

Projected Age Comparisons of the Levitical Townlists: Divergent Theories and Their Significance

Gary N. Knoppers

Recent decades have witnessed a revolution in the way scholars view the Levitical townlists in Joshua and Chronicles. The revolution has two aspects. First, a series of scholars have rejected any sort of early date for the original townlist—whether in the time of Israel’s emergence in the land, the monarchy of David and Solomon, the eighth century, or the seventh century.¹ Instead, the composition of the Levitical townlist is situated in the Persian period.² Second, some have questioned the traditional dependence of Chronicles on Joshua. In the view of Ross and Auld, the long account of Josh 21 has been taken from 1 Chr 6. If the revolution in dating returns scholarship to the position of Wellhausen, the revolution in literary dependence returns scholarship to a pre-deWette phase of biblical criticism.³

¹ Some have argued for multiple stages in the development of the Levitical townlist. See, for example, M. Haran, “Studies in the Account of the Levitical Cities,” *JBL* 80 (1961) 45–54, 156–165 and N. Na’aman, *Borders and Districts in Biblical Historiography* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 4; Jerusalem: Simor, 1986) 209–236.

² E.g., A.G. Auld, “The ‘Levitical Cities’: Texts and History,” *ZAW* 91 (1979) 194–207; E. Ben Zvi, “The List of the Levitical Cities,” *JSOT* 54 (1992) 77–108; J.R. Spencer, “Levitical Cities,” *ABD* 4:310–311.

³ In the matter of dating, Wellhausen’s view was followed by M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (2nd ed.; HAT 1/7; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953) 131–132. G. Schmitt provides a helpful overview of criticism, “Levitenstädte,” *ZDPV* 111 (1995) 28–48. In speaking of pre-de Wette biblical criticism, I do not mean to imply a common scholarly assumption that Joshua drew from Chronicles. Rather, Chronicles’ relationship to Joshua was more of an open issue before the work of de Wette. On the modern development of Chronicles criticism and its relationship to the criticism of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, see M.P. Graham, *The Utilization of 1 and 2 Chronicles in the Reconstruction of Israelite History in the Nineteenth Century* (SBLDS 116; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) and K. Peltonen, *History Debated: The Historical Reliability of Chronicles in Pre-Critical and Critical Research* (2 vols.; Publications of the

Both developments are important, but the second has wider ramifications for our understanding of the Former Prophets. If part of Joshua is dependent on Chronicles, one might well have to rethink the whole notion of a Deuteronomistic historical work.

In what follows, my concern will be the second part of the recent revolution—the purported derivation of Joshua from Chronicles. I want to begin by saying there are a number of commendable features in the reexamination of Joshua’s relationship to Chronicles. The careful attention to the many discrepancies between the content and order of the Chronicles account, compared to that of Joshua, is quite helpful in understanding the peculiar features of each tradition. The importance of textual criticism in discussing the development of these texts is, in my view, on the mark. The points raised by Auld and others before him about the relevance of LXX Joshua, especially Codex Vaticanus (LXX^B), as a witness to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that shares more affinities with Chronicles than MT Joshua does, are generally sound.⁴ One may argue about which way the line of dependence

Finnish Exegetical Society 64; Helsinki/Göttingen: The Finnish Exegetical Society/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).

⁴ Some see the LXX^B as representing a text lying between Chronicles and MT Joshua; see W.F. Albright, “The List of Levitic Cities,” in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (English Section; New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945) 49–73; A.G. Auld, *Joshua Retold: Synoptic Perspectives* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998) 7–36; J. Svensson, *Towns and Toponyms in the Old Testament* (ConBot 38; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994) 82–89. J.R. Spencer regards LXX^B Josh 21 as representing a parent text for both MT and LXX Chronicles (“Levitical Cities,” 310–311). On the general importance of LXX Joshua, see M. Gaster, “The Samaritan Book of Joshua and The Septuagint,” *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (1909) 115–127, 149–153; H.M. Orlinsky, “The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua,” in *Congress Volume: Rome, 1968* (ed. G.W. Anderson et al.; VTSup 17; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 187–195; A. Rofé, “Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated,” in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985) 131–147; E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2001) 142, 327–332; L. Mazor, “The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua,” *BIOSCS* 27 (1994) 29–38; E. Noort, *Das Buch Josua: Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder* (EdF 292; Darmstadt:

runs, whether from Chronicles to LXX Joshua to MT Joshua or vice versa, but the point about LXX Joshua's importance is, in my view, unassailable.⁵

After summarizing the arguments for Joshua's derivation from Chronicles, I will proceed to question some of these arguments. My focus will be on comparing prominent literary motifs and locutions within the two accounts, analyzing the internal organization of the Chronistic narrative, and examining its structure in the context of the Levitical genealogies. Special attention will be paid to the many pluses of MT and LXX Joshua in comparison with MT and LXX Chronicles. I will argue that the differences between the texts of Joshua and Chronicles may be best understood in the context of the development of multiple editions of biblical books in the centuries before the Common Era. The essay will conclude with some comments about what the discrepancies in content, length, and structure between Joshua and Chronicles may tell us about the development of both texts.

I. Revisiting the Relationship between Joshua and Chronicles

The case for viewing the (original) presentation of Chronicles as antecedent to the composition of Joshua is multi-faceted.⁶ Joshua offers a substantially

Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998) 46–59; H. Rösel, "The Septuagint-Version of the Book of Joshua," *SJOT* 16 (2002) 5–23; K. De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Script: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible* (SBLTS 4; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2003) 29–58, 127–128.

⁵ In Auld's theory, the witness of LXX Joshua is employed to mark a step in the development from the authorship of Chronicles to that of MT Joshua, a process that resulted in the longest formulation among all of the textual witnesses (see Section II below).

⁶ J.P. Ross, "'The Cities of the Levites' in Joshua XXI and I Chronicles VI" (Ph.D. diss., Edinburgh University, 1973); A.G. Auld, "Cities of Refuge in Biblical Tradition," *JSOT* 10 (1978) 26–40; idem, "Levitical Cities," 194–207; idem, "The Cities in Joshua 21: The Contribution of Textual Criticism," *Textus* 15 (1990) 141–152. The work of Ross was unavailable to me. The articles on Joshua by Auld, appearing over the past three decades, have been collected in his recent book, *Joshua Retold*. For the sake of convenience, my citations of Auld's work will be to this book.

longer text, including anecdotes, explanations, comments, and numerical summaries that are not found in Chronicles. References to the cities of refuge (Josh 21:13, 21, 27, 32, 38), the account (Josh 20:1–9) of which does not appear in Chronicles, occur only twice (1 Chr 6:42, 52). Some eight towns in MT Joshua do not appear in Chronicles, although some of these towns do appear in LXX Joshua.⁷ Aside from noting these matters of detail, it is useful to look at larger matters of organization. The account in Joshua appears to be more orderly in its presentation than the corresponding narrative in Chronicles, which seems at first glance to be more disorderly. Taking the presentation in Joshua as a reference point, the contrast with Chronicles may be summarized as follows:

	<i>Joshua</i>	<i>Chronicles</i>
Introduction	21:1–3	6:39a
Overview for Qohathite Aaronides	21:4	—
Overview for Other Qohathites in Ephraim, Dan, and East Manasseh	21:5	6:46
Overview for Gershonites, Issachar, Asher, Naphtali, and Manasseh in Bashan	21:6	6:47
Overview for Merarites in Reuben, Gad, and Zebulun	21:7	6:48
Summary	21:8	6:49
Introduction to Settlements in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin	21:9	6:50
Qohathite Aaronide Towns in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin	21:10–18	6:39b–45a
Summary for Qohathite Aaronides	21:19	6:45b
Qohathite Towns in Ephraim, Dan, and East Manasseh	21:20–25	6:51–55
Summary for Other Qohathites	21:26	—
Gershonite Towns in East Manasseh, Issachar, Asher, and Naphtali	21:27–32	6:56–61
Summary for Gershonites	21:33	—
Merarite Towns in Zebulun, Reuben, and Gad	21:34–37	6:62–66
Summary for Merarites	21:38	—
Summary Total of Levitical Towns	21:39–40	—
Fulfillment of Divine Promises	21:41–43	—
Joshua's Inheritance	LXX21:42a–d	—

⁷ For larger comparative purposes, it is, of course, relevant that some towns mentioned by MT Joshua are not mentioned in LXX Joshua.

Joshua and Chronicles share similar content, but offer different sequences of presentation. Joshua first presents a detailed historical context for the assignment of Levitical towns (21:1–3) and summarizes the number and tribal sources of the towns to be assigned to each of the Levitical groups and sub-groups: the Aaronide Qohathites (21:4), the rest of the Qohathites (21:5), the Gershonites (21:6), and the Merarites (21:7). Following a concluding summary (21:8), the text details these towns by name (21:9–38), according to both the order and the categorization provided in the earlier introduction: the Aaronide Qohathites (21:9–19), the rest of the Qohathites (21:20–26), the Gershonites (21:27–33), and the Merarites (21:34–38). The presentation concludes with numerical summaries (21:39–40) and promise-fulfillment notices (21:41–43).⁸ LXX Josh 21:42a–d presents an additional summation, centering on Israel’s inheritance and that of Joshua himself, which brings closure to the section devoted to the assignment of inheritances begun in Josh 13.⁹

Auld questions whether the authors of Chronicles would have taken such a coherent and well-organized passage and deliberately introduced incoherence and disorganization into this composition.¹⁰ A more likely scenario, he thinks, is that the authors of Joshua attempted to correct the problems inherent within the earlier text of Chronicles. According to Auld, “In virtually every detail 1 Chr 6 is prior to Josh 21.”¹¹ Moreover, the passage in Chronicles is said to make a good fit, when seen in the larger

⁸ Josh 21:41ff., the Deuteronomistic-style conclusion to the conquest, may properly belong to the next account (Josh 22:1–6). See further J.A. Soggin, *Joshua* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972) 206; A. Rofé, “The End of the Book of Joshua According to the Septuagint,” *Henoch* 4 (1982) 35.

⁹ There is a parallel between the material found in this LXX plus and the summation found in MT (and LXX) Josh 19:49–51. See Rofé, “End of the Book of Joshua,” 34–35; idem, “The Editing of the Book of Joshua in Light of 4QJosh^a,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (ed. G.J. Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 73–75.

¹⁰ *Joshua Retold*, 25–36, 49–57.

¹¹ *Joshua Retold*, 31.

context of the book. “Most of the material developed in its present context, and was not imported into 1 Chr 6 from elsewhere.”¹² In this case, small is not beautiful, but small is definitely earlier. The longer text of Josh 21 is a later and derivative product.

How, then, according to Auld, should one explain the apparent disorganization of Chronicles? The passage is viewed as a composite text, a collage that developed gradually and haphazardly in four stages.

1. a list of Aaronide towns (6:39–45);
2. an early expansion of #1 by a list summarizing the allotment of land to the three Levitical phratries (6:46–49^a) along with an addition in 6:45 “and from the tribe of Benjamin;”
3. a pedantic note in 6:50 referring back to #1 (6:39b–45), concluding: “(they assigned) these towns which they mentioned by name” (את הערים האלה אשר יקראו אתהם בשמות);
4. a name list of towns as awarded to the Levitical families by the other Israelite tribes (6:51–66).

According to Auld, each of the four sections is a unit in itself and the end of each unit makes for a good conclusion.¹³ Moreover, the later units presuppose the earlier units: “Each successive part depends on what goes before, but what goes before is complete in itself.”¹⁴ The rationale of the passage is one of growth, not one of structure. It is, therefore, misleading to term the passage a list of Levitical cities, because it is not a list.¹⁵

When the Chronistic account, or some earlier version thereof, was appropriated by the authors of Josh 21, the Chronistic narrative underwent a whole variety of changes:

¹² *Joshua Retold*, 47.

¹³ *Joshua Retold*, 27, 43.

¹⁴ *Joshua Retold*, 43.

¹⁵ *Joshua Retold*, 43.

1. the insertion of subtotals in 1 Chr 6:45, 46, 47, 48, making the total 48, a total that does not appear in Chronicles but has been supplied by the composers of Josh 21:40;
2. the creation of greater coherence by reworking the text into a more logical arrangement. This involved:
 - i. bringing forward section #2, the overviews of the tribal allotments (1 Chr 6:46–49 // Josh 21:5–7);
 - ii. composing Josh 21:4;
 - iii. rephrasing in Josh 21:8 the summary of 1 Chr 6:49;
 - iv. providing a complete list of tallies for #1 and #4;
 - v. correcting the Aaronide list of names (totalling 11 in MT 1 Chr 6:39b–45) to correspond to the required 13;
 - vi. adding the more comprehensive summary in Josh 21:39–40;
 - vii. creating a narrative framework in Josh 21:1–3 and 21:41–43.¹⁶

From this summary, one can see that the theory posits a massive amount of reworking and supplementation in the process of composing Josh 21. Before examining whether 1 Chr 6:39–66 is best viewed as an indigenous product from within Chronistic circles, it may be relevant to make a couple of comments about the place and function of textual criticism. One of the strengths of the new hypothesis is that it takes textual variants seriously not only between MT Chronicles and MT Joshua, but also between MT and LXX Joshua.¹⁷ In this context, the theory points to the crucial issue of length—the fact that Chronicles is significantly shorter than either MT or LXX Joshua. Defenders of traditional views will have to take these points into consideration in any future discussions of the Levitical townlists. Yet, in spite of the attention given to the importance of LXX Joshua as an

¹⁶ In this reconstruction, it is unclear what happened to 1 Chr 6:39a, the Chronicler's introduction to the Levitical settlements. Presumably, this was overwritten by the authors of Joshua.

¹⁷ One of the weaknesses of some older treatments (e.g., Noth, *Josua*, 7) is that they either do not deal with the textual variants at any length or explain them simply as attempts to abbreviate, smooth out, and simplify an older text.

intermediary account between Chronicles and MT Joshua, the theory devotes little attention to the accidents of textual transmission that produce variants. That is, the theory paradoxically accepts MT Chronicles, LXX Chronicles, MT Joshua, and LXX^B Joshua as representative of their respective traditions and does not inquire as to whether some of the discrepancies among them arose as the result of textual transmission rather than as the result of the actual compositional process.

I would want to ask whether some of the variants among the witnesses to Joshua and Chronicles resulted from textual corruption in the form of haplography, dittography, and graphic confusion (especially in place-names). Passages containing lists, obscure toponyms, and recurring formulaic phrases are especially vulnerable to textual corruption. Both Joshua and Chronicles, but especially the latter, have been prone to haplography, including whole-phrase haplography. A prime example of such a loss in Joshua may be seen in the edition of *BHS*, which uncharacteristically restores a text into the MT instead of listing it as a variant in the footnotes.¹⁸ So confident that a loss of text has accidentally occurred, the editors of *BHS* insert two verses (Josh 21:36–37) into the MT on the basis of the parallel in 1 Chr 6:63–64 and the versions to Josh 21. The editors assume (with justification) that homoioteleuton has occurred from **ארבע** at the end of v. 35 to **ארבע** at the end of (the missing) v. 37.¹⁹

To take another example, the second clause of MT 1 Chr 6:46 begins in a puzzling way and seems to be fragmentary, **ממשפחת המטה ממחצית מטה חצי**, “from the family of the tribe, from the half-tribe, half-Manasseh.” By contrast, the parallel in Josh 21:5 reads, **ממשפחת מטה אפרים וממטה דן ומחצי**, “from the family of the tribe of Ephraim and from the tribe of

¹⁸ The material in question is missing from Codex Leningradensis (B 19^A), Codex prophetarum Cairensis, the Tg., and the 1524/25 edition (Bombergiana) of Jacob ben Hayyim.

¹⁹ Some Hebrew MSS, LXX* Josh 21:36–37 (or 21:35a–b,36–37; M. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek. Part V: Joshua 19:39–24:33* [Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1992] 417–420) and arithmetic (Josh 21:1–8, 40–41) bear witness to their originality.

Dan and from the half-tribe of Manasseh.” After comparing the two lemmata, one suspects that a loss of text has occurred in Chronicles (perhaps through homoioarkton) and that the original read, ממשפחת מטה{ה} מנשה וּממחצית דן וממטה אפרים וממטה דן וממחצית {ה} מטה מנשה of Ephraim and from the tribe of Dan and from the half-tribe of Manasseh.”²⁰ That a textual corruption has occurred in Chronicles is all the more likely given the presence of Ephraimite and Danite sites in the following settlement list (vv. 52–54) and the testimony of some witnesses to LXX Chronicles.²¹ In short, the plus in Joshua is really a minus in Chronicles.

The aforementioned examples are only two of the many cases of textual corruption to have afflicted the witnesses to Joshua and Chronicles. To be sure, the tools of textual criticism cannot account for all of the variants between the two books. There are too many differences among the texts to be explained through mechanical means, but textual criticism can explain some of the minuses of Chronicles over against Joshua.²² The issue that now lies before us is the claim that the account of 6:39–66 stems from Chronistic circles.

²⁰ With respect to the lemma, “from the half-tribe of Manasseh,” I am reading with the versions (*lectio brevior*). See Section IV.B.1 (below).

²¹ Cursives *bi* of LXX 1 Chr 6:46 preserve part of the earlier reading, τοῖς καταλειμμένοις ἀπὸ τῆς συγγένειας (ἐκ) τῆς φυλῆς Εφραϊμ, “those left behind (from) the family of the tribe of Ephraim.” Cf. LXX Josh 21:5 τοῖς καταλειμμένοις ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Εφραΐμ. See also the comments of L.C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Masoretic Text, Part II* (VTSup 27; Leiden: Brill, 1974) 140.

²² The textual criticism of Chronicles is a major issue in and of itself and one that may be most profitably dealt with in another context. See my commentary, *I Chronicles 1–9* (AB 12; New York: Doubleday, 2004) 52–71; *idem, I Chronicles 10–29* (AB 12; New York: Doubleday, 2004).

II. Was the Account of 1 Chr 6:39–66 First Authored by the Chronicler?

According to Auld's theory, "The Chronicler's version is at home while Josh 21 is derived from it."²³ It will be useful to examine this critical assertion in greater detail. If the text originates within Chronicles, albeit in multiple stages, one would expect its terminology, style, and themes to conform to the terminology, style, and themes found in other sections of the book. But there are many expressions in 1 Chr 6:39–66 that are not characteristic of Chronistic style or theology.²⁴

A. Terminology, Style, and Expressions

1. גורל (ה), "(the) lot, (the) allocation (by lot)"

There are at least two meanings for this word in biblical literature: 1) "lot," that is, the particular object cast to make a particular decision; and 2) what is given by lot: an "allocation" or "allotment."²⁵ The first designation of the term גורל predominates in the townlists of Joshua (21:4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 38) and 1 Chronicles (6:39, 46, 48, 50). There is one instance of the term with the second meaning in the townlist of Joshua (21:20), but this occurrence is textually disputed. The difference between the MT's גורלם, "their allocation," and the LXX's τῶν ὁρίων ἀτῶν, "their boundaries, limits" (= גבולם, "their territory") evinces a ב/ר confusion. The witnesses of MT (גבולם) and LXX (τῶν ὁρίων ἀτῶν) 1 Chr 6:51 side with LXX Joshua. Hence, the employment of גורל with the first meaning ("lot") may be the only original use of the term in the Levitical townlist. In the context of Josh

²³ *Joshua Retold*, 44.

²⁴ The following treatment is indebted to the brief collection of collocations compiled by Ben Zvi, "Levitical Cities," 77–78.

²⁵ Some list a third meaning, a "portion in the figurative sense of fate, destiny" (*HALOT* 185). See Isa 17:14; 34:17; 57:6; Dan 12:13; W. Dommershausen, "גורל *gôrāl*," *TDOT* 2:450–456; H.H. Schmid, "גורל *gôrāl* lot," *TLOT* 1:310–312. Since the term with this meaning does not appear in Joshua or Chronicles, it does not require any further discussion in this context.

21 and 1 Chr 6, the term is used with specific reference to the process of determining tribal allotments. It is true that the term גורל with the first meaning is also used elsewhere in Chronicles, but always in the context of casting lots for sacerdotal rotations and duties (1 Chr 24:5, 7, 31; 25:8, 9; 26:13, 14). Sortition does not appear elsewhere in the book as a means of dividing tribal lands. Nor does גורל in the sense of “allocation” or “allotment” (meaning #2) appear elsewhere in Chronicles.

Looking beyond the immediate range of Josh 21 and Chronicles, it is important to observe that גורל is often used with respect to the process of determining tribal allocations in the last part of Numbers (26:55, 56; 33:54; 34:13; 36:2) and in the second half of Joshua (14:2; 15:1; 16:1; 17:1, 14, 17; 18:6, 8, 10; 19:1, 10, 17, 24, 32, 40, 51). One occasionally sees possible instances of the word used with the second meaning, “allocation” in Numbers (36:3), Joshua (e.g., 18:11), and Judges (1:3); but, as Auld points out, many of the references in Joshua are textually disputed (Josh 15:1 [LXX גבול]; 16:1 [LXX גבול]; 17:1 [LXX גבול]).²⁶ The use of the term in Judg 20:9 refers to the procedure of preparing to wage war (in line with meaning #1). In sum, the use of גורל to indicate the process of arriving at tribal territorial divisions is common in the so-called Priestly portions of Numbers and Joshua, but is restricted to one chapter within the book of Chronicles.

2. נתנו להם את GN/עיר/ערים, “they assigned to them GN/town/towns”

This expression appears in 1 Chr 6:40, 42, 49, 50, 52, but nowhere else in 1 Chr 1–9. With a singular subject, the collocation appears in 2 Chr 8:2 (//1 Kgs 9:13; cf. Josh 6:16). The collocation (with a plural subject) appears in Josh 21 (vv. 8, 11, 21) and once in Josh 22 (v. 7). The locution is also common in the asylum town statutes of Numbers (Num 35:13, 14) and in the Levitical towns legislation of Numbers (Num 35:2, 4, 6, 7, 8; cf. Judg 1:20). When viewed in the context of the Chronicler’s own treatment of the Levitical towns, there is a problem with the use of this collocation. Its appearance does not dovetail with the Chronicler’s own introduction to the

²⁶ *Joshua Retold*, 31.

Levitical towns, “These are their places of residence according to their settlements within their territories” (ואלה מושבותם לטירותם בגבולם; 1 Chr 6:39a).²⁷ The issue is not simply that the expression is confined to essentially one chapter in the entire book. The issue is also that the use of the repeated locution, “they assigned to them GN/town/towns,” does not mesh well with the Chronicler’s own references to tribal lands. In the introduction provided by the Chronicler these towns appear as traditional patrimonies, rather than as a grant from a national leader or one from the other tribes.

In Joshua, the assignment of Levitical towns appears in a very different context. The allocation of towns arises from a request to Joshua and to the priest Eleazar at Shiloh (Josh 21:1–3) after the other Israelite tribes were given their territorial allotments (Josh 13:1–19:51b) and certain towns were set aside as places for asylum (Josh 20:1–9). Such allotments for the Levites were promised, while the Israelites were still encamped on the plains of Moab (Num 35:1–8). The towns specially set aside as Levitical towns derive from the inheritances of the other tribes. The means by which the three Levitical phratries receive their estates is through the casting of lots (Josh 21:4–8).

Chronicles does not contain any of the material in Numbers and Joshua that sets the stage for the assignment of Levitical towns. Since the Exodus and Conquest are not prominent themes in Chronicles,²⁸ it is not surprising that they do not figure prominently here. The Chronicler focuses on the towns, families, and territories belonging to each tribe without directly

²⁷ That the Chronicler’s own introduction may be found in 6:39a is recognized by Auld, *Joshua Retold*, 31.

²⁸ M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1957) 175; A.-M. Brunet, “Les Chroniste et ses sources,” *RB* 61 (1954) 368–369; W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 21; Tübingen: Mohr, 1955) ix; S. Japhet, “The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew,” *VT* 18 (1968) 330–371; idem, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ 9; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1989) 374–386.

addressing the question of Israel's origin in the land.²⁹ The genealogies contain a variety of anecdotes relating how a given tribe or a phratry within a tribe gained new land, but these tales involve natural demographic growth, tribal migrations, and territorial skirmishes.³⁰ In no other case in the genealogies does one find a reference to a sacred lot as a determining factor in the assignment of a tribal land or town. Because the Levitical account repeatedly alludes to the lottery (6:39, 46, 48, 50) and includes statements, such as "they gave Hebron to them in the land of Judah" (6:40), it is unique among the genealogical materials in Chronicles.

3. ערי (ה)מקלט, "towns of refuge"

This expression appears twice in the Levitical town list in Chronicles (1 Chr 6:42, 52). The phrase and similar versions of it are common in the asylum town legislation found in Numbers 35: ערי המקלט, "towns of refuge" (Num 35:6); הערים האלה למקלט, "the refuge towns" (Num 35:12); הערים האלה למקלט, "these towns for refuge" (Num 35:15); עיר מקלטו, "town of his refuge" (Num 35:25, 26, 27, 28, 32). The expression in singular form, עיר מקלט, "town of refuge," appears twice in the asylum town account of Joshua (20:2, 3), and several times in Josh 21 (vv. 13, 21, 27, 32, 38). Such towns were to be set aside for homicides who killed by mistake (בשגגה; Num 35:11; cf. Josh 20:3). The resonance between the locution appearing in Chronicles, ערי המקלט, "towns of refuge," and the Priestly materials appearing in Numbers and Joshua is striking. By contrast, the Deuteronomic (or Deuteronomistic) texts speak of setting aside three specific towns (שלוש ערים), geographically distributed throughout the land YHWH will give Israel, to which any homicide may flee (והיה לנוס שמה כל רצח) (Deut 19:2–3), provided that such a manslayer does not kill intentionally (literally, "without knowledge," בבלי

²⁹ For another view, see S. Japhet, "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles," *JBL* 98 (1979) 205–218.

³⁰ E.g., 1 Chr 1:10; 2:3, 7, 22–23; 4:9–10, 27, 28–33, 38, 39–40, 41, 42–43; 5:1–2, 9–10, 23–26; 7:21–24, 28–29; 8:12–13, 28, 29, 32; 9:34–35.

עוד שלוש)³¹ Should YHWH expand Israel's borders, three more sites (ערים) may be set aside for this purpose (Deut 19:8–9). In neither this passage nor the passage dealing with setting aside three specific towns in the Transjordan to which those accidental killers may flee (לנוס שמה רוצח; Deut 4:41–43), often thought to be a later addition to the text, do the authors of Deuteronomy speak of towns of refuge. Hence, the overlap in terminology lies with Numbers and Joshua, but not with Deuteronomy.

The resonance between Chronicles and Numbers and Joshua is, in this case, limited to only one chapter in Chronicles. Aside from its occurrences in 1 Chr 6, the expression ערי המקלט, “towns of refuge,” is not found elsewhere in the book. It seems highly unlikely, then, that Chronicles was the source for the use of this term in other biblical contexts.³² It seems much more probable that its use has been imported into this one section of Chronicles from another biblical context or set of contexts.³³

4. מחצית מטה מנשה, “the half-tribe of half-Manasseh”

The expression occurs twice in 1 Chr 6 (vv. 46, 55).³⁴ The locution's provenance is very limited in biblical literature. It occurs only elsewhere in the parallel of Josh 21:25 (מחצית מטה מנשה). A somewhat similar expression, מחצית בני ישראל, “half of the sons of Israel,” appears in Num 31:30 and 31:42.³⁵ But no such similar expression appears elsewhere in Chronicles.

³¹ Cf. MT Josh 20:3 בבלי דעת (lacking in the LXX and the Vg.), Rofé, “Joshua 20,” 139–40.

³² So Auld, *Joshua Retold*, 47–48.

³³ Because the towns of refuge are not a productive thematic concern for the Chronicler, there was no need for him to have continual recourse to Num 35 (*pace* Auld, *Joshua Retold*, 52).

³⁴ In the former case, I am reading מחצית מטה מנשה. See Section IV.B.1.

³⁵ For other uses of the term מחצית, “half,” see Exod 30:13, 38:26; 1 Kgs 16:9.

5. חצי מטה מנשה, “half-tribe of Manasseh”

Although this expression, very similar to מחצית מטה מנשה (II.A.4 above), appears three times in the parallel of Josh 21 (vv. 5, 6, 27), it only appears once in 1 Chr 6 (v. 56). The expression also appears once in 1 Chr 12:32 (חצי מטה מנשה). Elsewhere, its distribution is limited to Moses’ oration in Num 34:13, 14, 15 and to the introduction to Joshua’s dismissal of the Transjordanian tribes (חצי מטה מנשה; Josh 22:1).³⁶ Aside from its dual appearances in 1 Chr 6 and 12, the locution is not found anywhere else in the book.

The Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic alternative to this expression, חצי שבט (ה)מנשה, “half-tribe of Manasseh,” appears once in Deuteronomy (3:12) and twelve times in Joshua (1:12; 4:12; 12:6; 13:7; 18:7; 22:7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 21). In contrast to the restricted use of חצי מטה מנשה in Chronicles, the Deuteronomistic alternative, חצי שבט (ה)מנשה, is found in a variety of contexts in the book (e.g., 1 Chr 5:18, 23, 26; 12:38; 26:32; 27:20, 21).³⁷ In none of these cases is the author simply reproducing a source text in the Pentateuch or the Deuteronomistic historical work. All of these occurrences are unparalleled elsewhere in the Hebrew scriptures. In other words, one should not argue that the recurrent use of מטה for tribe in Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6 simply reflects exilic and postexilic usage and therefore proves nothing.³⁸ In the case of Chronicles, the author lived in the late Persian or early Hellenistic period and had a choice in his use of terminology. In almost all instances in which he wished to speak about a particular Israelite sodality or group of sodalities, he chose שבט and not מטה. The usage of חצי מטה מנשה in 1 Chr 6 is, therefore, most unusual in the larger context of the book.

³⁶ Cf. חצי המטה in Josh 14:2, 3.

³⁷ In 1 Chr 27:21, I read with some Hebrew MSS. The MT has חצי מנשה, “half-Manasseh.”

³⁸ Contra Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 184.

6. PN מטה בני, “tribe of the sons of PN”

Appearing twice in the Levitical townlist (1 Chr 6:48, 50), this expression occurs nowhere else in Chronicles. It does often appear, however, in the second half of Joshua (13:15, 29; 15:1, 20, 21; 16:8; 18:11, 21; 19:1, 8, 23, 24, 31, 39, 40, 48; 21:9) and in Priestly-style texts in the book of Numbers (e.g., 10:15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27; 34:14, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28; 36:5). The distribution of a similar expression, PN מטות לבני, “tribes of the sons of PN,” is restricted to a few instances in the last part of Numbers (30:2; 32:28; 36:8) and the last third of Joshua (14:1; 19:51; 21:1). In sum, the appearance of this locution in Chronicles is unique to one chapter, but its appearance in Josh 21 conforms to the larger literary context of Priestly authored or Priestly-influenced texts in Numbers and Joshua.

7. PN מטות/מטה, “tribe(s) of PN”

In contrast with the previous locution, this phrase is found often in the list (1 Chr 6:45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65). It occurs often, of course, in the Joshua parallel (Josh 21:4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 23, 25, 28, 30, 32, 34). But it also appears in a variety of contexts within Joshua (7:1, 18; 17:1; 21:4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 20, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 34; 20:8; 22:1, 14). As with the previous expression, this one occurs frequently in the Priestly writing and in Priestly-influenced texts.³⁹ The expression PN מטה, “tribe of PN,” appears, however, only once elsewhere in Chronicles (1 Chr 12:32).⁴⁰ By contrast, the Deuteronomistic (and Deuteronomistic) alternative, PN שבט, is common in Chronicles (e.g., 1 Chr 5:18, 23, 26; 11:23; 12:38; 23:14; 26:32; 27:16, 30; 29:6;

³⁹ E.g., Exod 31:2, 6; 35:30, 34; 38:22, 23; Lev 24:11; Num 1:21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 49; 2:5, 7, 12, 14, 20, 22, 27, 29; 3:6; 7:12; 13:4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; 17:18, 21, 23, 25; 18:2; 31:4; 34:19, 21; 36:9.

⁴⁰ Cf. MT 2 Chr 5:2 (//1 Kgs 8:1) ראשי המטות נשיאי האבות לבני ישראל, “tribal heads (and) leaders of the ancestral houses of the sons of Israel.”

2 Chr 6:5; 11:16; 12:13; 33:7).⁴¹ Of the many occurrences of PN שבט, in Chronicles, most appear in non-synoptic contexts (1 Chr 5:18, 23, 26; 12:38; 23:14; 26:32; 27:16, 30; 29:6; 2 Chr 11:16).⁴² In other words, one cannot explain the common appearance of שבט within this book by contending that the Chronicler was simply reproducing the text of his *Vorlage* of Deuteronomy or his *Vorlage* of Samuel-Kings. When employing this terminology, the author was often composing his own texts. The appearance of PN שבט, in a variety of Chronistic contexts only underscores how unusual the appearance of PN מטה/מטות is in 1 Chr 6.

8. ירדן ירחו, “the Jordan (near) Jericho”

Aside from its singular appearance in the Levitical townlist (1 Chr 6:63), this locution appears nowhere else in Chronicles. It does appear a few times in the second half of Joshua (13:32; 16:1; 20:8; 21:36)⁴³ and in Priestly or Priestly-influenced texts in the last sections of Numbers (22:1; 26:3, 63; 31:12; 33:48, 50; 34:15; 35:1; 36:13). The distribution of this expression within the Bible has, therefore, a narrow range, being almost entirely confined to the latter parts of Numbers and Joshua.

9. ואת שדה העיר ואת חצריה נתנו לכלב בן יפנה, “and they assigned the territory of the town [Hebron] and its villages to Caleb son of Jephunneh”⁴⁴

The reference to Caleb son of Jephunneh presupposes certain materials (and not others) in the Pentateuch (e.g., Num 14:24) and in Joshua (14:6–15; 15:13–19). That 1 Chr 6 and Josh 21 situate Caleb *ben* Jephunneh squarely

⁴¹ On the latter usage, see also the concluding discussion to II.A.5 (above).

⁴² There is one occurrence of שבט in a summary subtotal in Josh 21:16, but this reference is unparalleled in Chronicles.

⁴³ The expression appears in the LXX Josh 21:36, but it is lacking in those Hebrew MSS that have 21:36–37 (see nn. 18–19).

⁴⁴ The parallel to 1 Chr 6:41 in Josh 21:12 adds “as his estate” (באחוזתו). See Section IV.A.4.

within an Israelite context is revealing. Analysis of some biblical traditions raises questions about whether Caleb was originally regarded as a Judahite (Gen 36:9–11, 15, 42; 1 Sam 30:14).⁴⁵ Caleb is sometimes called a Qenizzite (Num 32:12; Josh 14:6, 14) and sometimes a brother of Qenaz (Josh 15:17; Judg 1:13; 3:9). In this respect, the association between Caleb and Judah found in 1 Chr 6 and Josh 21 aligns these two texts squarely with the perspective of the Priestly writers, because Priestly (or Priestly-style) texts present Caleb as fully Judahite (Num 13:6; 34:19). The lineages of the Israelite tribes in Chronicles also contextualize Caleb *ben* Jephunneh within Judah (1 Chr 4:15).⁴⁶ So far so good. Initially, it would seem that the reference to Caleb *ben* Jephunneh in 1 Chr 6 is unproblematic.

Closer study shows, however, that there is a substantial discrepancy between the claim made here and the presentation of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh in the Chronicler's lineages of Judah. The Judahite genealogy mentions no less than three different Calebs—Caleb son of Hezron (2:9, 18–20, 24, 42–50), Caleb son of Jephunneh (4:15), and Caleb the brother of Shuhah (4:11–12).⁴⁷ In this respect, the depiction of the Calebites in Chronicles is more complex than that of the Pentateuchal sources and the Deuteronomistic History. In the Judahite lineages of Chronicles, Caleb son of Hezron receives much more attention than either Caleb son of Jephunneh or Caleb brother of Shuhah do. A main section of the tribe appears as the descendants of Hezron. This branch, fully integrated into Judah and central to its collective identity (1 Chr 2:9, 18–20, 42–50a), attracts some of the features associated with Caleb son of Jephunneh in Pentateuchal traditions and the Deuteronomistic work. In Chronicles, it is Caleb *ben* Hezron, who is linked to Hebron. Hebron appears as one of the descendants of Caleb *ben* Hezron

⁴⁵ See, for instance, G.E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) 162; R.L. Braun, *1 Chronicles* (WBC 14; Waco: Word, 1986) 33.

⁴⁶ W. Zwickel, "Die Landnahme in Juda," *UF* 23 (1993) 481–483.

⁴⁷ See S. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993) 113, although I do not agree with all of her conclusions.

(1 Chr 2:42).⁴⁸ Many of the other descendants of this Caleb represent settlements in the vicinity of Hebron (2:42–45).

In contrast to the substantial coverage accorded to Hezronite Caleb and his Hebronite affiliations, the coverage accorded to Jephunnite Caleb is rather brief. He appears suddenly in a list of lineages near the close of the Judahite genealogy (1 Chr 4:15).⁴⁹ This Caleb is associated with the Qenizzites. The lineage of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh is situated immediately after the lineage of Qenaz (4:13–14) and one of the descendants of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh is named Qenaz (4:15). In this respect, there is some resonance between the presentation of Jephunnite Caleb in 1 Chr 4 and the associations between the Calebites and the Qenizzites found in the Hexateuch (Num 32:12; Josh 14:6, 14; 15:17; Judg 1:12–15; 3:9). But neither of the minor branches of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh and Caleb the brother of Shuhah (4:11–12) is completely integrated into the tribe of Judah through clear genealogical links. In this respect, the lineages of Caleb *ben* Hezron and Caleb brother of Shuhah may be distinguished from that of Caleb *ben* Jephunneh.

Ironically, the Caleb who receives the most attention elsewhere in biblical sources receives the least attention here. The Caleb of the conquest stories

⁴⁸ Reading “Mesha his firstborn... and his second son Mareshah the father of Hebron” (מישע בכור... ובנו משנה מרשה אבי חברון); Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 18). The MT, which problematically lists the sons of Mareshah as the father of Hebron, has suffered a haplography (homoioarkton) of “and his second son” (ובנו משנה) before “Mareshah.”

⁴⁹ Because the new reference to Caleb is surprising, some scholars view the entire verse as a later interpolation; I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Chronik* (KHAT 20; Tübingen: Mohr, 1901) 14; R. Kittel, *Die Bücher der Chronik und Esra, Nehemia und Esther* (HAT 1/6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902) 27–32; E.L. Curtis and A.A. Madsen, *The Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910) 110. I disagree (*I Chronicles* 1–9, 347–349), but if these scholars were right, this would only exacerbate the distance between the claims about Caleb *ben* Jephunneh in Josh 21// 1 Chr 6 and the presentation of Caleb in the Judahite genealogy.

becomes a minor figure in Chronicles.⁵⁰ More importantly, it is Caleb of Hezron, rather than Caleb of Jephunneh, who is directly associated with Hebron. Given this evidence, it is unlikely that the notice found within 1 Chr 6:40–42 (and Josh 21:11–13) originated within a Chronistic setting. It seems more likely that this material stems from a literary context outside the book.⁵¹

The expressions outlined in the preceding section are important in two respects. First, they point toward an original context outside of Chronicles. If one wished to press the case for the originality of the Chronicles account and the derivative nature of the Joshua account, one would have to declare that the authors of Chronicles developed a whole series of expressions and concepts in this particular account that are largely foreign to other sections of their book. This seems improbable. The appearance of much material in 1 Chr 6 displaying clear overlap with texts authored by the Priestly writers or by writers who were themselves influenced by the Priestly school is telling. Second, as we have seen, the Levitical material in Josh 21 shows clear affiliations with the towns of refuge passage that precedes it (Josh 20), as well as with other material in the last third of Joshua and the latter part of Numbers. The passages with similar expressions and concerns are all located in Priestly-style contexts. If the account dealing with the Levitical

⁵⁰ Num 13:6, 30; 14:6, 24, 30, 38; 26:65; 32:12; 34:19; Deut 1:36; Josh 14:6–15; 15:13–17; Judg 1:12–15; 3:9; Sir 46:9–10.

⁵¹ Auld (*Joshua Retold*, 30–31) recognizes that this passage may be an interpolation into the Levitical townlist, but argues that the insertion in Joshua is much more expansive than the insertion in Chronicles. In this context, Auld also allows for the possibility that the traditions of Joshua have exerted some influence on the text of Chronicles. He thinks that 1 Chr 6:39b–41 represents an insert, albeit one involving a certain amount of editorial reworking, that was inspired by an earlier, briefer edition of Josh 21. This earlier edition of Josh 21, reconstructed by Auld (*Joshua Retold*, 31) as, לבני אהרן נתנו את חברון בארץ יהודה ואת מגרשיה סביבתיה ואת לבנה ואת מגרשיה ("to the sons of Aaron they gave Hebron in the land of Judah along with its surrounding open lands and Libnah and its open lands"), bears, however, more affinities to the text of 1 Chr 6:39b–41 than it does to the text of Josh 21:11–13.

towns has a primary home in any particular setting, it is in the context of the Priestly-style materials in Numbers and Joshua.

B. Toponyms

Another way to approach the issue of original context is to look at the place names mentioned in the accounts. Do these find parallels in the context of Joshua or in the context of Chronicles? Do the sites reappear elsewhere in either book? How does the tribal contextualization of a given site in the Levitical townlist fit (or not fit) with the contextualization of that site elsewhere in Joshua as opposed to elsewhere in Chronicles? If the townlist originates within Chronicles, one would expect that many of its toponyms would be mentioned elsewhere in the book. Clearly, there are some well-known sites, such as Hebron, Gibeon, Gezer, Shechem, and Jericho that are well-attested in both Joshua and Chronicles. But there are other Levitical towns that are much more obscure. Many of these lesser known toponyms are found nowhere else in Chronicles, but are found within other contexts in Joshua.⁵² This would be surprising if the townlist had its natural home in the Chronicler's work. Even in those limited cases in which the toponyms in Chronicles differ from those in Joshua, the closest parallels to the sites listed in Chronicles are found in other texts in Joshua. A few examples may suffice to serve the general point. A couple of cautions must be registered, however, at the beginning of this exercise. To begin with, it is not at all clear whether in a given instance the discrepancy between the name of a site in Chronicles and the name of a site in (MT) Joshua stems from textual corruption.⁵³ In what follows, I have eliminated discrepancies that can easily be explained by recourse to textual criticism. Even so, some of the following examples evince text-critical complications. There are also some cases in which one or more of the LXX witnesses to Joshua line up with

⁵² For more details see my *I Chronicles 1–9*, 437–450.

⁵³ Most of the discrepancies in names can be explained text-critically. In this respect, the following examples may be exceptional.

readings in Chronicles.⁵⁴ In these instances, the issue is not so much textual corruption as it is variant witnesses to the text of Joshua itself. Granting this phenomenon, it is nevertheless useful to examine whether a given reading of a toponym shared by LXX Joshua and Chronicles lines up with other readings in Joshua or Chronicles.

1. עשן, "Ashan"

First Chronicles 6:44 mentions "Ashan" as a Aaronide Qohathite settlement in Judah, whereas MT Josh 21:16 mentions "Ain" (עין).⁵⁵ Elsewhere "Ashan" appears in the Shephelah district of Judah (Josh 15:42) and in the Simeonite allotment (Josh 19:7). The latter text is paralleled by the Simeonite genealogy (1 Chr 4:32), but the settlement does not elsewhere reappear in Chronicles. The same site may be referred to as בור עשן ("the well of Ashan") in 1 Sam 30:30.

2. ראמות, "Ramoth"⁵⁶

One of the Gershonite settlements is referred to as "Ramoth" in 1 Chr 6:58, but as "Jarmuth" (ירמות) in MT Josh 21:29.⁵⁷ In the allotment assigned to Issachar, "Remeth" (רמת) appears (MT Josh 19:21), but the site does not appear again in Chronicles.

⁵⁴ For more detail, see Svensson, *Towns and Toponyms*, 121–123, 138, 143–148.

⁵⁵ But there is a textual issue. LXX^a Josh 21:16 registers Ασα (cf. LXX 1 Chr 6:44 Ασσ), hence there is a distinct possibility that the Chronicler's *Vorlage* read עשן.

⁵⁶ To be distinguished from "Ramoth (in) Gilead," assigned to Gad (Josh 21:38// 1 Chr 6:65), which does appear elsewhere in Joshua (20:8) and Chronicles (2 Chr 18:3–28// 1 Kgs 22:3–29).

⁵⁷ But LXX^b Josh 21:29 registers Ῥεμμάθ. See the previous textual note.

3. חוקק, "Huqoq"

One of the Gershonite sites associated with the tribe of Asher is named "Huqoq" in 1 Chr 6:60, but "Helqath" (חלקת) in Josh 21:31. Both appear elsewhere in Joshua (19:25; 19:34),⁵⁸ but not in Chronicles.

4. קרייתים, "Qiriathaim"

This Gershonite site in Naphtali (1 Chr 6:61) appears as "Qartan" (קרתן) in Josh 21:32. "Qiriathaim" is elsewhere mentioned in connection with Reuben (Num 32:37; Josh 13:19), but is not mentioned again in Chronicles.⁵⁹

5. תבור, "Tabor"

First Chronicles 6:62 mentions "Tabor" as a Merarite town in Zebulun, but Josh 21:35 offers "Nahalal" (נהלל). This site is mentioned in the Zebulunite allotment of Josh 19:15.⁶⁰ The appearance in Chronicles is surprising, because Tabor is normally referred to as a mountain (e.g., Judg 4:6–14; 8:18; Jer 46:18; Ps 89:13) and not as a settlement.⁶¹ In any event, (Mt.) Tabor is mentioned elsewhere in Joshua (19:12, 22, 34), but not in Chronicles.

6. עלמת, "Alemeth"

Benjaminite "Alemeth" in 1 Chr 6:45 differs slight from MT Josh 21:18 "Almon" (עלמון). The latter does not reappear in either book, but "Alemeth" is mentioned in the Benjaminite genealogies (1 Chr 7:8; 8:36 / 9:42).⁶² Hence,

⁵⁸ The latter (Josh 19:34) with the locative ending, חוקקה. Cf. LXX^A Josh 19:34 ἰ(α)αωκ.

⁵⁹ It may appear as *qrytn* on the Mesha stele (KAI 181.10).

⁶⁰ It also appears as נהלל in Judg 1:30.

⁶¹ As a sacred site, see Hos 5:1.

⁶² It is curious that Almon/Alemeth does not appear in the townlist of Benjamin (Josh 18:21–28). The possibility that a whole-phrase haplography involving several towns (homoioteleuton) occurred in an earlier version of the text cannot be dismissed; Z. Kallai, *Historical Geography of the Bible: The Tribal Territories of Israel* (Leiden/Jerusalem: Brill/Magnes, 1986) 399–400. Unfortunately, the evidence

this may be a counter-example to the pattern sketched above (II.B.1–5). The evidence could suggest an original reference in Chronicles or that an older reference in Joshua has been updated to its new context in Chronicles. But there is a text-critical issue: LXX^B Josh 21:18 reads Γαμαλα, LXX^A reads τὴν ἄλμων, and the Old Latin reads *Galamath*. In this case, one cannot discount the possibility of a ligature, namely that the letter נ was read as נן by a scribe working in the textual tradition represented by MT Joshua.⁶³ Hence, it is very possible that the slight variation between the two texts may be explained by text-critical means.⁶⁴

With respect to the composition of Josh 21, the argument has been made that its authors drew on earlier materials in Joshua 13, 19, and 20.⁶⁵ Given the evidence presented above, it may well be that the authors of Josh 21 drew from other texts in Joshua as well. The toponyms found in Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6 overlap with the toponyms found in the tribal allotments of Josh 13–19. In any event, study of the place names in Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6 reaches conclusions similar to those reached about terminology, style, and expressions (II.A.1–9). The account dealing with the Levitical towns, as attested by MT Joshua and MT Chronicles, fits better within the setting of Joshua than it does within the setting of Chronicles. The conclusion holds true even if one focuses on those toponyms that appear to be unique to Chronicles or on those toponyms that are shared by Chronicles and LXX

supplied by LXX Joshua does not help, in this case, in reconstructing an older form of the list. The witnesses to LXX Joshua do help to reconstruct an older form of the townlist of Judah (LXX Josh 15:59a).

⁶³ R. Weiss discusses this phenomenon, “On Ligatures in the Hebrew Bible (נו=ם),” *JBL* 82 (1963) 188–94. See also Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 249.

⁶⁴ MT (and LXX^{AN}) 1 Chr 6:61 “Ḥammon” may also reflect a ת/ן error; L. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Masoretic Text* (VTSup 25; Leiden: Brill, 1974) 188. LXX^B 1 Chr 6:61 reads Χαμωθ. The parallel in MT Josh 21:32 reads חמת דאר (LXX^B Νεμμαθ). MT Josh 19:35 חמת (LXX^B Ωμαθα; LXX^{AN} Αμαθ).

⁶⁵ Na’aman, *Borders and Districts*, 209–212.

Joshua over against MT Joshua (II.B.1,2). Looking at the transmission of the Levitical townlist, it is entirely plausible that this account was modified or updated to reflect the ideals of writers in different circumstances and times.⁶⁶ Such a theory would explain at least some of the variations in geopolitical names. Close study of the variants among MT Joshua, LXX Joshua, and Chronicles suggests that most of these changes occurred within the history of the text of Joshua, perhaps at a pre-Chronistic stage of development.⁶⁷ Given the affinity between many of the lemmata in Chronicles and those of LXX Joshua, there is little evidence that the Chronicler himself updated the toponyms found in his *Vorlage*.

III. Is there a Method to the Chronicler's Madness?

The contextualization of the Levitical townlist in Joshua raises the larger question of why the Chronicler drew from this account in composing his own work. If many of the locutions, stylistic devices, toponyms, and concepts of this passage are foreign to Chronicles, why include the work at all? One finds an initial clue to the resolution of this issue in the Chronicler's own introduction, because it brings the townlist into some conformity with the material dealing with land in the other tribal lineages. In the setting of the author's presentation, the foreword to the Levitical settlements: "These are their places of residence according to their settlements within their territories" (1 Chr 6:39a), has its own integrity and purpose. Having provided readers with lineages for the tribe of Levi (5:27–41; 6:1–38), the writer supplies information about their places of residence (6:39–66). In this respect, the treatment of Levi is similar to that of the other tribes. Information about identity and descent is coupled with information about settlements and history. To this it may be added that the tripartite division

⁶⁶ The importance of this consideration was stressed to me by Paul Dion (personal communication).

⁶⁷ Alternatively, some changes could have occurred in the textual tradition(s) of Joshua after the Chronicler borrowed the account from his *Vorlage*. See further the conclusions to this essay.

of the Levitical tribe into three phratries (the Gershonites, Qohathites, and Merarites) in Josh 21 conforms to the Chronicler's own presentation (1 Chr 5:27; 6:1).

Having included the older account within his own work, the Chronicler develops select motifs from this work within his own narrative. For example, the notion that the Levites lived in certain towns and had access to the open lands of these towns is reflected on a number of occasions in the Chronicler's story of the Judahite monarchy.⁶⁸ The Deuteronomistic story of the monarchy lacks all such references. The author has thus made some attempt to integrate the text from Joshua within his own narrative, even though he has not overwritten the older passage.

What, then, should one make of the disorder in the Chronicler's account? As we have seen, the (dis)organization of the Chronistic passage has been cited as clear evidence that the logical progression in Joshua is a secondary development, an attempt to unify and reorder the older account of 1 Chr 6. I would like to argue the opposite view. The Levitical townlist shows signs of having been rearranged and adjusted to a new literary setting in Chronicles.⁶⁹ The argument can be made on two levels. A couple of transitional statements that appear to be quite awkward in 1 Chr 6:39–66 are best explained by their recontextualization in a new literary setting. These expressions, appearing at the seams of the older text, appear as odd in Chronicles precisely because the Chronicler has rearranged his Joshua *Vorlage* to suit his own purposes. One can also make the argument by recourse to structure. The organization of the passage in Chronicles bears its own narrative logic, although that logic may not be apparent at first glance.

⁶⁸ See 1 Chr 13:2, 2 Chr 11:14, and 31:19, texts that are unparalleled in Samuel–Kings. The term מגרש appears some forty times in (MT) 1 Chr 6 and over fifty times in (MT) Josh 21. Elsewhere the term is not nearly so common, Lev 25:34; Num 35:2, 3, 5, 7; Josh 14:4; Ezek 27:28; 36:5; 45:2; 48:17.

⁶⁹ See also the comments of S.J. De Vries, *I and II Chronicles* (FOTL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989) 64–68; M. Kartveit, *Motive und Schichten der Landtheologie in I Chronik 1–9* (ConBOT 28; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1989) 69–77; Schmitt, "Levitenstädte," 37–40.

It may be appropriate to begin with the placement of transitional expressions. In 1 Chr 6:50 the text speaks of certain towns being “designated by name” in Judah, Benjamin, and Simeon, but the towns go unspecified in the following verses (1 Chr 6:51–66). This is puzzling. Auld presents this verse as a (later) pedantic note, referring back to the list of Aaronide sites in 1 Chr 6:39–45.⁷⁰ The reference in 1 Chr 6:50 cannot be to the overviews immediately preceding (1 Chr 6:46–49), because these overviews do not mention any specific sites. The best explanation of the evidence points to a point of origination in Joshua. There, the list of Aaronide Qohathite towns (Josh 21:10–18) appears immediately after the introductory overview of the Aaronide Qohathite settlements in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin (Josh 21:9//6:50). In this respect, the order in Joshua elucidates the presentation in Chronicles. The Chronicler’s repositioning of the list of Aaronide Qohathite towns at the beginning of his own account has created a problem. In conformity with its source (Josh 21:9), 1 Chr 6:50 speaks of specifying certain towns by name, but the relevant towns appear earlier. All of the introductory material the writer draws from his source text (Josh 21:5–8//1 Chr 6:46–49), including the introduction to the Qohathite settlements in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin (Josh 21:9//1 Chr 6:50), appears after the actual list of such Qohathite settlements. One of the narrative seams used to order and unify the older account is still visible in the new setting.⁷¹ In the context of Chronicles, the introductions to the towns held by each of the three major Levitical groups (1 Chr 6:46–49//Josh 21:5–8), which forms a natural bridge to the lists of towns for the remaining Qohathites, the Gershonites, and the Merarites (6:51–66//Josh 21:20–37), is interrupted by this notice referring to the Aaronide Qohathite towns.⁷²

⁷⁰ *Joshua Retold*, 27.

⁷¹ The question of whether this incongruity resulted from the Chronicler’s own “infelicitous” editing (Curtis and Madsen, *Chronicles*, 137) or from the work of a later editor (Benzinger, *Bücher der Chronik*, 24; Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 61, 63; Braun, *Chronicles*, 99–100) is debated.

⁷² One can argue that the notice of 1 Chr 6:50 (/Josh 21:9) takes on a new meaning in Chronicles, functioning more as a summary than as part of a larger preamble to

To take another example, 1 Chr 6:62 speaks of an allotment of towns “to the remaining descendants of Merari” (לבני מררי הנותרים). The choice of such terminology is quite surprising in this context, because this verse introduces the only listing of Merarite settlements (vv. 62–66). Auld’s explanation for this use of terminology is that the Merarites were the only one of the three groups (the Qohathites, the Gershonites, the Merarites), introduced in vv. 46–49, that the writer had left to discuss.⁷³ In this line of interpretation, the adjective (“the remaining”) refers not so much to the preceding noun (“Merarites”) as it does to the larger understood subject (the Levitical families). But is this line of interpretation compelling? When similar terminology was used earlier in the account in 1 Chr 6:46 (//Josh 21:5), ולבני קהת הנותרים, “to the remaining sons of Qohath,” it means those Qohathites who had not been referred to before. In other words, the expression is used to signify all those Qohathites who were not among the descendants of Aaron mentioned earlier. In the case of 1 Chr 6:62, one would think that “the remaining descendants of Merari” (לבני מררי הנותרים) would refer to those Merarites who had not been specified in previous verses. Oddly enough, I think that Auld’s interpretation can be salvaged by recourse to textual criticism. The parallel in MT Josh 21:34 reads, “to the families of the sons of Merari, the remaining Levites” (ולמשפחת בני מררי הלויים הנותרים). On this basis, one can see that a loss of text may have occurred in the Chronicler’s text through homoioteleuton. The original would have read, “to the descendants of Merari, the remaining Levites” (לבני מררי הלויים הנותרים). But the very case for homoioteleuton is damaging to the view that

the list of the Levitical towns in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin (Josh 21:10–19; cf. 1 Chr 6:39b–45). But such a reinterpretation is necessary precisely because the statement has been borrowed from Joshua and placed in a new literary setting.

⁷³ *Joshua Retold*, 52.

Chronicles is older than Joshua. One has to assume the text of Joshua to make sense of Chronicles.⁷⁴

In light of our discussion of the placement of summaries and introductions in the Chronistic account, it may be useful to turn to the larger issue of the (dis)organization of this account. Analysis of the structure of the two texts augurs against viewing Joshua as derivative from Chronicles. The latter has its own internal logic. The layout in Chronicles may be sketched as follows:

The Structure of the Levitical Townlist in Chronicles

Introduction	6:39a
Qohathite Aaronide Towns in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin	6:39b–45a
Numerical Summary for Qohathite Aaronides	6:45b
Overview for Other Qohathites in Ephraim, Dan and East Manasseh	6:46
Overview for Gershonites in Issachar, Asher, Naphtali, and Manasseh in Bashan	6:47
Overview for Merarites in Reuben, Gad, and Zebulun	6:48
General Summary	6:49
Summary of Settlements in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin	6:50
Qohathite Towns in Ephraim, Dan, and East Manasseh	6:51–55
Gershonite Towns in East Manasseh, Issachar, Asher, and Naphtali	6:56–61
Merarite Towns in Zebulun, Reuben, and Gad	6:62–66

Having provided his introduction to the Levitical towns account (1 Chr 6:39a), the author immediately lists the towns set apart for the Qohathite Aaronides (1 Chr 6:39b–45a//Josh 21:10–18). It is important to note that over against his pattern elsewhere, he also includes the numerical summary of thirteen Qohathite Aaronide towns found in Joshua (1 Chr 6:45b//Josh 21:19). The arrangement of material in Chronicles foregrounds the Aaronide inheritance. This raises a larger question: why did the Chronicler rearrange his source? In my judgment, the new sequence highlights the assignments given to the sons of Aaron, contextualized within the Qohathite phratry,

⁷⁴ Or, to sustain the argument for the dependence of Joshua upon Chronicles, one would have to make the case that the writer of the Joshua account borrowed from a textual witness to Chronicles in which the missing material was still present.

and honors the distinction that the Chronicler observes between the tribe of Levi and those specific members (Aaronides) of this tribe, who serve as priests.⁷⁵ Such a reordering brings the Chronicler's text into line with his presentation of the Levitical genealogies. There he lists one particular priestly succession—the sons of Qohath through Amram and Aaron (1 Chr 5:27–41) before discussing the other descendants of Levi, including the other Qohathites (1 Chr 6:7ff.).⁷⁶

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Qohathite Aaronide Priests
(1 Chr 5:27–41) | 1. Qohathite Aaronide Towns
(1 Chr 6:39b–45) |
| 2. Gershonite, Qohathite, Merarite
Singers (1 Chr 6:1–38) | 2. Qohathite, Gershonite, Merarite
Towns (1 Chr 6:46–49, 51–66) |

The author thus brings the order of the Levitical townlist into conformity with his own presentation of the Levitical genealogies. Having pushed forward the list of the Aaronide Qohathite towns, the Chronicler returns to the basic order provided by his source. In this respect, the minor changes and omissions he makes to this source are telling. He skips the introductory enumeration of the towns awarded to the Qohathite Aaronides (Josh 21:4) and continues with the introductory tallies of Levitical towns awarded to the other Qohathites (Josh 21:5//1 Chr 6:46), the Gershonites (Josh 21:6//1 Chr 6:47), and the Merarites (Josh 21:7//1 Chr 6:48). Following the order of Joshua, he includes the summary (Josh 21:8//1 Chr 6:49) and the

⁷⁵ That the issue is not primarily the Qohathites vs. the other Levitical phratries (the Gershonites and the Merarites) can be seen in the order of other Chronic lists (1 Chr 5:27; 6:2, 5). There, Gershon (consistently spelled Gershom in the MT, but Gershon in the LXX) and his descendants appear first, presumably because Gershon is the firstborn of Levi (1 Chr 5:27; 6:1). But Chronicles is not entirely consistent in this matter. In the ascending lineages of the Levitical singers (1 Chr 6:18–32), the Qohathites appear first, followed by the Gershonites and the Merarites.

⁷⁶ G.N. Knoppers, "The Relationship of the Priestly Genealogies to the History of the High Priesthood in Jerusalem," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, (ed. O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003) 109–133.

introduction to the Levitical towns in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin (Josh 21:9//1 Chr 6:50).

His decision to begin with the Aaronide Qohathite towns explains why he omits the introductory overview of the Qohathite Aaronide settlements (Josh 21:4), when he returns to the earlier material in his source (Josh 21:4–8). This overview was unnecessary to the Chronicler's purposes, because it duplicates the content of the summary found in 1 Chr 6:45b (//Josh 21:19). A similar pattern may be observed in his treatment of the other material he inherited from his source. Because he includes the introductory tallies for the remaining Qohathites (v. 46), the Gershonites (v. 47), and the Merarites (v. 48), he can omit the summary tallies for them occurring after the actual townlists: the Qohathites (Josh 21:26), the Gershonites (Josh 21:33), and the Merarites (Josh 21:38). In this respect, the Chronicler is consistent. He has provided only one summary tally for each of the four groups in the Levitical towns account. But the makeup and placement of those summaries vary and his procedure can only be explained by recourse to the organization of his source.

IV. Comparative Textual Analysis and Expansions in the Book of Joshua

One issue remains. If the author of Chronicles borrowed his material from Joshua, why is his text significantly shorter than that of Joshua? One possibility that we have already discussed is the phenomenon of haplography (including whole-phrase haplography), which is amply in evidence in 1 Chr 6.⁷⁷ Yet this phenomenon does not amount to any kind of a full explanation of Chronicles' brevity in relation to either LXX or MT

⁷⁷ Another theory that might be mentioned in this context is the common source hypothesis, which views the presentations of the Levitical towns in Chronicles and Joshua as derived from a common (lost) source. See B. Mazar, "The Cities of the Priests and the Levites," in *Congress Volume: Oxford 1959* (ed. G.W. Anderson et al.; VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960) 193–205. Following this theory, one could say that Joshua expanded the shared source more than Chronicles did. I find this theory to be unconvincing, because the Chronicler's text bears a number of traits that show the influence of the formulation and structure of Joshua.

Joshua. Another possibility is that the writer greatly abridged his *Vorlage*. The Chronicler is perfectly capable of selecting from and shortening his sources.⁷⁸ Recourse to selectivity and abridgment clarifies why some summaries are not found in his account (see above) and why his introduction is shorter than that of Joshua. The non-appearance of the concluding material in Josh 21:41–43 within Chronicles can be variously interpreted.⁷⁹

Nevertheless, I do not think that condensation suffices as a complete explanation of the many pluses in Joshua. To begin with, whether all the other numerical subtotals found in Joshua were present in the Chronicler's source is unclear. It is possible that he omitted the many numerical subtotals in Joshua (21:19, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37 [LXX], 38), as well as the grand summary of forty-eight towns (Josh 21:39–40).⁸⁰ But it is also possible that not all of these tallies were part of his *Vorlage*.⁸¹ In dealing with the differences between Chronicles and Joshua, one has to reckon with the distinct likelihood that the Chronicler employed a variant, shorter, and typologically earlier version of Josh 21.

⁷⁸ The Chronicler's universal genealogy (1 Chr 1:1–2:2), culled from texts in Genesis, is a case in point. Precious little of the narrative material found in Genesis appears in Chronicles. Moreover, 1 Chr 1:1–2:2 includes only some of the anecdotes included in the lineages of Genesis. See my "Shem, Ham, and Japheth: The Universal and the Particular in the Genealogy of Nations," in *The Chronicler as Theologian* (ed. M.P. Graham, S.L. McKenzie, and G.N. Knoppers; JSOTSup 371; London: T. & T. Clark/Continuum, 2003) 13–31.

⁷⁹ The issue is difficult to resolve, because the Chronicler may not have thought of Josh 21:41ff. as the conclusion to the townlist, but rather as the introduction to the following account—Josh 22:1ff. (see n. 8). Whether the Chronicler's *Vorlage* contained the plus in LXX Joshua (21:42a–d) may be, therefore, impossible to determine. There is no positive indication that it did; but, given the absence of all the material from the end of the Joshua townlist (21:41–43) from Chronicles, there is no way to be certain.

⁸⁰ So Japhet, *Chronicles*, 148.

⁸¹ So Na'aman, *Borders and Districts*, 209.

For comparative purposes, one should have recourse to the other major passage in Chronicles (1 Chr 4:28–33) that has been drawn from Joshua (19:1–9).⁸² As with the Levitical townlist, there are numerous variants (toponyms, phraseology, grammatical constructions, etc.) between the two pericopes, not all of which can be explained through textual corruption. As with the Levitical townlist, Chronicles lacks most of the introductory and concluding material found in Joshua. The differences in contextualization may be attributed to the reuse of the Joshua passage in Chronicles. In Joshua the various Simeonite sites appear as an inheritance awarded to this sodality within the confines of the territory awarded to Judah (Josh 19:1–2a, 8b–9). Granting the likelihood that the introductory colophon and conclusion of the Joshua text were in the Chronicler's *Vorlage*, it appears that the inclusion of such materials did not suit the Chronicler's own purposes.⁸³ He focused on the sites themselves, adding only the briefest of introductions: **וישבו**, "And they resided" (1 Chr 4:28), as well as his own summary: **זאת מושבתם**, "Such were their dwelling places" (1 Chr 4:33).⁸⁴ Of the two numerical summaries appearing in the pericope dealing with the inheritance of Simeon (Josh 19:6, 7), one appears in the Simeonite genealogy (1 Chr 4:32).⁸⁵ The other is lacking. In its stead, one finds a narrative

⁸² Aspects of the text of Joshua are also reflected in 1 Chr 2:7 (cf. LXX^B and Pesh. Josh 7:1 Αχαρ; MT Josh 7:1 עכנן), 7:28 (cf. Josh 16:7), and 7:29 (cf. Josh 17:11). For the case that the author of 1 Chr 4:28–33 was drawing from Josh 19:1–9 and not from the longer text of Josh 15:26–32, 42, see my *I Chronicles 1–9*. Some believe that Josh 19:1–9 has itself been derived from the base text of Joshua 15, A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (München: Beck, 1953), 2.285–86; Noth, *Josua*, 113; cf. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 38.

⁸³ Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 120–27.

⁸⁴ The next clause, **והתיחשם להם**, "And their genealogical enrollment," constitutes the introduction to the following list of Simeonite proper names in 4:34–38, rather than the conclusion to the list of geographical names in 4:28–33. See my *I Chronicles 1–9*, 362, 367.

⁸⁵ Although the actual number (five) is higher, because Chronicles includes a site not mentioned in Joshua (Tochen). Both lists count Ain Rimmon (עין רמון) as two different sites. Cf. Josh 15:32.

summary: “These were their towns until David became king” (אלה עריהם עד (מלך דויד; 1 Chr 4:31). In short, one finds the Chronicler making full use of the geographical material within the Joshua passage, while replacing its literary contextualization with his own. In dealing with the Levitical townlist and the Simeonite allotment, one finds similar editorial processes at work. Given that the Chronicler occasionally includes numerical summaries and ordinals elsewhere in his genealogies,⁸⁶ employs some numerical summaries within his own account of the Levitical towns (see above), and incorporates numerical summaries in lists he includes within his work,⁸⁷ there is no obvious reason why he should have omitted all of the other numerical summaries in the Joshua townlist.

A. Pluses in Joshua

In what follows, I would like to provide some examples of pluses in Joshua over against Chronicles. Not included in the following list are variants and obvious cases of homoiarkton and homoioteleuton.⁸⁸ The instances of homoiarkton and homoioteleuton should be classified as minuses in Chronicles, rather than as pluses in Joshua. Nor will I deal with the references to asylum towns found in Joshua, which are lacking in Chronicles, since these references are a special issue.⁸⁹ Rather, my intention

⁸⁶ See, for example, 1 Chr 2:3, 4, 6, 13–16; 3:1–4, 8, 15, 20, 22–24; 7:3, 6, 7; 8:1–2, 39.

⁸⁷ See, for example, 1 Chr 12:10–14, 25–38; 15:5–10; 16:38; 23:3–5, 8, 10–12, 19, 20, 23; 25:3, 7, 9–31; 26:8, 9–31; 26:2–5, 8, 9, 11, 17; 27:1–15.

⁸⁸ Because of the variants between Joshua and Chronicles, not all of which can be explained text-critically, it seems likely that the text of Joshua employed by the Chronicler also differed on occasion from the textual traditions represented in LXX and MT Joshua; see Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 431–436.

⁸⁹ Compare Josh 21:13, 21, 27, 32, 38 with 1 Chr 6:42, 52. Some think that the Chronicler designates all of the Levitical towns as asylum towns (Auld, *Joshua Retold*, 37–38; Svensson, *Towns and Toponyms*, 83). It is also possible that he designates only two towns (Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 148) or two groups of towns (Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 438) as asylum towns. In any case, there is general

is to point to instances in which one may see clear indications that the Chronicler's *Vorlage* was shorter than MT Joshua. Reference to LXX Joshua is useful in this context, because it is sometimes briefer than MT Joshua. For the sake of convenience, I will take the text of Chronicles as a reference point. The following tabulation does not pretend to be exhaustive.⁹⁰

1. 6:39—"the Qohathites" (הקהתי)

MT and LXX Josh 21:10 clarify by adding "from the sons of Levi" (מבני לוי). In this case, one cannot rule out the possibility that the text in question was lost by homoioteleuton. But there are few actual references to priests and Levites in the Chronicles version of the list.⁹¹

2. 6:39—"the lot" (הגורל)

Some commentators insert "first" on the basis of the Syriac and Arabic witnesses to Chronicles, but these versions correct toward the longer lemma of MT Josh 21:10 (הגורל ריאשונה). The adjective ריאשונה is lacking in LXX* Josh 21:10.

3. 6:40—"Hebron"

MT and LXX Josh 21:11 preface, "Qiryat Arba the father of Anaq, that is" (את קרית ארבע אבי הענוק היא), an explanation that is probably based on Josh 15:13, "Qiryat Arba the father of Anaq, that is (Hebron)" (את קרית ארבע אבי (הענק היא חברון)).

agreement that we are dealing in this case with a deliberate authorial change (whether by the author of Chronicles or the author of Joshua).

⁹⁰ In my judgment, the Chronicler's text has, in this case, been subject to many instances of haplography (*I Chronicles* 1–9, 432–436). Because I see many more minuses in Chronicles than most scholars do, my list of pluses in Joshua may be conservative (briefer than those that might be compiled by others).

⁹¹ A point stressed by Auld, *Joshua Retold*, 25–26, 113–119.

4. 6:41—"Jephunneh" (יפנה)

MT and LXX Josh 21:12 specify by adding "as (MT adds: his) estate" (באחזתו).

5. 6:42—"Aaron" (אהרן)

MT Josh 21:13 adds "the priest." It is possible that הכהן has been lost by homoioteleuton, but it seems more likely that MT Joshua represents an expansion. The term הכהן is lacking in LXX* Josh 21:13.

6. 6:45—"all of their towns" (כל עריהם)

The longer text of MT and LXX Josh 21:19 "all of the towns of the Aaronide priests" (כל ערי בני אהרן הכהנים) clarifies an older, briefer lemma.

7. 6:47—"and from the tribe of Manasseh" (וממטה מנשה)

The more expansive MT and LXX Josh 21:6 specify by reading "and from the half-tribe of Manasseh" (ומחצי מטה מנשה). In this case, one cannot rule out the possibility that מחצי was lost by homoioarkton, but the longer reading is not necessary to make sense of the Chronicler's text.⁹²

8. 6:47—"in Bashan"

MT Josh 21:6 expands by adding "by lot" (בגורל). This plus is lacking in LXX* Josh 21:6.

9. 6:49—"towns" (את הערים)

Josh 21:8, along with Syriac and Arabic 1 Chr 6:49, specify by adding the demonstrative pronoun, "these" (האלה). The demonstrative pronoun is lacking in LXX Josh 21:8.

⁹² For a different view, see Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 60.

10. 6:49—“along with their open land”

MT and LXX Josh 21:8 add a theological expansion, “as YHWH commanded (MT adds: through the hand of) Moses by lot” (כאשר צוה ה' ביד משה בגורל).

11. 6:52—“towns of refuge” (עירי המקלט)

Josh 21:21 reads the singular, “town of refuge” (עיר מקלט).⁹³ The addition in MT (and LXX) Josh 21:21, “of manslayer” (הרצח), recalls the terminology used in Num 35:12,30 and MT Josh 20:2–3 and conforms to the verbiage found in Josh 21:13, 27, 32, 38 (עירי מקלט הרצח).

12. 6:62—“Zebulun”⁹⁴

It is theoretically possible that the addition of “Qartah along with its open land” (את קרתה ואת מגרשה) in MT and LXX Josh 21:34 represents a minus in Chronicles (whole-phrase haplography).⁹⁵ Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that the plus in Joshua is suspect, given the testimony of Josh 21:32 (את קרתן ואת מגרשה).

13. 6:63—“Bezer in the wilderness” (את בצר במדבר).

Some witnesses to LXX Josh 21:36 expand by adding τῆ Μισωρ (transliterating Heb. מִיֶּשֶׁר). In so doing, they bring the Joshua text more in

⁹³ See Section II.A.3.

⁹⁴ The temptation to add “Joqneam along with its open land” to this list should probably be resisted, even though MT Josh 21:34 (cf. LXX^B Μααν; LXX^A Εκναμ) contains this phrase and MT and LXX^B 1 Chr 6:62 lack it. MT and LXX^B 1 Chr 6:62 may have lost the phrase due to homoioteleuton. It appears in LXX^{AN} (Ιεραμα), cursives cehin, and Arm. 1 Chr 6:62. Alternatively, one could treat the lemma of LXX^{AN} as a correction toward MT Joshua, but these LXX witnesses contain relatively few such corrections.

⁹⁵ There is evidence of haplography elsewhere in this verse; see Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 436.

line with Deut 4:43, “Bezer in the wilderness in the Tableland” (בצר במדבר) (בארץ המישר).⁹⁶

Examination of the aforementioned pluses in Joshua allows for some generalizations.⁹⁷ LXX Joshua occasionally lines up with Chronicles in sharing minuses over against MT Joshua (IV.A.2, 8, 9). Only once do some Hebrew witnesses to Joshua, MT Chronicles, and LXX Chronicles share a briefer text in comparison with LXX Joshua (IV.A.13). This evidence supports the notion that LXX Joshua functions to some degree as an intermediary text between Chronicles and MT Joshua.

B. Pluses in Chronicles

For the sake of completeness, one should also examine whether the text of Chronicles exhibits pluses over against MT or LXX Joshua. If Chronicles exhibited a whole range of materials that were not found in either LXX and MT Joshua, one would have to refrain from drawing any conclusion that the Chronicler’s source was shorter than LXX or MT Joshua. Nevertheless, as the following tally makes clear, MT and LXX Chronicles share very few pluses over against MT or LXX Joshua. Not included in the following list

⁹⁶ 1 Chr 6:63–64 are not attested in MT Joshua, although some Hebrew MSS contain them (cf. above, nn. 18–19).

⁹⁷ One should also observe that the Simeonite allotment of Josh 19:8 exhibits a plus (עד בעלת באר ראמת נגב, “Baalath Beer, Ramoth Negeb”) over against its parallel in the Simeonite genealogy of 1 Chr 4:33 (עד בעל, “as far as Baal”). LXX^B Josh 19:8 is garbled, ἕως Βαρὲκ πορευομένων Βάμεθ κατὰ λίβα, “as far as Balek journeying to Bameth southward.” LXX^A Josh 19:8 seems to correct back toward the tradition of the MT, ἕως Βααλεθ βηρ ραμωθ πορευομένων Ιαμεθ κατὰ λίβα. There is potentially a second plus in MT Josh 19:2 (באר שבע ושבע) in comparison to MT 1 Chr 4:28 (בבאר שבע). Nevertheless, in this case, I am inclined to read with LXX 1 Chr 4:28 ἐν Βηρσαβει καὶ Σαμα(α) (= באר שבע ושמע). See also MT and LXX Josh 15:26 (שמע), and LXX^B and OL Josh 19:2 Βηρσάβει καὶ Σάμμα. This evidence suggests that a haplography (homoioteleuton) has occurred from באר שבע to שמע(ו). First Chr 4:28–33 exhibits one plus over against the list contained in Josh 19:1–9. There is an additional site in 1 Chr 4:32 (ותכן; “and Tochen”) in relation to the sites mentioned in Josh 19:7.

are obvious cases of homoioarkton and homoioteleuton that should be classified as minuses in Joshua, rather than as pluses in Chronicles.

1. 6:46 – “from the half-tribe of half-Manasseh” (ממחצית מטה חצי המנשה)

MT and LXX Josh 21:5 are briefer, “from the half-tribe of Manasseh” (מחצי מטה מנשה). In this case, the versions to 1 Chr 6:46 probably have the earlier reading, “from the half-tribe of Manasseh” (ממחצית מטה מנשה). The addition of superfluous חצי in MT 1 Chr 6:46 may have been influenced by the use of חצי in Josh 21:5.

2. 6:48—“by lot” (בגורל)

Thus MT and LXX and Chronicles. Lacking in MT Josh 21:7, but present in LXX* 21:7.

3. 6:50—“by lot”

MT and LXX Josh 21:9 are lacking.

4. 6:63—“to the east of the Jordan” (למזרח הירדן)

Thus MT and LXX^B Chronicles (κατὰ δυσμὰς τοῦ ἰορδάνου).⁹⁸ It is lacking in LXX Joshua and in most extant Hebrew witnesses to Josh 21:36.⁹⁹ It is conceivable that this phrase was lost due to homoioteleuton after ומעבר לירדן, “and from across the Jordan.” But it is more likely that 1 Chr 6:63 incorporates a double reading.

It is relevant to observe that of these four pluses, two are textually disputed (IV.B.1, 4). In one case, Chronicles agrees with LXX Joshua over against MT Joshua (IV.B.2). Given the paucity of pluses in Chronicles and the many pluses in Joshua, especially in MT Joshua, one can surmise that

⁹⁸ LXX Josh 21:36: prefaces καὶ πέραν τοῦ ἰορδάνου τοῦ κατὰ ἰερίχω, before ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ῥουβήν, but 1 Chr 6:63 is even longer, ומעבר לירדן ירחו למזרח הירדן. Some Medieval Hebrew MSS simply begin 21:36 with ומטה ראובן.

⁹⁹ Josh 21:36–37 are missing from MT Joshua, because of haplography (nn. 18–19).

the Chronicler's *Vorlage* of Joshua was shorter than either MT or LXX Joshua. If many of the numerical subtotals found in MT and LXX Joshua were not part of the Chronicler's source and the grand summary of Josh 21:39–40 was also absent from his source, one has to reckon that his *Vorlage* was a considerably shorter text than most scholars have thought.

V. Conclusions

Given the comparative evidence *vis-à-vis* Josh 21, as well as the larger literary dynamic of the Chronicler's presentation of the Levitical genealogies, one is led to offer a different view of the relationship between Joshua and Chronicles from either the traditional theory or the new theory championed by Auld. The townlist does not represent an indigenous development within the text of Chronicles, but a borrowing from another biblical context. With some exceptions (e.g., the introductory colophon, the summary conclusion), the author did not greatly abbreviate his source. The Chronicler employed an earlier and briefer form of Joshua than can be found in the shorter (LXX) and longer (MT) forms of Joshua. On occasion, the Joshua source employed by the Chronicler differs from the witnesses to Joshua.¹⁰⁰

In drawing from his version of Joshua, the Chronicler did not simply passively appropriate material from his source. He recontextualized, edited, and rearranged his *Vorlage* so that it reflected something of his own distinctive point of view. The rearrangement of his source allowed the writer to conform the Levitic townlist to his own preferred way of organizing the Levitical lineages. It should be observed, however, that the supplementation and rewriting of his source was sparse, being largely

¹⁰⁰ The same is basically true for the Simeonite inheritance in Joshua (19:1–9) in relationship to the Simeonite lineage (1 Chr 4:28–33). Not all of the variants between the two texts can be attributed to textual corruption or to the adaptation of the Joshua source to a new genealogical context in Chronicles. Some of the differences can be best explained by recognizing that the Chronicler's *Vorlage* was not identical to either MT or LXX Joshua.

limited to the introduction of 6:39a and the categorizations of larger groups of towns as cities of refuge. Most elements of the older text still appear in the Chronicler's rendition of the Levitical townlist.

Recent studies of Joshua have explored the relationship and differences between MT and LXX Joshua. The Septuagint of Joshua exhibits occasional deviations in sequence compared to the MT. The text of LXX Joshua is approximately four to five percent shorter than MT Joshua, even though the LXX sometimes includes material that is not found in the MT. One example of this phenomenon is LXX Josh 21:42a–d, a summary section at the end of the Levitical townlist, which details the award of an inheritance to Joshua (a town on Mt. Ephraim) and comments on the fate of Joshua's circumcision knives. The sorts of additions one finds in MT Joshua (in relation to LXX Joshua) have been classified as "small elucidations, harmonizing additions, contextual additions, theological corrections, and deuteronomistic phrases."¹⁰¹ The recent publication of 4QJoshua^a and 4QJoshua^b has contributed to this picture of textual pluriformity, because one of the Qumran witnesses to Joshua (4QJosh^a) presents a particular sequence that differs from both MT and LXX Joshua.¹⁰² What is more, the 4QJosh^a (and

¹⁰¹ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 328.

¹⁰² In 4QJosh^a, Joshua and the Israelite leaders build the altar earlier (at the end of Joshua 4) and at a different location (Gilgal) than that depicted in the MT (Mt. Ebal; Josh 8:30–35) and the LXX (Mt. Ebal; Josh 9:3–8). The sequence in 4QJosh^a comports with the testimony of Josephus (*Ant.*, V.16–20). 4QJosh^a preserves a sequence of the Joshua narrative that may be prior to the other major textual witnesses to this book. For the *editio princeps*, see E.C. Ulrich, "4QJosh^a (Pls. XXXII–XXXIV)," in *Qumran Cave 4, IX: Deuteronomy to Kings* (ed. E.C. Ulrich et al.; DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995) 143–152. Further commentary may be found in L. Greenspoon, "The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle are They Part of and Where do They Fit?" in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (ed. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 159–194; Rofé, "Editing of the Book of Joshua," 73–80; Rösel, "Septuagint-Version," 6–8; E. Noort, "4QJosh^a and the History of Tradition in the Book of Joshua," *JNSL* 24 (1998) 127–144.

occasionally 4QJosh^b) fragments exhibit a number of readings that are shorter than their MT counterparts.¹⁰³

The variants among the textual witnesses to Joshua testify to the development of different literary strata in the history of certain biblical writings. The textual evidence supports the view that there were multiple stages in the growth of this biblical book.¹⁰⁴ Within the last centuries before the Common Era, one has to reckon with multiple editions of the book of Joshua. LXX Joshua bears witness to a stage in the development of this work that is earlier, or at least different, from MT Joshua. In this respect, textual criticism proves to be intimately tied to literary (source, tradition, form, redaction) criticism. Since the ancient biblical text is now recognized to be pluriform, one can no longer separate the history of its composition from the history of its interpretation and transmission.

Close analysis of the shared material between Chronicles and Joshua sheds further light on this picture. In some cases, the textual witnesses to Chronicles (primarily MT and LXX Chronicles) offer a more primitive reading than can be found among the witnesses to Joshua. In these instances, Chronicles can be used to reconstruct an earlier form of Joshua.¹⁰⁵ The evidence supplied by Chronicles provides additional confirmation for the hypothesis that there existed in antiquity multiple editions of the text of Joshua. In this context, one can agree (although for different reasons) with

¹⁰³ E. Tov, "4QJosh^b (Pls. XXXV)," in *Qumran Cave 4, IX: Deuteronomy to Kings* (ed. E.C. Ulrich et al.; DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995) 153–160.

¹⁰⁴ Auld, *Joshua Retold*, 7–18; Rofé, "End of the Book of Joshua," 17–36; E. Tov, "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in Light of the LXX Translation," in *Studies in Bible* (ed. S. Japhet; ScrHier 31; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986) 321–339; L. Mazor, "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho: A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography," *Textus* 14 (1988) 1–26; Noort, "4QJosh^a," 140–141.

¹⁰⁵ The converse is, of course, also true. In some cases, the witnesses to Joshua offer a more primitive reading than can be found in Chronicles. In these instances, material in MT and LXX Joshua may be used to recover an older form of Chronicles; see Knoppers, *I Chronicles 1–9*, 430–450.

Auld's point of view that Chronicles supplies one window into the development of the book of Joshua. From Chronicles one can learn something about the history of Joshua's composition and the history of its interpretation and transmission. The sorts of pluses one sees in MT Joshua, and to a lesser extent in LXX Joshua, are congruent with the sorts of pluses identified earlier: harmonizing additions, elucidations, specifications, and theological comments. When seen from an inner-biblical, comparative perspective, the differences in sequence among the witnesses to Joshua (MT, LXX, 4QJosh^a) do not seem so surprising. The same sort of change in sequence appears in Chronicles. Like the scribes who reordered texts within Joshua, the Chronicler reordered his Joshua source for his own purposes.¹⁰⁶

Two explanations may be suggested to account for why the Chronicler was employing a shorter, somewhat variant version of Joshua. The text of Joshua may have continued to grow (and change) after the Chronicler used it in the Persian period. In this explanation, the pluses appearing in LXX and MT Joshua are basically a post-Chronistic phenomenon. Alternatively, there may have been multiple editions of Joshua already in existence, when the author of Chronicles began his work. In this case, the Chronicler happened to employ an edition of Joshua that was somewhat different from and briefer than the editions of the work that were to make their appearance in the LXX and the MT.

¹⁰⁶ But he can scarcely be accused of introducing disorder into the Joshua account, because he left that account alone. He did not intervene within the text of Joshua, even though he reworked that text when he employed it within his own writing.