SOURCES, REVISIONS, AND EDITIONS: THE LISTS OF JERUSALEM'S RESIDENTS IN MT AND LXX NEHEMIAH 11 AND 1 CHRONICLES 9

Gary N. Knoppers

The Hebrew Bible contains many cases of texts that parallel one another in whole or in part. Careful study of such passages affords insight into the vagaries of textual transmission and even into the composition of the biblical text itself. One of the parallel texts that has not received the close scrutiny it deserves is 1 Chr 9:2-18//Neh 11:3–19. Both passages list various residents of Jerusalem, mention assorted genealogical connections of Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, and Levites, and follow a similar order. But the connection between the two texts has been imagined in every conceivable way. Bertheau, Myers, and Williamson posit an original source from which the authors of Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9 each selectively drew. Ackroyd's analysis is simpler: "two forms of the same original list have been used in two places." He thinks that the relationship between 1 Chronicles 9 and Nehemiah 11 is analogous to that of the parallel catalogues in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7. Keil senses, however, some differences between the two lists. He avers that 1 Chronicles 9 represents a preexilic register of Jerusalem's citizens, while Nehemiah 11 represents a somewhat different postexilic register of the same citizens. Kittel likewise pursues a historical explanation. He contends

1 A. Bendavid, Parallels in the Bible (Jerusalem: Carta, 1972).


4 C. F. Keil, The Books of the Chronicles (Engl. transl.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1873) 152-168. See also the similar comments of O. Zöckler, The Books of Chronicles Theologically and

that the list in Chronicles dates from the Chronicler's time, while the list in Nehemiah dates from Nehemiah's time. Some scholars explain the connection between the two passages by positing a literary dependence of one text upon the other. Braun, Curtis and Madsen, Japhet, and Kellerman, for example, see 1 Chronicles 9 as dependent on the longer list in Nehemiah 11. But Hölscher thinks that the longer formulation of Nehemiah 11 is dependent on the shorter text of 1 Chronicles 9. Blenkinsopp also acknowledges a relationship between the two passages, but does not see any need to speak of an original, extra-biblical source. Finally, there are scholars who contend that either 1 Chronicles 9 or Nehemiah 11 (or both) is a later addition to Chronicles and Nehemiah.

_Homiletically Expounded_ (Commentary on the Holy Scriptures 7; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1877) 86-87.

5 R. Kittel, _Die Bücher der Chronik und Esra, Nehemia und Esther_ (HAT 1/6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902) 53.


8 He leaves open the question of which direction the line of dependence might run; see J. Blenkinsopp, _Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary_ (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988) 323-324.

The aforementioned scholars call attention to many complex issues in dealing with the relationship between the catalogues in 1 Chronicles 9 and Nehemiah 11. But largely missing from these discussions is a detailed and systematic comparison between the lists themselves. If one makes large claims with respect to the dependence of one pericope upon the other on the basis of a few phrases or ideological tendencies, one is inevitably on shaky ground. Many commentators have expressed opinions about the connections between the respective passages, especially between their different headings, but have not substantiated those views with sustained analyses of the textual evidence. There are major discrepancies between the two passages that go far beyond the minor discrepancies between the lists of Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7. Indeed, as we shall see, there are at least as many differences between the lists as there are parallels. These disparities must be both explored and explained. There is another factor in the comparison between the two texts that has been neglected in previous discussions. LXX Neh 11:3–19 is significantly shorter than MT Neh 11:3–19. The introduction of LXX Nehemiah 11

1 Chronicles 9 is a later addition, but he also holds that the list in 1 Chronicles 9 is dependent upon the list in MT Nehemiah 11. For a critique of the position that the list in 1 Chronicles 9 is a later interpolation, see M. Kartveit, Motive und Schichten der Landtheologie in 1 Chronik 1–9 (ConBOT 28; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1989) 106–107.

10 One cannot assume that a list is ipso facto a neutral and objective recounting of materials, titles, or personnel. In a Persian period context, the very categorization of various kinds of people may reflect certain presuppositions, concepts, and commitments. Moreover, the editor of a given book may choose to rewrite or supplement portions of an inherited source in accordance with his own interests. On the dangers of beginning one’s analysis with Tendenzkritik, see the cautions expressed by J. Trebolle Barrera, Salomón y Jeroboán: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes 2–12; 14 (Institución San Jerónimo 10; Valencia: Investigación Bíblica, 1980) 186–201.

11 An exception is the extensive treatment of S. Japhet in her commentary, I & II Chronicles (OTL; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993) 18, 202–219. As the following discussion will make clear, however, I disagree with her about the dependence of 1 Chronicles 9 on the list in MT Nehemiah 11.

into the comparison raises a series of interesting issues, because source-critical, textual, historical, and literary concerns all overlap. Any study investigating the relationship between the texts of 1 Chronicles 9 and Nehemiah 11 must take the testimony of LXX Nehemiah into account.\textsuperscript{13}

Some attention must also be given to the delimitation of the lists themselves. To speak of parallel catalogues in Chronicles and Nehemiah is to abstract two portions of longer lists from their distinctive literary contexts (1 Chr 9:2-34; Neh 11:3-32). In other words, each list parallels the other only in part. To gain some precision about the limits of the shared catalogue and also of the possible relationships among the textual witnesses, it will be helpful to begin with a review of the principal texts. Each begins with a similar progression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT Nehemiah</th>
<th>LXX Nehemiah</th>
<th>Chronicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>11:3</td>
<td>11:3</td>
<td>9:2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>11:4-6</td>
<td>11:4-6</td>
<td>9:4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>11:7-9</td>
<td>11:7-9</td>
<td>9:7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>11:10-14</td>
<td>11:10-14</td>
<td>9:10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levites</td>
<td>11:15-18</td>
<td>11:15, 17-18\textsuperscript{14}</td>
<td>9:14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeepers</td>
<td>11:19</td>
<td>11:19</td>
<td>9:17-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9:23-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levitical Singers</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rest</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Servants</td>
<td>11:21</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levitical Overseers</td>
<td>11:22-23</td>
<td>11:22-23</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with Crown</td>
<td>11:24</td>
<td>11:24</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>11:25-35</td>
<td>11:25-27,30-31\textsuperscript{15}</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Biblia griega III: 1–2 Crónicas} (Textos y Estudios “Cardinal Cisneros” 60; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1996).

\textsuperscript{13} The recent study of D. Böhler (\textit{Die heilige Stadt in Esdras a und Esra-Nehemia: Zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels} [OBO 158; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1997]) commendably pays attention to the witness of 1 Esdras, but he does not explore the ramifications of the minuses in LXX Nehemiah 11-12 over against MT Nehemiah 11-12.

\textsuperscript{14} LXX Nehemiah lacks v. 16 and parts of vv. 12-19. See II.3-13 below.
The common outline suggests a relationship among the three texts. Because of the similar organization and content, the theory of a common source is credible.\textsuperscript{16} It is also relevant to observe that each of the three texts contains consecutive sections devoted to Judah, Benjamin, the priests, the Levites, and the gatekeepers. Hence, it is possible that part of the heading found in all three passages—Israel,\textsuperscript{17} the priests, and the Levites (MT Neh 11:3; LXX Neh 11:3; 1 Chr 9:2)—was part of an original source and was not an editorial addition contributed to that source.\textsuperscript{18} As the chart demonstrates, the three witnesses begin to part company with each other toward the end. For example, Neh 11:25–35 documents the inhabitation of the villages, while Chronicles, consistent with the interests it manifests elsewhere, provides an extended list of gatekeepers.\textsuperscript{19} Because of the divergent endings among the witnesses, one cannot determine the original conclusion to the list.\textsuperscript{20} We will limit our comparison to the sections of the texts that parallel each other at least

\begin{itemize}
  \item LXX Nehemiah lacks vv. 28–29 and v. 32. LXX Nehemiah also lacks portions of vv. 25, 26, 27, 30, and 31.
  \item Contra Blenkinsopp, \textit{Ezra–Nehemiah}, 323.
  \item I am understanding “Israel” as representing Judah and Benjamin. Kartveit (\textit{Motive und Schichten}, 151) takes “Israel” to be the priests, Levites, and temple servants and thus construes the return in Chronicles as primarily a clerical endeavour. But given the consecutive sections devoted in order to Judah, Benjamin, the priests, and Levi in both Nehemiah and Chronicles, a clerical interpretation is too restrictive.
  \item So also Williamson (\textit{Chronicles}, 87–88). The common presumption is that the headings in 1 Chr 9:2 and Neh 11:3 are not part of an original list, but are editorial additions designed to integrate the list into new literary contexts. The source of the editorial comments is disputed. Kellerman (“Die Listen in Nehemia 11,” 212–213) and Japhet (\textit{I & II Chronicles}, 207) think that the editor of 1 Chronicles 9 borrowed from Nehemiah 11, but Blenkinsopp (\textit{Ezra–Nehemiah}, 324) contends that the heading in Nehemiah 11 borrows from 1 Chronicles 9. In my judgment, each editor may have shaped the heading to the catalogue, but the catalogue originally did have a heading that partially survives in the material shared by Neh 11:3 and 1 Chr 9:2.
  \item In the present formulation of the lists, neither the heading of 1 Chr 9:2 nor the headings of MT and LXX Neh 11:3 completely match the content of the lists. Chronicles lacks any enumeration of “temple servants,” while MT and LXX Nehemiah lack any enumeration of the “sons of Solomon’s servants.”
\end{itemize}
in part (1 Chr 9:2-18; Neh 11:3-19). This is not to prejudice the question of the original extent of the list. Rather, it represents an attempt to focus our investigation on the material shared by the three principal witnesses.

Since the testimony of LXX Nehemiah will form an integral part of our discussion, some attention should also be paid to the witness of LXX Chronicles. Does LXX Chronicles, like LXX Nehemiah, supply a notably different text from the MT? A related question concerns the relationship between LXX Chronicles and LXX Nehemiah—do these witnesses share any significant readings over against MT Chronicles or MT Nehemiah?

I. The Witness of LXX Chronicles

The readings of LXX Chronicles generally line up with MT Chronicles. Only in a few cases is LXX Chronicles shorter than MT Chronicles.

1. 1 Chr 9:4, “son of Ímri” (בֶּן-אֶמְרִי).
Lacking in LXX*. Neh 11:4 reads “son of Amariah” (בֶּן-אֲמָרִי; cf. LXX οὗτος Σαμαριτα). MT Chronicles contains an extra generation in the first Judahite genealogy, but there is a possibility of dittography after “son of Omri” (בֶּן-עָמְרוֹ).24

2. 1 Chr 9:5, “and his sons” (וֹסְבוּ).21

21 Many commentators include only 1 Chr 9:2-17 as part of their discussions, while others include 1 Chr 9:18. Since v. 18 continues v. 17, dealing in summary form with the gatekeepers, I will include v. 18 as part of the discussion. One could make the case, however, along with Kartweil (Motiv und Schichten, 107) that the parallel ends in v. 17a.

22 The list could have extended beyond 1 Chr 9:17-18//Neh 11:19. The interest in the villages in Nehemiah 11 is consistent with its heading (vv. 3-4). Given the mention in all three texts of repatriates living in the villages (Neh 11:3; 1 Chr 9:2, 16, 22, 25), one cannot automatically assume that the material in the Vorlage of Neh 11:25-27, 30-31 (see LXX) was not part of the original source (pace Williamson, Ezra, Nehemiah, 349). The author of 1 Chronicles 9 may have cut this material from his own presentation because it did not fit his own primary interest in the repopulation of Jerusalem (vv. 3, 34) and the staffing of its cultus. See further my I Chronicles (AB; New York: Doubleday, in preparation).

23 X3L (by) reads ὦτος Αμβρι εἰς ὦτος Αμβρι.

LXX* Chronicles lacks the reference in MT to Asaiah’s offspring.25 There do not seem to be any significant cases in which LXX Chronicles agrees with MT or LXX Nehemiah over against MT Chronicles. There is one possible exception.

3. 1 Chr 9:12, LXX\textsuperscript{8} c\textsubscript{2} מַשְׁלֵלִית (משללית). So also MT Neh 11:13. MT 1 Chr 9:12 “Meshillemith” (משילמית). The name is not found in LXX Neh 11:13. The difference between the two readings is relatively minor and can be traced to a yod/waw confusion.\textsuperscript{26}

That LXX Chronicles aligns itself with MT Chronicles occasions no great surprise. LXX Chronicles is generally thought to be closely related to and dependent on a forerunner of the text represented by MT.\textsuperscript{27}

II. The Pluses in MT Nehemiah Compared with LXX Nehemiah

Having briefly examined the witness of LXX Chronicles and its affiliations, it is appropriate to turn to LXX Nehemiah and its relationship to MT Nehemiah. Whereas MT and LXX Chronicles share many of the same readings, the catalogue in MT Nehemiah 11 contains substantially more material than its counterpart in LXX Nehemiah 11. MT Neh 11:3–19 is 32% (227 words) longer than LXX Neh 11:3–19 (reverted as 172 words).


Lacking in LXX Neh 11:3. It is possible that the term was lost by haplography after海尔ים, “the Levites” (homoioiteuton), but this does not seem to be the case. The catalogue of Nehemiah 11 later lists some temple servants (v. 21), but this material is not found in LXX Nehemiah.

\textsuperscript{25} So LXX\textsuperscript{8}, LXX\textsuperscript{AN} and Arm add καὶ ὅιοι σύντοι, while cursives add καὶ ὅιοι σύντοι. The Syr has אַרְאֶה מַשְׁלָלִית (םשליית).

\textsuperscript{26} The earlier name is likely to be מַשְׁלְלָת (משלחת), cf. J. J. Stamm, “Hebräische Ersatznamen,” in Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger (Assyriological Studies of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago 16; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965) 420.

\textsuperscript{27} Rudolph, Chronikbücher, vi; L. C. Allen, The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Masoretic Text, Parts I, II (VTSup 25, 27; Leiden: Brill, 1974).
In LXX Nehemiah, Benjaminites’ Joed begins a new ascending genealogy.


4. Neh 11:12, “and Adaiah son of Jeroham son of Pelaliah son of” (ｭ＜ｬ＜ｧ<_functions). This section of the priestly genealogy does not occur in LXX Neh 11:12. Hence, in LXX Nehemiah the ascending genealogy begins with Amzi, rather than with Adaiah.

Lacking in LXX Neh 11:13.

6. Neh 11:13, “son of Ahzai son of Meshillemoth son of Immer” (ｭ＜ｬ＜ｧ<_functions). In LXX Nehemiah the ascending priestly genealogy of Amashsai ends with his father Azarel (LXX 'Ἐσδρηλα).28

This problematic phrase is not found in LXX Neh 11:14.29

Two generations of Shemaiah’s Levitical genealogy are lacking in LXX Neh 11:15.

28 In Chronicles both names are different. MT 1 Chr 9:12, “Maasai” (ｪ＜ｬ＜ｧ< 字素). LXXB Μασσαίου. The readings of MT Neh 11:13 “Amashsai” (ｪ＜ｬ＜ｧ< 字素) and LXX Neh 11:13 (ｭ＜ｬ＜ｧ<_functions) reveal, among other things, metathesis (M. Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsamzeitlichen Namengebung [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928] 178). For MT Neh 11:13 “Azarel” (ｪ＜ｬ＜ｧ< 字素; cf. LXX Ἐσδρηλα), MT and LXX (ｭ＜ｬ＜ｧ<_functions) 1 Chr 9:12 offer דריאל. Cf. LXXB Αδοιά.

29 Rudolph, Esra und Nehemia, 184; Williamson, Ezra, Nehemiah, 343.
9. Neh 11:16, “and Shabbetai and Jozebad, in charge of the outside work of the house of God, from the heads of the Levites” (רשבי ווובכ על-המלאכה ויהיה ללבית; הַמְלָאָכָה הַחֲיִינָה לְבֵית הַבָּרוּך). This material, dealing with the Levitical administrative responsibility for the external affairs of the temple, does not appear in LXX Nehemiah.30

10. Neh 11:17, “son of Zabdi son of Asaph the head of the beginning (LXX: praise), who gave thanks in prayer, and Baqbuqiah the second among his kinsmen” (בֶּן-דהיָּם בֶּן-אָסֵף וְרָאשׁ הַחֲיָּה וַיִּזְבָּהֵהוּ בַּאֹהֵבִית וַיִּקְרָא הַנְּאָשָּׁר הַחֲיִינָה וַיִּזְבָּהֵהוּ בַּאֹהֵבִית). Part of Mattaniah’s genealogy, linking him to Asaph, as well as further Levitical information are lacking in LXX Nehemiah.


12. Neh 11:18, “all of the Levites in the holy city” (כָּלָּלוֹמ בֵּית הַקְּדָשׁ). Much of the summary for the Levites provided in the MT does not appear in the LXX.

13. Neh 11:19, “those standing watch at the gates” (הָשָּׁמְרֵים בֵּית הַקְּדָשִׁים). This redundant phrase mentioning the work of the gatekeepers is not found in the LXX.

From a text-critical vantage point, there do not seem to be clear reasons for the minuses in LXX Neh 11:3–19. There are few indications of haplography. The Greek translation of Nehemiah is relatively literal, so it seems reasonable to assume that its minuses over against MT Nehemiah reflect a shorter Hebrew parent text.31 There is, however, another possible explanation. One could contend that LXX

---

30 The reference to “outlying work” (הַמְלָאָכָה הַחֲיִינָה) is rare and only found in late sources (Nehemiah and Chronicles). 1 Chr 26:29 mentions Levitical responsibilities “for the outlying work” (לְהַמְלָאָכָה הַחֲיִינָה) with regard to Israel as officials and judges.

Nehemiah 11 is a later abridgement and reworking of MT Nehemiah. According to this theory, the material in LXX Nehemiah 11–12 would represent a literary development subsequent to the establishment of MT Nehemiah. As such, the catalogue in LXX Nehemiah 11 might be grouped with midrashic sections of other biblical books in the LXX. But there is no clear evidence that LXX Nehemiah falls into this category. LXX Nehemiah is the shorter, less corrupt text. MT Nehemiah is the longer text, because it furnishes longer headings and summaries (vv. 3, 18), fuller genealogies (vv. 7, 13, 14, 15, 17), an additional numerical total (v. 12), more administrative information (vv. 16, 17), and more descriptions of functions (vv. 17, 19). Hence, the most likely explanation for the disparities in length is that MT Nehemiah 11 has undergone expansion. Being less prone to various kinds of additions, the Vorlage of LXX Nehemiah 11 represents a typologically earlier text than MT Nehemiah 11. In other words, LXX Nehemiah and MT Nehemiah represent two editions of the same unit.

A related issue relevant to our immediate investigation is determining the extent of the divergence of LXX Nehemiah 11 from MT Nehemiah 11. Granted that LXX and MT Nehemiah 11 represent two different literary strata, what is the


33 See also the partial repetition of Neh 11:17 (מְנִיתָה בָּשָׂם בּוֹ-בָּשָׂם בּוֹ-קָהָק) in 11:22 (כְּפָר-מְנִיתָה בּוֹ-מְנִיתָה מְנִיתָה אָסָף).

34 It is interesting to observe that most of the discrepancies between the two texts occur in vv. 12–19. One might be tempted to conclude that the second half of the list was more unstable than the first half, but the situation is more complicated. The brevity of LXX Nehemiah over against MT Nehemiah is not confined to these verses (vv. 12–19). It continues for the rest of the list in vv. 20–32 and into Nehemiah 12. Whether the list in the Vorlage of LXX Nehemiah was briefer only for vv. 12ff. or whether the earlier part of the list (vv. 3–11) was revised to conform to a proto-rabbinic text (an earlier version of MT Nehemiah) are questions that deserve further study.

35 Pace Myers, Chronicles, 67.


37 For other examples of this phenomenon, see Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 243–252.
relationship between them? Are the connections between LXX Nehemiah and MT Nehemiah fairly close, despite the differences in length? Or is the relationship more analogous to the relationship between the shorter and earlier text of Jeremiah (represented by the LXX, 4QJer<sup>bd</sup>) and the longer and later text of Jeremiah (represented by the MT, 2QJer, 4QJer<sup>a</sup>, 4QJer<sup>c</sup>)? Many of the variants between the longer and shorter Jeremias do not constitute sporadic or tendentious alterations of a standard and fixed text, but form genuine witnesses in their own right to different textual and literary traditions in the history of the book of Jeremiah. The shorter readings of the LXX and of 4QJer<sup>bd</sup> reflect an earlier edition in the process of composing and editing the biblical text than is reflected in either the received Rabbinic text (the MT) or the other Jeremiah fragments (2QJer; 4QJer<sup>a</sup>, 4QJer<sup>c</sup>) from Qumran. In short, the question that now must be addressed is the amount of distance between the two major witnesses to Nehemiah 11.

III. Pluses in LXX Nehemiah?

If the Vorlage of LXX Nehemiah represented a substantially different literary edition from that of MT Nehemiah, one might expect to find additions, differences in sequence, and evidence of reworking. But as we have already seen (I), the two texts share a parallel structure. There are, of course, variants in names (e.g., נחל-גוז in v. 5), but there are very few pluses in LXX Nehemiah 11 over against MT Nehemiah 11. To take one example:

---


1. Neh 11:10, καὶ Δαδεὶο υἱὸς Ἰωαβέβ. 
Aside from the corruption in the first name, the deviation from MT, ἶαυτήν Ἰωάβ, is very minor (initial waw).

Given that the variations between LXX Nehemiah and MT Nehemiah are of this minor character, excepting the larger differences in length, it would be misleading to put too much distance between the two witnesses. LXX Nehemiah is substantially shorter than MT Nehemiah 11, but the two texts seem to belong to the same textual tradition.

Nevertheless, the recognition that LXX Nehemiah 11 represents an earlier text than MT Nehemiah has important ramifications for some theories of their relationship. Examination of LXX Nehemiah provides insight into how an earlier form of a list was expanded by a later tradition in MT Nehemiah. Bertheau's hypothesis of a long common source from which the authors of both Chronicles and Nehemiah each selectively drew has to be qualified. Such a theory does not adequately allow for the possibility of growth within a single textual tradition (LXX and MT Nehemiah). To be sure, the supposition that the lists in Chronicles and Nehemiah are dependent upon an older, common base text is quite credible. But one must also allow for the contextualization and supplementation of such information within the compositional history of each book. Similarly, the strategy of pursuing an exclusively historical explanation for the disparities between Nehemiah and Chronicles (so Keil and Kittel) proves to be highly problematic. The issue is not only historical, but also textual, redactional, and literary in nature.

IV. Pluses in Nehemiah Compared with MT and LXX Chronicles

Having examined the relations between the LXX and the MT of Chronicles and the LXX and the MT of Nehemiah, it is appropriate to turn our attention to the relationship between LXX Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9 on the one hand and MT Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9 on the other hand. Is 1 Chronicles 9 closer to one of these witnesses than to the other? One of the basic disparities between the principal texts is length. MT Neh 11:3–19 is significantly longer than its parallel in 1 Chr 9:2–18. MT Neh 11:3–19 is 19% (227 words) longer than 1 Chr 9:2–18 (191 words). At first glance, LXX Nehemiah 11 and MT 1 Chronicles 9 appear to be more similar. MT 1 Chr 9:2–18 is only 11% (191 words) longer than LXX Neh 11:3–
19 (172 words). These statistics do not do justice to the disparities between Nehemiah and Chronicles, because they do not address basic differences in context, vocabulary, and diction within the respective texts. The following list summarizes the pluses that MT and LXX Nehemiah share over against MT Chronicles.

1. Neh 11:3, “These are the heads of the province, who resided in Jerusalem and in the towns of Judah. They resided, each person” (ואלה ראשיה המוריהם אשר ישב ביהורusalem ויתריה הוורדים ישבו איש).

Each book (Nehemiah and Chronicles) has its own introduction to the catalogue. The introductions only partially overlap.


The expression “sons of Solomon’s servants” is unique to Ezra (2:55, 58) and Nehemiah (7:57, 60).⁴⁰


In this particular case, the absence of the expression from 1 Chr 9:4 may be due to haplography (homoioarcton) after “and from Manasseh” (ון-מנשה) in 1 Chr 9:3. See also the pattern “PN (בן)” in 1 Chr 9:7, 10, 14.


The genealogy of Athaiah (Chronicles: Uthai) varies from and is one generation longer than its counterpart in Chronicles.⁴¹


On this ascending genealogy and numerical summary, compare the different and much shorter Shilonite genealogy in 1 Chr 9:5.⁴²

⁴⁰ Other biblical texts mention the “servants of Solomon” (1 Kgs 9:27; 2 Chr 8:18; 9:10).
⁴¹ On the differences between the two genealogies, see further VIII.1.
6. Neh 11:7-9a, “... son of Joed son of Pedaiah son of Kolaiah son of Maasiaiah son of Ithiel son of Jesiaiah, (8) and after him, Gabbai and Sallai—928. (9) Joel son of Zichri was their overseer” [Esth 8]. The first Benjaminites genealogy is much longer in MT Nehemiah than it is in Chronicles. On the version in LXX Neh 11:7, see II.2.


8. Neh 11:10, “(Jedaiah) son of ( Joiarib)” (ודיעת בֶּן יָיוֹרִיב). Nehemiah provides a partial genealogy, while 1 Chr 9:10 provides a list: “Jedaiah and Jehoiarib” (ודיעת ויהייריב). 43

9. Neh 11:12, “and their kinsmen, who did the work of the temple” (והםלאכש כלת). Compare the material in 1 Chr 9:13 (V.8).

10. Neh 11:12, “Amzi son of Zechariah” (אָמָצִי בֶּן-צָחָרָה). This priestly genealogical material is not found in Chronicles.

11. Neh 11:13, “ancestral heads—242” ( למהט להבות הארבעים ושניים). This summary is lacking in Chronicles.

12. Neh 11:14, “Zabdiel was in charge of them” (מצליית בּוֹדְיֵל). Another administrative detail not found in Chronicles.

---

42 See also the comment in VIII.2.

43 The readings of LXX: Neh 11:10-11 (יוֹדֵעַ יְוַיְרִיב b יְוַיְרִיב) suggest: “Jedaiah son of Jehoiarib son of Jachin son of Seraiah”. The variant “Azariah” (Chronicles) / “Seraiah” (Nehemiah) has been caused by a ligature; cf. Tov, Textual Criticism, 249. An ayin followed closely by (or joined to) zayin was taken as a sin/sin.

44 The reading of LXX (בּוֹדְיֵל) has lost the initial zayin.
Unlike Chronicles, Nehemiah provides a numerical total for the Levites.

The additions in Nehemiah vis-à-vis Chronicles may be summarized as follows: a longer heading (v. 3), genealogical information (vv. 4, 5-6, 7-8, 9, 10, 12), titles and functions (vv. 9, 12, 13, 14), and numerical totals (vv. 6, 9, 18, 19). The pluses in Nehemiah are not confined to any particular section of the list.\(^{45}\) They are spread fairly evenly throughout the catalogue.

Given the pluses that MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 share over against Chronicles, one could make the case that the list in 1 Chronicles 9 represents a shorter version of the longer catalogue in Nehemiah 11. Or, one could contend along with Hölscher that the list in 1 Chronicles 9 is the source for Nehemiah 11. But, as we shall see, such views are far too simplistic to explain the complexity of the available evidence.

V. Pluses in Chronicles Compared with Nehemiah

Despite being shorter than the list in MT Nehemiah 11, the list in MT and LXX 1 Chronicles exhibits a number of pluses against both MT and LXX Nehemiah 11.

1. 1 Chr 9:2, “and the first residents” (ותיוסננים ו). Part of the introduction to the catalogue in Chronicles. The introductions in Nehemiah and Chronicles only partially overlap (see also IV.1,2).

2. 1 Chr 9:3, “and some of the children of Ephraim and Manasseh” (בני אפרים ומנשה). Chronicles registers a greater number of tribes as having members residing in Jerusalem than Nehemiah does. This comports with the Chronicler’s larger ideological interests,\(^{46}\) but it could have been added by the Chronicler or an editor.

\(^{45}\) Neh 11:19 provides a numerical total for the gatekeepers, “172” (מהא שבעים ושנים). While this total is lacking in 1 Chr 9:2-18, a different numerical total for the gatekeepers is provided in 1 Chr 9:22 (see VIII.4).

to his Vorlage. It need not have been a change introduced to the text of Nehemiah borrowed by the Chronicler.47

3. 1 Chr 9:4, “son of Judah” (כנר). So the MT and LXXAN,48 Chronicles links Perez directly to the patriarch Judah.

4. 1 Chr 9:6, “from the sons of Zerah: Jeuel and their kinsmen—690” (כנר-כני זרחו).

This material is lacking in Neh 11:5–7. In a latter part of the Nehemiah list, which is unparalleled in Chronicles, reference is also made to Zerah (MT Neh 11:24; lacking in LXX Nehemiah). But the lineage is completely different: “Petaiah son of Meshezabel of the sons of Zerah son of Judah.”49

5. 1 Chr 9:8–9, “Ibneiah son of Jeroham, Elah son50 of Uzzi son of Machir,51 and Meshullam son of Shephatiah52 son of Reuel son of Ibnijah;53 (9) and their kinsmen according to their lineages—956. All of these men were heads of their ancestral houses” (רוכשים בן-ירוחם ואלה בן-עצי בן-מקיר ומשלא בן-שפתי בן-רואאל בן-יכניא).

47 Along with a number of commentators, I do not see any compelling reason to deny that much of the genealogical material in 1 Chronicles 1–9 is part of the Chronicler’s larger work. See S. Japhet, “Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles,” JBL 98 (1979) 205–218; idem, I & II Chronicles, 1–10; Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 37–40; Kartveit, Motive und Schichten; M. Oeming, Das wahre Israel: die ‘genealogische Vorhalle’ 1 Chronik 1–9 (BWANT 128; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990). For a different view, see A. C. Welch, Post–exilic Judaism (The Baird Lectures [1934]; Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1935) 185–186; Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, 110–31; Rudolph, Chronikbücher, 6–91.

48 LXXAN “and the son of Judah.”

49 LXX9 Neh 11:24 reads simply καὶ Παθαία υἱὸς Βασηλής.

50 So the MT (כנר בן). Some follow the LXX (οὗτοι υἱοὶ) and read “these are the sons of” (כנר בן), but MT’s name is attested elsewhere (1 Kgs 16:6–14; 2 Kgs 15:30; 17:1; 18:1, 19; 1 Chr 1:52 [// Gen 36:41]; 4:15).

51 So the LXX8 Μαχείρ (= מַהֲרִי). The difference with the MT, “Michri” (מַהֲרִי; cf. b Μαχεΐρι), a hapax legomenon, reveals metathesis.

52 The phrase, “son of Shephatiah,” is lacking in the Syr.

53 So the MT (כנר). LXX8 אֱלָה; LXXL (byes) and Arm lexouiov.
This Benjaminites genealogy and numerical summary are unparalleled in Nehemiah 11.

6. 1 Chr 9:12, “son of Meshullam” (בֶּן-מְשֻלָּם).
The priestly genealogy of Adaiah differs in some respects from that of Neh 11:12.54

7. 1 Chr 9:13, “heads of their ancestral houses” (ראשיׁם לָבֵית אֲבוֹתָם).
The phrase does not appear in Neh 11:14, but both Neh 11:14 and 1 Chr 9:13 describe the kin of Immer’s line as “men of substance” (נָבוֹרי חִלָּה).

8. 1 Chr 9:13, “for the work of the service of the house of God” (לְמַלְאָאכָה בְּבֵית אֱלֹהָיִם).
Reading with the LXX and the Vg.55 Speaking of the priests and Levites as active in “the work of the service of the temple” is typical of Chronicles, over against the Priestly source.56 Earlier, Neh 11:12 depicts priests as involved with “the work of the temple” (הָמֵלָאכָה לְבֵית).

9. 1 Chr 9:14, “Merari” (מְרָרִי).
MT and LXX Neh 11:15 lack the linkage between Shemaiah and this Levitical phratry. Merari appears consistently in the Chronicler’s genealogies (1 Chr 5:27; 6:1, 4, 14, 29, 32, 48, 62; 9:14) and in the account of the monarchy (1 Chr 15:6, 17; 23:6, 21; 24:26; 26:10, 19; 2 Chr 29:12; 34:12). By contrast, Merari appears only once in Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezr 8:19).

54 See further IV.5, VI.2, and VIII.2.


10. 1 Chr 9:15, “and Baqbaqar,\(^58\) Heresh and Galal” (בַּקְבַּקֶּר הַרְשֵׁה גָּלָל). Thus the MT and the LXX.\(^59\) The names Heresh and Galal do not appear in MT and LXX Neh 11:17. The name Baqbuqiah (בַּבַּקְעִיָּה) appears in a slightly different context in MT Neh 11:17 (lacking in LXX Neh 11:17).

11. 1 Chr 9:16b, “and Berechiah son of Asa son of Elqanah, who resided in the villages of the Netophathites” (בֵּרֵכְיוֹ הַנֶּתוֹפָחִים). This Levitical genealogy and demographic reference are not found in Nehemiah 11.

12. 1 Chr 9:17, “Shallum” (שָׁלֹם). The reference to this gatekeeper does not appear in either MT or LXX Neh 11:19.

13. 1 Chr 9:17, “and Ahiman” (אֹהֵימִן). So the MT.\(^60\) This gatekeeper is missing in Neh 11:19. The name may originate from a dittoography of “their kinsman” (אָדָמִים), which follows.

14. 1 Chr 9:17, “Shallum was the head” (שָׁלֹם הָרָאשׁ). MT and LXX Nehemiah lack this phrase (see V.12 above).

15. 1 Chr 9:18, “up until now in the King’s Gate in the east.” Lacking in MT and LXX Neh 11:19. The catalogue of Neh 11:19 provides its own brief summary of gatekeeper activity.

16. 1 Chr 9:18, “belonging to the camps of the sons of Levi” (לְמַחֲנֵת הַנָּשִׁים לֵי). So the MT.\(^61\) Lacking in MT and LXX Neh 11:19.

---

\(^{58}\) So the MT. LXX\(^b\) καὶ Βασάρ. Cf. 1 Chr 25:13.

\(^{59}\) Some point to the evidence of the Syr and Arab to read “son of Heresh son of Galal son of Mattaniah.”

\(^{60}\) Cf. LXX\(^b\) καὶ Αἰμάν; LXX\(^i\) καὶ Αἴμαν.

\(^{61}\) LXX\(^ab\) τῶν παρεμβολῶν ὕιων Λευ, “of the camps of the sons of Levi.”
The pluses of Chronicles vis-à-vis Nehemiah are much of the same character as those of Nehemiah vis-à-vis Chronicles: introductory material (vv. 2, 3), genealogical information (vv. 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17), functions and titles (vv. 9, 13, 14, 18), and numerical summaries (vv. 6, 9). The length of the pluses in Chronicles is not as great as those found in MT Nehemiah (over against Chronicles). Nevertheless, the extent of the Sondergut in Chronicles makes it much harder to sustain the argument that the lists in Chronicles and Nehemiah are intimately related. Ackroyd’s proposed analogy with the parallel lists in Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7 becomes unwieldy if not unhelpful.\(^{62}\) Given the number and extent of the pluses in Chronicles, it becomes much more difficult to sustain the argument that the list in Nehemiah derives from Chronicles. The pluses in Chronicles are, after all, not confined to introductions and summaries, in which one might expect to find editors most active, but also appear throughout the list itself. By the same token, the pluses in LXX and MT Nehemiah over against Chronicles (IV.1–13) make it much more difficult to sustain the argument that the list in Chronicles derives from MT Nehemiah. The issue involves, after all, more than the filling out of a few genealogies and headings. To demonstrate a relationship of direct dependence, one would have to show how and why an editor of Chronicles (or Nehemiah) both excised a substantial amount of material from his source and added his own material. Moreover, the added material would not simply replace deleted material. Instead, the editor would have to situate at least some of the additional administrative information, numerical totals, and genealogies in new contexts. It would seem that the variations between Chronicles and Nehemiah are much more economically explained by positing writers who each revised and supplemented a source with their own information than by positing one editor who configured relationships one way and another editor who later abridged, altered, and reconfigured these relationships. Recognizing that each trident

\(^{62}\) One might instead compare the discrepancies between 1 Chronicles 9 and Nehemiah 11 with those between portions of MT 1 Kings 11–14 and the so-called supplement of LXX 1 Kgs 12:24a–z. But there are basic differences of sequence between 1 Kings 11–14 and the supplement that render such an analogy less than exact. See my Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies; vol. 1: The Reign of Solomon and the Rise of Jeroboam (HSM 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 172–223; vol. 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah (HSM 53; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 73–120.
supplemented the source according to his own interests also explains the presence of unique material in each work.

But what of the relationship between Chronicles and LXX Nehemiah 11? Given that the catalogue in LXX Nehemiah 11 is much shorter than the baroque version in MT Nehemiah 11, could not one contend that the list in Chronicles is dependent on an earlier version of Nehemiah 11, a list that more closely resembles LXX Nehemiah 11?

VI. Pluses Shared by MT Chronicles and MT Nehemiah

At first glance, it might seem plausible that the list in 1 Chronicles 9 has been derived from an earlier version of Nehemiah 11 resembling the Vorlage of the LXX. But this theory has to be qualified, when one considers that MT and LXX 1 Chronicles share a number of similar readings with MT Nehemiah 11 over against LXX Nehemiah 11.

1. 1 Chr 9.2, “temple servants” (נוהים).

So the MT and the LXX, as well as MT Neh 11:3. Lacking in LXX Neh 11:3. Reference to these functionaries is found only in late biblical sources (Ezr 2:43, 58, 70; 7:7; 8:17, 20 [Qere]; Neh 3:26, 31; 7:46, 60, 72; 10:29; 11:3, 21), in the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q340), and in the Talmud (m. Qidd. 4.1; m. Hor. 3.8; b. Hor. 13a; b. Qidd. 70a, 72a).63 Other alleged occurrences in Chronicles are textually disputed (1 Chr 6:33; 2 Chr 35:3//1 Esdr 1:3).64

2. 1 Chr 9:12, “and Adaiah son of Jeroham” (揆יה בֶּן-יוֹרְם).


Haran, “The Nethinim,” 165. See also II.1.
So the MT and the LXX, as well as MT Neh 11:3. Lacking in LXX Neh 11:3.

3. 1 Chr 9:12, “Malchiah” (מַלְכִּיָּה). So also MT Neh 11:12. Lacking in LXX Neh 11:12.

4. 1 Chr 9:12, “Jahzerah” (גַּחְזֵרָה). The name is a *hapax legomenon.* MT Neh 11:13 has “Ahzai” (אַחָזָי). Neither name is found in the parallel of LXX Neh 11:13.

5. 1 Chr 9:12, “Meshillemith” (מְשִׁלְלֶמִית). On the different version of this name in MT Neh 11:13, see I.3. The name is not found in LXX Neh 11:13.

6. 1 Chr 9:12, “son of Immer” (בֶּן-אָמֶר). So the MT, the LXX (ὕπον Εὔμηρο) and MT Neh 11:13. Lacking in LXX Neh 11:13.

7. 1 Chr 9:14, “son of Hashabiah” (בֶּן-חַשָּׁבְיָה). So MT and LXX 1 Chr 9:14 (ὕπον Ἀσσυβία) and MT Neh 11:15. Lacking in LXX Neh 11:15.

8. 1 Chr 9:14, “of the sons” (בֶּן-בֵּנֵי). So the MT and the LXX. The contrast with MT Neh 11:15, “son of Bunni” (בֶּן-בּוֹנָי), reveals a *mem/bet* confusion. Lacking in LXX Neh 11:15.

9. 1 Chr 9:15, “son of Zichri son of Asaph” (בֶּן-זֶכֵּרי בֶּן-אָסָף). Reading with MT and the LXX (ὕπον Ζζχρι ὦ τοῦ Ἁσαφ). MT Neh 11:17 “son of Zabdi son of Asaph” (בֶּן-זָבְדִי בֶּן-אָסָף). This part of the Levitical genealogy is not found in LXX Nehemiah.

---

65 LXX: ἦπον Εὔμηρο; LXX: Ἐζζρα; Syr: מְשִׁלְלֶמִית.
66 For other examples, see McCarter, *Textual Criticism, 44–45.*
67 To reconcile these two readings one would have to assume both a *bet/kaph* and a *dalet/res* confusion, but this would not be impossible, McCarter, *Textual Criticism, 44–46.*

11. 1 Chr 9:16, “Jeduthun” (יְדֵוְתָן). So the MT and the LXX, as well as MT Neh 11:17 (Qere). Syr, and Vg. 1 Chr 11:16 and MT Neh 11:17 (Ketib) “Jedithun” (יְדֵיתָן). Lacking in LXX Neh 11:17.

The material common to MT Chronicles and MT Nehemiah over against the LXX is not plentiful. It pertains to the introductory heading (v. 2) and to the genealogies (vv. 12, 14, 15, 16). No numerical summaries, functions, and titles are involved. Since Chronicles and MT Nehemiah share a limited number of similar readings over against LXX Nehemiah, the catalogue in 1 Chronicles 9 must postdate the Vorlage of the catalogue in LXX Nehemiah. But one should press the investigation further. Is the list in 1 Chronicles 9 related to LXX Nehemiah (as opposed to MT Nehemiah) at all? Is it possible that the Vorlage of 1 Chronicles 9 postdates the version in LXX Nehemiah, but antedates the version of MT Nehemiah? To address this question, one should examine the readings of Chronicles and LXX Nehemiah more closely.

VII. Minuses in LXX Nehemiah 11 and MT, LXX Chronicles

Some of the readings of MT Nehemiah that are not shared by LXX Nehemiah 11 are also not found in either MT or LXX 1 Chronicles 9.

1. MT Neh 11:12, “822” (שָׂנֵנָה חַמָּת עֵשֶׂרִים וּשְׁנֵי). LXX Neh 11:12 lacks “822.” The number is lacking in 1 Chr 9:13, which also lacks other material found in Neh 11:12 (see II.3; IV.9, 10).

2. Neh 11:12, “son of Pelaliah” (בֶּן-פֶּלַּלְיָה). This phrase appears near the end of a large minus in LXX Neh 11:12 over against MT Neh 11:12 (see II.4).

The phrase appears neither in LXX Neh 11:13 nor in 1 Chronicles 9 (see also II.5).

This expression is absent from both LXX Neh 11:14 and 1 Chr 9:13.\(^{69}\)

5. Neh 11:16, “and Shabbetai and Jozebad, in charge of the external work of the house of God, from the heads of the Levites” (וְשַׁבְֹתֵי יוֹדֵעַ עַל-מַלְאָכָה הַחֹזֵה לְבֵית אֱלֹהִים מַרְאֵשׁ הָלָיוֹם).
Both LXX Nehemiah and 1 Chr 9:14 lack all of this material. The minus in LXX Nehemiah begins earlier in Neh 11:15 and includes material that is found within another context in Chronicles—“son of Hashabiah” (בְּנוֹי-חשָׁבִי; 1 Chr 9:14).\(^{70}\)

6. Neh 11:17, “head of the beginning, who gave thanks in prayer, and Baqbuqiah the second among his kinsmen” (רָאשׁ חַנָּתָל יְהוֹדָה לָפֵלָה וֹכְקַבְּעוֹי עַמִּים מַאֲחֵי).
See the comment to II.10 above.

7. MT Neh 11:18, “all of the Levites in the holy city” (כָּל לֶוִי בְּעֵיר הַכָּרְשֵׁם).
Lacking in both LXX Neh 11:18 and 1 Chr 9:16. The minus in LXX Nehemiah begins in Neh 11:17 and includes material that is found in the parallel of 1 Chr 9:16, “son of Galal son of Jeduthun” (בְּנוֹי גָּלָל בֶּן-יוֹדְוָן).

Some comments follow from this list. First, because 1 Chr 9:2–18 shares a number of minuses with LXX Nehemiah, the author(s) of the list in 1 Chronicles 9 may have drawn upon an older text that resembled the Vorlage of LXX Nehemiah to some degree. Second, the minuses are significantly longer in LXX Nehemiah than they are in Chronicles. Some of the material lacking in LXX Nehemiah is found, albeit in different contexts, in Chronicles. Because MT and LXX 1 Chronicles also share some readings with MT Nehemiah 11 over against LXX Nehemiah 11 (VI.1–11), one also has to allow for the possibility that the lists of MT Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9 have been partially corrected to one another. Third, the editor of MT Nehemiah expanded earlier material more fully and differently than the editor of

\(^{69}\) See further II.7.

\(^{70}\) See further V.9 and VI.8.
Chronicles did. To elaborate on this last point, it will be helpful to examine some cases in which MT Nehemiah and Chronicles each seem to go their own way with shared material.

VIII. Variations in Kinship, Sequence, and Number

In previous sections, we have observed that in a number of instances parallel terms or expressions are used within different contexts. It will be useful to pursue these instances a step further. Such comparisons between MT 1 Chr 9:2-18 and MT Neh 11:3-19 go beyond variations in length (plusses and minuses). Even where the two texts provide numerical summaries or employ the same names, they may provide different totals or configure relationships differently. These important variations occur within the lists themselves. To be sure, some differences between the two texts, such as the spelling of names, are relatively minor and may be explained text-critically. But other differences, involving whole sequences of names and kinship relationships, are much harder to explain as the result of errors in textual transmission. The following list is not exhaustive.

1. In tallying the Judahites who lived in Jerusalem, both 1 Chr 9:3-4 and Neh 11:4 mention an “Uthai” (Neh 11:4: “athaia’”) who stems from the phratry of Perez. These facts the two texts share in common. But 1 Chr 9:4 renders Uthai as “son of Ammihud son of Omri son of Imri son of Bani,” while Neh 11:4 renders Athaiah as “son of Uzziah son of Zechariah son of Amariah son of Shephatiah son of Mahalalel.” There is a possibility of dittography in 1 Chr 9:4 (I.1) and one can

71 For example, MT 1 Chr 9:16 reads, “and Obadiah” (עבדיה), while MT Neh 11:17 has a hypocoristicon “and Abda” (עבדיה). 1 Chr 9:16 continues with “son of Shemaiah” (בן-שמאיה), while MT Neh 11:17 again has a hypocoristicon “son of Shammu” (שלמה). 72 Such variations should also be noted and observed in any attempt to use the lists to reconstruct the history of Persian period Jerusalem.

73 So the Qere of 1 Chr 9:4 (יָד) and the Vg (Bonni). The Targum combines features of the Qere and the Keteb. The LXX* reads (ὑίος) οὗόν, but some LXX cursive shows (βαβύν). 74 Hence, it is not a matter of one author telescoping a longer lineage (pace W. L. Osborne, The Genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9 [Diss., Dropsie University, 1979] 303). Although the phenomenon of telescoping is typical of ancient genealogies, the names themselves differ within these two lineages.
understand Imri (יאָם) as a variation (possibly a hypocoristicon) of Amariah
(אָם). Otherwise, the two texts differ both in the list of names and in the total
number of generations.\(^{75}\)

2. In recording another lineage of Judahites, 1 Chr 9:5 and Neh 11:5 mention a
figure: Asaiah (אָשִׁיאָה; 1 Chr 9:5) or Maaseiah (מָאָשְׁיָה; Neh 11:5), who is ultimately
related to the Shilonite(s).\(^{76}\) MT 1 Chr 9:5 registers Asaiah as “the firstborn and his
sons,”\(^{77}\) while Neh 11:5 registers Maaseiah as “son of Baruch son of Col-Hozeh, son
of Hazaiah, son of Adaiah, son of Joiarib, son of Zechariah son of the Shilonite.”\(^{78}\)
Moreover, 1 Chr 9:5 presents the Shilonites as a separate phratry within Judah, but
Neh 11:6 subordinates the lineage of the Shilonite to the phratry of Perez. One can
understand how Baruch (בּוֹרָךְ) may have become “the firstborn” (בּוֹרָךְ) or vice
versa, but the two lineages are otherwise distinct.\(^{79}\)

3. In listing various lineages of the Benjaminites, both 1 Chr 9:7 and Neh 11:7
mention “Sallu son of Meshullam.” Chronicles presents him as “son of Hodaviah
son of Hassenuah (חָסְנָא),” but Nehemiah provides him with a different lineage:
“son of Joel son of Pedahiah son of Kolaiyah son of Maasaiah son of Ithiel son of
Jesaiyah.”\(^{80}\) To complicate matters further, Neh 11:9 later mentions a “Judah son of
Hassenuah,” who is “second in charge of the city.” One could make a case for the
transformation of Judah to Hodaviah (חָדָד) or vice versa, but it is striking
that the same unusual name “Hassenuah” appears in two such different
Benjaminites contexts.\(^{81}\)

\(^{75}\) Zadok (“Notes,” 47) thinks that Ammihud (עָמִימוּד) may be a corrupted combination of
יְהוָּא and וֹדֵי.

\(^{76}\) Often emended, with good reason, to the Shelanite(s) (Num 26:20; 1 Chr 2:3; 4:21–23).

\(^{77}\) On LXX 1 Chr 9:5, see I.2.

\(^{78}\) See further IV.5.

\(^{79}\) LXX 1 Chr 9:5 “his firstborn” (πρωτότοκος μισθοῦ = בּוֹרָךְ).

\(^{80}\) On LXX Neh 11:7, see II.1.

\(^{81}\) The variants in LXX 1 Chr 9:7 are relevant: LXX \(Σααβά\) and Tg \(סְמַעָה\) (cf. Vg. Asana). Cf.
LXX \(אֶשְׁבָּא\); cf. \(אֲשָׂאָא\). LXX Neh 11:9 \(אֲסָאָאָה\). A similar name appears elsewhere in MT Ezr
2:35 (\(שָׁמַעָה\) and in Neh 3:3 \(סָמָעָה\). R. Zadok thinks that MT 1 Chr 9:7 offers an
“eclectic” spelling, a combination of \(šmwh\) and \(sn\h\), “A Note on \(sn\h\),” VT 38 (1988) 483–
486.
4. Both catalogues are punctuated by summaries that provide numerical totals for categories of people. Neither list employs such summaries systematically. Both furnish one total for one phratry of the Judahites. The phratries—Zerah (1 Chr 9:6); Perez (Neh 11:6)—and the totals—690 (1 Chr 9:6); 468 (Neh 11:6)—differ. 1 Chr 9:9 provides a total for the Benjaminites (956), while Neh 11:8 provides a total for only one branch of the Benjaminites (928). 1 Chr 9:13 lists one grand total for the priests (1760). The list in Neh 11:12–14 provides three consecutive subtotals for groups within the priesthood—822 (v. 12), 242 (v. 13), and 128 (v. 14). Only Neh 11:18 provides a tally of the Levites (284). Both texts list aggregates of gatekeepers, but the numbers are different—212 (1 Chr 9:22) and 172 (Neh 11:19).82 In brief, the two lists neither agree on a single number, nor show consistency in how they tally such numbers.

Conclusions

In the past fifty years, as evidence provided by the discoveries at Qumran has come to light, scholars have become increasingly aware that the MT, the LXX, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Samaritan Pentateuch preserve different editions of some biblical books and passages. Careful study of this variegated textual evidence has furnished scholars with not only unprecedented discernment into the rich literary history of the Hebrew Scriptures, but also with new insight into the legacy of ancient Israel and Judah. Examination of the parallel lists in Chronicles and Nehemiah confirms the existence of multiple editions of individual passages within biblical books. The many incidental, but not insignificant, dissimilarities between Nehemiah and Chronicles make it difficult to derive one list from the other.83 One can readily understand why tradents would provide their own editorial comments on sources in their employ, but it seems unlikely that they would randomly alter kinship relationships, excise genealogies, delete

82 The heading (1 Chr 9:2) and summary (1 Chr 9:34) in Chronicles make it clear that the editor of the list regards the gatekeepers as Levites. This is in keeping with the stance of other texts in Chronicles, Japhet, I & II Chronicles, 214. The status of the gatekeepers is more ambiguous in Nehemiah 11. They appear in a category apart from the Levites (Neh 11:18), Blenkinsopp, Ezra–Nehemiah, 324–326.

83 Contra Curtis and Madsen, Chronicles, 172.
administrative functions, and arbitrarily change, supplement, or excise numerical totals for a particular group or sub-group. It seems more likely that the two lists are only indirectly related. Each represents a revision of and a development from an older source. This explanation is much less labored than positing a direct relationship of dependence between the lists. It accounts for the divergences between MT and LXX Nehemiah as well as the discrepancies between Chronicles and both MT and LXX Nehemiah. Examining the similarities and differences between the catalogues enables one to see how editors have each gone their own way with earlier material. Each has contextualized, edited, and supplemented the catalogue according to his own interests. Because the lists in both Chronicles and Nehemiah betray some of the language and typical concerns of these works, it is doubtful that they are late additions to these books.

In the case of the two literary strata in Nehemiah 11, we have an indication of how a base text underwent expansion within one textual tradition. LXX Nehemiah 11 may also be of some use in comprehending the composition of 1 Chronicles 9. Inasmuch as a comparison between MT Nehemiah 11 and LXX Nehemiah 11 provides some clues about how a shorter list was expanded within a particular tradition, one can appreciate how an earlier list was edited, revised, and expanded to reach its present form in Chronicles. But the differences between LXX and MT Nehemiah should not become confused with those between Nehemiah and Chronicles. Whereas LXX and MT Nehemiah 11 represent two stages in the growth of a single literary unit, the lists in Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9


85 Most of the writers who dismiss the list(s) as later interpolation(s) hold to a common authorship view for Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah and presume that a single author would not produce two somewhat different versions of the same source within one literary work. This is not a problem, of course, if one holds to a view of separate authorship. In any case, dismissing the list(s) as later additions only postpones the question of determining the possible connections between them.

represent two distinct literary editions.\textsuperscript{87} In this respect, the important disparities among the lists say something about the larger works of which they are a part. The differences between the catalogues of 1 Chr 9:2–34 and Neh 11:3–32 provide further evidence that the editors of these books were not one and the same.\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{87} On the significance of the terminology, see n. 39.