and Benjamin. Thus, in order to bolster the scope of settlement, the editor of the list found in the MT employed known scribal patterns, as seen in earlier lists such as Joshua 15, and added several towns as well as types of settlements, namely “dependencies.” The purpose of these changes was to mirror the reality of a later community, but placed within the context of settlements in the Persian period. This was done in order to create a history of Judahite and/or Benjaminite settlement at the site, probably pointing to competing claims on these particular settlements. It appears, then, that the author of the list found in the MT either missed the general point of the material in the LXX, or more probably chose to disregard the earlier material, which simply outlined select settlements and types of settlements throughout Judah. For the writer of the list in the MT, specific settlements were necessary to mention for the purpose of “legitimacy.” That is, certain towns were necessary to clearly name in order to show that the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites settled here. Other cities, which one would expect to appear on the lists, corresponding to settlements directly south of Jerusalem, do not appear. This may be because there was not a pressing need to lay claim to these particular settlements.

While it is often argued that the material found in the MT is an idealized portrait of settlement, this does not fully consider the argument of what kind of settlements the author/editor of the list preserved in the MT is presenting. Based on the material preserved in the LXX, which is a short list of certain small settlements throughout the periphery of Judah and Benjamin, the author of the material preserved in the MT, worked within the parameters of settlement types laid out in the LXX. Although the six different places of settlement represent regions in the LXX, many of which fall out of what
modern scholars reconstruct as the territory of Judah, it is not an exhaustive list. The list in the MT is not exhaustive either, but rather focused on the towns that may have been disputed. These are not border lists, such as what is found in the examples of Joshua 15, 18, and the Rehov Synagogue Inscription. As Janzen has observed (2002: 501), if the author of the list in the MT were attempting to draw a “coherent border,” then “why did the list in Nehemiah not include all the sites on the western edge of the Shephelah in the list of Joshua?” This observation is important since there are key areas that one would expect to find, particularly on the list preserved in the MT, such as the western Shephelah, as well more sites in the Judean highlands. Thus, one must conclude that the list preserved in the MT does not preserve all places of settlement dating to the Persian period, but rather is a select register of towns in which they claim connections. When compared to other settlement lists in Ezra and Nehemiah, such as Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, and Nehemiah 3, it is also clear that MT Neh 11:25-36 preserves the most far reaching of all of the lists. MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36 are probably a response to these earlier lists. Since equal attention is paid to the settlements in Judah and Benjamin, the list preserved in MT Neh 11:25-36 functions as a counterweight to the settlement list in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, which are clearly focused on the area of Benjamin. I will return to the historical parameters of the settlement lists in chapter 6.
Figure 4-1: Towns of Settlement in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7
Figure 4-2: Towns of the Wall Builders in Nehemiah 3
Chapter 5

The Cultic Personnel and the Dedication of the Walls in Jerusalem: MT and LXX Nehemiah 12

1. Introduction

Among the biblical accounts of the Persian period settlement and occupation of Judah, Nehemiah 12 is noteworthy because it focuses on certain priests and Levites who came out from the exiled Jewish community in Babylon with Zerubbabel and Jeshua during the kingship of Darius I. Additionally, Nehemiah 12 presents a list of the priests and Levites who were in power during the time of Joiakim, lists of certain priestly genealogies, and a list of cultic personnel associated with the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem. All of these diverse lists highlight the elite cultic members associated with the return from Babylon, linking certain people with subsequent generations of priests and Levites. The lists in chapter 12 are significant for several reasons: from a compositional perspective, they are situated as the last lists concerning cultic membership within Ezra and Nehemiah; from an historical perspective, they provide genealogies that continue into a period that is considerably later than the rest of the genealogies in Ezra and Nehemiah; and also from an historical perspective they provide important information for reconstructing the cultic community in Persian period Jerusalem. The wealth of

---

338 1 Esd 5:5-6 places Zerubbabel’s return in the second year of Darius I, which is dated to 520 B.C.E.
genealogical information on the priests and Levites has shown Nehemiah 12 to be of great importance.\(^{339}\)

Thus, Nehemiah 12 has garnered much attention in modern scholarship, specifically with regard to form critical and historical critical studies. Yet the text critical discrepancies have not drawn the same careful consideration.\(^{340}\) Since Nehemiah 12 is important for understanding certain aspects of the Judean cult during the Persian period, it is noteworthy that MT and LXX Nehemiah 12 display several differences in form and content, particularly with regard to the names and number of people who left with Zerubbabel from Babylon (vv. 1-11) as well as to the narrative concerning the dedication of Jerusalem (vv. 27-47). MT Neh 12:1-11 lists 22 priests and eight Levites in the time of Jeshua who returned under the leadership of Zerubbabel, while LXX Neh 12:1-11 provides six names for the priests and six for the Levites. Other text critical issues are

---

\(^{339}\) Within this chapter, scholars use MT Nehemiah 12 to reconstruct lineages of the priests and Levites. Of particular interest are the genealogies of the priesthood in Judah (esp. vv. 2-7 and 12-21, as well as vv. 10-11 and vv. 22-23), along with similar genealogical lists found in Neh 10:3-9 and 1 Chronicles 24. With regard to these different lists, scholars have noticed overlap among the names in these respective lists as well as several discrepancies in form and content. See Cross (1975: 4-18) as well as subsequent responses to his proposal, as seen in Williamson (1977: 1985), Blenkinsopp (1988: 333-38), Koch (2001), VanderKam (1991: 2004), and Fulton (2009: 94-115), for varying interpretations as to the purpose of these priestly genealogies.

\(^{340}\) Nehemiah 12 is oftentimes divided into (at least) two main sections: 12:1-26 and 12:27-47. Scholars have noted certain form critical differences between 12:1-26 and 27-47. In Neh 12:1-26, the unit is constructed out of a series of third-person catalogs held together by their shared focus on the priests and Levites. Although lists are also abundant in Neh 12:27-47, the dedication of the wall is central to the story as well as the reappearance of Nehemiah and his first-person account of the events. The first person account of Nehemiah appears in Nehemiah 7:5, but then is interrupted by a series of events connected to the cultic community. Many scholars credit at least part of Nehemiah 12:27-43 to the Nehemiah Memoir (NM), including Myers (1965: 202-203), Clines (1984: 227-28), Williamson (1985: 369-72), and Blenkinsopp (1988: 343-48), because of the return to Nehemiah’s first person account.
found throughout the chapter, particularly in vv. 25, 27-28, 36, 43, 44, and 47, but the most pronounced differences are found in vv. 2-7, 14-21, and 38-42.

In order to understand the nature and scope of the return to Judah within the context of Nehemiah 12, this study seeks to examine the variants between the MT and LXX and to compare these diverse materials to other lists that overlap with MT and LXX Neh 12:1-11, such as Neh 10:3-9, 12:12-21, and 1 Chronicles 24. I begin with an investigation of MT Nehemiah 12, paying particular attention to the literary and form critical issues. Next, I examine the MT text in light of the corresponding LXX material, highlighting instances where these two overlap and also diverge from one another. With these divergences in mind, I examine the historical implications of these differences in the priestly and Levitical lists and also the narrative concerning the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem. In the example of the lists preserved in the MT, clear evidence indicates that the writers attempted to harmonize these lists with similar priestly and Levitical lists as well as to expand them to include more families. In contrast to the MT, the LXX lists are not meant to be an exhaustive catalog of cultic membership. Thus, while the overall intent of MT and LXX Nehemiah 12 is similar, the addition of certain names and events creates a distinct image of the magnitude of temple personnel connected to cultic participation.
2. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of MT Nehemiah 12

2.1. Introduction

The text of MT Nehemiah 12 recounts the story of the priests and Levites who returned from exile; presents a genealogy of the high priesthood, set during the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E.; and describes the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem during the time of Nehemiah. This chapter comprises the last section of genealogies within the book of Nehemiah. While some of the material is preserved in different forms in Ezra and Nehemiah, certain genealogies are only found in Nehemiah 12, spanning several subsequent generations after Zerubbabel.³⁴¹

MT Nehemiah 12

| 1. These are the priests and Levites who went out with Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua: Seraiah, Jeremiah, Ezra, | 1. פֶּתַחְתָּה הַבָּתִּים וְהָלָה רַבָּה | 湎ָעִים וּרְבָּכָל בַּרְשָׁאלִים | פֶּתַחְתָּה הַבָּתִּים וְהָלָה רַבָּה: | פֶּתַחְתָּה הַבָּתִּים וְהָלָה רַבָּה: |
| 2. Amariah, Malluch, Hattush, | 2. אֵמֶרְחָה מַלּוֹך הַטְּשָׁע | אֵמֶרְחָה מַלּוֹך הַטְּשָׁע | אֵמֶרְחָה מַלּוֹך הַטְּשָׁע: | אֵמֶרְחָה מַלּוֹך הַטְּשָׁע: |
| 3. Shecaniah, Rehum, Meremoth, | 3. שֶּׂכֶנֶּיאָה רִֽהֲמָה מְרָמִית | שֶּׂכֶנֶּיאָה רִֽהֲמָה מְרָמִית | שֶּׂכֶנֶּיאָה רִֽהֲמָה מְרָמִית: | שֶּׂכֶנֶּיאָה רִֽהֲמָה מְרָמִית: |
| 4. Iddo, Ginnethoi, Abijah, | 4. יִדְדֹּו גִּינְנֶהוֹי אֲבִיחַ | יִדְדֹּו גִּינְנֶהוֹי אֲבִיחַ | יִדְדֹּו גִּינְנֶהוֹי אֲבִיחַ: | יִדְדֹּו גִּינְנֶהוֹי אֲבִיחַ: |

³⁴¹ Josephus's chronology of the priesthood, found in Neh 12:10-11, and 22-23, designates Jaddua, the last name in the priestly genealogy, as contemporary with Alexander the Great (ca. 333 BCE). While Josephus’s chronology is problematic in part because he seems to rely solely on Neh 12:10-11 (or a parallel genealogy) as his framework for his chronology of the Persian period, he is one of the only early sources on the history of the priesthood in Jerusalem. Moreover, while Neh 12:10-11 may not be an exhaustive genealogy, it does span more than one century.

³⁴² MT Neh 11:4 Ginnethoi (גִּינְנֶהוֹי) is commonly emended to Ginnethon (גִּינְנֶהוֹנִי) based on the evidence in Neh 10:6 and 12:16, in which both the MT and LXX agree on the wāw-nūn (וָנָנִּֽי) ending rather than a wāw-yōd (וָֽיֹֽד) ending. While this emendation may be correct following these other readings, I have chosen not to emend this name because there are so many spelling variants within Nehemiah 12 (particularly vv. 12-21) that, unless the mechanism in which the error was made can be tracked, I have not emended the text.
Since Ezra 3:9 does not list a “Judah” as a family head, several scholars (cf. Blenkinsopp 1988: 334) emend “Judah” (יהודה) to Hodiah (חודה) in order to harmonize with Neh 8:7; 9:5; and 10:11; and 14, or Hodaviah (חodial) following Ezra 2:4. There is, however, a Levite named Judah mentioned in Ezra 10:23 as one of the members who signed the written pledge of conduct.

The kethib spelling Unno (ヴォ) is generally emended to the qere spelling Unni (_conv), based on other attestations of the qere reading (1 Chr 15:18 and 20). See Williamson for a discussion of Unno vs. Unni (1985: 357).

There is a textual issue in this genealogy. In 12:10-11, the normal pattern is “x the father of y, y the father of z.” But in the case of Eliashib, יָדָה (“the father of”) is missing in the formula. This appears to be an haplographic error, where the copyist missed the wāw prefix skipping over the hiphil verb as well as the particle object.

The kethib reading יָדָה is found in the qere as וָדָה, which may have occurred because of dittography from the following יָדָה (from וָדָה). Thus, many scholars (including Williamson 1985: 357) emend the text to read “of Malluch” (מַלְלָך), following v. 2 and also the LXX rendering of the name (τὸ Μαλουχ). Since Malluch is mentioned in v. 2 and also found in the LXX, Williamson’s emendation appears to be correct.

There is no descendant following Miniamin (מְנַיָּם) even though his name appears with the prefix –ל, indicating that an object should follow (acting as a dative). In the list of names, all of the other patronymics have a name listed after them. Thus, this is probably a case of haplography, but it is not possible to reconstruct the name since there are no parallel lists for this material.

The fact that a reference to the Levites (טָבְרִים) opens this verse has troubled commentators since it mostly discusses the priests. Rudolph (1949: 194), following Meyer (1896: 103) argues that this is a gloss from v. 23, which was misplaced with the addition of v. 22. Blenkinsopp (1988: 333) agrees with this interpretation, omitting the phrase altogether because he argues that “in the days of…” is the proper heading to v. 22, following the pattern in v. 12.

The word יִדְתֵּשׁ (“son of”) breaks the established pattern of listing the leaders without a patronymic. Also, the LXX has a variant, “and his sons” (οἱ υἱοὶ σὺν ήτοι), which may be from יִדְתֵּשׁ. Thus, יִדְתֵּשׁ is oftentimes emended to יִדְתֵּשׁ, “Binnui” since this is provided as a Levitical name in 10:10 and 12:8 (cf. Williamson 1985: 358 and Blenkinsopp 1988: 333).

This literally means “to make a dedication and joy”, which is also seen in Neh 8:12 and 1 Chr 30:23. This is probably best explained as a hendiadys and thus, following Williamson 1985: 368 (contra Blenkinsopp 1988: 342) should not be emended.

The word יִדְתֵּשׁ is oftentimes translated “thanksgiving song” or “thanksgiving offering” in the context of Neh 12:31, 38, and 40. But Neh 12:27 is oftentimes translated as “thanksgiving” with the exception of Williamson (1985: 367) who harmonizes it with vv. 31, 38, and 40, and thus translates it “thanksgiving choirs”. Boda (1994: 388)
5. Mijamin, Maadia, Bilgah,
6. Shemaiah, Joiarib, Jediah,
7. Sallu, Amok, Hilkiah, Jediah. These were the heads of the priests and their brothers in the days of Jeshua.
8. And the Levites: Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel, Sherebiah, Judah, Mattaniah who was over the hands, he and his brothers
9. and Bakbukiah and Unno. Their brothers (stood) opposite them in shifts.
10. Jeshua was the father of Joiakim, Joiakim the father of Eliashib, Eliashib of Joiada,
12. In the days of Joiakim the priests, heads of ancestral houses, were: of Seraiah, Meraiah; of Jeremiah, Hananiah;
13. of Ezra, Meshullam; of Amariah, Jehohanan;
14. of Malluch, Jonathan; of Shebaniah, Joseph;
15. of Harim, Adna; of Meraioth; Helkai;

maintains that it should rather be translated not as a “verbal thanksgiving song but rather a material thanksgiving offering”. His evidence for this interpretation is based on the Mishnah (spef. Shebouth II 2), as well as other attestations of its use in the Bible (cf. Lev 14:11 and 16:7). Boda also asks, “if the narrator wanted to say choirs, why did he not use the term used later in the chapter: ham’esor’rim?” (390). Through an examination of the LXX, specifically 2 Esd 22:27, 31, 38, and 40, he translates this as a reference to actual offerings, not songs. Although the choirs are directly involved in the events that are going on, it is logical to translate this as “give thanks” in the material sense.

As Williamson (1985: 368) points out, since Zechariah has direct kinship ties to Asaph, he is a Levite. Thus, the phrase (דומני הנשים והצפרדים) “and some of the sons of the priests with trumpets,” should go with the previous verse and not with the reference to the Levites. Following 1 Chr 15:24, trumpeting was a job of the priests, even (according to the Chronicler) back to the time of David (Clines 1984: 231).
16. of Iddo, Zechariah; of Ginnethon, Meshullam;
17. of Abijah, Zichri; of Miniamin, of Moadiah, Piltai;
18. of Bilgah, Shammua; of Shemaiah, Jehonathan;
19. of Joiarib, Mattenai; of Jedediah, Uzzi;
20. of Sallai, Kallai; of Amok, Eber;
21. of Hilkiah, Hashabiah; of Jedediah, Nethanel.
22. As for the Levites, in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua, there were recorded the heads of ancestral houses; also the priests until the reign of Darius the Persian.
23. The Levites, heads of ancestral houses, were recorded in the Book of the Records until the days of Johanan son of Eliashib.
24. And the leaders of the Levites: Hashabiah, Sherebiah, and Jeshua son of Kadmiel, with their associates over against them, to praise and to give thanks, according to the commandment of David the man of God, section opposite to section.
25. Mattaniah, and Bakbukiah, Obadiah, Meshullam, Talmon, and Akkub were gatekeepers standing guard at the storehouses of the gates.
26. These were in the days of Joiakim son of Jeshua son of Jozadak, and in the days of the governor Nehemiah and of the priest Ezra, the scribe.
27. Now at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem they sought out the Levites in all their places, to bring them to Jerusalem to celebrate the dedication with rejoicing, with thanksgivings and with singing, with cymbals, harps, and lyres.
28. The companies of the singers gathered together from the circuit around Jerusalem and from the villages of the Netophathites; 29. also from Beth-haggagil and from the fields of Geba and Azmaveth; for the
singers had built for themselves villages around Jerusalem.

30. And the priests and the Levites purified themselves; and they purified the people and the gates and the wall.

31. Then I brought the leaders of Judah up onto the wall, and appointed two great companies that gave thanks and went in procession. One went to the right on the wall to the Dung Gate;

32. and after them went Hoeshaiah and half the officials of Judah,

33. and Azariah, Ezra, Meshullam,

34. Judah, Benjamin, Shemaiah, and Jeremiah,

35. and some of the sons of the priests with trumpets: Zechariah son of Jonathan son of Shemaiah son of Mattaniah son of Micaiah son of Zaccur son of Asaph;

36. and his kindred, Shemaiah, Azarel, Milalai, Gilalai, Maai, Nethanel, Judah, and Hanani, with the musical instruments of David the man of God; and the scribe Ezra went in front of them.

37. At the Gate of the Spring, in front of them, they went straight up by the stairs of the city of David, at the ascent of the wall, above the house of David, to the Water Gate on the east.

38. The other company of those who gave thanks went to the left, and I followed them with half of the people on the wall, above the Tower of the Ovens, to the Broad Wall,

39. and above the Gate of Ephraim, and by the Old Gate, and by the Fish Gate and the Tower of Hananel and the Tower of the Hundred, to the Sheep Gate; and they came to a halt at the Gate of the Guard.

40. So both companies of those who gave thanks stood in the house of God, and I and half of the officials with me;

41. and the priests Eliakim, Maaseiah, Miniamin, Micaiah, Eloenai, Zechariah, and Hananiah, with trumpets;

42. and Maaseiah, Shemaiah, Eleazar,
Uzzi, Jehohanan, Malchijah, Elam, and Ezer. And the singers sang with Jezrahiah as their leader.

43. They offered great sacrifices that day and rejoiced, for God had made them rejoice with great joy; the women and children also rejoiced. The joy of Jerusalem was heard far away.

44. On that day men were appointed over the chambers for the stores, the contributions, the first fruits, and the tithes, to gather into them the portions required by the law for the priests and for the Levites from the fields belonging to the towns; for Judah rejoiced over the priests and the Levites who ministered.

45. They performed the service of their God and the service of purification, as did the singers and the gatekeepers, according to the command of David and his son Solomon.

46. For in the days of David and Asaph long ago there was a leader of the singers, and there were songs of praise and thanksgiving to God.

47. In the days of Zerubbabel and in the days of Nehemiah all Israel gave the daily portions for the singers and the gatekeepers. They set apart that which was for the Levites; and the Levites set apart that which was for the descendants of Aaron.
2.2. The Literary Critical Analysis

Nehemiah 12 combines several different kinds of lists, including genealogies, participants in certain temple events, and cultic positions, all connected to the cultic activities centered in Jerusalem. MT Nehemiah 12 may be outlined in this manner:354

MT Nehemiah 12
12:1-26: The cultic officials:
12:1-9: The priests and Levites who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua
   12:1a: Introduction: The return of Zerubbabel and Jeshua
   12:1b-7: Heads of the priests
   12:7b: Conclusion of the priestly list
   12:8-9: Heads of the Levites
12:10-11: Jaddua’s genealogy
12:12-26: Priests and Levites during the time of Jehoiakim
   12:12-21: Heads of the priests
   12:22-23: Eliashib’s genealogy
   12:24-25: Heads of the Levites: A list of Levites during the time of Jehoiakim and summary of events
   12:26: Concluding remarks
12:27-43: The dedication of the wall in Jerusalem:
   12:27-29: The Levitical musicians
   12:30: The purification of the priests and Levites
   12:31-42: The procession of cultic personnel around the wall
   12:31-37: Ezra and certain cultic personnel (moving to the right)
   12:38-39: Nehemiah and certain cultic personnel (moving to the left)
   12:40-42: The meeting of the cultic personnel at the House of God
   12:43: Conclusion of the dedication
12:44-47: Financial matters supporting the temple staff:
   12:45-47: Historical context of temple duties
   12:47: Financial support of the musicians and gatekeepers

MT Nehemiah 12:1-26, focuses on the priests and Levites during the periods of Jeshua and Joiakim. The unit as a whole brings together multiple generations, who through their

shared connections to the first generation of returnees, are then linked to the events in
12:27-47. Nehemiah 12:1-26 may be sub-divided into two basic literary units. The first
major unit is MT Neh 12:1-11 and opens in 12:1a with the governor Zerubbabel and the
priest Jeshua leading a repatriation of priests and Levites from the exile. MT Neh
12:1b-7 lists the heads of the families of priests who took part in the return with
Zerubbabel and Jeshua, cataloging 22 priests in this list. This register concludes with a
title for the 22 prists, along with their associates, calling them the ראמים דביהון (“heads
of the priests”). MT Neh 12:8-9 shifts to the eight Levites who returned to Judah at the
same time as the 22 priests, listed in 12:1-7. Finally, MT Neh 12:10-11 ends the lists of
priests and Levites with a priestly genealogy, beginning with Jeshua and ending with
Jaddua — a span of six generations. The basic literary unit in MT Neh 12:1-11 is
constructed from different types of lists, linking together different priests and Levites.
This section is part of a larger literary unit of lists that begins in Nehemiah 10 and
continues through Nehemiah 12, and is mostly focused on people, area, and dedication of
the cultic community. In the case of 12:1-11, these three lists consist of the priests who
returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua (12:1-7), the Levites who also returned (12:8-9),
and the descendants of Jeshua (12:10-11). All three sections are clearly distinct from

355 Jeshua is not specifically listed as a high priest in Nehemiah 12:1 or 7, but in other
contexts he is (Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4). He is also consistently listed as the first high
priest during the Second Temple period, particularly in Josephus (11.7-318).
356 Scholars have argued that the 22 priests in Nehemiah are witness to the system of
courses as seen in 1 Chr 24:1-19 (cf. Williamson 1979; 1985: 341-64). Knoppers
cautions against this direct correlation since there are no references to priestly courses in
Nehemiah and also there are variants within the lists of priests (2004: 840-42).
357 Japhet points out that Nehemiah 11 is built around a “literary sequence” which Neh
12:1-26 continues (2006: 250). This “literary sequence” is structured around lists, and
thus, the lists are not a part of the actual narrative but rather are independent. Japhet also
argues that Nehemiah 11-12, is a compilation of lists with an independent history.
each other, but in their present form, each is dependent on Neh 12:1a in order to provide
a context for the list within the broader framework of Nehemiah.

Further, MT Neh 12:12-26 focuses on the priests and Levites but in contrast to vv.
1-11, these events take place during the time of Joiakim. According to the genealogy in
12:10, Joiakim is the generation following Jeshua. The priestly list (vv. 12-21) and the
Levitical list (vv. 24-25) are interrupted by a priestly genealogy, presumably used for
chronological purposes, as well as a description of sources used to compile the material
(vv. 22-23). MT Neh 12:12-26 concludes with a reference to the people who were in
power during the time of Joiakim, Nehemiah, and Ezra.

MT Nehemiah 12:27-43 turns attention away from solely highlighting lists of
priests and Levites from the elite temple population and focuses on the dedication of the
wall in Jerusalem. Together with the priests and Levites, Nehemiah takes part in the
procession around the city (esp. in vv. 31, 38, and 40). This procession, consisting of two
different groups, meets “in the house of God” ( asigny בֵּית הָגוֹ�) where they sacrifice and
give thanks for the dedication of the wall. The entire community also takes part in this

---

358 Scholars such as Clines (1984: 224-25) places Joiakim in the period between the return
from exile and the era of Ezra and Nehemiah (c. 458, 445). According to Josephus,
Joiakim died during the Feast of Tabernacles and was subsequently succeeded by his son,
Eliashib (Ant. XI.5).

359 The term בֵּית הָגוֹ� commonly appears in post-exilic literature throughout
Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah (cf. Ezra 2:68; 3:8; 6:22; 8:36; 10:1; Neh 6:10; 8:6;
11:11, 16, 22, 40; 1 Chr 6:33; 9:11, 26, 27; 22:2; 23:28; 23:28; 2 Chr 5:1; 23:9). This
particular use in MT Neh 12:40 is different from other attestations because the groups,
both cultic and lay members, meet in the house of God, not just at it. Eskenazi observes
that this shows a coming together of the lay and cultic communities, with no separation,
in Ezra-Nehemiah. This is possible from the cultic viewpoint because the people have
gone through purification rites. Eskenazi adds the unification is also possible “because
the house of God refers to the wide space within the walls” (1988: 121).
celebration. Nehemiah 12:30 specifies that everything, including the gates, walls, and people, are purified. Thus, it is clear that in order for this procession to take place, it is necessary to make the entire community “holy.” Nehemiah 12 concludes with the full participation of the community in the dedication of the city wall of Jerusalem. As previously mentioned, Nehemiah 12 completes the series of lists in Ezra-Nehemiah. These lists serve as a means of creating an image of future hope, as they are drawn from past, present, and even future cultic institutions.

Although there are clear divisions within chapter 12, particularly between vv. 1-26, vv. 27-43, and vv. 44-47, the larger theme of Nehemiah 12 ties together priestly and Levitical groups over several generations as well as provides the outcome of the rebuilding activities in vv. 27-43 with the dedication of the wall. As Williamson remarks, “The dedication of the newly built wall of Jerusalem is the climax to the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. It marks the last stage in the long process of restoration after the exile” (1985: 376). Thus, the activities of rebuilding, both temple and settlements, are brought to completion. Nehemiah 12 serves as a link between the events within the chapter as well as with the beginning of Ezra-Nehemiah, specifically Ezra 1, through the

---

360 And, as Eskenazi observes, “The purification of all the people is especially important. It demonstrates that they are brought into the same ritual status as priests and Levites...This amplifies the point made by the Israelite pedigrees: the sanctity of the people, not merely the clergy, matter” (1988: 117-18).

361 Concerning 12:1-26, Williamson (1985: 366) correctly observes that the author of the material works hard to create “close family associations” between the period from the building of the second temple to the next generation, which is the period of Ezra and Nehemiah.
use of genealogies that are meant to create cohesion between the past and present.\textsuperscript{362}

Nevertheless, it also creates a link with the future, since the genealogies attempt to link the events to successive priestly generations (cf. v. 10-11, 22, and 23). Ultimately, this link with successive generations is the goal of the lists in Nehemiah 12 because it serves as a means of legitimizing later generations, who were not directly involved in the repatriation of Jerusalem.

2.3. The Structure and Form of MT Nehemiah 12

MT Nehemiah 12 creates an image of a restored community, centered on the restructuring of both community and cultic institutions. Yet many form critical issues are apparent when examining the entire chapter. First, the natural divide between vv. 1-26 and 27-47 reflects a change in focus, form, and content. The shift from lists and genealogies to a dedication ceremony is a clear division between the two sections. Yet even within the two sections, textual as well as form critical problems abound. As several scholars have noted, some of this material may be attributed in part to the Nehemiah Memoir (NM), but not the material in its entirety.\textsuperscript{363} And in fact, as we shall see, text critical matters further complicate certain issues concerning the NM.

In Neh 12:1-26, the material begins with the introduction of the return during the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua. Neh 12:1a is integral for holding together the material in

\textsuperscript{362} Eskenazi argues that Nehemiah 12 forms a chiasm with Ezra 1 (1988:115). This brings the text full circle, ending with the hopes of resettlement and restoration of temple institutions laid out at the beginning of Ezra 1.

\textsuperscript{363} See Myers (1965: 202-203); Clines (1984: 227-28); Williamson (1985: 369-72); and Blenkinsopp (1988: 343-48; 2009: 90). For a discussion of the composition of this chapter with regard to the Nehemiah Memoir, see chapter 7.
12:1b-11. MT Neh 12:1a serves as both a heading for the subsequent material, which is a list of the priests and Levites who returned with Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua, and also provides a relative chronological context for the lists in Neh 12:1-9.\textsuperscript{364}

This relative chronology is based on dating the return to both the governor Zerubbabel as well as the high priest Jeshua. Further, the introductory phrase, \(\text{גָּאֲלָה} \text{בְּכַנִּים} \text{וֹלֶּדְנָי} \text{מִיִּים} \) (“these are the priests and the Levites”) clearly outlines the two groups that are listed as returning with Zerubbabel and Jeshua as well as highlights the material that will follow. The designations of priests and Levites, \(\text{בְּכַנִּים} \text{וֹלֶּדְנָי} \) show the separation of these groups into distinct positions.\textsuperscript{365} The use of \text{בְּכַנִּים} clearly highlights their

\textsuperscript{364} Hag 1:1, 2:23; Ezra 3:2, 8, and 5:2 record that Zerubbabel was the son of Shealtiel, who was the first son of Jehoiachin. MT 1 Chr 3:19 offers a variant genealogy, referring to him as the son of Pedaiah, the third son of Jehoiachin. Albertz argues that in the later genealogy, Shealtiel does not have any children, and so is a case of levirate marriage, where Pedaiah married Shealtiel’s widow, once Shealtiel died without offspring (2003: 107). It should be noted, however, that LXX 1 Chr 3:19 does not refer to him as the son of Pedaiah, but calls him the son of Shealtiel. See VanderKam for a discussion of Zerubbabel’s lineage (2004: 104).

\textsuperscript{365} As I mentioned in chapter 2, Gunneweg (1965: 207-8) asserts that this intentionally copies the Deuteronomistic phrase \(\text{בְּכַנִּים} \text{וֹלֶּדְנָי} \) (“the Levitical priests”). But it is noteworthy that the two groups are clearly divided in Nehemiah. The phrase \(\text{בְּכַנִּים} \text{וֹלֶּדְנָי} \) also appears in 2 Chr 5:5; 23:18; and 30:27. An allusion to this deuteronomistic phrase may appear because later redactors were not careful when copying these terms and mixed up the Deuteronomistic term with the Chronicler’s term. See Myers (1965:176), Williamson (1982: 214, 318, 371-2); and Japhet (1993: 572) for a discussion of this phrase.
division and shows that the Levites were not considered priests. Likewise, these separate designations are found throughout Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

After the introduction of Zerubbabel and Jeshua in MT Neh 12:1a, vv. 1b-7 presents a record of the 22 priests who participated in the return to Judah. The priests are: Seraiah, Jeremiah, Ezra, Amariah, Malluch, Hattush, Shecaniah, Rehum, Meremoth, Iddo, Ginnethoi, Abijah, Mijamin, Maadiah, Bilgah, Shemaiah, Joiarib, Jedaiah, Sallu, Amok, Hilkiah, and Jedaiah. MT Neh 12:7b provides more detail for these 22 priests, adding ellos hamenu ovadim ba'im ahimvati ("These are the heads of the priests and their brothers in the days of Jeshua"). The 22 priestly names are the heads of the families and their brothers, and not simply the priests who returned with Jeshua and Zerubbabel. MT Neh 12:7 dates the people to the “time of Joiakim,” which may have been the priest in power when the list was compiled.

---

366 They are no longer considered the Levitical priests, a term that is used in the P source. Scholars, such as Nurmela (1998: 166), argue that in the post-exilic period, a clear distinction is drawn between the two groups. This is clearly evident throughout the book of Nehemiah.

367 Other examples of המנהיגים והלשheimerim ("the priests and Levites") appear in Ezra 6:20; 8:30; Neh 8:13; 12:30; 13:30; 1 Chr 13:2; 15:14; 24:6; 2 Chr 11:13; and 23:4.

368 Of note is that 1 Macc 2:1 lists Joiarib as an ancestor of the Maccabean family. Since the Maccabees were of a priestly family, it is significant that they were able to tie their lineage back to the first return from the Babylonian exile.

369 Jedaiah is listed twice (vv. 6 and 7). The LXX varies, listing Hodaviah (Οδουαο) for the second attestation of Jedaiah.

370 Rooke points out that this is distinctive to Nehemiah 12 (12:12, 22, 26). She also observes, “At first sight this looks like an indication of the high priest’s authority, since anyone important enough to serve as a date marker must have been making some impact on the community. But the lists so dated are lists of Temple personnel only, not of the community as a whole, and surely the obvious way to date them is by the one in charge of the people listed” (2000:170-71).
Nehemiah 12:7b refers to the priests as the "heads of the priests". A variant of this title is also found in the singular, "the head priest") which is a name for the high priest used in several contexts, including 2 Kgs 25:18; Jer 52:24; Ezra 7:5; 2 Chr 19:11; 24:6, 11; 26:20; and 31:10. Since the two titles are very similar, one may think that the plural is also a title for the high priesthood. Yet the use of the singular title is employed only when referring to priests from the pre-exilic period, although it appears primarily to be used in the post-exilic period. It should also be noted that the structure of the title is different. In Neh 12:7 is in construct to but is opposite in the case of the titles of the high priests where is in construct to. Further the title does not seem to be another

371 Nehemiah uses "heads" (םהבהים) in the construct to indicate specific official positions. It appears in several different contexts, including Neh 10:15 (leaders of the people), 11:3 (leaders of the province), and 12:46 (leaders of the singers). But (leaders of the priests) only appears in this context. In fact, the more common title in post-exilic literature is ("chiefs of the priests") which is found in Ezra 8:24, 10:5; and 2 Chr 36:14. Yet never appears in Nehemiah. As Vanderhooft has pointed out, the use of the term in the books of Ezra-Nehemiah, appears to suggest that these were members of a "theocratic hierarchy." He contrasts this with Chronicles, where the term is used to highlight members of the military (1990: 187). See Shoshan (1988: 1050-51) for further examples of .

372 Jer 52:24 mentions Seraiah was the grandfather of Jeshua, the first high priest of the Second Temple period. Rooke (2000: 77) points out that 2 Kgs 25:18 is the only occasion in the Deuteronomistic History where a high priest is mentioned without a clear connection to a king. The title can also appear with the article - in a prefix to the noun .

373 Japhet argues that in the case of Ezra 7:5, the title, (רשיבה), means "first priest" and is a reference to Aaron. Thus, this is not a title for Ezra specifically, but rather a reference to Aaron’s standing and Ezra’s connection to the first priest (1968: 343-44).
There are several reasons for this anomaly. First, Jeshua is not listed among this group, but rather provides a heading for the section. Second, it is unlikely that 12:1b-7 lists 22 high priests after listing Jeshua, who is identified as a high priest in other contexts. This same construction is also used as a title for the Levites in Neh 12:24 (יִשְׂרָאֵל רְאוּפִּים) and thus, is employed when describing the heads of the families connected to the priesthood and other temple positions. Finally, in the case of Nehemiah 12, דָּוִד רְאוּפִּים in the construct is used as a title for several different jobs but does not appear to be a specific title for the high priesthood.

In MT Neh 12:8, the register changes focus to the Levites who may have returned with Jeshua, but this register is still dependent upon 12:1a to set the context for the Levites. Thus, the register of the Levites follows the introduction “these were the priests and Levites who went out with Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua,” and thereby mirrors the priestly material by listing the Levites who were part of the return to Jerusalem.

---

374 יְשָׁבוֹת is more commonly used to describe a family head in connection to a family house, such as the heads of the family, יְשָׁבוֹת אָבֵּד (cf. Ezra 1:5; 2:68; 4:2, 3; 10:16; Neh 3:36; 7:69, 70; 8:13; 11:13; 1 Chr 7:11; 8:6, 10, 9:9, 33; 2 Chr 1:2; 26:12).

375 Rooke correctly observes “It would be very strange if there were twenty-two more high priests alongside the one who was supposedly in office at that time” (2000: 172).

376 Williamson points out that these two titles are used in apposition, which is unusual in this context (1988: 358-9).

377 Bartlett (1969: 1-10) argues that in the pre-exilic texts the title “head” can refer to a leader of small groups, even within a certain tribe. But within the post-exilic context, the term was employed when referencing the head of a family. Examples of this are seen in 1 Chr 9:17 (List of gatekeepers), 16:4 (Levites connected to the Ark), Ezra 5:10 (Wall-builders), and Neh 12:24 (Levites connected to songs of praise). See also Weinberg (1992) for a discussion of this term.

378 Neh 12:8-9 is linked to the previous material, through the use of the conjunctive wāw, tying together vv. 8-9 with 1b-7.
Judah. MT Neh 12:8-9 supplies eight names for the Levites who held jobs in the temple precinct: Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel, Sherebiah, Judah, Mattaniah, Bakbukiah, and Unni. These verses also provide a description of their jobs within the temple precinct: they are in charge of the certain work, oftentimes translated, “over the praise/thanksgiving” (על הרודה). The ketib reading, however, may in fact mean “over the hands.” In 12:9, Bakbukiah and Unni are also mentioned as leaders of the Levitical singers. MT Neh 12:9b states that they “stood opposite them in shifts” (לָנָהָרָים לִמְדִיגָנָה). Thus, Bakbukiah and his brothers stood opposite Mattaniah and his brothers in the temple service.

MT Nehemiah 12:10-11 marks a change in the form of the lists. Whereas Neh 12:1-9 provides a list of family heads anchored to a specific event (the return under Zerubbabel and Jeshua), Neh 12:10-11 shifts to a linear genealogy of one family, beginning with Jeshua and continuing to Jaddua—a span of some six generations. Following MT Neh 12:1-9, this list does not provide a position or title for the people recorded in the genealogy. MT Neh 12:1 never lists Jeshua’s position, presumably the first name in the genealogy found in 12:10-11. Yet this follows the larger pattern in

---

379 Williamson argues that this strange form of הָדוֹרָה should be read as הָדוֹרָה (“the thanksgiving”) which would be an infinitive functioning like a verbal noun, or as הָדוֹרָה. Either of these solutions resolves the problem of the strange form present in the MT (1985: 357).
380 Mattaniah and Bakbukiah are also mentioned as temple singers in MT Neh 11:17. In the corresponding LXX material, Bakbukiah is not mentioned.
381 For a full analysis of Neh 12:10-11 as a priestly genealogy, see Fulton (2009: 94-115).
382 It should be noted that Zerubbabel is also not given an official title in Neh 12:1.
Ezra and Nehemiah, in which Jeshua is never referred to as a high priest. Other sources, such as Haggai, Zechariah, and also Josephus’s *Antiquities*, refer to certain people listed in the linear genealogy in MT and LXX Neh 12:10-11 as high priests. Thus, without knowledge of other biblical passages mentioning the titles of a few of the people in 12:10-11, namely Jeshua and Eliashib, no one would normally hypothesize that this is a high priestly genealogy. There are no titles, functions, or synchronisms within the material.

Further, this abrupt switch in style with no clear introduction to the genealogy in vv. 10-11 indicates that within its current placement in the text, it is dependent on previous material to set a context for the genealogy, beginning with Jeshua. The genealogy lists six generations: Jeshua, Joiakim, Eliashib, Joiada, Jonathan, and Jaddua. Although the genealogy never clearly states this fact, it is commonly interpreted as a high priestly genealogy. As such, the list is taken as an important building block for the chronology of the Persian period. Nevertheless, without other

---

383 He is listed without a position in Ezra 2:2; 3:9; 4:3; 5:2; Neh 7:7; 12:1, 7. He is called a priest in Neh 2:36 and Neh 7:39.

384 Jeshua is the first to be called, יְהוָה נֵצָרֵל (“great priest”) in Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4; Zech 3:1, 8; 6:11. This term does not appear until the postexilic period. VanderKam (2004: 21) connects this title to the expression in Lev. 21:10, רָבָּת יִהוָה נֵצָרֵל (“the priest who is exalted above his brothers”). It is unclear if this is equivalent to the title לֶוֶת נֵצָרֵל (“head priest”) in 2 Kgs 19:1-7 or Jer 19:1 (Dommerhaun 1995: 71). Jeshua is also commonly connected to Zerubbabel (cf. Hag 1:14: רָבָּת יִהוָה נֵצָרֵל פִּי יִהוָה אֲשֶׁר יַהֲדַךְ נֵצָרֵל), During the monarchy, the high priests were occasionally referred to as לֶוֶת (“the priest,” 1 Kgs 4:2), or לֶוֶת (“head priest,” 2 Kgs 25:18). This same title is also used in Ezra 7:5 to refer to Aaron. It is debated, however, whether there were any high priests until the late pre-exilic period.

385 VanderKam provides a synopsis of the extra-biblical references to the names of the high priests mentioned in the Neh 12:10-11 (2004: 44-87).
biblical references to these people, it would be unclear if this lineage were truly a
genealogy of high priests, or simply a genealogy of a prominent figure within the
religious community named Jeshua. Further, according to Josephus’ chronology, the
genealogy spans a period of approximately 200 years. Jeshua is said to have returned
with Zerubbabel, and according to Josephus, Jaddua (the last name in the genealogy)
served as a high priest during the reign of Alexander the Great, c. 333 BCE (*Ant.* 11.317).

The priestly genealogy in Neh 12:10-11 has drawn much attention in biblical
scholarship, originally by Cross (1975:1975; 1998), and later by Koch (2001),
Williamson (1977; 1985), Blenkinsopp (1988), and VanderKam (2004). These scholars
attempt to solve the problem of the lengthy tenures of these proposed “high priests” in
light of various considerations in order to reconstruct the chronology of the high
priesthood and understand the compositional process of the Nehemiah material. One of
the chief issues in understanding the genealogies in Nehemiah 12 (vv.10-11, 22, and 23)
are the discrepancies in the priestly succession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-1: The Priestly Genealogies in Nehemiah 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT and LXX Neh 12:10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiakim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliashib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaddua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These internal issues are problematic when attempting to determine the names, order, and
number of priests in the Persian period. Nehemiah 12:10-11 lists a Jeshua, Joiakim,
Eliashib, Joiada, Jonathan, and Jaddua. However, 12:22 begins with Eliashib, the third
name in the list, and then mentions Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua. The name Johanan does not appear in 12:11, but it does appear in 12:23 (and Ezra 10:6) as the son of Eliashib. To further complicate the matter, Johanan is also mentioned in Neh 12:22, but as the son of Joiada and grandson of Eliashib. 386

Several solutions have been proposed to address these major issues. Cross, Koch, Williamson, and Blenkinsopp all argue that the lists are incomplete and offer different hypotheses to resolve the chronological issues, including ponymy and textual haplography (Cross 1975). In response to Cross’s suggestion, others argue for the intentional omission of names from an earlier version of the list (Koch 2001), and for the possibility that these lists were never complete (Williamson 1985; Blenkinsopp 1988). On the other end of the spectrum, VanderKam argues for the fundamental accuracy of the list (1991; 2004). 387 While all of these interpretations admirably attempt to resolve difficult chronological issues, they are all based on the assumption that this is a high priestly genealogy list in genealogical dress.

Without knowledge of other biblical passages mentioning the titles of a few of the people in 12:10-11, particularly Jeshua and Eliashib, no one would normally hypothesize that this is a high priestly genealogy. 388 As previously stated, there are no titles, functions

386 Johanan is also mentioned in the Elephantine Papyri. This is probably the same Johanan who is mentioned in Neh 12:22. See VanderKam (2004: 55). See also Porten (1996: 140), specifically Papyrus 30, for the reference to Johanan.
387 For a full discussion of each interpretation, see Fulton (2009: 96-103).
388 To complicate matters, there is no biblical confirmation that all of the six individuals named in the lineage served as high priests. Only Jeshua and Eliashib are listed as high priest (Jeshua appears in Hag 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4; Zech 3:1, 8; 6:11 and Eliashib is mentioned in Neh 3:1, 20 and 13:28). Joiakim, Johanan/Jonathan and Jaddua are never listed as high priests in the Hebrew Bible. A Johanan is mentioned in the Elephantine Papyri (Papyrus 30) as a high priest (Porten 1996: 140). The name יַדְדַעַ (Jaddua) has
or synchronisms within the material. In fact, to illuminate the function of this genealogy, scholars have turned to Josephus who states that these people were all high priests in succession. Josephus’ chronology of the priests mostly matches the sequence of Neh 12:10-11, but lists Johanan, as found in 12:22, instead of Jonathan.389 Yet this is clearly a case in which Josephus is using a version of (or some part of) Nehemiah as a source to create his own genealogy. And thus, Josephus’s construction of the high priestly genealogy should not be used to argue for the accuracy of Neh 12:10-11.390 It is significant, however, that this genealogy was established by the time of Josephus, suggesting that the haplographic error between Eliashib and Joiada (12:10) was set by this time.391

The other main issue is the time-span among the six names. If one follows Josephus’s chronology for these six priests, then the average generational span for each priest was around 34.5 years.392 A parallel study of the regnal lengths of the kings of Israel and Judah reveals that this is much longer than any mean length of time for six

---

389 Josephus’s Ant. mentions five names in the genealogy found in Neh 12:10-11: Jeshua (11.73), Joiakim (11.120-121), Eliashib (11.158), Joiada (11.297), and Jaddua (11.317-318). The fifth name in the list of 12.10-11, Jonathan, does not appear, but rather Johanan (11.297), who appears in Neh 12:22.

390 As Grabbe (2004; 234) has observed, in almost every case, Josephus did not have any genealogical information in addition to what is found in the Bible.

391 As previously mentioned, between Eliashib and Joiada, there is no reference to Eliashib begetting Joiada, which breaks the established pattern (x “the father of” y). Since this pattern is broken only in this link, it must be assumed to be a scribal error, which is found in MT and LXX Neh 12:10-11 as well as Josephus.

392 Cross 1975: 17. This is based on his interpretation that Jeshua was born c. 570 BCE and Jaddua c. 420 BCE.
kings in a row in either Israel or Judah. Since there is no evidence that the high priest’s tenure could begin as a child or that his average life span was greater than the kings of Israel or Judah, it would seem highly unlikely that the six names provided in Jeshua’s genealogy could span approximately 200 years.

What, then, is the purpose of the genealogy in Neh 12:10-11? It appears that the importance of validating Jeshua’s lineage is the reason supporting the inclusion of Neh 12:10-11 within the broader framework of Nehemiah 11-12. Also, Neh 12:10-11 links Jaddua to his famous ancestor Jeshua, the authoritative priestly figure of the early postexilic age. Some of the persons named in the list may have served as high priests and others may have not. Most importantly, this genealogy was compiled in order to establish a succession within a single family from Jeshua to Jaddua. Through this succession, Jaddua’s ancestry was clearly seen as legitimate, which is the ultimate goal of this material. The need for legitimacy may also explain why it is placed directly after the list of the first generation of returnees.

After concluding the portion concerning the priests and Levites who were contemporary to Jeshua’s and Jaddua’s generations, Neh 12:12-21 opens with “in the days of Joiakim” and then lists 21 patronymics of priests who are contemporary to Joiakim. This block of priests dating to the time of Joiakim is parallel

---

393 See Fulton 2009: 101-102 for specific examples of particularly lengthy contiguous reigns in both Israel and Judah.
394 Indeed, all of the names on the list could be high priests. This does not mean, however, that they were the only ones during the Persian period.
395 The phrase יִמְלָכָה (“in the days of…”) is found throughout the Bible (84 references), but the highest concentration of references is found within Nehemiah 12 (vv. 7, 12, 22, 26 (2 times), 46, and 47 (2 times)). In fact, it is not used anywhere else in Nehemiah, and
to the list of priests in 12:1-7. There are a few differences between the two lists, including the absence of Hattush from 12:12-21, as well as spelling variants with certain names, specifically, Malluch (Malluchi), Shecaniah (Shebaniah), Rehum (Harim), and Meremoth (Meraioth). Parallels are found with other priestly lists, including Neh 10:3-9, 1 Chr 24, and Ezra 2:36-39 (see Table 5-2). In fact, because of these minor discrepancies, most scholars have argued that vv. 1-7 were created from vv. 12-21. But the number of spelling variants among the names is striking: certain changes may be attributed to simple errors, but certain other differences (such as Rehum/Harim) are much more problematic. One has to wonder if changes were made to certain names intentionally, in order to efface names. If this were the case, then it is odd that the names were not changed in both lists.

MT Nehemiah 12:22 moves to the Levites, stating “and as for the Levites, in the days of…” (וֹלַדְוָאֵי בְּנֵי). This reference to the Levites is followed by a priestly genealogy. Although it could be argued that v. 22 is listing a Levitical genealogy, the names clearly appear to be priestly, since they list Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua. These names, with the exception of Johanan, are found in the priestly genealogy in vv. 24 only once in Ezra (4:7). There are some appearances of this phrase in 1 Chr (4:41; 5:10, 17; 7:2; 13:3) and 2 Chr (9:20; 13:20; 26:5; 32:26). For a discussion of its use in the singular (יְהוּדָיִם) and plural (יִהוּדִים) throughout the Bible, see Brin (1981: 183-96). See for example, Clines (1984: 223-225), Williamson (1985: 358-59), and Blenkinsopp (1988).

This dependence becomes clearer when one examines the LXX with regard to the composition of the MT. An example of a simple error is Shebaniah/Shecaniah. The ב/ך confusion can occur, particularly in the Herodian script. But Rehum/Harim is more problematic because it involves transposition (_formatted as_), which is not a common scribal error.
Following Williamson’s interpretation concerning the reference to the Levites (1985: 364), there is no need for emending the text by removing the reference to the Levites. Rather, he interprets this text to be a “comment by the editor on the list of Levites which he is about to introduce” in v. 23. And thus, v. 23 may be an attempt to explain the similarities to vv. 8-9.

In vv. 22 and 23 the compiler then offers the sources for these lists of the priests and Levites, for the purpose of, as Blenkinsopp (1988: 340) quips, “wishing to assure the reader of the reliability of his information.” Nehemiah 12:22 mentions written records of the heads of the ancestral houses (טביה יבשות אבות) until the time of Darius the Persian. In v. 23, the heads of the ancestral houses of the Levites were recorded in the

---

399 As previously mentioned, Johanan differs from Jonathan, found in 12:11. If a scribal error accounts for the difference in these names, then this would have had to occur in two stages. First metathesis would have had to occur, where two letters switched (the ר switched places with נ). Next, the scribe would have had to mistake two letters (ך/ך). Since two major errors had to have occurred, this reduces the likelihood of a simple scribal lapse.

400 For the opposite interpretation, see Blenkinsopp (1988: 339)

401 Williamson adds, “That this is an artificial device to cover over the way in which he composed vv. 8-9 out of vv. 24-25 is shown by the fact that some of the names with their associated tasks are patently those of individuals” (1985: 364).

402 Who this “Darius the Persian” is has been debated since there were three Persian kings named Darius. If this is a reference to the registration of the priests up to the time of Darius, then it is not likely to refer to Darius I (c. 520-486) because of the time of his reign. Another option is Darius II (c. 423-404), but this is a problem when one considers that, according to Josephus, a Jaddua was contemporary with Alexander the Great. A third option is Darius III (c. 336-331), who according to Josephus is contemporary with the high priest Jaddua. Williamson (1977: 64-65), following Mowinckel (1964), points out that later Jewish writers did not make a distinction between Darius II and III. He argues that the title “Darius the Persian” was used when referring to Darius I for the purpose of distinguishing this Darius from Darius the Mede. Thus, “the glossator’s aim was to show that at that early time the priests were recorded by families, just as the Levites continued to be for several generations. This form of reference is certainly to be dated well into the Hellenistic period, thereby confirming our judgment that v 22b is
“book of the records” (עַלְמֵי הָרֶפֶּר). This book was most likely a compilation of lists of the cultic families, as well as other lists. MT Neh 12:23 also offers a short genealogy, of “Johanan the son of Eliashib.” This contrasts with the longer genealogy in 12:22, which lists Johanan as the grandson of Eliashib. The reference in v. 23, however, may not literally mean that Johanan was the actual son of Eliashib, but rather a descendant.\(^{403}\)

MT Neh 12:24-25 lists the Levites during the time of Joiakim, contemporary with Ezra and Nehemiah, according to v. 26 (Table 5-3). This list provides individual names (Hashabiah, Sherebiah, Jeshua “son of Kadmiel”).\(^{404}\) The gatekeepers are recorded as Mattaniah, Bakbukiah, Obadiah, Meshullam, Talmon, and Akkub. These names are also found in Neh 11:17-18 with the exception of Meshullam.\(^{405}\)

Nehemiah 12:26, paralleling the structure of v. 12, is the conclusion to the lists of Levites. MT Neh 12:26 states, “in the days of Joiakim” (בִּימֵי יֹאוֹקִים) similar to v. 12, but then catalogs an ascending genealogy back to Jozadak, rather than a descending genealogy, as seen in v. 12. The list of Joiakim’s lineage, is set in the time of “Nehemiah late gloss” (1985: 365). Blenkinsopp (1988: 340) warns that the title “Darius the Persian…does not in itself presuppose the perspective of the Hellenistic period, for Herodotus (2.110, 158) speaks of Darius I in this way.” Wilson (1915: 193; 1917: 91-145) earlier disagreed that Darius the Persian is a sign of a late date. A different interpretation is that this is meant to be an historical reference, meaning that this registration of the priests began during the time of Darius I. Albright (1921: 112-13) argued for Darius I, emending the text from מָלֹל to מָלָל. This change was the result of haplography, according to Albright. But it is most logical for this Darius to refer to Darius III since it appears to be a reference to a practice done over a period of time.\(^{403}\) For other biblical examples of this, see Wilson (1977) and Johnson (1988).\(^{404}\) As previously mentioned, this interpretation is also dependent on emending “son of” to Binnui.\(^{405}\) Meshullam is not found on any of the Levitical Lists. See Table 5-2.
the governor and Ezra, the priest and scribe” (נַחֲמִיאוֹ הַמְּלֶךְ וְעֹרָא הָרָא הַשְּׁמֹרֶה). It is difficult to place Nehemiah as contemporary with Joiakim because he is generally thought of as contemporary with Eliashib. This specific chronological issue does not appear to be important to the author/editor, however, since his larger purpose is to link Ezra and Nehemiah together, united in restoring Jerusalem, both cultically and civically. For this reason, Williamson observes that it is a “serious misunderstanding” to remove “Nehemiah the governor and,” believing it to be a later addition (contra Rudolph). Thus, for Williamson, unity between leadership is more important for the author than historical reliability.

MT Nehemiah 12:27-47 shifts focus to the dedication of the wall as well as the procession to the House of God. Nonetheless the climactic event of the dedication of the wall, in vv. 27-47, is not a seamless narrative. Nehemiah 12:27-30 begins with a reference to the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem and the Levites coming from their places of habitation, including Geba, Azmaveth and the villages of the Netophathites. Reminiscent of MT Neh 11:25-36, there are references to fields and regions around Jerusalem, where certain Levitical singers are said to be living. These passages are similar to 11:25-36 because of the use of terms like “villages” (of the Netophathites)

406 Williamson (1985: 366) observes that it may be expected that the author knew that Eliashib was the high priest during Nehemiah’s tenure, but that “such accuracy was not his concern”

407 Ibid. He also adds that “the case is quite different from 8:9; our author is working with a text that has already fused the two reformers’ activities.” His interpretation, however, is complicated when the LXX is considered.

408 As most commentators argue, this is a return to the NM, which was interrupted after Neh 7:5. Most scholars see sections of 12:27-47 as made up of the NM (with some editorial additions), including Myers (1965: 202), Fensham (1982: 254), Williamson (1985: 369), and Blenkinsopp (1988). For a contrary view, see Torrey (1896: 43-44) and Burrows (1935: 29-39).
Yet only Geba overlaps with MT Neh 11:25-36 as a place of Levitical settlement. Beth-haggilgal (or the “House of Gilgal”), Azmaveth, and the villages of the Netophathites are missing from the settlement list.\(^{410}\)

MT Nehemiah 12:30 concentrates on the purification of the priests, Levites, the people, and the wall—that is, the entire community. Nehemiah 12:31 also signals a shift to a first-person narrative, which has been absent in MT Nehemiah since chapter 7 (v. 5). Although it is clear that the text cannot be divided simply based on the presence or the absence of the first person voice, certain scholars see a shift from vv. 27-30 to vv. 31-37, based on content. One of the main pieces of evidence for different sources between vv. 27-30 and vv. 31-37 is the focus on the Levites in vv. 27-30. Since certain scholars (cf. Myers 1965: 202; Blenkinsopp 1988: 344) argue that the Chronicler was responsible for portions of Nehemiah 12, particularly vv. 27-30, they separate this out from the NM, \(^{410}\)

---

\(^{409}\) The town of Netophah is mentioned in 2 Sam 23:28-29 and 1 Chr 11:30 as the hometown of Maharai and Heleb, two of David’s מִשְׁפַּט (“mighty men”). 1 Chr 2:54 mentions that the Netophathites were the descendants of Caleb. Ezra 2:22 mentions 56 men from Netophah were part of the group who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon. Nehemiah 7:26 disagrees with Ezra 2:22 and records that 188 men returned with Zerubbabel. Alt (1935: 47-54) identified Khirbet Bedd Falul as the site of Netophah, primarily based on a spring located nearby called ‘Ain en-Natuf. Azmaveth appears to be located in the Judean hill country, north of Jerusalem. Albright (1922: 156-57), following Robinson, associated Azmaveth with the modern village of Hizmeh, located near the ancient towns of Geba and Anathoth. Azmaveth is referenced in Ezra 2:24, Neh 7:28, and 1 Esd 5:18 (as Bethasmoth).

\(^{410}\) Beth-haggagil is mentioned several times in the Hebrew Bible, but is probably the name of several different locations (at least three). Haggagil may mean, “circle” as in a circle of stones.
which begins in 12:31. Although one does not have to credit the Chronicler simply based on references to the Levites, it is clear that the narrative in vv. 27-47 is not seamless. There are several form and content shifts that interrupt the flow of the narrative, which are probably a result of the use of different source material to compile the wall dedication narrative. Williamson comments that, it is likely that different accounts of specific events were preserved and that the stylistic differences are the result of a later editor compiling the two accounts (1985: 371). Williamson’s explanation reconciles the awkward flow of the narrative without crediting the supposed Chronicler’s hand in this particular narrative.

After the purification of the community, the procession begins moving in different directions, leading up to the temple. The two groups journeying around the both consisted of the following groups: choirs, priests (7 in each group), a lay leader, other lay leaders, a leader of music, and Levitical musicians (8 in each group). The procession culminates in a celebration of joy, which incorporates the whole community,

---

411 For evidence that the Chronicler was responsible for the composition of the material Myers states, “the Levites always had a prominent place in such rites (cf. I Chron XV 4; II Chron v 4 ff.).” Thus, for Myers, the presence of the Levites signals the hand of the Chronicler. Blenkinsopp credits the addition of the cultic members (vv. 33-36 and 41-42) to the hand of the Chronicler. While a “Chronicleresque” hand may have been involved, it is not necessary to connect all “Chronicler moments” to the Chronicler.

412 The text actually states that one group went to the right on the wall (לֵאוֹמָה לִיוֹנָה וְלַשֹּׁם), and the other went to “in front of” (לִשְׁמֵו לִיוֹנָה), which is most often emended from l’mô’l, “in front of”, to liśmô’l “right” (cf. Blenkinsopp 1988: 343). For a discussion of the layout of Jerusalem and the procession in Nehemiah 12, see Fullerton (1919: 171-79); Burrows (1935: 29-39); and Williamson (1984: 81-88).

413 Hosaiah (v. 32) is part of the first group and Nehemiah (v. 38) is part of the second.

414 Zechariah (v. 35) is part of the first group and Izrahiah (v. 42) is part of the second.

415 Ezra is also mentioned in MT 12:36. Snaith (1967: 243) cautions against those who would argue that Ezra’s presence is a simple interpolation. In his very short article, he cites Job 21:33c, which also places a person right at the end of a procession. Again, this becomes a more complex issue when the LXX is considered.
including women and children. The celebratory nature of this event is made clear in v. 43, since the text mentions joy, in either the verbal form (םלָלָה) or noun form (םלָלָה) five times. After this celebration, Neh 12:44-47 shifts focus to the administration of tithes and offerings for the priests and Levites. MT Neh 12:45-46 ties these institutions back to David and Solomon, as well as Asaph, the temple singer. This is then connected to the periods of Zerubbabel and Nehemiah (v. 47), when the community came together to support the priests and Levites. As previously mentioned, these last three verses are commonly included with the subsequent material, specifically 13:1-3 because they do not fit seamlessly into the context of the NM. Neh 12:44-47 clearly has more affinity with the following material than the former material.

Taken as a whole, MT Nehemiah 12 focuses on the cultic community and the dedication of the wall and temple institutions, mostly set into the period of Ezra and Nehemiah, but with reference to past and future contexts as well. While there are many

---

416 In its verbal form in v. 43, it appears in both the qal and piel.

417 Asaph is the most commonly cited temple singer in post-exilic literature. His name is synonymous with temple singing in Ezra-Nehemiah, since the singers were also called “Asaphites” (Ezra 2:41//Neh 7:44//1 Esd 5:27). He is, however, only one of three families who made up the singers in the post-exilic temple, according to 1 Chr 6:39; 25:1, 2; 2 Chr 5:12. It is also noteworthy that 12 of the Psalms are credited to Asaph (תָּנֵס הָיְתָה), specifically Pss 50, 73-83.

418 These verses shift focus to the administration of the temple and payment of the temple personnel. While the phrase “on that day” (םלָלָה לֵבָנָה) creates a certain amount of cohesion with the previous narrative focused on the dedication of the wall, vv. 44-47 move to administrative issues. MT and LXX Neh 12:45-47 cite past leaders, specifically Zerubbabel, Jeshua, Asaph, and even David, as witnesses to certain cultic procedures. Thus, the focus shifts from Ezra and Nehemiah and the wall dedication, to administrative issues, which are legitimized through their supposed ancient roots (a common motif in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles).
form critical issues in the MT, an analysis of the differences in the LXX material elucidates certain MT questions.

3. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of LXX Nehemiah 12

Reminiscent of MT Nehemiah 12, LXX Nehemiah 12 provides lists of priests and Levites during the time of Jeshua and Joiakim, genealogies, and also certain details concerning the dedication of the wall in Jerusalem. Similar to the pattern established in chapter 2 and 3, I have created a Hebrew text from the LXX material.

LXX Nehemiah 12

| 1. καὶ οὗτοι οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευίται οἱ ἀναπαύοντες μετὰ Ζωροβαχᾶ καὶ Ἰσσοῦ Σαλαμίνι καὶ Ἰσσοῦ Σαρσαία ἠρμία Εσδρᾶ | 1.1 καὶ ἱερεῖς ἠναπαύοντες μετὰ Ζωροβαχᾶ καὶ Ἰσσοῦ Σαλαμίνι καὶ Ἰσσοῦ Σαρσαία ἠρμία Εσδρᾶ | 1. And these are the priests and the Levites who went out with Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua: Seraiah, Jeremiah, Ezra |
| 2. Αμαρια Μαλουχ | 2. Αμαρια Μαλουχ | 2. Amariah, Malluch |
| 3. Σεχενια | 3. Σεχενια | 3. Shecaniah |
| 4-7a. -- | 4-7a. -- |

---

419 Hanhart also includes Ἀνανία at the end of v. 12, thereby finishing the genealogical section for the οἱ ἁρχοντες τῶν πατριῶν. Ἀνανία is missing in the B’, S₂ˢᵗ, and Aeth texts.

420 Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935: 657) do not include vv. 15-21. In v. 14, they only include τῶν Μαλουχ and then move to v. 22. The absence of this material in Brooke, McLean and Thackeray is because it is not found in B, S, A, and Arm. Hanhart, however, includes all of v. 14-21.

421 Hanhart includes καὶ κινύραι (oftentimes translated “and lyres”), arguing that it is a case of homoioteleuton. Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935) do not include καὶ κινύραι because it is not found in B, S, A, or in the later Aeth tradition.

422 Hanhart (1993: 237) also includes Milali, Gilalai, Maai, Nethanel, Judah, and Hanani. But these are not found in B, S, A, or Aeth. Thus, Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray do not include these names.

423 There is another divergence between Hanhart (1993) and Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935) starting at the end of v. 37 to the beginning of v. 39. Hanhart argues that, through a series of haplographies, the material was omitted from the texts. But if
7b. These (were) the heads of the priests and their brothers in the days of Jeshua.
8. And the Levites: Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel, Sherebiah, Judah, Mattaniah, over the hands, he and his brothers
9b. for the service.
10. And Jeshua was the father of Joiakim, Joiakim was the father of Eliashib, and Eliashib of Joiada.
12. In the days of Joiakim his brothers the priests, heads of ancestral houses, were: of Seraiah, Meraiah; of Jeremiah.
13. of Ezra, Meshullam; of Amariah, Jehohanan;
14. of Malluch,
14b-21. --
22. As for the Levites, in

one looks at the block of material missing, these are an odd series of haplographies, and would have occurred in many different stages. I am following Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935) because the missing material is not found in B, S, A, or AethB. 424 Hanhart includes 39b. και ἐστήσαν ἐν πύλῃ τῆς φυλακῆς 40. καὶ ἔστησαν αἱ δύο τῆς αἰνέσως ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἔγενε τῷ ἱμασίῳ τῶν στρατηγῶν μετ' ἐμοῦ 41. καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς Ελιακίμ Μασσιας Βενιαμιν Μιχαῖς Ελισαβεί Ζαχαρίας Ανανίας ἐν σάλπιγξ ἐν καὶ Μασσιας καὶ Σεμεῖς καὶ Ελαχαρ καὶ Οξή καὶ ἱωαναν καὶ Μελχίας καὶ Ἄλαμ καὶ Εξουρ, but it is not found in Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935) because it is not found in B, S, A, AethB, or Arm. Hanhart argues that this has been omitted through homoioioteleutos (1993: 238). But this seems unlikely since it is missing in many different early manuscripts.
425 The LXX states, “When I gathered the gatekeepers” (ἐν τῷ συναγαγεῖν με τοὺς πυλαρούς) which is a divergence from the MT, which states, “gatekeepers standing guard at the storehouses of the gate” (σαμρεὼν κεῖσαν σταθέρων κατὰ τὸ θυρών τῶν συναγαγείν τῶν κατὰ τὸ θυρών). See below for a discussion of this divergence.
426 LXX αἰων is a transliteration of מָיִם ("spring").
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Iwanan kai Idoia
gegrammenvoi arkhontes
patriow kai oi iereis en
basileia Daresiou tou
Peiraou
23. uioi Levi arkhontes
ton patriow
gegrammenvoi epi bibliow
logon ton hemorow kai
esas hemorow Iwanan uio
Eliosoub
24. kai arkhontes ton
Leuitou Asebia kai
Sarebia kai Iesou kai
uioi Kadmihl kai oi
adelphi autov
kataanntion autov eis
imeni kai ainein en
enntole Daves andrapou
ton theou efmeria pros
efmerion
25. en to suneugavein me
tous pulowous
26. en hemeraios Iosakim uio
Iesou uioi Iosedeck kai en
hemeraios Neemia kai
Essdras 9 iereus o
grammateus
27. kai en egkainiois
teixous Ierousalhm
exihtesan tois Leuitas en
tosis totois autov ton
eneqkai autov eis
Ierousalhm poineias
egkainia kai evphrosunhn
en theoiska kai en oidais
kymbalithontes kai
palatiria
28. kai synexhthesan oi uioi
tow adontov kai ap
theis perichorou kuklonthen
eis Ierousalhm kai ap
epauloicn
29. kai apo agron oti
epaulieis okodomhmasen

the days of Eliashib, Joiada,
Johanan, and Jaddua, there
were recorded the heads of
ancestral houses; also the
priests until the reign of
Darius the Persian.
23. The Levites, heads of
ancestral houses, were
recorded in the Book of the
Records until the days of
Johanan son of Eliashib.
24. And the leaders of the
Levites: Hashabiah,
Sherebiah, and Jeshua and
the son of Kadmiel, with
their associates over against
them, to praise and to give
thanks, according to the
commandment of David the
man of God, section
opposite to section.
25. When I gathered the
gatekeepers,
26. In the days of Joakim
son of Jeshua son of
Joazak, and in the days of
Nehemiah and of Ezra the
priest and scribe.
27. Now at the dedication of
the wall of Jerusalem they
sought out the Levites in
their places, to bring them
to Jerusalem to celebrate the
dedication with rejoicing,
with thanksgivings and with
singing, with cymbals,
harps.
28. The companies of the
singers gathered together
from the neighborhood
around Jerusalem and from
the villages
29. and from the fields; for
the singers had built for
themselves villages around
30. And the priests and the Levites purified themselves; and they purified the people and the gates and the wall.

31. Then I brought the leaders of Judah up onto the wall.

32. and after them went Hoshiaiah and half the officials of Judah,

33. and Azariah, Ezra, Meshullam,

34. Judah, Benjamin, Shemaiah, and Jeremiah,

35. and some of the young priests with trumpets:
Zechariah son of Jonathan son of Shemaiah son of Mattaniah son of Micaiah son of Zaccai son of Asaph;

36. and his kindred, Shemaiah, Azarel, with the music of David the man of God; and the scribe Ezra went in front of them.

37. At the Gate of the Spring, in front of them, they went straight up by the stairs of the city of David, at the ascent of the wall, above the house of David, to the Water Gate

38.--

39. of Ephraim, and by the Fish Gate and the tower of Hananel, to the Sheep Gate.

40.-41.--

42. And the singers sang with their leader.

43. They offered great sacrifices that day and rejoiced, for God had made them rejoice with great joy; the women and children
43. καὶ ἐθυσαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ θυσίαμα μεγάλα καὶ ἰμπράνθησαν ὕμνον τῷ θεῷ ἰμπράνθησαι αὐτοὺς μεγάλας καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἰμπράνθησαν καὶ ἰκούσθη ἡ εὐφροσύνη ἐν ἱεροσαλήμ ἀπὸ μικρόδεν.

44. καὶ κατέστησαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀνδρὰς ἐπὶ τῶν γαζοφυλακίων τοῖς θησαυροῖς τοῖς ἀπαρχαῖς καὶ τοῖς δεκάταις καὶ τοῖς συνιγμένοις ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀρχοῦσιν τῶν πόλεων μερίδας τοῖς ἱερεύσι καὶ τοῖς Λευίταις ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑπέρ τοῦ Λευίτας τοῦ ἑστῶτας.

45. καὶ ἐφύλαξαν φυλακὰς θεοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ φυλακὰς τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀδύντας καὶ τοὺς παλιάρους ὡς ἑντολαὶ Δαυὶδ καὶ Σαλωμὼν ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ.

46. ὡς ἐν ἡμέραις Δαυὶδ Ἀσαφ ἀπὸ ἀρχής πρῶτος τῶν ἀδύντων καὶ ἤμυνο καὶ αἴνεισιν τῷ θεῷ.

47. καὶ τὰς Ἰσραήλ ἐν ἡμέραις Ζωροβαβέλ δίδοντες μερίδας τῶν ἀδύντων καὶ τῶν παλιάρων λόγον ἡμέρας ἐν ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγιάζοντες τοῖς Λευίταις καὶ οἱ Λευίται ἀγιάζοντες τοῖς υἱοῖς Ααρων

also rejoiced. The joy of Jerusalem was heard far away.

44. On that day men were appointed over the chambers for the stores, the contributions, the first fruits, and the tithes, to gather into them the portions for the priests and for the Levites from the fields belonging to the towns; for Judah rejoiced over the priests and the Levites who ministered.

45. They performed the service of their God and the service of purification, as did the singers and the gatekeepers, according to the command of David and his son Solomon.

46. For in the days of David and Asaph long ago there was a leader of the singers, and there were songs of praise and thanksgiving to God.

47. In the days of Zerubbabel all Israel gave the daily portions for the singers and the gatekeepers. They set apart that which was for the Levites; and the Levites set apart that which was for the descendants of Aaron.
The shorter LXX list presents both coherent lists and genealogies as well as a coherent narrative of the events connected to the dedication of the wall. Like the division in MT Nehemiah 12, the LXX provides two major literary units, vv. 1-26 and 27-43, as well as a minor section, vv. 44-47. The material may be outlined as such:

**LXX Nehemiah 12**

12:1-26: The Cultic Officials:
   - 12:1-9: The priests and Levites who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua
     - 12:1a: Introduction: The return of Zerubbabel and Jeshua
     - 12:1b-3: Heads of the priests
     - 12:7b: Conclusion of the priestly list of returnees
     - 12:8: Heads of the Levites
     - 12:9b: Additional comments
   - 12:10-11: Jaddua’s genealogy
   - 12:12-26: Priests and Levites during the time of Jehoiakim
     - 12:12-13a: Heads of the priests
     - 12:22-23: Eliashib’s Genealogy
     - 12:24-25: Heads of the Levites: A list of Levites during the time of Jehoiakim and summary of events
     - 12:26: Concluding remarks

12:27-43: The Dedication of the Wall in Jerusalem:
   - 12:27-29: The Levitical musicians
   - 12:30: The purification of the priests and Levites
   - 12:31-42: The procession of cultic personnel around the wall:
     - 12:31-37: The cultic procession
     - 12:42: The singers’ song
   - 12:43: Conclusion of the events

12:44-47: Financial matters to support the temple staff:
   - 12:45-47: The historical context of temple duties
   - 12:47: Financial support of the musicians and gatekeepers

Akin to MT and LXX Nehemiah 11, LXX Nehemiah 12 follows the same order as the MT. Neh 12:1a is identical in both the LXX and MT, introducing the period of priests and Levites during the time of Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, and Jeshua. Both MT and LXX Neh 12:1-9 specifically focus on the first generation of priestly and Levitical returnees, but with different results regarding the number of names. The LXX preserves
a tradition in which six priests and six Levites returned during the time of Jeshua. The genealogy of Jeshua also has six generations. This pattern of six appears in the settlement list in LXX Neh 11:25-36.\footnote{It may also be noteworthy that LXX 12:12-14 have 9 names mentioned in the LXX.} It is highly unlikely that six is arbitrarily chosen when compiling this material.\footnote{While the number six does not have many biblical parallels, the Babylonian parallels are numerous. The number six was particularly important to the Babylonian mathematical system (use of base-60) as well as important in mythology. This is seen in both the Enuma Elish and Atrahasis where important events happen in multiples of 6 (i.e. 6, 600, 3600). It should also be noted that the use of six is particularly interesting since they are returning from Babylon. Although numerology can be a difficult study, particularly when trying to interpret what the ancient authors intended when using specific patterns of numbers, when a number repeats itself several times, it is then necessary to pursue the possible reasons for this. For a discussion of the sexagesimal system in Mesopotamia, see Powell (1995: 1941-57).} Rather, the LXX is creating symmetry through the repeated use of the same number of individuals.\footnote{Or settlements, in the case of LXX Neh 11:25-36.} It is also unlikely that an editor cut the list down to six, since there is no identifiable patterns for subtracting material. Patterns for additions are easier to establish than the opposite.

LXX Neh 12:12-47 also follows the general outline of MT Neh 12:12-47, but with several textual differences. The text, however, preserves a version that is coherent and relates the story of the priests and Levites during the period of Joiakim as well as a narrative of the dedication of the walls, but with fewer details. Thus, the overall focus of LXX Nehemiah 12 is the same as the MT, but is a much more abbreviated version of events.
4. MT and LXX Textual Divergences

In order to understand the possible reasons for these differences, it is necessary to consider each textual divergence. For this reason, I have highlighted the differences between MT and LXX Nehemiah in one text. Similar to chapters two and three, the material that is present in the MT but not in the LXX is underlined. The plain text corresponds to the overlap between the MT and LXX. Any material that is unique to the LXX is italicized.

Composite List of MT and LXX Nehemiah 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. These are the priests and Levites who went out with Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua: Seraiah, Jeremiah, Ezra,</td>
<td>אלְאָלֵהַ הַמִּרְכָּבָה זַרְעָאָל נֶהְמָיָה: סֵרֶאִים יְרֵםָיהַ אֶזְרַאִיל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amariah, Malluch, Hattush,</td>
<td>עַמָּרִיָה מַלוֹךְ חַטְעְשָׂי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shecaniah, Rehum, Meremoth,</td>
<td>שנכֵנַיָּה רַהְוֵם מֶרֶמֶת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Iddo, Ginnethon, Abijah,</td>
<td>יְדוֹ בְּנֵי יָטָן אֵבִיָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mijamin, Maadiah, Bilgah,</td>
<td>מְיָאָיִם מָדוֹיָה בֵּילְגָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shemaiah, Joiarib, Jedediah,</td>
<td>שְׁמֵאיָה יֹיאָרִיב יַדְגֵּיָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sallu, Amok, Hilkiah, Jedediah. These were the heads of the priests and their brothers in the days of Jeshua.</td>
<td>סַלְלוֹ אוֹמָק הַלָּכִיָּה יַדְגֵּיָה: הָיוּ בְּנֵי נְמַרְבָּה וּנְשָׁמָה בִּנְחַר בְּנוֹת יָשָׁע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. And the Levites: Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel, Sherebiah, Judah, and Mattaniah (who were) over the hands, he and his brothers.</td>
<td>וְהָלְבוֹת יְשָׁע בִּנֵי קַדְמִיאֵל שֵרֵפָיָה יְדָעָה וֹמאָנַיָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. And Bakbukiah and Unno and their brothers (stood) opposite them in the divisions.</td>
<td>וְבְקַבְּקֵיָה וּעָנֶנוֹ וּבָנָיו (זָזָה) בְּקַבִּיקָה וּבֵין עַנְנוֹ וּבָנָיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Jeshua was the father of Joiaikim, Joiaikim the father of Eliashib, Eliashib (the father) of Joiada,</td>
<td>יָשָׁע בָּן יְוִיאָיָקִים יְוִיאָיָקִים בָּן אָלַיָּשָׁב אֲלָיָשָׁב בָּן יוֹיָדָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Joiada the father of Jonathan, and Jonathan the father of Jaddua.</td>
<td>יוֹיָדָא בָּן יוֹיָדָא יוֹיָדָא בָּן יוֹוָדָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In the days of Joiaikim his brothers the priests, heads of ancestral houses, were: of Seraiah, Meraiah; of Jeremiah, Hananiah;</td>
<td>בְּיוֹיָדָא בְּנֵי יְוִיאָיָקִים בְּנֵי הַמִּרְכָּבָה: סֵרֶאִים מְרַאִיָּה: יְרֵםָיהַ חֲנַנְיָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

430 Transliterated in the LXX.
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13. of Ezra, Meshullam; of Amariah, Jehohanan;
14. of Malluch, Jonathan; of Shebaniah, Joseph;
15. of Harim, Adna; of Meraioth, Helkai;
16. of Iddo, Zechariah; of Ginnethon, Meshullam;
17. of Abijah, Zichri; of Miniamin, of Moadiah, Paltai;
18. of Bilgah, Shammua; of Shemaiah, Jehonathan;
19. of Joiarib, Mattenai; of Jedaiah, Uzzi;
20. of Sallai, Kallai; of Amok, Eber;
21. of Hilkiah, Hashabiah; of Jedaiah, Nethanel.
22. As for the Levites, in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua, there were recorded the heads of ancestral houses; also the priests until the reign of Darius the Persian.
23. The Levites, heads of ancestral houses, were recorded in the Book of the Records until the days of Johanan son of Eliashib.
24. And the leaders of the Levites: Hashabiah, Sherebiah, and Jeshua son of Kadmiel, with their associates over against them, to praise and to give thanks, according to the commandment of David the man of God, section opposite to section.
25. Mattaniah, Bakbukiah, Obadiah, Meshullam, Talmon, and Akkub were gatekeepers standing guard at the storehouses of the gates. LXX: And when I gathered together the gatekeepers.
26. These were in the days of Joiakim son of Jozadak, and in the days of Nehemiah the governor and of Ezra the priest and scribe.
27. Now at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem they sought out the Levites in all.

431 Qere נוּדֵי.
432 As previously mentioned, the LXX text states, “And when I gathered together the gatekeepers” (ἐν τῷ συναχαζέων με τοὺς πύλωρος), which deviates from the MT.
their places, to bring them to Jerusalem to celebrate the dedication with rejoicing, with thanksgivings and with singing, with cymbals, harps, and lyres.

28. The companies of the singers gathered together from the neighborhood around Jerusalem and from the villages of the Netophathites;
29. also from Beth-haggagil and from the fields of Geba and Azmaveth; for the singers had built for themselves villages around Jerusalem.
30. And the priests and the Levites purified themselves; and they purified the people and the gates and the wall.
31. Then I brought the leaders of Judah up onto the wall, and appointed two great companies that gave thanks and went in procession. One went to the right on the wall to the Dung Gate;
32. and after them went Hoshaiah and half the officials of Judah, Azariah, Ezra, Meshullam, Judah, Benjamin, Shemaiah, and Jeremiah,
33. and some of the young priests with trumpets: Zechariah son of Jonathan son of Shemaiah son of Mattaniah son of Micaiah son of Zaccur son of Asaph;
34. and his kindred, Shemaiah and Azarel, Milalai, Gilalai, Maai, Nethanel, Judah, and Hanani, with the musical instruments of David the man of God; and the scribe Ezra went in front of them.
35. At the Fountain Gate, in front of them, they went straight up by the stairs of the city of David, at the ascent of the wall, above the house of David, to the Water Gate on the east.
36. The other company of those who gave thanks went to the left, and I followed them with half of the people on the wall, above the Tower of the Ovens, to the Broad Wall, and above the Gate of Ephraim, and by the Old Gate, and by the Fish Gate and the
Tower of Hananel and the Tower of the Hundred, to the Sheep Gate; and they came to a halt at the Gate of the Guard.

40. So both companies of those who gave thanks stood in the house of God, and I and half of the officials with me;

41. and the priests Eliakim, Maaseiah, Miniamin, Micaiah, Elioenum, Zechariah, and Hananiah, with trumpets;

42. and Maaseiah, Shemaiah, Eleazar, Uzzi, Johanan, Malchijah, Elam, and Ezer. And the singers sang with Jezrahiah as their leader.

43. They offered great sacrifices that day and rejoiced, for God had made them rejoice with great joy; the women and children also rejoiced. The joy of Jerusalem was heard far away.

44. On that day men were appointed over the chambers for the stores, the contributions, the first fruits, and the tithes, to gather into them the portions required by the law for the priests and for the Levites from the fields belonging to the towns; for Judah rejoiced over the priests and the Levites who ministered.

45. They performed the service of their God and the service of purification, as did the singers and the gatekeepers, according to the command of David and his son Solomon.

46. For in the days of David and Asaph long ago there was a leader of the singers, and there were songs of praise and thanksgiving to God.

47. In the days of Zerubbabel and in the days of Nehemiah all Israel gave the daily portions for the singers and the gatekeepers. They set apart that which was for the Levites; and the Levites set apart that which was for the descendants of Aaron.
The principal differences between the MT and LXX are mostly evident in the number of people and places recorded, as well as details of the cultic procession through Jerusalem (12:2-7a, 9, 14-21, 25, 28-29, 31, 36, and 38-42). Within the narrative framework, there are some small-scale text critical issues, namely in 12:12, 26, 39, 43, 44, and 47. Similar to previous case studies presented in chapters 2 and 3, if the discrepancies are the cause of human error, then it is important to establish whether they may be attributed to haplography or other common scribal errors, and thus a scribe mistakenly skipped over certain details in the narrative as well as the priestly and Levitical lists. If these differences are not the cause of textual corruption, then the processes by which the changes occurred are also necessary to establish. A careful analysis reveals that, while some of the divergences may be caused by errors, most are intentional additions to the text. Further, although suppression may also be an explanation for the changes to the text, the patterns that develop do not point to suppression, but rather growth.

4.1 Large Scale Differences

The most critical discrepancies between the MT and LXX begin in 12:2-7a. The variances begin with Hattush (钊SocketAddress), who is missing in LXX Neh 12:2. In both MT and LXX Neh 12:3 Shecaniah is present, but all of the following names found in MT

433 A Hattush is mentioned in 1 Chr 3:22 as a descendant of David and may be the same person who went with Ezra (who is also a descendant of David) to Jerusalem (Ezra 8:2). Of note are the text-critical issues in MT Ezra 8:2 concerning the genealogy of Hattush. It states, “of the sons of David, Hattush, of the sons of Shecaniah, of the sons of…” LXX A. 1 Esd 8:29 appears to preserve a less problematic reading because it states that Hattush was “the son of Shecaniah” and thus follows 1 Chr 3:22. The most important references to Hattush are found in MT and LXX Neh 10:4 where he is one of the covenant signers, who is probably the same Hattush mentioned in MT Neh 12:2.
12:3b-7a, are missing from the LXX (that is, Rehum, Meremoth, Iddo, Gannothoi, Abijah, Mijamin, Maadiah, Bilgah, Shemaiah, Joiarib, Jedaiah, Sallu, Amok, Hilkiah, and Jedaiah). Thus, all but one name missing in the LXX are grouped together in the MT. Concerning the absence of Hattush (חָתִישו) in the LXX, if this were a copyist error, then the copyist skipped from Malluch (מַלְעֹכ) to Shecaniah (שְׂכֵנָיָה), and left Hattush (חָתִישו) out. Although this case does not follow set rules of homoioioarkton or homoiooarkton, it is not out of the realm of possibility that the copyist made an error and simply skipped over a name (parablepsis). But when looking at the possibility of scribal errors, it would seem more likely that if the copyist were to leave a name out among the first few, Shecaniah would be missing since Hattush (חָתִישו) ends with a ש and Shecaniah (שְׂכֵנָיָה) begins with one. Yet this is not the case, and so the copyist made a less common scribal error by omitting Hattush, which does not reflect any of the normal mechanisms to explain its absence.

Following Shecaniah (vv. 3b-7a), the LXX does not contain any other names that are included as leaders of the priests during the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua, compared to the 15 additional names recorded in the MT. Taking into consideration a possible scribal error, the differences may be explained by homoiooteleuten, by which the copyist recorded Shecaniah and then skipped over the rest of the list because the copyist’s eye caught the theophoric ending of the last name on the list, Jedaiah (יְדַיָּה). Yet it is notable that Jedaiah appears twice in the MT list of priests (12:6 and 7), and both do not appear in the LXX. If homoiooteleuten did occur, then the LXX copyist skipped over a
list of names in which 5 of the 15 names have theophoric endings (specifically Yahwistic endings). If the errors were due to *homoiooteleuton*, then the copyist may have skipped several other names with theophoric endings (יְהֹוָּוָּה) such as Abijah, Maadiah, Shemaiah, and Jediah twice (יְהֹוָּוָּה, יְהֹוָּדָּה). Indeed, the absence of these names would have only required one scribal error, albeit a very large one. If these textual discrepancies were because of haplography, it would be one of the most acute cases in the Bible. 434

MT and LXX Neh 12:12-21 list the offspring of the priests in the time of Joiakim, but with many differences. These textual divergences are important to note because vv. 12-21 overlap with vv. 1-7 in the MT text. The names in the LXX mostly overlap between vv. 2-3a and vv. 12-14a. When correlating these textual traditions, most of the names missing in LXX Nehemiah 12 vv. 2-7 are not found in vv. 14-21 (see Table 5-2). The only name that is present in LXX 12:3 (the first list), but not in v. 14, is Shecaniah. 435

There are no clear mechanisms that would cause this kind of haplographic error, other than simple *parablepsis*. Moreover, it cannot be coincidental that the two lists that provide the most overlap in the MT text (vv. 1-7 and vv. 12-21) are almost identical in the material they are missing in the LXX. In other words, the first six names in vv. 1-7 are found in vv. 12-14, with the exception of Shecaniah (MT v. 14 records a Shebaniah). Thus, with the exception of Malluch’s offspring and Shecaniah, the rest of the list cannot

434 To my knowledge, if this is a result of haplography, it is one of the worst examples with regard to lists. There are no examples in the Pentateuch or postexilic literature that are as egregious as this example.

435 As previously noted, Hanhart (1993) emends this material, but he does not follow the evidence from the earliest manuscript traditions.
be missing in the MT because of a scribal error, but should be thought of as an addition to the material, not preserved in the LXX. \(^{436}\) It is hard to explain why the LXX does not record offspring for Malluch in v. 14, since Malluch is in the dative form (τῶν Μαλουχ), and is part of a catalog, listing the patronymic and then offspring, of the priests. It is likely that Malluch and Shecaniah were part of the original list, but were lost in the LXX text at a later date. If this is the case, then the use of six, or in this case, a multiple of six, continues into vv. 12-14.

The lists of Levites are also problematic in MT and LXX Neh 12:8-9. LXX 12:8-9 states, “And the Levites: Jeshua, Binnui, Sherebiah, Judah, and Mattaniah: (who were) over the hands, he and his brothers (were) in the divisions.” The MT states, “And the Levites: Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel, Sherebiah, Judah, and Mattaniah, were over the hands, he and his brothers. And Bakbukiah and Unno and their brothers (stood) opposite them in the divisions.” In the example of Neh 12:8 both the MT and LXX generally appear to be the same, but LXX Neh 12:9 is missing names and certain details. This appears to be an example of additions, which are represented in the MT text. The case for the addition of material to the text preserved in the MT is also strengthened by the fact that in each instance where Bakbukiah is mentioned in the MT (i.e. Neh 11:17 and 12:25) his name is missing in the corresponding LXX verses. Further, in the case of ὡν (Unno), which is missing in the LXX, MT Neh 11:9 preserves the only attestation of this spelling. Since Unno (住房公积) is a *hapax legomena*, certain scholars follow the qere reading

\(^{436}\) See below for a discussion of overlap with 1 Chronicles 24.
Both Unno and Bakbukiah are problematic, and thus, it appears that the LXX reading is preferred over the MT text. A later editor added these names to the earlier proto-Rabbinic text. These names and positions were inserted in order to create a more comprehensive image of the Levitical temple staff, particularly those standing guard.

In LXX Nehemiah 12:25, the list of Levites standing guard outside the gate is missing. Thus, Mattaniah, Bakbukiah, Obadiah, Meshullam, Talmon, and Akkub are all absent, and in fact, the LXX also offers a variant reading for the Levites, found in v. 25b. The MT states that these six Levites, “were gatekeepers standing guard at the storehouses of the gates” (שָׁמָרִים שְׁאוּרִים מְשָׁמָרִים). The LXX records in v. 24 that the leaders of the Levites stood section opposite section. In v. 25, the LXX adds, “when I gathered the gatekeepers” (ἐν τῷ συναγαγεῖν με τοὺς πυλωροῦς), which diverges from the MT. The most noticeable divergence is the use of the first person, which is the first appearance of the first person in Nehemiah 11-12. Although the LXX diverges from the MT, it appears to be a translation issue. The LXX translators understood (אֲכַפֹּרִים בַּאֲכַפֹּרִים) (“at the storehouses of the gates”) to mean “I gathered the gatekeepers”, because he/she understood בַּאֲכַפֹּרִים as a first person singular, from the verb בַּאֲכַפֹּרִים, rather than a plural construct from the noun בַּאֲכַפֹּרִים. The material absent in LXX Neh 12:25 may be due to haplography since the material missing begins after בַּאֲכַפֹּרִים (leaving

437 See Williamson 1985: 333. Unlike Bakbukiah and Unno, Unni is attested, but during the time of David (1 Chr 15:18 and 20). Blenkinsopp argues that Unno is hypocoristic for Anaiah, who is found in Neh 8:4, or Ananiah, mentioned in Neh 3:23. But no Anaiah or Ananiah are found in other Levitical lists, namely Ezra 2//Neh 7, or Neh 12:24-25.
The copyist may have skipped the list of gatekeepers because his eye saw the repetition of מֶלֶךְ and skipped over everything in between it. Or, this may be a case where the material inserted into the text is indicated by the repetition of מֶלֶךְ. And thus, through the use of resumptive repetition, the material is indicated (by the editor) to be an addition. This addition, represented in the MT text, clearly specifies which gatekeepers were in charge of standing guard at the storehouses of the gates.

While it is impossible to completely rule out haplography, particularly when one can see a possible trigger for it (מלך), there are certain compositional issues that are problematic. MT Neh 11:17 is seen by certain scholars to be the material partially responsible for the composition of MT Neh 12:25. Thus, v. 25 is a later addition to the Nehemiah 12 material. This interpretation is more complicated when one takes into consideration LXX Nehemiah 11 and 12. The LXX has divergent lists in both 11:17 (see Table 5-2) and 12:25 (see Table 5-3). In both examples, it appears that the LXX retains a shorter list. Thus, the construction of both lists is more complicated than simply using MT Neh 11:17 as a base for the construction of 12:25. Additionally, if the list of gatekeepers is missing as a result of haplography in LXX Neh 12:25, this cannot explain why Bakbukiah is missing in LXX Neh 11:17.

In MT Neh 12:28-29, the settlements of the singers are not found in the LXX. In fact, in contrast to MT Nehemiah 12, not a single town, with the exception of Jerusalem,

---

438 For other examples, see Long (1987: 385-99)
439 One scholar who is a proponent of this is Blenkinsopp (1988: 340).
appears in LXX Nehemiah 12. The MT records that for the dedication of the wall, the
singers were gathered from the surrounding villages of the Netophathites, Beth-haggagil
(“House of the Gilgal”), and also from the fields of Geba and Azmaveth. Even though
the LXX records that they were gathered from the surrounding villages and fields from
Jerusalem, there are no towns mentioned in connection to the villages or fields. Thus, the
singers are simply gathered from unnamed towns and fields around Jerusalem.

MT Nehemiah 12:31 includes a first-person narrative of the leaders of Judah who
were brought up onto the wall and Nehemiah appointing them into two groups. In the
LXX, this division into two groups is not present, as evidenced in certain Greek
manuscripts (B, S, A, and also later Aeth B). Thus, the LXX only presents the leaders of
Judah ascending onto the walls. Hanhart (1993: 236) argues that the absence of the two
groups is a case of homoiooteleuton (καὶ to καὶ), but an accidental omission is not the best
explanation for why this material is not in the LXX. Rather than a mistaken omission,
additions may be better explained as functioning more like a midrashic explanation for
the two groups. The addition becomes clearer when it is observed that the other
references to the two groups moving in different directions (esp. vv. 38-41) are not
present in the earliest LXX material. Thus, the groups are never clearly divided in the
LXX. The difference in the MT and LXX is more than a simple haplographic
difference—rather, it is a change in the narrative. The MT is much more elaborate with
regard to the movements of the groups.

The final large-scale textual differences may be found in vv. 37-42. The entire
sequence of the procession is very different in the LXX. Whereas MT Neh 12:37-42 has
the cultic procession broken into two groups, parading over and around the gates of the
city and ending up at the house of God, the LXX has a very cursory list of events. LXX Neh 12:37-42 details a procession, which is not clearly split into two, mentions fewer gates, fewer people, and most significantly, there is no reference to the (House of God). While copyist errors cannot always be explained, most of the time there is a trigger for these events. Thus, what would allow for these omissions to have happened in either the Hebrew or Greek? While it is true that in the gate narrative (vv. 38 and 39), the repetition of (where) may have led to the disappearance of certain gates (esp. the Old Gate), there are no plausible explanations for the disappearance of the House of God from the narrative. In fact, the arrival at the House of God is the culmination of the ceremony.

A better explanation for the discrepancies is that a later editor, seeing the narrative was incomplete, took the opportunity to include more landmarks of Jerusalem into the story. In MT and LXX Neh 12: 43, both texts explain that “They offered great sacrifices that day and rejoiced, for God had made them rejoice.” The later editor, seeing that the procession ended at the Sheep Gate, made additions to the story since it was unclear where the sacrifices were made. Thus, the House of God was added to the events, along with more temple personnel, and leaders of the community.

Another list that has many unique features when compared to the LXX is MT Neh 12:36. The material not present in the LXX is from the lists of Levites who were part of the procession to the House of God. Other material not included in the LXX includes certain Levites, namely Milalai, Gilalai, Maai, Nethanel, Judah, Hanani, and also a reference to musical instruments. The LXX records that the brothers, Shemiah and
Azarel were in the procession, “with the music of David, the man of God” (ἐν ωδαῖς Δαυίδ ὁ ἱερῳπός τοῦ θεοῦ). While both Shemaiah and Azarel are part of the processions in MT and LXX, the texts differ with regard to a specific reference to musical instruments (MT). The LXX simply mentions the music of David. Thus, the MT makes explicit this reference to music as well as which Levites participated in the event, and thereby is a scribal gloss.

4.2. Small Scale Differences

Turning to the list of Levites in Neh 12:8, there is a possible textual variant between the MT and LXX. MT Neh 12:8 records that certain Levites were “over the thanksgiving, he and his brothers” (ἐν ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν ὑπερεῖς). The LXX editors translated the phrase ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν, which is present in the MT, as ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν meaning “over the hands.” It appears the LXX translators understood ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν, which is most commonly translated as “thanksgivings,” (ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν) for “hands” (ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν). Were the LXX translators confused about this particular phrase? Since the confusion arises in the pointing of the word, it seems that ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν, which was understood to be a noun from the context of music is also found in 1 Chr 6:16, where David set men in charge of the singing, ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν μου ἐξωγράφησα σου. Levitical references to music are not found in the Deuteronomic and Priestly material. But in post-exilic literature, this is not the case, and in fact, the temple musicians play an important role in the “temple administration” that David established (Knoppers 1999: 67-68). For examples of their roles, see 1 Chr 6:16, 17; 13:8; 15:16-22; 16:4-36; 23:5; 25:6; 2 Chr 20:21-22; 23:18; 29:28).

---

440 This phrase is also found in Ex 34:29 when Moses brings the tablets down from Mount Sinai (καὶ αἱ δύο πλάκες ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν Μωσῆ). It also appears in Isaiah 49:16 (ίδου ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν μου ἐξωγράφησα σου).

441 The use of hand in the context of music is also found in 1 Chr 6:16, where David set men in charge of the singing, ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν (“over the hands of song”). Levitical references to music are not found in the Deuteronomic and Priestly material. But in post-exilic literature, this is not the case, and in fact, the temple musicians play an important role in the “temple administration” that David established (Knoppers 1999: 67-68). For examples of their roles, see 1 Chr 6:16, 17; 13:8; 15:16-22; 16:4-36; 23:5; 25:6; 2 Chr 20:21-22; 23:18; 29:28).
verb הָדָע, was later pointed to reflect this. But in unpointed Hebrew, the LXX copyist understood this to mean χειρ (hand). In fact, if the LXX translators were to have understood this word to mean thanksgiving, they would have translated יהודִּי, as αἰνέσις (“thanksgiving” or “offering”). Additionally, יהודִי, the hiphil infinitive construct from הָדָע, appears in Neh 12:46 (יהודִי וֹלַדְתֵּל וּלָבֵר), meaning “the song of praise and thanksgiving” but in this case, the LXX translates it as “over the songs and praise and thanksgiving” (τῶν ἄδοντων καὶ ὑμνῶν καὶ αἰνέσιν). Since this is the only attestation of יהודִי, it would appear to be a corruption of hands, and thus, the LXX translators understood this Hebrew phrase to be a genitive plus task phrase. This difference, however, is a translation issue rather than an addition to the text.

MT and LXX Neh 12:12 introduce the next series of priestly lists. Before the large-scale differences in the priestly list in vv. 14-21, there is a small-scale text critical issue that is of note in v.12. The MT states that “in the days of Joakim, the priests, heads of ancestral houses were…” (יָדָע יִמְשָׁרִים מְיָהוֹק מֶיָּהוֹ וְיָבָא). In LXX Neh 12:12, there is a variant, “In the days of Joiakim, his brothers, the priests, heads of the ancestral houses…” (καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις Ιωακιμ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχοντες τῶν πατριῶν). The inclusion of “his brothers” into the LXX is most likely an error the scribe made by switching יָדָע (“they were”) with יָדָע (“his brothers”). Graphic

---

442 This term appears in many contexts, including references to praise offerings (Lev 7:12, 13, 15) and praise songs (Psa 26:7; 2:4; 69:30; 95:2; Jer 30:19; 1 Chr 25: 3; 2 Chr 5:13; 33:16; Neh 12:46; Judith 15:14; Sir 17:28, 39:15).

443 This type of phrase is not commonly used in Greek. It is uncommon for επὶ + a genitive to be taken as a position or specific job.
confusion is an improbable explanation for this error if the scribe did view the scroll; however, it is possible that the scribe erred because of auditory confusion. In other words, the text may have been read to him/her as the scribe was copying, and thus may have heard the text incorrectly. Thus, this difference may be attributed to scribal error, and not an addition for explanatory purposes.

LXX Neh 12:9b translates as εἰς τὸς ἐφημερίας, meaning “over the divisions/service.” This refers to the class or division of priests who worked in the Temple in Jerusalem, performing daily chores. The LXX term ἐφημερίας (“divisions”) appears in 1 Chr 23:6; 28:13, based on a different term in the MT, namely מַלְכַּלְכּוֹל (“divisions”). In Josephus’s writings, he uses ἐφημερίας to describe the division of priests, specifically Matthias, “a priest of the order of Joiarib” (ἱερεὺς ἐξ ἐφημερίδος Ἰοϊαρίβ). Accordingly, the phrase “stood opposite them in shifts” refers to both a position and their actual place within the temple precinct.

Another small-scale difference that has a large impact on the text is that the position of Nehemiah as “the governor” (הנהניה) is not found in LXX Neh 12:26. In fact, there are a few key places in LXX Nehemiah where the position of Nehemiah,
specifically as a governor is lacking (cf. 8:9 and 10:2).\textsuperscript{447} Therefore, this is not just a matter of haplography, but rather an issue of how Nehemiah is viewed as an authoritative figure within the larger text preserved in LXX Nehemiah.

Additionally, Nehemiah is not mentioned at all in the conclusion to LXX Neh 12:47. Set in the time of Zerubbabel, the MT records that also “in the days of Nehemiah” \( \text{בְּמֵי נְחֶמֶיה} \) all of Israel gave a daily portion for the singers and the gatekeepers.” The LXX, however, does not mention Nehemiah within this context. MT Neh 12:47 is commonly interpreted to mean that during the periods of Zerubbabel and also Nehemiah, Israel performed their sacred duties. Williamson, for example, believes that “in the days of Zerubbabel and Nehemiah” is included in order to expand “the vision of the well-ordered community to include the days of Zerubbabel as well as the whole period of Nehemiah” (1985: 384) which is certainly the case in the MT. In the LXX, however, the context is set within the return under Zerubbabel, and not tied to Nehemiah. Thus, the LXX clearly views the foundations of the tithe in the time of Zerubbabel, which provides the legitimacy for giving portions to the singers and gatekeepers. By adding Nehemiah to the text, this practice has continuity over a period of time, thereby bolstering the legitimacy of Nehemiah, as well as the singers and gatekeepers.\textsuperscript{448}

Two other small-scale differences between MT and LXX that may also be examples of scribal glosses are found in vv. 42 and 44. In Neh 12:42, the MT includes

\textsuperscript{447} In Neh 5:14, when the MT calls Nehemiah a governor \( \text{נְחֶמֶיה} \), the LXX understands this term as ruler \( \text{ἀρχοντος} \).

\textsuperscript{448} That is, unless the editor was confused about the chronology, and thought that Zerubbabel and Nehemiah were contemporaries. This, however, seems unlikely since the chronology of Nehemiah is not confused in other appearances in MT Nehemiah 12.
“with Jezrahiah” who, according to this text, was the leader of the Levitical singers. A Jezrahiah is never mentioned in the LXX, which may reflect a later gloss to the material found in the MT, in order to name specifically who was the leader of the singers. An additional example of a later gloss is found in MT Neh 12:44, where the narrative is explaining that men were appointed to gather tithes and specific contributions for the priests and the Levites. In the MT, it specifically states that this was required “by law” (טבוח). Similar to the other examples, this specific statement is not present in the LXX, but clearly appears to be a scribal gloss. The editor of the MT text is making explicit what he/she sees as implicit.  

Some of these small scale cases may be scribal errors as was the case in Nehemiah 11, but it is difficult to argue for a situation that could explain all of these errors. I am not arguing that there are no cases of haplography in Nehemiah 12. Indeed, there are certain cases where textual differences should be highlighted as cases of haplography. But these fall into the normal realm of text-critical differences. The highlighted cases of textual divergences point to other factors, and not just scribal error. Rather, the textual differences emphasize a need to explain certain practices and also add members to the cultic community. Thus, there are clear mechanisms that may explain the reason for each addition.

---

449 For other examples of this in the biblical texts, see McCarter (1986).
450 One example may be v. 43 with the disappearance of the second use of “joy” (יהוה) in the MT.
5. Parallel Priestly Lists

In order to understand the compositional processes behind the creation of the lists in MT and LXX Nehemiah 12, it is necessarily to examine any overlap with other lists. The lists of priests in MT Neh 12:1-7 and 12-21 have many similarities with lists found in Neh 10:3-9, 1 Chronicles 24, and Ezra 2:36-39/Neh 7:39-42 (Table 5-2). The Levitical lists found in MT Neh 12:8-9, 24-25 also have similarities with certain lists, such as MT and LXX Neh 10:10-11 and MT and LXX Ezra 2:40-42/Neh 7:43-45.

The closest parallel to MT Neh 12:1-7 is Neh 12:12-21, which consists of a catalog of the next generation after the return, including the names of their fathers, contemporary to Joiakim’s priesthood. Of the 22 names that appear in the priestly genealogy of MT Neh 12:1-7, the only name that does not appear in MT Neh 12:12-21 is not present in LXX Neh 12-21: Hattush. As previously mentioned, there are also a few spelling variants in names found between MT Neh 12:1-7 and 12:12-21: Malluch (Malluchi), Shecaniah (Shebaniah), Rehum (Harim), and Meremoth (Meraioth). It is hard to account for so many scribal differences with these names. Nevertheless, with the exception of Hattush and some name differences, there is a great deal of overlap between Neh 12:1-7 and MT Neh 12:12-21. However, the overlap between MT Neh 12:1-7, and vv. 21-21 differs dramatically in the LXX.

In the example of overlap with other parallel priestly lists, particularly Neh 10:3-9, there are also several names that appear in these lists, but with fewer overlaps than was the case in MT Neh 12:1-7 and 12-21. The first nine names, from Seraiah to Meremoth, appear in both lists. Nehemiah 10 does not mention an Iddo, the tenth name in MT Neh
12:1-7, but the next six names in MT Neh 12:1-7 are also found in Neh 10:3-9 in the same order (with several more names interspersed throughout the material). There are several names from both lists that do not have any overlap. In the case of MT Neh 12:1-7, the last six names of priests are not found in MT Neh 10:3-9 (Joiarib, Jedaiah, Sallu, Amok, Hilkiah, and Jedaiah). Conversely, several names in Neh 10:3-9 are not in MT Neh 12:1-7 (Pashur, Malluch, Obadiah, Daniel, Baruch, and Meshullam), interspersed with the first 16 names that overlap. Therefore, unlike the names that only appear in MT Neh 12:1-7, which are all lumped in 12:6-7, Neh 10:3-9 has no particular order to the material that is missing. In the case of LXX Neh 12:1-7, all of the names are also found in Neh 10:3-9. Yet, as would be expected, Nehemiah 10 is a much longer list than LXX Neh 12:1-7.

The overlapping names in MT Neh 12:1-7 and 1 Chronicles 24 are not nearly as prominent as the other two case studies. 1 Chronicles 24 is a list of the lots drawn by the descendents of Aaron to determine their jobs in the temple. Among these names, there is partial overlap with MT Neh 12:1-7: Malchijah (Malluch), Shecaniah, Harim (Rehum), Abijah, Mijamin, Maaziah (Maadiah), Bilgai (Bilgah), Jehoiarib (Joiarib), Jedaiah. Thus, 9 names overlap with the 22 found in MT Neh 12:1-7. When comparing LXX Neh 12:1-7 and 1 Chronicles 24, two names are found in both lists: Malchijah (Malluch) and Shecaniah.

---

451 Even though there is a Malluch (מַלְכִּיָּה) in Neh 10:5, most commentators correlate Malchijah (מלכייה) (Neh 10:3) with Malluch (מַלְלֹך) in Neh 12:2 because of its placement in the list. Thus, Malluch (מלך) in Neh 10:5 does not have a direct parallel in Neh 12.

Finally, in the example of Ezra 2:36-39//Neh 7:39-42, there are a few points of convergence. Since there are only five priests mentioned in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, it is not as comprehensive as the list in MT Neh 12:1-7, or MT and LXX Neh 12:12-21. The three names that overlap are: Jedaiah, Jeshua, and Harim. In the case of LXX Neh 12:1-7, none of these names are found within the list, except for Jeshua, who is mentioned as leading the return with Zerubbabel.\textsuperscript{453}

Hence, it cannot be concluded that in the priestly lists in MT and LXX Neh 12:1-7 and 12:12-21 any one of the parallel passages was fully responsible for the creation of these lists. Rather, it would appear that the roots of MT and LXX Neh 12:1-7 and 12-21 lie in other lists, not recorded in the biblical material.

\section*{6. Parallel Levitical Lists}

Similar to the priestly lists in MT Neh 12:1-7 and 12-21, the Levitical list in MT Neh 12:8-9 also has lists that overlap in material found in Neh 12:24-25, Neh 10:10-11, and Ezra 2:40-42//Neh 7:43-45 (Table 5-3). Although not every name in Neh 12:8-9 is found in the other lists, there are a few similarities in order and content. MT Neh 10:10 has the most overlap with MT and LXX Neh 12:8, but not with v. 9 since the first three names are the same in each list. Further, these 3 names (Jeshua, Binnui, and Kadmiel) are not present in MT or LXX Neh 12:24. Yet the final five names in MT Neh 12:8-9 are not present in Neh 10:10, but three out of five are present in MT Neh 12:24-25

\textsuperscript{453} And, in the case of MT Neh 12:1-7, this is also the context in which Jeshua is listed.
Thus, it appears that MT Neh 12:8-9 is similar to both Neh 10:10-11 and 12:24-25, yet these two lists do not share any names in common with each other. Considering LXX Neh 12:8-9, this passage follows the overlap with MT Neh 12:8-9 with the exception of Bakbukiah who is not present.

In the example of Ezra 2:40-42/Neh 7:43-45, there are two names that overlap with MT and LXX Neh 12:8-9, a Jeshua and Kadmiel, and three names that overlap with MT Neh 12:24-25, Shallum, Talmon, and Akkub. Like the other lists, however, there are names that are unique to each list. Thus, the amount of overlap these verses have as well as the conspicuous absence of certain key names--for example Bakbukiah and Judah--highlights other influences at work in MT and LXX Neh 12:1-11.

7. The Compositional Process of LXX and MT Nehemiah 12

The compositional phases of Nehemiah 12 prove to be difficult to fully reconstruct, based on certain discrepancies, particularly concerning names and numbers of groups connected to the different cultic institutions. What is clear is that the writers of MT and LXX Nehemiah 12 consulted different lists in order to compile the material. Moreover, the editor responsible for the material in the MT also felt the need to explain the procession around the walls in much more detail. The compositional process predominately takes into consideration how the list in the MT came to be the longer text:

---

454 Judah and Unni are not listed in Neh 12:24-25 or Neh 10:9-10.
455 There is one key difference with the listing of Jeshua and Kadmiel in MT and LXX Neh 12:24 versus Ezra 2/Neh 7: Jeshua is listed as the son of Kadmiel. In the case of MT Neh 12:25, this number of overlapping names is based on the argument that Shallum and Meshullam are the same person. Based on other references to Shallum/Meshullam (1 Chr 9:17; Ezra 10:24; and Neh 11:19), it would appear that these are the same people.
Compositional Horizon 1:

- **Phase 1**: An author/editor constructed the *Vorlage* of the material found in LXX Neh 11:25-12:9 based on other lists of priests and Levites as well as a list of settlements. This was added to the priestly genealogy found in vv. 10-11. It seems likely that Jaddua’s genealogy (found in vv. 10-11) was added after the material preserved in 11:25-12:9 was compiled because the compositional style differs. The material moves from places of settlement and people to a linear genealogy. The lack of an introduction to the genealogy is probably due to the fact that, when it was placed into the context of the lists preserved in LXX Neh 11:25-12:9, the introduction was not needed because the editor may have felt that Neh 12:1a provided a sufficient introduction to the material. Or, the compiler felt that the genealogy did not need an introduction since it was clearly of the family of Jeshua.

  - **Sub-phase 1.1**: The author/editor combined the lists found in LXX 11:25-12:11 with LXX Neh 12:12-26. These were constructed from earlier lists of priests and Levites. The priestly lists, dating to the time of Joiakim, were built from the material found in 12:1b-7. In the case of Malluch’s offspring, Jonathan and Shebaniah and his offspring, these three names were lost in the LXX, but retained in the MT.

- **Phase 2**: The details of the Jerusalem procession (LXX 12:27-47) was written independent of the priestly and Levitical lists (vv. 1-26). The material in LXX 12:27-47 focused on the procession of the community and certain elites who were part of the purification of all of Jerusalem.

- **Phase 3**: The portions of tithes (LXX 12:44-47) was added as a final note to the procession, laying out certain tithes and portions for the priests and Levites and their historical precedence.

Compositional Horizon 2:

- **Phase 1**: The material corresponding to LXX 12:1-26 and 27-47 were placed together for the purpose of concluding the events of Ezra-Nehemiah.

- **Phase 2**: Later, an editor added material to the lists (vv. 1-7 and 12-21) adding more priestly figures. This allowed for almost complete overlap between the first generation of priests found in vv. 1-7 and 12-21. When these additions were made, it destroyed the symbolic boundaries that the earlier proto-Rabbinic text attempted to create (symbolic use of six).

  - **Sub-phase 2.1**: Other scribal changes were made, particularly to other Levitical lists (found in vv. 9, 25, and 36).
Sub-phase 2.2: Details were added to the procession around the city, seen in the grouping and movement around the city (vv. 31, 38-42)

Sub-phase 2.3: Finally, small glosses were made to the text, particularly to material found in vv. 26, 28-29, 42, 44, and 47. The glosses in vv. 26 and 47 were an attempt to give more importance to Nehemiah than the original text allowed, as seen in the LXX.

This reconstruction allows for a process of editing and reediting material that may be contradictory in nature. It also best explains the deliberate structure of the LXX material, which is not represented in the MT text (esp. 11:25-12:9, and also possibly 12-14).

Of course, one could argue that an editor removed names in order to suppress certain families, at a later date. This omission of names could have occurred if one were disinheriting groups, meaning that they were not included as part of the cultic institutions. But, if this were the case, then it would make sense to remove the names from all of the lists of priests and Levites in Nehemiah 12. Moreover, any names found in parallel lists in Ezra and Nehemiah would also have these names removed, most notably Neh 10:3-9.

In addition, if one were suppressing this information, the details about the events in Jerusalem—that is, the purification of the community—would not need to be shortened. There is no process that could explain the removal of the House of God from the material. As previously mentioned, the procession ending at the Temple is the culmination of the dedication ceremony. There is no incentive to a shortened narrative that focuses on the holiness of the community and the importance of cultic institutions.456

This theme is found throughout MT and LXX Ezra and Nehemiah. It is much more

456 This is particularly the case since no later Rabbinic sources object to the groups mentioned in MT or LXX Nehemiah 12.
reasonable to adduce that the names and narrative events were added to the text. Since it is possible to see the addition of a narrative strand, that is, the details of the two processions around Jerusalem, it should be concluded that a later scribe added material to the text preserved in the MT. It is telling that the one name to which the Hasmonean family connected its roots, was Joiarib, who is not found in the LXX Nehemiah 12, but is mentioned twice in MT Nehemiah 12 (vv. 6 and 19).\textsuperscript{457} Hence, as is the case with most of the differences between MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12, \textit{lectio brevior} is the most logical explanation for the text critical differences.\textsuperscript{458}

8. Conclusion

The differences between MT and LXX Nehemiah 12 reveal that there is no clear textual incentive to a shorter LXX. The material that is not present in the LXX mostly consists of names of the priests who returned with Zerubbabel, lists of certain Levites, places where the Levites reside, the narrative of the cultic procession around Jerusalem, and references to Nehemiah and his position. While these people do not undo the repatriation and dedication ceremony in Nehemiah 12, they do add substance to the list. Thus, the differences between the MT and LXX are dramatic.

When examining the differences between traditions, it is noteworthy that in LXX Nehemiah 12, there are three lists with six names in each: six priests, six Levites, and six

\textsuperscript{457} Cf. 1 Macc 2:1
\textsuperscript{458} Indeed, several scholars have already argued that the material in MT Nehemiah had to be “updated” at some point in time, particularly vv. 6, 19, 22, and 23. Blenkinsopp (1988: 334) argues that in the final form, the list cannot be earlier than the late fourth century, but that later “touches” were put into the list, some two centuries later, since Joiarib is present. See also Hölscher 1923: 553 and Rudolph 1949: 191.
generations of priests. Also, when considering the material in Neh 12:25-36, the settlement list consists of six different places. Thus, the lists in the LXX totaling six each cannot simply be a coincidence. Considering the symbolic nature of six and the symmetry within these lists, it appears that the LXX lists preserve select lists of returnees. This has implications for both the interpretation of these lists and also for understanding the process of composition. In the case of the divergences between MT and LXX Nehemiah 12, certain editors noticed the differences in the list of priests and Levites in the Vorlage of the LXX and thus added material in order to harmonize the text with other priestly and Levitical lists. When certain additions were made, it destroyed the symbolic boundaries that the earlier proto-Rabbinic text attempted to create. There are three explanations for the “undoing” of these boundaries: 1) The later MT writer knew that the lists were symbolic, but did not want to have competing lists, 2) The later MT writer was not aware of the symbolic nature of the lists and thus made the changes in order to harmonize with other material, 3) the later MT writer chose to update the material in order to include more people. Whatever the choice, the later MT writer attempted to create cohesion within the lists and thus add onto the earlier, LXX material.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT Neh 12:1-7 With Jeshua</th>
<th>LXX Neh 12:1-7</th>
<th>MT Neh 12:12-21 With Joiakim</th>
<th>LXX Neh 12:12-21 With Joiakim</th>
<th>Neh 10:3-9 //Neh 7</th>
<th>Ezra 2</th>
<th>1 Chr 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seraiah</td>
<td>Seraiah</td>
<td>Seraiah/Meraiah</td>
<td>Seraiah/Meraiah</td>
<td>Seraiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jedaiyah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah/Hananiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah/Hananiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>Ezra/Meshullam</td>
<td>Ezra/Meshullam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pashur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amariah</td>
<td>Amariah</td>
<td>Amariah/Jehohanan</td>
<td>Amariah/Jehohanan</td>
<td>Amariah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malluch</td>
<td>Malluch</td>
<td>Malluchi/Jonathan</td>
<td>Malluchi</td>
<td>Malchijah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattush</td>
<td>Hattush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shecaniah</td>
<td>Shecaniah</td>
<td>Shebaniah/Joseph</td>
<td>Shebaniah</td>
<td>Shebaniah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehum</td>
<td>Harim/Adna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meremoth</td>
<td>Meraioth/Helkai</td>
<td>Meremoth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iddo</td>
<td>Iddo/Zechariah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginnethoi</td>
<td>Ginnethon/Meshullam</td>
<td>Ginnethon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijah</td>
<td>Abijah/Zichri</td>
<td>Abijah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abijah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijamin</td>
<td>Mijamin/-</td>
<td>Mijamin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mijamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart is modified from Blenkinsopp’s “Lists of Priests” with the addition of LXX material and Ezra 2/Neh 7 (1988: 333).

The numbers in parentheses are the courses, or places of the priests. In 1 Chronicles 24, there are 24 priestly courses, but I have only included the priests that overlap with the list in MT Neh 12:1-7, 12-21.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maadiah</th>
<th>Moadiah/ Piltai</th>
<th>Maaziah</th>
<th>Maaziah (24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilgah</td>
<td>Bilgah/ Shammua</td>
<td>Bilgai</td>
<td>Bilgai (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shemaiah</td>
<td>Shemaiah/ Jehonathan</td>
<td>Shemaiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiarib</td>
<td>Joiarib/ Mattenai</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jehoiarib (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jedaiyah</td>
<td>Jedaiyah/ Uzzi</td>
<td>Jedaiyah (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallu</td>
<td>Kallai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amok</td>
<td>Ammok/ Eber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilkiah</td>
<td>Hilkiah/ Hashabiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jedaiyah</td>
<td>Jedaiyah/ Nethanel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5-3: The Levitical Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shemaiah</td>
<td>Shemaiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabbethai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hashabia⁴⁶¹</td>
<td>Hashabiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeshua</td>
<td>Jeshua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sherebiah</td>
<td>Sherebiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Binnui</td>
<td>Binnui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeshua ben Kadmiel</td>
<td>Jeshua ben Kadmiel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kadmiel</td>
<td>Kadmiel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sherebiah</td>
<td>Sherebiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hodaviah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>Shallum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jozabad</td>
<td>Mattaniah</td>
<td>Mattaniah</td>
<td>Mattaniah</td>
<td>Mattaniah</td>
<td>Mattaniah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakbukiah</td>
<td>Bakbukiah</td>
<td>Bakbukiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁶¹ Following Hashabiah, MT Neh 12:24 lists Sherebiah, Jeshua, “son of Kadmiel.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Talmon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unni</td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>Akkub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshullam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatuta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Akkub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abda</td>
<td>Abda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6

Mapping the Persians, Judahites and Benjaminites: An Archaeological and Historical Examination of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36.

1. Introduction:

In order to advance the debate over the historicity of the list in MT Neh 11:25-36, scholars must consider several archaeological and historical presuppositions. By way of introduction, consider a passage from “Monty Python’s Quest for the Holy Grail”:

Arthur: I am Arthur, King of the Britons. Whose castle is that?
Woman: King of the who?
Arthur: The Britons.
Woman: Who are the Britons?
Arthur: Well we are all…we are all Britons. And I am your king.
Woman: I didn’t know we had a king….

Monty Python’s tongue-in-cheek interpretation of 10th century British kingship succinctly illustrates that identity, whether that of a nameless peasant or a king, is based on perspective. The local peasant woman in the sketch (conspicuously played by a man) has no notion of the larger political system led by Arthur, who claims he is her king. She neither labels herself with his rubric, that is, a Briton, nor does she see identity based in a larger identity of Britain. This lighthearted interpretation has intriguing parallels with

---

462 Excerpt from “Monty Python and the Quest for the Holy Grail” (1975).
463 She understands that authority is to be found within her “autonomous collective”. Many scholars have characterized the 10th century in England as a time of local control, or regional control rather then a larger system of “kingdoms”. Stenton (1971) discusses the political systems of 10th c. England in his classic work on the subject.
the era in Judean history commonly referred to as the Persian period. Like the early
Middle Ages, the Persian period is shrouded in mystery, particularly with regard to the
political, social, and economic systems that were at work under Persian dominance. The
multifaceted record of the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E. reveals that there are
many problems that modern biblical and archaeological scholars face when attempting to
understand a period of history that, for the most part, is arbitrarily time-bound.
Compounding the problem, the name “Persian period” automatically assumes a
perspective that is based on understandings of control exercised by external empires over
certain regions. Yet the view of the biblical and archaeological material is not from the
perspective of the superpower in control over the political sphere. These problems
continue into the Hellenistic and even Early Roman periods (late-fourth through first
centuries B.C.E.).
Authors of historical and archaeological studies of the period of Persian
dominance in the near east make many assumptions related to Persian identity and
control and how this affected the southern Levant. Many of these assumptions, however,
are hard to substantiate, based on the historical and archaeological record. In order to
approach the Persian period in this study, three lines of inquiry are examined. The first
seeks to understand what demarcates Persian as a distinct slot of time, a project requiring
us to ask, “who are the Persians?” and “what does Persian period mean?” in the discourse
of certain historical and archaeological studies. In an attempt to understand the history of
the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E., one must turn to certain ancient sources, both

464 Oeming and Lipschits point to the difficulties in studying this period. In their edited
volume, they introduce this study by stating that the study of “Judah and the Judeans in
the Achaemenid Period leads us into the realm of mystery” (2006: ix).
biblical and extra-biblical, and identify how they construct the Persians as a group and how they explain dominance over various subject peoples: Is control (as expressed in the texts) described in political, economic, or cultic terms, or more specifically, seen as founded by these Persian institutions? While this is a sizeable area of study, a brief presentation of views from scholars such as Herodotus and Thucydides help frame these extrabiblical perspectives. A second line of inquiry required to explore the Persian period entails an examination of how material culture and other archaeological finds attest to any presumed political domination. Is it possible to find a period within the archaeological record? If so, what is the evidence for a distinct Persian period and does archaeological evidence reshape our understanding of the textual reports on the Judahites and Benjaminites in the context of the return from Babylon? Finally, the third line of inquiry tackles settlement, particularly in the physical distribution of the Judahites and Benjaminites. Can we locate these groups in the archaeological record? This third line of inquiry leads directly to the settlement lists in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, which are excellent case studies for examining the wide range of interpretations that exist in the scholarly studies. And thus, in order to attempt any kind of periodization of the lists in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, it is necessary to deconstruct many assumptions concerning context, identity, and the use of material culture to delineate boundaries. Similar to the scene from “Monty Python” at the beginning of the introduction, clearly defined identification is essential. This study does not solve the problems of using periodization in historical writings, but it does expose the problematic nature of using periodization to

465 This is particularly true with regard to MT Neh 11:25-36. There are no discussions on the connection between archaeology and LXX Neh 11:25-36.
direct the inquiry into the “archaeological” record.

2. The Term “Persian” in Ancient Historical Sources

The most well known sources on the Persians were most often not written by Persians. Although it is impossible to claim that the Persians did not write their histories in narrative form, it is true very few of them are preserved. Indeed, the Persians left very few records of any kind. We do not have royal annals, eponym lists, detailed chronicles, or detailed building inscriptions. In his work, From Cyrus to Alexander, Pierre Briant comments:

One of the most remarkable peculiarities of Achaemenid history is that, unlike most conquering peoples, the Persians left no written testaments of their own history, in the narrative sense of the word. It is noteworthy that unlike the Assyrian kings, the Great Kings had no Annals prepared where the memory of their mighty deeds on the battle-field or in the hunt could be made heroic and preserved (2002: 5).

Briant’s observation stands in contrast to Herodotus, who comments that he knew of three different Persian narratives of the life of Cyrus (Hist 1.95). Contra Briant’s statement, Gera comments in her discussion of Xenophon’s Cyropaedia:

It would seem that the burden of proof lies upon those who would deny the Persians…any kind of folk narrative dealing with men of the past. Cyrus the Great, in particular, left his mark upon Babylonian and Jewish literature; it is difficult to believe that his own people did not commemorate him in some fashion (1993: 15).

466 For a comprehensive presentation of all major texts, both Persian and foreign, that discuss the Persian period (that is, from Cyrus the Great to the death of Darius III and conquest of Alexander the Great) see Kuhrt (2007).
While Gera may be correct, her comment is derived from an argument of silence, which cannot be substantiated, and is simply rooted in a comparison to other near eastern cultures. There are, however, several references to Persian archives in ancient sources. Ctesias, a fifth to early-fourth century Greek physician in the court of Artaxerxes II, claims he had access to royal court archives.\textsuperscript{467} Ezra 4 and 6:1-2 also refers to royal records, but unlike the records that Ctesias presumably consulted, these appear to be administrative in nature.\textsuperscript{468} Examples of extant Persian administrative records, the Persepolis fortification texts, were uncovered in the 1930’s by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.\textsuperscript{469}

The only information that provides us a window into what Persian narratives might be is contained in the few monumental royal inscriptions: Darius’ Behistun Monument, the tomb inscriptions at Naqši-Rustam, and other royal documents such as

\textsuperscript{467} Ctesias is considered by many scholars to be an unreliable source since he tends to focus on court intrigue and “harem gossip.” If he were working in the court of an Achaemenid king, however, he may have had access to court documents, or possibly a royal library. For a discussion of Ctesias’s writings, see Llewellyn-Jones and Robson (2010). They reconstruct his Persica based on Testimonia, Epitomes (by Diodorus Siculus, Nicholas of Damascus, Plutarch, Photius, as well as 40 other authors), and Excerpts. See also Nichols (2008). Arrian relates a story of Alexander’s burning of the palace at Persepolis, which would have contained many administrative documents (Anabasis III, 18.10-11). Briant, however, calls this entire story “suspect” (2002:6).

\textsuperscript{468} Ezra 6:1-3a states, “Then King Darius made a decree, and they searched the archives where the documents were stored in Babylon. But it was in Ecbatana, the capital in the province of Media, that a scroll was found on which this was written: “A record. In the first year of his reign, King Cyrus issued a decree”” ( \textsuperscript{469} These tablets date to the 13\textsuperscript{th} -28\textsuperscript{th} year of Darius I (509-494 B.C.E.) and provide information on the movement of certain commodities throughout parts of the empire (Hallock, 1969).
the Cyrus Cylinder. These inscriptions are all royal propaganda, targeting specific audiences or set for specific commemorations. Nevertheless they do provide key data for understanding how royal Persian propaganda presented the king.470 Some of the most important inscriptions are the royal genealogies, texts that connect specific monarchs to various ancestors. One noteworthy and famous inscription that offers a glimpse into royal self-identity is the Behistun monument of Darius. This monumental inscription reports Darius’ genealogy and then states, “Proclaims King Darius: For this reason we are called Achaemenids; from ancient times we are noblemen; from ancient times our family has been kings.” In the royal writings of the Achaemenid monarchy, at least from the time of Darius, the kings often refer to themselves by their eponymous ancestor, Achaemenes. Thus, the concept of self-identity is tied to family connections within the social systems. Kinship connections are what make the king Persian, or more specifically, Achaemenid.

Since Achaemenid records are few, other sources must be used to probe Achaemenid social, political, economic, and religious systems. Greek writers and the

470 One of the most difficult questions to answer is who is the reader of these inscriptions? In the example of the Behistun Monument, it would have been difficult for the people passing by it on the road to read it, since it was placed in such an elevated location. The tombs at Naqši-Rustam, while in a more visible location, would not have been seen by many people. Thus, one could argue that these inscriptions were not written for a wide audience to read, but rather for a select, elite group (and/or divinity) to read. 471 As translated by Schmitt (1991:49 1-11). Darius’s genealogical claim to the throne is debated. For a discussion of Persian genealogical kinship claims see Fulton 2011. Xerxes refers to himself as, “Son of Darius, an Achaemenid” in monumental inscriptions at Ganj Nameh and on the double ramped stairway at Persepolis (Kuhrt 2007: 244). An earlier example of this is found in the Cyrus Cylinder; Cyrus the Great connects himself to Teispes, who may be the son of Achaemenes (Kuhrt 2007: 70-74).
biblical texts pen the most noteworthy documents about the Persians and their empire. They are written by "outsiders," and consequently, they likely inform in a different manner from that of a Persian written narrative. Ancient Greek writers were fascinated with the Persians, writing narratives, plays, biographies, geographies, proto-novels, and orations that focused on the positive and negative attributes of their neighbors to the east. Authors such as Thucydides, Xenophon, Ctesias, Demosthenes, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, Pausanias, and Aelian all dealt with the Persian monarchy in different ways and for different purposes. These authors often focus on the imperial crown, particularly the nature of imperial dominance over subject peoples. For most Greek writers, it is impossible to separate their comments on the Persian monarchy from their view of kingship, which they generally considered a foreign, even barbaric practice, yet also a point of fascination.

In the Greek sources, the most comprehensive depiction of the Persians and their empire appears in the annals of Herodotus. Approximately half of the Histories

---

472 Many scholars have speculated that certain biblical texts (esp. Ezra 4-6) used Persian documents as a source. This assertion was first made by Meyer (1896), and later championed by Torrey (1910, repr. 1970), Bickerman (1965: 249-75), and de Vaux (1971). For a discussion of the composition of Ezra 1-6, and the possible use of official documents, see Williamson (1983: 1-30; 1985: xxiii-xxiv); Halpern (1990: 81-142); and Porten (2002: 27-44).

473 This is not to say that documents written by internal, dominant groups, do not have inherently problematic issues in their telling of their history. Yet these issues tend to be different from when external groups record the history of another group.

474 The Cyropedia of Xenophon is oftentimes referred to as a “proto-novel.”

475 For a complete list of classical and Hellenistic authors who provide information about the Persians, see Briant, 2002:7. The ancient Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman sources on the Persian Empire generally shift from negative to positive opinions, as time went on. Early on, the Greeks and Hellenistic authors had a characteristically negative view of the Persians, but by the first and second centuries C.E., authors such as Plutarch and Pausanias have a generally positive outlook on this group.

specifically focus on Persian history, policy, and cultural practices. The only other Greek author comparable in coverage of the Persians is Xenophon, who wrote extensively about them in his *Anabasis*. Of these Greek authors, Herodotus offers the more comprehensive picture of the Persian monarchy and its different institutions. Christopher Tuplin provides a basic system of classification for tabulating the different ways that Herodotus references the Persians and their empire (2007). This classification is particularly useful when we consider both ancient and modern historical perspectives on the Persian monarchy, how they controlled their empire, and ultimately whether signs of Persian control may be detected in the archaeological record. This classification helps understand Persian in the adjectival sense. The first way “Persian” or “Persian empire” may be used is with regard to specific religious and social practices (1.131-140). Even though Herodotus oversimplifies, he covers a wide range of contexts for Persian social and religious practices. Tuplin’s second category contains the lists of districts that pay tribute to Persia (3.89-95) and military contingents (7.61-97) in the Persian army. Tuplin’s category explores the organization of the empire and how the monarchy organized itself and applied power over subject nations. The third category focuses on the history of the Persians. Herodotus provides a history of the Persians from their beginnings as a tribal group, through their rise to power, and eventual domination over

---

477 This led Plutarch to later refer to Herodotus as a “Barbarian-lover” in his work, “on the Malice of Herodotus.”
478 Another notable corpus are the Greek tragedians. Aeschylus’ work *The Persians* is an important early source for Greek construction of “the other.” The tragedian Phrynicus is also said to have written plays on the Persians, but none of his works have survived.
479 This is particularly true in his presentation of the religious practices of the Persians. Within the religious category, Herodotus focuses on the Magi and other religious practices among the “Persians”. He also discusses coinage, debt, and the marketplace economy in his discussion of social customs.
the Medes, Lydians, Babylonians, and Egyptians, as well as the defeats, particularly by
the Greeks (in 490 and 480 B.C.E.). The fourth category focuses on the “information
of the character and institutions of the Achaemenid state that is embedded in the
narrative” (2007: 793-95). In category four, Tuplin outlines the actual administration of
the empire, albeit in a limited fashion, in terms of the Persian administration’s output in
such activities as road building. These four categories nicely summarize how ancient
sources use the term Persian:

1. Social and religious practices.
2. Administrative and/or military organization.
3. History, particularly with reference to tribal affiliations and kinship ties.
4. Imperial institutions.

Tuplin’s classifications reveal that Herodotus did not have simply one image in mind
when he used the term Persian; rather he viewed them as a group, bound together by
social and religious customs that differentiated them from other groups. But Herodotus
also views the Persians as an empire with an administrative agenda to gain political

In Book 1.125 Herodotus provides one of the only narratives describing the tribal
system in Persia. He states, “There are many tribes of Persians. The ones whom Cyrus
got together and persuaded to rebel against the Medes were the ones on whom all the
other Persians depended: Pasargadae, Maraphii, Maspii. Of these, the Pasargadae are the
noblest, and to them belongs the Achaemenid clan, from which all the Persian kings
come. The other Persian tribes are: Panthialaei, Derusiae, Germanii-they are all
agriculturalists; the other are pastoralists: Dai, Mardi, Dropici, Sagartii” (Purvis 2007:
69). Thus, Herodotus clearly sees the “Persians” as a group, made up of several tribes,
including the specific tribe of the monarchy, the Achaemenids.

Tuplin rightly points out that Herodotus leaves out certain administrative pieces of
information, such as the king’s movement from capital to capital. In other words, there is
no reference to Persepolis, no reference to the city Pasargadae (it is only mentioned as a
tribe), and Ecbatana is simply used as a capital of the Medes. Also, local systems are also
not mentioned in Herodotus. Thus, most often he focuses on large-scale projects and
does not tend to focus on certain aspects of the administration of kingship, such as the
movement of the court.
dominance. When Herodotus mentions “Persian Empire” he uses the term in the framework of the Persian administrative system. In the context of Darius’s reforms, he conveys this story:

He established within the Persian Empire (archē) twenty provinces, or satrapies, as the Persians call them. Once he had established the provinces and appointed governors, he fixed the tribute which each people was to pay—“a people” being counted as including not only the neighboring tribes, but also past the immediate neighbors, certain more remote tribes, which were variously assigned to the various peoples (3.89).

Thus, Persian Empire here does not suggest a specific period of time or a chunk of space, but a stake of political control.482 When Herodotus uses the term archē, or empire, it does not convey the same meaning as it does in the modern, western usage. In J. W. Wright’s examination of the borders of Yehud, he comments that, “the modern nation-state has deeply, and negatively, affected the historical reconstruction of Palestine and the polities of Israel and Judah in the first millennium B.C.E.” (2006: 86). Wright’s observation is clearly also true for the larger empire (i.e. Persia) or archē as well, which may have been less “precisely bounded” than modern scholarship presents.483

In the context of fifth and fourth century Greece, the term archē may refer alternatively to an authoritative kingdom or, apparent in the Thucydidean use of the term, a power that has political domination over a territory.484 Herodotus appears to be in

---

482 Of course, Herodotus was writing during the height of the Persian empire.
483 Wright (2006: 70) also comments: “Recent maps that depict Yehud as a precisely bounded territory belong to a tradition of map-making that originated as recently as 1718. Borders are not ontologically real but are human constructs of the imagination.”
484 Thucydides also uses this term to describe Athens and her sphere of political dominance in the fifth century. In the “Melian Dialogue” (5.89-112), the Athenians request for Melos (a Spartan colony) to submit to their authority. In defense of their position Athens argues, “For ourselves, we shall not trouble you with specious
agreement with Thucydides, and the term satrapies (3.89-117) is interchangeable with archai (3.97.1). Hence, Herodotus may simply refer to the realm ruled by the Persians as the satrapies/archai as is seen in 3.97.4, which states, "the limit of what is ruled (archetai) by the Persians."  

Writing approximately 500 years after Herodotus, Josephus offers us a later Jewish memory of the Persians and their period of domination. Josephus’s view of the Persians is affected by his use of sources as well as his own experience with the Roman government. In many cases, he is writing a synopsis of the biblical texts (or parallel versions of the biblical texts). Josephus’s text mirrors biblical depictions of the Persians as well as many of Herodotus’s images of the Persians in terms of their social and religious systems. Several of Tuplin’s categories are also applicable to Josephus, though in a much more concise version. In relating the story of the death of Cambyses and Darius’s rise to power, Josephus mentions certain religious and social institutions, such as the “slaughter of the magi.” This concern with religious institutions in Josephus is similar to Tuplin’s first category of Persian depictions in Herodotus. Similar to Tuplin’s second category, Josephus makes several references to Persian imperial pretenses—either of how we have a right to our empire (archē) because we overthrew the Mede” (5.89: trans. by Strassler).

And in fact, in Herodotus, it is clear that it was impossible for him to separate the term “Persian” from the political control wielded by the Achaemenid monarchy, particularly over Ionia, the near east, and at times, Egypt. The control over Ionia affected Greek (particularly Athenian) and Persian relations throughout the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E..

Studies by scholars like Grabbe (1987) and Feldman (1998) have shown that, when Josephus is relating the history of the period of Persian dominance, he primarily relies on the biblical text. When he does not have a biblical text to help him, he seems to piece together his information from other sources, which were of varying quality.

Indeed, Josephus may have had Herodotus at his disposal.
administration, particularly in the reconstruction and administration of the temple in Jerusalem (cf. *Ant* 11.3.1; 11.4.4). Akin to Tuplin’s third category of the history of tribal affiliations and kinship ties, Josephus mentions the “seven families of the Persians” who elected Darius king (*Ant* 11.3.1). Tuplin’s fourth category, which is focused on imperial institutions, is encompassed in Josephus’s references to the “end to the dominion of the Persians” when Alexander conquered the Persian empire (12.1.1). Thus, Tuplin’s four categories of Herodotus’s discussion of the Persians and Persian empire are found within the text of Josephus, yet in a much more cursory fashion than what is seen in Herodotus.  

Further, the biblical depictions of “Persian” contain all four of Tuplin’s categories, as seen in Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah 1-8, and Esther. In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, three categories are most clearly seen: certain social and/or religious practices, the political and military organization of the Persians, and references to certain Persian institutions. One key difference between Ezra-Nehemiah and Herodotus is the use of a theological perspective to interpret certain historical events. In the biblical books, the repatriation of the province of Judah is seen as Yahweh’s plan that is administered by the Persian monarchy. But this does not mean that these books dilute the level or control of the Persian crown. In fact, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah clearly recognize control by the crown, or more specifically certain monarchs, such as Cyrus.

---

488 This lack of detail is not surprising since Josephus is simply offering a synopsis of Jewish history.

489 Other texts that focus on the first category, which are the specific cultural and religious practices of the Persians, are both Esther and Daniel. While Esther is of questionable date and authority concerning Persian customs, it does attempt to outline specific practices based on what the writer believed to be Persian customs. This may be due to later, Hellenistic, memories of the Persians.
Darius, Ahasuerus (Xerxes), and Artaxerxes (cf. Ezra 1; 4:3; 5:7, 13-17; 6:1-14; 7:11-28; Neh 2; 5:14; 13:6). The local peoples (that is, the non-returnees) also turn to the Persian crown for support. In the book of Ezra, both the יִשְׂרָאֵל, the “people of the land” and the נְתֵנִי, the “people of Judah” write directly to the crown for support, explicitly arguing why they oppose the building of the temple in Jerusalem (Ezra 4:7-23).

Another example of the importance of royal authorization is seen in chapter 2 of Nehemiah, when Artaxerxes bestows upon Nehemiah the authority to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah both convey a belief that the Persians have control over the region, which is evident in the importance of imperial authorization for certain building projects, such as the walls and the Temple, as well as in the fact that local control is authorized by the Persian crown. Thus, for the Bible, authorization and control are in the hands of the Persians, which may be expressed through local authority. Without this authorization, Nehemiah would not have been able to reconstruct the walls of Jerusalem.

While the ancient documents never clearly refer to a period as Persian, they

---

490 The exact nature of the יִשְׂרָאֵל “People of the land,” has been much discussed in literature. Talmon (1967: 71-76) argues that the term has a different meaning in the pre-exilic and postexilic periods. In the pre-exilic period, in the singular form, it refers a “social phenomenon” most clearly seen in the urban settlements of Judah. Under the early Davidic monarchy, it became part of the “socio-political framework of the empire” (1967: 76). In the postexilic period, the term (both singular and plural) has a negative connotation, connected to what Talmon calls the “motley population of Palestine that was encountered by the returning exiles (Ezra IX:2).” Halpern (1981: 191-95) argues that the pre-exilic references to the “people of the land” were the “enfranchised citizens of Judah who had many different social, political, and economic functions.” For a discussion of the term, see also de Vaux (1997: 70-72), who argues that they were the men with full citizenship, afforded “civic rights”. In the postexilic context, Blenkinsopp (2009: 35) avers that, from the perspective of the golah, the “people of the land” are outsiders. See also Rudolph (1949: 34-35), Williamson (1985: 54-61), and Willi (1995: 11-17).
demonstrate understanding of an era when the Persians controlled the geo-political situation of the Near East. In fact, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah mark time in Persian terms. Events that are particularly important are understood in relation to the year of the king (cf. Hag 1:1; 2:1; Zech 1:1; Ezra 1:1; 6:15; Neh 2:1). The postexilic practice of using the Persian monarchy as a chronological marker is in contrast to the infrequency with which the biblical authors mark time by the Assyrian, Egyptian, or Babylonian monarchy. Thus, the term “Persian” in the Bible may be understood to refer to the political, economic, and in certain cases, social control over an empire by the monarchy.

3. Modern Scholarship and the Use of the Term Persian

In modern scholarship, the terms Persian and Persian period seem to bear multiple meanings; confusion is amplified by a lack of definitions. Often the scholar assumes “Persian period” refers to a specific period of time, characterized by the political and possibly economic dominance of the Persians. Certain scholars attempt to avoid the use of the term Persian period by referring to it as the Achaemenid period. The use of Achaemenid allows scholars to focus on the actual family in power, titled by their eponymous ancestor, Achaemenes, and modern scholars such as Williamson use the title

---

491 In contrast to marking time by the foreign monarchy in control, 2 Kgs 25:37 dates the release of Jehoiachin of Judah to the 37th year of his exile. In this instance, time is still reckoned by the deposed Judahite monarch.
492 The beginning of Williamson’s study states, “The study of Jewish history in the sixth to fourth centuries BC has both benefitted by, and contributed to, the recent upsurge of interest in the sources of knowledge available to historians of the Achaemenid empire” (1998: 145).
of the monarchs themselves—that is, Achaemenid. This is a means to use the terminology that would have been favored by certain monarchs, particularly Darius and his descendants.

How, then, did the term Persian Empire become the label for identifying the late sixth through mid-fourth century B.C.E.? In order to understand the shifting of political power, scholars of history (including Bible and archaeology) have focused on periodizing history. Constructing periods of history is not a modern invention, but rather has its roots in ancient tradition, as seen in ancient Near Eastern king lists, or the writings of Hesiod. While certain modern labels, such as the Bronze Age and Iron Age, are a way to understand time blocks based on material culture, other labels classify by politics, that is, what power was in control and its sphere of influence. Examples of this appear in any region, but in the case of the Near East, periodization by rubrics runs rampant: for example, Assyrian period, Babylonian period, Persian period, Hellenistic period, and Roman period, to name only a few. In modern biblical scholarship, the Persian period has become synonymous with a period in which the biblical texts claim Persian authority over the Southern Levant. This authority is seen throughout Ezra and Nehemiah, in

493 This Achaemenes is mentioned in Darius’ Behistun inscription. Cyrus only mentions his ancestor Teispes, who, according to Darius, is the son of Achaemenes.

494 Hesiod uses “Ages” such as the Gold, Silver, Bronze, and Iron, to describe different epochs of life (both divine and human), in his didactic poem *Works and Days* (l. 109-126). For a discussion of these ages, see Momigliano (1983: 133-55).

495 Of course, the Bronze Age and Iron Age are also problematic markers of units of time. While these designations are meant to reflect certain material cultural behaviors, they do not reflect the reality of ancient life. We do not assume that once the Iron Age began, everyone dropped their bronze tools, never to use them again.

496 There have been attempts to create certain periods of ancient history. There has been an emphasis in certain circles to shy away from referring to the Babylonian and early Persian period and instead, refer to the sixth century B.C.E. as the Iron IIIb (cf. Barkay 1992:302-73) and therefore a continuation of earlier periods.
which the Achaemenid kings are said to have authorized restoration of the temple and
walls of Jerusalem (cf. Ezra 1-4, Neh 1-2).

Another popular approach in modern scholarly discussions defines the Persian
period by comparing and contrasting it to previous and/or later periods. Most of these
studies focus on the administrative policies of the Persians. One clear example is
Lipschits’s presentation of the effects of Persian control over the Southern Levant.
Lipschits states:

During the long years of Persian rule in Palestine, many geopolitical changes
occurred, along with administrative reorganization, particularly on the coast but
also in the hill country and in the southern areas of Cis- and Transjordan. We can
also assume that, like the Assyrians, Egyptians, and Babylonians, the
Achaemenids also tried to shape the political, social, and demographic systems in
Palestine according to their own military, economic, and governmental interests

Lipschits argues for a Persian period that is both similar to and distinct from previous
empires. In a similar approach, Hoglund has focused on the administration of the Persian
government over the Southern Levant (1992). He sees both a certain amount of
continuity and discontinuity with earlier Babylonian practices. The approaches by these
two scholars represent the most popular model for reconstructing systems of Persian
control. They focus on the concept of “Persian” as an administrative system, one that
may also have social implications for the subjugated peoples. It is never argued that a
group, such as the Judahites in the southern Levant has become culturally Persian.
Hence, unlike the Monty Python quote of king Arthur, when he says, “we are all Britons”
this statement does not reflect the approach of the Persian monarchy. This is clear in the

497 Notable examples of this are Stern (2001), Hoglund (1992), Briant (2002) and
Achaemenid inscriptions depicting the peoples that they control, especially the “empire lists.” While the Persian monarchy recognized control over these subjugated groups, they did not attempt to create cultural homogeneity among them. Also, the depiction of the different “nations” bringing tribute seen at Persepolis also reflects this notion. Finally, the Cyrus Cylinder also appears to recognize specific social and religious practices that are characteristic of certain cultures, seen from a geographical perspective. The Persians do not choose to recognize all the subject groups as Persian. On the contrary, they see themselves as controlling a vast empire, made up of many different people groups who seem to retain their individual religious and cultural status.

4. The Textual Approach in Light of Ezra and Nehemiah

Similar to the use of Persian period empire lists, the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah are used to reconstruct the area of settlement by the people connected to the political area called Judah. The textual approach explains the political, economic, and religious history of the sixth through fourth centuries through analysis of the texts that are commonly dated to this period. Historians have examined the list of MT Neh 11:25-36 by comparing it with other biblical lists of the Judahite and/or Benjaminite settlements during the Persian period of dominance. Biblical scholarship has examined parallel textual traditions in order to find a context for each list, principally by looking for overlap.

---

498 Inscriptions depicting the “people” of the Persian empire include: The Behistun Monument, the Persepolis Terrace Inscription, Darius’ Susa Inscription, Xerxes’ Daiva Inscription, the tombs at Naqshi-Rustam. See Briant (2003) and Kuhrt (2007) for a discussion of these texts.

499 See chapters 3 and 4 for a full discussion of the similarities and differences in the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah.
in the different settlement lists. These lists consist of the following: Ezra 2 and its parallel list in Nehemiah 7 (lists of returnees and their towns of settlement), Nehemiah 3 (the wall builders of Jerusalem), and finally MT Neh 11:25-36 (settlements in Judah and Benjamin). Since scholars commonly understand these groups as related, their studies pursue the following questions: What towns are mentioned in all of the lists and what towns are only found in one or another? Does the space defined by these overlapping towns equal the settlement area of the province of Judah? If so, what towns lie outside the settlement area of Judah? Who is said to have lived in these towns of settlement? Finally, how did the landscape of settlement change from the end of the Judean monarchy (late-Iron II) to the Hellenistic period? Based on these conclusions, a boundary of settlement is drawn around what a scholar believes the list represents. As we see in chapters three and four, these lists had different purposes to them. Thus, a comparison among these lists is more difficult than previously acknowledged.

Another group considered when scholars attempt to recreate the territory of Judah, particularly in light of MT Neh 11:25-36, is the Edomites. For this group, also referred to as the Idumeans, certain texts, such as Josephus, Diodorus Siculus, and the Zenon Papyrii, are relied upon to draw both cultural and political boundaries around the

500 For examples of these boundaries, see Avi-Yonah (1966: 23); Stern (1982:249); Grabbe (1992: 87); and Rainey and Notley (2006: 296). In these studies, they actually draw a boundary line around the area of settlement that corresponds to these lists. Carter (1999: 82-90) provides an overview of the differences in the maps of Yehud (especially Avi-Yonah, Stern, and Grabbe) and states, “Faced with the limits of textual traditions, archaeologists have turned to material remains to supplement and perhaps correct the biblical traditions. Unfortunately, there is no clear consensus concerning what types of archaeological data may be used to indicate the extent of the province’s sociopolitical influence, and, therefore, to determine its borders” (1999: 83). His assessment succinctly highlights the problems of boundary making in scholarly reconstructions of the province of Judah.
westward expansion of the Edomites into the area of the northern Negev. Scholars rely on certain third through first century B.C.E. writings as well as the writings of Josephus, to project a history for the Persian period. The papyri of Zenon (ca. 259 B.C.E.) are the earliest written sources discussing a southern border for a territory of Judah, and mention that the city of Mareshah was Edomite. The books of Maccabees refer to a territory called Idumea (1 Mac 4:29, 5:3, 65) as well as certain Idumean cities, such as Hebron (1 Mac 5:65), Beth-zur (1 Mac 6:7, 26, 31; 11:65), Adoraim (1 Mac 13:20), and Mareshah (1 Mac 5:66; 2 Mac 12:35). Diodorus Siculus also refers to several of these towns, calling them “Idumean settlements” (xix. 95.2; 98.1). Additionally, Josephus also mentions that John Maccabeus conquered the cities of Adoraim and Mareshah (Ant 13.9.1). Thus, we have third century B.C.E. through first century C.E. sources that mention cities, as well as a region, considered to be politically and culturally part of Idumea. However, there are no sixth through fourth century B.C.E. sources that clearly demarcate any territory as Idumea. And thus, these later sources are often used as a means to understand the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E. The texts are key pieces of information for reconstructing the political and economic domination over specific regions by groups like the Judahites and Edomites. The gaps in the texts, however, make it difficult to reconstruct when certain groups, such as the Edomites, had control over the specific areas and what this control really meant.

---

501 See Pestman (1981) for a discussion of the various papyri.
502 See Lipschits (2005: 147-49) for a discussion of the Hellenistic and Roman sources that discuss the boundaries of Judah during the Hellenistic period.
503 And, in fact, Levin (2007: 251-52) asserts that this area was actually under Qedarite control during the fifth to fourth centuries. Only under the Seleucids did this become the “eparchy” or “hyparchy” of Idumea.
5. Archaeological and Historical Approaches to Settlements in the Persian (and Hellenistic) Periods

How, then, may we understand Persian control over the southern Levant? The textual evidence is helpful, but has proven to be both difficult to interpret and incomplete. When considering the area of Judah during the Persian period, it is assumed by some scholars that if one looks hard enough with archaeological eyes, this period should make itself known through the archaeological research, particularly settlement patterns and material culture. But as Kuhrt asserts, it is not an easy task to recognize the presence of Persian domination outside of the heartland (2007: 2). Within the modern scholarship, there have been two popular archaeological approaches for reconstructing Judean power within the larger sphere of Persian imperial power: The material culture approach, and the historical archaeology approach. These two approaches appear to continue to dominate the scholarship of the study of the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E. in the area of the southern Levant.

5.1. The Material Culture Approach

By means of archaeological remains, scholars seek to understand where people are settled. Some studies also attempt to tackle the much more difficult questions of identity—that is, who were the people who settled in certain regions and how did they

504 These studies also seek to understand, where people are not settled. The different types of settlements that may be found, ranging from pastoralists, to villagers, to city dwellers, complicate the notion of settlement. Further, differences in material culture from site to site further complicate cross-site interpretation. See London (2003: 146-49) for a discussion of the limitations of material culture in determining ethnicity.
conceptualize themselves. Scholars who use this method argue that there should be a
correlation between the material culture that exists and the identity of specific groups in a
population. Objects such as stamp seals, coins, certain cultic materials, inscriptions, and
pottery are argued to “show” signs of the Judahites and the Edomites.\footnote{Specific cultic materials that are used as evidence are figurines and incense stands.
For a discussion of certain cultic materials in the southern Levant, see Stern (1982: 183),

Indeed, the study of stamp seals is a popular approach for demarcating boundaries
of the province of Judah. Studies by scholars such as Stern (1982), Avigad (1987),
Lipschits (2005) and Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007) discuss the areas where stamp
impressions referencing the Province of Judah have been found and their differences.\footnote{For a history of the study of the \textit{yhw}d seal impressions, see Christoph (1993) and Lipschits (2005).}

In Stern’s analysis of the \textit{yhw}d seal impressions, he offers a classification system derived
from several categories, including: 1) the spelling of \textit{yhw}d, either in the plene form
(\textit{Yhwd}) or defective form (\textit{\text{Dhy}}), 2) the spelling of the province in an abbreviated form
(\textit{hy} or \textit{\text{H}}), and 3) The appearance of the word “governor” (\textit{\text{Shp}}). And, as Lipschits
(2005: 176) emphasizes, these studies reveal that 90% of the seal impressions only have
the name of the province, which “reinforces the theory that has become rooted in the
research from the inception—that these are official seal impressions of the provincial
administration and are chiefly related to tax matters.”\footnote{Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007: 75) provide totals (and percentages) of types of seal impressions as well as their locations. At Ramat Rahel, a total of 257 Yehud Seal Impressions (YSI) have been located; 165 YSIs found in Jerusalem. Other cities have been found to contain YSIs, including Tell en-Nasbeh (20), Nebi Samwil (16), Gezer (8), En-gedi (10), Rogem Gannim (7), and Jericho (18). Certain places only have one YSI, including Kadeshbarnea, Jericho, En-Gedi, Gezer, Jarmuth, Azekah, Tel Nimrin, east of}
generally dated to the Persian and early Hellenistic periods based on their paleographic typology, form, and stratigraphic data from the excavations. Because of these three considerations, Lipschits and Vanderhooft have classified *yhwd* stamp impressions (YSI) into three groups: early, middle, and late. From their detailed analysis of the known YSIs, Lipschits and Vanderhooft have found paleographic continuity between the late Persian period and the Macedonian and Ptolemaic periods. They attribute the continuity to the style, form, and content of YSIs, as well as where these were found. The *yhwd* impressions are believed to help demarcate the political regions of the province of Judah, based on the location of the seal impressions.

A second piece of evidence that is used to point to a province of Judah is coins. There are many different types of coins found in the area of the southern Levant. Stern categorizes these coins as follows: Persian, Greek, Phoenician, Cypriot, Anatolian, Egyptian, Palestinian (“Philisto-Arabian” or “Egypto-Arabian”), Province of Judah coins, and Samarian Province coins (2001: 557-570). Of note are the coins that contain the

---


509 Lipschits and Vanderhooft’s (2007: 84-85) analysis has led to several important conclusions. The early stamp impressions date to the late sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E.. Also, a major change happens between the early and middle group of YSIs, particularly clear in changes to the form, style, paleography, and also the orthography of the province name. The name of the province shifts to three letters, written in Paleo-Hebrew. The late seal impressions also show changes to the spelling of the province name, as well as other form and style shifts. It is significant that the seal impressions are written in Paleo-Hebrew, and shows that a change in script was at a state or official level in the Persian period.
name *yehud* or *yhd* in Aramaic. Meshorer characterizes the coins based on the designs and symbols on the coins, as well as spelling variants (1982: 17-23). He argues that *yhd* coins were styled to look like Athenian coins and were struck in Judea during the Persian period (1982: 17). Coins inscribed with *yhdh* and designed with the image of Ptolemy I, however, date to the era of Ptolemaic rule. Thus, the short spelling of *yhd* dates to the Persian period (fourth century B.C.E.), and coins from the Ptolemaic era employ the longer spelling, *yhdh*. These coins reveal that an area referred to as *yhd* was allowed to mint coinage during the period of Persian domination. Meshorer argues that this process of minting coins probably took place in Jerusalem, although very few coins have been found in excavations (1982: 31). The locations of the coins, however, are not used to create boundaries, since coins have been found at places outside any proposed reconstructions of the area of Yehud, including Mount Gerizim. Like the YSIs, the significance of these coins is in the use of the name *yhd*, written in Paleo-Hebrew and Aramaic. This use is assumed to reflect a period of some autonomy and also a renewal of political connections to the past (Stern 2001: 562-70).

In contrast to the political and economic province of Judah, some scholars have argued for a “territory” of Idumea, dating to the Persian period. While there is clear written evidence for a region, referred to as Idumea, dating to the Hellenistic period, this

---

510 Meshorer notes that two *yhd* coins were found in set excavations in Jerusalem, several were found south of the city, one north of Jericho, one at Beth-Zur (with the inscription *yhzygh*), and several at Tel Jemmeh (1982: 30-31). Stern notes that they were also found at Ramat Rahel and Mount Gerizim (2001: 565).

511 I. Stern argues that this “renewal in national pride” and the “rise in ethnic awareness” is best contextualized in the “Samaritan-Jewish tensions” (2007: 230). This, however, seems to be doubtful since other evidence shows cooperation between the two groups (cf. the book of Chronicles).
is not clear in the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E.. Through studies of specific ostraca, oftentimes referred to as the “Aramaic Ostraca of Idumea,” scholars such as Lemaire (1999; 2000; 2002; 2006), Eph’al and Naveh (1996), and Kloner and I. Stern (2007) assert that certain personal names that appear in the ostraca, have different theophoric elements. These elements are then tied to ethnicity. As Lemaire states, “the onomastica found in these ostraca include several theophoric elements characteristic of the various ethnicities” (2006: 416). He cites north Arabic theonyms like El and Manat/Manawet to support his argument, as well as Edomite names with “Qôs,” the national deity of Edom, Phoenician and/or Canaanite names, as well as Yahwistic names. Attempting to explain the occurrence of Yahwistic names among the Idumaean ostraca, Lemaire states that the presence of these names, “may explain the enigma of the list of towns with a Judean population in Neh 11:25-30” (2006: 417). The

---

512 See also Porten and Yardeni for discussions of the Aramaic Ostraca (2004; 2006; 2009). In Kloner and Stern’s 2007 publication, they produce a chart of the “ethnicity of names from selected Idumean sites” (pg 143). Ostraca have been uncovered at Arad, Beer-sheba, Tell Jemmeh, and Mareshah. According to Lemaire (1996; 2006; 2007), Eph’al and Naveh (1996), most of the ostraca date to the fourth century B.C.E.. These ostraca mostly deal with agricultural issues, specifically in connection to orchards and fields. They are generally summaries of the parties and the type of commodity that was involved in certain transactions. These texts all record dates, based on the regnal year of the Persian or Greek king in power, ranging in date from 363 to 311 B.C.E.. See Eph’al (1998: 106-119) and Stern (2001: 364-5).

513 El, of course, is not simply a North Arabic theonym, but found in other cultures.

514 Examples of Qôs names include Qoshanan (Nos. 8-12, 13-16), Qoslaytha (Nos. 17-22), and Alqos (Nos. 26 and 27). For full texts, see Porten and Yardeni (2004: 161-83). Names with the divine name Qôs have been found in earlier stamp seals and seal impressions from the area referred to as “Edom” in the Transjordan. Also, Assyrian records mention kings of Edom, such as qa-uš-ma-la-ka (Qosmalak) referenced in Tiglath-pileser III’s annals, and both Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal reference a qa-uš-gab-ri (also mentioned on a seal found at Umm el-Biyara). During the time of Sennacherib, an Edomite kings named a-a-ram-mu/me is mentioned. See Bartlett (1989: 202-203) for a discussion of these royal names, as well as other examples of officials and citizens who have names with a Qôs element to them.
reason for citing Nehemiah 11 is that this is the only list that enumerates Judahite settlements in the Negev, set within the context of the Persian period. These finds have been controversial because many are unprovenanced, purchased by private collectors on the antiquities market. However, recent studies by scholars such as I. Stern (2005 and 2007) assert that these other unprovenanced ostraca are legitimate, based on the similar epigraphic style of ostraca found at sites such as Arad, Beersheba, Maresha, as well as Tell Jemmeh and Tel el-Far‘ah (south). But this is difficult to assert, since no scientific analysis has been undertaken (or at least published) that makes a case for a connection between the provenanced and unprovenanced ostraca.

Moreover, according to I. Stern (2007: 207), many of the Aramaic ostraca “provide insights into the ethnic makeup of the area as well as the economy of the period.” Stern later adds:

> It is clear from the epigraphic evidence…that ethnicity was not a constant attribute of the groups but perhaps reflects a conscious means by which individuals or clans freely chose to identify with a social unity for economic social reasons (not necessarily known to us today). Theoretically, at a later date this interaction could be defined in more ideological terms, which may be inclusive or exclusive of others depending on the situation. Whether or not a

---

515 I. Stern (2007: 212) comments that the majority of ostraca are of unknown provenance “but are believed by many scholars to originate in the area of Khirbet el-Kôm. This assumption is based upon rumors from local antiquities merchants that the ostraca originated there and is reinforced by the appearance of the name Makkedah on many of the ostraca; this site has been independently identified with Khirbet el-Kôm.” He also cites the similarities of one bilingual (Greek and Aramaic) ostraca as well as eight Aramaic ostraca that were found during excavations at Khirbet el-Kôm for proof of the validity of the unprovenanced ostraca. In Porten and Yardeni’s 2004 article, they begin with the statement, “It is a truism that some of the best finds turn up on the antiquities market.”

516 Ostraca have also been found at Tel el-Kheleifeh and the area of Yata. See Naveh (1985) and Pratico (1985) for a discussion of these ostraca.

517 I. Stern bases his ethnic classifications on the theophoric elements found in the names on the ostraca.
group used its ethnicity as a means of exclusion or inclusion is difficult to ascertain from archaeological remains (2007: 227).

Stern’s interpretation conceptualizes the ambiguity of certain groups, as well as highlights the problems of interpreting groups in static terms. But his conclusions are still driven by the belief that certain individuals, which he demarcates based on theophoric elements in names, have a connection to each other, which he sees as ethnic, and ultimately manifests itself onto the landscape. That is, these ethnic groups may clearly be connected to towns and villages, and thus, geography because of these ostraca. While there are no written sources that point to the exact borders of an Idumea during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E., these ostraca have created one in the minds of historians and archaeologists.

Further, in Stern’s model, borrowing on Tainter’s discussion of “Post Collapse Societies” (1998: 988-1039), both Judah and Idumea may be described as post collapse societies in the period of Persian domination since many of the towns and cities that were present in the Iron II period were not in existence in the Persian period. A region with little population “could create social conditions that would be conducive for co-operation rather than competition over its limited resources, paving the way for low ethnic boundary maintenance” (2007: 215). Moreover, when “economic stress and competition

---

518 He cites Hodder (1982: 159-78) in his study of “ethnic boundaries” which he argues are “maintained by symbols that emerge or develop in order to identify and separate” (2009: 213). While there are symbols that can be used as markers of identity, it is important to explain exactly how one can ascertain these “symbols” of self-identity, which Stern does not make clear.

519 Following Faust (2009) and Lipschits’s (2005) interpretations. But others see continuity with the Iron II period in settlement locations. See, for example, Edelman (2005).
are at an ebb,” ethnic borders may be blurred (2007: 216). Stern views what he interprets as many ethnic groups living together in a region, defined as Idumea, as an exception rather than the rule.\(^{520}\) It appears that in normal circumstances, when resources are more abundant, this living arrangement would not have crystallized. In fact, competition becomes stronger. But in the fifth and fourth centuries, there was integration and a division of shared resources among these groups. Stern cites Nehemiah 11, stating:

> The Judahite population may very well represent the descendants of the Iron Age Judahite population that did not perish, flee or suffer exile at the hands of the conquering Babylonians at the beginning of the sixth century BCE. Mareshah, Lachish, Tel Halif, Tel Arad, and Tel Beersheba indicate a settlement hiatus during this period, with a modest renewal occurring in the late fifth century BCE and accelerating slightly into the fourth century BCE (2009: 225-26).

Stern compares his model to behavior at places such as Elephantine and Samaria as examples of acculturation going on in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E.. In his example of Samaria, he points to Naveh and Magen’s onomastic studies of Persian period Samaria, as well as Cross’s date of this corpus to the fourth century B.C.E. (2007: 233). These studies reveal a wide range of theophoric elements in names. In Elephantine (Yeb), Stern argues that the “Judahites” living on the island exhibit a great amount of activity with the other populations, based on the epigraphic evidence. The names, however, reveal that most people had \(yhw\) theophoric elements to their names (2007: 234). Thus, according to the high level of theophoric names, Stern concludes that there

---

\(^{520}\) In Stern’s discussion of ethnicity, he argues that Hodder’s use of tribe should be read as “ethnic group.” Fried makes a connection between certain concepts of the tribe and ethnicity, but only after demonstrating the multidimensional approach that must be considered when using such terms (1975). The connection between tribe and ethnicity is difficult in the ancient context, without a suite of evidence that would equate aspects of tribal identity to ethnic identity.
was a “high level of boundary maintenance by the Jewish population, indigenous population, or both.” In Judah, he argues, that in the fifth century B.C.E., the beginnings of ethnic boundaries may be emerging, which is seen in the stamp seal impressions, coins, and also official weights. \footnote{I. Stern, following E. Stern (2001: 332-39), argues that the return to the symbol of the shekel symbol on weights and measures, and the use of Paleo-Hebrew, shows signs of a desire to return to the “glory days” of Judah (2007: 229)} Thus, in Judah, the fifth century was a time in which there was not more cooperation among ethnic groups, but less. \footnote{This assertion appears to be based solely on the books of Ezra and Nehemiah and not from the archaeological data.} Thus, Stern employs a series of economic documents to argue for social and cultural cooperation among groups. These groups, however, are ethnically different, according to his model.

Ultimately, it is difficult to prove whether there was cooperation in the region of the Negev among tribal groups. If names can be traced to ethnicity, which these studies have yet to demonstrate, then one could assert that less cooperation occurred. Certain kinds of identity, such as kinship, may be marked by family names, so that it is possible to ascertain connections through their shared use. But like Stern’s model, this notion is simply conjectural. \footnote{These documents are economic in nature, so one could assume that there are economic ties that bind certain peoples together. An analysis of the economic connections between certain names would be useful for understanding if any clear connections between certain peoples emerge, based on the economic transactions.} This kind of evaluation it based on the belief that ethnicity is rooted in what Cameroff and Cameroff characterize as “human cultural differences and ascribed status group affiliations.” \footnote{John and Jean Camaroff (1992: 50) point out that there are many models conceptualizing ethnicity (of which they offer five). They characterize this particular model that Stern uses as a “long-standing contention” to explain ethnicity.} In the case of the Negev during the period of Persian domination, these cultural differences are then manifested or revealed through
names, according to many scholars’ beliefs. One may wonder, however, how the elite administrative population living in Judah would have self-identified. We do not have clear evidence pointing one way or the other regarding this matter. Characters like Zerubbabel and Sheshbazzar clearly have Babylonian sounding names, but are considered by the biblical writers to be Judahites.

While Eph’al and Naveh (1996), as well as Porten and Yardeni (2004) have hypothesized certain patterns of family, clan, and tribal connections in the ostraca, which are based on names and patronymics, these possible kinship ties do not necessarily translate to ethnic ties.\(^{525}\) It is not clear that ethnicity can be linked to naming children in the area of the Negev in the period of Persian dominance. It may be the case, but this connection has yet to be firmly established. Additionally, as Hesse and Wapnish show, ethnicity is a much more complicated matter, and many different models must be considered before making such a conclusion (1997).\(^{526}\) Killebrew observes, “defining

\(^{525}\) For a synopsis of the common approaches to employing the term “ethnicity” in biblical studies, see Knoppers (2007: 305-309; 2009: 147-48). He observes that there are two ways modern sociologists and ethnographers commonly examine identity: 1) Through “practical concerns” such as habits, shared customs, dress, food systems and 2) Through the definition of boundaries (mental and/or physical). For a discussion of “ethnicity” in historical and archaeological studies, see Killebrew (2005), who outlines the positive and negative aspects of this kind of study. Her case study of the LB II through Iron I periods shows that finding “ethnicity” in the historical and archaeological record are not hopeless pursuits. The key, of course, is that multiple perspectives may be required, with overlapping pieces of material culture, as well as understanding the relationship between the social, economic, and political processes at work within different groups.

\(^{526}\) Wapnish and Hesse have outlined three basic models of ethnicity, titled “primordial ethnicity,” “boundary and hierarchy ethnicity,” and “strategy and contingency.” All three should be considered in any discussion of material culture and ethnicity (1997: 238-70), but the most relevant for this discussion is “boundary and hierarchy ethnicity.” Thus, ethnicity is a result of social interaction and many different factors of these interactions (settlements, class, neighborhoods) must be considered.
ethnicity based on material culture in modern-day societies has often proven challenging for social scientists. Even greater obstacles are encountered when archaeologists attempt to discern ethnicity and ethnic boundaries based on the very incomplete material record of the past” (2005: 9). Thus, archaeological interpretation is related to the meaning behind the artifact. Without further consideration, ethnicity may not be established through this evidence alone.

Cooperation among certain groups is also difficult to demonstrate when one looks at the pottery from the period of the end of the Iron II and into the period of Persian domination. One example, which attempts to tie ethnicity to a corpus of pottery, is seen in the study of Edomite pottery.\(^5\) While the corpus of pottery called “Edomite” constitutes only a small percentage of the pottery found in the Negev during the end of the Iron II and into the beginning of Persian domination, it has become the marker for the Edomites. Petrographic analysis reveals that certain pottery forms that are characterized as Edomite are locally made (cf. Edomite vessels from Beersheba Stratum II).\(^6\) The Edomite cooking pots, however, are not made in the Negev, but appear to be imported from the Transjordan. Bienkowski and Van der Steen’s study raises serious doubts about the connection between the Edomite pottery and Edomite ethnicity in the late seventh and

---

\(^5\) “Edomite” pottery is seen in seventh to sixth century examples in the territory called Edom. Glueck (1935) was the first scholar to label certain pottery “Edomite.” This label is seen in M. Oakeshott’s ceramic typology (1978; 1983). This position remained popular for some time (cf. Bartlett, 1989). 

\(^6\) Singer-Avitz 1999: 11-12, 30-38. Beersheba stratum II is generally argued to have been destroyed in 701 B.C.E. by Sennacherib. Thus, “Edomite” pottery, which has traditionally been dated to the seventh and sixth centuries may extend back to the eighth century B.C.E.. See Bienkowski and Ven der Steen (2001: 23 fn. 4) for a discussion of the pottery chronology of the late Iron Age II period.
sixth centuries B.C.E. (2001: 21-47). More recently, Whiting (2007) has drawn attention to past models that equate Edomite pottery to an Edomite people. Following Barrett’s interpretation of material culture (1995), Whiting argues that material culture cannot be used to point to one single, objective meaning, but rather can carry a multitude of meanings, depending on the context from which it is drawn. And thus, her question emerges: “Is it, for example, possible to assume that everyone who saw Edomite pottery in the southern Levant understood it in the same way?” (2007: 99). Whiting’s study proves that the answer to this question is no. Thus, while pottery serves to show similarities and differences in material culture, in the case of the late Iron II and early Persian period, Edomite pottery, as well as Judean pottery, has not provided the answer to questions of ethnicity.

Another popular mode of examining the archaeology of the period in the search for social groups is the use of survey data. Unlike archaeological excavations of specific settlements, surveys oftentimes enable the archaeologist to explore larger areas. Studies by scholars such as Kochavi (1972), Dagan (1992), Ofer (1993), Finkelstein (1997), Zertal (1999; 2001), Lehmann (2001; 2003), Liscphits (2005, 2008), and Faust (2007), to name a few, have helped to illuminate settlement patterns throughout Israel. These surveys generally focus on examining settlements in certain regions, for the purpose of understanding settlement patterns, kinds of settlements, and demographic shifts that may be detected. Such studies are very popular in historical reconstructions of the southern

---

529 Thus, borrowing on Kramer’s classic study, “Pots and People” (1977). Bienkowski and van der Steen also examined ethnographic models from the area of the Transjordan in the 19th century, specifically looking at the movement of tribal groups and their connection to the Arabian trade routes.
Levant, but are also subject to interpretation.\textsuperscript{530} These studies, however, have been important for scholars attempting to understand population and settlement patterns during Iron Age II, Babylonian, Persian, and also the Hellenistic periods.

They are highly interpretive, however, as studies by Lipschits (2005), Finkelstein (2008; 2010), and Edelman (2005) have shown. In these studies, there is disagreement about how large the population of the areas in the Judean highlands, Shephelah, and Negev were in the Persian period. In relation to the settlements in Ezra and Nehemiah, as we shall see, surveys have been the primary archaeological data to argue for or against certain textual traditions of settlement.

\subsection*{5.2. The Historical Archaeology Approach}

A second model may be called the Historical Archaeology Approach. In this model, scholars use textual evidence as well as archaeological evidence to reconstruct the state of the Province of Judah during the period of Persian domination. In fact, there are few studies of the sixth through fourth centuries B.C.E. that rely solely on either material or textual evidence alone. Even those scholars of the minimalist school of thought still

\textsuperscript{530} Kloner and Stern (2007: 141) highlight a few of the difficulties of survey work: “It should be mentioned...that surveys are very limited sources of information because of three factors: (1) the easily mistaken identification of pottery; (2) the very low number of sherds collected in many sites; and (3) the possible biases of the persons collecting them.” In the end, however, they favor this approach since little is known about Idumea in the fourth century B.C.E. Other studies that reflect a difference in opinion are Lipschits (2005) and Faust (2009). For a full discussion of the kinds of goals archaeological surveys may answer as well as limitations, see Banning (2002).
Lund’s study of the coastline of Syria in the Persian period is typical. He states, “If the ancient literary sources had not been preserved, forcing us to rely on the archaeological material alone, few would probably have dared to suggest that the northern coastline of Syria had ever been controlled by the Persians” (1990: 32). While this study shows a bias towards textual evidence, there is little archaeological evidence that point to Persian domination of the northern Levantine coast. This is certainly the picture in the scholarly studies of the southern Levant as well. Within southern Levantine studies, the written sources are used to help illuminate certain pieces of material culture, such as seal impressions and pottery, in order to understand where administrative centers were, how they were used, and what goods moved around the southern Levant. And in fact, all of the scholars working to construct a Persian period Idumea from the material culture, use written sources to argue their position. Without these sources, it is impossible to create an Idumean identity.

Thus, each model must be considered with regard to its limitations. That is, what does the material culture actually indicate? If the stamp impressions do, indeed, reveal specific administrative centers during the Persian period, then this helps elucidate certain aspects of Persian administration. But this evidence may only be used to point to economic boundaries. Concentration of YSIs are important, but should not be equated to social boundaries. Thus, this evidence does not necessarily delimit Judahite, Benjaminite, and Levite settlement. The locations where YSIs have been found are not

---

531 Scholars such as Thompson (1987) and Davies (2007) cannot make their argument without both forms of evidence.
532 But it is not impossible to reconstruct people groups solely from the material culture. If it were, then prehistorians would have an impossible task, reconstructing connections between the material culture and the people who used it.
the only places where people, who may have thought of themselves as Judahite, Benjaminite, or Levite, could settle. The material culture does not point to this limitation. This assertion is also true for the Edomites/Idumeans. The most common model that is employed examines peoples in economic terms, but then equates their presence or absence in social and political terms. What also needs to be considered are forms of kinship organization, settlement types, and economic connections, as well as political networks. While later, Hellenistic and Roman, sources may refer to cities and even a region called Idumea, this cannot be retrojected into the past without multiple forms of specific evidence. But retrojection still may not answer the question of how people understood themselves or the other.

6. The Historical Archaeology Model and the Lists in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36

In an attempt to understand and “historicize” the settlement lists in MT and LXX Ezra and Nehemiah, most studies have relied heavily on settlement patterns—that is, where people may have settled in the Persian period. Recently several archaeological studies of sixth through fourth century settlements have been published. These studies of settlements seek to understand areas of settlement and population density changes from the Iron II through the Hellenistic period. Based on these studies, two fields of thought are available as the context for the lists such as MT Neh 11:25-36. The first

---

534 As previously mentioned in chapters 3 and 4, none of these studies take into consideration LXX Neh 11:25-36.
and most pervasive perspective in current scholarship is to view MT Neh 11:25-36 as an idealized portrait of Judah during the Persian period.\(^{535}\) This position arises from the belief that the Judahites and Benjaminites could not have settled places like Beersheba, in the Negev, and Lod and Ono, along the coast since they would have been out of the assumed jurisdiction of the province of Judah. Rather, these settlements must date to an earlier or later period than the Persian period. This notion of “idealized” generally translates in these studies into a list that has little historical reality, dating to the Persian period. Thus, the “historical reality” of the Persian period (i.e. where people identified as Judahites and Benjaminites would have settled), was in and around Jerusalem. In this interpretation, one may not use MT Neh 11:25-36 as a means for reconstructing the area of settlements for people who are identified in the text as Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites. Scholars generally argue that MT Neh 11:25-36 is a literary construction and a reflection of an earlier list one from the time of the late-Judean monarchy (seventh century), used to bolster the size of Persian Period Yehud during the Persian, Hellenistic, or even Maccabean period.\(^{536}\)

A second perspective argues that MT Neh 11:25-36 is an accurate list of settlements, but the purpose of this settlement list differs. Scholars such as Myers, Janzen, and Weinberg assert that it is an accurate list of Persian period settlement by the

\(^{535}\) This has become a popular thesis as of late, but is built on von Rad’s belief that the list took older, Josianic material to construct an ideal boarder of Judah (1930). See: Stern (1982: 245-9), Williamson (1985: 346-50); Blenkinsopp (1988: 231-39); Carter (1999: 80-83); Lipschits (2002 and 2005) and Edelman (2005).

\(^{536}\) Kellerman (1966: 209-27) argues that, since the southern boundary of Neh 11:25-36 is problematic in the Persian period, it best describes the southern boundary of Judah between the late-eighth century until the fall of the Kingdom of Judah in 586 B.C.E. G. von Rad argues for a Josianic date at the root of the list, based on the putative use of Joshua 15 (1930: 21-25) to construct MT Neh 11:25-30.
Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levies. For Janzen and Weinberg, settlement was possible because of the link between the Jerusalem temple and its citizenry. Myers also supports a connection between the list and actual Persian period settlements because, as he maintains, all of the area was under Persian control, which allowed for returning citizens to settle wherever they could. A third perspective maintains that this is not a list of Judean settlements in the Persian period, but rather from the Hellenistic period.

Most of these studies presuppose that MT Neh 11:25-36 is attempting to create a territory of Judah, whether political or theological, and the list is an accurate depiction at some point in the history of Judean settlements.

The question that must be answered before it is possible to explore any archaeological correlation is, what is the purpose of these lists? Since the earlier interpretations, most scholars believe that MT Neh 11:25-36 is a settlement list, that in essence, creates boundaries. While this list is clearly a settlement list, it does not have

__________________________

537 Myers (1965: 191) argues that the returnees were citizens of Persia, and thus could settle throughout Persian controlled land. Weinberg (1992: 34-38 and 49-61) also supports a Persian period context for this material, based on his “Citizen-Temple” model. Janzen (2002: 498-99), following Myers and Weinberg, posits that the list is made up of Yehudim who were not living in Jerusalem. He also takes Ezra 2:1//Neh 7:6 as an accurate picture of the activities of the returnees to Judah. Moreover, he avers that the exiles were returning to their old land, which belonged to their families in the late-monarchic period in Judah. Janzen also points to fourth century epigraphic evidence (i.e. the Aramaic Ostraca) that the settlements in some of the contested areas, particularly the Negev, would have been possible. He believes that the exiles could have returned to their ancestral homes, even if they were outside the Persian period province.

538 Böhler maintains that the MT reflects a Maccabean reality because the list encompasses the scope of Judah during that period of time. He also argues for a second century B.C.E. MT redaction of Nehemiah 11, because the settlement list could not have been possible before the Maccabean period. He sees a “Nehemiah renaissance” under the Hasmoneans, when an editor reworked both Ezra and Nehemiah for the purpose of the Maccabees (2003: 48). Other scholars, such as Rudolph (1949: 189-91), Mowinckel (1964: 151), and Gunneweg (1987: 148-50) also argue for a post-Nehemiah period context for Nehemiah 11.
certain geographical considerations to make it a traditional boundary list, like Joshua 15 and 18. Moreover, Joshua 13-19 lays out the different territories for the tribal inheritance. Joshua 15 records the Judahite settlements and Joshua 18 records the Benjaminites settlements connected to the (re)distribution of the land under the leadership of Joshua. In these chapters (Joshua 15 and 18) the boundaries (geographical features) and cities of settlement for these tribes are laid out in detail. Both Alt (1953: 193 ff) and Aharoni (1979: 248) assert that two sources were used to create Joshua 13-19: boundary delineations and town lists. In contrast, MT Neh 11:25-36 deals with towns of settlement, not the geographical features that may mark out bounded areas. In MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, there are certain towns and, in certain cases, outlying settlements where specific groups settled. Within these locations, some of the Judahites, Benjaminites, and even Levites settled. As we observed in chapter four, the pattern of settlement is probably best explained by the author examining Joshua 15 and 18, and other similar lists, and employing an established pattern of listing settlements (that is, beginning with Kiriath-Arba and moving south, then north). Yet unlike Joshua 15, both MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36 are not asserting a claim to complete control of a bounded territory. If these lists are attempting to make a claim to a boundary, they do not complete the circuit. Rather, the MT and LXX focus on the periphery, and not the interior. In the example of the MT, the list begins in Kiriath-Arba and ends in the west, while the LXX begins with Kiriath-Arba and ends north of Jerusalem. They do not complete a circuit in the way that Joshua 15 does, but both lists do indicate specific settlements of Judahites and Benjaminites. Instead of a boundary, these towns are clearly

539 See chapter 4 for a discussion of these sources.
delineating frontiers that are connected to the larger community of the Judahites and Benjaminites. In the example of LXX Neh 11:25-36, the list appears to be a selection of towns, each of which represents a different region, tied together by what the author views as settlements of certain tribal groups in specific towns. According to the larger narrative of Nehemiah 11 (both MT and LXX), it appears that the authors believe these to be new settlements, connected directly with the activities of the returnees (contra Kallai 1986; Aharoni 1979).  

When one takes into consideration the material culture in relation to MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, there are several issues that immediately present themselves. Within both the MT and LXX material, the list does not include key settlements within the heartland of, what many scholars would argue, is Judah during the Persian period. Certain key sites, including Jericho or Mizpah, do not appear in Nehemiah 11. Yet, these sites provide clear evidence of Persian period occupation and administration, according to the yhwd seal impressions.

One final area of inquiry that must be considered in relation to MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, are the data from specific excavations of sites and surveys of regions that are connected to the lists. As I have indicated in chapters three and four, many of the sites cannot be identified with any certainty. In Finkelstein’s study of Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, he examines the site reports as well as survey data connected to sites identified as equating to places in these parallel lists (2008). For the purposes of this study, I attempt to

---

540 Both scholars assert that the MT settlements are made up of villages whose inhabitants were not exiled, and thus, lists the population of Judahites and Benjaminites who remained in the land.

541 This is most pronounced in the LXX material because of the brevity of the list.
ascertain whether settlement was even plausible during the period of Persian domination. It is impossible to know whether these settlements consisted of Judahites, Benjaminites, or any other tribal group, but only that there are signs of occupation during certain periods. Following Finkelstein’s classification system, I have listed the time period and the settlement name, and then classified whether there is strong evidence of “datable” material to a certain chronological period, medium evidence, or weak evidence. If the site is unknown, I have listed it as “U” (for unknown), if the evidence is difficult to interpret, I have listed it as unclear; and finally, if there is a datable destruction level, the century is listed with “dest”:

Table 6-1: Archaeological Evidence of Settlements from LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX Neh 11:25-36</th>
<th>Iron II</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Hellenistic</th>
<th>Modern Name and Map Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiriath-(Ha)Arba</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>el-Khalil (M.R. 160103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeshua</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Tel es-Saweh? (M.R. 149076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beersheba</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Late 5th c. on</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Tel es-Seeba‘ (M.R. 134072)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachish</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Tel ed-Duweir (M.R. 135108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geba</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Tel Jeba (M.R. 171192)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

542 These “signs” are generally based on the pottery analysis and other pieces of material culture, such as coins, seals, and any epigraphical materials that are datable.
543 Finkelstein’s exact standards for listing the strength of occupation at any site are not clearly stated. In looking at his data, it appears that he bases this on sherd abundance and the percentage represented in larger collection. I have adopted this methodology in order to synthesize my data with Finkelstein’s.
544 Aharoni (1979: 379) argued that Tel es-Sawehe should be identified with Jeshua, located approximately 19 km E and slightly north of Beer-sheba. If this identification is correct, then there is strong evidence for an Iron II occupation, but there is little evidence of a postexilic occupation.
546 Geba is associated with Jeba, a village located to the northeast of Jerusalem. In the Feldstein et al. (1993: Eng 35, Heb 177-79) survey of the tel, out of 284 sherds collected, 23% were Iron II, 22% Hellenistic, and 10% Roman. The other identifiable sherds dated
According to the data collected, each site which appears in LXX Neh 11:25-36 and can be clearly identified, shows signs of occupation in all three of these periods (Table 6-1). Interestingly, the strongest evidence is for Iron II occupation, at least based on the percentage of pottery collected and identified. But there is also clear occupation in the Persian and Hellenistic periods. According to Finkelstein’s interpretation of the survey data of many of the sites mentioned in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, the only criteria for the strength of occupation solely rests in the relative abundance of pottery.  

The evidence from excavations at Lachish and Beersheba, indicates that at both sites, there were Persian period settlements. In the case of Beersheba, these date from the fourth century on. Moreover, these two towns represent some of the more contested sites within the LXX Neh11:25-36 list since they are in areas that are considered borderlands for the settlements of Judahites and Benjaminites and outside of the political area of to the Iron I, Byzantine, Early Islamic, Medieval, and Ottoman periods. According to Kallai’s earlier study (1972: 183), he identified some sherds from the Persian period. In Finkelstein’s study (2008: 12), he follows Fieldstein et al. survey data, arguing that it was either deserted or sparsely inhabited during the Persian period.

Identified with Mukhmâs, a village northeast of Jerusalem. The ancient site, Khirbet el-Hara el-Faqua is on the northern side of the village (Finkelstein 2008:12-13). In Fieldstein et al. (1993: Eng 37: Heb 185-86) survey of the site, they collected 643 sherds, dating 14% to the Iron II, 10% to Persian period, and 19% to the Hellenistic period. Other periods represented include Iron I, Roman, Byzantine, Medieval, and Ottoman. Finkelstein believes this is sufficient evidence to point to habitation during all three periods in question (2008: 13).

But this system is problematic because if one bases the strength of occupation solely on the percentage of pottery, then this fails to account for continuation of pottery styles and forms, population fluctuation, changes in systems of habitation (i.e. settlement size, pastoralist communities vs. settled communities), as well as environmental factors. See Banning (2002) for a full discussion of post-depositional factors that may affect survey data.
Yehud itself. It is clear that the evidence points to the sites that represent the southern and western regions of the settlements by the Judahite population (Neh 11:25-30), and could have been settled by the late-fifth century B.C.E.. This evidence, however, cannot account for who settled -- only that people did settle in these locations.

Turning to the MT list, there are many different settlements listed (Table 6-2).

The data, however, are much less conclusive with regard to certain periods of occupation:

Table 6-2: Archaeological Evidence of Settlements from MT Neh 11:25-36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Neh 11:25-36</th>
<th>Iron II</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Hellenistic</th>
<th>Modern Name and Map Reference(M.R.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiriath-(Ha)Arba</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>el-Khalil (M.R. 160103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jekabzeel (Kabzeel)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibon</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Tel Rabûd? (M.R. 151093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeshua</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Tel es-Saweh? (M.R. 149076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moladah</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>K. el-Waten? (M.R. 142074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-pelet</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazar-shual</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>K. el-Watan? (M.R. 137071)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

549 At Hebron (el-Khalil/Tell Rumeida), evidence shows that the site was destroyed at the end of the Iron Age and it was abandoned some time in the sixth century B.C.E.. There is no clear Persian period material culture. While occupation moved to the foot of the tell, in the valley in the Hellenistic period, no clear evidence has been revealed that points to this occurring in the Persian period (Ofer 1993b: 606-609; Lipschits 2005: 250).

550 This is most commonly argued to refer to Debir, associated with Tel Rabud (cf. NEAEHL 4.1440). The wall was destroyed during Sennacherib’s campaign, but was rebuilt. Also the inner tower was also built. It appears that the occupation was not as dense as the previous level, but occupation did spill over onto the western slope of the hill, which is an area of 5-7 dunams. See also Lipschits (2005).

551 Aharoni (1979: 379) argued that Tel es-Saweh should be associated with Jeshua, located approximately 19 km east and slightly north of Beer-sheba. If this identification is correct, then there is strong evidence for an Iron II occupation, but there is little evidence of a postexilic occupation.

552 The location of Moladah is uncertain, but many (including Aharoni 1979: 410) associate it with Khirbet el-Waten, located 12 km east of Beersheba. Boling and Wright (1982: 382) make this connection because Moladah is related to yld, meaning “to give birth”, and Khirbet el-Waten also deals with childbearing (or kinship).

553 The site is unknown. Petrie (1930: 15) identified it with Tell el-Fara (M.R. 100076), 18 miles south of Gaza, which is now identified with Sharuhen.

554 The name means, “enclosure of the fox” which does not help us find it. Based on its location in the settlement lists (in Joshua and Nehemiah), many argue that Hazar-shual is
near Beersheba. It has been suggested that Khirbet el-Watan, 4 km east of Beersheba (M.R. 137071), is the location of Hazar-shual.  
555 Identified as Tell esh-Shari‘a, also known as Tel Sera’. It is located between Beer-sheba and Gaza in the northwest Negev. Evidence for the fifth to fourth c. B.C.E. are attested, consisting of two “superimposed houses of the courtyard type. In area A a well-preserved brick-lined grain silo, some 5 m across, came to light. Identical structures were recorded at neighboring Tell Jemmeh.” Oren mentions several Greek vessels, terra-cottas, a number of Aramaic ostraca as evidence for fifth and fourth century occupation (Oren 1992: 6: 1093).

556 This site is unknown. Simons (1959: 145) identified it as located to the northeast of Beersheba, but there is no clear evidence for this.

557 Oftentimes identified with Khirbet Umm er-Rammamin, located 16 km northeast of Beersheba. Excavations have only uncovered Iron Age remains. Thus, Borowski (1988) has argued that Rimmon may have moved from er-Rammamin to Tel Halif, located 1 km north, which has a substantial amount of Iron I-II and Persian period remains.

558 Located in the Sorek valley, and identified with Sar‘a (Tel Zor’a) approximately 3 km north of Beth-shemesh. See Aharoni (1979: 443).


560 Khirbet Zanu‘ is the most popular candidate for Zanoah (Albright 1925:10-11; Aharoni 1979: 443).

561 Lipschits 2005: 222.

562 Lipschits (2005: 219-220) states “Bliss and Macalister assigned long periods of the strata they excavated, and the dates suggested by Albright for these strata were based primarily on historical considerations. There are only scanty remains from the Persian period, but conspicuous among these is a rare Athenian coin dated to 526-430 B.C.E. (Bliss 1900a: 7-16; Bliss and Maccalister 1902: 26 pl. 56:44). Thus, it appears that settlement activity was renewed at Azekah at the end of the sixth century or beginning of the fifth century B.C.E.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>7th c. dest.</th>
<th>2nd c. on</th>
<th>Tel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ziklag</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Sera (M.R. 119088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meconah</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-Rimmon</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Tel Halif (M.R. 137087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorah</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Zor’a (M.R. 148131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarmuth</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Khirbet el-Yarmûk (M.R. 147124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanoah</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Khirbet Zanu‘? (M.R. 150125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adullam</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>esh-Sheikh Madkhûr (M.R. 150117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachish</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Tel ed-Duweir (M.R. 135108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azekah</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Khirbet Tel Zakariyeh (M.R. 144123)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anathoth\textsuperscript{563} & U & U & U & ? \\
Geba & Strong & Unclear & Strong & Tel Jeba (M.R. 171192) \\
Michmash & Strong & Medium & Strong & Mukhmâs (M.R. 176142) \\
Aija\textsuperscript{564} & U & U & U & ? \\
Bethe\textsuperscript{565} & Strong & Weak & Strong & Beitîn (M.R. 172148) \\
Nob\textsuperscript{566} & U & U & U & ? \\
Ananiah\textsuperscript{567} & Strong & Strong & Strong & El-‘Azariyeh? (M.R. 174131) \\
Hazor\textsuperscript{568} & U & U & U & ? \\

---

\textsuperscript{563} Anathoth has been identified with Ras el-Kharuben, which reveals Iron II and Hellenistic material, but according to Dinur and Feig (1993: Heb 358, Eng 60*), no Persian period finds have been uncovered (contra earlier studies). Another site that has been identified with Anathoth is Khirbet Deir es-Sidd, which has a strong Iron II presence, but the evidence for the Persian period are found in the tombs (Dinur and Feig 1993: Heb 379, Eng 65*). Finkelstein (2008: 11) argues that neither of these identifications is satisfactory, and the most likely candidate is the modern village of Anata, which is built on an ancient site. In Dinur and Feig’s survey (1993: Heb 359-60, Eng. 60*), out of the 242 sherds collected, 35% were Iron II, and 10% were Hellenistic, with no evidence of Persian period occupation. Other periods represented include Roman, Byzantine, and Medieval.

\textsuperscript{564} The site is unknown. Finkelstein (2008: 13) argues it may be associated with Deir Dibwan, but there is no conclusive evidence to point to this association.

\textsuperscript{565} This is most commonly associated with the ruins underneath the modern village of Beitin. There is clear Iron II evidence (Kelso 1968: 36-37), as well as 6th century activity (Kelso 1968: 37; Stern 1982: 31; and Finkelstein 2008: 9). The only piece of Persian period evidence for the site is a sherd of a fifth century Greek lekythos (Kelso 1968: 80), which Finkelstein and Singer-Avitz (2009:42; see also Finkelstein 2008: 9) argue is supported with very little evidence. They also suggest that the 6th century seal, which was bought from a villager of Beitin, may have originated from a different site. The Hellenistic period, however, is well represented (Kelso 1968: 36 and 40).

\textsuperscript{566} The location is unclear, although it is in close proximity to Jerusalem, according to Isaiah 10:32.

\textsuperscript{567} If identified with Bethany. Albright (1923: 9) first identified Bethany with Ananiah. His argument is based on parallel biblical examples in which Beth ‘Ananiah (the founder Annaniah) and ‘Annaiah were “interchangeable and the slight difference between Beth ‘Ananiah and Beth ‘Aniah is due to syllabic haplology” McGarry (1992: 224).

\textsuperscript{568} Unknown Location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramah</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Er-Râmeh (M.R. 187259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gittaim</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Ras Abû Humeid (M.R. 140145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadid</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>El-Hadîtheh (M.R. 145152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeboim</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neballat</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Beit Nabala (M.R. 146154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lod</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Al-Ludd (M.R. 140151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ono</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Kafr Juna (M.R. 138159)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What can this analysis tell us? Since many of the names in the lists have yet to be identified with certainty, it is difficult to make any overarching conclusions. In fact, when one examines the reasons for scholars to connect a specific tel to a settlement name, many of the sites have been identified simply based on where they appear in the lists in Joshua 15, 18 and MT Nehemiah 11:25-36. In addition, in most cases, the Joshua material is more important for the identification process because scholars were clearly

569 Identified with the modern village of er-Ram. Fieldstein et al (1993: Heb 168-69, Eng 33*) collected 359 sherds. Of these sherds, 20% were Iron I, 2% Persian period, and 13% Hellenistic. Other periods represented are Iron I, Roman, Byzantine, Early Islamic, Medieval, and Ottoman. See also Finkelstein (2008: 12).

570 “The meaning of Gittaim is ‘Double Gath” or “Double Winepress.” But this Gath is not the same as Gath of the Philistines. It is oftentimes associated with Râs Abû Humeid (M.R. 140145).

571 Associated with el-Hadîtheh. Finkelstein (2008: 9-10) reports that salvage excavations have found remains dating to the Iron II, Persian, and Hellenistic periods. Also, Na’aman and Zadok (2000) report of two Neo-Assyrian cuneiform tablets that were found at el-Hadîtheh, dating to the seventh century B.C.E.)

572 Since it is listed along with Lod and Ono, it is oftentimes associated with Khirbet Sabîyeh, north of Lod.

573 Associated with Beit Nabala (M.R. 146154), 4 miles northeast of Lod. Both Iron II and Persian period remains have been found.

574 Lod is associated with the modern development of the same name. Rosenberger and Shavit (1993: 54*-56*) have found Iron II, Persian, and Hellenistic finds in their survey of the site.

575 Gophna, Taxel, and Feldstein (2005) have convincingly argued that Ono should be associated with Kafr Juna, rather than Kafr ‘Ana, based on the periods each site was occupied. Juna was occupied from the Chalcolithic through the Byzantine periods, but ‘Ana was not occupied from the Iron I through Roman periods.
looking for sites with Iron Age material. Hence, like much of the study of the Bible, the text has driven archaeological interpretation, and not vice-versa.

Yet there are a few key patterns that develop. First, the number of settlements that are in the northern Negev reveals the importance of clearly delineating towns of settlement in this area. The same is true for the Lod-Ono area. But the evidence is difficult to assess since many of the sites in these contested areas cannot be identified with certainty. From the sites that may be identified with some certainty, there are more settlements dating to the Hellenistic period than to the Persian period.

When comparing the settlements in MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36, even though the LXX is shorter, the area covered is still considered contested since Beersheba is included in the list. As previously mentioned, it is impossible to assess whether Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites settled in these areas--only that occupation occurred. The archaeological evidence points to possible settlement, in the example of the LXX text, by the late Persian period. As I asserted in chapters three and four, the LXX is a select settlement list and not an exhaustive list of settlements dating to the late Persian period. Archaeological surveys have revealed dozens of small settlements throughout each region mentioned in the list. In contrast, the MT is a much more complete list of settlements, with more towns, villages, and dependencies recorded in each region, as well as the addition of the Lod-Ono area. Thus, MT Neh 11:25-36 appears to document a later development to the list, with additions of certain towns meant to create a much more detailed list of settlement. As the archaeological survey data indicates, the number of

settlements and intensity of occupation develop through the Persian period and into the Hellenistic period. And hence, MT Neh 11:25-36 shows growth in occupation of certain areas.

7. Archaeology and Text: An Integrated Approach

This study of the material culture and historical record reveals that the dialogue between text and artifact cannot and should not be overstated. When texts are used to reconstruct settlement patterns, it is first necessary to understand what the texts claim. As I have demonstrated in chapters 3 and 4, these two lists represent two snapshots in time, according to the literary record. Both represent settlement lists, and not boundary lists. The MT and LXX focus on settlements of specific peoples from the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi. The LXX highlights one town within each region of settlement. When additions are made to the MT, they do not fundamentally change the focus of the list, only the number of settlements and scope of settlement. It is clear, however, that the MT editor felt a need to claim these towns, set within the context of the Persian period. Through the act of settlement a link was created to the towns, connected fields, villages, and farmsteads where the Judahites and Benjaminites settled.

Moreover, one may assert that the list grew because the editor witnessed behavior that allowed him/her to make these changes. Since we cannot track a Judahite or Benjaminite in the material culture during the period of Persian domination, it is difficult

---

577 Halpern’s study is applicable here. In his article, “Text and Artifact: Two Monologues?” he begins by responding to his title, quipping “the short answer to the title of this paper is yes” (1997: 311). But as his study shows, the two fields may reconcile themselves when examined properly.
to see this growth occurring. Like Monty Python’s sketch, in which the claims of cultural identity are totally confusing to the woman, the material culture leaves us wondering about many questions concerning identity, namely who are the Judahites and who are the Benjaminites? To further complicate matters, drawing upon Whiting’s (2007) observation of Edomite pottery, it is not entirely clear what people envisioned when the text articulates Judahite, Benjaminites, or Levite. To complicate matters even more, as identity studies have shown, people may maintain multiple points of identity, depending on the circumstance.

While it is nearly impossible to track specific people in the archaeological record, we can track certain kinds of behaviors, which may be categorized. These behaviors can be classified as economic, political, social, and religious, to name a few, and are linked through different networks of connections. It is no coincidence that the Judahites are said to have returned to the pre-exilic region of Judah, as well as the Benjaminites to Benjamin. In the LXX, the settlement focuses on a brief sketch of the regions to which settlers returned. But in the MT the areas of settlement that are stressed (that is the Negev, the Highlands, and the Northern Shephelah) also reveal an attempt to show depth in the settlement of these specific areas. One may thus conclude that there was a need to lay claim to these specific settlements, possibly caused by competing claims, which explains why most of the towns are found along the periphery and not within the interior. The archaeological survey and excavation data, while difficult to interpret, reveal that during the postexilic period, the most logical period is in the Hellenistic period. The text-critical evidence also points to this. The LXX list probably has earlier roots—indeed, it probably dates to the transition from Achaemenid control to the Hellenistic period. The
MT settlements are best contextualized at a later date and within a context in which the political, economic, and cultic spheres could all make claims to this area. The additions to the text were done in an attempt to assert dominance over certain areas, where competing voices made proof of a history of settlement necessary.
Figure 6-1: LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36 Settlements
Figure 6-2: MT Nehemiah 11:25-36 Settlements
Chapter 7

Conclusion: The Compositional Phases of Nehemiah 11-12

As I have highlighted in this dissertation, Nehemiah 11-12 provides a unique study in textual criticism since it is the largest series of divergent lists in the MT and LXX texts of the Hebrew Bible. These text critical differences allow for a window into the construction of the lists as well as a window into the process of updating lists. When these divergences are taken into consideration, clear patterns emerge that reveal the impetus behind specific additions. In this chapter I offer three lines of concluding thoughts regarding: 1) the composition of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12, 2) the composition of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12 within the larger work of Nehemiah, and 3) the historical contexts for the development of these different versions.

1. The Composition of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12

The texts of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12 outline the community involved in repopulating Jerusalem, the areas surrounding Jerusalem, as well as dedication of the wall surrounding Jerusalem. I offer two major phases for the composition of the material preserved in the MT and LXX. It is important to note that much of the material clearly emerged from earlier lists. The first phase consists of the settlement of Jerusalem and a limited settlement of the countryside, priestly lists, genealogies, and an account of the
The First Compositional Horizon of the Lists Preserved in Nehemiah 11-12

- **Phase 1: Settlement of Jerusalem (LXX Neh 11:4b-19, 22-24):** The lists of the Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, Levites, gatekeepers, and the advisor to the king who lived in Jerusalem were constructed in order to delineate who settled in Jerusalem from the population of returnees (presumably during the time of Nehemiah). These lists focus on the genealogies, position, and/or people, who were part of this settlement. Many of these lists were constructed from older records (genealogies and census records). The structure of this material was written in a chiastic structure, beginning with the Judahites and ending with Petatiah, a Judahite.

  - **Sub-phase 1.1: Introduction to the Settlement Lists (LXX Neh 11:1-3a):** As a means of uniting the list of settlers to Jerusalem, to the larger process of settlement in Nehemiah, an introduction of the events that led to this settlement was added (1-3a). It was meant to clarify that not everyone settled in Jerusalem, but only a select few. Its goal was to make a clear connection between this settlement and Nehemiah’s efforts to resettle the city (as seen in Neh 7:1-3). The material followed the list of returnees during the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua (7:6-72a).

- **Phase 2: Town Settlements, Returnees, and Genealogies (LXX Neh 11:25-12:11):** A different author constructed the lists of town settlements (LXX Neh 11:25-36). This material was added to the list of priestly and Levitical returnees (LXX Neh 12:1-9) as well as Jaddua’s genealogy (LXX Neh 12:10-11). It seems likely that Jaddua's genealogy was added last because the compositional styles are so different (indicating a different source for this material). The lack of an introduction to the genealogy is probably attributed to the fact that, when it was placed into its context (represented in LXX Neh 11:25-12:9), the introduction was not needed because the editor may have felt that Neh 12:1a provided a sufficient introduction to the material. Or, it may be that the author, compiling the different lists, felt that the genealogy did not need an introduction since it was clearly of the family of Jeshua. The lists and genealogies were constructed from archival materials at the author’s disposal.

  - **Sub-Phase 2.1: Compilation of the Settlement List as well as the**
Priestly and Levitical Lists (LXX Neh 11:25-12:26): The author/editor combined the settlement lists and priestly lists (LXX 11:25-12:11) with the priests during the time of Joiakim as well as the Levitical list, and more information about the next generation of priests (time of Joiakim) as well as Jaddua's genealogy (LXX Neh 12:12-26). The priestly lists, dating to the time of Joiakim, were constructed from material found in 12:1b-7. In the case of Malluch's offspring (Jonathan) as well as in the case of Shebaniah and his offspring Joseph, these three names were lost in the Vorlage of the LXX, but retained in the material found in the MT.

- **Sub-phase 2.2 Introduction to Settlements Outside Jerusalem (LXX Neh 11:3b-4a):** As a way of making it clear that not everyone settled in Jerusalem, the inclusio of who settled outside the city, indicating that the same people who settled in Jerusalem also settled outside of Jerusalem. In this original list, the Netînîm were not present.

- **Phase 3: Dedication of the Wall (LXX Neh 12:27-44):** The dedication of the wall (LXX 12:27-44) was written independently of the series of lists (LXX Neh 11:1-12:26), as a redaction to the already constructed NM.

  - **Sub-phase 3.1: The Dedication Ceremony with the Other Lists (LXX Neh 12:27-47):** At a later date, the author of the dedication narrative (LXX 12:27-47), using earlier NM material, focused on the procession of the community and certain elites who were part of the purification of all of Jerusalem.

  - **Sub-phase 3.2: The Compilation of the Lists, Genealogies, and Dedication Ceremony (LXX Neh 11:1-12:47):** An editor of the material, corresponding to LXX Neh 12:27-47 placed together the lists and genealogies with the events of the dedication ceremony.

As my reconstruction shows, the material preserved in the LXX provides a guideline for the composition of this material. In the form present in the LXX, each list clearly lays out who was part of each activity and what their role was. These settlers to Jerusalem, as well as the earlier returnees mentioned in LXX Neh 12:1-22, all share in the dedication
ceremony of Jerusalem (LXX Neh 12:27-47) through their connection to the rebuilding of the community. In this first series of phases, more material focuses on the cultic community, but the lay population still remains central to these activities. Thus, the concern with all of Israel is central to the theme of these lists. The author, who compiled Phase 1, is different from the author of the material in Phase 2. The author of Phase 2 did not compose the original material in Phase 3, but may be responsible for the compilation of this material.

In the second stage of composition, details are added to each list, particularly the settlement of Jerusalem by the priests, Levites, and Netînîm, the settlement of the surrounding countryside, the priestly lists, and also the dedication of the wall:

The Second Compositional Horizon of the Lists Preserved in Nehemiah 11-12

- **Phase 1: Additions to the Lists of Settlers (MT Neh 11:4b-24):** The material preserved in the MT used the material preserved in the LXX as its starting point, and added details concerning the cultic community. Specifically, certain names, genealogies, positions, and totals were added to the settlers in Jerusalem (11:4b-19, 22-24). This is particularly evident in the material corresponding to vv. 12, 13-18, 19, and 22-24.

  - **Sub-phase 1 Additions of Cultic Institutions:** (MT Neh 11:20-21): The addition of the Netînîm was included into the list of settlers, as found in 11:3b and also the place of the Netînim found in 11:21. The change to the introductory list, found in 11:3b, may have been to correct the list found in Neh 7:72. Interestingly, there are no additions of the Sons of Solomon's servants to the lists of settlers.

- **Phase 2: Additions to the Judahite Settlement List (MT Neh 11:25-30):** Material was added to the Judahite list (vv. 25-30), based on established (earlier) list-making patterns seen in Joshua 15 (or a similar, extant, list of Judahite settlements). This was done in order to bolster the size of Persian
period Judah, and to possibly reflect actual settlement, retrojected into an 
a earlier period. This list may have also served as a counter-balance to the 
material found in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, which is primarily focused on the 
Benjaminites, almost completely ignoring the area of Judah.

- **Phase 3: Additions to the Benjaminite Settlement List (MT Neh 11:31-35):** 
  Material was added to the Benjaminite list (vv. 31-35). This, too, was 
  probably a response to the settlement list in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7. Although it 
  does not have the depth of the settlement list in Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, the size 
  of the settlement list (MT Neh 11:31-36), the territory it covers is dramatically 
  larger than any other settlement list in Ezra or Nehemiah.

- **Phase 4: Additions to the Dedication of the Wall (MT Neh 12:27-47):** 
  Additions to the dedication ceremony (MT Neh 12:27-47) are presented next. 
  Dividing the population into two groups occurred after the insertion of 
  Nehemiah 8-10 into the narrative. In Nehemiah 8, when Ezra reads the law, 
  there are two groups behind him (one on the right, and one on the left). Also, 
  the insertion of the Temple into the narrative is necessary in order to tie these 
  events to the Temple. Nehemiah's position is made clearer in the narrative 
  (found in vv. 26, 38, and 47).

Additionally, I offer some general conclusions that may be drawn from the comparison 
between the MT and LXX: First, additions to the earlier LXX text are primarily 
concerned with supplementing the priestly and Levitical material. These additions may 
all be by the same author. In contrast to the dramatically divergent lists and genealogies 
of the priests and Levites in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:10-12:26, the Benjaminites and 
the Judahites are relatively unchanged between texts. The only area that has a 
dramatic divergence with regard to the Judahites and Benjaminites is the settlement list in 
MT and LXX Neh 11:25-36. In fact, in comparison to 1 Chr 9:2-9, which has several 
note-worthy divergences in the population of the Judahites and Benjaminites when

---

578 This is with the exception of "son of," which is not found between Meshullam and 
Joed (LXX Neh 11:7).
compared to MT and LXX Neh 11:4-19, the MT and LXX in vv. 4-9 are almost identical. The most dramatic divergences between the material preserved in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12 mostly concern temple institutions, specifically certain people and positions. Although MT and LXX Neh 11:1-12:47 focus on the cultic community, the cultic community in the MT is much larger than the LXX community. In the third tradition preserved in 1 Chr 9:10-18, there are also many different divergences from what are found in MT and LXX Neh 11:10-14. These changes to the cultic population continue through the rest of chapter 11 and into chapter 12, with the addition of one new group (the Netînîm) not present in the LXX. Genealogies, lists, positions, and the narratives surrounding the dedication are all inserted, as reflected in the MT. Since the themes of the additions are unified in their concern for temple institutions and temple positions, it is clear that authorship may point to the cultic community. Both the priests and the Levites benefit from the additions to the text preserved in the MT. Certain priestly families gain more prominence, particularly with the addition of so many more people connected to the return under Zerubbabel and Jeshua.

One has to question why there are so many differences between the MT and LXX in Nehemiah 11-12, but very few differences in the lists in MT and LXX Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7, or 10. In other words, why are these dramatically divergent traditions preserved here but not in other important lists in Ezra or Nehemiah? Why are additions necessary to the lists in Nehemiah 11-12, but not as evident in other

---

579 As previously mentioned, there are some preserved variants at the end of the list in MT and LXX Nehemiah 3, but not to the extent of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12. See Wooden (2006) for a discussion of these differences.
These additions appear to be a case of an accident in transmission, that is, LXX Neh 11-12 was not revised toward the developing MT. The other examples were mostly set, with few large-scale divergent traditions affecting the later Old Greek translations.

Also, with the exception of the settlement list in Neh 11:25-36, the lists are concerned with the people living in Jerusalem. Since Jerusalem was, presumably, the main center of Judean cultic practice during the late Persian period, it is likely that cultic representation on this list may have had importance at a later date. In other words, if one could prove representation from a genealogy or list in Nehemiah 11 or 12, then there was precedence at a later date for cultic or civic duties. The narrative concerning the procession around Jerusalem is also expanded, but mainly regarding details of the procession (many of which are explanatory glosses) and the people involved in the procession. In the example of both the lists and the procession, the additional names bolster the size of the community, and also the added geographical features (specifically the gates) seem to add to the size of Jerusalem. The additions are also in place names (preserved in MT Neh 11:25-36), which creates a much larger image of settlement, particularly in the areas in the southern Judean hills and the Negev. As I have argued in chapter six, this is a select register, not meant to exhaust every place of settlement surrounding Jerusalem. But in contrast to Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 which primarily focuses on the area of Benjamin, the list preserved in MT Neh 11:25-36 covers a wide area,

---

580 This is not presuming that other lists did not undergo periods of revision. This is clearly not the case, as the small-scale differences between Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7 show. 581 Gates are an expensive endeavor to construct and maintain. Thus, if Jerusalem had as many gates as the material preserved in the MT indicates, it would have had to staff these gates.
particularly in the area of Judah.

My proposed reconstruction of the composition of the material found in MT and LXX Neh 11-12 allows for a process of editing and reediting material that may seem at odds with itself. Moreover, there are places in which more overlap with earlier lists, such as the list of covenant signers in Nehemiah 10, would seem to make sense. Yet only some overlap is found in any of the lists. In fact, since both LXX and MT Nehemiah 11-12 are the final set of lists in each respective text, it would appear that these lists are not only the final images of the holy community, but they are also responses to earlier lists within the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Specifically, in both the MT and LXX, Nehemiah 11-12 is the final vision of the entire community. And thus, the city is built around all of the people of Yehud (Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, Levites) who, during the time of Nehemiah, resettled it, as well as the countryside. Although Nehemiah 13 departs from the lists to the failure of the community to keep holy, the most optimistic visions of the community are found in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12.

The additions to the text, preserved in MT Nehemiah 11-12, reflect larger trends in textual criticism. Two examples provide parallel examples to the divergences between MT and the LXX Nehemiah: 1 Samuel and Jeremiah. As I mentioned in my introduction, MT and LXX 1 Samuel preserve divergences in a few key places, specifically chapters 1-2 and 17-18. There are other witnesses to the material, such as 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}, 4QSam\textsuperscript{b}, 4QSam\textsuperscript{c}, and Josephus. In 1 Samuel 1-2 (the story of Hannah), Ulrich argues that the MT preserves the older edition, narrating what he refers to as “one portrait of Hannah.” In contrast to this, the LXX, constitutes a reworked edition in which Hannah is depicted differently, probably for theological reasons (1999: 66). In 1 Samuel 17-18 (the David
and Goliath story), Ulrich (1999: 67-68) and Tov (2001: 334-36) both assert that the LXX preserves the older version, with one general narrative strand, whereas the MT preserves a reworked edition, with new details. This is similar to the characteristics of Nehemiah, in which there are later reworkings of the text found in the LXX, when compared to the material preserved in the MT, as Wooden argues is the case with Neh 3:33-4:17 when compared to 2 Esdras 14-15:23. In MT and LXX Neh 3:33-4:17, the material in the LXX is a later explication of the text preserved in the MT. In contrast, MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12 closely resemble 1 Samuel 17-18. Thus, the LXX preserves the older version, and the MT preserves the reworked version.

Another book that has many textual divergences is Jeremiah. It is preserved in many witnesses, including the MT, 2QJer, 4QJer⁹, 4QJer⁸, as well as the LXX and 4QJerᵇ. Jeremiah is also preserved in a different order, according to the MT and LXX witnesses. Ulrich and Tov both argue that there are two stages, or editions, to the text of Jeremiah. These editions are classified by Tov as “edition I,” represented by the form found in the LXX and 4QJerᵇ, and a later expanded edition, called “edition II,” characterized by the MT, 4QJer⁹, and 4QJer⁸. Similar to Jeremiah, albeit a much more modest case study, LXX Nehemiah 11-12 preserves the “edition I” of the text, whereas MT Nehemiah 11-12 preserves “edition II” of the text.

---

582 This interpretation is debated, and scholars such as Halpern maintain that the LXX attempts to “harmonize apparent contradictions” found in the MT tradition (2001: 7). Thus, the MT preserves the older material.
2. The Connection of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12 with the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah

Most of this study details a specific text critical problem in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11-12, yet it has important implications for the larger construction of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The lists and narratives in Nehemiah 11-12 are meant to tie certain elite cultic and lay members to the events of the return from Babylon, as well as tie them to the dedication of Jerusalem. Within these lists and narratives, it becomes clear that the authors of the material preserved in the MT and LXX are not just detailing the people of Jerusalem, but through the settlement of the Judahites, Benjaminites, and Levites, they are also detailing all of the people of Judah. From a form critical perspective, it is logical that the lists in Nehemiah 11-12 are found at the end of the book, for as I have argued through this work, they are the most ambitious of all of the lists preserved in MT or LXX Ezra and Nehemiah.

Moreover, these lists also complete the settlement and rededication of Jerusalem—a process that we first see in the book of Ezra, beginning in chapter 3 with the dedication of the altar (3:2-3) and the laying of the foundations of the Temple (3:10) under the direction of Zerubbabel and Jeshua. This theme of rededication continues in Ezra with the completion of the Temple in the sixth year of Darius (6:15). In the book of Nehemiah, the city is finally dedicated after the walls were repaired under the guidance of Nehemiah (12:27-47). This process of rebuilding and dedicating the city of Jerusalem continues throughout the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Since the books of Ezra and Nehemiah emphasize the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem, it is logical that the final dedication of the city is placed near the end of the book of Nehemiah.
This final dedication, however, is more than just a final act of rebuilding the city. It also links the initial rebuilding activities with the activities of Nehemiah. MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 highlight the rebuilding of the population of Jerusalem during the time of Nehemiah. Moreover, MT and LXX Nehemiah 12:27-47 tie together Ezra and Nehemiah in the dedication of the city. But these activities are also tied to Zerubbabel and Jeshua (12:1), who began the process of resettling Judah as well as rebuilding the city of Jerusalem. Thus, Nehemiah 11-12 is the culmination of the rebuilding efforts of many important people, namely Zerubbabel, Jeshua, Ezra, and Nehemiah, bound together in the final lists of settlers and the dedication of Jerusalem.

While the theme of rebuilding Jerusalem unifies the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the books are not a seamless narrative. Within the book of Nehemiah, many scholars have observed that the connection between Nehemiah 10 and 11 is awkward, since the themes, activities, language, and syntax are inconsistent. Nehemiah 10 is concerned with the people who signed a covenant to abide by the law—a theme not found in Nehemiah 11. In fact, Nehemiah 11:1 would be more logical if it followed Nehemiah 7, which focuses on the repopulation and maintenance of Jerusalem. Most scholars argue that Nehemiah 11 more closely follows Nehemiah 7 in theme and content, yet there is little scholarly consensus on whether Neh 11:1 originally followed the material present in Nehemiah 7:3 or 72a (LXX 73a). But when one examines each of these proposals, the

585 The theme of the law is only once found in MT Neh 12:44 and continues through 13:3.
586 Torrey avers that Neh 11:1-24 originally followed Nehemiah 7:69 (1896). Blenkinsopp (1988:46) argues that Neh 7:4 and 11:1 are interrupted by the material in 7:5-10:40. He also argues that Neh 10 was the latest material found in the book. Wright (2004: 304-307) maintains that only a small part of Neh 11 (vv. 1-12) follows 7:1-3,
theme of settlement seems to be most closely built on 7:72a (LXX 73a). While Wright is correct in observing that 11:1-2 is closely tied to 7:1-3, it is logical that Nehemiah 11-12:26 once followed Nehemiah 7, including the introduction (1-5) and the list of returnees (vv. 6-72a).

Further, Scholars such as Williamson (1985) and Blenkinsopp (1988) have traditionally argued that the list in 7:6-72a is independent of 1:1-7:4, which in the earlier composition of the material, may have been the case. But it is likely that the list of returnees (7:6-72a) was part of the material in Neh 7:1-4 by the time of the composition of the material preserved in LXX Neh 11:1-12:26 took place. I assert this because the structure is similar to that of Nehemiah 7. Both Nehemiah 7 and Neh 11:1-12:26 begin during the time of Nehemiah and discuss the nature of Jerusalem, and then move to lists that are set during the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua. This movement from the mid-fifth...
century B.C.E., during the time of Nehemiah, to the late-sixth century, during the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua, cannot be mere coincidence. They are also the only series of lists and narratives that unite the people to the rebuilding efforts of Nehemiah, Zerubbabel, and Jeshua. The authors of the material in LXX Neh 11:1-12:26 intentionally mirrored the general structure of the material in Nehemiah 7—that is, the beginning events are set during the time of Nehemiah and move to the list of the early returnees during the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua. It is likely that the authors of the lists in Nehemiah 7 and 11-12 were different since there are so many discrepancies among the different lists as well as a shift in emphasis on the resettlement of Jerusalem.

The material preserved in Nehemiah 8-10 separates the narrative events of Nehemiah (1:1-7:5, 6-72a) and the lists of settlers (11:1-12:26), and focuses on the importance of the law as well as the Temple and certain cultic practices. It seems most likely that Nehemiah 8-10 is placed in this location because it emphasizes the theme of Nehemiah’s reforms.\textsuperscript{589} After rebuilding the walls, attention turns to the people. Ezra is introduced and the law is read (ch 8), the so-called Levitical confession takes place (ch 9), and finally the (חַסְדָּא) “agreement” is signed (ch 10). Nehemiah 11 returns to the settlement of the community in Jerusalem--an event yet to take place. I would argue that Nehemiah 8-10 was inserted between the material found in Neh 1:1-7:72a after the construction of the material preserved in the LXX. I argue this on several grounds. First, it interrupts the flow of the event of resettling, found in Nehemiah 7 and 11. There are a few key terms that do not appear in the text preserved in LXX Nehemiah 11-12, but are

\textsuperscript{589} Pakkala (2004) has argued that redaction of Nehemiah 8 is similar to Ezra 7-10. He has argued this based on a number of grounds, including most notably language and theme.
found in the text of MT Nehemiah 11-12 that have affinities to Nehemiah 8-10. First, the term הָרְכִּיָּהוּ ("agreement") appears in Nehemiah 10:1, describing the signed agreement of the community, as well as MT Neh 11:23, describing the agreement between the king and the Levites.\(^{590}\) This term is not found in LXX Nehemiah 11:23. Also, the theme of the Law (יָדַּעִים) is prevalent in Nehemiah 8-10, but in Nehemiah 11-12, it only appears in MT Neh 12:44.\(^{591}\) Thus, both of these key legal terms are found in important narratives in Nehemiah 8-10, but are not found in LXX Nehemiah 11-12. Thus, I would argue that based on theme, content, and language, the material corresponding to Nehemiah 8-10 was inserted into the resettlement after the construction of the material preserved in LXX Nehemiah 11-12. The insertion of this material led to an editor--possibly the same person who inserted the material corresponding to Nehemiah 8-10 into the narrative--to make changes to the settlement lists and dedication ceremony (ch 11-12). These changes created more cohesion between the events outlined in chapters 8-10 and 11-12.

The material preserved in LXX Neh 12:27-47 was constructed in order to finish the dedication of the city of Jerusalem (first seen in Nehemiah 7:1-4). LXX Neh 12:27-47 preserves a much smaller ceremony, in which the role of Nehemiah is less prominent when compared to the material preserved in the MT. The first person narrative of Nehemiah, oftentimes highlighted as part of the Nehemiah Memoir, is not as prevalent in the LXX. Since the only first person material in LXX Nehemiah 12 are found in vv. 26

---

\(^{590}\) See also Wright (2004: 214-15) for the use of this term in Neh 10:1.

\(^{591}\) In the book of Nehemiah, the Law is not mentioned before Nehemiah 8. But when one looks through chapters 8-10, there are many references (cf. Neh 8:1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18, 9:3, 13, 14, 26, 29, 34, 10:28, 29, 34, 34). Both MT and LXX Neh 13:3 have references to the Law.
and 31 (v. 38 is missing altogether) it seems that Nehemiah's first person voice appears at the beginning of the narrative, but then switches to the third person for the rest of the material. This is reminiscent of the structure of Nehemiah 7, which begins with a first person narrative (7:1-5), then switches to third person (vv. 6-72a). Since Nehemiah is almost completely absent in voice (but present in person in the narrative), it would make sense if this narrative were structured similarly to Nehemiah 7, introducing the first person narrative of Nehemiah and then the dedication of the city.

Moreover, with the addition of Nehemiah 8-10, and the introduction of Ezra in the book Nehemiah (Neh 8), Ezra has an active role in the context of LXX Neh 12:27-47 (v. 36). At a later date, Nehemiah's importance was modified, which is seen in MT Neh 12:38 (addition of the first person voice), 47 (addition of Nehemiah), as well as 12:26 (addition of "the governor"). With the additions to the material in Neh 12:38, Nehemiah is connected to the actual procession, moving with one group around the wall. In the LXX, he is only responsible for bringing the leaders onto the walls. The events in LXX Neh 12:44-47 depict the appointment of certain people to watch the contributions to the temple, as well as to summarize the role of the priests, Levites, gatekeepers, and singers. LXX Nehemiah 12:47 concludes with the historical context for a portion of the singers and gatekeepers by the people of Israel, commenting that this was done "in the days of Zerubbabel." But for the MT, these events took place "in the days of Zerubbabel and in the days of Nehemiah." Nehemiah gains more prominence in the MT version, when compared to the LXX.

See also Alwertz (2006: 200) for a brief discussion of the reworkings of Nehemiah 12:31-32 and 37-40.
3. Historical Context for the Composition of Nehemiah 11-12

There is a clear historical impetus for the additions to the material. If one examines the lists of people and their inclusion or exclusion from the larger community, it is most likely that the material preserved in the LXX cannot be earlier than the early Hellenistic period (late fourth century B.C.E.). The key to this text is the placement of the priestly genealogies, particularly the person of Jaddua, contemporary with Darius III, and according to Josephus, contemporary with Alexander the Great. Elements of the lists are probably constructed from earlier lists, particularly aspects of the lists of priests and Levites during the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua, but the final version that is preserved in the LXX dates to the early Hellenistic period.\(^{593}\) In fact, the settlement of Jerusalem (11:1-24) may date to the mid to late Persian period, but the final compilation of what I refer to as Horizon One, dates to the early Hellenistic period.\(^{594}\)

The historical considerations for the composition of Horizon Two of the list have many factors that must be considered. The addition of so many priestly peoples and positions points to a time when additions to the priestly class were acceptable. Further, it also points to a time when the people who made additions to the text of Nehemiah believed that this would support their claims to legitimacy. Although it has become fashionable in biblical studies to place material that has been traditionally dated to the Persian period in the Maccabean period, the reason why the Maccabean period may be

---

\(^{593}\) Cf. Williamson (1985) and Blenkinsopp (1988).

\(^{594}\) Boda (2008: 25-54) argues that the material in Neh 7-13 were not as independent as previously thought, but rather built upon sources that are found in the early part of the Persian period. This reconstruction, however, does not properly consider names that fall outside of the early Persian period. For a response to his proposal, see Blenkinsopp (2008: 309).
the best place to date the final editorial stages of Nehemiah, rests upon the importance of Nehemiah as a governmental figure in the time of the Hasmoneans. The Hasmoneans appear to elevate the position of Nehemiah, as is seen in 2 Maccabees (1:18-36). In fact, he is viewed as the person who rebuilt the temple and the altar (2 Macc 1:18). 2 Maccabees 2:13 mentions that Nehemiah founded a library and then collected books about the kings’ prophets, particularly the writings of David, "and letters of kings about votive offerings." This statement is followed with a comparison to Judas (167-160 B.C.E.), who collected the books that were lost during the war (v. 14). This would be a good context in which to place the composition of additions to this text since Judas ties the rededication of the temple to other events of Nehemiah. Since the Hasmonean family could trace its lineage to the person of Joiarib (1 Macc 2:1), found twice in MT Neh 12:6 and 19, but not found in LXX Nehemiah 12, it is likely that the additions to the text preserved in the MT took place during this time.

While the settlement list in MT Neh 11:25-36 is oftentimes used to date this material to post-Persian period, my primary reasoning for this reconstruction is not based on the settlement list in MT Neh 11:25-36. In fact, settlements in the southern area of Judah and the Negev begin to appear in the Early Hellenistic Period. Thus, while many

---

595 Blenkinsopp (1988: 57) contrasts Nehemiah with 1 Esdras, which he argues, "omits" the Nehemiah narrative. The author knew of Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel's position is given more status. He also asserts that it is possible to read 1 Esdras as anti-Hasmonean, or at least a response to the letter in 2 Maccabees.

596 1 Chr 24:7 also lists Joiarib as the first among the 24 priestly courses. VanderKam (2004: 270) points out that through this connection, the Hasmoneans were probably from the Zadokite lineage.

597 For a discussion of the connection between this Joiarib and the Maccabean lineage in 1 Macc 2:1, see Hölscher (1923: 553), Rudolph (1949: 191), and Blenkinsopp (1988: 334), and Böhler (2003: 48).
would argue that this settlement list is the best evidence for a Maccabean date, since John Hyrcanus laid siege to the area of Idumea and took control of the area (Ant. 13.257), I would argue that Hyrcanus’s conquest was not necessary for Judeans to settle the area. As I have argued, these settlements do not necessarily point to administrative Judah, but rather to a list of people bound through a religious and also familial connection to the settlers in Jerusalem. Thus, one does not have to look for administrative evidence to argue for settlement of Judahite and Benjaminites. This is not the purpose of the list. But the other material, particularly the role of Nehemiah, the importance of Jerusalem, and the changes to the genealogies, has its roots in mid-second century B.C.E. Maccabean history.

4. Conclusion

My research considers a specific text critical case study within the book of Nehemiah that has yet to warrant an in-depth analysis. This is surprising, since there are a number of recent studies that have examined the composition of Ezra and Nehemiah, as well as 1 Esdras. While there are many studies that consider the composition of these different post-exilic books, my study reveals that the composition of Nehemiah is more complex than previous reconstructions have considered. Future work on Nehemiah must consider the text critical issues I have examined before offering a reconstruction of the text.

Moreover, my study also examines the temple institutions in Jerusalem, particularly the appearance of certain groups in the post-exilic biblical lists. My research
offers a contribution to the study of the priests, Levites, as well as other cultic positions, such as the *Netînîm*, and sons of Solomon’s servants. One must consider that these groups were all welcome and considered full members within the framework of the book of Nehemiah. Finally, my work explores issues of identity and ethnicity in this formative period of Judaism. While archaeology is an important tool for historical reconstructions, it is important to address how the material culture may inform history. All of these studies add to the larger dialogue of biblical studies.

One future line of inquiry that would be worthwhile to consider concerns the administration of the Persian Empire and how it took into consideration *ethnē*, or groups of people that are tied together based on ancestral or religious considerations. It is evident from the postexilic material in Ezra and Nehemiah that the returnees from Babylon saw a connection to the people who stayed in Exile. Were these connections also understood by the Persian administration? If so, then did the Persian Empire consider a connection between people groups, even if they lived in different regions? The obvious connection between the returnees to Yehud and the community in Babylon, called Al Yehudu, cannot be missed. Did this apply to administration of the empire? Since the exiled community is named after their home territory, and then allowed to return to their former area, then the Persian administration must have understood this connection. This connection between the people and the land may explain the true nature of the list in MT Neh 11:25-36. One is immediately drawn to the notion of indirect ethnic rule, most clearly seen in the Ottoman Empire’s employment of the Millet system.  

My future

---

*Millet* refers to courts that were created to allow certain communities to handle legal matters with their own specific legal systems. These were generally ethnic minorities,
work will pursue this subject since it may prove to be fruitful in considering a different model of Persian control over their empire.

Consequently, a comparison between the MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24 provides biblical scholars with a good case study for understanding the stages of the redaction of Ezra-Nehemiah. This rare opportunity helps highlight certain issues like date and composition of specific texts. MT and LXX Neh 11:1-24 are such texts that reflect the complex nature of biblical composition. With this intriguing glimpse, the use of textual criticism to help inform literary criticism becomes all the more acute.

such as the Greek Orthodox, Armenian and Syrian Orthodox, Jews, Catholics, and Samaritans, to name a few. See Braude and Lewis (1982) for more on the Millet system.
Appendix

A Reconstruction of the Earliest Version of LXX Nehemiah 11-12

11:1. καὶ ἐκάθισαν οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ ἐν Ἰερούσαλημ καὶ οἱ καταλοιποὶ τοῦ λαοῦ ἔβαλοσαν κλήρους ἐνέγκαι ἕνα ἀπὸ τῶν δέκα καθίσαι ἐν Ἰερούσαλημ πόλει τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ ἐνεά μέρη ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν. 2. καὶ εὐλογησεν ὁ λαὸς τοὺς πάντας ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐκουσιαζόμενους καθίσαι ἐν Ἰερούσαλημ. 3. καὶ οὗτοι οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς χώρας οἱ ἐκάθισαν ἐν Ἰερούσαλημ καὶ ἐν πόλεσιν Ἰουδα ἐκάθισαν ἀνὴρ ἐν κατασχέσει αὐτοῦ ἐν πόλεσιν αὐτῶν ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευίται καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ δούλων Σαλωμών. 4. καὶ ἐν Ἰερούσαλημ ἐκάθισαν ἀπὸ τῶν Ιουδα καὶ ἀπὸ υἱῶν Βενιαμίν ἀπὸ υἱῶν Αδαία υἱὸς Αζαία υἱὸς Ζαχαρία υἱὸς Αμαρία υἱὸς Σαφατία υἱὸς Μαλέλη καὶ ἀπὸ υἱῶν Φαρές. 5. καὶ Μασσαία υἱὸς Βαροὺχ υἱὸς Χαλαζα υἱὸς Οξία υἱὸς Αδαία υἱὸς Ἰαουρίβ υἱὸς Ἰσαία υἱὸς τοῦ Σηλων. 6. πάντες υἱοὶ Φαρές οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν Ἰερούσαλημ τετρακόσιοι ἐξήκοντα ὀκτὼ ἄνδρες δυνάμεως. 7. καὶ οὗτοι υἱοὶ Βενιαμίν Σήλω υἱὸς Μεσολούμ Ιουσαυ υἱὸς Φαδαία υἱὸς Κωλία υἱὸς Μασσαία υἱὸς Ἰαουρίβ υἱὸς Ἰαουσία. 8. καὶ ὁ πόσῳ αὐτοῦ Γηβι Σηλι ἐννακόσιοι εἰκοσὶ ὀκτώ. 9. καὶ Ἰωκή υἱὸς Ζεχρί ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Ιουδας υἱὸς Ασανα ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως δεύτερος. 10. ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερέων καὶ Ιαδία υἱὸς Ἰαουρίβ Ἰαβιν 11. Σαραΐα υἱὸς Ελκα υἱὸς Μεσολούμ υἱὸς Σαδδουκ υἱὸς Μαριωθ υἱὸς Αἰτωβ ἀπέναντι οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ. 12. καὶ ἅδελφοι αὐτῶν ποιοῦντες τὸ ἔργον τοῦ οἴκου, Ἀμασί υἱὸς Ζαχαρία υἱὸς Φασσουρ υἱὸς Μελχία, 13. ἀρχοντες πατριῶν διακόσιοι τεσσαράκοντα δύο καὶ Ἀμασίας υἱὸς Ἐδρημία. 14. καὶ ἅδελφοι αὐτῶν δυνατοὶ παρατάξεως ἐκατον εἰκοσὶ ὀκτώ καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ αὐτῶν Βαδηρία. 15. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Λευιτῶν Σάμαία υἱὸς Ασσωρ υἱὸς Ἐξρι 16. — 17. καὶ Μαθανία υἱὸς Μιχα καὶ Μβήθ υἱὸς Σαμου, 18. διακόσιοι ὁγδούκοσια ἐπίσχεσις. 19. καὶ οἱ πυλωροὶ Ἀκουβ Θελαιμ καὶ οἱ ἅδελφοι, αὐτῶν ἐκατον ἐβδομάκοντα. δύο 20-21— 22. καὶ ἐπίσκοπος Λευιτῶν υἱὸς Βανι

599 Hanhart (1993) also includes the καὶ οἱ ναυηγοὶ also including the Levites. This phrase is missing from the B, S, and Aeth. It is present in 93-108, 74-130, 236, 248-381, as well as La123. I am reading with Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1935).

600 Hanhart (1993) includes υἱοὶ before Ἰουσαῦ, following the La123 manuscript tradition. It is, however, not present in the B, S, A, 71, and MT traditions.

601 Hanhart (1993) has ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως instead of ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως, correcting against the B, S, A, and 93-108, 64-728, and 119 manuscript traditions.

602 Hanhart (1993) includes the phrase καὶ ἅδελφοι αὐτῶν, based on manuscript traditions 93-108, and 44°. It is missing, however, in B, S, A, 71, and Aeth.

603 Hanhart (1993) has a variant and an addition. Instead of ἐπὶ αὐτῶν Βαδηρία, he has ἐπὶ αὐτῶν Ζεχρία υἱὸς τῶν μεγαλῶν. The spelling Ζεχρία, is found in La123 and the MT. The addition of υἱοὶ τῶν μεγαλῶν is found in La123 and the MT. It is not found in the B, S, A, 71, and Aeth traditions.


604 Hanhart also includes Ανανία at the end of v. 12, thereby finishing the genealogical section for the οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν πατριῶν. Ανανία is missing in the B, S, and AethB texts.

605 Brooke, McLean, and Thackery (1935: 657) do not include vv. 15-21. In v. 14, they only include τῷ Μαλουχ and then move to v. 22. The absence of this material in Brooke, McLean and Thackery is because it is not found in B, S, A, and Arm. Hanhart, however, includes all of v. 14-21.

606 Hanhart includes καὶ κινύραι, arguing that it is a case of homoioteleuton. Brooke, McLean, and Thackery (1935) do not include καὶ κινύραι because it is not found in B, S, A, or Aeth.
35. καὶ ἀπὸ υἱῶν τῶν ἱερέων ἐν σάλπιγξιν Ζαχαρίας υἱὸς Ιωναθαν υἱὸς Σαμαία
υἱὸς Μαθανία υἱὸς Μιχαία υἱὸς Ζαχχοῦρ υἱὸς Ασαφ. 36. καὶ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ
Σαμαία καὶ Ὀζηλ αἰνεῖν ἐν ὀδαῖς Δαυὶδ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἐσδρᾶς ὁ
γραμματεύς ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν 607. 37. ἐπὶ πῦλης τοῦ αἱν, κατέναντι αὐτῶν
ἀνεβήσαν ἐπὶ κλίμακας πόλεως Δαυὶδ ἐν ἀναβάσει τοῦ τείχους ἐπάνωθεν τοῦ
οἴκου Δαυὶδ καὶ ἔως πῦλης τοῦ ὕδατος. 608. 38. Ἐφραίμ καὶ ἐπὶ πῦλην τὴν
ἰχθυραν καὶ πῦργον Ἀνανελ καὶ ἕως πῦλης τῆς προβατικῆς
40-41. καὶ ἤκουσθήσαν οἱ ἄδωντες καὶ ἐπεσκέπτησαν. 43. καὶ ἔθεσαν ἐν τῇ
ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνην θυσίασμα μεγάλα καὶ ἤπραξθησαν ὅτι ο θεὸς ἤπραξεν αὐτοὺς
μεγάλως καὶ οἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καὶ τα τεκνα αὐτῶν ἤπραξθησαν καὶ ἤκουσθη ἡ
εὐφρασύνη ἐν Ιερουσαλήμ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν 44. καὶ κατέστησαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνην
ἄνδρας ἐπὶ τῶν γαζοφυλακίων τοῖς θησαυρίοις ταῖς ἀπαρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς
dεκαταῖς καὶ τοῖς συνηγμένοις ἐν αὐτοῖς ἄρχουσιν τῶν πόλεων μερίδας τοῖς
ἱερέωι καὶ τοῖς Λευίταις ὅτι εὐφρασύνη ἦν ἐν Ιουδά ἐπὶ τοὺς ιερεῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς
Λευίτας τοὺς ἐστώτας. 45. καὶ ἐφύλαξαν φυλάκας τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ φυλάκας τοῦ
καθαρισμοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄδωντας καὶ τοὺς πυλωροὺς ὑστοῖαι Δαυὶδ καὶ
Σαλομῶν υἱὸ αὐτοῦ 46. ὅτι ἐν ἡμέραις Δαυὶδ Ασαφ ἀπ' ἀρχὴς πρῶτος τῶν
ἄδωντων καὶ ὦνον καὶ ἁγιεῖν τῷ Θεῷ 47. καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραήλ ἐν ἡμέραις Ζοροβαβέλ
dιδότες μερίδας τῶν ἄδωντων καὶ τῶν πυλωρῶν λόγῳ ἡμέρας ἐν ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀγιαζόντες τοῖς Λευίταις καὶ οἱ Λευίται ἀγιαζόντες τοῖς υἱοὶ Αρσοῦν

607 Hanhart (1993: 237) also includes Milali, Gilalai, Maai, Nethanel, Judah, and Hanani. But these are not found in B, S, A, or Aeth. Thus, Brooke, McLean, and Thackera do not include these names.

608 There is another divergence between Hanhart (1993) and Brooke, McLean, and Thackera (1935) starting at the end of v. 37 to the beginning of v. 39. Hanhart argues that, through a series of haplographies, the material was omitted from the texts. Brooke, McLean, and Thackera (1935) do not include the material because it is not found in B, S, A, or Aeth.

609 Hanhart includes 39b, καὶ ἔστησαν ἐν πύλῃ τῆς φυλακῆς 40. καὶ ἔστησαν αἱ δύο τῆς αἰνέασας ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ τῷ ἡμίῳ τῶν στρατηγῶν μετ' ἐμοῦ 41. καὶ οἱ ιερεῖς Ἐλλείκη Μασσαίας Βενιαμίν Μιχαίας Ἐλισαβάης Ζαχαρίας Ἀνανίας ἐν σάλπιγξιν καὶ Μασσαίας καὶ Σεμείας καὶ Ἐλεάζαρ καὶ Ὁζ᾽ καὶ Ἰωανάν καὶ Μελχίας καὶ Αἰλαμ καὶ Ἐξουρ, but it is not found in Brooke, McLean, and Thackera (1935) because it is not found in B, S, A, Aeth, Arm, or Sixt. Hanhart argues that this has been omitted through homoiooteleuton (1993: 238).
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