

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php

THE RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EARLY SETTLEMENT OF LEVITES IN JUDAH.

Nigel Allan

Many, including myself, owe their career to the enthusiasm Professor Weingreen imparted to all his students and to the enormous interest he took in them not only while directly under his instruction but in the careers he had so ably prepared them for. It is a great privilege to make a small contribution in honour of his eightieth birthday and to wish him and Mrs Weingreen many more years of health and happiness.

The settlement of Levites in Judah is of great significance for understanding both the early propagation of the YHWH religion and directly connected with this, the emergence of Judah into a position of prominence in pre-exilic Israel. This association between the tribe of Levi with respect to its special relationship to YHWH and the tribe of Judah is witnessed by a number of traditions in the Old Testament.

Of particular interest to the study of the early domicile of Levites is the levitical genealogy found in Nu.26:58 a. This genealogy is quite different in content and style from the larger genealogy in which it is contained and unique among levitical genealogies. In place of the usual enumeration of Gershom, Kohath and Merari as the sons of Levi, the offspring of Levi are stated to be the families of the Libnites, the Hebronites, the Mahlites, the Mushites and the Korahites. Instead of the use of personal names as in other genealogies, a gentile form is used here. The genealogy is clearly an intrusion which enumerates the children of Levi differently from those already recorded in the previous verses.¹ The genealogy in v.57 is resumed in the same style at the end of v.58 with the words "and Kohath begat Amram", so providing the completion of the genealogy interrupted in the foregoing part of v.58².

There is little foundation on which to establish the correct chronological application for the origin of the Gershom, Kohath, Merari genealogy, except that in these names there lies an authentic memory of persons rather than references to places or names of families. As these three eponymous ancestors of levitical families remain constant although changing their respective positions from time to time, the totally divergent tradition in v.58 a stands therefore as the sole surviving memory of some ancient levitical communities which in later times lost their significance.

The names Mushi and Mahli afford little assistance in the search for a date of origin for this list but the name Korah³ indicates a pre-exilic date if the disgrace of Korah related in Nu.16 is attributed to a post-exilic struggle within the Jerusalem hierarchy⁴ and considered responsible for the subservient position of Korah found recorded by the Chronicler.⁵ This is supported by the fact

that Libnah and Hebron both achieved the height of their importance in the pre-exilic period.⁶ It is from the second of these two settlements that the most secure basis for the investigation of this levitical arrangement is to be sought. The earliest date must be subsequent to Israel's settlement in Canaan and allow sufficient time for a levitical family to develop in each of these places important enough to ensure the survival of their record. Libnah attained the height of its fortune in the later monarchic period when it was sufficiently strong to revolt against Judah (2 Kgs.8:22), and its leading families were regarded prestigious enough to intermarry with some of the later kings of Judah.⁷ Although this dating suits the foremost position of Libnah, it seems unlikely that Hebron, by that time an unimportant garrison town in a system of fortresses and therefore of little significance, should have contained an important levitical community the record of whose existence has survived. Hebron experienced the climax of its historical career during the reign of David. Subsequent to the reigns of David and Solomon it became part of the system of fortresses built by Rehoboam without any undue celebrity (cf. 2 Chr.11:10) and ultimately fell to the Edomites during the Exile. If the date of the list's formulation is placed in the reign of David, when Hebron as royal capital of Judah was enjoying the zenith of its long and illustrious career which had begun in patriarchal times, it is most probable that the Levites of Hebron would have insisted on their ascendancy over the other groups. It therefore follows that the period of Israel's settlement in Canaan prior to the establishment of the Hebrew monarchy is the period most appropriate for the formulation of these levitical groups when Libnah may have enjoyed sufficient prominence to claim a predominant position over the Hebron group still on the steady ascent to eminence, and other levitical groups in the vicinity.⁸

Of the five levitical settlements mentioned in this early list, three for which some locality can be ascertained belong to the southern regions of Judah. The southern origin of Korah is supported by the fact that Korah was one of the sons of Esau born to him in Canaan (Gen.36:5,14) and even more strongly by 1 Chr.2:43 where he is recorded as the son of Hebron. When the Israelites settled in Libnah, which was originally a Canaanite town, its inhabitants would have been incorporated into the YHWH community. As Levites were the followers of Moses *par excellence* and preservers of the pure mosaic tradition of Israel's faith which made them distinct from their fellow tribesmen in their dedication to YHWH,⁹ they would have been regarded as an important element in the integration of a Canaanite city into Israel. Their role at Hebron may have been of double significance when it is remembered that the Calebites who had settled there were not part of the group that came out of Egypt, but represented one of the elements that became subsequently attached to Israel in the wilderness. It is doubtful if they were YHWH worshippers before joining up with Israel during the period of wandering in the wilderness, and on account of the recentness

of their conversion to Israel's God (which may have been only nominal) it is very likely that on their settlement in the Canaanite city of Hebron they would either be influenced by the religion indigenous to the place or revert to their original faith. The Levites had to maintain the YHWH influence amongst the Calebites and at the same time propagate their religion among the native population. The association of the Levites with Judah rather than Caleb indicates acknowledgement of the alien nature of Caleb and implies that Judah was the strongest of the Israelite elements that had entered the promised land as part of the Calebite advance from the south.¹⁰ The concurrence of the traditions propagated by these Levites and those which circulated among the southern tribes, but especially in Judah the strongest of them, must have been an important factor in the subsequent emergence of Judah to a position of pre-eminence over all the tribes of Israel. It could be possible, although no definite conclusion may be reached, that Levites in these settlements functioned at a communal shrine sited at Hebron where besides Judah and Caleb, Simeon, Othniel, Jerahmeel and the Kenizzites gathered to worship.¹¹ However, it is evident from the meagre information available that Levites existed as a group in Judaeon and Calebite towns and being an entity distinct from the tribes in whose midst they lived, do not appear to have shared in the tribal allotment of land.

Moving to the final chapters of the book of Judges, we meet two different Levites. First, in Ju.17 and 18 the career of Micah's Levite is described and the origin of the sanctuary and priesthood of Dan explained. We are told in this ancient narrative¹² that a Levite, who came from Bethlehem in Judah, on arrival at the shrine built by Micah with silver stolen from his mother, was immediately offered the position of priest. The Levite accepted Micah's offer and received ten shekels a year, food and clothes, following which he was installed by Micah as chaplain to his household.¹³ The reference to the Levite in v.10 as a father as well as a priest¹⁴ may indicate that he had some administrative or counselling function in Micah's household and it is quite evident that the distinctive relationship of the Levite with YHWH was well known since immediately following his arrival Micah set aside his son whom he had appointed priest of his shrine and placed the Levite in charge in his stead. The comment of Micah that the service of the Levite at his shrine insured the special blessing of YHWH (17:13) suggests that the Levite, although perhaps infrequently met with was nevertheless highly esteemed. The second of the supplementary narratives to the book of Judges relates to a tribal conflict with Benjamin occasioned by the violation of a Levite's concubine. Unlike Micah's Levite we are given no background information regarding this Levite except that he sojourned on the side of Mt. Ephraim (19:1). However, he did have a link with Judah, albeit a tenuous one, in that his concubine came from Bethlehem in Judah, the home of Micah's Levite, and it was there he went to fetch her back from her father's house. It may be possible that this Levite originally came from the vicinity

of Bethlehem where he had first met his concubine and following from this, to postulate a settlement of Levites in or around Bethlehem. It therefore appears that during this early period of settlement we have evidence of a scattering of levitical settlements in Judah and an affinity between the two. As Levites had no tribal inheritance of land, they were free to move from their original domiciles in the south or wherever else they may have been to seek a living where it could be found and propagate their faith in YHWH whom they served.

We now turn to the lists of levitical cities recorded in Jos.21 and 1 Chr.6:39-66 (E.V.6:54-81).¹⁵ The priestly writer records in Jos.21 how forty-eight cities including six cities of refuge were assigned to the Levites in all the territory conquered by the Israelites on both sides of the Jordan. Additionally, the Levites also received pasture lands around each city's perimeter¹⁶ in which they were to raise their livestock (Nu.35:3). They could not sell them as they were their eternal possession among the children of Israel (cf. Lev.25:33f.). However, the fact that in the case of Hebron the village and arable land remained the property of Caleb (cf. Jos.21:11f.) shows that no land fit for agriculture was assigned to the Levites and in this way the principle was upheld which denied the Levites an inheritance of land among the tribes of Israel. The cities of refuge that are included among the levitical cities, being equally distributed throughout Palestine, provided areas of asylum where refuge could be sought in the event of unpremeditated homicide (Dt.4:41-43; 19:1-13). The selection of these cities of refuge must have originally been occasioned by their reputation as sites of important shrines which had become popular as asylums for the fugitive and were accordingly selected as places suitable for levitical settlements.

Because Jos.21.1,2 relate how the Levites requested cities from Joshua and Eleazar, these lists were traditionally taken to derive from the period of Israel's conquest of Canaan.¹⁷ However, as the area which they covered bears no relevance to this period of Israel's history when she had scarcely gained a footing in the land, this dating cannot be upheld.¹⁸ The most feasible assessment of the situation has been advanced by Benjamin Mazar¹⁹, who points to the closing years of David's reign or the early years of Solomon's administration when Israel's power was at its climax and all the places mentioned in the lists fell within her borders, as the period from which it is most likely the lists of levitical cities derive.²⁰ In support of this dating Mazar cites 1 Chr.26:30-32 which relates how, in the fortieth year of David's reign i.e. the last year of his life, certain members of the important levitical family Hebron were commissioned with religious and secular duties in the state especially in the area west of the Jordan and in the areas occupied by the Reubenites, Gadites, and half of the Manasseh tribe. Jerijah, which was evidently the foremost branch of the Hebronites, was sought out in Jazer of Gilead and found to include men capable of discharging state business in these regions.

From this information it becomes clear that David inaugurated a type of civil service staffed by Levites, which was continued and developed by his successor.²¹ As we have seen in the case of Hebron and Libnah some cities may already have had levitical settlements in them,²² while others became centres of levitical activity in accordance with royal policy. Jokmeam, included in the Ephraimite group of levitical cities, is connected with the family of Jekameam, a descendant of the levitical family of Hebron (cf. 1 Chr. 23:19; 24:23), which may indicate the antiquity of this settlement and its southern provenance. From the mode of arrangement of levitical cities the religious value of Levites as missionaries of YHWH was fully appreciated by David and Solomon and skilfully used by them in the spiritual affairs of the kingdom where the loyalty of the people could not be depended upon.²³

The lists are composed of groups of towns, each group separate from the rest. There is no geographical continuity between them yet they all lie within the bounds of Israelite territory. Hence a parallel may be drawn between the area in which the levitical cities are found and the territory of the kingdom of Israel as defined in the description of Israel's borders in David's census (cf. 2 Sam. 24). It is possible that Levites were settled in the cities around Jerusalem for the purpose of protecting the capital from a rising of the family of Saul in Benjamin or an insurrection of the northern tribes.²⁴ The absence of Jerusalem itself from the lists can be accounted for by the fact that it was the religious and political centre of the nation and the seat of government. There is accordingly no mention of priestly land in connection with Jerusalem, but it is possible that the pasturage around the levitical settlements in Benjamin was used for the maintenance of the Jerusalem priesthood throughout the year. Moreover, it would appear reasonable to assume that these towns provided a residence for the overspill of the Jerusalem clergy, and as the royal cult developed, priests who had discharged their course of priestly office at Jerusalem may have retired to one of these cities until their next turn of duty came up. Thus, these settlements would have come directly under the control of the Jerusalem priesthood and may have stood in the same relationship to Jerusalem as medieval parishes to their cathedral. As late as the return from exile fortified camps of Levites are found mentioned in the region of Geba and Azmaveth (Neh. 12:29). The levitical presence in a number of cities east of the Jordan doubtless exercised a consolidating influence in an area where Israelite settlements were thinly scattered among Moabites, Ammonites and the people of Bashan.²⁵ Levitical settlements are also found in the extreme south among the Calebites, Kenizzites and Jerahmeelites,²⁶ and among the alien Canaanite cities further north.²⁷

The ruling family having a natural affinity with Judah, the loyalty of this area was never in question, hence we have no levitical settlements in central Judah their purpose being superfluous there. Similar to Judah there was generally speaking, an absence of Canaanite elements in the central region of Palestine

and no mention of levitical cities is found in this area either with the exception of Shechem, where the presence of Levites could have been a deliberate safeguard to Davidic interests at this ancient shrine which had in earlier times close associations with the Joseph tribes and may have been regarded as a potential rival to Jerusalem.²⁸ Further north lay frontier areas, and regions of mixed and doubtful allegiance where a number of cities contained levitical elements probably with the purpose of maintaining the loyalty of the local populace so far removed from the seat of government to the royal house at Jerusalem.²⁹

In view of the close association of Levites with the tribe of Judah a strong sense of loyalty would have existed between levitical elements scattered throughout Israel and the ruling Judaeon family. As we have seen from the closing chapters of the Book of Judges Bethlehem appears to have contained an early settlement of Levites.³⁰ It is therefore not without significance that David and his family came from Bethlehem (2 Sam.16:1). It follows that, as an influential element steeped in the mosaic tradition which they shared with Judah, David and his son should have found it expedient to extend the influence of the Levites by advancing their position in the state.³¹ The levitical families connected with Hebron may have been the first to be sought out for promotion. It was probably not only due to the elders whose friendship David had cultivated (cf. I Sam.30:26-31) but also to levitical co-operation that he was able to set up his residence in Hebron as king of the whole of Judah, and to use it as a jumping off ground for his future ambitious designs. They must have witnessed and perhaps even officiated at his coronation, and would doubtless have watched his career with keen interest, as the progress of their missionary activities in the name of his god, YHWH, would in no small measure have been dependent on the ultimate success of his plans.

The connection of Levites with Judah is further witnessed by the experience of the Levites in the northern kingdom following its separation from Judah. Under Jeroboam's regime Levites in the northern kingdom became redundant, unable to discharge their priestly office, act as civil servants or spread Judaeon propaganda (I Kgs.12:31). It seems that they were not actually displaced by Jeroboam from their sanctuaries but their importance was eclipsed by the setting up of non-levitical priests to operate at Bethel and Dan (I Kgs.12:25 ff.).³² An interesting tradition relating to the fate of these northern Levites occurs in 2 Chr.11:13,14,17. Here it is stated that the Levites throughout Israel resorted to Rehoboam in Judah as Jeroboam had denied them their priestly office. They were followed by all the faithful who sought YHWH at his sanctuary in Jerusalem, and made Rehoboam secure for three years.³³ The verb used to denote the rejection of the Levites from their priestly function is *znh* which has the basic meaning "to be foul" or "rancid". It can in most instances be understood to mean something that is abhorrent i.e. foul or stinking.³⁴ In v.14

of the passage under consideration this verb again occurs in the hiphil form to express Jeroboam's and his son's rejection of the Levites from the priesthood. The correct interpretation appears to be that Jeroboam in making the Levites abhorrent injured their reputation as priests among the people, and the fact that his sons are mentioned suggests that the process of stirring up public opinion against the Levites continued for some time.³⁵ This would agree with the record of I Kgs.12:31 where there is no evidence of a direct attempt to drive out the Levites, but rather to break their monopoly over the state's religious affairs by setting up priests not of the sons of Levi. It is probable that the Chronicler has preserved a genuine tradition that told of a stream of levitical refugees from the northern kingdom back to Judah that doubtless continued for many years. However, the special position of the levitical tribe in Judah seems to have survived into later years, for during the reign of Jehoshaphat, we find them still engaged in civil administration and in the cultic and legal life of Judaeen cities (cf. 2 Chr. 19:11).

NOTES

1. In the levitical genealogy recorded in Ex. 6:16-19, the first four families do not appear as gentilics but as persons enumerated along with others as grandsons of Levi. The fifth family, the Korahites, appear in v.21 as Korah, the great grandson of Levi. See A.H.J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester*, Göttingen, 1965, p.170.
2. See K Möhlenbrink, "Die levitschen Überlieferungen des Alten Testaments", *ZAW*, 52, 1934, pp.184-231, especially pp.192ff. Also M. Noth, *Numbers*, London, 1968, p.155.
3. K. Möhlenbrink *op.cit.*, thinks that as Mahli and Mushi always occur together, a transcriber of the text accidentally inserted Mahli here since it is absent from the LXX version of the list, and considers the placing of Korah by the LXX in third place as original, its present position at the end of the list in the M.T. being subsequent to the incident in Nu.16 following which the Korahites were doubtless repressed.

4. So A. Kuenen in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur biblischen Wissenschaft* translated from Dutch by K. Budde, Leipzig, 1894, pp.465ff., who places the struggle of the Levites recounted in the priestly tradition sometime during the fourth century B.C. It is interesting to note however, that even in the very subordinate position occupied by Levites by the first century A.D. they still made good a minor pretension to priestly privilege by obtaining from Agrippa II the right to wear priestly linen. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, XX.8 §6.
5. The Korahites were gatekeepers cf. I Chr.9:19, 26:1,19; bakers of sacrificial meals cf. I Chr.9:31, and singers cf. 2 Chr.20:19, positions hardly appropriate for a group powerful enough to contend for the Aaronic priesthood, and may therefore indicate their demotion from high office following their dissension with the Aaronites.
6. Korah is generally found in the genealogies as the "great grandson" of Levi and "grandson" of Kohath, cf. Nu.16:1. The remaining four in the verse under discussion always appear in the other genealogies as "grandsons" of Levi, but Libni is sometimes referred to as the son of Gershom cf. Nu.3:18; I Chr.6:2 (E.V. v.17), and sometimes as the son of Merari, cf. I Chr.6:14 (E.V.v.29). Mahli and Mushi always appear as the sons of Merari and Hebron as the son of Kohath.
7. Cf 2 Kgs.23:31; 24:18; Jer.52:1.
8. So L. Waterman "Some determining factors in the northward progress of Levi", *JAOS*, 57, 1937, pp.375-380 who also takes into consideration that sufficient time must be allowed for the Mushi group, which he identifies with Moses, to be relegated from its original position of importance to its present position in the list of levitical families recorded in Nu.26:58.
9. Ex.32:25-29 and Dt.33:8-11 record traditions relating to the attachment of Levites to YHWH at the expense of ties of kindred. See N. Allan, "Some levitical traditions considered with reference to the status of Levites in pre-exilic Israel", *Hey. J*, 21, 1980, pp.1-13 and A.H.J. Gunneweg, *op.cit.*, pp.41ff.
10. See M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, Stuttgart, 1948, pp.114 f., and 143 ff. who identifies the narratives in Nu.13 and 14 and 21:1-3 with a tradition peripheral to the wilderness wanderings which relates a Calebite conquest of the Hebron region initiated from Kadesh. See also N.H. Snaith, "Numbers" in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, London, 1962, pp.259ff.

11. Caleb is first encountered in Kadesh in Nu.13 and 14 (see previous note) and subsequently represented as inhabiting the locality of Hebron only some sixty miles distant (Jos.14:13ff.; 21:12; Ju.1:20). Kenizzites are associated with Edom in Gen.36:11,15,42; I Chr.1:36,53, but I Chr.4:15 enumerates Kenaz among the sons of Caleb and records him as occupying an area in the Negeb region. See also Ju.1:13ff., and E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, Halle, 1906, pp.73ff.
12. J. Brewer, "The Composition of Ju.17 and 18", *AJSL*, 29, 1913, pp.261-283, claims the narrative to be a complete unit with few evidences of redaction. C.F. Burney, *Book of Judges*, London, 1918, p.416 considers that the narrative presents a combination of two ancient traditions derived from J and E which were in all essentials strikingly similar. A. Murtonem, "Some Thoughts on Judges xvii sq.," *VT*, 1, 1951, pp.223f., postulates three sources while C.A. Simpson, *Composition of the Book of Judges*, Oxford, 1957, pp.63-70, divides the narrative into J and E plus considerable redactional material. M. Noth, "The Background of Judges 17-18" in B.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson eds., *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: essays in honour of J. Muilenberg*, New York, 1962, pp.68-85 interprets Ju.17 and 18 as a polemic by partisans of Jeroboam's cultic innovations at Bethel and Dan (I Kgs.12:25-33). See also A.D.H. Mayes' analysis of Ju.17-21 in *Israel in the period of the Judges*, London, 1974, pp.42-46.
13. G. Ahlström in *Aspects of Syncretism in Israelite religion*, Lund, 1963, pp.25-27 points out that for Micah to set up a *bēt 'elōhîm* shows him to have been a petty prince or ruler. This seems to agree with his pursuit of a whole tribe which an individual with his household would hardly be capable of.
14. Besides the use of the term 'āb "father" as one of respect given to prophets and priests (2 Kgs.6:21) it is also used of the king's chief minister or vizier cf. Gen.45:8.
15. W.F. Albright in his article "The list of levitic cities" in *Louis Ginzberg's Jubilee Volume*, Vol. I, New York, 1945, pp.49-75 eliminates the divergencies between Ju.21 and I Chr.6 by comparing them with the Greek versions, especially Vaticanus.
16. Nu.35:4 states that the pasturage area was to extend a thousand cubits from the wall, but the following verse defines the area as two thousand cubits without the city, so reducing the city itself to a mere point. Perhaps something of an idealistic nature may be seen in this provision.

17. It has long been thought that the lists were a retrojection of the post-exilic imagination into earlier times. J. Wellhausen in his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, translated by J.S. Black and A. Menzies, Edinburgh, 1885, pp.162ff. was one of the pioneers of this hypothesis.
18. A. Alt, "Bemerkungen zu einem judäischen Ortslisten des Alten Testament", *Kleine Schriften*, 1953, pp.289-305, considers that the list refers to an evacuation of the Levites to Jerusalem and the replacement of their cities with armed fortresses. He explains the discrepancy between the statements of 2 Kgs. 23 and the absence of Judaeian towns in the list by the theory that the reform came to a stop before it was accomplished.
19. B. Mazar, "The Cities of Priests and Levites", *VTS*, 7, 1960, pp.193-205.
20. On the archaeological evidence see G.W. Ahlström, *Royal Administration and National Religion in Ancient Palestine*, Leiden, 1982, p.38 who also points to this dating.
21. J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology I; The Encroacher and the Levite, the Term 'Aboda*, Berkeley, 1970, pp.84ff. discusses the military nature of the Levites as witnessed by terms such as *pēḳudat* used here which can mean armed guard. Cf. Ezek.9:1 and 2 Kgs.11:18.
22. Cf. W.F. Albright, *op.cit.*, especially pp. 58f. J. Gray, *Joshua Judges and Ruth, The Century Bible*, new ed., London, 1967, p.29 suggests that the intensive settlement of Levites in Hebron and the Kenizzite district to the south and east of Hebron (Ju.21:11,13,14) may represent measures taken by David after the suppression of Absalom's revolt which had been organised from Hebron (2 Sam.15:10).
23. It is worth mentioning that not all settlements with remains dating from this period appear in the lists of levitical cities. For instance the fortresses of Arad in the Negeb which guarded the way to Edom (2 Kgs. 3:20) connecting Beersheba, Hebron and Jerusalem with Arabah and the Gulf of Aqaba. Archaeological evidence places the building of this fortress in Solomon's reign, see Y. Aharoni, "Arad: its inscriptions and temple", *BA*, 31, 1968, pp.2f. to which Ahlström, *Royal Administration, op.cit.*, pp.40f. tries to give levitical connection from the mention of the Qerosite on an ostraca found there, identifying them with the Nethinim, a class of temple servant found in Ezra 2:44 and Neh.7:47.
24. Which in view of Sheba's revolt (2 Sam.20) and the cursing of Shimei (2 Sam.16: 5-14) was more than a mere possibility.

25. Bezer, Jahaz, Kedemoth, Mephaath, Ramoth-Gilead, Mahanaim, Heshbon, Jazer, Golan and Ashtaroth. Cf. Jos.21:27,36-39 and L.H. Grollenberg, *Atlas of the Bible*, London, 1956, pp.59f., 65f., 81f. It is interesting to note that on the Moabite stone it is recorded that Mesha, king of Moab, annexed Jahaz to Dibon (l.20) so indicating the debateable nature of this border territory. See W.H. Bennett, *The Moabite Stone*, Edinburgh, 1911, pp.3f.,36,51.
26. Hebron, Libnah, Jattir, Eshtemoa, Debir, Juttah and Bethshemesh, cf. Jos.21:13-16 and L.H. Grollenberg, *op.cit.*
27. Eltekah, Gibbethon, Gathrimmon, Gezer, Aijalon and Beth-horon, cf. Jos.21:22-25 and L.H. Grollenberg, *op.cit.*
28. N. Allan in "Jerusalem and Shechem", *VT*, 24, 1974, pp.353-357 suggests that it was the presence of Levites in Shechem which determined Jeroboam to move his capital to Penuel (I Kgs.12:25).
29. Kishon, Dabareh, Engannim, Abdon, Helkath, Rehob, Hammoth, Jokneam and Dimnah, cf. Jos.21:28-35 and L.H. Grollenberg, *op.cit.*
30. G.W. Ahlström, "Was David a Jebusite subject", *ZAW*, 92, 1980, pp.285-287, contends that David was already familiar with the Jebusite administration when he took over Jerusalem and its priesthood and so explains Zadok's predominance (2 Sam.15:24ff.) as priest of Jerusalem over Abiathar from Nob. This he deduces from the idea that Bethlehem, David's home town, formed part of the Jebusite kingdom of Jerusalem. However, it is highly problematical that David as an alien Jebusite would have been accepted first as Saul's general and then appointed by Samuel as Judah's leader and future king. R. de Vaux, *Histoire ancienne d'Israël des origines à l'installation en Canaan*, Paris, 1971, pp.509f., claims that David the Judaeon from Bethlehem in his defeat of a common enemy, the Amalekites, united around him all the surrounding tribes with his own to Judah by the gifts he gave to his friends, and the list which follows enumerates those various groups united under his sceptre (I Sam.30:26-31).
31. G.W. Ahlström, *Royal Administration ...*, *op.cit.*, pp.6-9 gives parallel instances in Mesopotamia where the ruler used religion to establish and maintain royal administration.

32. S. Gevirtz in "Simeon and Levi in 'The Blessing of Jacob' ", *HUCA*, 52, 1981, pp.93-128 cogently argues that the curse of Simeon and Levi by Jacob, in Gen.49:5-7 represents a latter-day idealization of a pre-Judaean confederation of Israelite tribes now at the point of its dissolution in the reign of Jeroboam I. Simeon is cursed for its violent support of Judah under David which enabled Judah to become predominant so disrupting the tribal federation of pre-Davidic Israel. Levi's destruction of a bull he sees as their destruction of the cult object at Bethel during the time of the Levites' tenure of office as agents of the Jerusalem government or subsequent to their dismissal by Jeroboam I.
33. The reason for the limitation of three years is due to the invasion of Shishak in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign (cf. 1 Kgs.14:25; 2 Chr.12:2). This invasion from the Chronicler's point of view must have been caused by some religious delinquency on the part of Rehoboam and his people (cf. 2 Chr.12:1) which brought about a weakening of the kingdom. This naturally falls in the fourth year of the reign immediately preceding the invasion, and hence only three years are left for obedience and increase in strength.
34. i.e. *zānah* 'eglēk *šōmērōn* "thy calf is abhorrent, Samaria", Hos.8:5. Cf. also Lam.2:7; Ps.44:10 (E.V.v.9), 24 (E.V.v.23); 60:3 (E.V.v.1), 12 (E.V.v.10); 74:1; 77:8 (E.V.v.7); 89:39 (E.V.v.38). In Is.19:6 a hiphil form occurs with the word *nēhārōt* (rivers) which means "the rivers stink" i.e. for lack of water. The form here shows the Aramaic influence and seems to be made up of two readings *hizniḥū* and *'azniḥū*, the latter of which imitates the Aramaic (cf. Gesenius's *Hebrew and Chaldee lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*, London, 1859, p.249f.).
35. In 2 Chr.13:9 the verb *ndḥ* is used to express Jeroboam's action against the Levites. The rendering "dismissed from office" which is adopted in the NEB and which is appropriate to the context implies that the priests of YHWH ceased to be the official state priesthood and others took their place. This accords with the interpretation proposed for 2 Chr.11:14. However, due to the reference "the sons of Aaron" as a priestly caste it is doubtful if this text is contemporary with the events it records as Aaron does not appear as the ancestor of priests until post-exilic times.

Dr Nigel Allan is Librarian at the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, London