DEIRDRE N. FULTON

Reconsidering Nehemiah's Judah

Forschungen
zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe
80

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
2. Reihe

Herausgegeben von

Konrad Schmid (Zürich) · Mark S. Smith (New York)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen)

80

Deirdre N. Fulton

Reconsidering Nehemiah's Judah

The Case of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11–12

Mohr Siebeck

Deirdre N. Fulton, born 1976; 1998 BA; 2002 MA; 2011 PhD; 2012–13 Research Fellow at Boston College; 2012–13 Lecturer at the Department of Theology at Boston College; since 2013 Assistant Professor of Old Testament at the Department of Religion at Baylor University.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-153882-7
ISBN 978-3-16-153881-0
ISSN 1611-4914 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed on non-aging paper and bound by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Foreword

This book began as a dissertation at The Pennsylvania State University. Initially I was interested in pursuing a study of the size and scope of Judah during the Persian period as depicted in Ezra and Nehemiah. With the encouragement of my doctoral advisor, Gary Knoppers, I more closely undertook a critical examination of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11–12. I would like to express my deep gratitude to Gary and the rest of my dissertation committee, Baruch Halpern, Paul Harvey, Ann Killebrew, and Ken Hirth, for their assistance. Sadly, Brian Hesse, a member of the committee and valued mentor, passed away during the final stages of writing. I appreciate all of the direction I received from my diverse committee.

I would also like to thank the Department of History, Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies and Jewish Studies at The Pennsylvania State University, for their continued support throughout my Ph.D. work. I want to thank other Pennsylvania State University faculty members for their support: Aaron Rubin, Mark Munn, Gonzalo Rubio, and Paula Wapnish Hesse. Also, thanks to my fellow graduate students, including Jonathan Greer, Kenneth Ristau, Margaret Cohen, Matthew Adams, and Eric Welch. Finally, thanks to Daniel Mack for his library research assistance.

Many thanks to my colleagues at Baylor University in the Department of Religion: particularly James Nogalski, Bill Bellinger, Elise Edwards, and Beverly Gaventa. I would also like to specifically thank Joel Burnett for his guidance and feedback on this manuscript. Also, a special thanks to Katherine Smith who helped format and edit the manuscript and Seung Ho Bang for editing work. Thanks to Carey Newman for encouraging me to submit the manuscript for publication in the first place. Parts of the present book were also enhanced by my time spent at Boston College from 2012 to 2013. I enjoyed my conversations with David Vanderhooft and Jeffrey Cooley, as well as Pheme Perkins, Yonder Gillihan, and John Darr.

I would also like to thank Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and the rest of the staff at Mohr Siebeck for all of their assistance through this process. Additionally, thanks to the editors of *Forschungen zum Alten Testament II* for allowing my work to be a part of such an excellent series.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for all of their support through the many stages of research and writing. My parents, Drs. Felicia and David Dix-

on, thank you for your continued encouragement throughout my education. My children, Jada and Dane, you have brought such joy and happiness to my life. Thanks so much to my other family members including my sister Dr. Diane Dungan, and my sisters in law Melinda Fulton and Lydia Fulton. Thank you for your support. Finally, thanks to my husband, James Fulton, for your assistance and reassurance. It is wonderful to have your unceasing support and love. This book is dedicated to you.

Table of Contents

Foreword V

List of Tables XII

List of Abbreviations XIV

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

A. Background 1

B. The History of Scholarship of Nehemiah 11–12 3

C. The Implications of the Divergence between MT and LXX Nehemiah 11–12 10

D. Outline of the Study 13

E. Cambridge Versus Göttingen Critical Editions 15

Chapter 2: The Cultic and Civic Settlement of Jerusalem: MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:1–24 17

A. Introduction 17

B. A Taxonomy of the Lists in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:1–24 19

C. A Literary critical and Form Critical Analysis of MT Neh 11:1–24 20

I. The Literary Critical Analysis 23
1. The Unity of Nehemiah 11:1–24 24
2. The Structure and Form of MT Nehemiah 11:1–24 27
II. Content 28
1. Lists/Components within Nehemiah 11 33
2. The nᵉṯînîm 36
3. The Sons of Solomon's Servants 40

4. Lineages: Judah and Benjamin 42
5. Genealogies: The Priests 43
6. Genealogies: The Levites 45
7. Genealogies: The Gatekeepers 46
8. Summary Section: Nehemiah 11:20–24 46

D. A Literary and Form Critical Analysis of LXX Neh 11:1–24 49

E. MT and LXX Textual Divergences 52

F. A Comparison with Parallel Lists 63

G. The Compositional Process of MT and LXX Neh 11:1–24 65

H. Conclusion 66

Chapter 3: The Judahite, Benjaminite, and Levitical Settlements: An Evaluation of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 69

A. Introduction 69

B. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of MT Nehemiah 11:25–36 70

I. The Literary Critical Analysis 72
II. The Structure and Form of MT Nehemiah 11:25–36 73
III. Tribal Designation 74
IV. Regional Location 75
V. Town Location 76
VI. Categories of Settlement 80

C. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 85

D. MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 Textual Divergences 89

Chapter 4: The Scope of Settlement: A Comparison of the Judahite, Benjaminite, and Levitical Settlement Lists 95

A. Introduction 95

B. An Analysis of Nehemiah 11:25–26 in Comparison with Other Settlement Lists 96

I. A Comparison of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 to MT and LXX Joshua 15 and 18 96
II. A Comparison of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 to Ezra 2:20–33//Nehemiah 7:25–38 107
III. A Comparison of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 to Nehemiah 3 110
IV. A Comparison of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 to other Levitical Settlement Lists 112

C. The Compositional Process of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 115

D. Conclusion 116

Chapter 5: The Cultic Personnel and the Dedication of the Walls in Jerusalem: MT and LXX Nehemiah 12 119

A. Introduction 119

B. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of MT Nehemiah 12 121

I. Introduction 121
II. The Literary Critical Analysis 126
III. The Structure and Form of MT Nehemiah 12 129

C. A Literary Critical and Form Critical Analysis of LXX Nehemiah 12 141

D. MT and LXX Textual Divergences 151

I. Large Scale Differences 153
II. Small Scale Differences 156

E. Parallel Priestly Lists 159

F. Parallel Levitical Lists 161

G. The Compositional Process of LXX and MT Nehemiah 12 161

H. Conclusion 163

Chapter 6: Mapping the Persians, Judahites and Benjaminites: Archaeological and Historical Approaches to Settlements in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods 167

A. Introduction 167

B. Archaeological and Historical Approaches to Settlements in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods 168

I. The Material Culture Approach 169
II. The Historical Archaeology Approach 177

C. The Historical Archaeology Model and the Lists in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25–36 179

D. Archaeology and Text: An Integrated Approach 187

Chapter 7: Conclusion: The Compositional Phases of Nehemiah 11–12 189

A. The Composition of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11–12 189

B. The Connection of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11–12 with the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah 195

C. Historical Context for the Composition of Nehemiah 11–12 199

D. Conclusion 201

Appendix A: A Reconstruction of the Earliest Version of LXX Nehemiah 11–12 203

Appendix B: Maps of the Towns of Settlement in Ezra and Nehemiah 209

Bibliography 221

Reference Index 239

Index of Modern Authors 251

Subject Index 255

List of Tables

Table 1–1: Lists and Genealogies in Ezra and Nehemiah 2

Table 2–1: MT Neh 11:3b in Comparison to other lists in MT Neh 11:1–24 36

Table 2–2: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:7 56

Table 2–3: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:12 56

Table 2–4: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:13 57

Table 2–5: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:15 58

Table 2–6: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:16 58

Table 2–7: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:17 59

Table 2–8: Genealogies in MT and LXX Neh 11:24 62

Table 3–1: Settlements in MT Neh 11:25–36 According to Regional Location 75

Table 3–2: Settlements in LXX Neh 11:25–36 According to Regional Location 86

Table 4–1: Lists of Judahite Settlements 98

Table 4–2: A Comparison with Joshua 18 Benjaminite Settlements 103

Table 4–3: A comparison with Ezra 2//Nehemiah 7 Benjaminite Settlements 109

Table 4–4: A Comparison of the Judahite and Benjaminite Settlements 111

Table 5–1: The Priestly Genealogies in Nehemiah 12 134

Table 5–2: The Priestly Lists 164

Table 5–3: The Levitical Lists 166

Table 6–1: Archaeological Evidence of Settlements from LXX Neh 11:25–36 182

Table 6–2: Archaeological Evidence of Settlements from Neh 11:25–36 183

Abbreviations

A	Codex Alexandrinus
Aeth	Ethiopic
$Aeth^{A}$	Ethiopic A Version
$Aeth^{B}$	Ethiopic B Version
Ant.	Josephus's *Antiquities*
Arm	Armenian Version
B	Codex Vaticanus
EM	Ezra Memoir
Grk	Greek
Il.	Homer's *Iliad*
La^{123}	Latin
LXX	Septuagint
LXX^{L}	Lucianic Greek Text
MT	Masoretic Text
NM	Nehemiah Memoir
Od.	Homer's *Odyssey*
OG	Old Greek
S	Codex Sinaiticus
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
Syr	Syriac Text
Tg.	Targum
Tg. Ps-J.	Targum Pseudo Jonathan
Vulg.	Latin Vulgate

DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
1QDan[b]	Second series of Daniel scrolls found in Qumran Cave 1
Pap6QDan	Fragments of Daniel found in Qumran Cave 6
2QJer	Jeremiah Scroll found in Qumran Cave 2
4QJer[a]	First series of Jeremiah scrolls found in Qumran Cave 4
4QJer[b]	Second series of Jeremiah scrolls found in Qumran Cave 4
4QJer[c]	Third series of Jeremiah scrolls found in Qumran Cave 4
4QSam[a]	First series of Samuel scrolls found in Qumran Cave 4
4QSam[b]	Second series of Samuel scrolls found in Qumran Cave 4
4QSam[c]	Third series of Samuel scrolls found in Qumran Cave 4
4Q340	Text 340 found in Qumran Cave 4

Chapter 1

Introduction

A. Background

In recent decades, the Achaemenid period (538–332 BCE) has become a key area of research in biblical studies.[1] This is particularly evident in the growth of studies dealing with two main texts set within the context of this period: Ezra and Nehemiah. These two books are generally thought to represent the richest biblical texts concerning the Achaemenid period of post-exilic Judah. Ezra and Nehemiah owe their status in modern scholarship to their subject matter. Both discuss the leaders of the returnees from the Babylonian exile to Jerusalem and the surrounding towns, as well as the rebuilding of specific cultic and civic institutions in Jerusalem. Some of the richest information concerning the people and their places of settlement within Ezra and Nehemiah are found in several lengthy lists and genealogies as outlined in Table 1–1.

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

---

[1] Several scholars have observed this trend in scholarship. See for example Pakkala (2004) 1; Kessler (2006) 91.

[2] On the composition of Ezra 2/Neh 7: Batten (1913) 71; Rudolph (1949) 26; Schneider (1959) 37; Mowinckel (1964) 29–45; Myers (1965); Japhet (1982) 84; Williamson (1985) 29–32; Clines (1984) 45; Halpern (1990) 95–96; Edelman (2005) 175; and Lipschits (2005) 154–68. On Neh 3, see Fensham (1982) 169–79; Williamson (1985: 198–212), Blenkinsopp (1988: 227–42), Bailey (1990: 34–40), Carter (1999) 56–57; Grabbe (1998) 43–44; and Lipschits (2005) 168–74.

Table 1–1: Lists and Genealogies in Ezra and Nehemiah

Location	Genealogies
Ezra 2//Neh 7	Lists of families and the number of members who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua.
Ezra 7:1–5	Ezra's Genealogy.
Ezra 8:1–4	Lists of the families and number of adult men who returned with Ezra.
Ezra 10:18–43	People, both cultic and lay members, who married foreign women.
Neh 3:1–32	List of the people and towns that were part of the repair of the wall of Jerusalem.
Neh 10:2–28	Covenant signers during the time of Nehemiah.
Neh 11:4–24	List of the settlers of Jerusalem by the Judahites, Benjaminites, priests, Levites, gatekeepers, *nᵉṯînîm*, sons of Solomon's servants, and advisor to the king. Also, these lists contain genealogies of certain settlers.
Neh 11:25–36	Catalog of the Judahite, Benjaminite, and Levite towns of resettlement.
Neh 12:1–9	Priests and Levites who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua.
Neh 12:10–11	Heads of certain ancestral houses and sources.
Neh 12:12–21	Priests and their patronymics in the time of Joiakim.
Neh 12:22	Jaddua's genealogy, beginning with Eliashib.
Neh 12:23–26	Levites and gatekeepers during the time of Joiakim.

Scholars have noted that the lists in Neh 11–12 are particularly problematic when compared to other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah since much of the material is unique to these two chapters. Thus, several scholars have attempted to reconcile the textual discrepancies between Neh 11–12 and other lists in Ezra and Nehemiah. Little is said, however, concerning the textual divergences that are present within Neh 11–12.[3] The material is preserved in the Hebrew Masoretic Text (MT) of Nehemiah and the Greek Septuagint (LXX) of 2 Esdras, of which the MT preserves the longer version.[4] The differences in the length of material are all the more striking in the case of Nehemiah because the MT and LXX largely correspond in form and content in chapters 1–10.[5]

[3] See Alt (1953) 289–305; Myers (1965); Tov (2001) 257; (2003) 127; Williamson (1985) 344; Blenkinsopp (1988) 330; Knoppers (2000) 141–68; and Klein (2006).

[4] 2 Esdras (or Esdras B) is the Greek translation of MT Ezra and Nehemiah. LXX 2 Esdras is not the same text as "The Apocalypse of Ezra," also called 4 Esdras.

[5] With the exception of MT Neh 3:33–4:17 when compared to 2 Esdras 14:1–15:23. Events relayed in the MT and LXX are connected to the wall building activities and Sanballat's attempts to halt construction. Wooden (2008: 248–57) discusses the text-critical differences, particularly in MT and LXX Neh 4:7–24. He argues that in Neh 4 there are intentional changes on the part of the LXX translator, who departed from the thematic considerations, followed in chapters 1–3. Although Wooden's conclusions merit further consideration in light of my findings for MT and LXX Neh 11–12, the differences in genre

These textual divergences are significant since Neh 11–12 contain names and positions of temple personnel, areas of settlement, and a narrative of the events surrounding the rededication of the walls, which are commonly used in modern scholarly discussions of Jerusalem during the Persian period. In fact, any discussion of the cultic institutions in Jerusalem, during this important period in Judean history, must consider the lists in Neh 11–12.

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

B. The History of Scholarship of Nehemiah 11–12

Previous studies have conceptualized Neh 11–12 in a variety of ways, revealing how difficult these two chapters are to situate within the broader compositional framework of Nehemiah. One area of study tends to highlight the place of MT Neh 11–12 within the broader context of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.[6] The composition of Ezra and Nehemiah has been examined and reexamined in order to understand the sources that were used to construct these texts.[7] Contemporary studies seek to understand the multiple composi-

---

and themes warrant a separate study that includes a discussion of the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah.

[6] Cf. Myers (1965) 195–99; Kellerman (1966) 209–27; Japhet (1968) 330–37; (2006) 250; Coggins (1976) 124–28; Fensham (1982) 242–48; Williamson (1985) 341–66; and Blenkinsopp (1988) 320–27.

[7] Origen, using the LXX and writing in the third century CE, first attests that the texts were originally one and then separated. This separation is also found in Jerome's *Sacra*. The Hebrew texts were not separated, however, until the fifteenth century. See Eusebius *Hist Eccl* 6.25.2 for a reference to this attestation. Until the 1960s, scholars generally viewed Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah as a unified work. With the rise of foundational studies by scholars such as Japhet (1968), the issue of common authorship was questioned. Japhet's study draws attention to the differences in language and terminology, particularly between Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. See also Williamson (1977; 1982). More recently, the issue of common authorship in Ezra and Nehemiah has also come under criticism. VanderKam has drawn attention to the linguistic differences between Ez 1–10 and Neh 1–13. He also points out that the editorial sections in Ezra cites official documents, but Ne-

tional layers and stages of editing that went into the final form of Ezra-Nehemiah.[8] Most scholars argue that fundamental to the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah are the first–person narratives, referred to as the Ezra Memoir (EM) and the Nehemiah Memoir (NM), as well as the sources that were used to compose Ezra 1–6.[9]

The EM includes the activities of Ezra, written in a first-and third-person account. Many scholars argue that Ezra was responsible for the first-person narratives (7:27–9:15), while a later editor put together the third person material on the person of Ezra (7:1–26; Neh 8; 9:1–5).[10] Pakkala, in his detailed study of Ezra, argues that the EM (Ezra 7–10, Neh 8) and also the account of the rebuilding of the Temple (Ezra 5:1–6:15) developed independently, and that a later editor, concerned with the rebuilding of the Temple, combined them in the post-exilic period.[11] A later editor added Ezra 1–4, and priestly groups concerned with the position of the Temple, later reworked these chapters. Through this editorial process, Pakkala argues that Ezra's position as a priest was stressed over his role as a scribe, and the position of the Babylonian returnees was stressed over the people who remained in Judah during the

---

hemiah never does this. Kraemer (1993) also highlights the thematic differences in Ezra and Nehemiah to show their disunity. Boda and Redditt's (2008) edited volume is dedicated to the question of unity between the books of Ezra and Nehemiah as well as to the compositional process behind these two books. In my work, I argue for unity, based on independent sources, of Ezra-Nehemiah. As Wright (2004) and other scholars have asserted, the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah is a *creatio continua.* While additions certainly took place after the earlier sources were put together, this does not mean that they were fully independent works. As Burt argues, "The process of the creation of Ezra-Nehemiah certainly began in disunity, in the existence of separate narrative and list sources. At some juncture, it gained its current unity, both in terms of existence of their appearance on a single manuscript and in terms of their (arguable) thematic and narrative coherence" (2014: 70–71). See Eskenazi (2008); Williamson (2008); and Blenkinsopp (2008) for a discussion of the debate between unity and disunity of Ezra-Nehemiah. See also Becking (2011).

[8] See Japhet (2006: 251) for a discussion of the diachronic approach to Ezra-Nehemiah studies. See Boda and Redditt (2008) for differing opinions on the unity of Ezra and Nehemiah, as well as VanderKam (1992) 55–75; and Wright (2004). See below for a discussion of this particular issue.

[9] Williamson (1983:1–30; 1985: xxiii–xxiv) argues there are several different sources within these chapters: the decree of Cyrus (Ezra 1:9–11), the list of the Temple vessels (2:1–3:1), the catalog of the people who returned from exile (4:6 and 7), Aramaic letters from Rehum and Artaxerxes (4:8–16), Artaxerxes's response (4:17–22), a letter to Darius from Tatteni (5:6–17), and Darius's response (6:3–12), which also included an Aramaic copy of Cyrus's decree. For a further discussion of the composition of Ezra 1–6 see also Clines (1984) 43–47; Blenkinsopp (1988) 42–47; and Halpern (1990).

[10] Several scholars argue for the historical reliability of the EM material, particularly Albright (1940) 248; Yamauchi (1990) 256–58; Hoglund (1992) 207–42; Frei (2001) 11–12; and VanderKam (2004) 3–4. See Pakkala (2004: 4–6) for a discussion of the differing opinions on the historical reliability of this material as well as scholarly reactions to Torrey (1896: 57–60), who argues that the "Chronist" mostly invented the EM.

[11] Pakkala (2004: 3, 141) argues that Ezra 5:1–6:15 is the oldest material in Ezra 1–6.

exile. Finally, Levitical editors combined Ezra and Nehemiah into the final form of the book, where they stressed the importance of the Torah as well as the position of the Levites.[12] Pakkala also concludes in a later study that the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah was a complex process, which, at its heart, has three independent sources, but through a series of editions, these sources were placed together into one larger text.[13]

Scholars commonly assert that the NM is an older source preceding the book of Ezra-Nehemiah, probably written by Nehemiah himself.[14] The sections that are most often credited to the NM are 1:1–2:20; 4:1–7:5a; 12:31–32, 37–41; and 13:4–31.[15] The original texts of the NM are debated, however, as seen in the work of scholars, such as Kratz, who argue that much of Neh 1, 4–7, and 11–13 should not be considered part of the NM.[16] Reinmuth, who builds upon Wiliamson's earlier observation that there were two stages to the first-person narratives connected to Nehemiah, argues for two layers: the *Mauerbau-Erzählung* (Neh 1:1–4:17; 6:1–7:5; 12:27–43) and the *Nehemia-Denkschrift* (Neh 5:1–19; 13:4–31), which is the later layer. [17] More recently, Wright has undertaken a detailed study of the compositional layers of the NM, emphasizing the weaknesses of some of the earlier scholarly arguments.[18] Wright's work represents the most radical departure from earlier studies of the NM, distilling it down to a matter of some 15 verses that focus on Nehemiah's building report.[19] In the example of Neh 11–12, he only briefly discusses the compositional processes at work in these two chapters.[20]

---

[12] Pakkala (2004) 4–6.

[13] Pakkala (2008) 200–15.

[14] Cf. Torrey (1896) 2; Rudolph (1949) 211; Mowinckel (1964) 14; von Rad (1964) 176–87; Kellerman (1967) 4–56; Fensham (1982) 4–5; Williamson (1985) xxiv–xxviii; Gunneweg (1987) 176–80; Blenkinsopp (1988) 46–47; Duggan (2001) 16; Karrer (2001) 128–213; Albertz (2006) 199–206; and Boda (2008) 25. Arguing against a traditional NM, divided as such, see Cohen (2008) 71–74.

[15] Williamson (1985: xxiv–xxviii) also places Neh 5:14–19 in a secondary edition of the NM. Also, some place Neh 7:5b–72a – a list of returnees from the Exile – in the NM. See Clines (1984) and Williamson (1985). Kellerman (1967: 23–26) argues that the list in Neh 7 is not a part of the NM, but rather is from the hand of a later redactor.

[16] Kratz (2005) 68–74. Fensham (1982: 4–5) is on the other end of the interpretation spectrum and argues in favor of including 11:1–13:31 as part of the NM.

[17] Reinmuth (2002); Williamson (1985) xxiv–xxviii.

[18] Wright (2004). See also Wright (2007) 333–48.

[19] These 15 verses are: 1:1a, 11b; 2:1–6 (not including, v. 4b "I prayed to the God of Heaven" and in v. 6 "the consort was sitting beside him" and "I gave him a time"), 11, 15 (not including "I came through the Valley Gate and returned"), 16a, 17, 18b; 3:38 (not including "it was completed until the half of it"); 6:15.

[20] Wright (2004: 331) briefly addresses the material in 11:3–12:26, arguing that these lists were inserted into the larger composition, but it is hard to determine when this occurred. Wright (2004: 340) does, however, place Neh 12:27–47 within his sixth stratum because it was written after the composition of Ezra 1–6 as well as Nehemiah's account. He adds that these additions "resemble other Jewish histories from the Hellenistic age"

Wright maintains that Neh 12:27–47 was added after Ezra 1–6, and is one of the later strata to be added to Nehemiah.[21] While his study draws attention to problematic areas that may relate to the compositional processes behind the book of Nehemiah and develops patterns within the text, his highly complex model has yet to supplant the more traditional view of the role of the NM in explaining the composition of the book of Nehemiah.

All of these various proposals highlight difficulties in reconstructing the composition of the book of Ezra-Nehemiah, especially since lists interrupt the narrative several times.[22] The most dramatic case of lists interrupting the narrative flow is found in Neh 11–12. In this example, Neh 11:1–12:26 interrupts the narrative from chapter 10, which deals with the people who signed the covenant in pledge to abide by the law during the time of Nehemiah. Chapters 11–12 are highlighted as the most difficult section to reconcile within the larger framework of Ezra and Nehemiah.[23] The placement of chapters 11–12, following chapter 10 of Nehemiah, is often questioned as it is believed that the literary style of 11:1–12:26 is most closely related to Neh 7.[24]

---

(340). Nehemiah 12:1–26 is placed within his seventh stratum, which is the final supplement mirroring the "friction between temple and Torah."

[21] Contra Williamson (1985: xxxiv), who argues that only after the composition of Neh 7–13 had taken place, was Ezra 1–6 added.

[22] Albertz (2006: 199–200) observes this problem in his discussion of the NM, pointing out that the rebuilding of the walls, found in 1:1–7:3, is interrupted by a list of wall builders in 3:1–32 and again at the beginning of chapter 5. The bigger problems, according to Albertz, are found in the rest of the NM material since the events in Neh 7:5b–12:30 interrupt the wall building report. Nehemiah 12:31–32 and 37–40 may have originally included the wall building report, but are now "far removed and heavily reworked by the editor" (250). In Boda's study (2008: 51), he adds that 12:27 is problematic since it is different in style from the first-person account in 1–7:5. Thus, according to Boda, it represents the use of a different document from the time of Nehemiah's second residency in Judah, when he may have served as a governor.

[23] To solve the problem of difficulties with this material, certain scholars argue that Neh 11–12, as well as 9–10, were constructed from younger materials that were originally independent of each other, and not part of the NM. See Mowinckel (1964) 50–59, 135–57; Kellerman (1967) 32–56; Kratz (2005) 73–74, 92; Pakkala (2004) 3; and Wright (2004: 330–31).

[24] The continuity in style and content between Neh 7 and 11 has been widely recognized in scholarly discussions for over a century, beginning with Meyer (1896: 94–102). See also Batten (1913) 266–67; Rudolph (1949) 186; Fensham (1982) 242; Clines (1984) 211; McConville (1985) 136; and Grabbe (1998) 59–60, 168. Williamson argues MT Neh 11:1–2 is a reworking of the NM (1985: xxxii–xxxiii, 345; 1999: 283 n. 17). See for example Clines (1984) 211; Gunneweg (1987) 140–44; and Blenkinsopp (1988) 322–23. Lipschits (2002: 427) agrees with Williamson, arguing that a later editor created the continuity between chapters 7 and 11, in order to "place his own interpretive stamp on these materials and to stress to his readers the message he wished to convey to them." Kellerman (1967:

Certain studies examine how the materials within Neh 11:1–12:26 were arranged into a unit since they comprise such different kinds of lists and genealogies. Nevertheless, chapters 11–12 are not a seamless unit because the material within these chapters is so heterogeneous (lists, genealogies, first–person narratives, third–person narratives). Thus, the material is commonly divided based on compositional style, specifically lists and narratives. [25]

Other studies examine the dates for composition of the lists. Since it is commonly argued that the lists in 11:1–12:26 interrupt the NM, scholars debate when these chapters were added to the larger work of Ezra-Nehemiah.[26] As previously stated, lists commonly appear in the larger work of Ezra-Nehemiah. Broad studies by scholars such as Scolnic, seek to explain the use of lists throughout the Hebrew Bible, offering a basic classification system for the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah.[27] Other studies, such as those of Wilson and Johnson, have examined the use of genealogies within the broader biblical context, highlighting their common appearance in Ezra and Nehemiah.[28] The list of the priests in MT and LXX Neh 12:10–11 has garnered the most attention, particularly in relation to reconstructing the high priesthood in Jerusalem during the Persian period. Since most scholars view Neh 12:10–11 as a list of high priests in genealogical dress, several reconstructions of the tenure of the priesthood have been offered.[29] Other studies have examined the entire corpus of lists in Ezra and Nehemiah. In depth studies have examined the lists in Ezra 2//Neh 7, Neh 3, Neh 11:25–36, as well as several others, in an attempt to contextualize each one as well as to understand a general chronology for the material.[30] In the case of Neh 11–12, scholars have offered a wide range of dates for their composition, including the Persian, Hellenistic (331–63 BCE), and even the early Roman period (ca. late first century BCE–first century CE). In certain cases, some lists are contextualized in the Persian

41–44, 103–5) argues for continuity between Neh 7 and Neh 12:27–43, but this view has not gained wide acceptance.

[25] See Rudolph (1949) 191–201; Mowinckel (1965); Myers (1965) 200–204; Fensham (1982) 250–60; Clines (1984) 223–34; Williamson (1985) 355–90; Blenkinsopp (1988) 332–48; and Throntveit (1992) 111–12.

[26] Japhet (2006: 250) contends that since the lists do not make up a complete unit, they form their own independent history, and are their own "literary phenomenon."

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

[28] Johnson (1988) discusses biblical genealogies. Wilson (1977) discusses biblical and ancient Near Easter genealogies.

[29] Scholarly studies on Neh 12:10–11 have generally reacted to Cross (1975: 4–18). See Williamson (1977) 1985; Blenkinsopp (1988) 333–38; Koch (2001); VanderKam (1991; 2004); Scolnic (1999); and Fulton (2009) 94–115.

[30] See Rudolph (1949); Myers (1965); Fensham (1982); Clines (1984); Williamson (1985); Blenkinsopp (1988); Edelman (2005); and Lipschits (2005).

period, while others date to the Hellenistic or even the early Roman periods. In the example of Neh 11, many scholars believe that the series of catalogs of people found in MT Neh 11:4–19 point to real historical circumstances, dated to events after the building of the wall of Jerusalem.[31]

The catalog of settlements in MT Neh 11:25–36 has drawn much attention within studies of Nehemiah. The list of Judahite, Benjaminite, and Levite settlements is examined in order to elucidate the history of postmonarchic Judah. Scholarly research on the subject attempts to establish whether these settlement lists represent real Persian era activities. If they do not, then scholars hypothesize where these lists may be placed (i.e. the Hellenistic or Roman periods). Some scholars champion the Persian period date, reconciling the text with the political situation of the time.[32] Others argue for a later date, such as Böhler, who sees the settlement list in 11:25–36 as belonging to the Maccabean period (late second c. BCE).[33] In fact, Böhler argues for a second century BCE redaction to Neh 11, during what he terms a "Hasmonean renaissance."[34] A final position asserts that the lists, particularly MT Neh 11:25–36, were idealized images of the Persian period settlement. Thus, the lists cannot fully be contextualized historically since they depict an idealized portrait of settlement, and not a realistic one. Scholars such as Lipschits most clearly champion this opinion.[35] As I argue in this study, Böhler's Maccabean dating merits further consideration when one factors in the text-critical data.

Archaeological evidence may provide a physical means of further examining certain historical claims. Of particular importance are the surveys that have been conducted throughout the highlands, the Shephelah, and the Negev.[36] Scholars have examined the lists in Ezra 2//Neh 7, and Neh 3 in light of the archaeological survey data.[37] These studies generally highlight certain continuity with Iron II settlement sites, but also point out that compared to the late Iron II, there was a dramatic decrease in population during the Persian period. More recently, Finkelstein entered into the debate, offering his inter-

[31] Lipschits (2002: 427–28) comments that most of the scholars who assert the historical reliability of Neh 11:25–36 place the lists within the context of the population who settled Jerusalem after the reconstruction of the walls. For this position, see Batten (1913) 267; McConville (1985) 136; Williamson (1985) 346–49; Grabbe (1998) 59–60. The issue with contextualizing the list in MT Neh 11:25–36 as part of the settlement of Jerusalem is that Jerusalem is not mentioned as a place settled in this list.

[32] See Myers (1965) 191; Clines (1984) 220; Weinberg (1992) 49–61; and Janzen (2002) 499.

[33] Böhler (2003) 48.

[34] See also Rudolph (1949) 189–91; Mowinckel (1964) 151; Gunneweg (1987) 14–15.

[35] Lipschits (2002) 427–40.

[36] See Kochavi (1972); Dagan (1992); Ofer (1993); Dinur and Feig (1993); Zertal (1999; 2001); Lehmann (2001; 2003); Liscphits (2005); Faust (2007); and Gadot (2015).

[37] Carter (1999); Lipschits (2002; 2005); and Edelman (2005).

pretation of these specific lists.[38] Yet the settlement list, found in Neh 11:25–36, has not drawn as much attention in the archaeological reconstructions of the region of Judah since it is believed that many of the sites mentioned in the list could not have been within the political borders of Persian period Judah.

In the case of MT Neh 12:1–26, several studies have focused on the different lists since they discuss the priests and Levites, set in the context of the return. Nehemiah 12:1–26 focuses on several generations of priestly returnees, and thus represents several generations within the elite temple community. As previously mentioned, the most significant studies of Neh 12 discuss the supposed high priestly genealogy in Neh 12:10–11 and 22–23. Nehemiah 12:27–46 shifts the focus, in narrative form, to the reinstitution of cultic activities, as the Jerusalem community gathers and parades around Jerusalem. The shift back to a narration of public cult has drawn much attention. This line of research is used for multiple purposes, including a discussion of the NM, as well as a reconstruction of both the physical space of Jerusalem and also the temple community.[39] And, as previously mentioned, the literary and historical questions are particularly intriguing since Nehemiah suddenly reappears in MT Neh 12:31.[40]

Moreover, MT Neh 12:27–47 is further divided on the basis of first-versus third-person narratives. Within chapter 12, MT Neh 12:31–32, and 37–41, are often considered part of the NM, since they are a first person account written by Nehemiah himself. Clines argues that the Chronicler, whom he views as the final editor of this material, was responsible for the composition of Neh 12:27–30, 44–47, and 13:1–3.[41] He is unsure whether 11:1–3 and 13–19 were part of the NM. Both Clines and Williamson agree that 11:20–36 and 12:1–26 were part of a later redaction of this material.[42]

All of these studies, however, fail to consider the differences between the MT and LXX texts of Nehemiah. When one is exploring any of the subjects that have been discussed previously in relation to MT Neh 11–12 (formation, style, composition, geopolitical as well as local political events, and modern archaeological studies), it is necessary to take into consideration the large-scale text-critical differences that may inform or affect their studies.

---

[38] Finkelstein (2008; 2010) offers a Hasmonean date for the different lists, based on his interpretation of the archaeological data. See chapter 6 for a discussion of his analysis and conclusions.

[39] Studies by scholars such as Fullerton (1919: 171–79), Burrows (1935: 29–39), Kraft (1954: 240), and Myers (1965: 112–20), have used Neh 12:27–43 to reconstruct the geography of Jerusalem.

[40] Nehemiah's first person accounts end in 7:5 and begin again in MT 12:31. In the LXX, Nehemiah's first person account begins in v. 25.

[41] Clines (1984) 9–12.

[42] Clines (1984) 12–14; Williamson (1985) xxxv.

C. The Implications of the Divergences between MT and LXX Nehemiah 11–12

There have been many different kinds of studies that have taken MT Neh 11–12 into consideration, yet the textual divergences in the book of Nehemiah (LXX 2 Esdras) are the focus of very few scholarly studies.[43] To be sure, scholars have noticed certain textual variants.[44] But with the exception of Knoppers's work on MT and LXX Neh 11:3–19 and Klein's response to Knoppers, few studies have spent time exploring the divergences between MT and LXX Neh 11–12.[45] This is exceptional considering the number of text-critical studies on biblical texts, such as Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, which have shown that textual criticism is important for providing information on the sources and compositional processes behind their creation and redaction. The differences in length (shorter versus longer), content, and order among textual witnesses are important to consider when examining any text.

In his study of the relationship of the MT and LXX, Tov states, "When comparing the LXX evidence with that of the other sources, we find that beyond the MT, the LXX is the single most important source preserving redactionally different material relevant to the literary analysis of the text, often earlier than MT."[46] Ulrich also notes the importance of the LXX for informing studies on the MT, particularly when the Qumran material is considered, which may favor one tradition over the other.[47] Moreover, De Troyer's work on the relationship between the MT and LXX texts of Joshua highlights the importance of different textual traditions for informing modern scholarly studies of the composition of these texts.[48]

In the example of 1 Samuel, there are divergences between the MT and LXX in a few key places, namely chapters 1–2 and 17–18. There are other

---

[43] Howorth (1902: 151) observed in his study of 2 Esdras, "As it occurs in the Greek Bibles it is a very low and servile translation of the Hebrew, or Masoretic, text. It follows in it eccentricities of diction and otherwise." Wooden's (2006: 121) comment, in response to this assessment that "2 Esdras has not fared well in scholarly assessments," is a fitting reflection on Howorth's statement.

[44] See Rudolph (1949) xx; Alt (1953); Myers (1965); Williamson (1985); Blenkinsopp (1988); Tov (2001; 2003); Ulrich (1996); Knoppers (2000); Klein (2006); and Wooden (2006; 2008).

[45] Klein (2006). Wooden (2008: 119–144) discusses the translation techniques of cases in 2 Esdras that have differing grammatical cases. One of his examples is Neh 11:4–7 and 2 Esd. 21:4–7.

[46] Tov (2003) 121.

[47] Ulrich (1999) 100–103.

[48] De Troyer (2003) 127.

witnesses to the material, such as 4QSam[a], 4QSam[b], 4QSam[c], and Josephus. These different texts reflect the compositional growth that this particular text underwent over a period of time. In 1 Sam 1–2 (the story of Hannah), Ulrich argues that the MT preserves the older edition, and the LXX constitutes a reworked edition.[49] In 1 Sam 17–18 (the David and Goliath story), Ulrich and Tov argue that the LXX is the older version, and the MT preserves a reworked edition.[50]

Another book that has many textual divergences is Jeremiah. It is preserved in many witnesses, including the MT, 2QJer, 4QJer[a], 4QJer[c], as well as the LXX and 4QJer[b]. Jeremiah is also preserved in a different order, according to the MT and LXX witnesses. Ulrich and Tov both argue that there are two stages, or editions, to the text of Jeremiah.[51] These editions are classified by Tov as "edition I," represented by the form found in the LXX and 4QJer[b], and a later expanded edition, called "edition II," characterized by MT, 4QJer[a], and 4QJer[c].[52] The different textual witnesses reflect a complex textual process, in which the text was edited and reedited over a period of time.

In the example of Daniel, there are several witnesses: the MT, LXX, and fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), including 1QDan[b], 4QDan[a], 4QDan[d], 4QDan[e], pap6QDan. Unlike Jeremiah, in which there are two editions of a single textual tradition, independent textual growth is evident in both the MT and the LXX.[53] In chapters 4–6, a number of divergences exist between the texts. Chapters 4 and 6 are shorter in the MT, whereas chapter 5 is shorter in the LXX. In fact, Collins notes that both the Old Greek (OG) and MT underwent secondary developments to the text.[54] Thus, unlike Jeremiah, which only has two versions, Daniel underwent changes from its *Vorlage*.

A final example in the biblical text that is important to consider, particularly in light of Nehemiah–2 Esdras studies, is the comparison between Ezra and 1 Esdras. In this case, the situation is complicated by the fact that 1 Esdras overlaps with Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, as well as contains its own unique material. Thus, each text reflects a later reworking of earlier material. A comparison of MT Ezra and LXX 1 Esdras, 4:7–11 shows that the LXX

---

[49] Ulrich (1999) 66.

[50] Ulrich (1999) 67–68; Tov (2001) 334–36. This interpretation is debated, and scholars such as Halpern maintain that the LXX attempts to "harmonize apparent contradictions" found in the MT tradition (2001: 7). Thus, the MT preserves the older material.

[51] Ulrich (1999) 66–68; Tov (2001) 334–36. See also Janzen (1973) for a discussion of the Greek text of Jeremiah, and Stulman (1985) on the Hebrew text, reconstructed from the Greek prose material.

[52] Tov (1976); (1981) 145–67; 1985: 213–237. See also Schmid (1996) for a discussion of these different versions.

[53] Ulrich (1999) 72.

[54] Collins (1993) 6.