Several branches of biblical scholarship have offered contributions to our understanding of Joshua 21: commentators on the book of Joshua, students of the ancient versions, researchers into the riddles of the literary history of Torah and Former Prophets, and historians – whether of early Israel's tribal geography, or of her priestly and levitical institutions. Each of these pursuits is complex enough on its own. When they are combined, they appear unmanageable. And yet, combined the right way, they may offer us more definite answers than we could expect if each were kept separate.

In a series of studies published between 1975 and 1980 I discussed the literary history of the second half of the book of Joshua in the light of two overlapping sets of relationships: between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Joshua, and between material in Joshua and clearly related material in other books (especially Judges 1 and within 1 Chr 1-9). Quite the most complex issues to be faced were those presented by the Hebrew and Greek texts of Josh 21:1-42 and of 1 Chr 6:39-66 on the cities for the Aaronites and (other?) Levites. The consensus opinion has long been that the Chronicler's text results from a reshaping and shortening of Joshua. At that time, I argued for the opposite case: that for the most part 1 Chr 6:39-66 was the source which a late editor of Joshua had reshaped and expanded to produce Josh 21:1-42. Reasons of space and time precluded in that period publication of all the relevant evidence.

1 A first draft of this paper was read to and helpfully discussed in a meeting of Professor E. Tov's Septuagint Seminar in the Hebrew University. This fresh version, and especially the discussion of מְשָׁרָה has benefitted from my reading of Professor J. Barr's Schweich Lectures, further aspects of which I hope to discuss elsewhere.

Albright's acute study of the place-names themselves demonstrated that the city names as attested in the B text of Joshua (LXX) occupied a middle position between the remarkably different names preserved in the Hebrew texts of Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6. The conclusion has naturally been drawn that the Chronicler had as source a Hebrew text much closer to the Vorlage of Codex Vaticanus than to the Masoretic text of Josh 21; and this view is widely held. My own studies paid more attention to the whole texts, and less to the lists of city names extracted from them. These studies amply confirmed Albright's view that the Hebrew text witnessed to by the Greek of Joshua is in an intermediate position between the Hebrew texts of Joshua and of Chronicles; but they argued that the main direction of influence was from 1 Chr 6 to Josh 21 rather than the other way round. It seemed to me that the order of the Chronicler's material (the details of the grant from 'greater' Judah to Aaron, then a summary of the situation elsewhere, then a summary of the southern situation, and, only after all these, the details from the rest of the country) was more likely to have arisen from gradual growth and supplementation rather than from an author's planning. Disordered growth also helped to explain the puzzling variation in terminology, which was harder to explain in the context of the otherwise more orderly Josh 21. Josh 21 had been produced by reshaping, expanding, and bringing more logical order to the disparate materials found in 1 Chr 6:39-66. The firstfruits of that rewriting of the material can be sampled in Josh 21(LXX); and still further supplementation is apparent in MT. Of course, at this stage in the argument, it would have been possible to claim that a common source had been available to the editors of both Joshua and Chronicles, and that this source was much more extensively reworked in Joshua than in Chronicles. However, not just the prominence of Aaron (which is less marked in Joshua 21) but also the unusual order of the Levitical clans, Kohath – Gershon – Merari, finds its closest parallels in the Books of Chronicles, and this suggests influence from Chronicles on the longer Joshua version of the tradition.

The intervening years have seen further discussion of Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6, including some interesting engagement with the issues I raised. It may be useful to distinguish between three different sorts of response:
(1) Exegetical and textual:

Butler pays scrupulous and often sympathetic attention to textual proposals, accepts the evidence of deliberate adjustment by later scribes to the textual traditions represented by MT and LXX, and notes that some of my "conclusions depend upon larger literary presuppositions." I should have preferred Butler to note that some of my textual proposals had led to larger literary conclusions; however, he may be correct! Williamson, while not committing himself, notes that the consensus has been "forcefully challenged." Then Greenspoon's only relevant note is his refusal to accept the priority of LXX דובית, even although this is supported by 1 Chr 6:51, over MT יִנְעָל in Josh 21:20,40.

(2) Historico-geographical:

Many of Na'aman's observations are in fact of a text-critical nature; and some of these will be discussed below. He holds to the priority of Josh 21, but without the summaries of the tribes which had been added after the Chronicler had copied the list. He also suggests that vv. 4-7 might have been a later addition -- with 8a (sic) an example of *Wiederaufnahme* of 3a -- but an addition before the Chronicler's re-edition of the material. Against my suggestion that the Chronicler's text had grown in stages, he argues that the material fitted the time of the monarchy but not of the Chronicler. I find this a very strange comment, for Na'aman himself goes on to argue that "a writer living in a late
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period could have made use of an early, authentic document"; and to admit to
being convinced by my suggestion that the thirteen Aaronite cities reflect the
original part of the document. Surely if one later writer could have used earlier
documents, so also could a series of compilers.

Kallai responds briefly to some of my remarks in the English edition of his
Hebrew magnum opus of 1967. It is clear to him\footnote{10} that the lack of the usual intro-
ductive remark from 1 Chr 6:39f to the effect that the following cities were from
Judah and Simeon is a mark of the dislocation caused by the Chronicler's rear-
rangement of Josh 21. He will not allow that בַּעֲדֵי הָיוֹדָד in 6:40 originally served
this function: it simply distorts the more accurate notation in Josh 20:7; 21:11,
that defined Hebron as the city of refuge בְּרוֹר הָיוֹדָד.

(3) Literary-critical:

Two different responses belong to this category. Kartveit\footnote{11} offers a num-
ber of well-stated points of criticism. Some of these draw renewed attention to questions
which must remain open; others do not show sufficient awareness of wider textual
and literary evidence. Much of the discussion relates to Josh 21:3-4,8-10. He ar-
gues\footnote{12} against my view that Josh 21:3 was drafted on the basis of Josh 21:8/1 Chr
6:49 with the claim that 21:8 was drafted more recently than 21:3. This he
'demonstrates' with the assertion that אל יִהְיֶה ה in v.3 is more archaic than רַצָּא יִד in v.8. Suffice it to say that both appear in the same verse Josh
17:4, which I have argued\footnote{13} was a source for the terminology of the redactor of
Josh 21. Then the very important issue of the presence or absence of Benjamin in 1
Chr 6:50/Josh 21:9\footnote{14} is much more complicated than he acknowledges: when he
notes that it is read in Chronicles but not in Joshua, he is describing correctly the
MT – however, the LXX evidence is the direct opposite. During his discussion of
whether 'Levites' has been added to a shorter text or deleted from a longer one,\footnote{15}

\footnote{10} Z. Kallai, Historical Geography of the Bible (Jerusalem 1986) 463, n.41.
\footnote{11} M. Kartveit, Motive und Schichten der Landtheologie in I Chronik 1-9 (Coniectanea
\footnote{12} Ibid., 71.
\footnote{13} Auld (above, n. 2) 94f.
\footnote{14} Kartveit, (above, n. 11) 76.
\footnote{15} Ibid., 75.
he asserts rightly that "die übrigen Merari-Söhne', I 6,62" is "ein sinnloser Ausdruck," but wrongly that it can be explained only by reference to a mutilation of Josh 21:34. It seems to me that the Chronicler's ganze männerם does make sense: context precludes "to the rest of the Merarites," for none have yet been mentioned – but it allows "to the Merarites who remained," that is who were the only group detailed in vv.46-48 but remaining to be dealt with in detail. The final question I quote from Kartveit16 is why a recent and political expression (אָזְרָיִם הָיוּifestyles) in 1 Chr 6:40 should have been replaced in Josh 21:11 by the more ancient geographical יהודים. Here again he is surely guilty of persuasive definition. קֹיָמָא is attested in a wider spread of texts than those from Jeremiah to which he draws attention. On the other hand יהודים is restricted to the four passages he quotes, which are in fact three late elements in the book of Joshua and a single reference in 2 Chronicles – hardly good evidence for an ancient phrase.

Next, the importance of my case, if valid, for Pentateuchal criticism was recognised by Cortese, from whom it has also elicited a detailed attempt at rebuttal, which however also includes much erroneous parody. However, as I shall attempt to demonstrate below, even if Cortese, Kallai, and Na'aman are correct in continuing to claim that the Chronicler depended on Joshua for his information on these cities, it may still be the case – to a much greater extent than even Na'aman concedes – that the text of Joshua the Chronicler used was considerably shorter than the one we know. The material in the related Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6 which provides the closest links with Num 35:1-8 is precisely the material we do find in Joshua but do not find in Chronicles. Cortese, in order to satisfy his wider Pentateuchal/Hexateuchal purposes, requires to show not simply that the order of the material in Joshua is more original than that in Chronicles, but also that the longer text is prior to the shorter. Admittedly, on issues relating to the 'original' ordering of the material, he does raise interesting questions, but not on the more vital issue of the relative length of the two forms of the tradition. The Chronicler may have wanted to highlight the role of the Aaronites, and may have ineptly reorganised the material from Josh 21 (although I still require persuasion on both these points); but no good reason has been advanced why he

16Ibid., 75f.
should so successfully, even if not deliberately, have purged that text of links with the Torah.

Some of the criticisms directed in these studies against my proposals are well taken; others might not have been made had I published the fuller evidence of which I was aware. The further discussion necessary admittedly still transcends the proper limits of a single article.

Within this Journal, it is appropriate to concentrate on textual rather than historical issues. However, such study is also the necessary precursor of any historical evaluation. Na’aman has observed that (almost) all of the names listed for the (non-Aaronite) Levites appear elsewhere and could in fact have been transcribed from earlier parts of the book of Joshua: the cities of refuge (ch. 20), the Transjordanian cities (ch. 13), and the cities from northern Israel (ch. 19). Whether the details of his own proposals are right or wrong, his wider remarks ought to have precluded any further (apparently straightforward) approach to these texts by historians of realia who start by noting that all the cities in question were in territory controlled by Israel only during the United Monarchy, and may continue by means of archaeological survey to consider in which periods each city was in fact occupied. It is not sufficient for historical geographers to admit that some of their source materials have suffered corruption, distortion, or alteration. In an area where so little is known or knowable, textual history and literary history may be the most reliable of the histories we can write.

The received Hebrew text of Josh 21 is apparently a mostly orderly text. Historians eager to use its information easily accommodate its few obvious oddities as minor adjustments to a sound source, or accidents of textual transmission. However, comparisons with the related texts make us face the question whether order has not been brought out of more disordered beginnings, in each text in different ways. If this were the case, such less ordered beginnings would of course be of no less interest historically.

---


18 Na’aman (above, n. 7) 216f.
There are at least three puzzling features of the inter-relationships which may have been noted, but have not been explored in recent published discussion: (1) the much greater agreement between all the texts in their transmission of the city names from Transjordan; (2) the odd feature of Greek Joshua, which renders שֶׁם by a form of περισσόρωα at beginning and end of the chapter, but by a form of ἅφωροσμένα in the middle; (3) the widely divergent attestation of forms of הַשָּׁם in the various texts.

(1) Of the four names listed for each of Reuben and Gad at the end of the relevant Hebrew texts in Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6, three are identical and one differs only over a vowel letter. Earlier in the texts only fifteen names are identical, and only seven more very similar, while in some twenty cases the names attested are much less alike, or are apparently incompatible, or are simply absent. Such virtual agreement over Reuben and Gad is remarkable; it is only remotely approached at the beginning of the texts, in the cities granted from Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, where six names are identical and five exhibit minor differences. The major discrepancies relate to the half of the material which deals with the centre and north of the country west of the Jordan.\textsuperscript{19}

(2) The different rendering of שֶׁם within Joshua LXX was noted by Holmes\textsuperscript{20} that περισσόρωα is used in vv.2,3,8,11 and then in vv.34-42(x13), but ἅφωροσμένα in vv.13-33(x35) – περισσόρωα is the only rendering used in 1 Chr 6. Delekat observed that the implications of this for the textual history of the material had never been assessed.\textsuperscript{21} Ross was later to use this feature in his remarks, but not quite accurately.\textsuperscript{22} Butler records Delekat's suggestion that Josh 21:2-11,34-42 must not have appeared originally in the Greek; but does not take up his challenge.\textsuperscript{23} Barr mentions the spelling of שֶׁם.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{19}The details can be assimilated at a glance from the tables in W. F. Albright, "The List of Levitic Cities," \textit{Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume} (City 1945) 61-65 (esp. 61-65).

\textsuperscript{20}S. Holmes, \textit{Joshua, the Hebrew and Greek Texts} (Cambridge 1914) 72.

\textsuperscript{21}L. Delekat, "Zum hebräischen Wörterbuch," \textit{VT} 14 (1964) 22.

\textsuperscript{22}J. P. Ross, \textit{The 'Cities of the Levites' in Joshua XXI and I Chronicles VI} (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis; Edinburgh 1973)

\textsuperscript{23}Butler (above, n. 3) 221.

\textsuperscript{24}J. Barr, \textit{The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible} (The Schweich Lectures 1986; Oxford 1989) 133.
Do these two features belong together? They could certainly be integrated with other possibly relevant details:

(a) Na'aman's observation has already been noted that the names assigned to the Merarites from Reuben and Gad are all found in Josh 13.

(b) The information about Transjordanian settlements in Josh 13:7b-13,15-32 has been added clumsily, and apparently in stages.\(^{25}\) It is interesting that it is precisely in this context that we find appended, in 13:14 (and also 13:33 in MT), a note about the different status of Levi.

(c) The institution of refuge was secondarily extended as the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua developed, from west of the Jordan to the east. This is attested by the wording or placing of each of the texts which deals with the issue – by the addition of vv.8-9 to the basic legislation in Deut 19:1-7,10; by the addition of Deut 4:41-43 to an already late chapter in that book; and by the fact that v.8 of Josh 20 describes the allocation of Transjordanian cities in different terms from those used by the original v.7 about the three cities from west of the Jordan.

If the information about Transjordan represented a later addition to the tradition of Levitic cities, then the prior version of that material had nothing to do with the ideal of \(48=4\times12\) which was so nearly achieved in Josh 21.\(^{26}\) And the shape of that earlier draft may have been closer to the disorderly situation we find still in 1 Chr 6 than to the more regular Josh 21. (Was the prior version composed of something like 1 Chr 6:39-45 [Aaronites] and 49,51-55,57-62 [West of Jordan Levites]? Wherever that shorter and simpler version originated, the structure of Levitic clans belongs best to Chronicles, while the demands of numerical balance require Golan in Bashan and Ashtaroth to be attributed to a different Levitic group from their eastern cousins.)

(3)Forms of מַשְׂכֹּת נְחַפְּשִׁים are used less in Josh 21(LXX) and in 1 Chr 6 (although not always in the same verses) than in Josh 21(MT). And in some cases the discrep-

\(^{25}\)Auld (above, n. 3) 57, 67.

\(^{26}\)I say nearly. Although Josh 21 talks of 12 tribes, not all provide 4 cities; and although it talks of 4 Levitical families, not all receive 12 cities. The total suggests that the details conform better to an ideal than in fact they do.
cies over the usage of this word overlap with other textual problems. The very complex situation can be summarized in five stages as follows:

(a) The noun occurs, in both MT and LXX, in eight verses of Josh 21. In five of these (vv. 7, 20, 26, 33, 40), LXX attests the forms found in the MT; while in the other three (vv. 4, 10, 34) LXX attests a singular form and MT the corresponding plural. Only in vv. 10 and 34 is the plene spelling used; while, in v. 4, the consonantal Hebrew text is in fact ambiguous and has been read differently by the Masoretes and by the LXX translators.

(b) Josh 21(MT) provides a further four instances: two in the form מְסַמֵּתַת pointed as plural (vv. 5, 27); two in the form מְסַמֵּת ה (vv. 6, 40). The latter form is also used in the MT in v. 10, where LXX offers a singular.

(c) The parallel tradition in 1 Chr 6 uses the term eight times also, like the Greek in Josh 21. Here too LXX attests the forms found in the MT in five instances: singular in vv. 39, 55 and plural in vv. 47, 48, 51. Then in vv. 46 and 56 MT is singular while LXX is plural, and in v. 45 LXX appears to reflect the more regular לִמְסַמֵּת ה for MT's exceptional לִמְסַמֵּת ה.

(d) However, despite the relative homogeneity of each tradition (Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6) within itself, it is actually only in four verses (7/48, 10/39, 20/51, 26/55) that instances of the noun מְסַמֵּת ה overlap in both MT and LXX of both Josh 21 and 1 Chr 6. And only in the first of these is the actual form used לִמְסַמֵּת ה attested in all the versions of both accounts being surveyed.27

(e) Of the four pluses in the MT of Josh 21 with respect to the LXX (see (b) above), the first three are shared with 1 Chr 6 (vv. 5/46, 6/47, and 27/56). However, before this fact is seized on by partisans of the received Hebrew text, it is important to note that the Hebrew texts of our two chapters differ over the exact form of מְסַמֵּת ה used in each of these three 'shared' cases.28

How should this head-breaking variety be assessed? The unusual, though limited, agreement just noted at (e) above between 1 Chr 6 and Josh 21(MT) against Josh 21(LXX) ought to give pause to any sufferers from the disease of

---

27 And even that statement depends on reading 1 Chr 6:48 with Mandelkern's Concordance - BHS offers the less usual plene spelling לִמְסַמֵּת ה, as in v. 47 (Barr, 520).

Settantamania (Septuagint madness) diagnosed in me by E. Cortese. Only Josh (MT) offers anything approaching a regular usage of ἡσυχασμός: it uses the noun in each of the summary verses (5/46, 6/47, 7/48), here supported by Chron; and it uses the noun at head and tail of each of the detailed lists of towns, here largely supported by Josh (LXX). The usage of this noun may offer a good test-case for the larger question already posed: is Josh 21(MT) a good witness to an ordered and regular text other versions of which have suffered in transmission and/or translation (Josh 21[LXX]) and when being altered by the Chronicler for his own purposes? Or is it witness to a tradition to which only a semblance of regularity has been lately brought, and whose prior stages (or elements in them) can still be detected in Josh 21(LXX) and 1 Chr 6?

My own preference, in this as so many textual issues in Joshua, is to follow the lead given by Holmes. Within the summarising verses 5–7/46–48, it is only in 7/48 that all versions agree in detail (see [d] above). The use of ἡσυχασμός in this verse will have been simply stylistic – as English might use ‘in their turn’ in the concluding member of a list. That its presence in 5–6/46–47 results from later standardisation can be deduced from the reference of this noun in these two verses: only there within Josh 21 is ἡσυχασμός used to refer to groups of the regular non-Levitical twelve tribes of Israel (or, in the case of the MT of 1 Chr 6:46 to refer simply to a single tribe); elsewhere in this material, except for 1 Chr 6:56, ἡσυχασμός refers only to the Levitical families or their sub-clans.

The other three passages in which some form of מָשָׁמָה occurs in both versions of both texts share a significant common feature: they are used in headings (10/39, 20/51) or conclusions (26/55) to the sections on the two subgroups of the Kohathites: there a further technical term is appropriate, even if not absolutely necessary. In 10/39, the Chronicler’s מָשָׁמָה is likely to have been the original form of the word used: it is identical to the form found in Josh 21:4(LXX) – plural in MT – a verse which by any account of the production of Josh 21 is a foreshadowing of v. 10. The alteration of מָשָׁמָה in 21:10 into מָשָׁמָה – plural again in MT – is readily understandable given its proximity in that verse to the following מְבָעִית לֹא.
These four common occurrences of מַמֵּשֶׁפְתָּה, even if in somewhat different forms, can be taken as witnesses to an assured minimal usage of this word. However, an even more reasonable pattern of 'original' usage would be achieved if we accepted the Chronicler's attestation of מַמֵּשֶׁפְתָּה at the end of the Aaronite listing in 6:45. Josh 21:19(MT) offers instead מַמֵּשֶׁפְתִּים. (LXX is shorter, and attests neither.) Williamson wisely notes that neither text should be emended to agree with the other, for each alternative is part of a wider pattern in its own context. Yet, once we move beyond commentary on either book in its own terms to the historical question about the development of this tradition, a choice can no longer be avoided.

If those five instances reflect the 'original' usage of מַמֵּשֶׁפְתָּה, then the expansions and alterations and regularisations we find in the different extant versions can be readily understood. Whether they have taken place independently, and naturally, or whether one or other of the expanded traditions influenced the expansion of another, is hard to pronounce on. What is worth noting, however, is this: if it is the case that only the four occurrences of מַמֵּשֶׁפְתָּה common to both versions of both traditions are original, then there is a high probability that only the forms מַמֵּשֶׁפְתָּה/מַמֵּשֶׁפְתוֹת and מַמֵּשֶׁפְתִּים/לִמֵּשֶׁפְתִּים are original, and that the other forms are secondary.

If the shorter text is also the more original, at least in terms of length, then we have a choice between two options. Either we accept some elements of the old consensus, and admit at least that the ordering of the materials is more primitive in Joshua. In this case, the Joshua we know has been thoroughly expanded since an earlier draft served as the source for 1 Chr 6. Or we maintain the principal elements of the case I argued for some ten years ago. I suspect that neither option will give any comfort to E. Cortese.

As a general rule, we expect the Chronicles version of any tradition to be later than any material it shares with Torah or Former Prophets. Even if this is a good rule, and I have some doubts about that, it can only be a general rule. We ought not to exclude a priori the possibility of at least isolated additions being made to Torah and Former Prophets in a period as late as the compilation of Chronicles.

30 Williamson (above, n. 5) 75.
It may be that Num 35 and Josh 21 are just such exceptions which prove the general rule just stated. Certainly, if we were on the look-out for late supplements in the books of Numbers and Joshua, then these chapters would be prime candidates.

Most of the terminology which Josh 21 shares with Num 35:1-8 and Josh 14:1-5, and which could be significant for plotting wider literary relationships, is in fact found in the opening and closing verses of Josh 21, namely vv.1-3 and 40-42.32 (And these verses of course have no counterpart in 1 Chr 6.) The absence of all Torah or 'Priestly' terminology from the Chronicles version could be an accidental result of its abbreviation. However, there is one interesting counter-indication. The noun נַחֲזָה, often labelled 'Priestly', is used in Josh 21:12,41; and to the former of these verses there exists a counterpart in 1 Chr 6:41. The Chronicler's text is identical to Josh 21:12 except that it lacks the final בִּית. There appears to be no motive for its deletion. This may be the single vital indicator that 1 Chr 6:39-66 is related to a stage in the development of Josh 21 which had not yet undergone editing from hands that are known as 'Priestly', in the widest sense of that term.

32 Auld (above, n. 2) 65-67.