OXFORD

לֹא תִרְצָח
לֹא תִנְאָף
לֹא תִגְנֹב
לֹא תַעֲנֶה רְשֵׁ
יֵשׁ
וְתַבְּ בֵּת רֵעֶךָ
טְוּבֵהְוַאֲמָחֹלוֹ
אֲלֹ רֵעֶךָ

HISTORICAL &
BIBLICAL ISRAEL

The History, Tradition, and Archives of Israel and Judah

REINHARD G. KRATZ

Translated by Paul Michael Kurtz

HISTORICAL AND BIBLICAL ISRAEL

Historical and Biblical Israel

The History, Tradition, and Archives
of Israel and Judah

by
REINHARD G. KRATZ

Translated by
PAUL MICHAEL KURTZ

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Acknowledgements

Contents

Contents

PART C. JEWISH ARCHIVES

Introduction

In the second half of the twentieth century, Hebrew Bible scholarship experienced substantial transformation. The spectacular unearthing of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Qumran), the no less important excavations of Mount Gerizim (the sanctuary of the Samaritans), and the epigraphic finds throughout Syria–Palestine have all produced a wealth of new material. These discoveries, alongside a diversity of new methodological approaches for investigating both literary and religious history, have cast new light upon the Hebrew Bible and set our conception of ancient Israel and early Judaism in the first millennium BCE upon a new foundation. Orienting itself toward these shifts, this book concentrates on three distinct fields of research that have been particularly impacted by such changes: the history of Israel and Judah, the formation of the Hebrew Bible, and Jewish archives.

While the first two fields, i.e., history and literature, belong to the traditional curriculum of Hebrew Bible scholarship—despite their different treatment here in some respects—the third constitutes a field of research intimately connected with the first two but one that tends to draw attention only in the scope of more specialized inquiries: those places that either yielded Jewish manuscripts and documents (Elephantine, Al-Yahudu, Qumran) or are associated conspicuously with the tradition of the Hebrew Bible (Mount Gerizim, Jerusalem, Alexandria). Indeed, historical reconstruction presupposes analysis of the biblical literature and other source materials, yet the the re-presentation here proceeds in the opposite direction. It follows a factual and overall chronological order. The first part of the book, on Israelite and Judahite history, thus delimits the historical and religious context in which the biblical tradition emerged, while the second concerns the formation and history of that very tradition. As for the third and final part, it considers those places in which non-biblical as well as biblical texts were preserved, copied, edited, annotated, updated, and translated—be they firmly established, archaeologically verified, or literarily attested. At the center of this book lies a fundamental yet unanswered question: under which historical and sociological conditions and in which manner the Hebrew Bible became an authoritative tradition, that is, holy scripture and the canon of Judaism as well as Christianity.

The title *Historical and Biblical Israel* should direct attention to a foundational and, for the arrangement of this book, crucial distinction between two modes of Israel. This distinction affirms that the Israel of biblical tradition cannot simply be equated with the history of Israel and Judah. For this reason, the book separates Israelite and Judahite history from the history (or portrait) of biblical tradition, though each depends directly and inevitably upon the other. Biblical tradition is, after all, a constituent part of Israel and Judah's history, its genesis and development taking place within that very history. At the same time, the biblical tradition created its own historical portrait of the people of Israel, an *historia sacra* (sacred history) not only inspired by Israelite and Judahite history but also—at a certain point in time—influential on that history itself, even if it represented only one single segment among many within the history of Israel and Judah (and a particular one at that).

In fact, the arrangement of this book proceeds from such differentiation. Whereas Part A depends on the broader, external scope of politics, culture, and religion for its reconstruction of Israel and Judah's *history*, Part B turns specifically to the segment of biblical *tradition* that developed within the history of Israel and Judah but reflects it in only a distinctive, peculiar way. In terms of method, Part A, on history, does not simply follows the biblical narrative but stands primarily on the archaeological—more specifically, epigraphic—evidence and additional information that can be won from the biblical tradition by means of both critical analysis and historical analogy. Part B, in turn, cannot offer a full investigation of the literary (i.e., secondary) biblical sources but presupposes it; this portrayal therefore focuses on the transformation of pre-biblical material into biblical tradition and then provides an outline of literary history through the centuries to come.[1]

Centering on the *archives*, Part C combines the two distinct perspectives on ancient Israel. Here, the various archaeological (especially epigraphic) and literary evidence for the history of Israel and Judah comes to the fore. Sometimes, this evidence represents Israel's history. Other times, it reflects its traditions. Still others, it reveals both simultaneously. Evaluation of these archives prompts a corresponding differentiation of the sources. Since the history of Israel and Judah is only available through the refraction of literary—more specifically, biblical—tradition, we must first distinguish between archaeological (i.e., epigraphic) and biblical sources, a distinction that correlates to the distinction between the historical and the literary

---

[1] In some respects, this approach along with the arrangement of Parts A and B, especially the methodological principles followed in Part A for "normal history," are comparable to Liverani (2006). The main difference comes in Part B, on the literary analysis, dating, and historical explanation of biblical texts, i.e., the "invented history" according to Liverani. On Liverani's important book, see Na'aman (2006*b*).

(viz. biblical) Israel. Furthermore, we must differentiate within the biblical tradition itself, that is, between an older, pre-biblical or non-biblical state of Israel and Judah and a later, biblical ideal (or, more precisely, ideals) of Israel, which became historical only later.

As any old hand should recognize, this particular approach is indebted to Julius Wellhausen's distinction between "ancient Israel" and "Judaism," which he established in *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (2nd edn. 1883, first under the title *History of Israel, Volume I*, 1878) and developed historiographically in *Israelite and Jewish History* (1894). Wellhausen divided the two modes of Israel (i.e., Israel according to history and tradition, or historical and biblical Israel) into two consecutive epochs, the "ancient Israel" of the pre-exilic monarchy and the "Judaism" of the post-exilic period—epochs separated from one another through the bisection or "coming-in-between" (*Zwischeneinkommen*) of the Jewish law or, in a broader sense, the biblical tradition. Although such distinction, especially the division of two epochs, is too schematic in detail—as Wellhausen knew himself—and requires modification in several regards, on the whole it rests upon solid ground and can serve as a hermeneutical key for further differentiating the biblical tradition. As we shall see, especially with our investigation of the Jewish archives, such differentiation proves necessary not only for pre-exilic Israel but also for Judaism of the post-state period. While there is no reason to change the actual direction of historical development and follow the biblical narrative, instead, as advocated by the great antipode of Wellhausen, Yehezkel Kaufmann,[2] the kind of unqualified animosity toward the Jewish "religion of the law" (and toward all other forms of institutionalized religion) that emerged in Wellhausen and many other scholars of his time and that, to some extent, continues even in the present must be renounced, of course. To illustrate this necessity and avoid potential misunderstanding, some remarks on terminology are in order.

Apart from *biblical Israel*, this book also uses terms like *biblical*, *para-biblical*, and *non-biblical literature* as well as *biblical* and *non-biblical Judaism*. Since the pre-Christian period knew neither the Hebrew Bible nor the Old Testament in the sense of a canon of holy scripture, the term *biblical* is admittedly anachronistic. In the absence of a better alternative, however, I retain such terminology. Consequently, *biblical* designates those writings that later found their way into the Hebrew Bible but already—and almost exclusively—enjoyed an authoritative status and regular citation in the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Para-biblical* literature, by contrast, encompasses the writings that, one way or another, relate to, depend on, refer to, or were influenced by texts that later became biblical (Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, Hellenistic Jewish literature). *Non-biblical*, then, denominates the writings that demonstrate no such relationship.

---

[2] See Elrefaei (2015).

The various designations for *Bible* also require some clarification. As early as the Greek version of Ben Sira (Jesus Sirach), ancient Jewish and early Christian sources spoke of the "law, prophets, and other writings" or "(holy) scriptures/ scripture." In Christian tradition, *Old Testament*—which arose as a counterpart to *New Testament* (2 Cor. 3:14)—has gained currency for specifying the corpus, whereas Jewish tradition and contemporary usage among scholars has more frequently employed *Hebrew Bible*. Here, I deploy such phraseology almost indiscriminately in hopes of avoiding any confessional or dogmatic implications. Nevertheless, when used technically, *Hebrew Bible* alone constitutes the Hebrew and, in part, Aramaic (Dan. 2–7; Ezra 4–7) books of the Masoretic canon, while *Old Testament* also includes the ancient translations along with their broader collection of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

In this book, the term *tradition* subsumes Hebrew Bible, Old Testament, biblical and para-biblical literature, or whatever other name may be preferred. Contrary to an all too common misconception, this understanding of tradition describes no mere preservation of the old or desperate adherence to the preserved; rather, it designates a highly dynamic process of inner- and extra-biblical interpretation. In doing so, the tradition constantly reinvents itself in an interplay of *traditum* (the transmitted) and *traditio* (the process of transmission): put differently, the tradition is continuously regenerated by those who move within it, the new appearing in the garments of the old and the preserved.[3]

Finally, *Israel* and *Judaism* present a problem both terminological and substantive. For the specific time period in question—namely the first millennium BCE—who or what Israel was and precisely who was Jewish or belonged to Judaism are queries far from settled.[4] *Judaism* and cognate locutions trace back to the territorial and tribal name *Judah*, as does the derived ethnicon *Judean* or *Judahite*. Linguistically, the ethnicon denominates first and foremost the ancestry of or an affiliation to the kingdom and later province of Judah (Yehud, Judaea) over and against the kingdom of Israel (Ephraim) and later province of Samaria (Samarina). Though similar in sociological and genealogical structure, the population of both these regions were ultimately separated by geography and political organization. What bound the two together was, first, their common language—i.e., Hebrew, which gave way to Aramaic more and more during the latter half of the first millennium BCE— and, second, their veneration of the deity Yhwh.[5] Moreover, within the biblical literature, and only within the biblical literature, the adherents of Yhwh in Israel, Judah, and the diaspora are characterized through the collective name *Israel* as a genealogically and religiously defined unity of twelve tribes, Judah

---

[3] Fishbane (1985), 6–7, 18–19; Kratz (2004*a*), 126–7.
[4] Mason (2007); for the term "Israel," see Kratz (2000*c*); Davies (2007); Weingart (2014).
[5] On the divine names, see Part A *History* II, p. 25 n. 27.

numbering as but one among them. According to Gen. 29–30 and—including Benjamin—Gen. 35 and to the re-naming of Jacob as Israel in Gen. 32:28–9 and 35:10, these twelve tribes correspond to the children of Jacob/Israel and represent Israel, the people chosen by Yhwh; since the theophany at Sinai, this people has been bound to the law of Moses, that is, the Torah.

These Hebrew- and later Aramaic-speaking devotees of Yhwh across Israel, Judah, and the diaspora therefore belong to Israel and Judaism in different ways. Depending on phraseology, they might represent the population residing in or stemming from Israel and Judah. Alternatively, under the appellation *Israel* (in the broader sense of biblical tradition), they stand as the collective people of Yhwh and thereby represent *Judaism*—so long as the genealogical connection, the biblical designation *Israel*, the exclusive veneration of Yhwh as stipulated by the Torah, and the observance of biblical law all be considered the typical features of Judaism. Yet even Judaism so defined was never a unified whole. Diverse groups all reserve the biblical honorific *Israel* for themselves and yet deny the same claim to others. However, they need to be distinguished, from the Torah community on Mount Gerizim (the Samaritans) through the community at Qumran and the Maccabean or Zealot warriors even to the early Christians, among others.

Yet not all adherents to Yhwh understood themselves as *Israel* in the genealogical or biblical sense, however. For this reason, I distinguish between an *historical Israel* in the narrower, political and geographic sense and a *biblical Israel* in the wider, genealogical and religious sense. Furthermore, since not all Yhwh-devotees stemmed from Israelite ancestry, the historical Judah necessitates a demarcation from the tribe of Judah as it constitued part of biblical Israel. To emphasize this distinction, I employ *non-biblical Judaism* for all those who saw themselves exclusively as Israelite/Samaritan or Judahite devotees of Yhwh and *biblical Judaism* for those who also or even instead availed themselves of the biblical designation *Israel* and invoked the biblical tradition for their own self-understanding, in all their diversity and range of thought. The advantage and necessity of such detailed distinction will become clear in the pages to follow.

Now juxtaposed, the three parts of this book proceed, to some extent, from earlier publications subsequently revised, extended, and at times reformulated for the context of the present volume. Part A comes from a survey of Israelite and Judahite history, originally printed in *Wissenschaftliche Buchgemeinschaft*'s (WBG) *Weltgeschichte*,[6] which has been both amended and expanded with additional references, further bibliography, an introductory chapter, and a survey of religious history.[7] An essay first written for *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*,[8] Part B now contains—in addition to

---

[6] Lehmann and Schmidt-Glintzer (2009), 68–91.
[7] The latter is based on an essay in Berlejung and Frevel (2006), 31–5.
[8] Rogerson and Lieu (2008), 459–88; for the disposition of the material see Kratz (2002*c*), 220–5.

augmented footnotes—a survey of literary history that not only summarizes the original conclusions of my research in the narrative books of the Hebrew Bible[9] but also includes an assessment of the para-biblical literature from the Hellenistic–Roman period. Though retaining its original structure, designed for a lecture series in the context of a Göttingen research program,[10] Part C has been conceptualized anew through the integration of other researches.

Depending on interest or need, these three parts can be read individually or together. The occasional overlap was intended both to preserve the integrity of each individual piece and to emphasize their continuity and inner coherence, as explained above. To facilitate reading and encompass as wide an audience as possible, I have forgone the citation of sources in their original languages. Individual terms do appear, from time to time, in (simplified) transliteration but not without English translation.

The footnotes provide only the bare necessities. Above all, reference to ancient sources refer to easily accessible compilations or text editions, which then provide further information on other editions and specialized literature. Additionally, the notes offer a selection of essential secondary literature that can then serve—when needed—as an entrance into further scholarly discussion. Reference to my other work provides the reader with access to more detailed argumentation of the theses advanced here as well as the greater conversation within scholarship more broadly. Consequently, the bibliography is divided in two parts: I. Sources, cited according to abbreviation or name in capital letters, and II. Additional Literature, specified by author and publication date in regular type. On occasion, the Additional Literature also contains source material, in which case it is cited among the Sources.

Finally, this volume offers three appendices to provide the reader with quick orientation: a timeline for the history of Israel and Judah, a list of Israelite and Judahite kings and high priests, and a glossary that explains more technical vocabulary, usually indicated through italics throughout the book. These features, too, should make the work readily accessible to a broader public.

---

[9] Kratz (2000*b*), 314–30 (ET 2005, 309–25).
[10] Kratz and Spieckermann (2006), ii. 347–74.

Part A

The History of Israel and Judah

I

The Premises

1. BEGINNING AND END

The history of Israel presupposes the existence of an entity named "Israel." Ultimately, the history of Israel thus depends on when this entity came into being and how long it continued to last. Behind such a simple statement, however, lies a fundamental problem: the question of ancient Israel's historical beginning and end in the first millennium BCE. From this initial point of inquiry diverge the many scholarly schemes of ancient Israel.[1]

Potential beginnings include the creation of the world (Gen. 1), the call of Abraham (Gen. 12), the birth of Jacob's children and his renaming as Israel (Gen. 29–32 and 35), the exodus of the Israelite people (Exod. 1), the existence of the twelve tribes of Israel within the land of Palestine (Joshua, Judges), the kingdoms of Israel and Judah (Samuel and Kings), and the Babylonian exile as the starting point of biblical historiography (Genesis–Kings, Chronicles, Ezra–Nehemiah).

As for the endpoint, most scholars have chosen the Romans' destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE along with the aftermath of the second Jewish uprising in 132–135 CE. Earlier caesuras include the end of the Persian period in the fourth century BCE, the Maccabean revolt in the second century CE, and Pompey the Great's invasion and the onset of Roman rule in Palestine in 63 CE. On occasion, the history of ancient Israel extends beyond the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and even encompasses the modern state of Israel.

---

[1] Classic outlines of the history of Israel include Wellhausen (1880) and (1914); see also the sketch in the English edition of Wellhausen (1905*b* [ET 1994]), 426–543; Noth (1950; ET 1960); Bright (1960); Hayes and Miller (1977); Soggin (1984); Miller and Hayes (1986); Ahlström (1993); Donner (2007–8). For more recent overviews, see Finkelstein and Silberman (2001) and Finkelstein (2013); Berlejung in Gertz, Berlejung, Schmid, and Witte (2010; ET 2012); Frevel (2012). On the surrounding environment, see Noth (1962; ET 1966) and Knauf (1994); also still essential are Alt (1953–9) and Noth (1971); Na'aman (2005*a*); (2005*b*); (2006*a*). For further discussion, see M. Weippert (1993); Hartenstein (2008) as well as Day (2004); Williamson (2007); Finkelstein, Mazar, and Schmidt (2007); Grabbe (2007); Ska (2015).

These possibilities largely derive from the literary repertoire of the Hebrew Bible, whether they follow the canonical order or an historical–critical arrangement of the biblical books. Upon closer inspection, however, such an approach proves extremely problematic. It presupposes a canonical collection that did not exist until after the pre-Christian period. In addition, this approach all too often ignores the fact that the Hebrew Bible (or Old Testament) exists in not one but many different versions and that these various versions divide the historical caesura differently. Finally, the intense focus on the Hebrew Bible risks an almost outright disregard for other sources of inquiry, not only archaeological and epigraphic but also older, contemporary, and younger para-biblical Jewish writings from the Hellenistic–Roman period, namely the so-called Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha as well as the Dead Sea Scrolls. Such procedure from the biblical standpoint ultimately lacks sustained methodological reflection and inevitably blends the histories of literature and events, thereby making historical–critical analysis of the biblical sources essentially meaningless.

This book, by contrast, proceeds along a different line of inquiry. Beginning with the first extra-biblical reference to "Israel"—i.e., the stele of Pharaoh Merneptah (1224–1204 BCE), around 1200 BCE[2]—it starts from the earliest tangible point of a historical development that led from the political entity of the kingdom of Israel to the religious entity of the people of Israel as conveyed in biblical tradition. Historically, then, the following division of epochs emerges. After an evidential lacuna spanning nearly three hundred years (a gap bridgeable only through indirect or hypothetical means and thus numbering among the prerequisites of the history of Israel), the period of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the first half of the first millennium BCE constitutes the earliest epoch in the history of Israel that is historically demonstrable. This era ends with the two kingdoms' demise, Israel in 722 BCE and Judah in 587 BCE, and gives way, successively, to the epoch of provinces—those of Samaria and Judah, respectively—which roughly comprises the second half of the first millennium BCE.

The account ends with the Jerusalem temple's destruction in 70 CE along with the second Jewish uprising in 132–135 CE. Yet such a caesura does not correspond to Martin Noth's explanation that "the history of Israel finds its true end" in Jesus Christ.[3] Rather, the crucial criterion is Jerusalem's second temple, which deeply influenced the epoch of a post-state period and whose destruction ultimately began yet another new phase, that of rabbinic Judaism. As the beginning, so also the end of Israelite history converges with extra-biblical evidence: from the time of the second Jewish revolt, letters and

---

[2] AEL ii. 73–8; ANET 376–7; COS ii. 40–1 (2.6); OTPar 91–3; TUAT i. 544–52; HTAT 159–65.

[3] Noth (1950), 386 (ET 1960, 432).

coins alike reveal an explicit aim to rebuild the temple and restore the kingdom of "Israel."[4]

Even further, this division of epochs ensures the necessary critical distance from a strictly Judahite perspective. As a result, the numerous other shrines throughout the land and the diaspora (Mount Gerizim, Elephantine, Leontopolis/Heliopolis) also come into view, these holy places existing alongside the Jerusalem temple in the post-state period and proving no less significant to their clientele than the latter did to its own. All these various groups of Yhwh-devotees thus undergo examination, regardless of their association to, distance from, or even total departure from a given temple, especially that in Jerusalem.

To some extent, the historical Jesus and earliest Christians rank among these groups as well. They, too, have a part in the history of Israel and early Judaism, though they were but one Jewish group in the midst of many others—and a rather insignificant one at first. The history of Jesus begins with his death, which some experienced as the beginning of divine salvation upon the earth and which came to be celebrated in the corresponding formulations of death and resurrection. Only at the end of the first century CE, however, did such a history grow into a comprehensive tradition of Jesus' life, through the canonical and apocryphal gospels. Just as much, or just as little, is known, historically, about the pre-Christian roots of rabbinic Judaism, alongside of which early Christianity evolved in the late first and second centuries CE and, in the end, set out on a course of its own.

2. THE SOURCES

History does not simply lie before us; rather, it must be deduced from selected sources and construed by each generation anew. As Julius Wellhausen wrote, "History, it is well known, has always to be constructed . . . The question is whether one constructs well or ill."[5] The construction operates on three distinguishable levels, which require constant consideration and correlation: 1) history itself, that which was; 2) the image of history, that which extant evidence conveys to us, be it contemporary with or subsequent to the events documented; and 3) the description of history, that which modern historians construct on the basis of what happened and what the available evidence suggests.

---

[4] See III 3. In the time between the end of the Israelite monarchy and the revival of an "Israelite" kingdom under the Hasmoneans, the name "Israel" occurs in non-biblical sources only in two inscriptions from Delos, both referring to Mount Gerizim; see Part C *Archives* II 4.

[5] Wellhausen (1905*b*), 365 (ET 1994, 367); see Kratz (2009*b*).

The extant evidence for a history of Israel is diverse and complex alike. While it separates into written and non-written evidence, the written evidence further divides into primary (epigraphic) and secondary (literary) sources. For the history of Israel and Judah in the first millennium BCE, written sources include, in a stricter sense, the Hebrew Bible and its various versions, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,[6] the Dead Sea Scrolls,[7] and the Jewish historiographers, especially Flavius Josephus, as well as the rabbinic tradition, the New Testament, and the Church Fathers, along with Christian and Islamic travel reports from Palestine. Most of them constitute literary sources that betray a later perspective looking back upon a time long since past. Importantly, even the biblical and para-biblical literature grew over the course of centuries and therefore necessitates critical analysis before it can serve as any evidence for historical reconstruction. Since these sources do not stem from the time they depict, they are designated literary or secondary sources.

Alongside such literary sources lie a host of epigraphic materials, written in any number of ancient languages upon stone, clay tablets, potsherds (i.e., ostraca), papyrus, and leather and found in Palestine and its environs. All sorts of texts belong to this latter category: i.e., inscriptions, graffiti, and letters as well as legal, economic, and administrative texts, and, not least of all, literary works. While Canaanite and Aramaic inscriptions,[8] Jewish archives from Babylon and the island of Elephantine in Egypt,[9] and the Dead Sea Scrolls[10] prove particularly significant for the history of Israel and Judah, additional texts from across the ancient Near East—viz. Asia Minor, Ugarit, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt— illuminate the history of the ancient world more broadly and, in some places, even that of Palestine from the Late Bronze Age at the end of the second millennium BCE through the Iron Age and into the subsequent eras of the first millennium BCE.[11]

Since the epigraphic evidence usually belongs to the temporal and geographic contexts in which it was discovered and with which it is concerned, it is called primary. Such designation, however, should not suggest that these materials necessarily hold a greater value than literary or secondary sources; primary sources, too, demand historical criticism and interpretation. Still, the epigraphic evidence does hold an advantage over the literary—i.e., biblical, para-biblical, and historiographic—sources insofar as their dates and provenances can usually be fixed with at least some degree of certainty. With the biblical and para-biblical literature, this discernment is nearly impossible, permitting only hypothetical approximation through a relative chronology.

---

[6] APOT; OTP; APAT; JSHRZ; JSHRZ.NF.
[7] DJD; DSSP; DSSR; DSSSE; DSSHW; MAIER A and B; QUMRAN 1–2.
[8] AHI; HI; SSI; KAI; HAE.
[9] For Babylonia, see CUSAS and BaAr as well as Joannès/Lemaire (1996, 1999); Abraham (2005–6); (2007); Lambert (2007); for Elephantine, see TAD and LOZACHMEUR.
[10] DJD; DSSP; DSSR; DSSSE; DSSHW; MAIER A and B; QUMRAN 1–2.
[11] ANET; COS; OTPar; TGI; TUAT; TUAT.NF; HTAT.

Primary sources also include non-written materials, archaeological finds being the first among them.[12] Through ceramic analysis, these excavations establish a relative chronology that, with luck, can lead to an absolute chronology when inscriptions or coinage materialize. Archaeological discovery, together with studies of geography and realia, facilitates the decipherment of not only the settlement history for a specific region or place, along with their various fates (as in the case of destruction by fire or earthquake), but also the shifts in architecture, cultivation, animal husbandry, trade, industry, and other ways of life. Even further, Near Eastern iconography, that is, visual representations on reliefs, seals, coins, and other media, can serve as excellent non-written evidence.

Working with all kinds of evidence is a difficult and delicate matter. Whether primary or secondary, the sources cannot speak for themselves but demand analysis and interpretation: that is, source criticism. Written sources, including literary and epigraphic sources, necessitate inquiries into literary history, genre history, tendency criticism, and history more broadly construed. Moreover, even non-written, archaeological, and iconographic material depends on historical interpretation, no less mute than written materials. In this way, preference for one kind of evidence over another has little real advantage. As a matter of principle, all evidence must be treated equally. Nevertheless, these various types of evidence cannot simply be blended, as when, for instance, the gaps of primary sources (archaeology and epigraphy) are filled by secondary sources (Hebrew Bible, etc.) or, conversely, when proof of the secondary sources' historicity is sought in primary sources as external evidence.

In general, the standard practice for handling the evidence begins with archaeological and epigraphic finds, i.e., the primary materials, which permit reasonably certain dating and historical arrangement. Although no continuous history of events may arise from such a practice, it does document the conditions of a specific epoch or long-term developments in demographics, economics, and politics, even offering insight into an isolated historical event from time to time. Nevertheless, primary sources produce little more than historical sidelights.

Literary or secondary sources can then undergo comparison with the snippets produced from primary materials, the former tending to depict individual events, retrospectively, in a uniform and continuous nexus of proceedings. Most notably, this tendency manifests itself in the sacred history of biblical tradition. For literary sources, the distinction between reported time and reporter's time is of the utmost importance. Critical analysis aims to uncover the various stages of tradition, some of which may indeed

---

[12] H. Weippert (1988); Finkelstein and Silberman (2001); Finkelstein, Mazar, and Schmidt (2007); Finkelstein (2013); Faust (2012). For the Babylonian–Persian epoch, see Stern (1982); Frevel, Pyschny, and Cornelius (2014).

correspond with the archaeological and epigraphic evidence, while others may demonstrate no such concord and thus require their own historical explanation. Through this process, a fuller though by no means complete overview of an epoch's historical proceedings and developments can then begin to emerge.

3. THE SETTING

The setting of Israelite and Judahite history in the first millennium BCE is the "land of Israel," also called "the land of Canaan" in the Bible and "Palestine" (i.e., "Philistines' land") in Hellenistic–Roman sources.[13] Part of the Syro-Palestinian isthmus running alongside the eastern Mediterranean, this "land" has natural borders, with sea to the west, desert to the east and the south, and Anatolian mountains to the north. It consists of two geographic zones: the coastal plain and a limestone massif. Whereas the Jordan River along with its prehistoric seas divides the limestone massif into Cisjordanian (western) and Transjordanian (eastern) halves, tectonic movements have deeply fractured the northern and southern parts. The original mesas, or table mountains, are best preserved in the Transjordan, and both valleys and river courses have subdivided them into different regions. Still more rugged in terrain, the Cisjordan features the following regions: the Galilean hill country in the north, which adjoins the northerly mountain ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon; the Jezreel Valley, which transects the territory in an east–westerly direction; the mountains of central Palestine, which—in terms of settlement history—bisects the Ephraimite and Judahite hill country; the western, up-stream Shephelah; the southern slope into the desert; and the western coastal plain, which is broken only once, by Mount Carmel.

The significance of geography for human living conditions and political developments could hardly be overestimated. Constantly coveted and heavily populated, the rainy, fertile regions of the coastal plain and Jezreel Valley sustained the Bronze Age's great city states, which were located primarily along highways and main trade routes. Be it through trade by land or by sea, in peace or by means of military deployment in war, the various encounters that bound Palestine to the major powers of Anatolia, Egypt, and Mesopotamia—and thereby their histories as well—also took place in these regions.

Less concentrated in settlement were the mountainous regions and desert fringes, where precipitation either ran off or dropped off. Semi-nomadic populations tended to employ these areas for pasturing their flocks, as the

---

[13] For regional studies, see Noth (1962; ET 1966); Donner (1976); Zwickel (2002).

geography and climate entailed substantial perils for economic livelihood, animal husbandry, and agriculture. Slow and difficult in development, commerce depended on the great surrounding powers, which traded metal and basic commodities for agricultural and artisanal products. Political association, too, benefited little from such geographic conditions. Alongside the lowland city states, only the formation of a small territorial state in the hill country of central Palestine, around Shechem, has bequeathed a tradition that reaches back to the second millennium BCE.[14] Palestine was, in essence, mere transit country—one whose history moved with that of greater powers, powers that surrounded this land and determined its history.

4. THE ORIGINS OF ISRAEL

The first reference to Israel appears in the victory stele of Pharaoh Merneptah, already mentioned above: "Desolated is Israel, it has no seed."[15] Around 1200 BCE, a group of people bearing the name "Israel" were evidently located in Palestine and surrounded by Canaanite cities likewise subject to the king of Egypt. Archaeological evidence may provide no insight into whether this people had previously resided in Mesopotamia (Gen. 11–12) or Egypt (Exod. 1), as the Hebrew Bible narrates, but—apart from prisoners of war, mercenaries, and nomads—the historical possibility for such a pre-history is as probable (or improbable) for Israel as for any of its other Canaanite neighbors. Even if the Egyptian name of Moses as well as his Midian kinship be deemed incomprehensible and therefore uninventable for a founding figure of Israel, as some indeed suppose,[16] this conclusion offers little in terms of true historical knowledge: an argument for the exodus credo's antiquity—or its historicity altogether—cannot arise from such perceived incomprehensibility. The same restriction also applies to the "incomprehensible" calling of a pagan

---

[14] ANET 483–90; in 485 (EA no. 244, l. 11): Labʾāya is the famous king of Shechem; COS iii. 237–42 (3.92); OTPar 137–40. On Palestine in the second millennium BCE, see HTAT 29–213; for the archaeological epochs and their findings, see H. Weippert (1988); for the history, see Naʾaman (2005b); regarding the pre-history of Israel, see Lemche (1996); Grabbe (2008b and 2013b); Finkelstein (2013).

[15] AEL ii. 73–8; ANET 376–7; COS ii. 40–1 (2.6); OTPar 91–3; TUAT i. 544–52; HTAT 159–65; for (possibly) earlier evidence, see Van der Veen, Theis, and Görg (2010). Egyptian texts also mention Moab (somewhat earlier) and Edom (almost contemporaneously); see ANET 259–60; COS iii. 16–17 (3.5); HTAT 151–2, 165. With respect to the following epoch, see Fritz (1996; ET 2011); Finkelstein (2013); for the epigraphic findings, see Lemaire (2004).

[16] Smend (1995; ET 2013); Blum (2012); see, however, Pfeiffer (2013). The choice of Abraham as the founding figure of Israel is likely owing to the connection of the primeval history and the patriarchal narratives; the choice of Moses, on the other hand, might be related to the Exodus creed. Both presuppose the demise of Israel in the eighth century BCE; see Kratz (2000b), 265–9, 275–7 (Abraham), 293–5 (Moses; ET 2005, 261–5, 270–2, 284–6); Gertz (2002).

Abraham from Ur in Chaldea, or Haran, to become Israel's ancient ancestor, which the book of Jubilees, a work from the second century BCE, subsequently sought to explain. Likewise, the patriarchal traditions permit no deductions for the early history of Israel before its first attestation in the Merneptah stele. Apart from the Bible, the name "Israel" first appears again in an inscription from the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III (858–824 BCE) and in a roughly contemporary one from the Moabite king Mesha. In both cases, the term "Israel" designates a political community under King Ahab, from the House of Omri.[17] The origins of Israel's history lie between these dates, i.e., 1200 and 850 BCE.

In this period of the twelfth to ninth centuries BCE, a phase of political, economic, and demographic upheaval took place, which corresponds to the multiple ups and downs of Palestinian urban culture over the course of the Bronze Age. For the period immediately preceding this disruption, namely the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BCE, Tell el Amarna has revealed extraordinary textual finds.[18] Lying ca. 300 kilometers south of Cairo, in the center of Egypt, the site has yielded diplomatic correspondence concerning the city states of Bronze Age Palestine, including Jerusalem, which were under Egyptian control and in continued conflict among themselves. Furthermore, Palestine and Egypt alike suffered intermittent onslaughts by intruders from the sea, the so-called "Sea Peoples." Unstable political conditions in the Amarna period and sporadic raids from the invading Sea Peoples likely bore negative economic effects. In addition, an increase in population may have further aggravated the situation.

As a result of these factors, a long period of de-urbanization in the Late Bronze Age began and finally led, around 1200 BCE, to the complete collapse of once flourishing cultures (e.g., Ugaritians, Hittites) and abandonment of Palestinian cities. Iron Age I (1150–900 BCE), by contrast, witnessed a gradual settlement of the mountain regions and desert fringes. With this development came a new household architecture (with two or three rooms) and an introduction of new agricultural and storage techniques.[19] The end of Iron I and transition to Iron II (900–587 BCE) then saw a process of re-urbanization that arose with new political entities: Aramean city and territorial states in the north, Phoenician and Philistine city states in the west, small Israelite and

---

[17] See ANET 278–9; COS ii. 263–4 (2.113A); and AḤITUV 389–419; ANET 320–1; COS ii. 137–8 (2.23); OTPar 157–9; RANE no. 51; SSI i. 71–84; also TUAT i. 360–2, 646–50; HTAT 242–8, 254–9.

[18] KNUDTZON; RAINEY A and B; IZRE'EL, Engl. translation MORAN; WAW 5; see also Goren, Finkelstein, and Na'aman (2004).

[19] H. Weippert (1988), 344–417, esp. 393ff.; Faust (2012). The dating of the archaeological epochs comes from Finkelstein and Silberman (2001); H. Weippert offers a slightly different classification: IA I (1200–1000 BCE), IA II (1000–587 BCE), in detail IIA (1000–900 BCE); IIB (900–850 BCE); IIC (850–587 BCE).

Judahite territorial states in the Cisjordan, and Ammonite, Moabite, and Edomite states in the Transjordan.[20]

According to the biblical presentation in Genesis–Joshua, the entire people of Israel migrated—first peacefully (patriarchs), then militarily (Moses and Joshua)—into the land from outside and had to prevail against the indigenous, Canaanite populations. This account suggests an opposition between aboriginal (Canaanite) and immigrant (Israelite) populations, a portrayal unverifiable for the time and place in question. More recent archaeological findings and critical analysis of biblical tradition offer a rather different explanation: a peaceful infiltration of the highlands not from outside but predominately from within.[21] Accordingly, the Israelite "conquest" constituted an internal process of demographic restructuring that took shape in the larger turmoil of the turn from Late Bronze to Early Iron Age and arose, in part, from the opposition of urban and rural life. Along with the Phoenicians and Sea Peoples (Philistines) to the west and the Arameans to the north, this internal process likely produced those demographic elements that ultimately led to the settlement of the highlands and the mobilization of elites for the new political entities. This process involved not only (indigenous) nomads from highlands and lowlands alike, who lived throughout the border areas, but also urbanites and peasants, whom hardship drove into the mountains, though not without experience and skill, which they employed for new innovations in the mountain regions.

Although certain populations may also have come from outside, the only clear attestation of this phenomenon relates to the Sea Peoples, who dwelled not in the highlands but rather the lowland cities.[22] The Hebrew Bible refers to these groups as well, calling them "Philistines" or "Canaanites." Despite the Hebrew Bible's sharp ethnic and religious distinction between Israel and Canaan, such discrimination is, in fact, a mere literary construct, one that presupposes the demise of the Israelite kingdom in 722 BCE and/or that of the Judahite kingdom in 587 BCE. From the perspective of sacred history, this literary construction rejects its own Canaanite past in retrospect and sees in "Israel" a holy people from the start, a people that had to distinguish itself from all others. Yet archaeology allows no such opposition between Israelites and Canaanites amid the populations that settled in the highlands of Palestine. In terms of history, only through state formation did Israel emerge as a separate entity among the various populations of Canaan.

---

[20] Alt (1953–9), iii. 1ff., 20ff., 214ff.; Noth (1971) i. 434ff.; ii. 133ff.; Sawyer (1983); Knauf (1994); in particular, see, for Ammon, Hübner (1992); MacDonald and Younker (1999); Tyson (2014); on Moab, Timm (1989); Routledge (2004); and, with regard to Edom, M. Weippert (1971).

[21] HTAT 179–98; see M. Weippert (1967); Finkelstein (1988); Finkelstein and Perevolotsky (1990), 67–88; Finkelstein and Silberman (2001); Finkelstein, Mazar, and Schmidt (2007). Thus, Albrecht Alt's infiltration hypothesis is corroborated—with slight modifications concerning origins and ethnics; see Alt (1953–9), i. 89–125, 126–75.

[22] ANET 262–3; ARE ii. 128, iii. 210, 241, 247–8, iv. 24–5, 36–9; COS i. 192–3 (1.75); HTAT 199–213.

II

The Two Kingdoms

1. TRANSITION TO THE MONARCHY

The population that settled in the Palestinian hill country and gradually diffused over the course of Iron Age I (1150–900 BCE) was organized into families, clans, and tribes. As for the tribes and their geographical distribution, the biblical books of Joshua and Judges contain geographical lists, but these descriptions reflect more than Iron I alone. Indeed, such conditions relate equally well to the time after the state's formation, thus continuing even beyond the loss of political sovereignty. In Iron II (900–587 BCE), the dynastic monarchy was merely overlaid upon the tribal organization.

Attempting to understand this transition, modern historiography has sought historical analogy in the amphictyony ("league of neighbors") of Archaic Greece and ancient Italy.[1] This interpretation conceives of Israel and its neighbors in pre-state federations of six or twelve individual tribes collected and united around a common central sanctuary. While these tribes may have had their own political existences, a kind of ethnic and religious collective conscience emerged—the prerequisite for the establishment of a monarchy and, after the fall of both kingdoms, the basis for the self-conception of "Israel" as a single people of the one God, Yhwh. This amphictyonic hypothesis, however, cannot withstand critical scrutiny. Indeed, the thesis stands or falls with the existence of a central sanctuary, which has no evidence in the period under question. Even further, it projects the ideals of the sacred history that emerged only after the Israelite and Judahite monarchy back onto the pre- and early history of Israel.

In all probability, the shift from tribal organization to dynastic monarchy proceeded in a manner much less spectacular. Families grew into clans, subject to a chief, and clans grew into tribes, subject to a leader, with tribes occasionally banding together in times of conflict. Such affiliations were not the result of but rather the precondition for a collective consciousness, motivated first and foremost by geopolitical, demographic, and military—much less ethnic

---

[1] Noth (1950), 83–104 (ET 1960, 85–109).

and religious—concerns. To stabilize such sporadic confederations, the tribal constitution could occasionally shift into a (dynastic) monarchic one. The boundaries between a tribal kingship and a monarchy nationally constituted would have been quite fluid.

For Israel and Judah, this transition to monarchy followed the larger process of re-urbanization throughout the region and subsequently moved from north to south. The prerequisite was a power vacuum. Whereas Egyptian influence over Palestine continued to wane, the new Mesopotamian power (i.e., the Neo-Assyrian empire) was mired in Syria, where the Arameans had proved formidable opponents since the time of Tiglath-Pileser I (1114–1076 BCE).[2] Only in the ninth and eighth centuries BCE did the Assyrians push further southward against Israel and Judah. In contrast to the Phoenicians and Sea Peoples (Philistines) to the west and the Arameans and Syro-Hittite populations to the north, who built upon the city state culture of the Bronze Age, Israel and Judah along with their Transjordanian neighbors developed small territorial states. Yet they, too, drew on an older Bronze Age tradition (see I 3). A distinction between kingships "Canaanite" and "Israelite" never, in fact, existed.

2. SAUL, DAVID, AND SOLOMON

Following several attempts by others (cf., e.g., Judg. 9), Saul became the first to establish a tribal kingdom in central Palestine during the tenth century BCE, which biblical tradition names "Israel." David together with his son and successor Solomon appear as the earliest kings of Judah and Israel in the biblical sources. After the death of Solomon, the Canaanite states distinguished themselves even further. The two kingdoms of Israel and Judah formed in the tenth to ninth century BCE and went their own separate ways thereafter.

Concerning the three monarchic founders in Israel and Judah, we have all too little information.[3] Extra-biblical sources are virtually non-existent. Although an eighth-century Aramaic inscription from Tel Dan mentions the "House of David" and thus confirms the biblical portrait of a Judahite kingdom referring to a certain David as its dynastic founder, neither Saul nor Solomon has so much as a shred of external evidence.[4] Once attributed to the latter (cf. 1 Kgs. 9:15), the remains of specific monumental architecture in

---

[2] ANET 274–5; TUAT i. 356–7.

[3] On this epoch, see Dietrich (1997; ET 2007); Finkelstein and Silberman (2001, 2006a); Finkelstein (2011, 2013); Finkelstein, Mazar, and Schmidt (2007); Grabbe (2008b and 2013b); for the discussion on the Davidic–Solomonic empire, see Kratz and Spieckermann (2010). For this and the following epochs of the monarchic period, see also Na'aman (2005a and 2006a).

[4] AḤITUV 466–73; COS ii. 161–2 (2.39); HI 147–8; OTPar 160–1; RANE no. 54; TUAT.E 176–9; HTAT 267–9. The end of the Mesha stele may perhaps read "house of David" as well; see

Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer are now dated to the ninth century BCE instead, and even later at times. Settlement, too, increased only gradually, suggesting origins in the most modest of conditions. In 926 BCE, the Egyptian pharaoh Sheshonk I (945–924 BCE) advanced through Palestine and conquered Megiddo, where he erected a stele.[5] His campaign reports mention neither Israel nor Judah.

Historical memory in biblical tradition paints quite a different portrait. In this telling, a pharaoh called Shishak advanced all the way to Jerusalem and looted temple and palace alike or, from a different perspective, received these items as tribute.[6] While the tradition in 1 Sam.–2 Kgs. 11 has much more to report on the monarchic origins of Israel and Judah in this as in several other respects, the vast majority of such information either rests on traditional legend or stems from sheer invention, with subsequent circumstances and perceptions projected onto that distant past of origins. Just how little was actually known at the time appears in the alleged reigns of David and Solomon, who supposedly ruled for forty years each—i.e., a generation (1 Kgs. 2:11; 11:42)—which then corresponds to that round number of Israel's fabled "judges" (Judg. 3:11; 5:31; 8:28). In the end, the tradition filled in and compensated for great gaps in knowledge with fabricated legends and theological objectives.

The Saul narrative tells the tale of a boy who sought his father's donkeys and found instead a kingdom (1 Sam. 9–10). According to this tale, Saul was invoked as the founder of the first dynasty in Israel (2 Sam. 2:8–10). Over the course of time, the story grew into a comprehensive Saul narrative (1 Sam. 1–14) that stressed—to the point of strain—Philistine dominance as motivation for the founding of a kingdom. Such stimulus may well be an exaggeration, however— the reflection of a later, theologically motivated reprimand of Israel wanting to be "like all other nations" (1 Sam. 8:5, 20). Yet another, older tradition connects the rise of the Saulides with victory over the Ammonites (1 Sam. 11).[7] Nevertheless, both versions attempt to explain the monarchy's origin after the fact. Rather than some great pressure from external circumstance, the formation of a small tribal kingdom in the Cisjordan and the Transjordan, governed by Saul from Gibeah and his clan, came from Saul's own drive to expand. After his death, the kingdom went to his son, Eshbaal (Ish-bosheth), which hardly lasted long (2 Sam. 2:8–9). Saul and his kingdom were but a fleeting episode on the way to the foundation of the kingdom of Israel, albeit an episode that made great history in literary tradition.

AḤITUV 389–419; ANET 320–1; COS ii. 137–8 (2.23); OTPar 157–9; RANE no. 51; SSI i. 71–84; HTAT 248 n. 49.

[5] ANET 242–3, 263–4; BAR iv. 344–6, 348–57; also TUAT i. 552–7; HTAT 228–38; TUAT. NF ii. 246–71. See K. Wilson (2005).

[6] 1 Kgs. 14:25–6; even more detailed, 2 Chron. 12.

[7] The narrative was repeatedly revised, as evidenced by the Masoretic Text (in 1 Sam. 11:6–8, 12–13) as well as the Qumran manuscripts (4QSamᵃ) and Josephus's Greek paraphrase.

For David and Solomon, too, nothing but legend has remained. A collection of stories from within the Jerusalem court, the core of this tradition recalls all kinds of royal intrigues, centering on David's successors (2 Sam. 11–1 Kgs. 2). While this particular collection of stories through 1 Sam. 15–2 Sam. 10 was combined with the Saul Narrative (1 Sam. 1–14) to portray David as the legitimate successor to Saul, it was also expanded by the Solomon Narrative (1 Kgs. 3–11), which recounts construction of the palace and temple in Jerusalem and commercial relationships with Phoenicia and Egypt, though the latter was more typical of Israel than Judah. In light of both archaeological evidence and textual analysis, this tradition cannot be used for historical reconstruction without strict reservations. Prudent deduction may allow depiction of an able warlord David establishing a power base in Judah—if nothing else through marriage—and becoming a rival to Saul. With a troop of "Cherethites and Pelethites," he undertook military campaigns and forays that earned him first and foremost ascendancy over Judah (Ziklag, Hebron, Jerusalem) and, evidently for a time, the territory of Saul (2 Sam. 2–5). In Jerusalem, center of the Judahite tribal kingdom, David and his successor, Solomon, seem to have (re-)established the rudiments of urban culture and administration, similar to those of the Bronze Age though somewhat more modest in reach.

Historically, then, David and Solomon were also only an episode, albeit more lasting than that of Saul, in the creation of a dynasty. Compared with developments in the north, Judah and Jerusalem lagged about a century behind. The biblical tradition reverses this reality, however. A golden age of some great Davidic–Solomonic empire that reached all the way "from Dan to Beersheba" (2 Sam. 3:10) actually serves as a foil to cast Saulide origination deep into the shadows and portray the history of the two kingdoms as a steep religious and political decline. In point of fact, the "Davidic–Solomonic empire" was only realized in the Hellenistic period, with the Hasmonean dynasty.

3. THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL

When Sheshonk I toured Palestine in 926 BCE, the founding of an Israelite kingdom on former Saulide territory had only just begun. Though this phase of political formation had not yet come to completion, the annalistic tradition in the biblical books of Kings already begins with this period and commences reportage on kingly reigns in Israel and Judah along with other scattered historical notices.[8] Extra-biblical sources, too, begin to flow in greater abundance at this time.

---

[8] Noth (1943; ET 1981); Jepsen (1953); Würthwein (1984), 505–15; see further Kratz (2000*b*), 161–74, esp. 192–3 (ET 2005, 158–70, 185); Aurelius (2003).

Once the lights of history dimmed on Saul and his son Eshbaal (Ish-bosheth), the highlands of central Palestine saw further attempts at dynastic formation with concomitant shifting capitals (Shechem, Penuel, Tirzah). In rather short intervals came Jeroboam I and his son Nadab; Baasha and his son Ela; Zimri; Tibni; and finally Omri.[9] Each attempt to built a dynasty met its end in a *coup d'état* until the military leader Omri ultimately prevailed in the early ninth century BCE. Such instability testifies to a kind of fermentation process in which various usurpers had to contend with a number of different competitors: Palestinian tribes in the immediate vicinity, Arameans to the north and east, Phoenicians and Philistines to the west, and Judahites to the south. Given this situation of near perpetual conflict, the first king of Israel to follow the founding generation, Jeroboam I (927–907 BCE), would almost certainly not have controlled "all Israel," i.e., the entire territory between Bethel and Dan (1 Kgs. 12:20, 29–30) including the valleys and major cities (Jezreel Valley, Megiddo, Hazor, Dan, Beth Shean) as well as areas in the Transjordan. Instead, the individual regions were fiercely contested and fell into Israelite hands, temporarily, only with the Omride dynasty; even so, conflict with neighbors never did cease altogether.

After many failed attempts, the military commander Omri was finally able to found a proper dynasty, which lasted almost forty years (882–845 BCE) and had its capital in Samaria. Comprising Omri, Ahab, Ahaziah, and Joram of Israel,[10] this dynasty proved significant enough to feature throughout Assyrian royal inscriptions as the designation for the entire northern kingdom of Israel. "The land of the House of Omri" or simply "Omri" thus refers to Israel—an eponym that endured even after the Omrides were ousted by the next line of rulers in the middle of the ninth century BCE, the dynasty founded by Jehu.[11]

The Omrides' great success correlated with a development in foreign policy that would determine the fate of the Israelite kingdom until its very end. Indeed, Omri and his descendants profited from Assyrian expansion west-ward, which began in Syria and exerted tremendous pressure first on the Arameans. This turn in geopolitical circumstance then permitted the Israelites to expand their own northern and eastern territorial holdings and to under-take an integrated policy of occupation and coalition. Epigraphic evidence documents both. Dating to the second half of the ninth century BCE, an inscription from the king of Moab, Mesha, recounts a 40-year period of Omride dominion over Moab and the expulsion of Israelites from its territory

---

[9] 1 Kgs. 12:20, 25, 26–30; 14:19–20; 15:25–8, 31–4; 16:5–6, 8–10, 14–18, 20–8.
[10] 1 Kgs. 16:21–31; 22:39–40, 52–3; 2 Kgs. 1:1, 18; 3:1–3 (8:28–9; 9:14ff.).
[11] ANET 279–80, 281–2; COS ii. 266–7, 267–8, 276–7 (2.113C, D, G); TUAT i. 363, 366–7, 385–6; HTAT 264, 274, 294–5. In addition, Assyrian inscriptions refer to Israel as "Samaria," i.e., by the name of its capital. For the Omrid dynasty, see Timm (1982).

at the dynastic transition from Omri to Jehu.[12] To protect themselves from Assyrian expansion, the Omrides, under Ahab, formed a successful coalition with both the Arameans and Phoenicians and obstructed Assyrian pursuits under Shalmaneser III at the Battle of Qarqar, in 853 BCE.[13] Political alliance with their northern neighbors also came with Ahab's marriage to the Phoenician princess Jezebel, which earned the former his infamy in later biblical tradition (1 Kgs. 16:31–2).

In the long run, however, the coalition met with no success. Internal conflict and massive external pressure led to considerable discord throughout the middle of the ninth century BCE, on the one hand, and, within Israel itself, the downfall of the Omrides at the hands of the military captain Jehu, on the other. As previously mentioned, the Tel Dan inscription emanates from this affair yet attributes the murder of Joram—the last of the Israelite kings to come from the house of Omri, who perhaps annulled the coalition with the Arameans—and that of his kinsman Ahaziah, king of Judah, from "the house of David," who was a son of the Omride Athaliah (2 Kgs. 8:18, 26), not to Jehu (2 Kgs. 9–10) but to an Aramean king instead, namely Hazael of Damascus.[14]

Initiating a sizable shift in the direction of Israel's foreign policy, Jehu secured his dynasty an astonishing longevity, nigh on a full century (845–747 BCE), which comprised Jehu himself, Jehoahaz, Joash, Jeroboam II, and Zechariah.[15] Instead of confederation with his neighbors, Jehu capitulated to the Assyrian King, Shalmaneser III, and bought himself favor with payments of tribute.[16] Continued conflict with neighbors to the north and east may have lasted on account of Assyrian absence, but the politics of Jehu and his successors yielded fruit when the Assyrians expanded again at the end of the ninth century BCE under Adad-nirari III (810–783 BCE).[17] Through Assyrian support, the kingdom of Israel not only recovered but even ascended to political and economic dominance in the eighth century BCE, with Joash (802–787 BCE) and Jeroboam II (787–747 BCE) at the helm. The Aramean prince Zakkur of Hamath went in a similar direction around 800 BCE, fending off an Aramean coalition and expanding his territory through alliance with

---

[12] AḤITUV 389–419; ANET 320–1; COS ii. 137–8 (2.23); OTPar 157–9; RANE no. 51; SSI i. 71–84; KAI no. 181; TUAT i. 646–50; HTAT 242–8.

[13] ANET 278–9; COS ii. 261–4 (2.113A); TUAT i. 360–7, esp. 360–4; HTAT 249–65, esp. 254–60.

[14] AḤITUV 466–73; COS ii. 161–2 (2.39); HI 147–8; OTPar 160–1; RANE no. 54; TUAT.E 176–9; HTAT 267–9. For the Jehud dynasty, see Hasegawa (2012).

[15] 2 Kgs. 9:14–10:17, 34–6; 13:1–2, 8–11, 12–13, 24–5; (14:15–6); 14:23–4, 25a, 28–9; 15:8–12.

[16] ANET 279–80, 281–2; COS ii. 266–7, 267–8, 276–7 (2.113C, D, G); TUAT i. 363, 366, 367; HTAT 264; on the iconography of the "Black Obelisk," see ANET 281; COS ii. 269–70 (2.113F); OTPar 166–71; RANE no. 40; Keel and Uehlinger (1994).

[17] ANET 281–2; COS ii. 272–7 (2.114), see also COGAN A 33–41; TUAT i. 367–9; HTAT 271–7. For the following epoch, see Schoors (1998).

Assyria.[18] Sam'al/Yadiya did likewise, though somewhat later, as an inscription from Zincirli documents.[19]

The violent overthrow of Jehu's dynasty sounded the death knell for Israel. Precipitated by a man named Shallum, son of Jabesh, who enjoyed the Samarian throne for only a single month, succession turmoil turned to tranquility when a more prudent ruler emerged victorious, Menahem of Israel (747–738 BCE). Despite his resumption of the Jehu dynasty's foreign policy and payment of tribute to Assyria,[20] Menahem's son and successor, Pekahiah, succumbed to yet another violent overthrow, with Pekah, son of Remaliah, assuming the throne in his stead.[21] The simultaneity of this occurrence and Assyrian royal succession is hardly coincidental. When Tiglath-Pileser III rose to power in 745 BCE, he immediately set his sights westward.[22] At this time, though, disagreement surrounded the proper political strategy: continued tribute to Assyria or, with backing from the Egyptians, total rebellion. The quandary led to abrupt reversals in policy and sparked the succession turmoil in Israel's final days.

In 734–732 BCE, an anti-Assyrian coalition arose in Syria and Palestine, which Israel joined (following a *coup d'état*) but Judah eschewed. Amid this complex set of political elements, characterized by diverse confederations and various loyalties, Israel ostensibly sought alliance with Damascus in an attempt to extend its territory southward into Judah—an occurrence termed the "Syro-Ephraimite War" in the scholarly literature. Unsurprisingly, Tiglath-Pileser III intervened against such anti-Assyrian aspirations on the rise in Syria–Palestine, subjugating Samaria and diminishing the domain of Israel.[23] Following the insurrection of Israel's final king, Hoshea, whom Tiglath-Pileser III himself appointed but who ceased payments of tribute after the death of the latter, Shalmaneser V (727–722 BCE) and/or Sargon II (722–705 BCE) then conquered Samaria a second time, in 722 (or 720) BCE.[24] With the population of Samaria and its vicinity deported, the region was settled anew and placed beneath an Assyrian governor. Already diminished in size, the kingdom of Israel was no longer a kingdom at all but rather an Assyrian province, denominated Samaria (Samarina) according to the city

---

[18] ANET 655–6; COS ii. 155 (2.35); RANE no. 53; WAW 12, 202–7; KAI no. 202; TUAT i. 626–8.

[19] ANET 500–1, 654–5; COS ii. 147–61 (2.30–7); SSI ii. 60–92; KAI nos. 24–5, 214–21; TUAT i. 628–32, 638–40; HTAT 290.

[20] ANET 283, 287; COS ii. 284–6, 287 (2.117A, B); TUAT i. 371, 378.

[21] 2 Kgs. 15:13–31.

[22] ANET 282–5; COS ii. 284–91 (2.117); TUAT i. 370–8; HTAT 285–95.

[23] 2 Kgs. 17:1–6, 21–3; ANET 282–5; COS ii. 284–91 (2.117); TUAT i. 372, 374, 377; HTAT 292–5; see Pitard (1987).

[24] ANET 282–5; COS ii. 284–91 (2.117); TUAT i. 378–87, 401–2; HTAT 296–309, esp. 300–2. The sources disagree as to which king conquered Samaria in which year; see ANET 284–7 (Sargon II); COS ii. 293–4 (2.118); GRAYSON (Shalmanezer V); HTAT 296–8; see Becking (1992).

that once stood as a sovereign nation's capital and now hosted the Assyrian provincial government.

Enduring almost a century and a half, ca. 140 years, the dynasties of Omri and Jehu represented the glory days of Israel. Whereas the Omride dynasty converted its capital city, Samaria, into a royal seat and made Jezreel a garrison, other cities and bases throughout the Transjordan provided additional military support for the kingdom in general and its widely ramified trade network in particular. Moreover, archaeological remains—such as gates, walls, water systems, fortifications, and monumental structures—evidence a highly developed infrastructure that presupposes social differentiation into any number of professional fields along with corresponding population densities. Their divergent orientations in foreign policy notwithstanding, Jehu and his successors added seamlessly to these Omride accomplishments and advanced even further, and undisturbed, as a vassal state of Assyria.

Apart from a few small pieces of evidence, little information has come to light to illuminate the institutions, social structures, and daily life in the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.[25] Their social compositions would have corresponded to those structures characteristic of other small monarchies at that time, with the king enjoying pride of place followed by his clan, the usual aristocracy, the military, and the administration. Both palace and temple would have constituted the fundamental institutions and employed an educated personnel (scribes, priests, etc.). As for jurisdiction over legal matters, power would have lain in the hands of the king, on the one hand, and the village elders (at the gate), on the other. A division of labor for skilled crafts and trades, commerce, and agriculture would have correlated with a geographical one—i.e., an urban/rural divide. Bearing witness to deliveries of wine and oil to the royal court, the Samaria ostraca offer a glimpse into Israel's economic situation in the eighth century BCE.[26]

With Israel's rise in political power and economic strength came Yhwh's ascent as the kingdom's patron deity.[27] A weather god and mountain god in the style of Syrian Baal and Aramean Hadad, Yhwh gradually absorbed the

---

[25] HTAT 352–64 as well as 365–96; for the social stratigraphy HAE ii.2, 110ff.; see Avishur and Heltzer (2000); Levy (1995); Faust (2012).

[26] HAE i. 79–110 as well as 135–44; AHI 39–51; AḤITUV 258–312; ANET 320–1; HI 423–98; SSI 1:5–15. See also TUAT i. 248–9; HTAT 278–84.

[27] In the Hebrew Bible as well as extra-biblical sources, the divine name appears with different spellings (YH, YHH, YHW, YHWH). This book, in conformity with scholarly convention today, uses the long version "YHWH" without vocalization and the short version with vocalization: "Yah" or "Yahu." However, the original pronunciation of the name remains unknown. The Hebrew Bible reads *'adonay* ("Lord") or, in Aramaic, *shema'* ("the name"). If the name appears in apposition to *'adonay* ("Lord"), the reading *'œlohim* ("God") is applied, which the Septuagint translates with *(o) kyrios* ("the Lord"). Earlier literature attests to the pronunciation "Yehovah" (adopting the vowels of *'adonay*), while more recent literature features the pronunciation "Yahveh," derived from the short version "Yah" or "Yahu" along with the Greek transcriptions (*Iouai, Iaoue, Iabe*). For the religious history, see IV.

attributes of the high god (El) and sun god (Shamash, goddess Shapshu) as well. Concerning the local cultus, Yhwh was venerated in individual households and at regional high places together with his consort Asherah and alongside other gods and divine beings, which—according to epigraphic materials (Kuntillet ʿAjrud, Mesha, Deir ʿAlla)[28]—trace back to the Northwest Semitic pantheon of the second millennium BCE and persisted among the indigenous Canaanite populations. Alongside the Israelite dynasty, this Yhwh probably rose from a localized "Yhwh of Samaria" to a greater national deity, resembling Milkom in Ammon and Chemosh in Moab.

Only after the two kingdoms' demise did Yhwh transform into the one and only god, a god who tolerated none other and, even further, who alone existed. The Hebrew Bible presupposes this conception of Yhwh, assessing the course of Israelite history as per the Decalogue's prohibition on "foreign" deities and images (Exod. 20 and Deut. 20) and reproaching the houses of Omri and Jehu alike—not to mention all other Israelite kings—with the "sin of Jeroboam" (1 Kgs. 12:28–30), the quintessence of Canaanite Baal's cultus. An erstwhile theurgist of the weather god Yhwh (1 Kgs. 18:41–6), Elijah then becomes a prophet of this one and only god (1 Kgs. 18–19) and stylizes Jehu's political revolt as a holy war against Baal (2 Kgs. 10:15–28). Even beyond the cultus, Israel's economic success and social relations come under theological fire, forcefully condemned in the books of Amos and Hosea. Yet from an historical perspective, this viewpoint pertains not to "ancient Israel" but Judaism, to which we owe the biblical tradition in its current form.

The end of an autonomous political life in 722 BCE did not mean the end of life altogether in the former kingdom of Israel, however.[29] As attested by archaeology, the various populations that remained, migrated, or resettled under the Assyrians established themselves in the new province of Samaria. Others entered Assyrian service. At least a portion of the populace would have continued to identify themselves as Israelites or Samarians, while others—especially in the central Palestinian region of Benjamin—would have considered themselves belonging to Judah and therefore Judahites. Contacts with the southern kingdom of Judah, which heard the same language spoken and saw the same deity (Yhwh) venerated as the national god, would have increased rather than dwindled after the northern kingdom's destruction, not least through refugees coming from the north.

---

[28] *Kuntillet ʿAjrud*: COS ii. 172–3 (2.47C); HI 277–98; WAW 14, 136–7; TUAT ii. 561–4; HAE i. 47–64; and Meshel (2012). *Mesha*: AḤITUV 389–419; ANET 320–1; COS ii. 137–8 (2.23); OTPar 157–9; RANE no. 51; SSI i. 71–84; KAI no. 181; TUAT i. 646–50; HTAT 242–8. *Deir ʿAlla*: AḤITUV 433–65; COS ii. 144–5 (2.27); OTPar 124–6; RANE no. 91; WAW 12, 207–12; KAI no. 312; TUAT ii. 138–47; Hoftijzer and van der Kooij (1976). On the expression "his Asherah" in the inscriptions of Kuntillet ʿAjrud and Hirbet el-Qom, see p. 49 n. 4.

[29] ANET 284–7; COS ii. 292–8 (2.118); ii. 293–4 (2.118); HTAT 310–25.

4. THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH

Southern Palestine developed later than the north. As the legendary pre-history
for David and Solomon in the tenth century BCE reveals, the biblical text itself
has little to tell of Judah's earliest origins. Whereas the biblical material depicts
the campaign of Pharaoh Sheshonk I advancing all the way to Jerusalem during
the reign of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, the Egyptian sources themselves
mention no such operation. Annalistic excerpts in the books of Kings recount
consistent clashes between Israel and Judah, with Arameans even involved in
the warfare at times (1 Kgs. 14:30, 15:7, 16).[30] These confrontations, if histor-
ical, likely stemmed from border disputes centered on control over Benjamin
along with the military posts of Mizpah and Gibeah, a region of great strategic
and economic importance. Similar conflicts seem to have erupted with the
Philistines to the west and the Edomites to the south as well, which suggests a
rather humble expanse for the early kingdom of Judah, one restricted to
Jerusalem and its immediate environs. As for annals from Judahite kings for
this period, the extracts offer little information, other than, perhaps, King Asa
allegedly deposing his mother from her post as dowager queen and suffering
"from his feet" or genitals—the word "feet" in Hebrew often being used as a
euphemism for the latter (1 Kgs. 15:13, 23).

The fate of the Judahite kingdom depended on its surrounding powers in
the end. During the Omride period, border disputes were apparently tranquil,
which may have contributed to internal stabilization as intimated by the long
monarchic reigns of Asa (908–868 BCE) and Jehoshaphat (868–847 BCE), who
followed Rehoboam and Abijah.[31] The annalistic sources emphasize peace
between Jehoshaphat in the south and the Israelite king in the north (1 Kgs.
22:45). In fact, the two royal houses intermarried at times:[32] son of and
successor to Jehoshaphat, Joram married Athaliah, either a daughter (2 Kgs.
8:18) or sister (2 Kgs. 8:26) of the Israelite king Ahab. After the death of
Ahaziah of Judah, son of Joram and Athaliah, Judah was even ruled by the
Omride Athaliah for a time. To the bitter end, Joram of Israel and Ahaziah of
Judah fought together as brothers in arms against the Arameans (2 Kgs.
8:28–9) and, in fact, died together, be it at the hand of Jehu or the Aramean
Hazael of Damascus.[33] All in all, Judah at the time of the Omrides seems to
have been the far inferior partner in league with the greater Israel—a dynamic
that corresponded to the northern kingdom's opposition to Assyria and which
proved to be beneficial for the southern kingdom.

---

[30] 1 Kgs. 14:21–2, 25–6, 29–31; 15:1–3, 7–11, 13–14, 16, 17–24.
[31] 1 Kgs. 15:9–24; 22:41–51.
[32] 2 Kgs. 8:16–29 and 9:27, 28–9; 11 (vv. 1–4, 19, 20).
[33] 2 Kgs. 9–10 ascribes the deed to Jehu, the inscription to Hazael (AḤITUV 466–73; COS ii.
161–2 (2.39); HI 147–8; OTPar 160–1; RANE no. 54; TUAT.E 176–9; HTAT 267–9).

With the rise of Jehu's dynasty in Israel, which brought with it the end of the Omrides and a shift in political strategy, came a turn in the tides for Judah. After the violent overthrow of Athaliah, Joash seized the Judahite throne, he being the only Davidide survivor and the son of King Ahaziah.[34] Jehu's rejection of anti-Assyrian alliances won Judah political autonomy, like that of Mesha's Moab. Accordingly, reports of conflict with neighbors recommence (2 Kgs. 8:20–2; 12:18–9; 14:7–15:22). Although the forcible kingly changeovers suggest a contested political course, these transitions of power reveal nothing in terms of motives; detachment from Israel to the north may have sparked such controversy. The lengthy reigns of Judahite kings, whose reigns coincided with Jehu's dynasty (Joash, Amaziah, Azariah/Uzziah, Jotham), bespeaks a certain stabilization. Archaeology also shows expansion in the cities of Judah along with an active economy of oil and textile production. This Judahite economy benefited from Philistine commercial centers and trade routes, even if its dimensions by no means compared to those of the northern kingdom.[35] With regard to notable occurrences, the royal annals recount Azariah/Uzziah suffering from illness and Jotham building a temple gate (2 Kgs. 15:5, 35).

Without any great injury, Judah withstood the political turbulence at the end of the eighth century BCE as well as Israel's downfall. The reason for such endurance lay in the political foresight of the Judahite king Ahaz (741–725 BCE).[36] Following the example of Jehu and the Aramean dynasty of Sam'al, he paid tribute to the Assyrian king. According to biblical tradition, Ahaz traveled to Damascus to meet his patron, Tiglath-Pileser III, whereupon he returned to his homeland, Judah, and erected an altar for Yhwh in Jerusalem based on the (Aramean or Assyrian) model he had seen in the course of his travels (2 Kgs. 16). What exactly lies behind this narrative is difficult to discern. In any case, Ahaz remains the first Judahite king to find mention in Assyrian inscriptions.[37] Under his son and successor, Hezekiah (725–697 BCE), the western hill of Jerusalem underwent settlement, as did the city's fortification, presumably on account of numerous northern refugees.[38] The water conduit he reportedly built (2 Kgs. 20:20) may well refer to the Siloam Tunnel, which channeled water from the Gihon Spring into the fortified city—a structure that yielded an epigraph recounting its own construction in a short and concise account written in Classical Hebrew.[39] Not only fortifications but

---

[34] For the following cf. 2 Kgs. 13:1–2, 8–13; 14:1–4, 7, 18–22; 15:1–7, 32–8 (without v. 37).

[35] H. Weippert (1988), 587ff., 634ff.

[36] 2 Kgs. 16:1–3a, 19–20.

[37] ANET 321; TUAT i. 375 in an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser III. Here, Judah appears for the first time as well. See also the inscriptions of Sargon II, ANET 272, 284, 287; TUAT ii. 381, 387; HTAT 300, 307. Concerning Judah in the eighth and seventh centuries BCE, see Schoors (1998); Finkelstein (2008c).

[38] 2 Kgs. 18:1–3, 7b, 8, 13–16; 19:36–7; 20:12–13, 20–1; cf. H. Weippert (1988), 589ff.

[39] AḤITUV 19–25; ANET 321; COS ii. 145–6 (2.28); HI 499–506; SSI i. 21–3; KAI no. 189; HAE i. 178–89; TUAT ii. 555–6; HTAT 328–9.

also royal seals on storage jars evince a Judah that experienced economic boom and territorial expansion under Hezekian rule.[40]

The death of Sargon II, king of Assyria, in 705 BCE likely led to Hezekiah's *volte-face*. Having joined the Philistine city states, he, too, rebelled against Assyria and availed himself of Egyptian support. Hezekiah ceased his payments of tribute and imprisoned Padi of Ekron, a loyal Assyrian vassal. Assyria's response did not take long to arrive. In the course of his third campaign, Sennacherib (705–681 BCE) crushed the uprising.[41] He battled the Egyptians at Elteke, liberated the Philistine Ekron, and then set his sights on Judah and Jerusalem in 701 BCE. On his way there, Sennacherib destroyed a number of Judahite towns, the greatest being Lachish, an administrative center of colossal importance. The capture of Lachish appears on a famous relief, preserved in the British Museum. Though besieged, Jerusalem did not fall. Hezekiah, in the meantime, had thought better of insurrection and paid the stipulated tribute.[42] From this reprieve of Jerusalem, the biblical tradition concocted a triumphant story of Yhwh and his prophet, Isaiah, defeating the foreign king and his foreign gods (2 Kgs. 18–20). Yet Hezekiah did not emerge unscathed. While portions of the Judahite populace were deported, the kingdom of Judah was diminished, reduced to Jerusalem and its immediate vicinity. Moreover, Assyria annexed the Shephelah into its provincial system, assigning it to the kings of Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza.

For the rump state of Judah, the seventh century BCE was a good and peaceful time. Rendering Assyria payments of tribute and troops against Egypt, Manasseh (696–642 BCE) followed in the footsteps of his father and predecessor, Hezekiah.[43] In doing so, he enjoyed a long reign on the throne of Judah and even extended his territory southward, into the Negev.[44] Archaeological traces from Jerusalem and nearby Ramat Rachel evince an upswing for Judah under Manasseh comparable to that of the adjacent Philistine cities in the Shephelah, especially Ekron.[45] This time of prosperity, however, earned him a reputation of squalid idolatry in the biblical tradition (2 Kgs. 21).

---

[40] H. Weippert (1988), 605ff., 613ff.

[41] ANET 288; COS ii. 302–3 (2.119B); Sennacherib COS ii. 300–5 (2.119); TUAT i. 388–92; TUAT.NF ii. 67–74; HTAT 326–37. See Camp (1990); Hardmeier (1990); Gallagher (1999); Grabbe (2003); Evans (2009); Thomas (2014); Kratz (2015).

[42] According to 2 Kgs. 18:13–16, 19:36, Hezekiah paid his tribute prior to Sennacherib's departure whereas Assyrian inscriptions state that the tribute had to be sent to Niniveh (ANET 288; COS ii. 302–3 (2.119B); TUAT i. 390; HTAT 333). Both texts likely refer to the same event, although precisely how the tribute was paid can no longer be verified.

[43] ANET 290–1; TUAT i. 397; HTAT 339–42, 345; see also HTAT 338–47 and 348–51; ANET 289–301 (Esarhaddon; Ashurbanipal); COS ii. 306 (2.120; Esarhaddon); see Spieckermann (1982).

[44] 2 Kgs. 21:1–2, 17–18. Dating to the eighth to sixth centuries BCE, the Arad ostraca provide a glimpse of the military administration in southern Judah (AḤITUV 142–5; AI 11–104, 122–5; ANET 568–9; COS iii. 81–5 (3.43); HI 5–108 (esp. 69–74); SSI i. 49–54; WAW 14, 118–24; HAE i. 20–2 and passim; HTAT 352–63), as do the ostraca from Hirbet Gazza/Horvat 'Uza (AḤITUV 351–4; HI 518–39; WAW 14, 137–8; HTAT 364; see Beit-Arieh (2007), 122–87; Na'aman (2012)).

[45] H. Weippert (1988), 578ff., 589ff., 597ff., 606–7.

Beginning around the middle of the seventh century BCE, internal factors discomposed the great Assyrian empire. Egypt was the first to profit, asserting itself in Palestine once again.[46] Anti-Assyrian impulses resurged in Judah as well. So it was that a *coup d'état* ousted Amon (641–640 BCE), Manasseh's son and successor, and set a young, nonaged Josiah upon the royal throne.[47] With the death of the Assyrian king, Ashurbanipal, in ca. 630 BCE, Josiah (639–609 BCE) availed himself of the opportunity to dissociate himself from Assyria and—through temple renovation—remove the emblems of Assyrian power, which his antecedents had affixed to temple and palace alike (2 Kgs. 23:11–2). Although much of the biblical tradition seems to purport territorial gains in the Negev and Shephelah, and perhaps even northward as well, evidence for such enlargement remains tenuous and therefore contested.[48]

In the course of these developments, the Neo-Assyrian empire fell prey to the coalition of Babylonians and Medes. While 614 BCE saw the conquest of the capital city, Assur, the royal residence, Nineveh, met its demise shortly thereafter, in 612 BCE. As Pharaoh Necho II advanced in northern Syria in 609 BCE, to shore up that residual Assyrian rump state of Harran and to ensure his dominance in Palestine against an emergent and ambitious Babylon, Josiah perpetrated the juvenile rashness of meeting Necho in Megiddo. Whether he intended to stop the pharaonic incursion or misunderstood the circumstance and hoped to welcome him, believing Necho II to campaign not for but against the Assyrians, either way the Judahite king paid for such imprudence with his life (2 Kgs. 23:29–30). From this sequence of events, the biblical tradition weaves the story of Josiah dying for the proper faith—i.e., prohibitions on foreign gods and images—and ascribes to him a sweeping cult reform, like that of the great Hezekiah (2 Kgs. 18:4). Yet such reform was directed much less outward than inward, against a religious diversity long native to the Judahites but strictly rejected by the champions of biblical doctrine (2 Kgs. 22–3).[49]

For Judah, then, detachment from Assyria did not mean a coveted political autonomy but rather Egyptian ascendancy.[50] The successor to Josiah, Jehoahaz, sat upon the throne scarcely three months before Necho II deposed him, deporting him to Egypt and replacing him with Eliakim/Jehoiakim (608–598 BCE).[51] Egyptian supremacy did not last long, however. When Nebuchadnezzar II (605–562 BCE) vanquished Egypt at the battle of Carchemish in 605 BCE,

---

[46] GRIFFITH, esp. 12, 67–71, 124–5, 162–7, 349–50, 353, 502–10; HTAT 397–402.

[47] 2 Kgs. 21:19–20, 23–6 (Amon); 22:1–2, 3–7, 9; 23:4a, 11–12, 28–30 (Josiah).

[48] An inscription from a fort south of Yavneh Yam, on the Mediterranean coast, constitutes extra-biblical evidence (AḤITUV 156–64; COS iii. 77–8 (3.41); HI 357–76; OTPar 331–2; RANE no. 58; SSI i. 26, 31; WAW 14, 109–10; KAI no. 200; HAE i. 315–29; TUAT i. 249–50; HTAT 370–2). However, it is uncertain whether Judeans or Egyptians had control over the fort.

[49] See Spieckermann (1982); Pietsch (2013).

[50] GRIFFITH, esp. 12, 67–71, 124–5, 162–7, 349–50, 353, 502–10; HTAT 397–402.

[51] 2 Kgs. 23:31–4, 35 (Jehoahaz); 23:36–24:1, 5–6, 7 (Jehoiakim).

Palestine fell into Babylonian hands.[52] Disagreement spread across Judah as parties diverged on the appropriate alliance, with Babylon or Egypt.[53] After the failed attempt of Nebuchadnezzar II to take possession of Egypt (601 BCE), Jehoiakim sided with the pro-Egyptian party and refused to pay Babylon tribute. Nebuchadnezzar responded in 597 BCE with his first campaign against Jerusalem, Jehoiachin by this time having succeeded his father, Jehoiakim, on the Davidic throne.[54] Beleaguered and then conquered, the city saw portions of its upper stratum deported to Babylonia. Among them went King Jehoiachin, whom the Babylonian king, Amel-Marduk (in the Hebrew Bible called Evil-Merodach), pardoned in 562 BCE and continued to provision.[55]

Back in Judah, Mattaniah (renamed Zedekiah) assumed the royal crown.[56] He, too, hoped for aid from the Egyptians and ceased Babylonian tribute—a decision that spelled the end of the Judahite kingdom. Yet again, in 587 BCE, Nebuchadnezzar II trounced Jerusalem. The escaped Zedekiah was eventually captured and forced to watch the slaying of his sons—all before he himself was blinded and conducted to Babylonia. With city and temple both plundered and burned, additional portions of the populace were deported as well. Ostraca from Lachish bear jarring witness to the dramatic scenes that unfolded between the two conquests of Jerusalem in Judah.[57]

Following the second seizure and destruction of Jerusalem, Judah was placed under the control of a native governor, a certain Gedaliah, who resided in Mizpah[58] and belonged to the pro-Babylonian party, which opposed insurrection and championed the proven politics of vassalage. The prophet Jeremiah was a spokesman for this bloc and an apparent advisor to Gedaliah (Jer. 40:6). Their political activities cost both these men their lives, though, with Gedaliah murdered by Judahite nationalists under the Davidide Ishmael (Jer. 41) and Jeremiah—according to legend—kidnapped and taken to Egypt (Jer. 43). Consequently, Judah lost its political independence once and for all and became a province of Babylon.

While the kingdom of Judah arose at about the same time as the kingdom of Israel, the former may have developed more slowly but in the end outlasted the latter by nearly 130 years. Judah was always in the shadow of greater powers,

---

[52] AḤITUV 59–72, 80–3; ANET 301–8, 322; COGAN A 189–210; COS i. 467–8 (1.137); GRAYSON 87–102 (Chronicles 2–5); TUAT i. 401–6; HTAT 403–24, 425–30.

[53] Ekron's request for help, addressed to Egypt, may also date to the same time: COS iii. 132–4 (3.54); SSI ii. 110–16; TAD A 1.1; WAW 14:34–5; KAI no. 266; TUAT i. 633–4; HTAT 419–20.

[54] 2 Kgs. 24:8–12, 15–17.

[55] 2 Kgs. 25:27–30; ANET 307–8; TUAT i. 405–6; HTAT 425–30.

[56] 2 Kgs. 24:18–25:7; the consequences 25:8–10, 18–21a.

[57] AḤITUV 56–92; ANET 321–2; COS iii. 78–81 (3.42); HI 299–348; OTPar 188–90; RANE no. 56; SSI 32–49; WAW 14:124–31; KAI nos. 192–9; HAE i. 405–40; TUAT i. 620–4; HTAT 420–4. For the entourage of Nebuchadnezzar mentioned in Jer. 39:3, see Jursa (2008); Becking (2009).

[58] 2 Kgs. 25:22, 25.

first the kingdom of Israel and then the superpowers of Assyria, Egypt, and finally Babylon. Indeed, it was always at its best when donning the role of vassalage. With tribute yielding security in foreign affairs and an increase in economic productivity, both these factors aided Judah in its political and economic upsurge.[59] The pursuit of political independence, by contrast, gave no advantage to Judah. Without the means to effect its goals, such ambition from a small political entity only provoked retaliation from the region's major powers.

In terms of religious history, Judah was, to some extent, a satellite. If Judah shared with Israel its regional and dynastic god, Yhwh, who also managed to find his way into personal piety, this commonality betrayed diversity as well.[60] Yhwh was not everywhere one and the same divinity. Geographical and political divisions corresponded to a differentiation of the same deity into local manifestations, a phenomenon otherwise common throughout the ancient Near East.[61] For the goddess Asherah and other divine beings—all venerated alongside Yhwh and portrayed as figurines (e.g., pillar and horse-and-rider) into the sixth century BCE—this process would likely have been the same.[62] Other peoples and gods surrounded Judah, like Israel, and these cultures constantly interacted with one another. In the realm of religious iconography, first Egyptian and Phoenician influences dominated, with a distinct tendency toward solarization.[63] With Assyrian suzerainty came astral and lunar elements that either combined with or superseded earlier Egyptian motifs.

The biblical tradition refers to this international symbolic system of religion in Israel and Judah of the pre-exilic, monarchic period almost always in the context of polemic. In this polemic, ancient Israelite and Judahite traditions actually are fused. Furthermore, the biblical tradition extends the name

---

[59] Concerning institutions, social structure, and daily life in Israel and Judah, see p. 25.

[60] Such diversity appears in the onomasticon (HI 583–622; WSS 623–38; HAE ii.1, 53–87; ii.2, 109–10) as well as other significant inscriptions (Kuntillet ʿAjrud, Hirbet el-Qom; Hirbet Beit Lei; Ketef Hinnom); see AḤITUV 220–4; COS ii. 172–3 (2.47C), 179–80 (2.52–3); HI 125–32, 277–98, 405–20; SSI i. 21–58; HAE i. 47–64, 199–211, 242–51, 447–56; TUAT ii. 556–64; TUAT.NF vi. 305–19; HTAT 365–86. Kuntillet ʿAjrud, a site located north of Sinai and supposedly a caravansary, school, or religious center, shows Israelite and Phoenician influence, which hints at the identity of the transients or residents. Concerning the parallels found in Hirbet el-Qom, they may also attest the historical development of religion in Judah; cf. Meshel (2012); Blum (2013). See also Stavrakopoulou and Barton (2010).

[61] The inscriptions of Kuntillet ʿAjrud refer to a "Yhwh of Samaria" as well as a "Yhwh of Teman"; see COS ii. 172–3 (2.47C); HI 277–98; WAW 14, 136–7; HTAT 365–6; Meshel (2012). The local epithets do not betray the origin of the respective deities. Rather, they reference the realm in which they functioned and where they received veneration; see p. 49, n. 5.

[62] Keel and Uehlinger (2001), 370ff., 390ff. (ET 1998, 325ff., 342ff.). On the Judean pillar figurines, see the comprehensive and thorough analysis by Darby (2014); on the later material, see Frevel, Pyschny, and Cornelius (2014), esp. the contributions of L.L. Grabbe, I. Cornelius, and R. Schmitt, ibid., 23–42, 67–93, 95–109.

[63] Keel and Uehlinger (2001), 199ff., 322ff. (ET 1998, 177ff., 283ff.).

"Israel" to encompass Judah as well, transforming it to epitomize a people chosen by and belonging to a god who has neither equal nor rival. This perspective both shapes and judges the monarchic period's political and religious dynamics, clearly manifest in the examples of Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Josiah (2 Kgs. 18–23). With respect to the theological criteria of this presentation, they stem from the Jewish law, especially the book of Deuteronomy, which had antecedents in the legal traditions of Israel and Judah (Exod. 21–2) but received its current form only after Judah's downfall.

III

The Two Provinces

1. SAMARIA, JUDAH, AND THE DIASPORA

The former kingdom of Israel, Samaria had already become an Assyrian province in 722 BCE. With the shift from Neo-Assyrian and Egyptian to Neo-Babylonian ascendancy in Palestine around 600 BCE, along with the attendant fall of Jerusalem in 587 BCE, both Samaria and Judah became provinces of Babylon. This condition lasted nearly a generation, until the Persian king Cyrus II, of the Achaemenid dynasty (559–530 BCE), vanquished the city of Babylon in 539 BCE almost without struggle.[1] As the last Neo-Babylonian king, Nabonidus had supported the cultus of the lunar god Sin and, through his long absence from the capital city, made himself rather unpopular. Consequently, the priests of Babylon's principal deity, Marduk, celebrated Cyrus as a liberator. Samaria and Judah (the latter called Yehud in Aramaic) became part of the Persian empire almost overnight, an empire that stretched all the way to Egypt thanks to Cambyses I (530–522 BCE) and encompassed the entire ancient Near East by virtue of Darius I (522–486 BCE). Following the triumph of Alexander the Great over the last of the Achaemenids, Darius III (446–331 BCE), and the subsequent turmoil from the wars of the Diadochi, the two provinces then fell into the hands of the Macedonian potentate.

The history of Samaria and Judah in the Babylonian and Persian periods is, in fact, little known.[2] Given the rather modest dimensions of the Babylonian destruction of Judah and Jerusalem, transition to a normal, everyday life would not have taken long. Even destruction of the temple in Jerusalem did

---

[1] For the transition from Nabonidus to Cyrus and on the Persian period more generally, cf. ANET 305–7, 315–16; COS ii. 314–16 (2.124); RIM 104–11; TUAT i. 406–10; TUAT.NF ii. 40–1; HTAT 431–56; and see Kratz (2002*b*); (2004*a*), 40–54.

[2] A more optimistic view is proposed by Albertz (2001; ET 2003) and Gerstenberger (2005; ET 2011); on the epoch more broadly, see, in particular, Davies and Finkelstein (1984); Galling (1964); Hoglund (1992); Willi (1995); Carter (1999); Grabbe (2004); Kratz (2004*a*); Williamson (2004); Becking (2011); further Kratz (2002*d*); Lipschits and Blenkinsopp (2003); Lipschits and Oeming (2006); Lipschits, Knoppers, and Albertz (2007); Lipschits, Knoppers, and Oeming (2011); Jonker (2011); Frevel, Pyschny, and Cornelius (2014).

not mean a termination of numerous cultic activities; instead, the locality found compensation in the former altar place and other prominent cultic places, such as Bethel. Indeed, the archaeological evidence indicates strong recovery in quotidian life from the loss of political autonomy and forfeiture of great territorial expanse, even though neighbors to the west (Phoenicians) and south (Edomites, Arabs) benefited much from the latter. As a result, the transition from Babylonian to Persian sovereignty brought with it no decisive break for the provinces of Samaria and Judah. The political and economic centers of greatest interest to the Persians lay on the Mediterranean coast. Although the Samarian and Judahite hinterlands had had a certain strategic significance since Cambyses I's campaigns against Egypt, no meaningful increase in settlement or material culture took place in Samaria and Judah until after the middle of the fifth century BCE.

While Babylonian governance ostensibly left these two provinces more or less to their own devices, the Persians, especially since Darius I, encroached on the political structures of the subjugated regions with much greater force. Samaria and Judah held the status of Persian province in the satrapy Transeuphratia ("beyond the Euphrates"). The satrapy was controlled by "satraps," the two provinces by indigenous or Persian governors. The names of some of these governors appear in epigraphic and literary sources.[3] As opposed to the Phoenician coastal cities, which still constituted monarchies, the internal administrations of the two provinces rested in the hands of executive commissions composed of the upper classes and priests. Now quite infamous, the Persian postal and registration systems not only organized but even controlled communication between the various stately authorities. The introduction of coinage also fostered economic efficiency. Aramaic, the official language of the Persian empire in the west, soon became the vernacular throughout Samaria and Judah, displacing Hebrew more and more. Hebrew, however, remained the language of holy scripture.

Concerning the general circumstances of the day, only a few prominent events from the history of these provinces, Samaria and Judah, are known. Their strategic importance likely accounts for the construction of a new temple in Jerusalem under Darius I between 520 and 515 BCE (Ezra 5–6),[4] though some attribute the project to Darius II (424–404 BCE)[5] or Artaxerxes I (464–425 BCE).[6] A new temple was founded in Samaria as well, more specifically on Mount Gerizim (near Shechem), which became the center of the Samaritan community.[7] As in Jerusalem, this temple almost certainly was

---

[3] Cf. HTAT 457–514; Grabbe (2004); Kratz (2004*a*), 93–119; and see Part C *Archives* II.

[4] The dates of Haggai's oracles further suggest that the temple was built during the reign of a king named Darius (probably Darius I); see Kratz (2004*a*), 79–92; Hallaschka (2011).

[5] Dequeker (1993).   [6] Edelman (2005).

[7] Magen (2008*a*) and see Part C *Archives* II 4.

not built without permission from the Persian authorities. Nehemiah's mission also finds explanation in Judah's strategic significance. A Jewish cupbearer to the Persian king, Artaxerxes I, Nehemiah was sent to Jerusalem to rebuild the city's walls.[8] This assignment probably related to disturbances in Egypt and other parts of the country, which violently convulsed a Persian empire already embroiled in protracted wars with Greece. Reconstruction of the city's ramparts further dovetails with the portrait outlined by archaeological findings, which suggest that Samaria and Judah experienced a certain political and economic revival in the second half of the Persian period.

Alongside both these provinces, Jewish settlements beyond the homeland, in the Babylonian and Egyptian diaspora, gained increasing significance over the course of the Babylonian and Persian eras. The segments of the population deported to Babylonia were settled in ethnic communities and organized themselves in the diaspora. Archives from one such community, designated Al-Yahudu ("City of Judah" or "Judahtown") and probably located in the region east and southeast of Babylon, along with other documents from Babylonia reveal a great amount of economic and legal integration for numerous generations, though they neither lost nor disowned their Judahite heritage and identity.[9] As for Jehoiachin's family, which the Babylonian court provisioned, its fate remains unknown.

A similar situation emerges in the public and private archives of Yeb, a Jewish military colony stationed on the Nile's island of Elephantine (near Aswan), which date to the late fifth century BCE.[10] Bearing the official status "Judean garrison," the colony operated its own temple, dedicated to the deity Yahu (i.e., Yhwh), which was built before Cambyses's conquest of Egypt in 525 BCE. Subsequently destroyed by Egyptians in conjunction with the Persian military around 410 BCE, the temple was permitted to be rebuilt on the other side of long and complicated diplomatic negotiations. The ruling circles of Samaria and Judah were also involved in these negotiations. According to extant documents, active epistolary and personal contact connected the homeland to the diaspora colonies. Still, no evidence even hints at any waves of return—an historical improbability in any case.

Biblical tradition in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, along with the books of Ezekiel, Isaiah (from ch. 40 onwards), Haggai, and Zechariah, paints a different portrait entirely. Concentrating solely on the situation in Judah, this tradition imagines a great stream of repatriates from Babylonian captivity

---

[8] Neh. 1:1a; 2:1–6, 11–18; 3:38; 6:15. On the archaeological evidence or non-evidence for Nehemiah's wall, see Finkelstein (2008*b*).

[9] CUSAS and BaAr; see already Joannès and Lemaire (1996); (1999); Abraham (2005–6); (2007); (2011); Lambert (2007); further Pearce (2006); (2011); (2014); Wunsch (2013); in addition, see also Beaulieu (2011); Zadok (2014); Waerzeggers (2014); Bloch (2014).; Stökl and Waerzeggers (2015). The evidence is discussed in Part C *Archives* II 2.

[10] TAD; LOZACHMEUR; on this material, see Porten (1968); Von Pilgrim (1998); (2003); (2013), as well as Part C *Archives* II 1.

(*Golah*) that represent "all Israel" or the true "Israel."[11] The tradition binds reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem with a certain Sheshbazzar, the Davidide Zerubbabel, and the priest Joshua, yet their roles in the province's restoration are anything but clear. Sheshbazzar appears only in connection with the temple vessels and the Decree of Cyrus from 539 BCE. Historically disputed, this decree allegedly authorized the temple's reconstruction and the Jews' return from exile in Babylonia.[12] Zerubbabel and Joshua then serve to fill the chronological gap between the Decree of Cyrus and temple reconstruction under Darius.[13] In Ezra 5–6, however, only the "elders of the Jews" (i.e., Judahites) are responsible for construction, and Sheshbazzar, Zerubbabel, and Joshua have no place in its completion whatsoever.[14] Proceeding from an analogous situation, papyri from Elephantine may facilitate conjecture concerning the diplomatic circumstances that led to the temple's construction.[15] The biblical tradition transforms the historical event into a sacred history and makes the year 539 BCE a holy date. From the biblical perspective, this year—when Cyrus II conquered Babylon—marks the reversal for "Israel": divine judgment gives way to salvation, with salvation consisting of a return to the circumstances that preceded deportation. Although the biblical portrait may seem to suggest a failed attempt at restoration of the Davidic monarchy under Darius I, with Zerubbabel as the dynastic pretender, little evidence would actually support such a reconstruction. In some cases, the Persians may have enlisted some members of the royal family, including Zerubbabel, to administer the province of Judah, but only afterwards, in the framework of biblical tradition, were they conjoined with a certain messianic hope.[16]

The mission of Nehemiah, too, has left literary traces in the biblical tradition. Here, besides reconstruction of the city wall, Nehemiah accrues extensive endeavors for political, social, and religious renewal. He receives designation as a governor of Judah, who must parry hostility from the governor of Samaria (Sanballat) along with other neighbors (Arabs, Ammonites, Ashdodites) to fulfill his commission for the people of God, namely "Israel."[17] At his side stands the figure of Ezra, a priest and scribe likewise sent by the Persian king Artaxerxes to deliver the ruler's contributions to the temple in Jerusalem and to declare and administer the Jewish law, the Torah of Moses, among the Jews in Judah and the entire region of Transeuphratia.[18] Yet again, the Elephantine papyri provide a certain analogy. They tell of a Judean envoy by the name of Hananya who travelled to Elephantine around 400 BCE in accord with Persian authorities as well as the ruling circles of the Samarian and Judahite provinces in

---

[11] On the relevant lists in Ezra 2 and Neh. 8, see Finkelstein (2008*a*).
[12] Ezra 1 and 6; Isa. 44:28; 45:1, 13.
[13] Ezra 2–4; 5:1–2; Hag. 1–2; Zech. 3–4.   [14] Ezra 6:13–5.
[15] ANET 491–2; COS iii. 116–31 (3.46–53); TAD A 4.1–10; TUAT i. 254–8; TUAT.NF iii. 362–4; HTAT 475–84.
[16] Hag. 2:20–3; Zech. 4.   [17] Esp. Neh. 1; 5; 13.   [18] Ezra 7–10; Neh. 8.

order to regulate Judean (Jewish) affairs.[19] However, the Torah of Moses, which would have presumably governed his mission, finds no mention at all. Throughout the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, by contrast, the reader can glimpse the emergence of Judaism, which expressly appeals to the Torah of Moses and other traditions that enter the later Hebrew Bible. It is a type of Judaism I therefore designate "biblical Judaism." As with the temple's construction, a historical event (namely Nehemiah's mission to build the wall) becomes the point of departure for a sacred history that depicts the establishment of a theocracy subject to the Torah of Moses.

The portrayal in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah—especially in the Aramaic documents of Ezra 4–7 and Nehemiah's memoirs—not only betrays the world of the Persian period but also corresponds to the framework of Achaemenid imperial ideology as revealed in Persian royal inscriptions.[20] Although such dovetailing might convey the impression that the biblical sources prove reliable and describe the history of Israel during the Persian period more or less faithfully, the authenticity of the Aramaic documents in Ezra is exceedingly dubious. Both critical analysis of the biblical sources and comparison with the archaeological and epigraphic evidence should encourage circumspection. Neither documents from the Babylonian diaspora nor the Elephantine papyri from the Egyptian diaspora show any trace of biblical Judaism. Quite the contrary, the religious and legal circumstances of the Judean garrison at Elephantine, as well as the literature discovered there— e.g., the Aramaic version of Darius I's famous Bisutun Inscription—have nothing to do with the biblical tradition. Conditions there would have incurred disapproval from an Ezra or Nehemiah across the board, and yet they apparently caused no trouble for the ruling circles of Samaria and Judah. Even the few finds in Palestine itself paint quite a multicolored portrait in religion and culture alike, with Persian and Greek influences becoming increasingly conspicuous, to say nothing of persistent Canaanite, Phoenician, Egyptian, or Mesopotamian motifs.

Unfortunately, we know next to nothing about the specific groups responsible for producing and transmitting the biblical tradition. They must have belonged to the learned elite of scribes and priests, either educated in official schools or trained in scribal families. Nonetheless, they seem to have distanced themselves inwardly from the ruling classes. With respect to biblical tradition, they polemicize against the prevailing reality of religious and cultural diversity. Exactly where this tradition was spawned and handed down, who was responsible for it, and how it came to dominate the religious paradigm of not only Palestinian Judaism (in Samaria and Judah alike) but also that of the

---

[19] ANET 491; COS iii. 116–17, 119–21 (3.46, 48); and TAD A 4.1; A 4.3; WAW 14, 63–7; TUAT i. 253; HTAT 479–80 and TUAT.NF iii. 360–1.

[20] CII 1.5.1; TUAT i. 419–50; for the Persian and the Akkadian versions, see CII 1.1 and 2.

Babylonian and Egyptian diaspora over the course of the Hellenistic period remains a mystery indeed.[21] What we see now is only the result: a biblical Judaism later retrojected onto the history of Israel from creation of the world until the demise of the Israelite and Judahite kingdoms in the pre-exilic period (Genesis–Kings; Chronicles) and onto the subsequent history of the Samarian and Judahite provinces in the "post-exilic"—i.e., Persian—period (Ezra, Nehemiah, and, for survival in the Babylonian captivity, Dan. 1–6).[22]

2. THE HASMONEAN KINGDOM

The transition from Persian to Macedonian dominion over Palestine brought with it a series of changes for Samaria and Judah, far beyond the mere change in name for the province of Judah (Yehud), now *Ioudaia* in Greek and *Judaea* in Latin.[23] Once again, the regions of these two provinces became an apple of discord among the powers that be, the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Syria and Mesopotamia, who struggled for Alexander's inheritance and supremacy in Palestine. Both provinces were then subject to the Hellenistic dynasties' influence, which greatly advanced the process of Palestinian Hellenization that had already begun long before. Alongside this development came an economic boom, evident in the resettlement of old and the foundation of new cities, as well as social restructuring and rifts. Politically, the provinces maintained their previous status but underwent consolidation into the administrative district of "Syria and Phoenicia" or "Coele-Syria (and Phoenicia)"— corresponding to the former Persian satrapy Transeuphratia—which fell into further hyparchic and eparchic subdivisions, again reflecting Persian provincial practice. In the second century BCE, Judah once again won political autonomy. After the Maccabean revolt came the Hasmonean dynasty under the Seleucids and the Herodian dynasty under Roman rule, which lasted—at least nominally—until the death of Agrippa II, i.e., the end of the first century CE.

Over the course of the third century BCE, Samaria and Judah witnessed considerable economic change, especially under Ptolemaic rule. According to the Jewish historiographer Flavius Josephus, the chief literary source for the Hellenistic–Roman era, Ptolemy I—who had been involved in the wars of the

---

[21] For greater detail, see Part C *Archives*.

[22] On this topic, see Kratz (2000*b*; ET 2005) and Part B *Tradition*.

[23] Concerning the Hellenistic–Roman epoch, see Davies and Finkelstein (1989); Schürer (1973–87); Maier (1990); Haag (2003); Schäfer (2003); further Bickermann (1937); Tcherikover (1961); Hengel (1973; ET 1974) and (1976; ET 1980); Hengel and Lichtenberger in Hengel (1996), 295–313; Bunge (1971); (1975); (1979); Fischer (1980*a*); Bringmann (1983); Bar-Kochva (1989); Gruen (1998) and (2002); Rajak (2002*a*); Ma (2002); (2012); (2013); Grabbe (2008*a*) and Grabbe and Lipschits (2013); Eckardt (2012) and (2013); Honigman (2014).

Diadochi after the death of Alexander in 323 BCE and reigned over Egypt from 306 to 285 BCE—captured Jerusalem in 301 BCE and deported segments of the population to Egypt.[24] His successors ruled the land with an iron fist and squashed it with a system of tax farming.[25] While some, like the family of the Tobiads,[26] benefited handsomely from this arrangement, others were driven to poverty and presumably came into contact with proponents of biblical Judaism, who rejected foreign, Hellenistic rule and advanced a vision of salvation for the righteous and divine judgment for the unrighteous. Such social dislocations triggered the political and ultimately religious construction of opposing parties in Judaism.

The Ptolemies ostensibly avoided entanglement in religious matters, though they did introduce the Hellenistic royal cult. Alongside the ancestral yet increasingly Hellenized cults and temples in Samaria and Judah, biblical Judaism must have also gained momentum at this time—even if its means of expansion across Palestine and the diaspora still remain unknown. Be it by prisoners of war, soldiers, latecomers, or any other means, the biblical tradition was exported to Alexandria, the Ptolemaic capital. There, over the course of the Hellenistic period, a burgeoning Jewish community arose, one that maintained a synagogue instead of a temple and began to translate the Hebrew Bible into Greek.[27] Nevertheless, as late as the second century BCE, the biblical writings were not well known at all. For this reason, the scribe Ben Sira took up his pen and wrote a compendium of the biblical tradition, which his grandson then translated into Greek at the end of the second century BCE.

The Hellenization of Judaism had begun already in the Persian period and stretched from the coast across Samaria and down to Judah, where it increased markedly at the time of the Seleucids. Through the granting of special privileges, taxes in particular, the Seleucid king Antiochus III (223–187 BCE) ensured support from wide sections of the Jerusalem elite, who vacillated between the Ptolemies and Seleucids based on promises of political and economic advantage. Intense debate fractured the Jewish elite, especially over the office of high priest, which carried substantial weight politically. Attested by a Greek stele

---

[24] Josephus, *A.J.* 12.1.1, 1–10; *C. Ap.* 1.22, 208–11 (referring to Agatharchides of Cnidus, second century BCE). Deportations also find attestation in *Let. Aris.* 12ff. (APOT ii. 95–6; OTP ii. 12–13; JSHRZ ii. 46–7). The voluntary relocation of Ezekias (Hezekiah), the high priest, is reported by Josephus in *C. Ap.* 1.22, 186–9 (with reference to Hecataeus of Abdera = Pseudo-Hecataeus, OTP ii. 905–18; JSHRZ i. 154–5). Josephus and rabbinic sources even mention Alexander the Great entering Jerusalem (*A.J.* 11.8.4–5, 325ff.; *b. Yoma* 69a), but the account should probably be counted among the legends. Ptolemy III Euergetes is also said to have visited Jerusalem and presented offerings there (*C. Ap.* 2.5, 48).

[25] Insight into economic life comes from the Zenon papyri: CPJ i. 1–17, 115–46; TUAT.NF i. 314–16; TUAT.NF ii. 370–2; see Pestman (1981); Clarysse (2009).

[26] Josephus, *A.J.* 12.4.2ff., 160ff.

[27] Cf. *Let. Aris.* (APOT ii. 2–122; OTP ii. 7–34; JSHRZ ii. 35–87); Josephus, *A.J.* 12.2.1ff., 11ff., and Part C *Archives* II 6.

and—indirectly—the legend in 2 Macc. 3, Olympiodorus' installment as warden of the temples in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia under Seleucus IV (187–175 BCE) probably belonged to the same conflict.[28] Both internal and external circumstances, which weakened the Seleucids' rule and created a power vacuum in Judah,[29] precluded a termination of these inner-Jewish disputes over the proper political course and office of high priest.

Under Antiochus IV (175–164 BCE), the controversy led to dismissal of the high priest, Onias III. First his brother Jason and then Menelaus succeeded him, even despite the latter's non-Zadokite and thus non-high-priestly lineage. According to literary tradition, these two launched radical reforms in hopes of transforming Jerusalem into a Greek polis.[30] Antiochus IV's activities in foreign lands, along with his campaigns in Egypt, created the opportunity for political struggles to break out once again in Jerusalem, between Jason and Menelaus (as well as the Tobiads). Hence, Antiochus undertook several military interventions in Jerusalem and mandated comprehensive reform or, rather, political reorganization. Jerusalem, like Samaria, was converted into a Hellenistic military colony and dedicated, through retable, to the Greek god Zeus.[31] For opponents of this policy and proponents of biblical Judaism, the king's course of action was stigmatized as sacrilege, the altar for the "Lord of Heaven" (*Ba'al Shamayim*) considered an "abomination of desolation" (*shiqquts [me]shomem*).[32] In point of fact, these "reforms" may have simply comprised the logical continuation of a Hellenization already long underway

---

[28] On the Heliodor stele found in Maresha, see Cotton and Wörrle (2007); Ameling (2012). The appointment of Olympiodorus filled the central power vacuum in Coele-Syria (including Jerusalem) that had existed since the last governor (*strategos*) and high priest (*archiereus*), Ptolemy son of Thraseas (who had changed sides from Ptolemaic to Seleucid rule under Antiochus III), disappeared around 195 BCE; on Ptolemy, see the Hefzibah-Inscription (Fischer (1980b); Bertrand (1982); Piejko (1991)). His successors bore only the title "governor" (*strategos*) and not "high priest" (*archiereus*) any longer; consequently, royal supervision of the temples and cults had to be reorganized (see Nikanor in Asia Minor), especially in times of inner conflicts.

[29] Not least among the causes was the appearance of Rome on the stage of world history. In 197/6 BCE, Philip V of Macedon was defeated; likewise, in 190–188 BCE Antiochus III was conquered in the battle of Magnesia as well as in the peace of Apamaea.

[30] 1 Macc. 1:11–5 (OBCA 131–2; APOT i. 68; JSHRZ i. 299–300); 2 Macc. 4:7ff. (OBCA 167–8; APOT i. 136–8; JSHRZ i. 215–17); Josephus, *A.J.* 12.5.1, 241. Josephus makes Menelaus a brother of Jason and thus an Oniad—obviously for apologetic reasons (*A.J.* 12.5.1, 231ff.); but cf. 2 Macc. 4:23, where Menelaus is a brother of Simon the overseer of the temple, who at least came from the clan of Balgea (Bilgah) according to 2 Macc. 3:4 (probably the original reading) and, as stated by the likely secondary version, was a "Benjamite." For a reassessment of the Maccabean revolt and the relevant sources, see Ma (2012); (2013); Honigman (2014).

[31] 1 Macc. 1; 2 Macc. 5–6; Dan., esp. 11:28–31; Josephus, *B.J.* 1.1.1, 31ff.; *A.J.* 12.5.1, 237ff. The polemics against Antiochus IV and the "Hellenists" culminated in the accusation of having suspended the Torah of Moses. However, this accusation only applies to Judah and Jerusalem. The Samaritans, whom Judean polemics accuse of having voluntarily consecrated their temple to the god Zeus (2 Macc. 6:2; Josephus, *A.J.* 12.5.5, 257ff.), do not appear in conjunction with the Torah at all. Perhaps the Torah was not yet established at both sanctuaries or binding for all Jews.

[32] 1 Macc. 1:54; 2 Macc. 6:5; Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:11.

and backed by many segments of Samarian and Judahite Judaism—a development requiring military enforcement given the political dimensions of cultic interests and the perils of revolt.

A broad insurrection revolted against Antiochus IV and his Judean partisans, enlisting a number of diverse factions and emanating first and foremost from political and economic concerns. The Tobiads constituted one of these groups, a family who had initially forged a pact with the Ptolemies in the third century BCE. One of its offspring, Hyrcanus, withdrew into the Transjordan and built a palace or temple complex in Araq el-Amir, east of Amman, a site still standing today, but the rest of the Tobiads had already changed loyalties at the time of Antiochus III and thus supported the Seleucids. Another priestly family, the Oniads, comprised a second faction and competed with the Tobiads, though the two were related by marriage. Stemming from the Zadokite line, the Oniads had hitherto supplied the high priest and championed the Ptolemies beginning in the third century BCE. Under the high priest Simon II (around 200 BCE),[33] they occasionally switched sides and aligned themselves with the Seleucids under Antiochus III, but when Antiochus IV rose to power some of them left the alliance, which meant a break within the family itself. The successor to Simon II, either Onias III—who was relieved of his duty in 174 BCE and replaced by his brother Jason—or his son Onias IV[34] escaped to Egypt and established a temple in Leontopolis (near Heliopolis) with support from the Ptolemies, which operated until 73 CE.[35]

The call to armed conflict against Antiochus IV and his Jewish supporters came from yet another priestly family—that of Mattathias and his sons from the house of Joiarib—and the family of Asmoneus (Hasmon) in the small village of Modi'in.[36] Their uprising became the nucleus of the Hasmonean dynasty. Judas in particular distinguished himself as a leader, so the rebels bestowed on him the epithet Maccabeus (*maqqaebaet*, which means "the hammer" in Hebrew) and carried the name Maccabeans accordingly.[37] As for the root of the Maccabean insurrection, it probably lay in (religio-)political as well as economic concerns.[38] From the perspective of a traditional priestly family, the expulsion of Zadokites from the office of high priest was an unambiguous sacrilege that defied the proper social order. Arbitrary occupation by loyalists of Hellenistic reform, who had obtained

---

[33] Cf. Sir. 50 (OBCA 108–9; APOT i. 507–12; Skehan and Di Lella (1987), 546–59; JSHRZ iii. 630–3).

[34] Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 1.1.1, 33; 7.10.2, 423 (Onias III) and *A.J.* 12.5.1, 237; 12.9.7, 387; 13.3.1, 62 (Onias IV), respectively.

[35] Josephus, *B.J.* 1.1.1, 33; 1.9.4, 190; 7.10.2–4, 421–36; *A.J.* 12.9.7, 387–8; 13.3.1ff., 62ff.; 13.10.4, 284–7; 20.10.3, 236–7; see Noy (1994); Ameling (2008) and Part C *Archives* II 6.

[36] 1 Macc. 2:1; Josephus, *B.J.* 1.1.3, 36; *A.J.* 12.6.1, 265; on the priestly lineage of Joiarib, see 1 Chron. 24:7; Neh. 12:6.

[37] 2 Macc. 5:27.   [38] Haag (2003), 53ff., 73–4 (n. 71); Schäfer (2003), 41–6.

political power and economic advantage by dubious means, went one step further still. The insurrectionists likely numbered among those who had lost to pro-Seleucid fiscal policy and power politics and therefore revolted.

Even further, the Maccabean revolt—according to literary sources—availed itself of biblical Judaism's religious rhetoric and fought its battles in the name of the biblical god and his law, regardless of whether biblical Judaism had already gained a foothold among the priestly classes or merely served as an instrument of revolution and underwent propagation for this specific reason. Biblical Judaism, whose adherents the sources name "the pious" (*Asidaioi*, *Hasidim*),[39] has always harbored national and, above all, religious reservations about the Seleucids and the Hellenization of Judaism, which was actually promoted by almost every party in play at the time. By appropriating such reservations, the Maccabees became the champions of the cause of biblical Judaism. In the literary sources, which reproduce the insurrectionists' viewpoint without fail and therefore require careful critical reading, the accusation of religious infiltration by foreigners and abrogation of the Torah prevails as the decisive ground for revolt: the Torah is portrayed as a time-honored Jewish tradition demanding defense against Hellenism's cultural and religious aberrations.

The actual diversity of motives all implicated in the uprising appears as early as 164 BCE, when the primary objectives of rescinding the cultic reforms and rededicating the temple were achieved[40] and the office of high priest was once again occupied, at least temporarily, by the Zadokite Alcimus.[41] From this point forward, the variegated Jewish factions of the Hellenistic–Roman period began to assume their contours, groups reported by Josephus.[42] The majority of priests associated with the Jerusalem temple (the later Sadducees)—over which a partisan of Antiochus IV first presided as high priest (namely Menelaus) and after him the Zadokite Alcimus—alongside the adherents of moderate biblical Judaism (i.e., the later Pharisees) contented themselves with the insurrection's outcome and moved on to other orders of business. Nonetheless, they vied with one another for influence and power in the temple and, afterwards, the Hasmonean monarchy itself. The Maccabees, by contrast, continued their armed struggle for national sovereignty and appealed to biblical tradition. As for the radical representatives of biblical Judaism, that is, "the pious," they distanced themselves from the temple priesthood as well as the Maccabees (and, later, the Hasmoneans) and awaited divine intervention instead. For them, the Maccabean revolt was only "a little help" (Dan. 11:34).

---

[39] 1 Macc. 2:42; 7:13. [40] 1 Macc. 4:36ff.; 2 Macc. 10:1ff.
[41] 1 Macc. 7:5ff.; 2 Macc. 14:3ff.; Josephus, *A.J.* 12.9.7, 385.
[42] Josephus, *B.J.* 2.8, 117–66; *A.J.* 13.5.9, 171–3; 18.1.2–6, 11–25; see Wellhausen (1874); Stemberger (1991).

The community at Qumran also ranks among the circle of the radical "pious." Writings from this group famously surfaced in caves alongside the Dead Sea,[43] and the community receives frequent association—if not identification—with the "Essenes," a party mentioned by Josephus and other ancient historians.[44] Calling itself "the community" (*ha-Yahad*) or "the new covenant," the group comprised smaller coalitions throughout the entire land and committed itself to a life led in accordance with the provisions of the Torah of Moses. For this end, they transmitted and studied biblical and parabiblical texts and also composed works of their own. Since the community's roots presumably reach back into the third or early second century BCE, they probably represent one of the biblical tradition's core tradent groups and hence early exponents of biblical Judaism.

During the Maccabean revolt, "the pious" joined the Maccabees and certain portions of the factious priesthood to form a kind of united front against Antiochus IV and his supporters. Despite their diverse motives, these groups banded together around the convictions of biblical Judaism, which they either brought with them from home or deployed as a means of propaganda and which remained more or less in effect among these various groups even after the front's dissolution. Advanced by the Samaritans, by the Alexandrian community of the Egyptian diaspora, and presumably by one or more groups of the Babylonian diaspora, biblical Judaism swiftly spread and became the solid foundation of ancient as well as later rabbinic Judaism, even despite their divergent orientations.

In their battle against the Seleucids, whom internal and external circumstance had considerably enfeebled, the Maccabees made great headway, conquering large portions of Palestine both west and east of the Jordan.[45] After the death of the high priest Alcimus and an interim of seven years, the brother of and successor to Judas Maccabeus, Jonathan, seized the office of high priest for himself. Like his other brother and eventual successor, Simon Maccabeus, Jonathan received official confirmation from the Seleucid king and laid the foundation for the (Maccabean–)Hasmonean dynasty. Their successors, John Hyrcanus (134–104 BCE) and Aristobulus I (104–103 BCE), claimed not only the office of high priest but also that of king. In consequence, they established the Hasmonean kingdom, which reached its greatest territorial expanse under Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE).[46] For the first time since 587 BCE, a kingdom

---

[43] DJD; DSSP; DSSR; DSSSE; DSSHW; MAIER A and B; QUMRAN 1–2; in addition, Stegemann (1993; ET 1998); VanderKam (2010), and Part C *Archives* II 3.

[44] On the Essenes, see Josephus (n. 42); Philo (*Prob.* 75–91; *Hypoth.*, according to Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8.11), Pliny the Elder (*Nat.* 5.17, 4), Dio Chrysostom (according to Synesius of Cyrene 1.5), and Hippolytus (*Haer.* 9.18–28). See Dupont-Sommer (1960), 24–43.

[45] 1 Macc. 5ff.; Josephus, *A.J.* 12–13.

[46] This development is also evident in Jewish coinage; see AJC 1:123–30; TUAT.NF ii. 323–6; also 1 Macc. 13:41–2.

stood upon Judean soil. This kingdom achieved the biblical borders of the "Davidic–Solomonic empire"—probably for the first and only time in history.

The Hasmonean kingdom was Hellenized through and through. Nevertheless, it sounded the battle cry for an "anti-Hellenistic" Judaism. With a vengeance, it confronted the hoary biblical enemies of "Israel" and proceeded to (re-)Judaize the population through circumcision and observance of the Torah.[47] A rival to Jerusalem, the Samaritan temple of Yhwh on Mount Gerizim was destroyed, presumably with appeal to the law of cultic centralization (Lev. 17; Deut. 12). This tactic proved counterproductive: the cultic site only gained greater significance for the Samaritan community, which continued to expand.[48] By the same token, even advocates of biblical Judaism like the Pharisees, who had challenged the union of high priest and king in a single person as well as the high priest's descent from Hasmonean instead of Zadokite lineage, were put to persecution and, at times, also death.[49] Should Josephus be believed, the Hasmoneans and Pharisees nonetheless sought a compromise and reconciled when Salome Alexandra, widow of Aristobulus I as well as Alexander Jannaeus, ascended the Hasmonean throne. Since she, as a woman, could not occupy the priestly office, Alexandra installed one son as high priest, Hyrcanus II, and the other as military commander, Aristobulus II. On the death of their mother, the two brothers fought to succeed her. On the domestic front, they capitalized on the smoldering power struggle between Pharisees and Sadducees. Regarding foreign and military affairs, Hyrcanus received support from both Antipater, governor of Idumaea and father of the later King Herod, and Aretas, king of Idumaea, whereas Aristobulus had his backing from the Roman envoy Scaurus. When the Roman general Pompey finally intervened and took Jerusalem, in 63 BCE, he changed sides and restored Hyrcanus II to high priestly office but denied him the title of king.[50]

3. THE HERODIAN KINGDOM

From this point forward, Palestine was subject to Rome. The governor Gabinius restructured the political situation and launched a policy of restoration.[51] Yet the rivalry between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus persisted, with both sides

---

[47] Josephus, *A.J.* 13.9.1, 257–8 (*B.J.* 1.2.6, 63); 13.11.3, 318–19; on the significance of Hyrcanus, *A.J.* 13.10.7, 299–300.

[48] Josephus, *B.J.* 1.2.6, 63; *A.J.* 13.9.1, 255–6; on the history of the Gerizim in the Roman and Byzantine periods, see Magen (2008*a*), 243–73 and (2008*b*).

[49] Josephus, *B.J.* 1.4.3, 88ff.; *A.J.* 13.15.5, 372ff.; 13.14.2, 379ff.; 4QpNah I, 5–6; on the reconciliation, Josephus, *B.J.* 1.5.2, 110ff.; *A.J.* 13.15.5, 401ff.

[50] Josephus, *B.J.* 1.7.4, 148ff.; *A.J.* 14.4.4–5, 69ff.

[51] On this epoch, see Schürer (1973–87); Maier (1990); Schäfer (2003) as well as Eck (2007). The main source comes from Josephus (*B.J.* 1.8.1ff., 159ff. and *A.J.* 14.4.5ff., 77ff.).

waging war against each other and courting the favor of Rome, where they were caught up in the civil war between Pompey and Caesar. After the death of Pompey (48 BCE), their future lay in the hands of a triumphant Caesar. Harried by the Parthians, who elected Antigonus, son of Aristobulus II, ruler of the Hasmonean kingdom, Caesar opted for one of his allies: Herod the Great, son of the Idumaean Antipater, who had supported Hyrcanus II. Connected to the Hasmonean royal household by virtue of his marriage to Mariamne, Herod and his successors preserved the Hasmonean dynasty. Having ascended the throne in 37 BCE, he ruled over almost all of Palestine—save for the free cities of the Decapolis—as the "allied king" (*socius rex*) to Rome. The architectural remains of his illustrious reign remain in situ today, the retaining walls of the temple in Jerusalem, reconstructed on the Roman pattern, being perhaps the most renowned. At the death of Herod, his kingdom was apportioned among his sons and grandsons. The Roman emperor Caligula (37–41 CE) awarded only one of them the territory in its entirety: Agrippa I (41–44 CE), grandson of Herod the Great. Already in 6 CE, Judaea was its own administrative district, subject to Roman prefects based in Caesarea; one of them, Pontius Pilate, won dubious fame and even became proverbial. After the interlude under Agrippa I, his son, Agrippa II, was allocated several portions of Herodian inheritance in northern Palestine, yet all regions were effectively governed by the Roman procurator and, on the death of Agrippa II (presumably around 95 CE), finally entered the provinces of Syria and Judaea.

With regard to the diaspora in the Hellenistic–Roman period, comparatively little is known, even less for the Babylonian (which would later gain great significance) than the Egyptian diaspora. Hellenization was everywhere well advanced, including those places where the Torah of Moses and other biblical traditions were not only treated as the foundation of Jewish (and Samaritan) identity but also made accessible to the Greco-Roman world through translation and interpretation. As the Hasmoneans and Herodians did with the Seleucids and Romans in Palestine, so also the Oniads rendered the Romans military aid in Egypt. Both regions had their temples, which hosted sacrificial cults, alongside numerous synagogues and houses of learning, which served as venues for prayer as well as recitation and study of the biblical writings.[52]

All the same, literary sources constantly refer to political unrest with respect to Roman rule. Under Caligula, who had permitted Agrippa I to expand his sphere of influence throughout Palestine in the first place, Jewish insurrection flamed in Alexandria in 38 CE, sparked by demands from the imperial cult.[53] Thus began a turbulent period that swept over Palestine, which had long been subject to the Roman procurator, since 44 BCE, and erupted into two

---

[52] See Part C *Archives* II 6.
[53] Philo, *Flacc.*; Philo, *Legat.*; Josephus, *A.J.* 18.8.1, 257ff.

Jewish revolts, in 66–74 and 132–135 CE, which spread to the Egyptian and Babylonian diaspora too (115–17 CE).

Both Palestinian uprisings sprang from the same Jewish sect, designated "Zealots" by its members and "bandits" or "dagger fighters" (*Sicarii*) by its opponents.[54] They distanced themselves not only from the established classes of Sadducee priests and Pharisee scribes but also from the radical Jewish groups like the Qumran community, the party of John the Baptist, and the Jesus movement and went on to instigate a national–religious revolt in the Maccabean model. The first insurrection ended with the temple's destruction in 70 CE (attested to this day on the Arch of Titus in Rome) as well as the persecution and defeat of fugitives in hiding and refuge alongside the Dead Sea (whose last bastion, Masada, became a symbol of Jewish resistance). Furthermore, the Oniad temple in Leontopolis, the "land of Onias" in Egypt, was shut down. After the second Jewish revolt, the Roman city of Flavia Neapolis (modern Nablus)—founded at the foot of Mount Gerizim—received a temple to Zeus on the former cultic grounds of the Samarian Yhwh-devotees, the later Samaritans.

The leader of the second insurrection was a man by the name of Simon bar Kosiba, which well-intentioned contemporaries interpreted as Bar Kokhba ("son of stars") in a messianic sense and others construed as Bar (Ben) Koziba ("son of liars") in derision after his demise. Letters and coinage alike attest to this figure and suggest that the uprising sought the resumption of a sacrificial cult in Jerusalem and the restoration of a politically sovereign "Israel."[55] This revolt, too, was brought to a brutal end. While Jerusalem was converted to a Roman city off limits to all Jews, the entire "land of Israel" both west and east of the Jordan was pronounced a consular province, *Syria Palaestina*. But Bar Kosiba was too late: already long ago and independent of Jerusalem those forces had come together that would give rise to rabbinic Judaism[56] and, as an offshoot, Christianity.

---

[54] The fourth "party" alongside Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as described by Josephus (see p. 43 n. 42).

[55] JDS 3; TUAT.NF ii. 328–30; iii. 377–81; Mildenberg (1984).

[56] Schäfer (2003), 137–45.

IV

An Outline of Religious History

1. THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH

The practical side of religion is the cult. Derived from the verb *colere*, the Latin word *cultus* designates service to deities in all its manifold workings. Being bound to specific times and places, religious service manifests itself in ritualized action as well as speech acts and requires a concomitant personnel. In the ancient Near East, all these dimensions find both vivid and abundant documentation.[1] While cultic places and temples were considered divine dwellings, which could facilitate contact with the respective deity, divine images represented divine presence and thus became objects of veneration. To nourish the deities and secure their favor, sacrifices were offered on altars at public sites and in private homes on both regular festivals and special occasions. Within the family, the patriarch acted as high priest; within the tribe, the chieftain; and within the state, the king. Subordinate to the monarch were all the various priestly classes, who provided the necessary temple ministries from supervision of the holy site to sacrifice on the altar.

Little documentation is extant for the cultus of the pre-exilic Israelite and Judahite monarchies (ca. 1000–722 BCE and ca. 1000–587 BCE, respectively).[2] From the few archaeological, epigraphic, and iconographic finds that have come to light, the cults of Israel and Judah hardly differed from their neighbors of the broader ancient Near East—any exceptions lying only in dimension. In contrast to the great powers of Anatolia, Mesopotamia, and Egypt or

---

[1] See Johnston (2004); Holland (2009); Snell (2011); Spaeth (2013); Pongratz-Leisten (2014) as well as Ringgren (1979); Hutter (1996); Görg (2007); Haas and Koch (2011); for Syria–Palestine, see van der Toorn (1996) as well as Haider, Hutter, and Kreuzer (1996); Niehr (1998).

[2] See Keel and Uehlinger (2001; ET 1998) and Renz (2009*b*); furthermore M. Weippert (1997); Köckert (1998); (2005); (2009); (2010); Albertz (1996–7; ET 1994); Albertz and Schmitt (2012); Römer (2014); for further discussion, see Janowski and Köckert (1999); Hartenstein (2003). Still worth reading is Wellhausen (1905*a*). Without a doubt, regional differences between Israel and Judah also existed with respect to the history of religion (see Köckert (2010)), but these divergences were minor and evened out—at least from the fall of Israel onwards, presumably even earlier (Kuntillet 'Ajrud and Khirbet el-Qom), and definitely in the post-exilic period through the intermingling of the two groups (Elephantine and perhaps Papyrus Amherst 63; see Part C *Archives* II 1).

the city of Ugarit at the end of the second millennium BCE, Israel and Judah established relatively small city or territorial states, like those of their contiguous neighbors in first millennium Syria–Palestine (i.e., Aram, Ammon, Moab, Edom, and Philistia). Thus their cultic institutions were quite modest. The biblical tradition, however, paints a completely different portrait.[3] This portrayal presupposes the religious history of Israel and Judah and only gradually constructed those characteristics that would come to distinguish Israel from all its contemporary peoples throughout the ancient Near East. In presenting a brief survey of the religious and theological developments determinative for such depiction, the overview to follow segues into the next part of the book, which centers on the formation of biblical literature.

In general, the cultus throughout the small states of Syria–Palestine concentrated on a single deity, at most a divine couple or a triad of father, mother, and child. For Israel and Judah, the divinities of devotion were "Yhwh and his Asherah," a divine couple that most likely featured in iconographic representation too.[4] In terms of origins, those of the god Yhwh remain just as obscure—and perhaps just as impossible to determine—as most of the other deities throughout the petty states of first millennium Syria–Palestine.[5] His nature reflects that of a typical Syro-Palestinian weather god, who, with time, assumed solar, astral, and lunar qualities of Egypto-Phoenician and Mesopotamian character. Yhwh was not only a deity of dynasty and state but also a personal god. Within the family realm and ancestral cult, other numinous beings—under increasing Aramean and Assyrian influence—as well as astral powers came to play a role alongside Yhwh and "his Asherah," even if further information is sorely lacking. The deities' iconography exhibits great diversity. Beyond the main god and divine pair, theriomorphic, symbolic, and aniconographic objects were employed in cultic activities.

---

[3] Albertz (1996–7; ET 1994); Keel (2007); Tilly and Zwickel (2011).

[4] Relevant for the following are the inscriptions from Kuntillet ʿAjrud, Khirbet el-Qom, Khirbet Beit Lei, and Ketef Hinnom; see p. 26 n. 28, p. 32 n. 60 and cf. especially Renz (2009b); COS ii. 172–3 (2.47C); HI 277–98; HAE ii.1, 91–3. For the iconographic evidence, see Keel and Uehlinger (2001; ET 1998); Berlejung (2013); Darby (2014); Frevel, Pyschny, and Cornelius (2014). The expression "his Asherah" in the inscriptions from Kuntillet ʿAjrud and Khirbet el-Qom is usually understood as a divine name or—because of the pronominal suffix—a designation for a cultic object representing the goddess Asherah; for a different interpretation, however, see Sass (2014), who for philological reasons prefers the meaning "his temple." Either way, the expression can still refer to Yhwh's consort, since the designation of a temple is sometimes used for that of a god or goddess as well, the case of "Bethel" providing but one example: see Part C *Archives* II 1 and 2.

[5] The first epigraphic attestation of the divine name Yhwh appears in an inscription from Kuntillet ʿAjrud and on the Moabite Stone (ninth century BCE). How the geographical term "land of the Shasu of Yhw(h)" in the Soleb-Texts and in Amara west are to be understood and whether they bear significance for the provenance of the god Yhwh remains uncertain; see HTAT 183–4 (with n. 39), KRI ii. 217, 10:92–7, and Pfeiffer (2005), 261–2; Pfeiffer (2013); Adrom and Müller (2013).

Scattered throughout the land, various cultic sites bore witness to local manifestations of the principal deity, as with Yhwh of Samaria, Yhwh of Zion, and so forth.[6] Sociological considerations may divide the cultic places and, with them, the entire religion of Israel and Judah into three distinct levels: the stately, the regional, and the familial cults.[7] Maintained by the monarch, the transregional state cult operated on central cultic sites with a temple, altar, and fixed priesthood (*bayt*, "house," or *hekhal*, "palace, temple"). Prophets and other cultic officials worked alongside the priests, as did women on occasion, though the activities of such women converged more with prophets and mourning ceremonies than sacrificial duties. The so-called high places (*bamot*, "heights")—with or without altar and sans any fixed priesthood— hosted the regional cultic institutions of clan or family, such as sacrifice and concomitant cultic feast. As for the private household cult, it materialized within the clan or family. These three levels—the stately, the regional, and the familial—distinguished themselves in accoutrements and dimensions but not in religious practice or theological conceptions, as far as we can tell.

Concrete cultic practice corresponded to specific occasions and fixed dates. With regard to the temple, the daily cult and that of specific festivals (such as new moon and Sabbath) or festive seasons necessitate distinction. Both regular and occasional sacrificial feasts, along with the agrarian calendar, determined the rhythm for the regional cult, whereas familial and personal events such as weddings, funerals, and other rites of passage (e.g., circumcision) set the course for the private sphere. Sacrifice stood at the center of all cultic activity. Diverse in form and decided by rite, such presentations to the deity were accompanied by prayer, which could comprise—depending on the occasion— lamentation and entreaty or praise and thanks, although prayer could arise from personal piety apart from any sacrifice.

Strict regulations governed contact with the deity and the divine realm, especially at the central sanctuaries (i.e., the temples), where priests supervised and conducted altar service. Mounting guard over the various zones of holiness, the priests provided information on purity and impurity. Only they could mediate contact with the divine, usher the participants' diverse concerns before the deity, and, if necessary, expiate iniquity. Beyond regulating contact with the divinity, the cult—maintained and executed by the priesthood—also

---

[6] See p. 32, n. 61.

[7] On the institutions, personnel, and functions of the cult mentioned in the following, cf. the respective articles in Berlejung and Frevel (2006): temple/sanctuary (pp. 385–9); altar (pp. 79–81); image (pp. 114–16); ancestors (pp. 77–8); priest and prophet (pp. 341–5); rite/ritual (pp. 353–4); holiness (pp. 242–3); purity/impurity (pp. 348–51); feast (pp. 184–6); sabbath (pp. 354–5); offering (pp. 331–3); prayer (pp. 198–200); lament, praise/thanksgiving (pp. 273–5; 308–9); and mourning (pp. 396–8). Another cultic site from pre-exilic times has been found at Tel Motza (cf. Josh 18:26) to the west of Jerusalem (as reported by the IAA in December 2012).

served to stabilize the natural and political order. In this way, the creation of identity was bound to the political system, founded by the god and administered by the king with his officials. The royal temple cult therefore permeated the other spheres of regional and private devotion and extended even further, into more everyday life in Israel and Judah as well.

The archaeological record has yielded almost no literary tradition for the pre-exilic cult in Israel and Judah: absent are any priestly regulations and liturgies, sacrificial rites, hymns and prayers, cultic myths and epics, specifications for dues and allocations, donations lists, invoices, and the like. While much of this rich cultic orbit would have been transmitted orally and hence disappeared over time, the biblical literature has incorporated certain vestiges nonetheless. More specifically, the tradition contains old sacrificial rituals in the priestly layer of the Pentateuch, hymns as well as rituals of petition and thanks in the book of Psalms, individual oracles in the prophetic books, and specifications for cultic installations along with other conditions of an earlier time (e.g., altar construction and festival calendar) apparent in the ancient law codes (Exod. 20:22–23:19), the narrative tradition (esp. in Genesis, Judges, and 1–2 Samuel), and even wisdom literature (sayings).[8] These slivers of tradition can aid in the reconstruction of pre-exilic cultic and religious history insofar as they converge with the archaeological evidence from Israel and Judah as well as the general framework of the ancient Near East, especially Syria–Palestine, in the first millennium BCE.

2. THE BIBLICAL TRADITION

The bulk of biblical tradition, however, did not originate in the pre-exilic monarchy but emanated from the scribal activity of later generations. This ensemble sought to found a new cult and, over time, a new religion—i.e., biblical Judaism—on the ruins of Israelite and Judahite history (which ended in 722 and 587 BCE, respectively) and in the wake of the Jerusalem temple's destruction. Based on certain rudiments tracing back to the period of 722–587 BCE, this tradition was formed at the time of Jerusalem's second temple (520 BCE—70 CE) and suited to withstand the cultic crisis that came with the second temple's own destruction and the concomitant cessation of the sacrificial system in 70 CE.

Following the groundbreaking work of Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, orientalist and biblical scholar Julius Wellhausen has the merit of discovering the decisive turning point in the biblical tradition. In his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, Wellhausen analyzed the literary

---

[8] See Part B *Tradition*.

tradition's development and reconstructed the cultic and religious history of Israel and Judah, on the one hand, and Judaism, on the other—a reconstruction still accurate in its essentials.[9] With respect to conceptualization of the divine, which in the end determined cultic history, the prophets marked a watershed. With respect to the cult in particular, Deuteronomy reflects a benchmark with the command for centralization (Deut. 12:13ff.). From this point forward, Israel and Judah could only have a single, central sanctuary for sacrifice and cultic devotion to Yhwh. Although profane slaughter could remain among the villages under certain conditions, particularly the taboo of blood, it lost its significance as an offering "to Yhwh." Such cultic centralization corresponds to the consolidation of the deity Yhwh in the famous "Hear, O Israel" of Deut. 6:4, which negates the differentiation of the principal deity's local manifestations ("Yhwh of Samaria," etc.).

Based on 2 Kgs. 22–3 and following de Wette, many scholars date the programmatic demand for cultic centralization back to King Josiah at the end of the seventh century BCE. The idea of cultic centralization, however, probably presupposes the end of the monarchy in 587 BCE.[10] Accordingly, the stipulation compensates for the absence of any other means of consolidating the scattered, disoriented constituents of the people throughout the former monarchies of Israel and Judah. Instead of a king who institutes unity among the people and coherence among the various cults practiced across numerous localities, the cultic place comes to the center, with a single deity—not a king— standing at its core. From rise to fall, the entire history of kingship in Israel and Judah hinges on this criterion in the narrative from Samuel to Kings.

Both Deuteronomy's demand for cultic centralization and Samuel–Kings' derivative portrayal of Israelite–Judahite kingship constitute a theological program within the framework of biblical tradition. Precisely when this program came to be and just how thoroughly it underwent execution escapes our grasp. Nevertheless, unequivocal evidence of its concrete implementation in religious practice does come from certain pious circles, like those at Qumran and the temples in Shechem (Mount Gerizim) and Jerusalem as well as the synagogues of Syria–Palestine and throughout the diaspora, but even they appear only in the Hellenistic–Roman period. Although anterior historical developments in religion or, more properly, theology can be reconstructed based on the biblical tradition's literary history, the trajectory of literary history cannot merely be identified with Israel's exilic and post-exilic religious history.[11] The religion of "ancient Israel"—i.e., the ancestral, pre-

---

[9] Wellhausen (1905*b*; ET 1994); see also the sketch of religious history in Wellhausen (1905*a*). The distinction between "Hebraism" and "Judaism" was already introduced by De Wette (1806–7); see Part C *Archives* III.

[10] For the discussion and further literature, see Kratz (2010*b*).

[11] For the differentiation, see Kratz (2002*c*); on the archaeological, epigraphic, and iconographic findings, see Cornelius (2011); Frevel (2013), and Part C *Archives* II 4 and 5.

biblical form of religion in Israel and Judah—did not simply restrict itself to the pre-exilic eras of the two monarchies but persisted throughout the entire histories of both kingdoms and, later, the two provinces. Indeed, post-state, biblical Judaism did not displace "ancient Israel" but developed alongside it, first in the biblical literature and ultimately in reality.

Inspired by Deuteronomy and therefore called "deuteronomistic," some biblical literature transformed an initially theological program of political and cultic unity into an ideal of cultic purity. With the proscription of any deity besides Yhwh and any site beyond Jerusalem came the death sentence for all sanctuaries, iconographies, and further symbols of divine presence in the land—entities interpreted and treated as accoutrements of a foreign Canaanite cult even if they actually pertained to Yhwh. Such purgation also reached the cult of Yhwh in Jerusalem. All cultic customs and installations even evocative of "other gods" were to be utterly destroyed.

The ideal of cultic purity was, in turn, exalted in Deut. 12 (vv. 1ff., 29ff.) and elsewhere in deuteronomic law and repeated in many places throughout the narrative literature of Genesis–Kings and other passages of the Hebrew Bible.[12] Such tradition presumed the Decalogue's first commandment and, soon afterwards, the prohibition of images (Exod. 20; Deut. 5 dependent thereon). In the wake of 722 and 587 BCE, the prophetic tradition first took the institutional and thus cultic framework of Yhwh's connection to his people and made it dependent upon a failed repentance. Referring to the *Shemaʿ Yisrael* ("Hear, O Israel"), the relationship underwent positive formulation in the Decalogue: essential now is a relationship to the god who led Israel out of Egypt, a relationship that excludes "other gods."

As a result, the deuteronomic–deuteronomistic ideal of cultic unity and purity then served as the basis for the priestly tradition in the Pentateuch (Priestly Writing) and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (Ezekiel, Chronicles, Ezra–Nehemiah). This particular tradition presupposes one lone and single deity and but one legitimate, central sanctuary. Description of the one and only sanctuary corresponding to the one and only deity has received much attention and many efforts within the biblical tradition. As for the Priestly Writing, it presents the temple's construction—projected back onto the tabernacle in the desert—within the context of world history. The sanctuary (Exod. 25–40) crowns Yhwh's creative activity, which begins with the creation of heaven and earth (Gen. 1) and fulfills the promise of covenant to Abraham and his seed (Gen. 17). With the books of Leviticus and Numbers, the cultic laws then follow. These passages reinterpret, revise, and update older ritual texts, at times quite heavily. In addition, they bring them into a theological system of cultic expiation. Thoughts of re-entry for Yhwh's glory and later

---

[12] Exod. 23:20ff., as well as Exod. 32–4; Josh. 23–4; Judg. 2:6–3:6; 2 Kgs. 17; 2 Kgs. 22–3.

conceptions of purity and holiness dominate the vision of a new temple in Ezek. 40–8. Collapsing the first (pre-exilic) and second (post-exilic) temples, 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah recapitulate Israelite history as narrated in Genesis–Kings but from a second temple perspective and subject to the theological stipulations set forth in biblical tradition.

Everywhere, the decisive benchmark is the law (i.e., the Torah of Moses or Torah of Yhwh). The conception of Israelite—and world—history, the notion of personal piety and conduct, and even the cultic prescriptions are all guided by this law. In biblical tradition, which serves as the basis for biblical Judaism, the religion of Israel and Judah transforms into a "religion of the law" (so Wellhausen), i.e., into the Jewish religion.

3. THE JEWISH RELIGION

The law had a long way to travel before it found universal acceptance and came into general practice in ancient Judaism. Indeed, in the post-exilic period, that is, the era of the second temple, biblical tradition had neither reached mainstream recognition nor bound together all segments of Judaism, as amply attested both inside and outside the biblical tradition. Two internal examples should suffice: firstly, the harsh biblical critique of foreign deities in the land, placed in prophetic mouths since Moses and persistent into the post-exilic period, and, secondly, those conditions into which the biblical tradition has Ezra and Nehemiah intervene. Outside of biblical tradition, the existence of a temple on the Nile isle of Elephantine in the fifth century BCE and yet another in Egypt's Leontopolis from the second century BCE into the first century CE both evince the lack of any kind of global Jewish practice of the Mosaic law.[13]

The nature of the second temple's cult still remains unknown. Any knowledge comes second- or third-hand, based not on authentic sources but rather on literary tradition yet again. However, already at the time of the second temple—and finally at its destruction in the year 70 CE—the collection of biblical writings and with them Mosaic religion (i.e., biblical Judaism) prevailed as the decisive, "orthodox" form of Judaism.

Alongside the biblical tradition, which converted cultic practice and its inherent (non-biblical) theology into biblical Judaism, stood another, even more important element: the rise of diverse Jewish groups. With its origins in

---

[13] TAD; LOZACHMEUR; on this material, see Porten (1968); Von Pilgrim (1998); (2003); (2013), as well as Part C *Archives* II 1. Josephus, *B.J.* 1.1.1, 33; 1.9.4, 190; 7.10.2–4, 421–36; *A.J.* 12.9.7, 387–8; 13.3.1ff.; 62ff.; 13.10.4, 284–7; 20.10.3, 236–7; see Noy (1994); Ameling (2008) and Part C *Archives* II 6.

circles of Samarian Yhwh-devotees, one such collective operated a temple atop Mount Gerizim, near Shechem in the province of Samaria, the former northern kingdom. While this group finds ample attestation in epigraphic sources from the Hellenistic period, archaeological evidence confirms their temple's existence as early as the fifth century BCE.[14] From the Yhwh-adherents on Mount Gerizim came the community of Samaritans, who fell into conflict with Jerusalem over "the place that Yhwh will choose [or has chosen]" (Deut. 12). Against the rest of biblical Judaism, the Samaritans recognized as holy scripture only the Torah of Moses, the Pentateuch. Others, like the Qumran community or early Christians, identified themselves either alongside the temple cult in Jerusalem or as an alternative to it, creating their own traditions on the basis of biblical texts (i.e., Torah, Prophets, Psalms, etc.).

External incentives presumably initiated or at least promoted the formation of these groups.[15] After the temple's reconstruction in Jerusalem and the province of Judah's restoration, political, social, and increasingly religious or theological conflicts broke out among rival interest groups both inside and outside Syria–Palestine, beginning in the late Persian period and escalating in the Hellenistic era. They culminated in a drastic political and cultic reorganization under the Seleucid king Antiochus IV (175–164 BCE), which showed strong Hellenistic influence. With support from powerful and probably even broader parts of the Jewish population, Antiochus converted Jerusalem into a Hellenistic military colony. He reportedly installed the Greek god Zeus Olympios upon the altar of burnt offering in Jerusalem and putatively rendered the Jewish law inoperative. Similar stories pertain to the temple on Mount Gerizim. For the latter and in contrast to Jerusalem, however, no accounts report an abrogation of the Mosaic law, which can carry two separate meanings: either the Seleucids treated the two sanctuaries differently for reasons unknown to us, or the political intervention in Jerusalem had nothing to do with the Torah, and the Torah had not yet gained the crucial significance that Jewish polemic against Antiochus IV ascribes to it in biblical (Daniel) and para-biblical literature (Maccabees, Josephus, etc.).

Against measures instituted by the Seleucid king and his elite collaborators at the Jerusalem temple, a group of insurrectionists staged a revolt. Stemming from the family of Hasmon, from the village of Modi'in, north of Jerusalem, this group was led, in part, by a man named Judas Maccabeus, eponym of the "Maccabees." Through armed conflict, they reversed the reform. The Jerusalem priests of Zadokite lineage (the later Sadducees), together with broader segments of the "pious" (*Hasidim*) (the eventual Pharisees), contented themselves with the outcome.

---

[14] Magen (2008*a*) and see Part C *Archives* II 4.
[15] On the following see III 2.

The Maccabees, however, did not. Zealous for more, they successfully fought against the Seleucids' occupation forces. From this battle came the Hasmonean kingdom, which installed a single person as king and high priest alike. On the death of Alcimus, in 159 BCE, the last high priest of Zadokite pedigree, Jonathan, brother of Judas Maccabeus, became the first Hasmonean high priest in 152 BCE. The Hasmoneans occupied the office into the Herodian period and put an end to the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim. Around 110 BCE, John Hyrcanus I demolished the establishment.

Behind this controversy lay a battle for the high priestly office, which arose from interests chiefly political and economic. Traditional Ptolemaic backers yet partial Seleucid supporters since the shift in power, the Oniad family—who had occupied the office of high priest for generations—were expelled under Antiochus IV. Following this dislodgment, a temple in Leontopolis, Egypt (near Heliopolis), was founded by either Onias III himself in 174 BCE or his son Onias IV in 160 BCE. This temple stood for almost two centuries, closed only after the Jerusalem temple's destruction in 70 CE, over the course of the Jewish wars against the Romans.

The religious movement revealed in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Qumran) and self-designated as "the community" (*ha-Yahad*) went in another direction.[16] Although modern scholarship frequently identifies this community with the one Josephus and other ancient sources call the Essenes, perhaps not entirely inaccurately, the two demand historical differentiation. The roots of the Qumran community probably trace back to the time before the Maccabean revolt. Successfully introduced by the Maccabees or Hasmoneans in their campaign for political supremacy, this community's religious and practical orientation towards the Torah and other biblical writings contributed to the expansion and establishment of biblical Judaism at the temple in Jerusalem. Yet the community of Qumran actually distanced itself from the ruling circles in Jerusalem and instituted a kind of counter-cult against Jerusalem. Theoretically and programmatically, the temple cult in Jerusalem obtained; practically, however, an alternative arose with participation in the cult of heavenly angels—far from the temple indeed.

Not detached from the temple in Jerusalem but rather closely coupled to it was the early Christian community. The crucifixion of Jesus and a particular kind of experience that manifested itself in a belief in his resurrection served as the external cause for the formation of this community. Both brought early Christians into conflict with their own origins in Judaism. Either participating in the temple cult as if it were quite natural or maintaining this connection through various collections and fees, they saw in the gospel of Jesus's death and resurrection little or no competition with the established cult concerning

[16] DJD; DSSP; DSSR; DSSSE; DSSHW; MAIER A and B; QUMRAN 1–2; in addition, Stegemann (2007; ET 1998); VanderKam (2010), and Part C *Archives* II 3.

the practical side of religion and the conventions of divine veneration. They quickly and clearly discovered, however, that the gospel did, in fact, contend with the law of Moses, particularly insofar as it appealed not to the Jews alone but to all peoples, even those not bound to the law of Moses. In this way, the early Christians increasingly distanced themselves from their roots, from the Jewish cult as well as from Judaism.

The first to recognize and articulate this dynamic with great keenness was the apostle Paul. Instead of the law, he set belief in Jesus Christ as the way to God, viewing Jesus as the ultimate fulfillment of all the law's requirements. Though not rejected, the cult and its ordinances were reduced in significance for salvation. The four canonical and several non-canonical gospels subsequently recorded this theological viewpoint in the life of Jesus from his birth to his death. Born a Jew and raised in accord with the law, the gospels' Jesus understands himself as the Christ, who stands above the law and cultic ordinances and even defies them—in view of God's coming kingdom—to reach what law and cult both promise: absolute, immediate contact with the divine. Theological conceptions and speech patterns originating in the cultus itself found their way into the New Testament's christology, ecclesiology, ethics, and eschatology as expressive imagery and symbols.

These various group formations of Hellenistic–Roman Judaism, including the early Christians, ultimately meant the fragmentation of Judaism. Yet this phenomenon contributed to its own character and survival as well. The community of Qumran and that of the early Christians demonstrated already in the Second Temple period what was yet to come in the history of Judaism more broadly: the Jewish religion's transformation into religious thought and life beyond the practiced cult. Indeed, the rest of Judaism would face the same task following the temple's destruction in 70 CE and the second Jewish revolt under Bar Kokhba.[17] Various paths and factions were excluded from Judaism thereafter—be it that of the Samaritans, Essenes, Christians, or apocalyptics— and Judaism set to work collecting and interpreting the normative tradition. Here, the Torah and, more broadly, the Hebrew canon of biblical books was and remains the fundamental document that Judaism has shared with all its diverse branches. Moreover, in the oral tradition of the rabbis, the cult still held its central significance. Apart from practical regulations for a fictive or future temple cult, the cultic laws, speech patterns, and imagination retained their meaning for the reshaping of divine service as well as everyday life in a time without the temple.

---

[17] See III 3.

Part B

The Biblical Tradition

I

The Premises

1. SCRIBAL CULTURE AND BIBLICAL TRADITION

Israel and Judah did not simply inherit the biblical tradition. This tradition presupposes an Israelite–Judahite scribal culture manifest in epigraphic materials as well as certain literary remains within the Hebrew Bible. As the biblical tradition absorbed from scribal culture specific practices, knowledge, and literary residuum, it also blazed new trails with the material it acquired as well as the material it produced independently on the basis of a common scribal heritage—trails that prove singular within the ancient Near East. The biblical books' genre and content alike break the standard mold of scribal culture: scribes became scholars of scripture, and biblical tradition rose from scribal culture.

Without the biblical tradition, Israel and Judah would probably have met the same fate as their neighbors. After their political demise, the two kingdoms and later provinces, along with their erstwhile scribal cultures, would have perished and vanished into oblivion until archaeological coincidence could have brought one or the other to light. Instead, the extraordinary happened: Israel and Judah have survived in the memory of biblical tradition on into the present. The transformation of Israelite–Judahite scribal culture into biblical tradition resembles a *metabasis eis allo genos*—i.e., passage into another aggregate state of religious and literary history—that firmly grounds the Jewish tradition in the Hebrew Bible. Although such a phenomenon could hardly be explained historically, the distinctive differences with respect to epigraphic and literary remains of the ancient scribal culture betray those stages that ultimately set the course for the formation and history of biblical tradition.

The material's complexity nearly precludes an exact dating of individual stages within the development and does not allow these stages simply to fall into a specific historical sequence. Yet the junctures did not happen all at once. The biblical tradition's transition was only accomplished in phases, the demise of the Israelite (722 BCE) and Judahite (587 BCE) kingdoms undoubtedly being the two most significant—though not the sole—caesura. Parallel to the Israelite–Judahite scribal culture, which extended from the very beginnings

of the pre-exilic monarchic period into the post-exilic period of the two provinces, transformations in the biblical tradition occurred simultaneously in pre-exilic and post-exilic times. Whereas the prophets broke the first ground at the end of the eighth century BCE and then again in the sixth, the tradition's other dimensions followed incrementally: narrative, law, cult, psalms, and wisdom.

Given its particular nature, the biblical literature requires a particular presentation. Since the biblical literature can, in large part, only be dated relatively (based on internal textual and conceptual relations) and not absolutely (in line with historical events), any representation of the material according to individual centuries or phases of Palestine's foreign domination—be it Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Ptolemaic, Seleucid, or Roman—proves insufficient to the task. Rather, a more fitting disposition of the material would follow every individual sphere of the tradition, describe the transition from Israelite–Judahite scribal culture to biblical tradition for each of these spheres independently, date them as precisely as possible, and orientate the entire account towards the more obvious internal caesura of Israelite and Judahite history.[1] Literary synthesis does not preclude all consideration of historical context, however. Such an outline of the literature's history will therefore conclude this section on the biblical tradition.

2. SCRIBES AND SCRIBAL SCHOOLS

As with the rest of the ancient Near East, Israel and Judah, too, saw the development of a scribal culture alongside monarchic formation.[2] The economies of court and temple as well as commercial intercourse more generally all made bureaucratic development essential. In addition to priests, prophets, jurists, and soldiers, these institutions required scribes, who undertook their professional endeavors both inside and outside the court. Bookkeeping and letter writing along with the composing, recording, and archiving of important political, juridical, economic, religious, and, not least of all, literary documents numbered among the scribes' various responsibilities.

A considerable amount of evidence suggests that scribes were trained in schools or scribal families, which passed on their specialized skills and knowledge from generation to generation. In both instances, pupils learned

---

[1] Kratz (2002*c*).

[2] On the emergence and documentation of scribal culture, see Lemaire (1981); Knauf (1994), 221–37; Hezser (2001); Carr (2005); Van der Toorn (2007); Renz (2009*a*); Whisenant (2008); Sanders (2009); Rollston (2010); Eshel and Levin (2014); Schmidt (2015); for a wider context, see Sanders (2006 [2007]); Schaper (2009).

far more than merely how to read and write; instead, they received as comprehensive an education as possible, which would then enable the graduate to provide services to the temple and court. Entrusted with the literature and traditions of their culture, the prospective scribes were also trained in proper conduct for themselves and with respect to others as well. As for the contents of education, they were collected and transmitted in a distinctive framework that modern scholarship terms "wisdom."

The extent to which scribal or wisdom schools both operated in society beyond the confines of future civil servants and educated wider circles among the elite is difficult to determine. At least for law and commerce, which were not entirely centralized, a certain inclusiveness may have characterized their efforts. Still, the ability to read and write as the foundation for a more comprehensive education remained restricted to a small minority of professional scribes and other professional groups. Thus, literary dissemination would have been severely curbed. Initially few, the number of private libraries likely increased only in the post-state period.

Their names preserved in epigraphic materials, professional scribes operated in both pre-exilic and post-exilic eras,[3] and the inscriptions from Israel and Judah along with the diaspora trace back to them and their ilk in the end. Yet apart from the biblical tradition, no evidence suggests these scribes recorded, copied, or even authored biblical books (Jer. 36; Bar. 1:1ff.). Trained in institutionalized schools or by professional families, scribes usually worked in the state's supporting offices. The biblical texts, however, challenged court and temple alike in the pre-exilic period and both institutions as well as elites in the post-exilic period with reserve and at times outright hostility. Thus, professional scribes almost certainly had little to do with the formation of biblical texts. Rather, the biblical books' authors and copyists arose from persons who stemmed from scribal schools and official bureaucracy but distanced themselves internally and perhaps also externally, setting out on paths of their own instead.

A comparison of two separate Jewish archives, discovered through archaeological excavation—those of Elephantine and Qumran[4]—leads to the same conclusion. Dated to the fifth century BCE, neither communal nor private archives from the Jewish colony at Elephantine contain any reference to the biblical books. To the contrary, their literature confined itself—so far as we can tell without succumbing to the argument of silence—to the Aramaic version of the Bisutun Inscription from Darius I, king of Persia, and the "Words of one by the name of Ahiqar," a non-Israelite piece of wisdom literature that left its traces in the apocryphal book of Tobit.[5]

[3] Jamieson-Drake (1991); Schams (1998); Vanderhooft (2011).
[4] See Part C *Archives* II 1 and 3.
[5] Tob. 1:21, 22; 2:10; 11:19 (GII 11:18); 14:10.

The caves of Qumran, in contrast, have yielded either copies or citations of almost every book of the Hebrew canon as well as vestiges of related para-biblical literature. These caves comprised a storage place for the writings of a Jewish community from the Hellenistic–Roman period that had renounced the Jerusalem temple's cult and founded its own system of education. As for the Qumran community itself, it not only undertook the standard scribal endeavors for correspondence and everyday life but also prepared multiple copies of biblical and para-biblical books and even composed writings of its own.[6]

Whether the biblical and para-biblical books were preserved in the Jerusalem temple archive as well as the synagogues of the homeland and diaspora still remains unknown. Also shrouded in obscurity is how long these texts were studied and employed in cultic practice. The first evidence of widespread circulation emerges in the translation of the Jewish law (the Torah) into Greek, perhaps in the middle of the third century BCE (Letter of Aristeas), as well as the threefold division of the eventual canon—i.e., Torah, Prophets, and other writings—in the book of Ben Sira and perhaps the halakhic letter from Qumran, 4QMMT.[7]

3. WRITING AND WRITING MEDIA

During the first half of the first millennium BCE, scribes wrote in Paleo-Hebrew, a local variant of the Phoenician alphabetic script that developed out of various precursors during the transition between the Late Bronze and Iron Ages.[8] First attested on a stele from the Moabite king Mesha, the Paleo-Hebrew script appears on inscriptions from Israel and Judah beginning in the eighth century BCE. During the second half of the first millennium, scribal practice then began to supplant Paleo-Hebrew with the Aramaic square script, a further development of the general alphabetic script's Old Aramaic variety. Though often conflated, the particular language written and the script employed to convey it are two distinct literary factors.

---

[6] On the self-understanding of these scribes, see III.

[7] Sir. 44–9 and prologue 1, 8–10, 24–5 (OBCA 73–4, 105–8; APOT i. 316–21, 479–506; Skehan and Di Lella (1987), 262–75, 497–545; JSHRZ iii. 505–6, 614–30); 4QMMT (4Q397 14–21:10 = 4Q398 14–17:5); while the "book of Moses" and the "books of the prophets" have certain attestation in the halakhic writing MMT from Qumran (see Part C *Archives* II 3), the reading of a subsequent "and in David," which could indicate the Psalms, remains uncertain.

[8] On language and writing, see Noth (1962), 180ff., 200ff. (ET 1996, 202ff., 224ff.); Knauf (1994), 190–221; Hamilton (2006); Tappy and McCarter (2008); Sanders (2009); on material and writing techniques, see Tov (2012), 191ff.; (2004); on the epigraphic evidence, see McCarter (1996); Jamieson-Drake (1991); Whisenant (2008); Renz (2009a); Rollston (2010); Schmidt (2015), and AḤITUV; HI; HAE.

The biblical texts' oldest extant manuscripts, namely the fragments discovered alongside the Dead Sea (i.e., in Qumran and its environs), predominately contain the Aramaic square script, still in use for writing the Hebrew language today. A few manuscripts, inscriptions, and coin legends as well as the tetragrammaton (written with Paleo-Hebrew script in both Hebrew and Greek manuscripts) all demonstrate, however, that the use of the Paleo-Hebrew script continued even up to the post-Christian era, no matter how restricted it may have been. In the Samaritan Pentateuch tradition, it lives on in the present day.[9]

As for writing materials, they consisted of stone, clay, wood, metal, papyrus, and leather. The choice of material depended on affordability and not least the reason for writing. Whereas stone served primarily for monumental and funerary inscriptions, clay was widespread in everyday life. Clay handles and bullae were inscribed—before or after firing—according to their function, while ostraca served for correspondence and commercial matters. Wood, usually in the form of a tablet coated with wax, was used for dictation or instruction. Metallic inscriptions were mostly means for more decorative ends.

In the second half of the first millennium BCE, papyrus and leather (later parchment) became the most important media, with the text itself written in ink. Papyrus, like other writing materials, had already long been in use. Although only a single papyrus composed in Paleo-Hebrew script has survived into the present—a palimpsest from the seventh century BCE (Wadi Murabba'at)[10]—clay bullae provide indirect evidence for their extensive application during the time of the monarchy. Functioning as fasteners, these objects feature a seal on one side and impressions of the papyrus itself on the other. Both leather and papyrus qualified as standard media for not only everyday applications but also archiving and transmission. While shorter texts, like treaties or letters, were written on single sheets, longer compositions, literary works in particular, were written on scrolls of sheets fastened together by glue or stitching. Sketched at times beforehand by the scribes, columns and lines divided the sheets themselves.

Papyrus and leather also bore the biblical books. Since no manuscripts have survived from the pre-exilic period, the earliest extant witnesses come from the Dead Sea Scrolls, which date from between the third century BCE and the first century CE. These manuscripts were composed primarily on leather, the preferred material given the length of the texts. Though the average scroll ran between eight and ten meters in length, they could also be longer or shorter, at times considerably so. In general, a single scroll at Qumran contained a single biblical writing or group of writings (e.g., the Twelve Prophets and presumably also the Pentateuch). With respect to the period after Qumran, fragments of

---

[9] See further Part C *Archives* II 4.
[10] AḤITUV 213–15; HI 381–4; SSI i. 31–2; WAW 14, 137; HAE i. 283–7; HTAT 366–7.

Hebrew manuscripts have only begun to appear again for the time between the sixth and eighth centuries CE (the Cairo Genizah especially). Most of these manuscripts, however, were no longer composed on scrolls but in the form of a codex, like the biblical text in Greek.

Unlike the majority of first millennium documents written on stone, clay, wood, or metal and even papyrus or leather, the biblical and para-biblical texts found at Qumran or known by other means exist in many, sometimes divergent copies, which scribes carefully preserved by way of improvements to text and material alike. Other writings may have fallen into oblivion, but the biblical and para-biblical manuscripts continued to proliferate.

4. PRE-BIBLICAL WRITTEN SOURCES

From all the productions of Israelite–Judahite scribal culture, only a few examples have survived. Among these artifacts number not only the Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions found throughout Palestine and its environs but also the vestigial relics absorbed and preserved in biblical tradition.[11] While the former constitute genuine testimony to this Israelite–Judahite scribal culture, the latter can only be identified hypothetically, through critical analysis of the literature. Hence, the authentic evidence furnishes criteria for literary assessment.

4.1 Economy and Administration

As rather quite expected, the vast majority of inscriptions consists of *economic and administrative documents*: financial bills, lists, and letters (found among the material from Samaria, Arad, Horvat ʿUza, Lachish, Elephantine, Wadi Daliyeh)[12] as well as stamps, seals, and weights—this second group scattered both temporally and geographically.[13] The Hebrew Bible contains virtually no

---

[11] The epigraphic material is collected in AḤITUV; HI; SSI; KAI; HAE; selected texts in TUAT and HTAT. See Renz (2009*a*); on the "remnants of ancient Israelite literature" in the Hebrew Bible, see also Levin (2001 [ET 2005]), 27–48.

[12] *Samaria*: AḤITUV 258–312; ANET 320–1; HI 423–98; SSI i. 5–15; HAE i. 79–110, 135–44; TUAT i. 248–9; HTAT 278–84; *Arad*: AI 11–104, 122–5; AḤITUV 92–154, 166–79; ANET 568–9; COS iii. 81–5 (3.43); HI 5–108; SSI i. 49–54; WAW 14, 118–24; HAE i. 20–2; TUAT i. 251–2; HTAT 352–63; *Horvat ʿUza (Hirbet Gazza)*: AḤITUV 351–4; HI 518–39; WAW 14, 137–8; HTAT 364; Beit-Arieh (2007), 122–87; Naʾaman (2012); *Lachish*: AḤITUV 56–92; ANET 321–2; COS iii. 78–81 (3.42); HI 299–348; OTPar 188–90; RANE no. 56; SSI 32–49; WAW 14, 124–31; KAI nos. 192–9; HAE i. 405–40; TUAT i. 620–4; HTAT 420–4; *Elephantine*: TAD and LOZACHMEUR; *Wadi Daliyeh*: DJD 24 and 28; DUŠEK A. See Part C *Archives*.

[13] See WSS.

documents of such quotidian life. Older material or patterns may still be preserved in certain lists—like that of David's sons (2 Sam. 3:2–5; 5:14–6), David's officials (2 Sam. 8:15–8), or Solomon's governors (1 Kgs. 4:1–19)—but the biblical text is otherwise largely disconnected from the social and economic concerns of everyday life.

4.2 Judiciary

The Hebrew Bible concentrates much more attention on *judiciary* matters. As implied by the farmhand's petition in the Yavneh Yam ostracon,[14] justice was administered locally: either by the "eldest" of the citizen's assembly "at the gate" or, as in this instance, by royal officials. Deprived of his outer garment by the superior in charge, the agricultural laborer claims his due at a higher level: "May my lord, the highest, listen!" Handled according to precedent, cases like this one were in the end decided simply on legal principle, retributive justice (*ius talionis*), or adequate compensation. Over time, an elaborate casuistry developed, which found its way into collections of legal provisions (*mishpatim*) following the formula "if—then."

The Covenant Code or Book of Covenant (Exod. 21:1–22:19) transmits such a compendium, which finds Near Eastern parallels as well. This corpus contains a compilation of cases from civil law and further regulates—with particular concern—the compensatory allowances and physical injuries crucial for communal life and interaction with the "neighbor." Such a collection is the exception, not the rule, however. In general, legal practice operated on the basis of common law and therefore remains accessible (today) only through individual circumstances. The family archives of Elephantine, for example, provide essential insight into contract law for marriage and land transfer.[15]

Preserved in the Covenant Code, the only extant compendium of ancient Israelite legal provisions was assembled either for the purposes of training or—as with the Code of Hammurabi—on behalf of and for the glory of the king, the monarch being commissioned by god as the highest protector of legislation and justice. In the biblical tradition, which not only casts Moses as the lawgiver

---

[14] AḤITUV 156–64; COS iii. 77–8 (3.41); HI 357–76; OTPar 331–2; RANE no. 58; SSI i. 26, 31; WAW 14, 109–10; KAI no. 200; HAE i. 315–29; TUAT i. 249–50; HTAT 370–2. Concerning the laws of the pre-exilic period, the Hirbet Qeiyafa ostracon may also be of relevance: if the proposed readings are correct, it would represent a widespread principle that demands care for the socially disadvantaged (*personae miserae*); for further discussion, see Rollston (2011); Achenbach (2012); Demsky (2012); on the archaeological context Finkelstein and Fatalkin (2012).

[15] Porten (1968); Muffs (2003); Botta (2009); Azzoni (2013). A similar case also appears in the archives from Al-Yahudu and other places in southern Babylonia; see Pearce (2006); (2011); (2014); Wunsch (2013); Stökl and Waerzeggers (2015), 7–32, 33–57; and Part C *Archives* II 2.

par excellence but also expanded such legal corpora subsequently, the legislation was loosed from its original social setting and elevated, instead, to the status of divine revelation. The legislation, in short, was constructed theologically. As a result, the legal case of the agricultural worker preserved in the Yavneh Yam ostracon gains a new significance: the question centers no longer on whether the worker's garment was seized rightly or wrongly but rather on the social status of the poor, who benefited from special legal protection always and everywhere across the ancient Near East. Furthermore, God himself answers the prayer of the poor, so the worker should regain his confiscated property before the setting of the sun (Exod. 22:25–6; Deut. 24:12–3, 17–18; Amos 2:8ff.).

4.3 Religious Practice

Within the realm of religion, primarily *burial and votive inscriptions* have survived among the material from Kuntillet ʿAjrud, Khirbet el-Qom, Khirbet Beit Lei, Silwan, Ketef Hinnom, and Ein Gedi.[16] These sources betray a remarkably different theological profile of Israelite and Judahite religion than that described in the Hebrew Bible, especially with respect to the first commandment. Alongside Yhwh, the main god manifest in different local forms, Asherah figures as a benedictory divine force and receives veneration next to Yhwh and other divinities (i.e., El, Baal). Usually, these inscriptions are interpreted as attestations of a popular religion that diverges from the official or established Yhwh religion. Such epigraphic evidence should not be marginalized, however. Rather, the dominant position of Yhwh—which also emerges in the onomastic evidence of the eighth and seventh centuries BCE[17] and in several specific formulas, like the Aaronite blessing of Num. 6:24–5, itself attested both on an inscription from Kuntillet ʿAjrud[18] and on two more recent silver amulets from Ketef Hinnom[19]—suggests a different conclusion. The boundaries between temple theology and popular religion were fluid in

---

[16] *Kuntillet ʿAjrud*: COS ii. 172–3 (2.47C); HI 277–98; WAW 14, 136–7; HAE i. 47–64; TUAT ii. 561–4; TUAT.NF vi. 314–19; HTAT 365–6; *Khirbet el-Qom*: AḤITUV 220–4; COS ii. 179 (2.52); HI 405–20; HAE i. 199–217; TUAT ii. 556–8; HTAT 367–8; *Khirbet Beit Lei*: COS ii. 179–80 (2.53); HI 125–32; SSI 57–8; HAE i. 242–51; TUAT ii. 559–60; *Silwan*: AḤITUV 44–8; COS ii. 180 (2.54); HI 507–12; SSI i. 23–5; HAE i. 261–5; TUAT ii. 558–9; HTAT 369; *Ketef Hinnom*: AḤITUV 49–56; COS ii. 221 (2.83); HI 263–76; TUAT.NF vi. 311–14; HAE i. 447–56; *Ein Gedi*: AḤITUV 236–9; HI 149–52; HAE i. 173–7; TUAT ii. 561; concerning this evidence, see further HAE ii.1, 2–3, 89–93; Renz (2009*b*).

[17] HI 583–622; WSS 623–38; HAE ii.1, 53–87; ii.2, 109–10.

[18] COS ii. 172–3 (2.47C); HI 277–98; WAW 14, 136–7; HAE i. 47–64; TUAT ii. 561–4; TUAT.NF vi. 314–19; HTAT 365–6.

[19] See n. 16. On the blessing of Yhwh, see the important pre-deuteronomic reference in Exod. 20:24; furthermore Leuenberger (2008).

the pre-exilic monarchy and, in fact, even later, as evident at Elephantine. Accordingly, the separation between "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy" throughout the biblical tradition, which expects blessing from Yhwh alone (cf. Gen. 12:1–3), actually originated only in subsequent theological reflection.

4.4 Magic and Divination

Formulas of benediction and malediction preserved in inscriptions and amulets display yet another important dimension of religion: *magic and divination*. Indeed, the belief in unseen godly powers as well as the ability to influence them through manifold magical means arises throughout the epigraphic and iconographic evidence. Yet only seldom do these inscriptions mention the relevant specialists who mastered the art of magic and prognostication: namely priests and prophets.[20] They, too, operated across Israel and Judah.

The military correspondence of a subordinate to his superior (the ostracon Lachish 3) quotes a Judahite prophet from the letter of a royal official.[21] In the fraught situation of Babylon's siege of Jerusalem around 597 BCE, the anonymous prophet—probably on behalf of the kingdom's patron deity, Yhwh— advises caution ("Beware!"), be it to warn the king of an enemy's raid (cf. 2 Kgs. 6:9) or to comfort him and pledge the aid of Yhwh against his enemies (cf. Isa. 7:4). As meager as the report may be, it does converge with parallels from the ancient Near East more broadly (such as letters from Mari, prophets from Neo-Assyria, the inscription of Zakkur).[22] Usually employed as cultic personnel, prophets served the king incumbent in the name of the patron deity, advising in political, military, cultic, and ethnic affairs often through written correspondence, which was then archived and preserved in one way or another. The sources from Mari refer, at times, to spontaneous *afflatus* from random or arbitrary persons, who then approached the court and communicated the epiphany bestowed upon them. Throughout the ancient Near East in general and the kingdoms of Israel and Judah in particular, prophecy served as an instrument of politics and propaganda.

---

[20] Avigad (1975), 101–5; WSS; HAE ii.2, 115; HTAT 382–3. "Priests" (*khn* for Judean, *kmr* for Egyptian) also appear in the Elephantine papyri: see PORTEN/LUND 154–5, 159–60.

[21] HI 308–14; WAW 12, 212–15; HAE i. 412–19; HTAT 421–2; cf. also ostracon 16 and perhaps no. 6 (conjecture); for further information, see WAW 12, 212–18.

[22] *Mari letters*: ANET; ARM; MC 12, 167–521; WAW 12, 13–77; TUAT ii. 83–93; *Neo-Assyrian prophecies*: ANET; SAA 9; WAW 12, 97–101; TUAT ii. 56–82; *Zakkur inscription*: ANET 655–6; COS ii. 155 (2.35); SSI ii. 6–17; WAW 12, 203–7; KAI no. 202; TUAT i. 626–8. On the phenomenon of prophecy in the ancient Near East more broadly, see Nissinen (2000); Köckert and Nissinen (2003); Kratz (2003*b*; ET 2015), 21–8; (2008*a*); (2011*a*); Stökl (2012); M. Weippert (2014).

Prophets did not always herald well, however. From the immediate vicinity of Israel, from Deir ʿAlla in the land of Gilead, come the words of Balaam, son of Beor, a seer of the gods.[23] This Balaam is none other than that of the Hebrew Bible (Num. 22–4), although the epigraphic sources from Deir ʿAlla reflect his original setting and time, around 700 BCE, before the biblical tradition appropriated him for Israel's own history. Through the inscription, which was written in black and red ink upon a whitewashed wall, Balaam literally paints the devil on the wall and announces to his people, with tears, an imminent and monstrous catastrophe decided by the gods. Unfortunately, the remains of the epigraphic text, poorly preserved as they are, reveal neither the cause for this disastrous proclamation and imprecation nor the purpose of the composition. Most likely, the inscription served as an injunction and admonition, aimed at either appeasing the affronted gods, Shagar and Ashtar (or Shamash, the reading is unclear), along with El and the council of the Shaddayin (cf. Num. 24:4, 16), or forestalling the imminent—or, at the time of transcription, survived—calamity by means of the seer's intervention with fasting and weeping. The Deir ʿAlla inscription resembles ancient Near Eastern augury, another form of mantic, which specialized in the recognition and interpretation of signs both good and bad.

The Hebrew Bible has preserved not only genres and locutions but also vestiges of prophecy from ancient Israel and Judah. *Prophetic legends* in the books of Samuel–Kings stand closest to the phenomenology of classical prophecy evident throughout the ancient Near East. Indeed, these legends feature kingmakers along with royal military and political advisors (Samuel in 1 Sam. 9–10; Nathan in 1 Kgs. 1–2; Elisha in 2 Kgs. 3:11ff.; Isaiah in 2 Kgs. 18–20) as well as thaumaturgists endowed with magical powers (Elijah and Elisha in 1 Kgs. 18:41–6; 2 Kgs. 4). Yet not every narrative contains an archaic literary core that dates back to the monarchic period: many were formed only later along much older patterns. In any case, all these narratives were later reworked in the spirit of that (deuteronomistic) redaction which gave the books of Samuel and Kings their present character and form.

Although the Prophetic books contain the *oracles of the* prophets, only a few authentic words are traceable back to the bequest of Israelite–Judahite scribal culture. Salvation oracles from the prophet Isaiah, which presage the demise of Judah's northern enemies, i.e., Aram and Israel, originated at the time of the so-called Syro-Ephraimite War, around 730 BCE (Isa. 7:4, 7–9; 8:1–4; perhaps also 17:1–3), while the same kind of prediction came from the prophet Nahum almost a century later, with reference to Assyria. Whereas slogans from both fronts of the Syro-Ephraimite War seem to have entered Hos. 5:8–11 as well, genuine words from the prophet were collected and altered in Hos. 6:8–7:7 to bewail the imminent destruction of the Israelite kingdom, which came to pass in

---

[23] AḤITUV 433–65; COS ii. 144–5 (2.27); OTPar 124–6; RANE no. 91; WAW 12, 207–12; TUAT ii. 138–48; KAI no. 312; Hoftijzer and Van der Kooij (1976); Blum (2008*a*).

722 BCE. The same incident occasioned parables (Amos 3:12; 5:2, 3, 19) and lamentations (Amos 5:18; 6:1ff.; cf. 3:12; 4:1; 5:7) from the prophet Amos, which portray the end of Samaria as ineluctable, regardless of whether these sayings originally bemoaned and hoped to deflect it (from an Israelite perspective) or welcomed and, in a certain sense, helped to actualize it (from a Judahite perspective). Certainly from the standpoint of those immediately affected come the oldest words of the prophet Micah in Mic. 1 (vv. 11–5),[24] which probably reflect the Assyrian invasion of Judah around 701 BCE, and the original words of Jeremiah. The latter consist of lamentations about Judah's portended destruction in 597–587 BCE, which extract the prophet's full and innermost commiseration (Jer. 4:7, 11, 13, 19–21; 6:1, 22–3). In these "jeremiads," not Yhwh but Jeremiah speaks. Utterly terrified by what he sees and hears befalling Judah, he only hints at the cause. Clearly, though, an egregious war machine—the ominous "enemy from the north"—is marching toward Judah and Jerusalem, not the deity Yhwh who wants to punish them for their transgressions. Zephaniah's "day of Yhwh" (Zeph. 1:14–16) aligns with the lament of Jeremiah, reminiscent of the inverted world in the vision of destruction seen by Balaam of Deir ʿAlla.

When all was said and done and the kingdoms of Israel and Judah were destroyed, the prophets lost their social setting and with it their significance. Some did speak on occasion. While a few, like the prophet Hananiah (Jer. 28:10–12), maintained the time-honored tradition and told of triumph over the enemy in the name of the god Yhwh, others raised their voice again only when the new rulers of the land and keepers of the temple became clear. Dated to the second year of King Darius (presumably Darius I), two oracles have survived that call for reconstruction of the temple and herald the advent of Yhwh's glory (Hag. 1:1, 4, 8 and Hag. 1:15b/2:1, 3, 9a). During the time of the second temple, we hardly hear of prophets any longer, though the absence in sources does not necessarily indicate an absence in reality (cf. Neh. 6:7, 10–14; Zech. 13). Nevertheless, the prophetic spirit had not swept in the prophets themselves for quite some time; instead, it blew through a written tradition that circulated with their names and accreted in the Second Temple period.

4.5 Temple and Cult

Regrettably, the epigraphic sources provide no insight into the literary tradition of priests and other cultic personnel at the temples in Israel and Judah.[25] In light of ancient Near Eastern parallels, god lists, sacrificial rituals, festal

---

[24] Only the lines ending with "inhabitants of" and "Moreshet Gat" in Mic. 1:11ab (without "naked in shame"), 12a, 13a, 14a ("give . . ."), 15a; see Corzilius (2015).

[25] For the few remains that have materialized, see AI 115–18; HAE ii.1, 26–8; Naveh (1979), 27, 30.

calendars, hymns, and prayers as well as myths about the gods likely comprised this tradition. Apart from a few labels on cultic paraphernalia, no such material has come to light on its own. The Hebrew Bible thus constitutes the sole source available.

Traditions from sacrificial priests presumably lie behind the Torah's sacrificial laws (Lev. 1–7) and purity regulations (Lev. 11–15). Likewise, the altar law in Exod. 20:24–6 and the festival calendar in Exod. 23:14–17 may stem from older cultic tradition with roots in the monarchic period.

Hymns and prayers appear in the Psalter. The oldest hymns, like Pss. 29; 93, and the participial series in the basic stratum of Ps. 104,[26] reveal an unbroken continuity with Canaanite tradition. In their poetic form, these texts echo the myth of divine kingship, which relates the battle of deities and powers—that of the weather god and the "lord of all the earth" (Baal or Yhwh) over and against the chaotic and destructive forces of the sea (Yam) and death (Mot)—for dominion over the gods and the earth in its entirety (cf. Ps. 97:9). Such hymns converge with the epigraphic evidence, be it the propriety declaration in one of the Khirbet Beit Lei inscriptions, the divine glorification in the cave inscription from Ein Gedi, or the description of theophany in a (Phoenician) wall epigraph at Kuntillet 'Ajrud.[27] Yhwh of Samaria and Yhwh of Jerusalem thus hardly diverged at all from Baal of Ugarit and Baal or Hadad of the Phoenicians and Arameans.

As for ancient prayers, they consist of individuals' complaints (e.g., Ps. 13) and expressions of gratitude (e.g., Ps. 118:5, 14, 17–19, 21, 28). These invocations constitute the spoken portion of a ritual linked to sacrifice, a ritual implied in texts of thanksgiving but otherwise unknown. Canaanite mythology acted as a model for them as well insofar as the divinity continually saves the supplicant from death. In the Ugaritic Baal Epic, Death (Mot) figures as the greatest adversary, second only to the Sea (Yam), with whom the weather god, Baal, struggles for kingship and dominion over all.

4.6 Royal Chronicle and Narrative

Hebrew narrative demonstrates a local peculiarity. Divine myths—i.e., stories about the gods that explain conditions on the earth, such as the Baal Cycle of Ugarit or Atrahasis and Enuma Elish of Mesopotamia[28]—are attested nowhere in the Hebrew Bible. Within the realm of biblical tradition, the prototypes or sources (*Vorlagen*) used in the primeval narrative (Gen. 1–11) bear the greatest resemblance to ancient Near Eastern myth: the anthropogony of Cain (Gen.

---

[26] Ps. 104:2b–4, 10a, 13a, 14b, 15, 32, along with the framework in vv. 1, 33.
[27] See p. 68 n. 16. On Kuntillet 'Ajrud 4.2, see Blum (2013), 21–39.
[28] COS i; TUAT iii.

2–4), the Deluge (Gen. 6–9), and the Noachitic table of nations (Gen. 10). Otherwise, Hebrew narrative flows much more in the stream of heroic legends common to Northwest Semitic tradition, also reflected in the Gilgamesh epic,[29] and concentrates primarily on the conditions of various social milieux, such as the family (Genesis), tribe (Judges), or royal court (Samuel, Kings). Only afterwards were individual stories incorporated into greater narrative cycles and an overarching historiography, thereby transforming them into a myth of the deity's dealings with his people, i.e., into sacred history (*historia sacra*) of Israel.

With the primeval narrative being a possible exception, the Hebrew narrative tradition resided in a courtly milieu, not a priestly one. Apart from the daily affairs reflected in ostraca (coming from Samaria, Arad, Horvat 'Uza, Lachish), the authors operating in this particular context had to maintain, first and foremost, *royal annals* or, more properly, *chronicles*. Details concerning changes of government and periods of rule ostensibly came from these documents, which eventually served as a chronological framework for the books of Kings. As in many royal chronicles, particular events, special campaigns, and noteworthy constructions likely supplied the subject matter on occasion.

These episodes ultimately served as a springboard for *historical narratives*, first developed separately and then subsequently inserted into the annalistic framework of the books of Kings (e.g., 1 Kgs. 20; 22; 2 Kgs. 3:9–10). Three inscriptions bear witness to this transition:[30] the Mesha stele, a Moabite version of 2 Kgs. 3, as it were;[31] the Tel Dan inscription, an Aramaic version of 2 Kgs. 9–10;[32] and the Siloam Tunnel inscription, the only epigraphic attestation of ancient Hebrew prose outside the Hebrew Bible, distinguished not only by its brevity but also by its silence on king and Yhwh alike in the episode it proceeds to narrate.[33]

4.7 Wisdom

Connected closely to the court, *wisdom* represents the intellectual home and training school of the scribes. This context promoted the recording, revising, and teaching of all traditions and knowledge circulated in the scribal culture of Israel and Judah—including the material that specialists like registrars,

---

[29] ANET 44–52; COS i. 458–60 (1.132); OTPar 19–30; RANE no. 12; TUAT iii. 646–759.

[30] On the historical consciousness evident in these inscriptions, see Parker (1997); Kratz (2007*a*; ET 2009); Sanders (2009), Schmidt (2015).

[31] AḤITUV 389–419; ANET 320–1; COS ii. 137–8 (2.23); OTPar 157–9; RANE no. 51; SSI i. 71–84; KAI no. 181; TUAT i. 646–50; HTAT 242–8.

[32] AḤITUV 466–73; COS ii. 161–2 (2.39); HI 147–8; OTPar 160–1; RANE no. 54; TUAT.E 176–9; HTAT 267–9.

[33] AḤITUV 19–25; ANET 321; COS ii. 145–6 (2.28); HI 499–506; SSI i. 21–3; KAI no. 189; HAE i. 178–89; TUAT ii. 555–6; HTAT 328–9.

chroniclers, priests, and prophets would have cultivated. Here, too, the narrative traditions may have been collected and given literary form.

As exemplified by the Aramaic version of Ahiqar, also read and transmitted at Elephantine, wisdom circles not only narrated but even versified.[34] In polished proverbs and diverse poetic genres, such literature meditates on nature's phenomena and ordering as well as human behavior and psychology, putting all into a nutshell. The oldest collections of Proverbs contain other examples as well,[35] and the sayings of Prov. 22:17–24:22 even have parallels in Egyptian literature.[36] Additionally, the portrait of nature painted in the divine speeches of the book of Job (38–41) converges with this tradition too.

Didactic narratives like that of Ahiqar provide illustrations of wisdom's application and the often convoluted but ultimately prosperous life of the wise individual. In the Hebrew Bible, the fable of Jotham (Judg. 9) and the story of Joseph (Gen. 37–50) both represent this genre. Similar but more recent texts transform the quintessential sage into the quintessential pious person, and they further reflect on the suffering of the sagacious and the devout in connection to God and wisdom (Daniel, Job). Yet even older narratives, which derived from different milieux, show the art of wisdom's storytelling.

---

[34] TAD C 1.1; ANET 427–30; APOT ii. 715–84; OTP ii. 479–508; JSHRZ.NF ii.2.
[35] Prov. 10:1–22:16; 22:17–24:22, and 24:23–34; 25–9.
[36] ANET 421–5; COS i. 115–22 (1.47); LAE 223–43; TUAT iii. 222–50; see Schipper (2005).

II

Transformation into Biblical Tradition

Following the discussion of conditions not merely confined to the earliest stage of literary history but actually operative throughout the entire period of both monarchies (Israel and Judah) and provinces (Samaria and Yehud), we now turn to the development of the biblical tradition itself. As explained above, this account does not follow the chronology of ancient Near Eastern empires. Instead, it proceeds according to the caesura and episodes of Israel and Judah's own history, approaching the various domains of tradition not in parallel but individually. This procedure thus corresponds to the conviction that every domain traversed its own extraordinarily intricate path of historical development, a development often distorted temporally when placed in comparison. No matter how desirable it may be, a synchronization and correlation of the evidence derived from literary history is in many—if not most—instances almost entirely impossible.

The ensuing exploration therefore centers on the transition and transformation of certain relics from Israelite and Judahite scribal culture into the biblical literature as it stands today. The discussion focuses on the moment the older sources entered the realm of biblical tradition. Thus, the terms "transition" and "transformation" should signify the fundamental change and interpretative dynamics experienced by the sources of scribal culture in the process of their becoming "biblical" literature. "Theologization" may, perhaps, serve as a temporary designation for this process of transition and transformation.[1] Such a designation connotes not only the continued theological reflection of ancestral sources along with their once distinct theological or otherwise ideological implications but also their conveyance into the biblical literature's own theological conceptions with all their different centers of gravity, be they prophetic, historical, legal, cultic, or sapiential.

The transitions and transformations into biblical literature followed no set schema and certainly cannot be reduced to some shallow, essentialized dualism of either chronology (pre-exilic vs. post-exilic) or substance (secular vs. theological, historical vs. fictive, Israelite vs. Jewish). Instead, these various

---

[1] See Kratz (2002c); K. Schmid (2013).

transitions into biblical literature corroborate a widely recognized and long established insight yielded by critical biblical scholarship, namely that the biblical literature in all its numerous dimensions grew in time and place and owes its current form to an extensive process of interpretation and revision (*Fortschreibung*). Furthermore, these moments of transformation in particular reveal how the biblical literature does not merely re-present or re-produce the reality it concerns or the sources it presupposes and processes; rather, the biblical literature subsequently construes and interprets reality and tradition, showcasing them in a (theologically) reflected literary form and its corresponding refractions. Just as the understanding of biblical literature sketched above cannot be restricted to individual epochs or phases in the history of Israel and Judah, so also the manifold and multifaceted transformations into biblical literature neither date to a single epoch nor spring from a single cause. This process did not begin simultaneously in all the various domains of tradition but developed quite differently in chronology and content alike.

1. FROM WEAL TO WOE: THE PROPHETIC TRADITION

The primary distinction between ancient scribal culture and the Hebrew Bible is their conception of God. Accordingly, the latter bears the features of a revelatory religion and proceeds from a central theological conviction, namely that Yhwh has chosen Israel as his people and demands from Israel a conscious decision either for or against him. Consequently, the relationship between Israel and God, in the Hebrew Bible's telling, is no longer a matter of course but entirely dependent on conditions. From an ancestral and undoubtedly presupposed synthesis of Yhwh and his venerators in Israel and Judah—to which the remnants of ancient scribal culture still bear witness today—developed the notion of an exclusive relationship with God founded on God's will and the decision to follow this will. As far as we can see, this essential conception of God has its roots in the prophetic tradition.

Indeed, the theological interpretation of the ancient prophetic oracles—transmitted by spoken word or written letter, reformulated and supplemented in the prophetic literature—displays this very transition.[2] Such interpretation

---

[2] For more on what follows, see Kratz (2003*b*; ET 2015); (2011*a*). On *First Isaiah*, see Becker (1997) and De Jong (2007); on *Second Isaiah*, Kratz (1991*a*); Steck (1991*b*) and (1992); Williamson (1994); on *Jeremiah*, McKane (1986) and (1996); Levin (1985), esp. 153ff.; Pohlmann (1989); K. Schmid (1996), esp. 330ff.; and Bezzel (2007); on *Ezekiel*, Pohlmann (1996) and (2001); Klein (2008); on Hosea, Vielhauer (2007); on Micah, Corzilius (2015); on Haggai and Zechariah, Hallaschka (2011); on the *Minor Prophets*, Nogalski (1993*a*) and (1993*b*); Wöhrle (2006) and (2008); Albertz, Nogalski, and Wöhrle (2012); on the *corpus propheticum* as a

implemented an abrupt change of intellectual direction. While Yhwh, patron deity of Israel and Judah, becomes the enemy of both monarchies, erstwhile prophets of court or cult turn into prophets of doom, no longer bound to divinity and king together but committed to Yhwh alone.

Accordingly, the salvation oracles of the Judahite prophet Isaiah (Isa. 7:4, 7–9; 8:1–4; 17:1–3) were reformulated into oracles of doom for their present literary context. Even before this transformation, however, they had undergone an earlier metamorphosis of their own, into the so-called memoir of Isaiah (Isa. 6–8). Like the northern kingdom of Israel (and Aram) in its role as Judah's adversary, Judah itself now becomes the subject of prophesied destruction, a disaster provoked by the people's lack of trust in their god and decided by the deity himself. The judgment Yhwh passes on his people now befalls both kingdoms, Israel and Judah alike (Isa. 6; 7:9b; 8:5–8). The memoir in Isa. 6–8 hence served as the basis for the formation of the book of Isaiah, which would eventually comprise the annular composition of "the vision" or "word concerning Judah and Jerusalem" (Isa. 1:1; 2:1) in Isa. 1–12, the Assyrian Cycle of Isa. 28–32, a kind of rewriting (*Fortschreibung*) of Isa. 5–10 centered on the fate of Zion, the oracles against the nations in Isa. 13–23, and the last judgment scenario of Isa. 24–27 and 33–35.[3]

Compiled and interpreted theologically, the words of Hosea and Amos followed the same trajectory in Hos. 4–9 and Amos 3–6, respectively. From the proclamations of imminent disaster befalling Israel came announcements of divine judgment; from the lamentations came accusations and motivations for that judgment; and from the bemoaned misfortunes and pilloried misconduct came sins against God himself. In all these changes, the political borders separating the kingdom of Israel from the kingdom of Judah are finally nullified. Israel signifies all the people of God, including Judah, whether implicitly or explicitly. The end of the two monarchies betokens the end of the Israelite people, as declared by Yhwh: in both books, Hosea and Amos, the tradition reflects deeply and intensively upon this very end. Such reflection manifests itself most patently in the framework added later, that is the nuptial narratives and theological meditations on history in Hos.

whole, Steck (1991*a*) and (1996; ET 2000). For the path-breaking approach of reception history, see Barton (2007). For a different, more traditional (or biblical) view, see, e.g., K. Koch (1978; ET 1983) and (1980; ET 1982); Blenkinsopp (1996); Sweeney (2005); Blum (2008*b*); J. Jeremias (2013); for further discussion, see Nissinen (2000); Köckert and Nissinen (2003); Floyd and Haak (2006); Edelman and Ben Zvi (2009); Nissinen and Carter (2009); Day (2010); Gordon and Barstad (2013).

[3] Kratz (2011*a*), 160–76 (English 2006*a*), 177–97 (English 2010*a*). For a different view, see Blum (1996–7); Barthel (1997); Kreuch (2011); Hartenstein (1997); (2004); (2011). Usually, the transition from the "weal" to "woe" finds explanation in the prophetic mentality; see most recently, Müller (2012) (who interprets Isa. 6 and several other oracles of doom in Isa. 28–31 as political statements, however, and thus diminishes or, in fact, excludes the theological dimension of "woe"); Williamson (2013).

1–3 and 9–14 along with the cycles of nations and visions in Amos 1–2 and 7–9 (cf. also 4:6ff.).[4]

The transformation in the conception of God is rather obvious. No longer is Yhwh the patron deity of both monarchies, manifest locally as Yhwh of Samaria and Yhwh of Judah/Jerusalem, but the one God of the one people of God, who reveals his true being and will in judgment. Israel's annihilation reveals the past and present relationship to God: according to the prophets' theological interpretation, fracture ensued from the standard the people of God should have followed in the past and must follow anew in the future, and restoration of that now broken relationship with God demands recognition and repentance of the people.

Concerning the old prophetic oracles, the specific catalyst of reinterpretation materializes in the categorical prophecies of doom displayed in the Hebrew Bible. First, the demise of Samaria and the kingdom of Israel in 722 BCE sparked such reinterpretation. Also threatening Judah at least until 701 BCE, this existential crisis prompted the transmitters of the tradition to contemplate Yhwh and Israel beyond present political realities.[5] The same situation transpired about a century later with the destruction of Jerusalem in 597 / 587 BCE. Hence, the lamentations of the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. 4:7, 11, 13, 19–21; 6:1, 22–3)—probably on the model of older tradition—underwent revision and rewriting *ex post* in order to render them into predictions of divine judgment upon (Israel and) Judah (Jer. 4–6; cf. esp. 4:5–6 and 6:1, 22). Here, too, a core tradition, i.e., songs about the "enemy from the North" (Jer. 4–6), provided the raw material for a book's literary growth: the inclusion of additional oracles, the symbolic acts and prose speeches, the stories of suffering and personal confessions of the prophet, and, not least, the extensive oracles against the nations, which stand at the midpoint of the book in the Greek version but come only at the end in the Hebrew.

The prophetic tradition always begins with theological reinterpretation of an older—at times, perhaps, authentic—oracle in the sense of categorical judgment. In spite of all political setbacks and defeat, the transmitters of the tradition relinquished both people and god of the Israelite and Judahite kingdoms to secure Yhwh as the God of Israel. If the god of "both houses of Israel" (Isa. 8:14)[6] supplanted rival patron deities, Israel as the people of God superseded the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah. In all the prophetic books, a process of exegesis and revision (*Fortschreibung*) furthered the interpretation

---

[4] Kratz (2011*a*), 287–309, 310–43; see also, for *Hosea*, Vielhauer (2007) and, for *Amos*, Wöhrle (2006), 59–137. For a different perspective, see, e.g., J. Jeremias (1996) and Yee (1987); Rottzoll (1996); Hadjiev (2009); Radine (2010).

[5] For a different explanation, see Jeremias (2013), who recognizes that we cannot ascertain the prophets' original words from the texts of the biblical books and yet insists, strongly no less, that the basic message of the prophetic books is absolutely authentic and must derive from the eighth-century prophets themselves, i.e., before 720 BCE.

[6] See Kratz (2012*b*).

of Israel's fall and Judah's demise as punishment from God himself. Such extensive revisions not only painted judgment in different colors but also introduced new reasons for Yhwh's rejection of his people. Over time, oracles against the nations and oracles for Israel's salvation entered the scene. They even won the upper hand in some books (Isa. 40–66; Hag. 1–2; Zech. 1–8). Although these particular additions certainly draw on the older, pre-exilic tradition of prophecies of salvation or more recent oracles of an older style (e.g., Hag. 1:1, 4, 8 and Hag. 1:15b/2:1, 3, 9a), they consistently presuppose the fall of both kingdoms and the literary tradition of a harsh prophetic judgment.

In sum, the books of the three Major and twelve Minor Prophets came into being only incrementally.[7] They permit no clear correlation to particular epochs, however, for they grew in the course of centuries. This continual process of actualization and revision (*Fortschreibung*) in the biblical books—except for certain details—came to a standstill only at the end of the third or beginning of the second century BCE. Specific content can merely supply a *terminus a quo* for the tradition, that is, the point of initial impulse. Therefore, while the Israelite kingdom's collapse at the hand of the Assyrians in the eighth century BCE served as the catalyst for prophetic tradition in the books of Isaiah, Hosea, and Amos, the Judahite kingdom's own demise owing to the Babylonians at the start of the sixth century BCE sparked the second flame that began with the tradition in the book of Jeremiah and resumed a kind of *midrash* on the earlier prophetic tradition both here and in the book of Ezekiel. Construction of the second temple in Jerusalem then marks the next caesura. Probably instituted under the Persian king Darius I (520–515), this momentous event triggered the tradition in the books of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Between these periods rose the books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah, which reflect the end of the two kingdoms and expect the end of the world. Although some of these books have even older cores that date back to the Assyrian (Micah, Nahum) or Babylonian (Habakkuk, Zephaniah) periods, for the most part they stem from the Persian–Hellenistic age, when the rest of the books were heavily revised and ultimately given their current form.

2. FROM PEOPLE OF STATE TO PEOPLE OF GOD: THE NARRATIVE TRADITION

The conception of Yhwh's people intertwines with the prophetic tradition's understanding of the deity. According to this tradition, the variegated and composite populations of Israel and Judah, once bound by the link of

---

[7] On the phenomenon of prophetic writing and literature, see Nissinen (2005); (2014).

monarchy, are now united by Yhwh's judgment. This perceived relationship then gave rise to a greater unity of "Israel" as the people of God, an ideal entity that transcends political borders and expresses a theological conviction.[8] Although—or perhaps since—such a theological ideal never actually converged with historical reality, the biblical literature stressed it all the more. Based on the prophetic message of an abrogated relationship to the divine, a foundation narrative for the people of Yhwh, the sacred history (*historia sacra*) came into being and began with that very relationship to achieve a positive perspective on the future. To this end, individual narratives from the diverse domains of tradition were all collected within Israel and Judah and consolidated into distinct narrative cycles and historical works, disparate elements thus being transformed into a coherent narrative of Yhwh's history with his people, Israel. So it was that the myth of a united kingdom and the myth of an Israel even before that kingdom were born.[9]

In fact, this development had commenced already between Samaria's end, in 722 BCE, and Jerusalem's fall, in 597/587 BCE, that is, already in the pre-exilic period. Three narrative works likely stem from this juncture in time, each offering, in its own way, a legend of Israel's origins and an explanation of the relationship with Judah: the legend of the kingdom's genesis and rise of David's dynasty (1 Sam. 1–1 Kgs. 2); the pre-priestly—i.e., the so-called Yahwistic—primeval and patriarchal narrative (Gen. 2–35); and the story of exodus and conquest (Exod. 2–Josh. 12).

The composition of 1 Sam. 1–1 Kgs. 2 recounts the kingdom's inception. However, even this composition sprang from older sources, which themselves had a longer stream of literary history: a tradition from the house of Saul in 1 Sam. 1–14 and the succession narrative from the house of David in 2 Sam.

---

[8] Kratz (2000*c*). On the emergence of the notion of "all Israel," see IV 1.

[9] For greater elaboration on the following, see Kratz (2000*b*; ET 2005) as well as the retrospect of research in Kratz (2011*d*). Analyses that still remain fundamental include De Wette (1806–7); Wellhausen (1899) and (1905*b*; ET 1994); Noth (1943; ET 1981/1987) and (1948; ET 1972); see also, on the *Pentateuch*, Rendtorff (1976; ET 1990); Blum (1984) and (1990); Levin (1993); on the so-called *Deuteronomistic history*, Dietrich (1972); (1987); Dietrich in Dietrich, Mathys, Römer, and Smend (2014); Veijola (1975); (1977); (2000); Aurelius (2003); Müller (2004); on *Chronicles*, Willi (1972); Williamson (1977); Japhet (1989); Steins (1995); Kalimi (1995); and on *Ezra–Nehemiah*, Willi (1995); Schwiderski (2000); Grätz (2004); (2006); (2009); Pakkala (2004); Wright (2004); Fried (2014). For more recent discussion, see the introductions of Blenkinsopp (2000); Zenger and Frevel (2012); Dietrich, Mathys, Römer, and Smend (2014); especially on *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Enneateuch*, see Otto (2000) and (2009); Gertz, Witte, and Schmid (2002); Otto and Achenbach (2004); Dozeman and Schmid (2006); Römer and Schmid (2007); Römer (2008); Dozeman, Römer, and Schmid (2011); Dozeman, Schmid, and Schwartz (2011); Dozeman, Evans, and Lohr (2014); on the *Deuteronomistic history*, see De Pury, Römer, and Macchi (1996; ET 2000); Knoppers and McConville (2000); Römer (2000); (2005); Witte, Schmid, Prechel, Gertz, and Diehl (2006); Stipp (2011); Schmid and Person (2012); Noort (2012); Jacobs and Person (2013); on *Chronicles*, see Graham, Hoglund, and McKenzie (1997); Graham and McKenzie (1999); Graham, McKenzie, and Knoppers (2003) as well as Kalimi (1990); (1995); (2013); on *Ezra–Nehemiah*, see Boda and Redditt (2008); Kalimi (2012).

11–1 Kgs. 2. Through the hinge of 1 Sam. 14:52 and the joint of 1 Sam. 16–2 Sam. 5 (8–10), David and Saul finally came together, with the Davidic house (viz. the southern kingdom of Judah) becoming the legitimate successor to Saul's (i.e., the northern kingdom of Israel). As a result, Israel and Judah comprised a single unity of state and people under the umbrella of the Davidic dynasty.

Similarly, the primeval and patriarchal narrative in Gen. 2–35 draws on the origins of the people.[10] It, too, descended from diverse, originally separate traditions that originated in a sub-national or familial milieu. Genealogically and geographically intertwined, these earlier sources were nationalized and connected to the Israelite–Judahite patron deity, Yhwh, thereby forging a unity between Israel and Judah. The older composition in Gen. 26–35, which resulted from combination of the southern Palestinian Isaac/Esau tradition (Gen. 26–7) with the northern Palestinian Jacob/Laban tradition (Gen. 29:16–32:2), exhibits a precursor to the greater narrative. Indeed, this initial fusion provided a model for the subsequent redaction that casts Jacob as not only the progenitor of Israel (Gen. 32:28–9) but also the father of Judah (Gen. 29:35) and further stages the genesis of petty states across Syria–Palestine in the first millennium BCE as the history of a specific family. Functioning as the fulcrum and pivot for this redaction, Gen. 12:1–3 links the primeval narrative to the Jacob story and, in doing so, forms the approach that governs the whole. In this particular perspective, the people (that is, Jacob–Israel) proceed from Abraham and find themselves bound to Judah along with the other neighbors present only after 720 BCE.

Furthermore, the narrative of exodus and conquest in Exod. 2–Josh. 12 also focuses on the people's beginnings.[11] In contrast to the previous two works, however, this composition exhibits an exclusively Israelite outlook, its nucleus lying in the Israelite or Benjaminite war narratives of Exod. 14 and Josh. 6, 8, which glorify Yhwh as the god of war much like the Song of Miriam in Exod. 15:20–1. By prefixing the call of Moses (Exod. 2–4) as well as other connecting links in the form of the desert itinerary, the composition of Israel's exodus from Egypt and its occupation of Palestine under Moses, Miriam, and Joshua eventually took form. The latter was bound to the exodus through literary connection of Num. 25:1a (arrival and encampment in Shittim), Deut. 34:5–6 (Moses's death), and Josh. 2:1 or 3:1 (decampment from Shittim), with Josh. 1:1–2 as a possible narrative transition.[12] In fact, the entire redactional plan

---

[10] On the distinction between Patriarchs and Exodus, see K. Schmid (1999; ET 2010); Gertz (2000).

[11] On the exodus narrative, see Gertz (2000); Berner (2010); contra Gerhards (2006), who defends the traditional view of source criticism.

[12] Here as well as in Deut. 34:5–6, of course without the title "servant of Yahwh"; contra Blum in Noort (2012), 137–57. This particular narrative connection as well as the more general narrative continuum in Genesis–Kings contradict the usual distinction between individual

follows the fundamental idea of Israel, the people of Yhwh, now stateless and homeless, entering the land of Palestine from without and therefore being exceptional within. The Israelites of the exodus–conquest narrative consider themselves not "related" to Judah and other neighbors, as in the primeval and patriarchal narrative, but rather autonomous and distinct. Only from 587 BCE onward was the exodus credo transferred onto Judah, itself now stateless and considered a sister people of Israel.

These three narrative works, with all their diverse portrayals and propositions, all respond to the Israelite kingdom's demise but still continue to flow within the stream of Israelite–Judahite scribal culture of the pre-exilic period. What sets them apart from the pre-exilic context is not so much the content but the loss of institutional setting and thus the validity of the depicted living conditions and shared ideas. What was once self-evident now requires special explanation and legitimation in historical coherence. Moreover, such explanation and legitimation provides no correlation to one of the two kingdoms but a connection of Israel and Judah into a single unity beyond their political systems. The unifying factor is no longer the monarchy but the concept of a lone and single deity. This conceptualization absolutizes the monolatry practiced within the cult of the monarchy and invests a once localized, patron deity with features of transcendence.

Like the books of the prophets, these three narrative works were manifoldly revised and expanded in the course of the seventh century BCE and, most of all, after the fall of Jerusalem in 597/587 BCE. The greatest change with the greatest implications came with the successive inclusion of legal corpora—i.e., that of the Covenant Code (Exod. 20–3), Deuteronomy, the Decalogue (Exod. 20; Deut. 5), the priestly law in Exodus to Numbers, and especially the Holiness Code (Lev. 17–26)—into the realm of the Pentateuch along with the redactions (deuteronomistic and post-deuteronomistic) inspired by this incorporation throughout the books of Joshua–Kings. The law and the revisions based on it merged the formerly distinct foundation legends, namely of the monarchy (Samuel–Kings) and of the people of Israel (Genesis, Exodus–Joshua), into a single overarching historical narrative, a sacred history, connected by the Book of Judges. Whether or not the individual books (viz. scrolls) were regarded and treated as portions of one single "work" or existed as separate units is irrelevant with respect to the narrative itself. Rather, the crucial point lies in the formulation of every single "book" from Genesis to Kings: all of them presuppose the larger narrative context and, even further, refer to no generic or otherwise unknown traditions but to the specific narrative received in the Hebrew Bible.

---

sources or "documents" (Yahwist, Elohist, Priestly Writing) in Genesis–Numbers, which would have lost their original continuation in a conquest narrative and the so-called Deuteronomistic history in Deuteronomy–Kings: see III.

This great historical narrative then served as a template for subsequent versions of history, on the people of Israel and the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, all of which date to the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Hence, the emergence of the people of Israel as told in Genesis–Joshua also constitutes the central concern of the Priestly Writing.[13] In stringent form, structured according to programmatic divine speeches (Gen. 1, 17, etc.), genealogies (Gen. 5, etc.), and itineraries (Gen. 12:4b–5; 13:6, 11b–2; 19:29, etc.), the Priestly Writing reproduces the primeval and patriarchal narrative as well as the exodus narrative. Originally, this work stretched from the creation of the world (Gen. 1) to the founding of a sanctuary on Mount Sinai (Exod. 24:15b–8; 25–40), which functioned as a fictive prototype and literary ideal for Jerusalem's (second) temple. "Covenant" in this context replaces the "law" of Genesis–Kings, be it the covenant with Noah, which guarantees survival for the world population (Gen. 9) or the covenant with Abraham and Sarah along with the people of Israel, which ensures Yhwh as Israel's God (Gen. 17; Exod. 6:7), a relationship experienced and mediated ritually at the sanctuary (Exod. 25:8; 29:45–6; 40:34). Only later was the priestly law (Leviticus and Numbers) implemented and— through a similar act of inversion—the "law" of Exodus–Kings conceptualized as "covenant" (Exod. 24; 34; Deut. 28:69, etc.). These and other such alignments evince how the Priestly Writing, almost certainly first conceived as an independent work, was unified with the non-priestly narrative of Israel's origins and thereby supplied the compositional framework for the Pentateuch.

Recapitulating history from Adam to Saul through rather protracted pedigrees (1 Chron. 1–9) and not merely reformulating but actually interpreting the books of Samuel to Kings, the new version of monarchic history in Chronicles (1–2 Chronicles) has remained an autonomous work. The base text (*Grundschrift*) presents the material as a history of the Judahite (i.e., Davidic) kingdom specifically and shapes it, like the Priestly Writing, into a cultic legend of Jerusalem's holy site. Through various interventions and some new material, the work was further extended into a narrative of Judah and the second temple under Persian rule in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Accordingly, 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah all constitute what is called the Chronistic History.

Both literary works, i.e., the Priestly Writing and Chronistic History, comprise the first instance of the phenomenon within the Hebrew Bible that is designated "rewritten bible," a phenomenon signaled already in Deuteronomy as a reformulation of the Covenant Code (Exod. 20–3) and widely attested outside the Hebrew Bible in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

[13] See Pola (1995); Knohl (1995); Nihan (2007); Römer (2008); for further discussion, Shectman and Baden (2009).

3. FROM JUSTICE TO LAW: THE LEGISLATIVE TRADITION

The prophetic tradition's conception of God changed not only Israel's role but also Yhwh's will. According to the prophetic tradition, Yhwh decides to terminate his relationship with Israel on account of the guilt they had incurred, and this resolution suggests Yhwh has a will that must be fulfilled at all costs, a will that decides between life and death for his people. This will of Yhwh is first and foremost negative, with explication of what Yhwh does not desire. The prophets' criticism of social and cultic disturbance explicates the cause of judgment. Grievances otherwise prevalent in all times and places become in the prophetic tradition transgressions against the deity himself, which therefore permits positive extrapolation of Yhwh's will: to do good, not evil (Amos 5:14–15), and devotion to and knowledge of God instead of sacrifice and burnt offerings (Hos. 6:6; cf. Mic. 6:8). Yet the will of God does not appear in any book. Fulfilling his will in the future and thereby escaping further judgment requires positive implementation of what Yhwh considers virtuous. In abstract terms, Yhwh desires both knowledge of and devotion to himself. Justice concretizes this desire. Codified as the divine will revealed by Yhwh and mediated by Moses, justice becomes the law itself—with certain theological qualifications. Justice on its own accord could not have been theologized and mutated into law: it is the prophets who stand at the fountainhead of law and justice's theologization.[14]

Following the prophetic and narrative traditions—though probably still in the seventh century BCE—justice began to be theologized with the revision of the old collection of legal principles (*mishpatim*) in Exod. 21:1–22:19, on the one hand, and their installation into the exodus narrative of Exodus–Joshua, on the other.[15] Consequent on the prophets' critique, this reworking inserted social and cultic regulations and provided the entire ensemble with a new framework. If the altar law (Exod. 20:24–6) resides at the bow, the festival calendar (Exod. 23:14–17) rests at the stern. Revealing its own hallmark in the process, the revision stylizes the legislation as a divine speech and addresses its audience in the second person singular. Although this revision first refers to Moses within the narrative context, it eventually extends the discussion to either the people in its entirety or each person individually. The content is nothing new. Rather, only the parenetic style is innovative. More specifically, it defines social solidarity—that is, peace among neighbors—as divine justice itself, this solidarity being governed by divine law and other cultic obligations to Yhwh. Placement in the exodus narrative further contributes to this redactional strategy: the divine justice revealed on the

---

[14] On the following, see Kratz (2000*a*); (2000*b*), 99–155 (ET 2005, 95–152); (2012*a*); also Crüsemann (1992); Otto (1994); Köckert (2002).
[15] On the Covenant Code, see Otto (1988); Schwienhorst-Schönberger (1990); Osumi (1991); Houtman (1997).

mountain of God in the desert of Sinai—as a stopover on Israel's way from Egypt into the promised land—impresses the stamp of law on the foundation legend of Israel. Called the Covenant Code in accord with Exod. 24:4–8, the law book in which Yhwh himself imparts his will has now become a charter for the chosen people of God.

Deuteronomy was the next step on the way to the law's formation. More concretely, the Covenant Code of Exod. 20–3 underwent a reformulation of the second-person-singular revision in substance and style alike. Dominated entirely by the concept of cultic centralization, the original version of Deut. 12–26 seeks to eliminate the multiplicity of cultic sites, a plurality justified in Genesis by the patriarchs, sanctioned in the Covenant Code (Exod. 20:24) by the altar law, and prevalent at the time of the monarchy both in Israel and in Judah.[16] Lost in 587 BCE, Judah's center of gravity—i.e., its king and temple in Jerusalem—was replaced by the one "place, which Yhwh will choose" (Deut. 12:14). This substitution sought to oppose the impending dissolution of Israel's solidarity. Hence, the framework of Deut. 6:4–6 ("Hear, O Israel") and 26:16 adds the unity of the deity Yhwh and—through the common address of "Israel"—the unity of the people (viz. Israel and Judah together) to a unity of the cultic place. The exodus–conquest narrative also integrates Deuteronomy, as it had the Covenant Code. Indeed, the historicization of Deuteronomy promoted this absorption by suggesting "the place, which Yhwh will choose," already in the formula of election and by introducing Moses as the spokesman. In terms of literary position, Deuteronomy lies between the arrival in Shittim (Num. 25:1a), on the one hand, that is, at the final sojourn of the wilderness wandering, where Moses first begins to speak (Deut. 5:1a + 6:4–6 + 12:13–26:16), and the death of Moses (Deut. 34:1a, 5–6), on the other, where the departure from Shittim toward the promised land under the leadership of Joshua adjoins (Josh. 1:1–2; 2:1; 3:1). Immediately before the crossing of the Jordan and the conquest of the land, Moses—in the telling of Deuteronomy—proclaims to the people the law Yhwh had revealed to him on the mountain of God and avails himself of the opportunity to attach other changes he perceives as necessary.

In the late Babylonian or early Persian period, the Decalogue evoked further modification.[17] On the pattern of the *Shema' Yisrael* ("Hear, O Israel") in Deut. 6:4–5, which acted as a prologue to the law collection of Deut. 12–26, the Decalogue was first inserted into Exod. 20 (as a prologue to the Covenant Code) and subsequently added in Deut. 5.[18] Similar to codification of the Covenant Code

---

[16] Thus the scholarly consensus since Wellhausen; see Levinson (1997). Otto (1998) and (1999) and others see the beginning in the command for exclusivity in Deut. 13 with curse and blessing in Deut. 28 and the corresponding Neo-Assyrian parallels. For further discussion, see C. Koch (2008); Kratz (2010*b*); (2013*f*); Crouch (2014*a*).

[17] Kratz (1994); (2005); Köckert (2007).

[18] Other commentators see Deut. 5 first, followed by Exod. 20; see Hossfeld (1982).

as the will of God, formulation of the Ten Commandments originated in prophetic (cf. Hos. 4:2) as well as legal sources, namely the (theologically revised) Covenant Code itself. From this point onward, the key commandment for the Hebrew Bible's legislation was no longer cultic (Deut. 12:13ff.) or divine (Deut. 6:4) unity but the first commandment and Yhwh's exclusivity. A monotheistic affirmation needed only one small step, which came in the Persian period and found its first explicit formulation in Isa. 40–55 (and Deut. 4). Belief in the one true god no longer forbids the veneration of "other gods" but denies their existence altogether.

The legislation of the Priestly Writing presupposes, in turn, the development from the Covenant Code to the Decalogue by way of Deuteronomy. Just as Deuteronomy operates as an amendment to the Covenant Code, so also the Holiness Code of Lev. 17–26 acts as an amendment to Deuteronomy itself beneath the banner of the first commandment and priestly ideal of holiness.[19] The Holiness Code, alongside sundry other laws, probably found its way into a then probably still autonomous Priestly Writing, with the category of holiness and the concept of atonement serving as master criteria. Within the context of the Priestly Writing, the entire sacrificial cult, which had generated the associated rituals and regulations, undergoes interpretation as a cult centered strictly on atonement.[20] Incorporation of the Priestly Writing into the non-priestly narrative led to an expansion of legislation in Leviticus and Numbers, which then spread to the older laws as well, i.e., the Decalogue, the Covenant Code, and the covenant renewal on Sinai in Exod. 20–4, 32–4 as well as Deuteronomy (in the land of Moab). In a combination of deuteronomistic and priestly language, these laws were revised and expanded in multiple ways. Thus came into being the Sinai pericope of Exod. 19–Num. 10, an inflated text that—as claimed by the historical fiction—sees recapitulation in the book of Deuteronomy and entails the additional legislation in the desert (Num. 15, 18–19) and the fields of Moab (Num. 26–36). The process of theologizing justice in the Hebrew Bible came to an end with the Pentateuch's separation as the Torah of Moses or Torah of Yhwh, which then formed the first part of the subsequent division of the canon. Outside the Hebrew Bible, this process continued almost unabated. The Temple Scroll from Qumran, for instance, transforms Deuteronomy into a divine speech on Mount Sinai and hence confers divine legitimation to Moses's farewell address upon the plains of Moab.

Yet this process was not limited to the Pentateuch: it affected the other narrative books as well, viz. Joshua–Kings. On the basis of Deuteronomy's original form and its principal command, namely the demand for cultic centralization, an initial edition of a Deuteronomistic History emerged in the form of 1 Sam. 1–2 Kgs. 25 around 560 BCE. This work emanated from the older narrative

---

[19] See Cholewinski (1976); Ruwe (1999); Nihan (2007); Stackert (2007).
[20] See Janowski (2000); Eberhart (2002). On priests and Levites as well as the theologization of law and cult, see Samuel (2014).

of the monarchy's beginnings (1 Sam. 1–2 Kgs. 2) and a synchronistic chronicle of Israelite and Judahite kings (1–2 Kings), which a first Deuteronomist has compiled out of older annalistic materials and annotated according to the theological principles of Deuteronomy. Given the early unity of kingdom and cult alike under David and Solomon, the persistence of two separate states up until 720 BCE seems like a violation of the deuteronomic imperative for cultic centralization. The rupture of political and cultic unity under Jeroboam I thus receives designation as the "sin of Jeroboam." While this supposed "sin of Jeroboam" first leads the kingdom of Israel to destruction, which had made itself guilty of it per se, it then drives the Judahite kingdom to ruin, where the "high places" testify to infringement of the command for centralization.

After insertion of the Decalogue into the legislation (Exod. 20/Deut. 5), the first commandment became the ultimate standard according to which Yhwh's people—denominated "Israel" but now including Israel and Judah alike—must always and everywhere be measured. This development had extensive consequence in both literary and theological history. Beneath the banner of the first commandment, the foundation legend of the people of "Israel" (i.e., the exodus–conquest narrative in Exodus–Joshua) was bound to the history of the monarchy (that is, the fundamental stratum of the Deuteronomistic History in 1 Sam. 1–2 Kgs. 25), which then forged a continuous narrative line. The book of Judges was the binder, an assemblage of ancient heroic accounts whose oldest redaction may also be called deuteronomistic, even though this work presupposes the first commandment and therefore dates to later than Deuteronomy's original form along with the initial deuteronomistic edition of Samuel–Kings. From the once autonomous narratives contained in (Genesis +) Exodus–Joshua and 1 Samuel–2 Kings came a single, large-scale account of Israel's entire history. From this point forward and, above all, after incorporation of the Priestly Writing and priestly law into Genesis–Numbers, a secondary redactional activity that continued for quite some time as late- or post-deuteronomistic and experienced at times considerable priestly influence took its course in the scope of Genesis–Kings as a whole. This process persisted until the continuous narrative was divided into individual books and the canonical divisions of Torah (Genesis–Deuteronomy) and Former Prophets (Joshua–Kings).

4. FROM DIVINE KINGSHIP TO KINGDOM OF GOD: THE PSALMIC TRADITION

Although hymns and prayers, like the prophetic oracles and oldest legal propositions, belong to the most ancient inventory of Israelite–Judahite literature, the biblical tradition assimilated them relatively late in its literary history. The decisive moments for the formation of the Hebrew Bible were

staged, as we have seen, at the end of the Israelite kingdom, first in the prophetic tradition and then in those of narrative and law. By all appearances, the transition of hymns and prayers into the biblical tradition came only at the end of the Judahite kingdom and the Jerusalem temple's destruction.

This transition appears most clearly in the passages that preserve an older core.[21] Examples may be few and far between, but critical analysis within this sphere of inquiry is not yet well advanced, either. With respect to hymns, one specific group—the psalms of divine kingship (Pss. 29, 47, 93–9)—has received ample attention from scholars. While Pss. 29 and 93 constitute texts not only ancient but also largely intact, celebrating Yhwh as king and powerful vanquisher of chaos, both sustained several significant additions. These additions bring the people of God (Ps. 29:10–11) alongside the law (Ps. 93:5) into play and, by doing so, bestow the myth of divine kingship with the quality of personal (Ps. 93:2) or national (Ps. 29:11) confession.

Further examples of divine kingship as well as other psalms, especially those associated with hymns of Zion theology, demonstrate the same ancient myth, but they experienced even greater revision. Such revisions move in any number of directions: under Egyptian and Mesopotamian influence, they portray the former weather god—the lord of all the earth and king of all the gods—as the creator and preserver of the world (Ps. 104), the deliverer of Israel, and the judge of all the nations (Pss. 48, 96, 98); they introduce the history of Israel and Judah into the worldview of prayers and hymns (Pss. 47, 95, 99) or permit only a section of Israelite society to participate in the divine king's saving deeds (Ps. 97; cf. Pss. 24:3–6; 104:35); and they style the representative of the heavenly king on earth, the terrestrial (Davidic) king, as a messiah or paragon of piety (Pss. 2; 18; 21:8; 72). In addition, these reworkings thrive on citation of or allusion to other portions of the biblical literature. Even more, they display a universalization, nationalization, individualization, and/or eschatologization of the underlying myth of divine kingship.

The same tendencies emerge in the transmission history of complaints and thanksgiving hymns. Accordingly, the old thanksgiving scheme in Ps. 118 (vv. 5, 14, [15–16,] 17–19, 21, 28) was collectivized in vv. 1–4 and 29 as well as vv. 22–7, individualized in vv. 6–13, and applied to the righteous in vv. 15a, 20. Moreover, deliverance of the supplicant from death and the enemy's hands became an event not only "narrated" in public praise (vv. 17, 19) but also apposite to the entire temple community. The original rituals of complaint and thanksgiving thus underwent two distinct transformations: the individual supplicant and his own fate represent the history of Israel's suffering, that of the people of God, on the one hand, and the suffering of each individual righteous one and pious person within Israel, on the other.

---

[21] On the following, see Spieckermann (1989); Köckert (2000); Kratz (2003*a*); (2004*c*); Müller (2008).

Both trends manifest themselves in the revision of older prototypes as well as the creation of new psalmic genres and poems. The collectivization of thanks and lament found expression in a new genre of communal lament.[22] In these songs, the national catastrophe of 587 BCE engenders elegy and petition (Pss. 44, 74, 137; cf. Lam. 1–2). Divine presence and assistance are sought no longer in the (now destructed) temple but in the memory of God's history with his people, Israel (Ps. 74:2–3). While historical reminiscence inspires contemplation of the people's own iniquity at the monarchy's demise (Pss. 78, 79, 106), the scenario also serves as a warning and gives rise to new hope as well (Pss. 77, 81), which can even assume a separate existence at times in the historical psalms' pure glorification of God (Pss. 68, 105, 114, 135–6). Throughout these psalms, sacred history either supplants or encompasses the ancient myth of divine kingship.[23]

The other trend, i.e., the individualization or internalization (spiritualization) of individual lament and thanksgiving, places a personal relationship with the divinity front and center.[24] Here, the old hymns' and prayers' mythological images and ideas become theological metaphors for the existence of the pious individual. For the righteous, then, the godless inside and outside of Israel constitute the enemy, his affliction being temptation and his deliverance being a certainty of faith. In new poems, attributes of lament and thanksgiving characteristic of the individual genre gain particular significance and take on lives of their own. Forensic language increases in conflict with the enemy, that is, the godless. Whereas the pious individual reaffirms his innocence and pleads for just retribution (Ps. 26), the supplicant's awareness of his sin against the deity also continues to grow. The supplicant acknowledges his transgressions, fully prepared to repent and seek forgiveness for his iniquity (Ps. 51). Both acts exhibit a profound confidence in the deity, expressed in the "songs of trust" (Ps. 23), which display a realization of assurance even in the midst of lament (cf. Ps. 13:6). If the divine relationship becomes most unmediated in these psalms, the Torah acts as an intermediary in others (Pss. 1 and 119).

Additionally, these three transformations themselves—i.e., collectivization, nationalization, and individualization—rest upon a universalization of the myth of divine kingship, a phenomenon encountered not only in hymns but also in individual prayers (cf. Pss. 22, 103). Universalization, too, materializes in the revision of older templates as well as new poetic creations. Shaped by the deity's long path to universalization, many psalms arose not as distinct individual elements but intentional literary components for the literary context of the Psalter as a whole. Following the pattern of the Torah, referenced already at the very beginning of the Psalter (Ps. 1), the book of Psalms has a

---

[22] Emmendörffer (1998); for the collective reinterpretation in general, see Marttila (2006).
[23] Gärtner (2012); Klein (2014).   [24] Hermisson (1965).

fivefold division achieved through doxological closures (Pss. 41:14; 72:18–19; 89:53; 106:48), with the fourth and fifth books being structured through Todah and Hallelujah psalms in addition to the doxological formula.[25] This structure reflects the Psalter's long compositional history. Individual psalms along with their revisions led to smaller collections and, through various stages, the Psalter in its present form. As one such compositional stage, the "Yhwh is King" psalms collection (Pss. 93–9) adjoined the basic foundation of Pss. 2–89. In the redactional closure of this collection (Ps. 100), a theocratic concept surfaced that would dominate the Psalter's composition henceforth— throughout the diverse caesura and former closures in Pss. (103–)106/107, 117/118, and 135/136 and on to the very end. Divine kingship over all divinities, over every nation, over Israel, and over the righteous transforms into the kingdom of God, where all creatures are properly tended and the pious are faithfully heard and protected (Ps. 145 as well as Pss. 146–50).

5. FROM SAGES TO PIOUS: THE SAPIENTIAL TRADITION

Like hymns and prayers, aphoristic sayings and sage didactic tales entered relatively late into the biblical tradition. As in the realm of justice, scholarship often describes a progressive "theologization" of wisdom, a term actually appropriate for all spheres of tradition, i.e., prophets, narrative, justice, sacrificial ritual, cultic lyric, and finally wisdom itself. The process of theologization manifests itself most clearly thorough comparison of the wisdom writings absorbed into the Hebrew Bible, namely Proverbs, Job, and Qoheleth (Ecclesiastes).[26] As for the first, it appears not only in the connection of older collections of proverbs (from chapter 10 onwards) to more recent discourses (Prov. 1–9) but also in the very transmission of the proverbs themselves. However, critical analysis for this corpus is, like that of the Psalter, not yet advanced in the differentiation of older sayings from subsequent theological commentary.[27]

In the individual sayings and collections of sayings found in Prov. 10:1–22:16; 22:17–24 and 24:23–32; 25–9, ancient wisdom's knowledge and its ideal of status quite clearly converge. As with ancient justice, i.e., the

---

[25] G. Wilson (1985); Millard (1994); Kratz (2004*a*), 255–79, 280–311; (2004*b*); (2011*b*); for more recent discussion in light of the Qumran material, see Jain (2014).

[26] See H.H. Schmid (1966); Von Rad (1970; ET 1972); Witte in Gertz, Berlejung, Schmid, and Witte (2010; ET 2012).

[27] See, e.g., Wilke (2006); for older wisdom, see Delkurt (1993); Hausmann (1995).

collection of *mishpatim* in Exod. 21–2, these and similar collections of wisdom sayings had already begun to form in the pre-exilic period, probably for the education of scribes in the context of wisdom schools. With transition into biblical tradition, these collections of sayings received theological glossing. At least three different trends developed in this process.

The first trend connects wisdom to the fear of God. According to Prov. 24:21, fear of God and fear of king constitute a single sapiential virtue among many. This ancient wisdom perspective served as a starting point for subsequent additions and introduced several theological touchstones: the fear of and trust in God represent the foundation for ancient wisdom's rules of living rightly (cf. Prov. 15:33 with 18:12; 22:4 with 21:21); the religious maxim supplants a diversity of norms (cf. Prov. 14:26–7 with 13:14; 23:17–8 with 24:13–4); and faith in God becomes the fundamental principle of wisdom (cf. Prov. 10:27; 16:20; 20:22; 21:30–1; 28:5, 25; 29:25–6).

A second current introduces the righteous/godless dichotomy. This antithesis has its origins in the numerous oppositions contemplated in the sayings of ancient wisdom, particularly that between the impecunious and the affluent. Accordingly, later proverbs transform the former social conflict of rich and poor into a religious antithesis, which relativizes the ideal of ancient wisdom theologically (cf. Prov. 10:16 with 10:15; 11:18–19 with 11:16–17). At the end of this trajectory, "poor" becomes just (cf. Ps. 37), and rich becomes wicked (cf. Ps. 49). Yet such religious antagonism bears upon other themes as well, whether the rather broad field of right speech and silence (cf. Prov. 10:11 with 10:10; 10:20 with 10:19; 15:28 with 15:23), for instance, or the pivotal connection between deeds and consequences, interpreted as equitable recompense (cf. Prov. 11:23 with 13:12 and 11:30–1; 12:7 with 11:29).

The third movement problematizes humanity's cognitive facility to understand God and world. Although older wisdom—despite full recognition of surprise (Prov. 14:12)—considers the potential to understand a simple matter of course (cf. Prov. 20:5), a string of other sayings do dig an almost insurmountable trench between divine ways and plans, on the one hand, and human sight and cognition, on the other: Prov. 16:9; 19:21; 20:24. All such gnomes seem eager to articulate more or less the same conviction, true to the motto "Man proposes, God disposes." However, closer inspection reveals certain variations that set the stage for the skepticism characteristic of later wisdom: ultimately, divine governance rests beyond human comprehension.

These three tendencies evident in the theological reworking of Proverbs already suggest a number of problems treated at length in later wisdom literature of the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Thus, the didactic tales in Prov. 1–9 proceed from the fear of God as wisdom's beginning and bedrock (Prov. 1:7; 2:1ff.). Wisdom's personification in Prov. 8 exemplifies an initial attempt to resolve the problem of humanity's cognitive facility to understand (cf. still Job 28; Sir. 24). No longer does creation itself or the phenomena perceptible within

it suffice. Creation's self-revelation now an impossible premise, the Torah stands as the only true mediation for knowledge of the world.[28]

On diverse theological and literary planes, each in its own way, the Job novella (Job 1–2; 42) and the book's dialogic portions both deliberate over the fear of God being tested and the challenge to the just posed by persistent personal suffering. In the former, God himself in league with Satan puts the ideal of fear of God to the proof while conventional theology unravels in the latter. The divine speeches of Job 38–41 relativize God's manifestation and his response to Job's indictment, deflating not only the suffering yet righteous Job but also the friends, who represent comforters and delegates of pure sapiential doctrine.

In Qoheleth, the maelstrom of doubt catches hold of everything, from piety and just retribution to cognitive facility itself. Qoheleth's attempt to reconcile the biblical portrait of God with Hellenistic popular philosophy and its specific belief in destiny leads him to the boundaries of Jewish theology and piety.[29] At the conclusion of his endeavors to fathom what, exactly, transpires under the sun, the Preacher recommends the axiom of *carpe diem* (Qoh. 9:7ff.)—not because God does not exist but because he evades human comprehension.

Protest against such detached and critical—though not impious—posture rises not only in the book of Qoheleth (Qoh. 12:9–14) but also in the book of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus). Reading like a true anti-Qoheleth work, Ben Sira found no entrance into the biblical canon solely because its author's identity was known, a figure who had clearly lived and written much later than the time between "Moses and Artaxerxes." Undergirded by a Jewish piety founded on the biblical tradition, the ideals of ancient wisdom come to life once more. For Ben Sira, wisdom and Torah are identical (Sir. 24), revealed in creation and scripture alike.

The Hebrew Bible's latest book, Daniel, does not take the easy way out.[30] Proceeding from the didactic narratives of older sapiential tradition (Dan. 1–6), Daniel exemplifies how Jewish wisdom and steadfast piety survived the diaspora. During the Hellenistic period in general and the reign of Antiochus IV in particular, at the middle of the second century BCE, both cultural and religious disruptions and inner-Jewish strife brought with them an abandonment of the narratives' own ideals. The progressive addition of visions in Dan. 7–12 postpone the solution to such turmoil until the end of times, when the promises set forth in scripture and affairs already long decided in heaven will finally be realized. Rather than resign themselves and settle for *carpe diem* or refer to conventional theology and holy scriptures, the pious and "discerning" within the book of Daniel have a long path of suffering before them and reach their goal only in universal judgment on the other side of resurrection (Dan. 12:1–3).

---

[28] Schipper (2012).
[29] Schwienhorst-Schönberger (1996); Krüger (2004).
[30] Kratz (1991*b*); (2001 [2004*a*, 227–44]).

III

The Books of the Hebrew Bible

Having demonstrated the development of distinct domains within the biblical tradition, we now turn to individual books and their collection within the framework of the Hebrew Bible.[1] Reference to "Bible" or "canon" is only appropriate for the end of the first century CE onward—and even then at the earliest.[2] Before that time, individual books or collections of books (i.e., scrolls) had circulated with a more or less accepted authority. At a relatively early juncture, the biblical tradition itself alluded to the Torah of Moses, first in connection with the book of Deuteronomy (Deut. 1:5) and soon thereafter in reference to the Pentateuch in its entirety. The prophetic books, viz. the *corpus propheticum*, as well as the Psalms seem to have also enjoyed special esteem alongside the Torah of Moses from the early second century BCE.[3] All other writings reached their canonical positions subsequently.

Alongside the compositions that found their way into what became the Hebrew Bible, a plethora of para-biblical literature also emerged during the Hellenistic–Roman period, a tradition that refers or relates to the biblical books in one way or another: the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the writings of Hellenistic Judaism.[4] These works, too, presume neither "Bible" nor "canon" despite such suggestive designations as "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," "rewritten bible," or "rewritten scripture" (e.g., Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, the Genesis Apocryphon). However, appellations of this variety should not promote the misleading, anachronistic distinction between biblical and non-biblical books.[5]

---

[1] On the following, see Blenkinsopp (1977); Steck (1988).
[2] 4 Ezra 14 (OBCA 236–8; APOT ii. 620–4; OTP i. 553–5; JSHRZ v. 400–5); *C.Ap* 1.7, 37–41; *b. Bab. Bat.* 14b–15a.
[3] Sir. 44–9 (OBCA 105–8; APOT i. 479–506; Skehan and Di Lella (1987), 497–545; JSHRZ iii. 614–30).
[4] Stone (1984); Mulder and Sysling (1988); Maier (1990); Schürer (1973–87), iii; and see IV 6.
[5] Najman (2012).

As demonstrated by the biblical manuscripts found at Qumran, the text of the biblical books was still in a state of flux.[6] The anonymity or pseudepigraphy of the rewritten bible texts distinguishes itself in no way from either the anonymous traditions or the various name attributions prevalent throughout the texts of the Hebrew Bible. Para-biblical writings raise no fewer claims of inspiration or revelation than those in the Hebrew Bible and assert such pretenses even more strongly or expressly than the latter (cf. Jubilees, Temple Scroll).[7] Derived from the Hebrew Bible and either appealing to or commenting upon it—with a marked distinction between text and interpretation—even writings from the Qumran community itself possessed an equal authority to that of the biblical books, to which they constantly refer, not least because they actually wish to say nothing more than the biblical texts already do.[8]

Nevertheless, the books of the Hebrew Bible do assume a special position insofar as these later, para-biblical texts reference, cite, paraphrase, imitate, or discuss them, sometimes at great length. It is this practice that gives the biblical books a kind of "canonicity." The increasing authority of biblical texts and the authority of those that cite them therefore show a mutual dependence. Both groups draw equally upon divine descent, i.e., inspiration and revelation. Exceptions do arise, however, as in texts that conform to the Hellenistic practice of naming their actual authors (e.g., Ben Sira, Philo of Alexandria, Josephus Flavius). In doing so, they demonstrate clear detachment from their point of reference—i.e., the biblical prototype (*Vorlage*)—and position the learned author or teacher as an authority in the service of interpreting the biblical witness.

Although these few, later cases do reveal the authors of certain writings and further evince, albeit indirectly, how they understood the tradition and what they hoped to accomplish with it, the authors of the remaining biblical and para-biblical literature remain a great mystery indeed.[9] While this earlier literature arose only on the other side of constant revision, updating, and reformulation over the course of centuries, the question persists as to how this host of anonymous scribes understood themselves and their activity as they participated in the production of the biblical tradition. What went through the mind of a scribe when he not only copied the text of the Mosaic Torah, that of the Prophets, or that of the Writings but even changed the text itself and, rather than merely

[6] Tov (2012); Lange (2009). The textual history constitutes only the final stages in a much longer compositional and textual history and can therefore serve as external evidence for the latter; on this particular subject and for comparison with other ancient Near Eastern materials, see the work of Tigay (1975); (1982); (1985); Tertel (1994); for further discussion Carr (2011); Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny (2014); Kratz (2004*a*), 126–56; "Bibelhandschrift" (forthcoming); "Nahash" (forthcoming); "Reworked Pentateuch" (forthcoming); "Sources" (forthcoming).

[7] Najman (2003).

[8] DJD; DSSP; DSSR; DSSSE; MAIER A and B; QUMRAN 1–2.

[9] I would like to thank Shani Tzoref and Reed Carlson for drawing my attention to this important question and for spurring me to think about it carefully.

correct the trifles of his predecessors, even added entire passages? Amidst such modifications, how did scribes conceptualize their relationship to the textual prototype (*Vorlage*) they also deemed authoritative? Unfortunately, we have no good answers to these questions. The phenomenon of pseudepigraphy is well known and much discussed, but we are far from actually understanding it.

As one possible means of explanation, the ancient scribes—like early composers and artists—may have possessed no pronounced awareness of originality, authorship, and intellectual property as it would come to develop over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Scribes' persistent modifications and additions would then have been authentic and legitimate contributions to the text they both bequeathed and considered authoritative. Neither the text they transmitted nor the supplements they added would have constituted intellectual property of any given author. Perhaps the scribes believed one and the same "author," namely God, spoke to them through the transmitted text and through them in their own modifications and supplements. Whether the revelation scene of Exod. 19–24 or Exod. 34 in the book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll or the introduction of the "Teacher of Righteousness" and the theophany in the commentaries of Qumran, the diverse strategies for granting authority point in this direction. In Judaism and Christianity, the later doctrine of inspiration brought this state of affairs to sustained consideration, and each solved the problem in its own way.

1. THE LAW (TORAH)

Persisting over the course of centuries, the formation of the Hebrew Bible continued from the eighth to the second century BCE—more precisely, until ca. 100 CE, when the Hebrew canon was virtually fixed in all of its divisions. The selection and separation of the canon's three divisions signified the end of literary history for the biblical and para-biblical books, which evidently reached far and wide in the Hellenistic period and afterwards continued in rabbinic and Christian literature.

Comprising the five books of Moses—i.e., the Pentateuch (*sc.* Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy)—the canonical division of Torah constitutes the first collection that achieved a recognizable authoritative status. The biblical books themselves already allude to the "Torah of Moses" or "Torah of Yhwh (God)," although the precise point of reference remains ambiguous at times, that is, whether the denomination encompasses the Pentateuch in its entirety or not. Based on external attestation,[10] this

---

[10] Septuagint, Samaritan Pentateuch, Ben Sira (OBCA 68–111; APOT i. 268–517; Skehan and Di Lella (1987); JSHRZ iii. 481–644), Letter of Aristeas (APOT ii. 82–122; OTP ii. 7–34; JSHRZ ii. 35–87), 4QMMT, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha (APOT, OTP, OBCA, AOT, APAT, JSHRZ).

designation probably did refer to the Pentateuch in its entirety during the Hellenistic era, which therefore indicates a detachment of the Pentateuch as Torah in the course of the late Persian or early Hellenistic periods.

Yet such separation is rather artificial. The narrative thread of sacred history stretches from the cosmogony in Gen. 1 to the end of the Judahite kingdom in 2 Kgs. 25, that is, across the "Enneateuch." Composed of nine distinguishable books—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings—the Enneateuch emerged through connection of Israel's older foundation legend in Genesis–Joshua to the monarchic history in Samuel–Kings, linked by the book of Judges and supplemented by the Priestly Writing in Genesis to Numbers. Consequently, not only the "Hexateuch"— i.e., a work either comprised of or at the very least flowing through the six books from Genesis to Joshua (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua)—but also the nucleus or base text (*Grundschrift*) of the "Deuteronomistic History" in Samuel–Kings preceded the Enneateuch's formation. The book of Judges first bound the two literary corpora together to form an ongoing narrative, with the first commandment as a conceptual connection. The genetic sequence thus progressed as follows: from Hexateuch (Genesis–Joshua) to Enneateuch (Genesis–Kings) to Pentateuch (Genesis–Deuteronomy).

In contrast to more conventional introductions to the Hebrew Bible, up to this point we have abstained from addressing the classic documentary hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, the Pentateuch arose from four individual sources: the three parallel narrative works of the Yahwist (J), Elohist (E), and Priestly Writing (P) in Genesis–Numbers along with the book of Deuteronomy (D). As demonstrated by more recent research on the Pentateuch, however, only the Priestly Writing and Deuteronomy consist of a textual basis verifiable enough to gain broad consensus.[11] Traditionally apportioned to the J, E, and JE (i.e., the Yehowist for the combination of J and E) sources, everything else within the non-priestly portions of Genesis–Numbers has fallen into dispute. Various textual elements intertwine within this non-priestly context: namely older individual traditions, one or more narrative threads composed of these individual traditions and further fashioned through redaction, and omnifarious additions such as individual source-like components (fragments) as well as pre-deuteronomic and post-deuteronomic along with pre-priestly and post-priestly supplements.

As the history of scholarship has shown time and again, the documentary hypothesis does not, and cannot, sufficiently explain the non-priestly textual components, for a neat mechanical separation of the J and E sources along with their redaction in the form of JE quite simply seems impossible.[12]

---

[11] See Kratz (2011*d*); for the discussion, see Dozeman, Schmid, and Schwartz (2011).

[12] Some scholars would, of course, disagree with this assessment and insist, instead, on the documentary hypothesis as well as the existence of independent sources, namely J ("Yahwist"), E ("Elohist"), D ("Deuteronomy"), and P ("Priestly Writing"); see Kratz (2011*d*), 46, as well as the

Furthermore, arguments for the non-priestly text as a literary unity composed entirely by some post-priestly "Yahwistic" redactor prove equally inadequate.[13] These older—and in point of fact outdated—models of literary formation turn out to be highly problematic, if not entirely idiosyncratic: they should therefore be abandoned. Instead, the non-priestly text running from Genesis through Numbers demands a more simple explanation, namely the differentiation between older individual traditions, their first redactional ties to a single narrative thread, and later additions or supplementations. Moreover, the redaction responsible for composition of the primeval and patriarchal narrative in Genesis is scarcely identical with that of the exodus narrative.[14] Contrary to the proposal rather common since Martin Noth's

article by Baruch Schwartz in Dozeman, Schmid, and Schwartz (2011), 3–16; Baden (2009); (2012); (2013); Stackert (2014); see also Levin (1993) for the "Yahwist" (J) and Graupner (2002) for the "Elohist" (E). Scholarship has reached consensus on the identification of D (Deuteronomy) and P (Priestly Writing including the Holiness Code H). The main issue now centers on explanation of the text traditionally labeled as J ("Yahwist"), E ("Elohist"), or JE ("Yehowist" according to Wellhausen). While the classical documentary hypothesis (Wellhausen (1899); (1905*b*; ET 1994); Noth (1948; ET 1972)) discovered several additions and literary layers within the individual sources, which are dependent on each other, and grouped the sources in a (relative) historical order (J, E, JE—D—P), the "renewed" or so-called "neo-documentarian" hypothesis insists on two premises: first, the singularity and literary independence of the sources (except D using J and E, on the one hand, and H using D and P, on the other) and, second, the simultaneity or timelessness of the sources, which then prohibits either an absolute or a relative dating (Baden (2012), 246–9; Stackert (2014), 19ff.). These two premises seem to be most important and even indisputable for the advocates of the "renewed" documentary hypothesis, although not only methodological procedures and textual observations but also the external evidence for the production and transmission of ancient Jewish texts speak strongly against their almost dogmatic presuppositions. Furthermore, this "renewing" is based on a crass opposition between *the* "European approach," on the one hand, and *the* "documentary hypothesis," i.e., the hypothesis as represented by Schwartz and his students, on the other (cf. Baden (2012), 53–67); this alternative, however, is obviously wrong and comes only from a sweeping and superficial evaluation of the history and actual discussion of pentateuchal scholarship.

[13] Van Seters (1983); (1992); (1994); (2006); (2013).

[14] For the original separation between the primeval–patriarchal narrative in Genesis and the exodus narrative in Exodus(–Joshua), see K. Schmid (1999; ET 2010); Gertz (2000). The crucial question is when the two narratives were connected. Some see a pre-priestly redaction (traditionally "J" or "JE"), which combines older fragments (sources) and creates a continuing narrative running from the creation of mankind to the wandering through the desert or the occupation of the land, respectively (Levin (1993)), while others maintain that the fragments or sources of the primeval, patriarchal, and exodus narratives existed independently and first underwent connection only through the Priestly Writing "P" (Rendtorff (1976; ET 1990); Römer (1990); Römer, in Lohfink (1991); A. De Pury in Kratz, Krüger, and Schmid (2000), 33–60; A. De Pury in Dozeman and Schmid (2006), 51–72; A. De Pury in Römer and Schmid (2007), 99–128; K. Schmid (1999; ET 2010); Gertz (2000); Blum in Gertz, Witte, and Schmid (2002), 119–56. Blum does not deny the possible reception of older fragments or sources, which could have existed as part of a continuous narrative circulated through common knowledge. Berner (2010), 10–48, has convincingly identified this pre-priestly connection in the text as a secondary link between the originally (and conceptually) independent primeval–patriarchal narrative and the exodus narrative; see also D. Carr in Dozeman and Schmid (2006), 159–80.

formational reconstruction of the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic
History,[15] the exodus narrative commenced in Exodus and extended not
only through the book of Numbers but continued on to include the conquest
described in the book of Joshua as well, which served as the natural end to the
narrative. This literary span has enjoyed wide recognition and received general
acceptance since the time of Wellhausen up to that of Noth; in fact, it has been
rediscovered today.[16]

Only later additions encompassed the entire range from Genesis, Exodus–
Joshua, Judges, and Samuel–Kings, that is, the Enneateuch. Yet these
additions themselves bear responsibility for the separation—or increased
independence—of individual books, more properly, scrolls. Once textual
transmission ceased its phase of production, the books obtained a framework
that not only marked both beginning and end but also indicated the greater
narrative context beyond the borders of each individual book.[17] In this way,
separate scrolls contained individual books without sacrificing the larger
coherency of sacred history.

The separation of the Pentateuch as Torah followed the same progression.
Availing itself of Moses's death, Deut. 34:10–12 declares Moses and his history
an exception. Specific reference to the patriarchal promises (Deut. 34:4) shows
that the Pentateuch in its entirety is in view, Genesis included. The Pentateuch
therefore gained an importance on its own even as the installation of Joshua
(Deut. 31:1ff.; 34:9) pointed to the continuation of Israel's history beyond the
confines of the Torah. Even more, the figure of Moses epitomizes an epoch
that reaches from the foundation of creation to the borders of the promised
land. By the same logic, the book of Jubilees, which acts as a reformulation of
Gen. 1–Exod. 15,[18] elevates Moses to the author of the primeval and patri-
archal narrative as well. In the "Mosaic" epoch embodied in the Torah as a
whole, Yhwh establishes everything that will become prescriptive for the
future. This perspective clearly manifests itself in the unmediated continuation
of Israel's history up until Judah's destruction, the kingdom of Israel having
failed to meet the Torah's demands. Yet the foundation history applies to
all of time. As a result, the "Mosaic" epoch in the Pentateuch becomes the
standard, while the subsequent history in the Former (Joshua–Kings) and
Latter (Isaiah–Malachi) Prophets along with the rest of scripture serves as an
exemplum for the future.

---

[15] Noth (1943; ET 1981) and (1948; ET 1972).
[16] Wellhausen (1899); see Kratz (2000*a*); (2000*b*), 289–91 (ET 2005, 282–3); (2002*a*);
(2012*a*); for a different view, see Otto (2000); (2009); for the discussion, see Frevel
(2004); (2011).
[17] See Gen. 50/Exod. 1; Num. 36:13/Deut. 1–3; Deut. 31–4/Josh. 1; Josh. 24/Judg. 1–2; Judg.
17–21, esp. 21:25/1 Sam. 1–3; 2 Sam. 21–4/1 Kgs.
[18] APOT ii. 1–82; OTP ii. 35–142; AOT 1–140; VANDERKAM; JSHRZ ii. 273–575.

2. THE PROPHETS (NEVI'IM)

Separation of the Pentateuch as Torah resulted in the isolation of Joshua–Kings. Positioned as the Former Prophets in the Hebrew canon, these books precede the prophetic works denominated as the Latter Prophets (i.e., Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor or Twelve Prophets). This compilation presupposes the theory set forth in Chronicles, shared also by Josephus, that each epoch had its own prophet and that each prophet was the chronicler of his age.[19] Thus, the historians became prophets, and the prophets became historians. As an instance of hagiography, the canonical division of the Prophets has its first attestation in the early second century BCE in the "Praise of the Fathers" (Sir. 44–9). The prologue to the Greek translation of Ben Sira, the document 4QMMT, and the New Testament all refer to "the Prophets" as well.

In large part thanks to Martin Noth, critical scholarship has long considered the Former Prophets a constituent collection of the so-called "Deuteronomistic History," which encompasses the books of Deuteronomy–Kings. According to more recent analysis, this work saw different stages of growth, be it by block, supplement, or both.[20] This hypothesis presupposes two or more separate accounts of the Palestinian conquest: while the sources (or documents, i.e., J, E, and P) of the Tetrateuch (Genesis–Numbers) ended with one, the Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy–Joshua) began with the other. Both literary entities supposedly came together in the end, however, with the Tetrateuch's version disappearing in the process. Yet should that dogma of the documentary hypothesis along with the postulation of a Deuteronomistic History (stretching all the way from Deut. 1 to 2 Kgs. 25) be suspended, and should the tradition as preserved be evaluated instead on its own, a rather different state of affairs can then come into view. First, the redactional connection of Num. 25:1a (arrival and encampment at Shittim) and Josh. 2:1; 3:1 (decampment and departure from Shittim) becomes eminently clear. Bridged by a simple notification of Moses's death (based on the model of Deut. 34:5–6) and perhaps a short transition (such as Josh. 1:1–2), this junction provides the oldest ascertainable framework for the

---

[19] For this theory, see Josephus *C.Ap.* 1.7, 37–41 and Kratz (2004*a*), 157–80.
[20] Noth (1943; ET 1981); Jepsen (1953); for the *supplementary hypothesis*, see Smend (1978); Dietrich (1972) and (1987); as well as Veijola (1975); (1977); (2000); Dietrich, Mathys, Römer, and Smend (2014), 167–282; for the *fragmentary hypothesis* (block model), see, e.g., H. Weippert (1972); Cross (1973); Nelson (1981); Provan (1988); McKenzie (1991); for a detailed critique of the latter approach, see Aurelius (2003). For further discussion, see De Pury, Römer, and Macchi (1996; ET 2000); H. Rösel (1999); Knoppers and Conville (2000); Römer (2000); Otto and Achenbach (2004); Römer (2005); Person (2009); Witte, Schmid, Prechel, Gertz, and Diehl (2006); Römer and Schmid (2007); Otto (2009); Stipp (2011); Schmid and Person (2012); Jacobs and Person (2013).

exodus–conquest narrative.[21] In addition, since the oldest deuteronomistic redaction appears only in the books of Samuel–Kings—with its strong orientation toward Deuteronomy and the demand for cultic centralization—then the Hexateuch (Genesis; Exodus–Joshua) and the deuteronomistic base text (*Grundschrift*) in Samuel–Kings (dependent on Deuteronomy) undoubtedly demand distinction. It was only the late deuteronomistic book of Judges and the secondary deuteronomistic revision in the books of Genesis–Kings (i.e., the Enneateuch) that merged the two corpora together to form a meta-narrative: Israel's *historia sacra*.[22]

After artificial detachment of the Torah, the literary brackets of Josh. 1:7–8 and Mal. 3:22–4 united the books of Joshua–Kings with the Prophetic books (of the canonical division Nevi'im) and, at the same time, reconnected this new unity to the Torah of Moses. The Former and Latter Prophets therefore stood not only as prophetically inspired authors of a sacred history but also as teachers of the law, exhorting the people of Israel to obey their God and his commands (i.e., the Torah of Moses) and warning them of failure's dire consequences.

Like the Former Prophets, the Latter Prophets also had a history of their own before they were combined with the historical books to comprise the Hebrew canon's second division.[23] Initially, each prophetic book was transmitted individually. Literary interrelationships between these individual books, however, reveal they were composed in close proximity to each other and harmonized later on. Such literary compositions emerged first in the book of Isaiah, which resulted from two distinguishable books (First Isaiah in chapters 1–39 and Second Isaiah in chapters 40–66) and in the Minor Prophets, which, for its part, materialized from subcollections such as the series Hosea–Amos–Micah and Haggai–Zechariah–Malachi, for instance. Altogether, the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel along with the Minor Prophets constitute the *corpus propheticum*.

Hardly coincidental, the number of prophetic books never exceeded the sum still found in the Hebrew Bible today. The *corpus propheticum* includes three Major and twelve Minor Prophets, reminiscent of the three patriarchs

---

[21] On the analysis of the following context, see Porzig (2009). For a different position—following his teacher Blum (Blum (2010), 219–48 and 375–404; Blum in Stipp (2011), 269–95)—see Krause (2014), who finds in Num. 25 and Josh. 2 late, post-deuteronomistic additions. As far as the older tradition is concerned, Blum in Noort (2012), 137–57, presents yet another solution. Accordingly, the conquest narrative was widely known and therefore needed no retelling in the sundry fragments and compositions (D and P) of the exodus narrative before the Tetrateuchal material in Genesis–Numbers, on the one hand, and the Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy–Kings), on the other, were somehow connected in the framework of a late Hexateuch and/or the canonical divisions of Torah (Pentateuch) and Former Prophets.

[22] See Kratz (2000*b*; ET 2005); Gertz (2002) and in Gertz, Berlejung, Schmid, and Witte (2010; ET 2012); Müller (2004), 75–7, 78ff.

[23] For the following, see Steck (1991*a*).

and twelve tribes of Israel—an arrangement certainly not attributable to chance. Furthermore, the books of the *corpus propheticum* correlate with one another through a sophisticated system of superscriptions. On two separate occasions, once in the three Major and again in the twelve Minor Prophets, the superscriptions range across the time span from King Uzziah in the eighth century BCE up until the second temple at the end of the sixth century BCE.[24]

Read on its own, the *corpus propheticum* thus covers the most important epochs of Israelite history, stretching from the Assyrian era to the Persian period with retrospects of earlier ages—between creation and the time of the prophets—as well as prospects of the world's consummation. In many sequences, the whole world comes into view, from the totality of Yhwh's chosen people, Israel, to the totality of the nations. Each learns of Yhwh's plans and Yhwh's demands. The unity of God guarantees the unity of his multifaceted and at times contradictory action in addition to the unity and purposiveness of that checkered history which he himself directs.[25]

The system of superscription, along with the prophetic view of history, fostered compatibility with the historical books of Joshua–Kings, especially since the historical epochs partially overlapped and thereby facilitated textual correspondence throughout the Former and Latter Prophets.[26] By means of literary links (Josh. 1:7–8 and Mal. 3:22–4) and reference to the "Torah" in the Prophetic books, the *corpus propheticum*—as part of the canonical division of Prophets—also nestles in the framework of the law.

3. THE WRITINGS (KETUVIM)

Without any apparent organization, the "Writings" constitute the canon's third division, an *omnium gatherum* of books selected in accord with the Jewish theory of canon from a mass of texts dated to the Hellenistic–Roman period. As specified by their own statements and associated traditions, these books trace back to the time between Moses and the Persian king Artaxerxes (Ezra–Nehemiah).[27] Already by the end of the second century BCE, the prologue to Ben Sira's Greek translation could invoke, alongside the Torah and the Prophets, the "other books" in reference to a third group of "canonical" texts, but it was only during the first century CE, and in some cases even later, that the particular inventory of writings would assume its current form.

---

[24] Isa. 1:1//Hos. 1:1; Amos 1:1, and Mic. 1:1 (from Uzziah to Hezekiah); Jer. 1:1–3//Zeph. 1:1 (from Josiah to Zedekiah); Ezek.//Hag. and Zech. (Exile and Second Temple).

[25] For the theological profile of the prophetic corpus, see Steck (1996; ET 2000).

[26] 2 Kgs. 18–20//Isa. 36–9; 2 Kgs. 24–5//Jer. 52.   [27] Josephus, *C.Ap.* 1.7, 40.

At the heart of the third division lies the Psalter, ascribed to David by many of its own superscriptions. Perhaps 4QMMT, a halakhic letter from Qumran, but certainly the New Testament (Luke 24:44) lists the Psalms beside the Torah and the Prophets. Like the Prophets, the Psalter is interconnected with the Torah, specifically through Ps. 1 and citation of Josh. 1:7–8 in Ps. 1:2–3.[28] If the prophets serve as teachers of the law, the teachings of the law itself then follow in the canon's third division to demonstrate a life properly lived in accordance with the Torah.

In this sense, the wisdom writings of Job, Proverbs, and Qoheleth as well as the books of Ruth, Esther, and Daniel were all included in the canon beside the book of Psalms. Through their pseudo-Solomonic authorship, Proverbs and Qoheleth found entrance into the canon, a path the Song of Songs might have travelled too. The selection of Ruth, for its part, may have issued from the Davidic genealogy in 4:17–22. Traditionally attributed to the prophet Jeremiah, Lamentations along with the books of Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles relate to the period of the first and second temples in Jerusalem, thereby converging with the second canonical section, i.e., the Prophets. Between the life teachings of Psalms and wisdom literature (Job, Proverbs), on the one hand, and the historical books (Daniel, Ezra–Nehemiah, Chronicles), on the other, the books of Ruth (Passover), Song of Songs (Feast of Weeks), Qoheleth (Feast of Booths), Lamentations (Tisha B'Av in commemoration of the Jerusalem temple's destruction), and Esther (Purim) all comprise the group of five "scrolls," viz. Megillot, which correspond to the specific feasts during which these books were read.

4. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Thus far, our literary exploration has centered on the Hebrew canon and its formation. However, the Hebrew Bible exists in a Greek version as well.[29] Its history began with translation of the Torah. According to the legend contained in the Letter of Aristeas, King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BCE)—by agency of the courtier Aristeas—convened a delegation of seventy-two priests from Jerusalem, six from each of Israel's twelve tribes, to translate the Torah into Greek for the Library of Alexandria in seventy-two days.[30] The Greek translation of the Torah and the Greek Bible in its entirety are therefore called the Septuagint, which literally means "The Seventy" (usually abbreviated LXX).

---

[28] See Kratz (2004*a*), 284–6.
[29] See Hengel (2002); Jobes and Silva (2000); Dines (2004); Marcos (2009); Law (2013); furthermore Hengel and Schwemer (1994); Kreuzer, Meiser, and Sigismund (2012).
[30] APOT ii. 82–122; OTP ii. 7–34; JSHRZ ii. 35–87.

Whatever the legend's historical value, it may well contain a kernel of truth. With the rise of Greek language and culture in Egypt and Syria–Palestine came the need for translation of ancestral literature or holy scriptures into Greek. For the translators, holy scripture meant the Torah on its own. The Torah was, and remained, the template for translation of the other would-be biblical books, which culminated only on the other side of a long and gradual process extending into the first century CE. As for the oldest manuscript evidence, Greek fragments of the Pentateuch and Twelve Prophets trace back to Egypt as well as Qumran and its environs during the late pre-Christian era.[31] In the course of the second century CE, the Septuagint became the Christian Bible, an association that accounts for its preservation in strictly Christian manuscripts.

A different ordering as well as an expanded inventory of writings distinguish the Septuagint from the Hebrew version. With a shuffled arrangement of the Hebrew canon's tripartite division alongside a new distribution of the constituent books themselves, the Septuagint features the assemblage of all historical books from the Torah, Former Prophets, and Writings into its first subsection.[32] In its second subdivision, the Septuagint has the poetic works,[33] while its third and final portion encompasses the Prophetic books.[34] Moreover, the first division contains (in addition to those of the Hebrew canon) the books of 1 Ezra (3 Ezra in the Vulgate's numeration), Judith, Tobit, 1–2 Maccabees (in some manuscripts even 3 and 4 Maccabees), along with prayer insertions and other additions in the book of Esther. The second division, for its part, exhibits a supplementary psalm (Ps. 151) alongside the Wisdom of Solomon and Ben Sira (together with the Odes of Solomon and Psalms of Solomon in several manuscripts). With respect to the third division, it embraces the Book of Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah (attached to 1 Baruch as Bar 6 in most Greek manuscripts), and additions to Daniel (Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, prayers in Dan. 3).

The additional documents and pieces either derived from a Hebrew or Aramaic original (*Vorlage*) or started as Greek compositions. In one way or another, all of them depend on the Hebrew Bible. Whether through paraphrase, imitation, or supplementation, they sought to accommodate the biblical books to the demands and preferences of the Hellenistic period. Indeed, they evince the diversity of Jewish literature in the Hellenistic–Roman era, which also encompasses the Hellenistic Jewish authors and

---

[31] See Rahlfs and Fraenkel (2004), 170–8 (P. Fouad, 266), 241–2 (P. Rylands, 458); Lange (2009), 36, 335.

[32] Genesis–Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel–2 Kings (= 1–4 Kingdoms), 1–2 Chronicles (= Paralipomena), Ezra–Nehemia (= 2 Ezra), Esther.

[33] Psalms, Proverbs (= Proverbia), Qoheleth (= Ecclesiastes), Song of Songs, Job, and Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Psalms of Solomon.

[34] Latter Prophets (following a different order than in MT), Lamentations (= Threni), and Daniel.

Dead Sea Scrolls alongside the literature incorporated into the Septuagint and numerous other apocryphal and pseudepigraphic writings.[35]

Within this broader stream of Jewish literature flows the Hebrew Bible itself. Although its initial context belonged to the world of the educated elite and thus a negligible—if not marginal—circle, the Hebrew Bible underwent great dissemination in the Hellenistic period, prompting other literary productions in the process. As demonstrated by the many copies and literary citations discovered in the Dead Sea Scrolls, which show a marked proclivity for the Psalter in addition to the Torah and the Prophets, these texts quickly crystallized into a nucleus of governing authoritative tradition in the context of biblical Judaism. Active selection came only for the "other writings," which could vary significantly, and in some cases proved long controversial throughout rabbinic and early Christian debates. The Hebrew canon's third division, the "Writings" (Ketuvim), along with the Septuagint's larger number of books represent two distinct paths that ultimately led to completion of the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament.

---

[35] See IV 6.

IV

A Sketch of Literary History

To conclude this section on the development of biblical tradition, we will attempt to correlate our various findings on literary history and then position them in their greater historical context, at least as much as possible. The history of the narrative tradition in Genesis–Kings alongside Chronicles and Ezra–Nehemiah provides the most conducive guideline for transitioning from a relative to an absolute chronology. Even here, however, only general approximations and broad statements are possible, oriented towards the most distinctive caesura and significant epochs in the history of Israel and Judah, such as the pre-state and post-state eras and the pre-Maccabean or post-Maccabean periods.[1] Since we know all too little about the internal relationship of the multiplex textual layers and their various connections to contemporary history, more precise dating is hardly an option. Rather, the common method of ascertaining dates for biblical texts by drawing on specific content, ancient Near Eastern analogies (real or suggested), or "influences" from the history of tradition proves to be—on the other side of sober reflection on method—merely a short circuit. Consequently, a *terminus a quo* may arise in the best of circumstances, but a true literary history scarcely lies within the province of possibility.[2]

---

[1] For the analysis presupposed here, see Kratz (2000b; ET 2005); to a great extent followed by Gertz in Gertz, Berlejung, Schmid, and Witte (2010; ET 2012).

[2] Wellhausen in Bleek (1886), 1–2; Smend (1978), 9; contra K. Schmid (2008; ET 2012) and Carr (2011), who date the biblical texts according to epochs of international politics; for the problems inherent in such dating, see Witte (2010); B. Sommer in Dozeman, Schmid, and Schwartz (2011), 85–108. Another approach was recently proposed by J. Schaper in Paget and Schaper (2013), 105–44, here 107–8, who seeks to arrange the material according to "institutions." Unfortunately, all too little is known about the institutions in which and for which the biblical literature was produced; as a result, the article can contribute rather little to such lines of inquiry. Nevertheless, despite their different approaches, both Schmid and Schaper offer a presentation quite close to the one I offer here.

1. HISTORICAL AND BIBLICAL ISRAEL

The reluctance to essay any precise dating of biblical texts has further rationale in the nature of the material itself, which leads to the central question of this book. Governed by a particular conception of Israel and its god, Yhwh, the biblical literature betrays a tension between the historical entities of Israel and Judah and their later manifestations as the provinces of Samaria and Judah, on the one hand, and the literary idea of Israel in the Hebrew Bible, on the other. In other words, the Israel of biblical tradition is not the Israel of history. Like the distinction between the historical Jesus and the kerygmatic Christ for the New Testament, the Hebrew Bible requires distinction between historical Israel and biblical Israel.

Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette[3] already saw—or, more likely, felt—this very contrast before Julius Wellhausen encapsulated it with his characterization of "ancient Israel" and "Judaism."[4] Martin Noth blurred the distinction somewhat by projecting back onto the early, pre-state period as an historical reality the concept of ancient Israel—an Israel in the "language of confession and belief," as Noth himself expressed it—that post-state biblical Judaism actually produced and the Hebrew Bible now articulates.[5] However, since the people of Israel did not exist in this early period as such, Noth's speculation must be dismissed: what constitutes or should constitute Israel according to the will of God as portrayed in the Hebrew Bible did not already exist at the beginning—whether in substance or *in nuce*.

Indeed, archaeology and the histories of tradition and text alike point in the opposite direction altogether. What distinguishes the Israel and the Yhwh of the Hebrew Bible and what determines the relationship of the deity Yhwh with his people, Israel, according to biblical texts come only on the other side of a long and anguished gestation period, in which the Israel of history gradually transitioned into the "language of confession and belief" and the striking characteristics (when compared with analogies from across the ancient Near East) developed into the Hebrew Bible's so-called "proprium."

Therefore, the sacred history of Israel as told in the Hebrew Bible must not be confused with the Israel of history.[6] Even further, the history of biblical tradition—which itself took place in the context of Israelite and Judahite history—cannot simply be correlated or even identified with the history of Israel and Judah. Yet not everything is literary fiction. From the oldest to the youngest literary layers, historical memory and remnants of authentic

---

[3] De Wette (1806–7).
[4] Wellhausen (1905*b*), 1, 363ff., among others (ET 1994, 1, 365ff.).
[5] See Noth (1950), 169 (ET 1960, 184), as well as the programmatic statements ibid., 9–15 (ET 1960, 1–7).
[6] On the construction of history in the biblical account, see, e.g., Garbini (1988); Brettler (1995); Liverani (2006); Gilmour (2011).

tradition rooted in ancient scribal culture entered the Hebrew Bible. Still, in no place is such material directly accessible. It survives only through a transmission and transformation of biblical texts that reflected upon and interpreted a vast array of circumstances, experiences, and ancient traditions, all retrospectively and with a specific conception of God.

Biblical scholarship debates precisely when and where the transition from historical to biblical Israel took place. Apart from Noth's early dating for a common consciousness of all Israel (including Judah) in the pre-monarchic (or pre-historical) period, some propose the united kingdom under David and Solomon, i.e., the tenth century BCE. Others suggest a pan-Israelite movement under Hezekiah or Josiah in the seventh century BCE. Still others date the transition to after Jerusalem's destruction in 587 BCE and the ensuing exile. Usually, discussion proceeds on an historical level, mixing historical (i.e., archaeological and epigraphical) and literary (viz. biblical) data.[7] This book, by contrast, tries to keep these levels separate as much as possible and therefore reaches a different conclusion: the change did not occur in history but in the biblical literature.[8]

If nothing else, the dramatic historical caesura from 722 and 597/587 BCE, though more mental than material, evoked the transition to biblical literature.[9] Defying all expectation, the connection to a fractured history and a distinct divinity did not disappear but rather transformed into a new and durable foundation for the future in the realm of memory. However, even those traditions that know nothing of the breaks in Israelite and Judahite history and reflect the actual circumstances of the pre-exilic monarchy function not as some historical protocol to document the past but as explanations to delineate the *status quo* and further identify a group, a religion, and a political system by reference to pre-history—a pre-history construed according to very specific ideals.

For this reason, the Hebrew Bible cannot serve as a primary source for Israelite and Judahite history, be it political or religious, yet it does provide excellent material for reconstructing intellectual or theological history. This source includes a few remnants for the time preceding and primarily the material for the period succeeding the historical caesura in 722 and 587 BCE, when tradition transitioned into the "language of confession and belief." Only in this era did Yhwh become the one and only deity for Israel, and Israel did become the one and only people for Yhwh.

---

[7] See, e.g., the dispute between Na'aman (2009) and Finkelstein and Silberman (2006*a*); (2006*b*); Finkelstein (2011); on the seventh century BCE as a formative period, see also Crouch (2014*b*); for a later period, see Davies (1992) and (2007). On the broader discussion, see Weingart (2014), who herself follows the view of the biblical narrative and ignores the epigraphic evidence.

[8] On the two sides, see, e.g., Grabbe (1998); Ben Zvi and Levin (2010); Berlejung (2012).

[9] For the dating of the transition, see already Kratz (2000*b*; ET 2005); (2000*c*); (2006*a*). Contra Weingart (2014), 23–5, who overlooked the date 720 BCE.

2. THE ERA OF THE TWO KINGDOMS

For the time before 722 BCE and 587 BCE, when Israel and Judah stood as two independent political entities in the Syro-Palestinian world of petty states during the first half of the first millennium BCE, a series of individual narratives and narrative cycles circulated independently and finally entered the composition of Genesis–Kings.[10] From the Israelite north or central Palestine came Jacob and Laban in Gen. 29–31, Yhwh's war in Exod. 14, Balaam in Num. 22–4, Joshua and the wars of Yhwh in Josh. 6 and 8, the local heroes in Judg. 3–16, Samuel and Saul in 1 Sam. 1–14, and excerpts of Israel's royal chronicles as well as individual traditions (e.g., 1 Kgs. 18:41ff.; 2 Kgs. 4, 9–10) in the books of Kings. As for the Judahite south, it gave rise to Lot in Gen. 19, Isaac and Esau in Gen. 26–7, David and Solomon in 2 Sam. 11–12 + 1 Kgs. 1–2, Absolom in 2 Sam. 13–20, David–Absolom–Solomon in 2 Sam. 11–1 Kgs. 2, and excerpts from Judah's royal chronicles along with individual narratives in the books of Kings as well (e.g., 2 Kgs. 11). While precise origins remain unclear for the Cainite anthropogeny in Gen. 2–4, the Noachic table of nations in Gen. 10, and the Song of Miriam in Exod. 15:20–1, the exact confines of the tradition itself prove difficult to delineate for Abraham and Sarah (Gen. 12–13), Joseph in Egypt (Gen. 39–41), Moses in Midian (Exod. 2), and numerous other fragmentary relics of tradition (e.g., Josh. 10:12–13), which intertwine with their immediate context and appear time and again across all literary layers.

The various narrative types—patriarchal stories, Yhwh's wartime tales, heroic legends, royal and prophetic narratives, and monarchic chronicles—do not represent distinct historical epochs that permit some reconstruction of Israelite history based on simple extrapolation from individual episodes (as later redactors did and modern historians still imitate from time to time) but require, instead, an almost synchronic perspective. All these genres mirror the social and religious circumstances of the early, middle, or late monarchic period and project them, paradigmatically, back onto specific incidents, often at "the beginning" or other critical junctures. Passing through different social circles, the narratives hence reflect the same historical circumstances but from different angles and with different interests. The origins of humanity and the patriarchal stories orbit within the sphere of family, clan, and tribe in Genesis, while related heroic tales in Judges circulate within the realm of tribes, localities, and regions, and accounts of Yhwh's warfare, narratives of dynastic foundation (for Israel and Judah alike), as well as excerpts from royal chronicles all move within the context of the monarchy.

---

[10] For identification of the (pre-biblical) traditions mentioned in the following, see the suggestions in Kratz (2000*b*), 315–16 (ET 2005, 310–11, 322–3).

As indicated by the overarching narrative and the conditions it presupposes, these diverse social milieux correspond to the three domains of religion typical for the period of the pre-exilic monarchy: namely family, region, and state.[11] The presumed living conditions and evoked religious phenomena throughout the narratives prove not only modest but also small in scale. Focused only on essentials, the narrative style is brief. Such frugality in description aligns with epigraphic findings and historical parallels in the Syro-Palestinian context. This sparse narrative style ultimately stemmed from the meager political and cultural conditions of Syria–Palestine's petty states in the first half of the first millennium BCE, which could hardly have reached the magnitude of the ancient Near East's cultures—Egypt and Mesopotamia—no matter how much Israel and Judah interacted with them and did so more and more over time.

Among the sources originating in the pre-exilic monarchy number not only narratives but also a hymn (Exod. 15:21b) and a collection of legal principles, namely the *mishpatim* preserved in the Covenant Code (Exod. 21:1–22:19)— an assortment that reflects the great diversity of tradition present in pre-exilic Israel and Judah. Rather than narrative, the functional literature at home in the temple and the court was probably the most ancient and even the most prominent of literary transmissions. Though no longer preserved, records of the political, military, and, above all, economic administration of temple and court—in other words, everyday affairs—would have had pride of place. The annalistic notices in the books of Kings represent a meager vestige of this once immense material. Other examples of vestigial material include the following: festival calendars and sacrificial rituals, which entered into the law; temple songs, such as "Canaanite" hymns or individual complaint and thanksgiving formulae, which the Psalter retained; ancient wisdom sayings, which still await precise literary distinction from later revision and addition; Israelite or Judahite prophecy, cached in the prophetic books of the Hebrew Bible but corresponding phenomenologically more to the narrative portraits in the books of Samuel–Kings, especially that of the "false prophet."[12]

Like priests and prophets, the judges also operated in small villages (as part of the city-gate justice system) as well as the capital (at temple and court alike). Legal codification, of which Exod. 21–2 offers only a humble selection, may have stemmed from courtly education procedures, similar to the codification of wisdom sayings, whereas sacrificial rituals, hymns, and prayers would have had their natural setting at the temple. Alongside this inventory of ancient tradition, the old narratives seem rather inconsistent. Such neglect should occasion no surprise, however, since only a limited circle of elites could read and write in the first place. If they did not issue from the spheres of court and

---

[11] See Part A *History* IV. [12] For examples, see I 4.

temple, the narratives likely emerged from the groups that they describe—an oral tradition falling into hands that turned it into literature.

A certain naïveté characterizes the pre-exilic traditions, which presuppose contemporary circumstance with respect to economy and society as well as religion and politics but do not (yet) address them in any explicit manner. Theological or social utopias like the exodus creed or the conception of a lone, single deity—especially one who brings together a people and delimits Israel from all other nations—remain far from the older narratives' view. Instead, they reflect a life concerned with ethnic and social relations confined to more specific regions. Though deployed, when necessary, against foreign enemies, any kind of national consciousness remains otherwise unexpounded in any systematic fashion. As confirmed in onomastics present in both biblical literature and epigraphical sources, Yhwh is a dynastic deity and personal god, waging wars and aiding those who serve him, the latter either alone or—according to inscriptions—together with "his Asherah." In hymns and prayers specifically, he bears the traits of El and Baal alike, the principal deities of the West Semitic pantheon, and reigns as king of the gods and lord of the earth, triumphing over the sea, giving forth the rain, and delivering humans from death. Human intrigues and superhuman miracles dominate these narratives. Legal propositions, wisdom sayings, and prophetic oracles appeal not to external authorities, be it to god or to king, but legitimize themselves on their own.

Although the ancient tradition may seem profane to us today, it is, in fact, thoroughly religious in nature, its religiosity and piety implicitly expressed and reflected indirectly. So long as the king provided peace both inward and outward, the sapiential teachers educated the elite, the priests, the prophets, and the judges performed their duties, the harvest continued to suffice, and the living conditions among families, tribes, and villages could develop beneath the unifying force of the monarchy and that of their own regulations and customs, then no catalyst arose to spark serious meditation on the identity of Israel, Judah, or Yhwh. Israel and Judah were the people of Yhwh just as Moab was the people of Chemosh; Yhwh was the god of Israel and the god of Judah in the same way as Chemosh was the god of Moab.

3. THE END OF ISRAEL

The situation changed when Tiglath-Pileser III, the king of Assyria, walked onto the stage of history at the end of the eighth century BCE. He annexed the Aramean city states to the Assyrian imperium, one by one and north to south, and continued on to the territorial state of Israel.[13] One of his successors,

---

[13] See Part A *History* II 3–4.

Sennacherib, marched to the gate of Jerusalem, but the military campaign languished for unknown reasons around 700 BCE. After the final subjugation of Samaria, the capital, in 722 BCE and its subsequent integration into the Assyrian system of provinces, Israel—the kingdom in northern Palestine—no longer existed. Until 701 BCE, the people of Judah and Jerusalem undoubtedly feared the same fate. Fortunately for them, however, only existential threat and territorial reduction to the capital, Jerusalem, and its immediate vicinity finally befell the region. Except for those deported, from this point forward the Israelites lived either in their previous territory, now the Assyrian province of Samaria, or as immigrants in the kingdom of Judah, be it within Benjamin's earlier and once contested borders or in the capital of Jerusalem, which began to expand westward. A considerable number of Israelites almost certainly must have fled to Egypt, too. There, a Jewish diaspora grew in the course of time, although evidence for this community appears only much later in time.

What, exactly, became of the Arameans in Syria subsequent to the Assyrian invasion remains shrouded in mystery. Launched much earlier than those against Israel and Judah, these campaigns always concentrated on individual city states, while other political actors—like Zakkur of Hamath or the kings of Sam'al/Yadiya—squeezed profit from the Assyrian presence by pledging themselves as loyal vassals for a time. In this way, the end of sovereignty for one did not ineluctably mean the immediate end of another. Under Assyrian hegemony, whether with or without a local king, the usual course ensued. Though he took a beating here and there, the patron god Baal or Hadad also survived the Assyrian invasion, both in the Aramean capitals still beneath his rule and in contractual coalitions with the gods of the Assyrian empire.

At the end of the eighth century BCE, Israel and Judah would have followed essentially the same course as their neighbors. The prophets of Yhwh in Israel probably saw destruction coming and then began their bewailing, while the prophets in Judah, in the name of Yhwh no less, desired this destruction for Aram and Israel alike, who had conspired against Assyria and Judah. Yet once this demise happened, northern calamity meant danger for the south. Accordingly, Judah probably came to terms with Assyrian rule as soon as possible, which persisted until Assyria's own downfall and the ensuing campaigns of Babylon at the end of the seventh century BCE.

Yet other reactions also rose at the fall of the northern kingdom. They involved the relationship of Israel and Judah, which had the same deity as their patron god, Yhwh. Indeed, in the pre-exilic period, Yhwh and other deities manifested themselves in any number of guises, whether Yhwh of Samaria or Yhwh of Teman and probably Yhwh of Judah/Jerusalem as well. Israelites and Judahites would have waged wars and formed coalitions all beneath the banner of his name. With the downfall of the northern kingdom, however, the same enemy—i.e., the Assyrians—defeated the same god in Israel but did

not conquer him in Judah. Though not an impossibility, this constellation proved incomprehensible for some, which created the need for a reconsideration of Yhwh's relationship to Israel. For the nascent prophetic tradition (Isaiah, Hosea, Amos), Yhwh himself bears responsibility for the liquidation of his kingdom and his people, and this assertion then triggered the search for explanation in Israel's own behavior. From the prophetic premonition of catastrophe came the announcement of retribution, a total judgment Yhwh would execute. From the lament over tumultuous circumstance came the denunciation and exposition of a judgment already effected in Israel but still impending for Judah. Owing to the deep impression left by Israel's demise and the prospect of Assyria's imminent southward expansion, the conception of Yhwh's singleness and the people's oneness first emerged, at least explicitly, in the prophetic tradition and thereby overcame the historical and political opposition of Israel to Judah and vice versa.

Proclaimed by the prophets in the name of Yhwh himself, absolute judgment fell upon Israel so the God of Israel could, in fact, survive. The situation seemed different to those Israelites who had survived the catastrophe and resided thereafter in either the former territory of Israel (now the Assyrian province of Samaria) or the diminished realm of Judah—Yhwh continuing to receive veneration in both. They were forced to find a future for Yhwh and his people beyond the existence of a monarchy. Revealed by the prophets and then projected onto both kingdoms' pre-history, that future was found in the unity of Yhwh and the unity of his people. Three narrative works bear witness to this perspective, which provided hope not only for the future but also for the present. Likely formed in the course of the seventh century BCE, each affords a legend of Israel's origins that also clarifies its relationship to Judah: the legend of the kingdom's beginnings and those of the Davidic dynasty (1 Sam. 1–1 Kgs. 2), the pre-priestly primeval and patriarchal narrative (Gen. 2–35), and the exodus–conquest narrative (Exod. 2–Josh. 12).[14]

From the legend of origins for the Saulide house in 1 Sam. 1–14 and the succession story for the Davidic house in 2 Sam. 11–1 Kgs. 2—both bound together by the rivet of 1 Sam. 14:52 and the interlude of 1 Sam. 16–2 Sam. 5 (8–10)—proceeds an entire narrative for the monarchy's very beginnings, the Davidic house (the southern kingdom of Judah) becoming the legitimate heir to that of Saul (the northern kingdom of Israel) as a result. Although this account champions a Judahite standpoint, it betrays a conscious, even agonizing effort to dispel any doubt of legitimacy and authority for the Davidic dynasty with respect to Israel. Israel and Judah now constitute a unity.

The unity of the people from Israel and Judah also occupies the center of the primeval and patriarchal narrative in Gen. 2–35. Comprised of the southern

---

[14] See II 2. For a detailed analysis, see Kratz (2000*b*); for a possible textual basis, see ibid., 320–1 (ET 2005, 323 with n. 20–2).

Palestinian Isaac–Jacob tradition in Gen. 26–7 and the northern Palestinian Jacob–Laban tradition in Gen. 29–31 (29:16–32:2a), the narrative turns Jacob into the progenitor of Israel and the father of Judah. The genesis of Syro-Palestinian city states, all vassals of Assyria, thus comes in the form of family history. The redactional concept places at center the patron god Yhwh and his blessings for and through the patriarchs on behalf of all clans on the earth (Gen. 12:1–3). In this sense, a "Yahwistic" primeval and patriarchal narrative would serve as an appropriate designation. The account exhibits a conception of restoration. More specifically, it replaces the monarchy with a realm of experience and a manner of life conventional for the family and its religious customs (from which the material originated in the first place) and substitutes the numerous personal gods and national deities—i.e., those of Aram, Moab, Ammon, Edom, and Philistia—for the single patron deity of Judah venerated on any number of holy sites throughout Israel and Judah, namely Yhwh.

Different from the narrative of monarchic foundations in 1 Sam. 1–1 Kgs. 2 and that of the primeval and patriarchal age in Gen. 2–35, the narrative of exodus and conquest in Exod. 2–Josh. 12 represents an Israelite and, in fact, a rather exclusive point of view. In this account, the old antagonism between Israel and Judah around the time of 722 BCE lives on in the conditions of the seventh century BCE. Accordingly, the redactional plan emphasizes the particularity of Israel over and against Judah as well as all other neighboring states. Only after 587 BCE was the exodus credo extended to include Judah as well.

Revision of the old legal collection (the *mishpatim* of Exod. 21–22) and its subsequent integration into the exodus–conquest narrative of Exodus–Joshua helped push in this direction.[15] Adding cultic and social stipulations, the revision transformed ancient law into divine speech, impressing the stamp of law on Israel's origins by embedding a collection of legal regulations in the context of exodus and conquest. In this way, the Covenant Code (Exod. 20–3) became a charter for the chosen people of Yhwh.

Responding to the collapse of the Israelite monarchy in 722 BCE, all three narrative works consolidate the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah into a single unity beyond the confines of statehood and grant a new identity explicitly justified and divinely legitimated to this new unity of the people "Israel." Even so, they proceed according to the basis of a pre-exilic, Israelite–Judahite Yhwh religion. The exodus–conquest narrative distances itself most from this foundation by condensing the experiences of roving semi-nomads and outlaws (called Hapiru in ancient Near Eastern sources) into the origins of the people of Israel with a high level of theological reflection. Whereas the monarchy's foundation legend in 1 Sam. 1–2 Kgs. 2 as well as the primeval and patriarchal narrative of Genesis both sanction the *status quo* of their time,

---

[15] See II 3. For a possible textual basis, see Kratz (2000*b*), 322 n. 23 (ET 2005, 323–4 n. 23).

the exodus–conquest narrative envisions an alternative insofar as the people of Israel come from the no man's land that is the wilderness. In addition, the Egyptian motif of the horse and rider almost certainly found strong resonance over the course of the seventh century BCE (cf. Exod. 15:21), which would have correlated with the decrease in Assyrian influence and the (temporary) increase in Egyptian supremacy throughout Palestine at the time (cf. 2 Kgs. 23:29–30).

4. THE END OF JUDAH

With the rise of the Neo-Babylonian empire under Nebuchadnezzar II came Judah's deprivation of its kingdom, its temple, and its center in Jerusalem between 597 and 587 BCE.[16] Yet again, the prophets in general and Jeremiah in particular forecast doom and intoned lament. Once more, survival of the patron deity, Yhwh, as well as his devotees—some deported to Babylon, others left in the land—hung precariously in the balance. Like their Transjordanian neighbors, Judah and the Judahites probably would have sunk into insignificance or vanished into oblivion altogether had the prophets and the three narrative works not prepared the way for an alternative, between 722 and 597/587 BCE, by opening the prospect of an existence for Yhwh and his people—Israel and Judah alike—beyond the existence of a state. After 587 BCE, however, the authors of the prophetic books followed their forerunners and once again pronounced the people guilty and their god, Yhwh, guiltless: the judgment that once fell upon Israel now befell Judah as well. Moreover, with the primeval and patriarchal narrative (Gen. 2–35), the exodus–conquest narrative (Exod. 2–Josh. 12), and the monarchic foundation legend (1 Sam. 1–1 Kgs. 2) all serving as a model, deprivation of the state and cultic center found compensation in Judah's fusion into the stateless people of Yhwh, Israel.

Through only a few modifications, the primeval and patriarchal narrative could have undergone reapplication, yet it fell into the background—probably on account of its many altars—until Deutero-Isaiah and the Priestly Writing rediscovered the significance of the patriarchs. Living among the Arameans, Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, and Philistines (or at least what remained of them) since 587 BCE, precisely as the Israelites had done in former times, the Judahites had to rely solely on themselves, on various family associations, and on the patron god, Yhwh, though now in the form of a personal deity. In consequence, they appear in the Yahwistic family of nations. Abraham, the ancestor domiciled in Judah, then became an identity figure. Eventually, the

---

[16] See Part A *History* II 4.

Judahites began to recognize that devotees of Yhwh and descendants of Israelites and Judahites also lived outside Syria–Palestine. The circles responsible for the traditions in Gen. 2–35 first envisioned the Egyptian, not Babylonian, diaspora and supplemented the patriarchal narrative accordingly, that is, by adding Gen. 37–45: Jacob–Israel lives on not only in Judah but also in Joseph, who was sold to Egypt.[17]

As demonstrated by its long afterlife, the Israelite exodus credo was adopted and then applied to Judah. Such Judaization began with the incorporation of Deuteronomy (itself a reformulation of the Covenant Code) into the exodus–conquest narrative of Exodus–Joshua.[18] This integration into the specific literary context was realized through the historicization of Deuteronomy, accomplished by presenting Moses as the speaker (Deut. 5:1a + "Hear, O Israel" in 6:4–6 + 12:13ff). This maneuver hence inserts the speech of Moses between the arrival at Shittim (Num. 25:1a) and Moses's death, along with the subsequent departure from Shittim under the command of Joshua (Deut. 34:1a, 5–6; Josh. 2:1; 3:1, with Josh. 1:1–2 perhaps serving as a transition). In contrast to the primeval and patriarchal narrative as well as the altar law (Exod. 20:24), on the one hand, and as a compensation for that lost center of gravity in the kingdom and temple in Jerusalem, on the other, the unity of the people "Israel" (consisting of Israel and Judah together) is not only completed but also complemented by unity of the cultic place (Deut. 12) and the unity of the god Yhwh (Deut. 6:4–6; 26:16). As a result, the book of Deuteronomy permits Moses to proclaim to the people on the plains of Moab the law that he had received on the holy mountain (i.e., the Covenant Code of Exod. 20–3) and yet avails itself of the opportunity to introduce its specific concern: viz. centralization of the cult practiced by "Israel" at the chosen cultic place, whose name the text quite prudently omits.

A number of authors (who also acted as redactors) proceeded from the deuteronomic demand for cultic centralization and from the book of Deuteronomy more generally. Given this dependency on Deuteronomy, scholars call them Deuteronomists.[19] Writing around 560 BCE, the first Deuteronomist expanded the foundation legend of a single Israelite–Judahite kingdom in 1 Sam. 1–1 Kgs. 2 by inserting the history of Israelite and Judahite kings in the form of a "synchronistic chronicle" (1–2 Kings).[20] With the kingdom's original unity as a backdrop (1–2 Samuel), this composition interprets the existence of two separate states, which persisted until 722 BCE, as a transgression of cultic

---

[17] For a possible textual basis, see Kratz (2000*b*), 324 n. 24 (ET 2005, 324 n. 24); on the Joseph story, see Ede (2014).

[18] See II 3. For a possible textual basis, see Kratz (2000*b*), 324 n. 25 (ET 2005, 324 n. 25).

[19] Although the term "Deuteronomism" (Deuteromist, deuteronomistic, etc.) has a broad meaning and thus finds itself a subject of perpetual debate, I continue to use it for pragmatic reasons, seeing no necessity to abandon or dismiss it altogether; contra Blanco-Wißmann (2008).

[20] For a possible textual basis, see Kratz (2000*b*), 325 n. 26 (ET 2005, 324 n. 26).

centralization. Such rupture in cultic and monarchic unity (labeled the "sin of Jeroboam"), for which the northern kingdom of Israel receives consistent blame and to which the "high places" in the southern kingdom of Judah actually attest, leads Israel and then Judah into ultimate destruction. Whether this first Deuteronomist hoped for the Davidic kingdom's renewal remains likely yet unclear. According to him, Israel and Judah—which Yhwh subjected to judgment on account of "the sin of Jeroboam"—survive through the person of the last Davidic king, who lived in Babylonian exile and found himself amnesty there. For the first time, the Babylonian diaspora manifests itself in the theological tradition.

With time came acceptance. Neither foreign domination by the Babylonians nor that by the Persians later on would give rise to renewal of the Davidic kingdom. As a consequence, the biblical tradition grounded the existence of "Israel" in connection to the deity alone: Yhwh, king of the gods and lord of the earth, became king of Israel and the world together. From the one god came the only god, a god who has chosen Israel as his people and demanded of them an unconditional obedience—not upon a lone chosen place but throughout the entire world, wherever Jews might live. Within the framework of the narrative that extends from Exodus to Joshua, this development finds expression in the Decalogue's insertion into Exod. 20 and, afterwards, Deut. 5.[21] From this point forward, not cultic centralization but the first commandment, i.e., divine exclusivity, would serve as the standard for the people of God, an "Israel" consisting of Israel and Judah alike.

Under this particular premise—that is, the first commandment and the Decalogue—the exodus–conquest narrative in Exodus–Joshua, which recounts the history of Yhwh's chosen people (i.e., Israel) and proceeds according to the law (*sc.* the Torah of Moses), was connected to the literary base text (*Grundschrift*) of the Deuteronomistic History in Samuel–Kings, which chronicles the Israelite–Judahite monarchy that was rejected by Yhwh in the end. Devised for this specific purpose and constructed from a collection of old heroic narratives, the period as narrated in the book of Judges forms a bridge to connect these two literary complexes. The structure itself was built by a later, deuteronomistic redaction in the books of Joshua and Judges.[22] Therefore, the exodus–conquest narrative in Exodus–Joshua (a sort of "Hexateuch," though still without Genesis) grew into an "Enneateuch" (viz. Exodus–Kings). However, this composition (comprising of a collection of individual books) itself underwent a secondary, post-deuteronomistic and in some instances even post-priestly revision over a long period of time.

At more or less the same time, a similar development transpired in other areas of biblical tradition too, as with the Psalms—and especially the

---

[21] See II 3. For possible endings, see Kratz (2000*b*), 326 n. 27 (ET 2005, 324 n. 27); (2012*a*).
[22] For a possible textual basis, see Kratz (2000*b*), 326 n. 28 (ET 2005, 324 n. 28).

Enthronement Psalms (Pss. 93–9)[23]—and the prophecies of salvation, which germinated anew. Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 40–66) serves as a good example of the latter,[24] although in the late salvation prophecies—save for several subsequent attempts at harmonization—the royal people chosen by God (i.e., Jacob–Israel) is not bound to the law but governed by Yhwh directly, king of the world and ruler of nations. Yhwh is the one and only god, and beside him is no other. Not Moses but Israel is his prophet.

This development corresponds more closely to the primeval and patriarchal narrative than the exodus–conquest narrative, though the Psalms and Second Isaiah adopt the latter, too. Here, the exodus credo, which covers the law alongside the history of the people, gains mythical and eschatological characteristics (cf. also Exod. 15). Creation, patriarchs, and exodus all exemplify, to some extent, the presence of eternal salvation, guaranteed by Yhwh since time immemorial and formerly celebrated through the cult. The pre-priestly connection of the primeval and patriarchal narrative (Gen. 2–45), including Joseph, to the exodus–conquest narrative (Exodus–Joshua, expanded through Judges + Samuel–Kings) operates along a similar line. Literarily, this combination manifests itself in the second part of the Joseph story (Gen. 45–50) and the transition to the exodus narrative in Exod. 1.[25] In this context, humanity's creation and patriarchal promises followed by the exodus from Egypt (including Exod. 15) precede the deuteronomistic narrative of collapse. In this way, creation, patriarchs, and exodus constitute specific stages of primordial salvation, that is, before the law erected obstacles so that Israel would fall. In the plot of sacred history, the realization of salvation and the demonstration of iniquity on account of the law succeed one another. Originally, this duality formed two opposing principles—a duality that would continue to govern the history of theology far into the post-exilic period.

5. THE ERA OF THE TWO PROVINCES

In 539 BCE, Cyrus' accession to power in Babylon did not generate the salvation long desired by many. Reconstruction of the Jerusalem temple (presumably between 520 and 515 BCE under Darius I) and construction of the wall (most likely under Artaxerxes I in the second half of the fifth century BCE) comprised the much more substantial historical caesura. Although no authentic tradition or archaeological datum has survived, the chronicles of temple construction in Ezra 5–6 and Nehemiah's memoirs in Neh. 1–6 both

---

[23] See II 4.   [24] Kratz (1991*a*); (2011*a*).
[25] Some scholars deny the possibility of a pre-priestly connection; see p. 97, n. 14, however.

trace back quite closely to the time of these endeavors.[26] According to the biblical evidence, the impetus to rebuild the temple emanated from the people living in Palestine, while Nehemiah, a member of the Babylonian diaspora who served as cupbearer to the Persian king, initiated the erection of the wall around the city. Only with consent from the kings of Persia could these events have happened. The authorities supported such development in the province of Judah for strategic reasons and in accordance with their ideology and practice of domination, a system apparent in Achaemenid royal inscriptions starting with those of Darius I. Opinions doubtless differed on the Persian kings' gracious gifts. If some were satisfied with these measures and saw in them salvation's realization, others eschewed entangling Yhwh entirely in the affairs of Persian politics and thus judged work on wall and temple alike a mere deposit on the salvation promised by God, while still others ignored the efforts altogether, acknowledging their transgressions and awaiting with great tenacity the salvific intervention of Yhwh. These dynamics and other, more radical social changes, which erupted as a consequence of foreign domination during the Persian and Hellenistic periods, caused great and persistent divisions among the people. Theologically, the situation was expressed through opposition of the wicked to the righteous.[27]

Traces of all these convictions arise in the narrative literature of the Hebrew Bible. The author of the Priestly Writing ranks among those who welcomed construction of the second temple but endowed it with special significance in a continued theological program.[28] To what Deutero-Isaiah, several historical psalms, and connection of the primeval and patriarchal narrative to the exodus–conquest narrative already implied the Priestly Writing gave more elaborate form. Creation, patriarchs, and exodus now represent a coherent myth of salvation's fulfillment in history. In a certain sense, the beginning of the sacred history in Genesis–Kings takes on a life of its own. Whereas creation of the world targets at the covenant with Noah, which ensures the world's survival, the patriarchs and the exodus—subsumed under Israel–Jacob's succession of generations (*toledot*)—coalesce in the covenant with Abraham, a covenant that guarantees Israel the presence of Yhwh as their god. The foundation of the holy site on Sinai, where God's presence is experienced and mediated through ritual, replaces the law that had caused the failure of the people (Gen. 1–Exod. 40). Only through a second step was the law integrated into this

---

[26] According to Wright (2004), 340, Nehemiah's original memoir included Neh. 1:1a, 11b; 2:1–6, 11, 15, 16a, 17, 18b; 3:38; 6:15. For the Aramaic chronicles of temple construction in Ezra 5–6, see Kratz (2000*b*), 56ff. (ET 2005, 52ff.); only two (datable) oracles from the prophet Haggai pertaining to temple construction could count as authentic tradition: Hag. 1:1*+1:4, 8; 1:15b/2:1 +2:3, 9b; see Kratz (2004*a*), 79–92; Hallaschka (2011). Both historical events are disputed, however: see Edelman (2005); Finkelstein (2008*b*).

[27] Regarding the theological constellation during the Persian period, see Kratz (1991*b*); (2004*a*), 187–226.

[28] For a possible textual basis, see Kratz (2000*b*), 328 n. 30 (ET 2005, 324 n. 30).

framework (Genesis–Numbers), but the Priestly Writing did not lose its distinctive character in the process.

Almost certainly created as an independent work to stand beside the narrative context of Genesis–Kings, the Priestly Writing was evidently conceptualized as a kind of reading guide for the first part of the sacred history. Presupposing a knowledge of the pre-priestly text in Genesis–Numbers, it projects back onto the time of Israel's origin and foundation, before the conquest, the new beginning that should follow destruction of the kingdom and deprivation of the temple. In this context, "Israel" and the people's relationship to Yhwh have been completely embraced by the "language of faith and confession." Through late deuteronomistic expansions, the same language also enters into the non-priestly presentation of sacred history in Genesis–Kings.

In spite of, or precisely because of, the difference in theological character, the incorporation of the Priestly Writing into the Enneateuch's literary context seemed like an obvious choice. The political situation at that time may have also converged with the more theological or educational motivation. Indeed, the Achaemenids showed a special proclivity for sanctioning culture-specific organizations and legal structures, especially within the realm of temple and cult, by means of select institutions and/or representatives of the central power—a political practice designated "imperial authorization" in scholarly literature.[29] Nevertheless, as far as we know, neither king nor governor decreed the composition of the Pentateuch, which combined the priestly and non-priestly texts. The process of composition brought with it a number of literary expansions. Both theologically and linguistically, these supplements move between the Priestly Writing and Deuteronomism—sometimes more priestly, other times more deuteronomistic. Of course, any precise distinction in these styles proves difficult to determine. Future scholarship must establish appropriate criteria to differentiate pre-deuteronomistic and post-deuteronomistic as well as pre-priestly and post-priestly supplements within these late literary layers of the Pentateuch. Indeed, not everything unambiguously non-deuteronomistic is necessarily pre-deuteronomistic, and not everything late or post-deuteronomistic or non-priestly is automatically pre-priestly.

Dating the Priestly Writing proves supremely precarious and only possible through speculation.[30] While the Priestly Writing may have materialized close

---

[29] See Part C *Archives* II 5.

[30] The exilic/post-exilic dating of P has enjoyed broad consensus ever since Wellhausen's classic formulation. However, it never remained beyond dispute, owing especially to linguistic reasons but also on account of ideological concerns: see Krapf (1992). Concentration less on absolute than relative dating with respect to the non-priestly material could provide a path forward in the debate. Furthermore, a distinction already drawn by Wellhausen might also prove useful in this regard, namely that between older material used primarily in the secondary passages of P (e.g., sacrificial rituals and purity laws) and at times, perhaps, traceable back to the period of the first temple, on the one hand, and the historiographic conceptions of P's base

to the time of the temple's reconstruction (under Darius I, around 500 BCE) or even somewhat later, its integration into the pre-priestly Hexateuch (Genesis–Joshua) as well as the (late deuteronomistic or post-deuteronomistic and post-priestly) supplements to Genesis–Kings dates to the fifth to fourth centuries BCE, in some places even into the Hellenistic era. This process of literary production came to an end with the Pentateuch's partition and subsequent translation into Greek as the Torah of Moses (i.e., Genesis–Deuteronomy). The books of Joshua–Kings (viz. the Former Prophets) conjoined with the prophetic texts (the Latter Prophets), which continued to grow tremendously over the course of the third century BCE, to form the canonical division Nevi'im, or "Prophets."

By that time, the third portion of the canon, i.e., the Ketuvim or "Writings," had already sprouted as well. Its center of gravity lay in the Psalter, which—with only a few exceptions—was completed around 200 BCE and frequently copied at Qumran. The wisdom literature (especially Job, Proverbs, Qoheleth) also took shape gradually over the course of the third and second centuries BCE.[31] Although these texts decry the painful experience of the wicked prospering while the righteous persistently suffer, they nonetheless maintain their faith in a righteous retribution in the end. In light of a God who seems to hide himself and recede further into the distance, intermediaries grow in significance as a kind of compensation, whether fear of God, personified wisdom, or Torah. What wisdom seeks in this world, Daniel and apocalypticism find in the next.[32]

Initiated around the middle of the fourth century BCE, the Chronistic History also moves within this literary and theological mélange. The excerpt of the Judahite royal history from Samuel–Kings begins the base text (*Grundschicht*) of 1–2 Chronicles, a document that describes the pre-history of the future Persian province of Judah with considerable pride.[33] The original excerpt, which at times offers new material peculiar to Chronicles, places substantial emphasis on a history of the kings of Judah that proceeds precisely according to the principle of retribution as the prophets advocate. Each king receives his due in accordance with the law and on the model of both David and Solomon: the pious earns honor and power, the sinner his proper penalty.

Chronicles' consistent Judahite perspective fostered a connection to the foundation legend of the Persian province of Judah in the memoirs of Nehemiah, which had meanwhile seen expansion in the passages on Sanballat and Nehemiah's governorship.[34] The temple construction in Ezra 5–6 served

text (*Grundschrift*), which provides the narrative and theological framework for the systematization and reinterpretation of older material and likely stems from the Second Temple period, on the other.

[31] See II 5.

[32] See Kratz (1991*b*) as well as (2004*a*), 227–44 (English 2001).

[33] For a possible textual basis, see Kratz (2000*b*), 330 n. 32 (ET 2005, 325 n. 32); see also (2004*a*), 157–80.

[34] For the analysis of Nehemiah, see Wright (2004).

as the copula. While the redactional hinge in Ezra 1–4 binds this narrative to Chronicles, the conclusion in Ezra 6:16–18 harmonizes it with the (secondarily appended) culmination of the Nehemiah memoirs in Neh. 12. Wall and temple in the Persian period therefore turned into the "post-exilic" equivalents of empire and temple under David and Solomon, along with the other Judahite kings, for the pre-exilic period.

Even more, this literary connection created the matrix for comprehensive supplements, which inscribed into Chronicles and Ezra–Nehemiah not only the genealogies of the Israelite tribes but also the law and the entire cultic apparatus. This process therefore updates the Chronistic History, which results in a time frame that encompasses the entire period from Adam to Nehemiah or, in terms of literary division, from Genesis to Malachi. Among Chronicles' many notable additions, the "genealogical portal" in 1 Chron. 1–9 and the Davidic foundations of the cultic system in 1 Chron. 22–9 stand out. In Ezra–Nehemiah, the introduction of the figure Ezra in Ezra 7–8 draws the most attention, which resumes in Ezra 9–10 and Neh. 8–10 and stylizes Ezra as the paragon of Torah piety.[35] As priest and scribe alike, Ezra thus becomes the icon of biblical Judaism. Certainly no mere coincidence, the tradition (i.e., Josephus and 4 Ezra 14) conceives of Ezra as the final prophet after Moses, who supposedly completed the canonical scriptures or wrote them by divine dictation. Other traditions, by contrast, elevate not Ezra but Nehemiah, who allegedly rebuilt the temple and altar, returned the altar fire, and founded a library of holy scriptures (2 Macc. 1:19–36 and 2:13–15). Still others count on Moses and Elijah, expecting the latter's return (Mal. 3:22–4; Sir. 48:1–11; Luke 1:17). Although the time of Elijah's return seems to commence in Mark 9:2–8, Jesus Christ enters the scene and stands alongside Moses and Elijah.

6. A VIEW OF THE PARA-BIBLICAL TRADITION

This development required considerable time to unfold, however: two or three hundred years had to pass before Jesus could join the ranks of Moses and Elijah. Indeed, the bulk of Jewish writings from the Hellenistic–Roman epoch arose in that span of time.[36] Even the formation of the biblical tradition lasted

---

[35] For a possible text basis, see Kratz (2000*b*), 330 n. 34–6 (ET 2005, 325 n. 34–6); for the character of Ezra, see Kratz (2008*b*); for further discussion, see Grätz (2004) and (2009); Pakkala (2004).

[36] See III 4; for the following, see also the outlines in Stone (1984); Mulder and Sysling (1988); Maier (1990); Schürer (1973–87), iii; for the Qumran texts, see DJD, DSSP, DSSR, DSSSE; MAIER A and B; QUMRAN 1–2; for the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, see APOT, OTP, AOT, APAT; JSHRZ and JSHRZ.NF; for Philo and Josephus, see the relevant editions cited in the bibliography.

into the Hellenistic period, i.e., into the second century BCE. In addition, the stream of para-biblical tradition began to flow in the pseudepigraphic and apocryphal writings of the Hebrew Bible, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and other literature of Hellenistic Judaism.

With only a few exceptions, like the work of the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria or that of the Jewish historiographer Flavius Josephus, knowledge of this literature's provenance and its composition time frame is approximate, if not entirely obscure. For this reason, a literary history in the proper sense hardly rests within the realm of possibility. Organization of the material by genre, moreover, proves similarly limited in effect, apart from the poetic texts, perhaps. Given these rather precarious prospects, the most productive course seems to be an analysis of the para-biblical literature from the Hellenistic–Roman period according to those spheres of tradition distinguishable within the Hebrew Bible itself. Most of all, this material lends itself to such a procedure since it consistently employs the biblical tradition as its greatest point of reference both theologically and literarily.

6.1 Narrative

A genre best called historiographic in the broadest sense, *narrative literature* experienced a boom during the Hellenistic–Roman period. Three primary means of engaging the *historia sacra* (sacred history) in biblical tradition emerged in the process: reformulation, completion, and continuation or updating. Yet these three kinds of scribal activity already appear in the Hebrew Bible itself as well as in the Septuagint, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and other contemporary Jewish traditions.

As a biblical model for the reformulation of sacred history—designated *rewritten bible* or *rewritten scripture* in the parlance of biblical studies—Chronicles recapitulates history from Adam (Gen. 1–3) to Zedekiah (2 Kgs. 25). Composed anonymously, like Chronicles and other biblical patterns, the para-biblical rewritings cover various periods of the sacred history, although the borders between reproduction and reformulation were rather fluid indeed.[37] Only among the Jewish historiographers and exegetes, whose real names or pseudonyms begin to appear in the third century BCE,[38] and

---

[37] Reworked Pentateuch 4Q158 (DJD 5; Zahn (2011*b*)), 4Q364–7 (DJD 13), which, however, is rather a manuscript of the Pentateuch than rewritten scripture; Genesis Apocryphon 1QapGen (FITZMYER; MACHIELA); Pseudo-Jubilees 4Q225–2277 (DJD 13); Commentary on Genesis A 4Q252 (DJD 22); Jubilees (APOT ii. 1–82; OTP ii. 35–142; AOT 1–140; VANDERKAM; JSHRZ ii. 273–575; DJD 1, 3, 13, 23, and 36); 1 (3) Ezra (OBCA 185–211; APOT i. 1–58; JSHRZ i. 375–425); *LAB* (OTP ii. 297–377; JSHRZ ii. 89–271).

[38] Eupolemos, Theophilos, Philo the Elder, Kleodemos Malchos, Artapanos, Pseudo-Hecataios as well as the exegetes Aristobulus, Demetrius, and Aristeas. See OTP ii. 855–919; JSHRZ i. 89–163; iii. 257–99.

specifically with Josephus Flavius in his *Jewish Antiquities* does the situation change. Here, the author comes into view as he critically examines and discusses his sources,[39] carrying sacred history forward even into his own age on occasion. Dramatic and epic adaptations of biblical narrative material demonstrate a particular type of rewriting as well.[40]

In the Hebrew Bible, completion of sacred history comes in the form of Ruth for the time of the Judges, Dan. 1–6 for the history of the Babylonian diaspora (to fill the gap of Jeremiah's seventy years in 2 Chron. 36/Ezra 1), and Esther for the Persian diaspora under Xerxes. Both here and in the para-biblical examples,[41] such texts attach themselves to specific persons or events in biblical literature. Apart from their own interests, which impact their general presentations in the end, these works seek to elaborate sacred history and—as in the class of reformulation—enhance it with haggadic, legendary material not contained in the "original." Each with its own theological, paraenetic, or didactic concerns, these writings—which actually constitute separate works—virtually insert themselves into biblical history itself.

Continuation, or updating, follows the same pattern. For many para-biblical works, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah provided the biblical model. All instances of such updating attempt to link themselves to sacred history,[42] but rather than limit their view to the time between Adam and Artaxerxes, they draw history up into the present age, that is, the Hellenistic–Roman period.

---

[39] A kind of commentary also occurs in 4Q252.

[40] In their poems, the epicists Philo and Theodotus both refer to Jerusalem and Shechem; the tragedian Ezekiel (*Trag. Ezek.*) draws on Exodus. See OTP ii. 565–82, 782–93, 803–19; JSHRZ iv. 113–33, 135–53, 154–71.

[41] Tobit (OBCA 13–21; APOT i. 174–241; JSHRZ ii. 871–1007; 4Q196–200); Judith (OBCA 21–33; APOT i. 242–67; JSHRZ i. 427–534); additions in the Septuagint both to Daniel (OBCA 120–8; APOT i. 625–64; JSHRZ i. 63–87) and Esther (OBCA 33–44; APOT i. 665–84; JSHRZ i. 15–62); Story of the Three Youths in 1 (3) Ezra 3–4 (OBCA 186–7, 194–7; APOT i. 29–34; JSHRZ i. 397–402); Prayer of Manasseh (APOT i. 612–24; OTP ii. 625–38; JSHRZ iv. 15–27); Apoc. Mos./Life of Adam and Eve (APOT ii. 123–54; OTP ii. 249–96; AOT 141–67 (only chs. 15–30); JSHRZ ii. 736–870); Joseph and Asenath (OTP ii. 143–76; AOT 465–504; JSHRZ ii. 576–735); as well as the Pseudepigrapha, which employ the names of numerous biblical characters (see later in this chapter). The relevant material from Qumran, excluding rewritten biblical texts, appears in DSSR 3 and 6.

[42] 1 Macc. (OBCA 129–60; APOT i. 59–124; JSHRZ i. 287–373); Jason of Cyrene and 2 Macc. (OBCA 161–84; APOT i. 125–54; JSHRZ i. 165–285); 3 Macc. (OBCA 216–17; APOT i. 155–73; OTP ii. 509–30; APAT i. 119–27); Damascus Document CD (DSSP 2 and 3; DJD 18); The Letter of Aristeas (APOT ii. 82–122; OTP ii. 7–34; JSHRZ ii. 35–87); Jewish historians and exegetes (OTP ii. 781–4; 861–918; JSHRZ i; iii, 257–99); Josephus (*B.J.*, *A.J.*, *Vita*); synoptic and apocryphal gospels. To some extent, this reception includes the historical summaries outlined in prayers (Neh. 9; Dan. 9) and apocalypses ("Ten Weeks" Vision; Animal Vision in 1 Enoch; Dan. 7–10, and even the Apocalypse of John).

6.2 Justice and Law

As already shown above, the law—the Torah of Moses—constitutes the very
backbone of sacred (biblical) history. Additional reformulation emanated from
the sphere of tradition associated with *justice* or *law* and extended more or less
continuously the literary development that appeared already in the Hebrew
Bible's legal corpora (namely the Covenant Code, Deuteronomy, the Priestly
Writing, and the Holiness Code). The Temple Scroll from Qumran exemplifies
the endeavor. This work accounts for the biblical fiction, which presents the
book of Deuteronomy as a recapitulation of the divine revelations on Mount
Sinai (Exod. 19–Num. 10) and in the wilderness (Num. 10ff.), but subsequently
delivers to Deuteronomy, as it were, the divine speech Moses himself had
received on the mountain.[43] Of course, the authors of the Temple Scroll do
not squander the opportunity to add new legal material as well.[44] Building on
biblical law and its revelation on Mount Sinai, the Qumran community further
formulates the statutes and standards normative for its own everyday life.[45] In
short, a tradition of interpreting the biblical legislation developed over time,
often called *Halakha*.[46] Traces of this development also appear in the books of
Tobit and Jubilees, fragments of which have survived at Qumran as well.[47]

6.3 Cultic Lyric

On the basis of Torah and sacred history, *cultic lyric* and wisdom saw further
development too, which affected, in turn, the historiographic and legislative
traditions. As a result, poetic prayers increasingly proliferate in works of
historiography.[48] Likewise, apocryphal psalms and at times even entire
collections of psalms appear both inside and outside the psalmic tradition—
these psalms either associating themselves with the names of David and
Solomon in line with the biblical pattern or remaining anonymous without

---

[43] See the editions of YADIN; DSSP 7; QUMRAN 2.

[44] Similarly, the book of Jubilees projects the Mosaic law back onto pre-Mosaic history insofar
as Moses's epiphany at Sinai (Exod. 19–24) bestows the events of Gen. 1–Exod. 15 as dictation.

[45] This development holds especially true for the Rule of the Community (*Serekh ha-Yahad*; QS) and the Damascus Document (CD); for the manuscripts, see DSSP 1–3; see Part C
Archives II 3.

[46] Relevant in this regard is the middle section of the Damascus Document (CD), attested by
fragments from cave 4 and the halakhic letter 4QMMT (4Q394–9); see DSSP 3 and the material
presented in DSSR 1.

[47] On the relationship between biblical law and the rule texts from Qumran, see Kratz
(2013*d*); for further examples in the textual tradition and the hermeneutics behind them, see
Teeter (2014).

[48] Cf. already 1 Chron. 16; Ezra 9; Neh. 9; Dan. 9 and the Prayer of Manasseh; prayers in the
LXX version of Dan. 3, Esther, and Tobit.

ascription of a pseudonym.[49] As with the biblical Psalter, whether the psalmody was designed for liturgical or individual use remains unclear. Such psalms do refer to the cult[50] and bear considerable resemblance to many liturgical and magical texts found at Qumran.[51] However, these two possibilities—liturgical or individual use—are not mutually exclusive. Psalms, like liturgical texts, could undoubtedly serve as private individual prayers, meditations, and, not least, instruction, an employment indicated in the many wisdom characteristics of later hymns and prayers. Deployment as individual prayer also subsists on the imagination of cult and liturgy—on earth as it is in heaven—when in temple, synagogue, or private study and be it collective or individual.

6.4 Wisdom

The *wisdom tradition* had long been in the service of teaching and instruction. In the Hellenistic–Roman period, the same function persisted but generated new forms as well. Probably written around 180 BCE and translated into Greek in approximately 130 BCE, the book of Ben Sira (also called Ecclesiasticus or Wisdom of Sirach) played a pivotal role in this development.[52] Representing himself as the type of scribe described in Sir. 38, Ben Sira also nurtures tremendous sympathy for the priestly temple cult. His work thus combines diverse spheres of biblical tradition, which makes it the starting point for the wisdom tradition's new development. Moreover, Ben Sira is the first "biblical" author to write in his own name. Such open identification may explain why his work failed to enter the biblical canon, which putatively ranges from Moses to Artaxerxes. Yet this exclusion did not derogate from the important impact of his work.

Indeed, the traditional maxims of wisdom live on in the book of Ben Sira. However, the tradition undergoes drastic changes—mainly theologization—with proverbs now understood as instructions for proper devotion to the Torah. Equating Wisdom and Torah—both domiciled in Zion/Jerusalem—Sir. 24 sees in them the key to understanding not only the cosmos but also history. Based on this identification of wisdom with Torah, Ben Sira's teachings on life converge with several other elements: several hymns that praise the creator as well as the good and just world order he himself has instituted, a praise of the "fathers" that recapitulates biblical history from Enoch up to Nehemiah, and a song of praise to the high priest Simon (II) as he presents

---

[49] Apocryphal pieces in 4Q88 = 4QPs^f (DJD 16); 11Q5 = 11QPs^a (DJD 4); Ps. 151 LXX (Hebrew in 11Q5 XXVIII); the five Syriac Psalms (OTP ii. 609–24; JSHRZ iv. 29–47; 11Q5 XVIII; XXIV); the non-canonical Psalms 4Q380 and 4Q381 (DJD 11); Hodayot QH (DJD 40); 1QS X–XI; the Psalms of Solomon (APOT ii. 625–52; OTP ii. 639–70; AOT 649–83; JSHRZ iv. 49–112).

[50] See, e.g., Ps. 145 and David's Compositions in 11Q5 (DJD 4, 37–8, 48).

[51] For this material, see DSSP 4A and DSSR 5.

[52] OBCA 68–111; APOT i. 268–517; Skehan and Di Lella (1987); JSHRZ iii. 481–644.

himself in full vestments to the people at the entrance to the temple. Soft eschatological tones that articulate hope for Israel and for the pious echo here and there as well. Additionally, the theological profile of Ben Sira shows particular overlap with both the Masoretic and the Qumranic version of the Psalter.[53] The book of Qoheleth represents an important dialogic partner, for Ben Sira counters its skeptical and distanced *joie de vivre* with the positive testimony of the biblical tradition.

Sapiential influence in line with Ben Sira conceptually pervades numerous spheres of tradition: in wisdom's didactic narratives,[54] in Qumran's oldest community regulations (Penal Code),[55] and, finally, in apocryphal psalms.[56] Owing to their historical context, some compositions indebted to biblical tradition bring sapiential teachings and Torah piety into conversation with Hellenistic conceptions of the afterlife or more popular Hellenistic philosophy.[57] Many employ Hellenistic pseudonyms and align with Hellenistic gnomic literature.[58] As with Ben Sira, most wisdom texts of this period display a more or less full-fledged eschatology concerning the people of Israel or even the individual. Indeed, individual death was a major concern at the time. Volatile historical circumstance seemed less than entirely advantageous for the fate of Israel and that of the pious, and these conditions fostered cosmological and eschatological speculations that reflect on time and temporality. Forming a bridge between prophetic and apocalyptic tradition, the wisdom texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls attest to this development most of all.[59]

6.5 Prophecy

Although the biblical books of the *prophets* experienced rather little reformulation or rewriting,[60] they did undergo an extraordinary amount of apocryphal and pseudepigraphic completion and updating.[61] In this respect, the prophets'

---

[53] Kratz (2004*a*), 245–79, 280–311; (2004*b*); (2011*b*).

[54] Dan. 1–6, Tobit (OBCA 13–21; APOT i. 174–241, JSHRZ ii. 871–1007), as well as the Testament of Job (OTP i. 829–68; AOT 617–48; JSHRZ iii. 301–87).

[55] Kratz (2011*c*); (2013*d*).

[56] See, e.g., 11Q5 XVIII–XXII (DJD 4).

[57] Wisdom of Solomon (OBCA 45–67; APOT i. 518–68; JSHRZ iii. 389–478); Letter of Aristeas (APOT ii. 82–122; OTP ii. 7–34; JSHRZ ii. 35–87); Aristobulus (OTP ii. 831–42; JSHRZ iii. 261–79); Philo; 4 Macc. (AOT 339–42; APOT ii. 653–85; OTP ii. 531–64; JSHRZ iii. 645–763).

[58] OTP ii. 565–82, 795–807, 821–39; JSHRZ iv, 173–287; Schürer (1973–87), iii. 617ff.

[59] See the material in DSSR 4.

[60] The text of the "New Jerusalem" (DSSR 6, 38–75), based on Ezek. 40–8, may provide the closest parallel.

[61] Apocrypha of Jeremiah (4Q383–4, 385a, 387, 387a, 388a, 389, 390) and Ezekiel (4Q385, 385b, 385c, 386, 388, 391) (DJD 19 and 30); Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242) and Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243–5, 246) (DJD 22); 1 Baruch and Epistle of Jeremiah (OBCA 112–19; APOT i. 559–611;

words and deeds as well as their lives and deaths receive especial attention, the tradition concentrating primarily on the "great" figures of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The Dead Sea Scrolls further attest to commentaries on Isaiah, Daniel, and the Twelve Prophets along with the Psalms of David. These compositions, called *Pesharim*, cite and then interpret the biblical text, whereby the formula *pishro* (meaning "its interpretation is") and other such formulations serve as a copula between text and commentary.[62] Such commentary comes in two distinct forms. Whereas one, presumably older, thematic *pesher* or *midrash* focuses on select passages from a number of different writings, another, ostensibly younger, continuous *pesher* concentrates on specific prophetic books and provides commentary on the work verse by verse or paragraph by paragraph. Thoroughly eschatological in orientation, such commentaries project the word of God as expressed in the books of the prophets onto their own contemporary age, for the interpreters saw their time as the end of days, when God would separate the wheat from the chaff.

6.6 Apocalypticism

Apocalypses of the Hellenistic–Roman period reveal a particular affinity with the prophetic tradition and its eschatological commentary.[63] These apocalyptic texts cannot simply be identified with or added to the prophetic tradition, however; rather, they exhibit a diversity of other influences, from historiographic to legislative, from poetic to liturgical, and above all sapiential tradition. To some extent, the apocalypses present a counterpart to Ben Sira insofar as various strands of biblical tradition converge within them, but apocalyptic texts view and interpret them in a very different light. Such literature frequently employs pseudonyms from different spheres of the biblical tradition: for instance, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Baruch, and Ezra.[64] In

JSHRZ iii. 165–81, 183–92); 4 Baruch (OTP ii. 413–26; AOT 813–33; JSHRZ i. 657–777); additions to Daniel in the LXX (OBCA 120–8; APOT i. 625–64; JSHRZ i. 63–87); *Liv. Pro.* (OTP ii. 379–400; JSHRZ i. 535–658); *Mar. Isa.* (APOT ii. 155–62; OTP ii. 143–76; JSHRZ ii. 15–34). See also the apocalypses of prophets and similar figures: 2 Baruch (APOT ii. 470–526; OTP i. 615–52; AOT 835–96; JSHRZ v. 103–91); 3 Baruch (APOT ii. 527–41; OTP i. 653–80; AOT 897–914; JSHRZ v. 15–44); Apocr. Ezek. (OTP i. 487–96; JSHRZ v. 45–55); Apoc. Zeph. (OTP i. 497–516; AOT 915–26; JSHRZ v. 1141–246; see Schürer (1973–87) iii. 803–4).

[62] See DSSP 6B; DSSR 2.

[63] See OTP; JSHRZ 5 (Sib. Or.; 1 Enoch; 2 Enoch; As. Mos.; 4 Ezra; 2 Baruch; 3 Baruch; Apoc. Ab.; Apoc. El.; Apoc. Ezra; Apoc. Zeph.; Apocr. Ezek.); pseudepigraphic testaments as well as 5–6 Ezra in OTP; JSHRZ 3; testaments, visions, and apocalypses in DSSR 3 and 6 as well as eschatological and apocalyptic texts without a pseudonym, such as the War Scroll *Milhamah* QM, the teaching of the two spirits in 1QS III–IV, 1QSa, etc. in DSSR 1 and 6.

[64] Ancient reports mention other names as well, such as the prophets Ezekiel and Zephaniah, some of whose quotations still survive (see n. 61). See Schürer (1973–87), iii. 787–808.

the form of divine revelation, apocalyptic texts explore these figures to reveal a deeper meaning in not only the biblical tradition, which it cites often and quite heavily, but also the order of the cosmos and the course of history itself, especially at the time of the author. The ultimate aim is the instruction of readers. Providing a contrast to Ben Sira and most other spheres of tradition (historiography, law, psalms, and wisdom), on the one hand, yet proceeding from the same set of assumptions and convictions, on the other, apocalypses imagine the consummation of divine activity in the future instead of the present, and when the contemporary age does come into view, all proceedings happen in the heavenly world.

6.7 Summary

The entire corpus of para-biblical Jewish literature from the Hellenistic–Roman period is quite expansive indeed—more expansive, in fact, than the Hebrew Bible, which provided the foundation for its standards and formulations. Each of these para-biblical writings actually deserves its own thorough analysis, a task unfeasible in this context. Such works bear far greater significance than commonly assumed and therefore merit much more attention than Hebrew Bible scholarship has traditionally granted the corpus. As with the biblical, para-biblical literature must also be juxtaposed with epigraphic material from the Hellenistic–Roman era and explained in the context of an increasingly complex network of heterogeneous political tendencies and diverse religious orientations of ancient Judaism.

Be it Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek, the language in which the texts were initially formulated could serve as a means of classification. While the cultural and sociological significance of Greek, which entered biblical Judaism by way of the Septuagint, already enjoys general acceptance, the distinction between Hebrew and Aramaic compositions has also had a considerable if understudied import in terms of content and sociology, a dynamic ever more clear from the Dead Sea Scrolls.[65] Undoubtedly, the provenance and time frame of each work's own formation and individual components likewise prove important. The Jewish writings from the Hellenistic–Roman period, including those from the Dead Sea, by no means a literary homogeneity, betray multiple signs of literary growth—no less than the biblical books themselves—and thus pose tremendous challenges with regard to textual history especially.

For the dating of this material, the Maccabean revolt in the middle of the second century BCE, on the one hand, and the destruction of the second (in fact, the third, Herodian) temple in 70 CE, on the other, do provide certain

---

[65] Dimant (2014), 185ff., 195ff.

points of orientation as historical landmarks. Yet as with biblical tradition, only approximate statements are possible for the para-biblical literature. With respect to the instigation and driving force of such compositions, inner-Jewish impetus was much more significant than international affairs. Although establishing specific dates and provenances may never become a possibility for this material, a relative chronology is not only possible but also necessary: necessary to combat—here as well as in the biblical tradition—the threat of contorting individual snapshots into an entire historical panorama and distorting the most recent literary layers or compositions into representatives or stereotypes of the whole.[66]

The relationship of para-biblical literature to the biblical writings is complex, to say the least. During the time in question, neither "the Bible" as some fixed canon nor a uniform textual tradition normative for all had yet come into being. Accordingly, the para-biblical literature and the biblical tradition exist on the same level, the former no more or less "biblical" than the latter. The para-biblical literature continues only what began in biblical tradition: the ongoing interpretation and reinterpretation of traditional texts conceptualized as authoritative in the course of literary production.

Yet the texts not only held as authoritative but also subject to perpetual use and interpretation as established points of literary and theological reference were precisely those texts that underwent canonization after the year 70 CE, in Judaism and Christianity alike: the Torah and Prophets led the way, and the Psalter and "other writings" followed close behind.[67] The selection of Torah and Prophets (Former and Latter alike) as a starting point is evident straightaway. These texts in particular display a cohesive framework of the sacred history, in which the law of Moses plays the leading role and to which the prophetic books, arranged by their superscriptions, easily conform. To all appearances, the biblical tradition won its authority not least through its reception and expansion in the para-biblical literature and thus became canonical in due course.

Given the ambiguous relationship between biblical and para-biblical literature, distinguished both by fundamental parity and by unambiguous dependency, scholarship has long had difficulty determining their precise connection. Whereas some emphasize the dependence and therefore view the para-biblical literature as clearly subordinate with respect to authority, others foreground the essential similarity, which can then suggest that either the biblical and para-biblical writings enjoyed the same level of authority or the para-biblical literature was supposed to supersede that very biblical literature upon which it

---

[66] See the landmark contribution by J. Dochhorn in Georges, Albrecht, and Feldmeier (2013).

[67] See the "Praise of the Fathers" in Sir. 44–9 as well as the prologue to the Greek version of Ben Sira (OBCA 73–5, 105–8; APOT i. 316–21, 479–506; Skehan and Di Lella (1987) 262–75, 497–545; JSHRZ iii. 505–6, 614–30); 4QMMT (4Q397 14–21, 10 = 4Q398 14–17, 5); Luke 24:44.

depended. The second assumption can be discarded rather quickly. Both literally and substantially, para-biblical literature always has an eye to biblical tradition, be it as reformulation or even explicit citation: such literature sought not to supplant but rather to confirm its literary point of reference and, ultimately, to set the record straight.

This dichotomy seems wrong to me from the start, however. Since dependence of para-biblical literature on the biblical tradition has its origins in interpretation and explanation, dependency and equality should not be mutually exclusive. The para-biblical literature hopes only to explicate the biblical text's (true) meaning and say nothing more besides, albeit in other words. In this respect, biblical and para-biblical texts are identical for the latter and bear the same authority. The interpretation draws its authority from the biblical original, which gains its authority, in turn, by serving as the object of interpretation.

As variously manifest in the *pesher*-interpretations from Qumran and in the authors and literature of the Hellenistic period (namely Ben Sira, Josephus, Philo), a certain distance was increasingly felt between biblical and para-biblical texts insofar as they differentiate the biblical source and their own formulations. If these phenomena demonstrate a gradual solidification of the "canonical" corpus in terms of authoritative "biblical" writings, they also show an attempt to grant corresponding authority to the interpretation or historiographic evaluation of those very writings. A number of paths led to such legitimation. Whether derived from the biblical texts themselves (Jubilees, Temple Scroll), guaranteed by additional revelation (Dan. 9, 1QpHab VII), contrived through inspired interpretive techniques (Philo), or fashioned through individual approaches to the sources—be they pious (Ben Sira) or critical authors (Josephus)—a subsequent authority did arise in the end.[68]

All these strategies of augmenting authority finally served a single aim: to ensure a harmonization, even identification, of biblical foundation and secondary application. This hermeneutical concern hence connects explicit commentary on biblical texts, which distinguishes text from interpretation, with other literary techniques: the revision and updating (*Fortschreibung*) within the biblical books themselves, the rewriting of biblical texts both inside and outside the Bible, and the creative literary production either styled on or referring to the biblical writings.[69] Despite all diversity in conception and orientation, the biblical and para-biblical literature distinguishes itself through an astounding coherence, even uniformity, of common literary and theological benchmarks as well as an underlying hermeneutical concept. Throughout this literature, scripture and tradition are not mutually exclusive, for here, scripture is considered its own interpreter.

---

[68] See Najman (2003).   [69] See Kratz (2004*a*), 121–80.

Part C

Jewish Archives

I

The Locations of Literature

Throughout the ancient Near East, the locations of literature and literary production were comprised of scribal schools, official court and/or temple archives, private archives, and the libraries of prominent elites.[1] Many scholars have sought to situate the genesis, preservation, and transmission of biblical literature at one of these very sites—be it in Palestine (usually Jerusalem) or the Babylonian and Egyptian diaspora—through support from certain references within the biblical text, on the one hand, or ancient Near Eastern analogies, on the other. Indeed, scholarship has pursued each line of inquiry. While some seek tradents where the biblical tradition positions itself historically (i.e., in the history of Israel from Adam to Nehemiah or, canonically, from Moses to Artaxerxes), others employ historical analogies and thus find tradents in scribal schools, archives, or libraries—all settings quite prevalent throughout the ancient Near East as well as the Mediterranean.[2]

Both explanations identify the biblical literature with the inventory of Israelite and Judahite tradition and conceptualize this tradition as accumulating over time and undergoing oral or written transmission through the work of scribal elites at official institutions. Consequently, the various social structures presupposed in this literature come to be identified with those rather diverse circumstances that shifted and transformed in the course of Israelite and Judahite history. The biblical literature, in this kind of assessment, therefore provides historical and sociological information that explains the biblical literature's emergence and transmission and, even further, classifies it within broader social and historical developments.

Though plausible at first sight, this explanation is not without problems. First, it proves to be largely circular. Moreover, such an explanation ignores precisely how the biblical literature betrays its own particular perceptions and judgments of the very historical and social circumstances that it, in fact, presupposes. Tribes, families, elders, kings, commanders, priests, prophets, judges,

---

[1] See Knauf (1994), 221–37 as well as Part B *Tradition* I.
[2] Carr (2005); Van der Toorn (2007); for a more nuanced portrait, see Sanders (2009); Du Toit (2011).

and scribes along with the various institutions to which they belonged doubtless existed in Israel and Judah just as they did among surrounding peoples in their more immediate vicinity and in the ancient Near East more broadly. Yet the biblical literature's perspective on these institutions, prominent elites, and various other groups comprising the general population cannot simply be identified with the historical circumstances addressed in the biblical literature itself or formulated according to ancient Near Eastern analogies. As with the necessary distinction between historical Israel and biblical Israel, historical portraits and biblical portraits of social and cultural conditions also demand distinction. This premise, then, requires a different means of determining the biblical literature's tradents beyond mere correlation with portrayed historical circumstance or ancient Near Eastern parallels. At the very least, literary—that is, biblical—reports paint a rather different portrait than the epigraphic evidence.

As far as the biblical literature is concerned, its authors and tradents were evidently educated in scribal circles that either enjoyed privileged access to historiographic, legal, sapiential, prophetic, and priestly traditions or even stemmed from one of these milieux. Only speculation, however, could even proceed to answer questions as to whether these circles operated in the administration, temples, or schools of the pre-exilic or post-exilic monarchy and in the homeland or diaspora abroad or whether they emerged from one of these specific institutions and subsequently experienced reorganization and reorientation.

Apart from phenomenological or phraseological parallels, the epigraphic material evinces no direct connection of institutional scribes to the biblical literature proper, at least thus far. Conversely, the biblical literature presupposes the ordinary institutions of both the pre-state and the post-state eras, as documented by ancient Near Eastern analogies and epigraphic finds from Israel and Judah; furthermore, this literature draws on the traditional repertoire of such institutions, refers to their existence, and employs them, on occasion, either directly or indirectly as a means of representation. Nevertheless, on account of very specific theological criteria, the institutions conveyed in biblical literature—mainly in a retrospect on the pre-exilic period, but at times in view of the post-exilic period as well—often receive critical assessment and even fundamental questioning. Such contestation and outright opposition challenges the assumption of literary origination and cultivation amidst these institutions.[3] Considerable uncertainties hence plague any inference from the biblical tradition about its presumed historical circumstances as well as the circles of its tradents.

The reverse procedure—that is, from the archaeological evidence to the biblical literature—may thus provide a more secure foundation. Beneath the

---

[3] Knauf (1994), 234.

title, "Jewish Archives," the pages to follow investigate the localities known either by archaeology or by literary reference as locations of preservation and transmission of non-biblical and biblical texts. Further, the coming chapters pursue the portrait of Israel and Judaism that arises from these very sources. Beyond strict reference to official or private storehouses of sundry business transactions, the term "archive" deployed in this particular context also encompasses libraries and archaeological sites. More precisely, the subject is various "textual deposits."[4] The nature of these materials usually remains uncertain, though—discernible only through the discovery site or statements in epigraphic and literary sources.

Among the many locations requiring closer inspection, two bear special significance: Elephantine and Qumran.[5] While both localities have yielded an exceptional amount of material that grants substantial insight into the greater historical context, each archaeological site demonstrates an exceedingly distinct set of circumstances. On the one hand, apart from a small quantity of practical and instructional texts, certain texts primarily literary in nature and, more specifically, manuscripts of biblical and para-biblical literature, which date paleographically to the third century BCE up to the first century CE, have come from the caves alongside the Dead Sea, near the settlement of Khirbet Qumran. On the other hand, practical texts, economic documents, and contracts along with an entirely different, non-biblical kind of literature have emerged from the archives of the Jewish colony at Elephantine, from around 400 BCE.[6] Since each of these environments has provided a considerable quantity of literary and non-literary as well as biblical and non-biblical Jewish texts, together they serve as the strongest of anchors for any comparison of archaeological sites and textual collections.

For the time between these benchmarks, ancient sources report three distinct locations that stood as centers of biblical tradition: Mount Gerizim, near Shechem in the province of Samaria; the temple of Jerusalem, in the province of Judea; and the city of Alexandria, in Egypt. From the temple on Mount Gerizim comes a group of dedicatory inscriptions, and an important textual witness to the biblical tradition also consorts with the site: the Samaritan Pentateuch, known from indirect transmission and medieval

---

[4] For a broader definition of "archives" and "libraries" as well as "textual deposit," see Du Toit (2011).

[5] Kratz (2010c). In a review of the German version of this book, in RBL 08/2014, the author sees a deficiency in the absence of any chapter on Ugarit, but to the best of my knowledge, Ugarit is neither an Israelite nor a Judean or Jewish archive and dates to the second, not the first, millennium BCE. For the Ugaritic influence on the biblical tradition, see Part B *Tradition*.

[6] In addition to Elephantine, the archives of the Judean colony Al-Yahudu ("city of Judah") in Babylonia from Babylonian and Persian times require attention in this context; on the evidence, see II 2. Furthermore, a Judean settlement in Cyprus, published by Heltzer (1989), should also be mentioned. Here, too, the reformations of Ezra and Nehemiah seem to be entirely unknown.

manuscripts alike. The Hebrew Bible usually finds association with the temple in Jerusalem, a connection advanced by the Hebrew Bible itself as well as the greater part of modern scholarship. While scholars rely on the account of Josiah's reform (2 Kgs. 22–3) for the first temple period, they refer to the books of Ezra and Nehemiah (most of all Ezra 7 and Neh. 8) alongside Chronicles and Daniel for the period of the second temple. Finally, in the Egyptian diaspora, Alexandria has come to symbolize translation of the Pentateuch as well as other biblical writings into Greek, i.e., the Septuagint. Here, too, only indirect tradition—especially the legend in the Letter of Aristeas—along with later manuscripts offer any such attestation. In all three instances (i.e., the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Hebrew Bible, and the Septuagint), the question ultimately arises as to how those statements concerning the biblical tradition that come from Mount Gerizim, Jerusalem, and Alexandria correlate with the evidence that comes from a comparison of Elephantine and Qumran.

II

Between Elephantine and Qumran

1. ELEPHANTINE

In the south of Egypt, alongside Aswan (Syene), lies the Nile island of Elephantine—the Egyptian name, Yeb, also preserved in Aramaic. About a century ago, here and elsewhere in Egypt, archaeological excavations unearthed Aramaic papyri bearing witness to the daily life of a Jewish garrison in the middle of the Persian period, around 400 BCE. These discoveries have yielded not only private and official dispatches, many kinds of contracts, onomastic lists, and various communications written on ostraca but also literary texts. Two cases consist of private archives, which have enabled the reconstruction of two family histories, namely that of Mibtahiah (or her son Yedaniah) and that of Anani. Betraying a rather formal character, another group of texts—most of them of the epistolary genre—stemmed from one or more archives of officials, such as the priest Yedaniah and his colleagues. One such archive, usually called the Yedaniah archive, preserves essential correspondence concerning reconstruction of the temple at Elephantine. Though ambiguous in any more precise provenance and attribution, the numerous other documents were probably formed and deposited in similar private or official archives at Elephantine.[1]

The papyri from Elephantine feature individuals who conventionally spoke Aramaic, not Hebrew, but still bore Hebrew personal names, calling themselves "Jews"—or, more properly, "Judeans"—and also "Arameans" at times.[2] How, exactly, these "Judeans" came to settle at Elephantine persists in some dubiety. If some scholars locate the colony's point of origin in ancient, pre-exilic Israel, others place it in the Judah of the same period, while still others

---

[1] For the texts themselves, see TAD; LOZACHMEUR; ANET 491–2; COS iii. 116–34 (3.46–54); for the following, see the groundbreaking introduction by COWLEY (AP xiii–xxxii); further Porten (1968); Muffs (2003); Joisten Pruschke (2008); Botta (2009); Azzoni (2013); Kottsieper (2013); Schwiderski (2013); Rohrmoser (2014); Granerød, *Dimensions of Yahwism* (forthcoming).

[2] For further discussion, see the important contribution of Knauf (2002); Kratz (2009a; ET 2011); (2013a); Becking (2011), 128–42; on the onomasticon, see Silverman (1969); (1970); (1985).

imagine Israelites and Judahites migrating and settling in Egypt in the course of the eighth to sixth centuries BCE. As yet another possibility, previous inhabitants of the Persian province of Judah may have pledged themselves as soldiers in the service of the Persian empire in the sixth and fifth centuries BCE and thus traveled to Elephantine by order. Regardless of their origins, the population associated themselves with the territory or province of Judah, as indicated in their endonym, or self-designation.

All the more surprising is the form of Judaism evident throughout the Elephantine papyri—a form of Judaism significantly different from the one encountered in the Hebrew Bible and across the para-biblical literature and designated "biblical Judaism" here. The distinction already appears in a single building. Biblical law, the Torah, permits but a single cultic place for Yhwh, namely the temple in Jerusalem (Deut. 12). According to this law, all other sanctuaries inside or outside of Judah are regarded as impure and devoted to other gods, which then warrants their destruction. The Judeans of Elephantine, however, did not bother themselves with this law. They operated a temple that should never have existed according to the Torah. Mentioned in papyri from the Yedaniah archive, this temple has since received corroboration in archaeological exploration.[3]

The Judean quarter at Elephantine shared its southern border with a large sacred district associated with Khnum—the Egyptian ram deity—the so-called "Khnum City," with the broad "Street of the King" running between and separating these two precincts. As specified by statements in the Elephantine papyri, the Jewish temple complex lay precisely here, between the Jewish residential neighborhood and Khnum City, where remnants of the Jewish quarter's southern row of houses have been preserved and excavated. Further archaeological investigations have uncovered wall remains of the temple, which give witness to a lively construction history. Founded in the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, during the sixth century BCE, the temple experienced destruction in the Twenty-seventh Dynasty, during the late fifth century BCE, at the instigation of Khnum priests and then restoration shortly thereafter with the consent of the Persian administration. Disappearing in the fourth century BCE, the temple fell victim to northward expansion of the Khnum temple and underwent complete superstruction in the Hellenistic period.

The exact reason for the destruction of the Judeans' temple, under Darius II around 400 BCE, does not emerge from the sources.[4] No actual evidence suggests a religious conflict between the Judeans and the Egyptians. Instead, the demolition most likely proceeded upon legal grounds. As the excavator, Cornelius von Pilgrim, has conjectured, the enclosure wall of the Jewish

---

[3] Von Pilgrim (1998) and (2003); on the fortification of the city, see von Pilgrim (2013).
[4] Relevant texts include the following: TAD A 4.5; 4.7–8; 4.9; 4.10; see Kottsieper (2002); Kratz (2004*a*), 60–78 (English 2006*c*).

temple extended to the "Street of the King" and therefore came in contact with the proprietary right of the Persian king and the Egyptian priests of Khnum, whose holy place also bordered the road. In addition, one document from the Yedaniah archive mentions Khnum priests harboring enmity against the Judeans of Elephantine ever since a certain man by the name of Hananiah began to sojourn in Egypt.[5] This Hananiah, a Judean ambassador, seems to have obtained from the Persian administration the official status of "Jewish garrison" for the Judeans on the island of Elephantine, whom he calls his "brothers"; this move may have aroused a certain rivalry with the local priests of Khnum.

Whatever the reason, the temple was destroyed. The leading representatives of the Judean colony then turned to the Persian administration in Egypt as well as various other authorities back in Palestine with the goal of procuring permission to reconstruct their temple. Still preserved today, this written correspondence proves exceedingly instructive for the history of religion. In many ways, it evokes the narrative of temple reconstruction in Jerusalem, including the Aramaic documents of Ezra 4–6, though it also displays important divergence.

As in biblical Judaism, the Elephantine correspondence assigns a significant role to foreign domination. Reaffirming resolute loyalty, the letters recall history. To procure the desired approval for reconstruction of the temple, they advance a crucial argument: at no point in time have the Judeans of Elephantine engaged in insurrection against the Persians, and even Cambyses himself did not demolish their temple, which preceded his conquest of Egypt in 520 BCE, although he destroyed many others there.[6] The argument therefore acknowledges foreign rule and then stresses a steadfast loyalty through comparison with the friction—actual or alleged—between the Egyptians and the Persians. As distinguished from biblical Judaism, Persian domination sees no theological usurpation or glorification. Unlike Ezra 1 or Isaiah 45, the explanation avoids any stylization of the king as vassal or confessor of Yhwh as the one and only deity; rather, practical interaction with the Persian authorities secures the political balance.

Such sentiment, or strategy, also proceeds from those passages in the letters that explicitly engage matters of religious practice.[7] Preserved in duplicate, the letter of petition features a salutation that commends to Bagohi—the Persian governor of Judah—providence from the God of Heaven, who should grant him benevolence from the royal dynasty along with a long life.

On the temple's demolition, so the letter continues, the inhabitants of the Judean colony at Elephantine wore mourning and appealed to the God of Heaven through fasting and prayer, which supposedly brought about punishment to all those who engaged in the destruction of the temple. Yet the fasting

[5] TAD A 4.3.   [6] TAD A 4.7–8.   [7] Ibid.

could not end until the temple was rebuilt and the offerings—since suspended—were sacrificed again upon the altar of Yahu (i.e., Yhwh). Accordingly, the petition presents the Persian governor in Judah with the prospect of intercessions and sacrifices in his name as an exchange for his support. His intervention in the temple's reconstruction is thus "a merit before YHW the God of Heaven more than a person who offers him holocaust and sacrifices (whose) worth is as the worth of silver, 1 thousand talents" (TAD A.4.7–8).

Once again, the "God of Heaven" is mentioned, a deity called YHW (Yahu) by the Judeans in Egypt and Palestine alike—YHW being the shortened form of the divine name YHWH—and also recognized by the Persian governor in Judah, regardless of the particular deity with whom the latter may have identified this God of Heaven. Ostensibly, the great national gods were equally commutable, whether the Samarian–Judean deity Yahu (i.e., Yhwh) or the Achaemenid imperial deity Ahuramazda. Similar circumstances elsewhere correspond to the same interchange. While the Achaemenids acted on Marduk's behalf in Babylon, their deity—Ahuramazda—appeared in Egypt through the guise of the sun god Aton-Re.[8]

In the Elephantine petition, the title "God of Heaven" occurs in its original application, in Persian chancery style. Diverging from biblical tradition, God of Heaven here does not designate the god of Israel—who governs all events for the sake of his people, Israel—but rather the higher authority, solicited for the sake of the Persian powers. The wishes for the governor and religious practices move in this direction too. Though also attested in biblical literature, such religious behavior corresponds with general praxis, not particularly derived from the Torah of Moses or other biblical writings. The same principle holds true for the religious values in Jewish proper names.[9]

The petition from the Judeans at Elephantine had its desired effect. In a specific memorandum, the Persian governor of Judah and Samaria endorsed the temple's reconstruction.[10] Even more, and perhaps somewhat surprisingly, no objection from priests or other religious leaders at the temple in Jerusalem has survived, directly or indirectly. In fact, the letters dispatched from the Judeans of Elephantine went completely ignored in Jerusalem. Neither competition with Jerusalem nor the purity and legitimacy of divine veneration among Egyptian sanctuaries seems to have caused any problem at all. Restriction of sacrificial practice to food and incense may, perhaps, be an exception. Though common before the destruction of the temple and announced for the future in the petition, burnt offerings are explicitly excluded in later documents.[11] Whether this limitation derived from the centralization commandment in Deut. 12,

---

[8] See Kratz (1991*b*), 201ff., 212ff.; for further discussion of the phenomenon, see Smith (2010).

[9] Silverman (1985).   [10] TAD A 4.9.

[11] See TAD A 4.7:21, 28; 4.8:17, 25 but cf. TAD A 4.9:9–10; 4.10:10–11.

which prohibits any kind of offering to Yhwh apart from in the chosen cultic place, or whether it stemmed from Persian reservations remains unclear thus far. On the whole, the Judeans of Elephantine lived as Jews among the nations, untouched by biblical Judaism and its holy scriptures.

Other distinctive features of religious life at Elephantine also point in this direction.[12] From the Yedaniah archive, again, comes a cultic communication from the ambassador Hananiah concerning the Feast of Unleavened Bread, a document modern scholarship has designated the "Passover Letter" or "Easter Letter."[13] Its prescriptions diverge, in some respects, from those provided by the Torah.[14] As a matter of fact, Hananiah does not invoke the Torah of Moses but an order from the Persian king, Darius II. Owing to textual fragmentation, the precise relationship between royal order and cultic instruction remains somewhat ambiguous. The message presumably grants authorization to the ambassador himself. Moreover, the text's poor preservation prohibits any further clarification as to whether the community at Elephantine already presupposes the biblical coalescence of Passover and Unleavened Bread, which evokes the migration out of Egypt (Deut. 16). Certain ostraca attest to the Feast of Passover as such, but they offer no additional insight into how the Judean colony observed or understood the religious feast.[15] In contrast to the Feast of Unleavened Bread, Passover here could perhaps (still) designate a festival only within the family.

In addition, other ostraca refer to the Sabbath.[16] However, these documents again evince no clear connection to the strictly biblical command for Sabbath (Exod. 20:8–11; Deut. 5:12–16), which the prophets supposedly demanded (Amos 8:5; Jer. 17:19ff.; Isa. 58:13–14) and Nehemiah reportedly established by force in Judah (Neh. 10:32; 13:15ff.). To the contrary, the ostraca provide no indication such stipulations were even known in Elephantine: individuals schedule various appointments on the Sabbath to pursue their labors and continue with their commerce. Instead of the seventh day of the week—the resting day "for Yhwh"—the Elephantine ostraca may allude to the day of the full moon, the biblical Sabbath's precursor.

More confusing than anything else, however, are the "other gods" revered by the Judean colony at Elephantine.[17] In several contract oaths and, most of all, in a donation list of the Judean garrison, additional deities appear as beneficiaries apart from the god Yahu (i.e., the biblical Yhwh).[18] Their names include Anat-Yahu, Anat-Bethel, Ashim-Bethel, and Herem-Bethel.

---

[12] For further discussion on the topic, see Kratz (2007*b*) as well as the literature cited there (ibid., 82); further Joisten Pruschke (2008); Grabbe (2013*a*); Rohrmoser (2014); Granerød, *Dimensions of Yahwism* (forthcoming).

[13] TAD A 4.1.   [14] Porten (1968), 126; Knauf (2002), 186.

[15] TAD D 7.6:9–10; 7.24:5.

[16] TAD D 7.10:5; 7.12:9; 7.16:2, 7.35:7, perhaps also 7.28:4; 7.48:5; see Doering (1999), 23–42; Becking (2011), 118–27.

[17] On these figures, see Van der Toorn (1986) and (1992); Becking (2003).

[18] TAD C 3.15.

Like the Arameans of neighboring Syene, these deities receive invocation not only in letters addressed to members of the Judean colony at Elephantine but also in vows alongside Yahu and other deities (i.e., Bel, Nabu, Shamash, Nergal, Sati, Khnum).[19]

As the name Anat-Yahu indicates, these deities consisted of native gods, that is, not foreign ones. Consort of the deity Baal in Canaanite mythology, Anat stands beside Yahu here, like Asherah and the biblical Yhwh in Palestinian inscriptions of the ninth to eighth centuries BCE.[20] Bethel—literally translated "House of God"—technically designates a cultic place but eventually came to nominate a deity, especially among the Arameans. Alongside Anat-Bethel, Ashim-Bethel ("Name of Bethel"?) and Herem-Bethel ("Precinct of Bethel"?) likely represent just multiple manifestations of a single deity. These divine names may suggest Aramean and northern Israelite regions, yet such Israelite and Aramean traditions had long been integrated into the Judahite religious system, having reached the Judeans at Elephantine at the very least. Bethel and his various manifestations may or may not have undergone equation with Yahu and his subsidiary, Anat-Yahu—a rather difficult problem to solve. Still, the donation list that catalogs names and different monetary amounts does suggest a plurality of deities and cults—if not temples, as in Syene—rather than simple equation and identification.

Unfortunately, no proper religious texts—such as sacrificial lists, cultic rituals, hymns, prayers, vows, or myths—have survived at Elephantine.[21] As a result, firm statements about concrete cultic operations at the temple or "religious life" more broadly lie outside the realm of possibility, as with the contemporary situation in Jerusalem. Nonetheless, the distinction—if not contradiction—between Judaism at Elephantine and biblical Judaism should by now be rather obvious. Correspondence prevails concerning the relationship to foreign domination. In Elephantine, as in biblical Judaism of the Persian period, the population not only came to terms with but even adapted to the greater political entity. In contrast to biblical Judaism, though, the relationship proves self-evident and requires no theological justification for the Judeans of Elephantine, even in times of conflict (cf. Ezra–Nehemiah and Dan. 1–6). The texts from Elephantine thus lack any reference to the Torah, the Prophets, or other biblical writings. In fact, the extant evidence indicates that religious institutions as well as religious thought and practice among the

---

[19] TAD A 2.1–7. Cf. the form of greeting in TAD A 3.5; 3.7; 4.1; 4.2; 4.4 (as in A 3.9; 3.10, etc.); D 7.21; 7.30; oaths B 2.8; 7.2; 7.3; for comparison, see A 2.1–7.

[20] See Part A *History* IV.

[21] Papyrus Amherst 63, from the fourth century BCE, contains remnants of pre-biblical or non-biblical cultic hymns similar to biblical psalms (esp. Ps. 20) in Aramaic language and Demotic script, which might be associated with the Aramaic-speaking Judean colony of Elephantine. Unfortunately, a proper edition is yet to appear, and linguistic analysis of the text still remains uncertain: see COS i. 309–29; Rösel (2000); Kottsieper (2001).

Judeans of Elephantine conform to what the Law and Prophets of biblical literature categorically prohibit. The Judaism of Elephantine therefore represents a non-biblical Judaism.

Contemporary scholarship often considers the Judean colony at Elephantine an exception that proves the rule. Some contend this religious diversity first emerged in Egypt, where military service brought Jews into close connection with Arameans who venerated the god Bethel (cf. Jer. 48:13) as well as the Queen of Heaven, also attested in pre-exilic Judah (cf. Jer. 7:18; 44:15ff.). Others, by contrast, assert the Judeans of Elephantine preserved and transmitted an older, pre-exilic form of syncretistic Yahwism imported from northern Palestine, where—as the Hebrew Bible contends—Israelite Yhwh-devotion alloyed with elements of Canaanite and Aramean religion. Yet a different explanation seems far more reasonable to me: rather than Elephantine and the Judeans of Egypt, it was the Hebrew Bible and biblical Judaism that were the exception to the rule, even into the Persian period. Accordingly, the situation at Elephantine would typify Judaism of the Persian epoch, a standard manifestation not only in the Israelite–Samarian region but also in Judah itself. Biblical Judaism, then, would stand as one specific faction's ideal. By no means presupposed by all Judeans or Yhwh-devotees during the post-state period, this ideal would have developed slowly and alongside other forms in pre-exilic and post-exilic times, achieving general acceptance only in the Hellenistic–Roman era.

Objections to this interpretation of the evidence might consider the archives of Elephantine, largely documents from daily life, incomparable to the biblical literature in terms of genre, which could then prohibit any broader conclusions on Judaism at the time. However, the conceptions and norms of biblical literature—had they won validity in the first place—would have certainly found reflection in one way or another in the realm of everyday life and therefore in the practical texts of everyday life, especially in the sphere of religion and cultic practice. As already shown above, they reflect no such norms and concepts. Moreover, not only practical but also literary texts have surfaced among the papyri from Elephantine. Though only two in number, these literary texts fully compete with biblical literature in terms of genre and literary quality.

Concerning personal conduct and its compatibility with the demands of biblical literature, common divine veneration provides an unambiguous instance. In Egypt, as in Palestine, Yahu/Yhwh was undoubtedly the highest god, i.e., the "God of Heaven." Nevertheless, the documents from Elephantine clearly show that other divine beings and even deities received veneration alongside Yahu himself. Communication with the deities of other peoples developed easily and informally as well.

A typical case comes from the life of Mibtahiah, the daughter of a Jew from Elephantine sometimes called "the Aramean of Syene." Jewish in origin, the name Mibtahiah means "(my) trust is Yah" and evokes Ps. 40:5 or 71:5. This

"trust in Yhwh," however, could have easily arisen independently of biblical tradition and belonged to the essence of Israelite–Judean religion more generally. Spanning more than three generations, Mibtahiah's family archive indicates she was married more than once: first to a Jew ("Judean") named Yezaniah, whose father-in-law bequeathed him a house as well as his daughter;[22] then to an Egyptian, a builder by the name of Pia, son of Pahi, whom she divorced, whereupon—at the distribution of assets—she swore an oath to the Egyptian goddess Sati;[23] and, finally, to another Egyptian, this time a royal builder called Eshor, son of Seha. Her sons were nonetheless considered Judeans from Elephantine or Arameans of Syene without any interruption.[24] The fate of Mibtahiah suggests fluidity in the boundaries of personal and economic status, and probably those of religion too. Yet by no means did the Judeans at Elephantine abandon their identity or fall prey to what—on the basis of the biblical tradition—is usually called "syncretism"; their Judean (or Jewish) identity was simply different than that portrayed by biblical literature.

Quite obviously, this particular literature was not studied day and night at Elephantine. Rather, other literature enjoyed the pride of place. Two important pieces have survived: the Aramaic version of King Darius I's Bisutun Inscription, a royal inscription with historical contents and propagandistic purposes, and the "Words of Ahiqar," a sapiential work comprising an extensive legend of Ahiqar's wisdom along with a collection of proverbs.[25] The Ahiqar text represents more of a precursor to the kind of material that entered the biblical wisdom literature and saw theological interpretation and revision in that very context. A similar process shaped the book of Tobit, a work of the Greek Old Testament that descended from a Semitic original and found transmission in both Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts at Qumran.[26] Here in Tobit, a Jewish version of the widely dispersed Ahiqar material has endured, in which the sagacious Ahiqar is completely absorbed by biblical Judaism and transformed into a member of the tribe of Naftali.[27]

The exact find-spot for each of these literary works—i.e., the Bisutun Inscription and the "Words of Ahiqar"—remains unknown, but indirect indicators, not least the reception of Ahiqar material within the book of Tobit, do suggest the Judeans at Elephantine read and preserved the works in at least one of their archives. Apparently, the Bisutun Inscription was intended to encourage members of the Judean colony to stay loyal to the Persian king. This loyalty supported their effort to reconstruct the temple, for example, as evidenced by

---

[22] TAD B 2.4–5.   [23] TAD B 2.8.   [24] TAD B 2.6; 2.9; 2.11.

[25] TAD C 1.1 as well as ANET 427–30; APOT ii. 715–84; OTP ii. 479–508; JSHRZ.NF i.2 (Ahiqar); TAD C 2.1 and CII 1.5.1 (Aramaic Bisitun). On Ahiqar, see Kottsieper (1990); (1991); Weigl (2010); on Bisitun, see Granerød (2013); on both pieces in the context of the Judean colony at Elephantine, see Kratz, "*Mille Aḥiqar*" (forthcoming); "Aḥiqar and Bisitun" (forthcoming).

[26] WAGNER; OBCA 13–21; APOT i. 174–241; JSHRZ ii. 871–1007.

[27] Tob. 1:21–2; 2:10; 11:19 (GII 11:18); 14:10; see Küchler (1979), 319–413; Kottsieper (2009).

explicit reference in their correspondence with various state authorities. Thus, the destiny of Ahiqar, who served in the court of the Assyrian king (like Daniel in the Babylonian court or Esther in that of the Persians) and withstood all sorts of intrigue through rather fortunate acts of providence, would have provided suitable material to exemplify the reward of loyalty and—together with sapiential tenets more generally—to warrant steadfast trust in the world's divine order and just guidance. In good wisdom fashion, the recipient of these two writings could and should learn to fear God and king alike (Prov. 24:21). The concept of obeying God alone as well as his word or following the Torah of Moses in all matters was still foreign to this literature.

The situation at Elephantine alone cannot reveal whether such circumstances were exceptional for or representative of Judaism in post-state Palestine and the rest of the diaspora. However, the texts discovered on the island cover the entire spectrum of official and private life and even encompass "aesthetic literature," which demonstrates their recipients were fully integrated into broader social structures and dominant cultural and political circumstances. Such integration of the conditions at Elephantine into the larger cultural and political context of the ancient Near East around 400 BCE suggests a commensurability with or even analogy to the Judaism outside Elephantine rather than an exception to the rule—an assumption based on the biblical literature, especially the testimony of Ezra–Nehemiah.

Indeed, the diversity of intersecting personal relationships substantiates the social inclusion of the archives from Elephantine into contemporary cultural and political circumstance. Alongside political authorities (i.e., king, satrap, governor), the scribes themselves—at times even mentioned by name—feature in the literature with all their assorted spheres of responsibility, as do other types of professions, from military personnel of various ranks through judges (*dyn*) and prefects (*sgn*) to priests (*khn*; *kmr* for Egyptian priests).[28] Involved in almost every undertaking of the Persian imperial and temple administration, scribes in particular served in diplomatic (both foreign and domestic), notarial, and fiscal capacities throughout various levels of the Achaemenid imperial administration. As always, the preservation of knowledge and transmission of literature came with the scribal profession. Depending on rank and division, scribes were well acquainted with different bodies of knowledge, be it traditions priestly, legal, or especially sapiential. The figure of Ahiqar offers a vivid example of the scribe's political and learned assignments. For Judeans at Elephantine, and likely elsewhere too, his character would have embodied scribal duties not only in the literature but also in reality.

Under the leadership of Yedaniah, priests of the god Yahu held responsibility for the Judean colony. In the scholarly literature, the figure Yedaniah—who appears with great frequency throughout official correspondence—has

---

[28] See Kratz (2004*a*), 93–119; "Judean and Samarian Sources" (forthcoming).

become the eponym for the colony's official "archive."[29] In the letters related to reconstruction of the temple, addressees include Sanballat, governor of the province of Samaria, along with his two sons, Delaiah and Shelemiah, as well as Bagohi, governor of Judah, Jehohanan, incumbent high priest in Jerusalem, alongside his priestly colleagues in addition to Ostanes, brother of Anani, and the "nobles of the Judeans" or "nobles of Judah."

The governance structure proves particularly interesting and implies two distinct yet equal ruling groups: the high priest and his colleagues, on the one hand, and a council of high-ranking laity, on the other. Strikingly, the Judeans of Elephantine granted influence and credibility to both provinces, Judah and Samaria, and their respective governing organs for regulation of their affairs. Apparently, the community at Elephantine considered itself bound in particular to its "brothers" in Judah. In consequence, they approached the governor of each province as well as priests and prominent laity in Jerusalem, yet neither, as far as we know, addressed the priests of the temple on Mount Gerizim. The letters do not create the impression of any first-time contact, either. In any case, the Judeans of Elephantine saw no reason to hide themselves or their institutions from the bodies in Jerusalem, for they speak plainly of their customary sacrificial practice, which encompassed burnt as well as food offerings, and experienced neither direct nor indirect (i.e., through the governors of Judah and Samaria) opposition from those back in Jerusalem, save for the issue of burnt offering, perhaps.[30]

Likewise, the mission of the ambassador Hananiah bears witness to close contact between the Judeans of Elephantine and those residing outside Egypt.[31] In a certain sense, he constitutes living proof for the situation at Elephantine being actually representative of many—if not most—portions of contemporary Judaism. Although Hananiah was himself a Judean, coming from Judah or perhaps even the Babylonian diaspora, and should therefore represent biblical Judaism of the post-state period (to follow the usual scholarly explanation), he called the thoroughly unbiblical Judeans of Elephantine his "brothers" without any reservation whatsoever. Two conclusions proceed from this state of affairs. First, the Judaism of Elephantine existed not at the edge of the world but in close contact with its Jewish brothers even outside Egypt, as evident in the correspondence concerning reconstruction of the temple and in the mission of Hananiah. Second, the Jews in the motherland, i.e., Yhwh-devotees in Samaria and Judah, raised no objection at all to their brothers at Elephantine—at least as far as we can see—nor did they distinguish themselves from them in either essence or kind.

---

[29] TAD A 4.1–10; on the correspondence concerning the rebuilding of the temple, see p. 138 n. 4; on the problems relating to a reconstruction of the "archives" of Elephantine, see Kottsieper (2013).

[30] See p. 140–1 with n. 11.

[31] See TAD A 4.1 and 4.3; further Kratz (2009*a*; English 2011).

Comparison with the biblical depiction of the post-state "restoration" confirms that these deductions are quite reasonable indeed. The biblical tradition presupposes for Judah as well the same conditions that prevailed at Elephantine. In this respect, the episode of Neh. 13:15–22, which recounts Nehemiah's imposition of a Sabbath labor prohibition, proves particularly instructive. First of all, the assumed conditions in Judah are a dead ringer for those at Elephantine, with fish and other commodities being traded on the Sabbath. The figure of Nehemiah also speaks volumes, as does Ezra's rigorous dedication to observing the Torah of Moses with regard to intermarriage. As portrayed in the Hebrew Bible, Nehemiah and Ezra provide a foil to Hananiah: whereas he operates as a (religio-)political negotiator and mediator between the Judean colony and the Persian central government, the biblical duo appear on the scene in the name of Yhwh and impose his divine will through support of the Persian king. Originally, however, Nehemiah's task lay solely in building the wall of Jerusalem and hence corresponded quite accurately to the mission of Hananiah, who presumably procured the status "Judean garrison" for the Judean colony at Elephantine. Even during the post-state period (or that of the second temple) biblical Judaism does not, in fact, seem to have been the norm. Only in the course of time would common knowledge recognize the law that any cultic site for Yhwh apart from Jerusalem (or Mount Gerizim) and any "other gods" apart from Yhwh were forbidden in Israel.

2. AL-YAHUDU

The findings from Elephantine around 400 BCE exhibit a striking similarity to the situation of Judeans in the Babylonian exile during the late sixth and fifth centuries BCE. New cuneiform material from three separate archives now provides additional insight into the rural landscape of Mesopotamia at the time. While the footnotes have already referred to this material on various occasions, the first of two volumes publishing the documents in their entirety has now appeared, albeit only after completion of this book's manuscript.[32] Consequently, the initial publication permits a prospect of the material, at least in a short excursus.

---

[32] CUSAS (= C) and BaAr (= B); see already Joannès/Lemaire (1996); (1999); Abraham (2005–6); (2007); (2011); Lambert (2007); further Pearce (2006); (2011); (2014); Wunsch (2013). For further evidence of Judeans in Babylonia, see Beaulieu (2011); Zadok (2014); Waerzeggers (2014); Bloch (2014); Stökl and Waezeggers (2015); for the Murashu archive, see the references in Pearce (2014), 167f. n. 7. I would like to express my gratitude to Cornelia Wunsch for kindly granting me access to the relevant texts from BaAr before their publication and for offering helpful comments on this excursus as well.

In terms of provenance, the texts have come from private collections first acquired on the antiquities market. Thus, it remains unknown where and under which circumstances the texts were discovered. While an early proposal suggested the region of Borsippa, the editors consider, instead, the region east and southeast of Babylon as a greater possibility based on information provided by the texts—"beyond the city of Nippur, delimited to the east by the river Tigris and to the south by the marshlands" (CUSAS p. 7). The editors divide the material into three separate groups or "archives": (1) texts from *ālu ša yāḫūdaia* ("town of the Judeans") or *āl-yāḫūdu* ("Judah Town"), (2) texts from *ālu ša* ᵐ*Našar* ("town of Nashar"), and (3) texts from the archives of *Zababa-šar-uṣur*, named according to their primary protagonist. With respect to the question of dating, the documents encompass the period 572–477 BCE, in other words, the entire epoch of the Babylonian exile and deep into the Persian period under Darius (522–486 BCE) and—strewn throughout groups (2) and (3)—even Xerxes I (486–465 BCE). As with the documents from the Murashu family archive, which stem from the vicinity of Nippur and—with regard to dating—succeed the Al-Yahudu texts, an exceptional number of Hebrew names manifest themselves in the three new archives. In contrast to the Murashu documents, however, the Judeans in this context feature not on the margin, as witnesses, but as real actors in the events documented by the texts themselves. Most of the Hebrew names occur in the texts of group (1), i.e., the archive of Al-Yahudu, a settlement inhabited predominantly by Judeans. There, they lived among other West Semitic populations as well as Babylonians, with whom they shared both commercial and private interactions. Like the Elephantine papyri, the Al-Yahudu documents demonstrate clear consciousness of a distinct, Judean identity, on the one hand, and acculturation in established conditions (here, Babylonian), on the other.

As at Elephantine, too, the texts designate this ethnic group as "Judeans" (*yāḫūdaia*) and thus their settlement as "city of the Judeans" (C 1; B 1) or, for short, "Judah Town." Nowhere in the extant documents does the name "Israel" occur. The group's distinct identity finds clearest expression in its onomastics. Here, the theophoric element "Yhwh" proves to be significant. It appears as *yāḫû-* or *-yāma* in Akkadian, both with and without the determinative for "God," as in Yāḫû-natan (Jonathan) or Natan-Yāma (Nataniah), which both mean "Yhwh has given." Other Judeans did, indeed, have Babylonian names; however, only in special instances can their ethnic identity be determined with any certainty. In one such case, the same person has two separate appellations. The son of Nubâ, a creditor, for example, is called Bel-šar-uṣur (C 2–3) as well as Yāḫû-šar-uṣur (C 4): he is named not only for Bel-Marduk, the chief god of Babylon, but also for Yhwh, the god of the Judeans. In another instance (C 77), two brothers have two different names, whereby the first bears the theophoric element from the Babylonian god (Nabû-aḫ-uṣur), the other that of the Judean god Yhwh (Aqabi-Yāma);

since the father also has a name with Yhwh as the theophoric element, the family was probably Judean. As yet another instance (C 40), one father bears a Babylonian name (Nabû-eṭir) whereas his son may well have a Judean one (Iššûa). Assuming onomastics has some degree of correspondence with religious belief, the Judeans of Al-Yahudu were doubtless Yhwh-devotees who nonetheless paid deference to or perhaps even worshiped the deities of their Babylonian milieu.

Furthermore, the Judeans from Al-Yahudu show absolutely no reserve for or aversion to maintaining social intercourse with inhabitants of the same or neighboring villages who had Babylonian ancestry or belonged to different ethnic groups. Theophoric elements from Babylonian (particularly Nabu and Bel-Marduk) or West Semitic (especially Amurru and Bethel) deities indicate their own identities, in turn. Most bearers of West Semitic names did not reside in Al-Yahudu, with the Judeans, but rather in neighboring settlements, which, together with the strong presence of the deity Bethel, also evokes the situation at Elephantine and Aswan. In fact, an Egyptian population not only with Egyptian names but also with the gentilic "Egyptian" (^{lú}*miṣrāia*) manifests itself in the Babylonian texts, and the Judeans had commercial dealings with them as well (C 27 and 46; see also B 42). The same applies for persons with Persian (C 9) and Arabic (C 31) names. After the Persians seized Babylon, the Babylonians lived beneath foreign domination just as the Judeans and other West Semitic ethnicities had previously. Nevertheless, the Persians altered little in the administrative structures, so the Babylonians comprised the social, economic, and cultural elite.

Contact with the native Babylonians appears in the mixed lists of witnesses, which show Judean and Babylonian names alongside one another, in long-standing commercial dealings with Babylonians (C 6), and, most of all, in the presence of the scribes themselves—mentioned explicitly by name—who composed the documents from Al-Yahudu and nearby settlements. All bearing Babylonian names, the scribes wrote in cuneiform and employed the standard Babylonian formula from commercial documents. Business among Judeans also followed Babylonian law (C 5; B 13). Yet mutual exchange does seem to have occurred among the scribes on a professional level. Unfortunately, the full name of the "alphabetic scribe" has not been preserved, who had West Semitic heritage and operated as a business partner (C 1). In other documents, supplementary inscriptions on the edge of the tablet evince an alphabetic script either written by the Babylonian scribes themselves or later appended by others. Though usually impressed into soft clay, in one particular case the inscription was added in ink once the clay had already dried. The inscription concerns archival notation in Aramaic square script, which correlates the document (*šṭr*) to a name (C 40–2; 53; 71B; 102, perhaps also C 37 and 52; further B 1; J9). All these documents stem from the Persian period (since Darius I). In one record dated to the sixth year of King

Nabonidus (549 BCE), however, the supplementary inscription was (still) written in Paleo-Hebrew script (C 10).

The proceedings documented in these texts reflect the feudal system of rural regions of Babylonia, which operated according to a land-for-service model. Accordingly, the texts provide insight into a multitude of economic activities, especially the distribution and administration of land, the organization of labor, the system of debt and credit, and the traffic of goods (including slaves). The Judeans and members of other ethnicities did not serve merely as serfs but could themselves engage in business affairs. While some became tradesmen able to conduct their dealings regionally and transregionally, others even rose to occupy higher administrative offices. Three such businessmen feature prominently in the three extant archives: the family of the Judean Ahiqam in Al-Yahudu, which traces back four generations; Ahiqar, son of Rimut, in the "city of Nashar," whose own name betrays West Semitic heritage, his wife Babylonian (B J9), and his son Judean, i.e., Yahwistic (B 27); and Zababa-šar-uṣur, the eponym of the third and final archive, whose commercial affairs ranged widely, primarily around the town of Bît Abī-râm but extending even further. Zababa-šar-uṣur represents that class of royal officials beneath which the first two, Ahiqam and Ahiqar, managed their goods at the local level and, with any luck, expanded in the course of time.

Although the land that the Judeans cultivated over many generations, through emphyteusis, was called the "Judean Fields" (C 24–5), it was, in fact, royal property allocated to them and subject to administration by higher royal officials in Babylon (C 14–15; B 12). Within this system, the Judeans had the same rights and duties as Babylonians, who conducted the same business among themselves, with Judeans involved as witnesses on occasion (C 47–51; B 2). To receive the allotments, the Judeans were required to offer military service or civil corvée and, of course, pay taxes. At the local level, the cultivation and administration of plots of land was coordinated by compatriots, like Ahiqam or Ahiqar, which ultimately led to a lucrative line of business. They lent credit for paying taxes and various fees, coordinated and financed partnerships, and also collected yields and delivered them to the next-highest official, who, for his part, was answerable to the provincial governor "Across the River" (C 16–18; see also B 39). Ahiqam probably received this business from his father (C 7–8) and then passed it on to his sons (C 24–7; 45; B 15–16). In the case of Ahiqar, son of Rimut, too, both father and son were involved in business together (B 55 and 57; B 20–2). Indeed, such entrepreneurial activities explain the legal disputes that entangled them on occasion (C 16 and 27; B 11; 27) as well as the contact they had to higher trade positions, which even extended to Babylon (C 44 and 45; B 5). Still, transregional connections were the exception. Life for these Judeans—who operated in and sometimes between the neighboring villages from which

these three archives issued (C 65; 83; 96)—generally proceeded rather insulated from the great centers of Sippar, Babylon, or Nippur, and they remained somewhat isolated from the political turbulence that unfolded in such places during the transition in rule, from Babylonia to Persia, and in king, from Darius (C 74–6; 100 and 49; 59; 86) to Xerxes (C 51).

Unlike Elephantine, Al-Yahudu was no military garrison. Yet the settlers had to provide military service or corvée for the Babylonian or Persian lord (in Elam, for instance) within the framework of the land-for-service model. Some avoided such service through a pecuniary compensation or paid-for replacement, delivered in the form of silver (B 4; J9). Here, too, another line of business developed over time, in which Ahiqam (C 41) and Ahiqar (C 86 and 91) were also particularly active. Judeans from Al-Yahudu were appointed as summoners (*dêkû*) and collectors of pecuniary compensation (C 12 and 83; B J9). This task entailed multiple points of contact between the Judean Yhwh-adherents, the members of other ethnic groups, and the native Babylonians. In fact, one marriage contract from Al-Yahudu (Abraham 2005–6 = B A1) further demonstrates private bonds between the various populations—namely mixed marriage—in addition to any commercial and military dealings. Following Babylonian formulae, the contract invokes, unsurprisingly, the Babylonian deities Marduk, Zarpanitu, and Nabu as witnesses for any breach of contract. The god Nabu also serves as guarantor in a very strange tablet (B 3). Cornelia Wunsch has ingeniously explained this text as a Babylonian scribe's testimony of a bequest made by a Judean father for his daughter and further witnessed by Judeans; the testimony was necessary since the original document was lost. The marriage between Ahiqar, son of Rimut, and Bunnanitu (B J9) may attest to yet another mixed marriage.

In sum, neither the warnings of Moses (Exod. 34) or Joshua (Josh. 23–4; cf. Judg. 2:1–5), those of the book of Deuteronomy (Deut. 7)—which King Josiah reportedly rediscovered and reintroduced in Judah (2 Kgs 22–3)—nor the reformation of Ezra (Ezra 9–10), all of which consider mixed marriage the very root of idolatry, seem to have had an impact on the Judeans of Al-Yahudu in the Babylonian exile. Rather, they aligned much more with the prophet Jeremiah, who—according to tradition—recommended that his compatriots establish themselves in Babylon, build houses, plant gardens, marry off sons and daughters, and pray for the peace of the city of Babylon (Jer. 29:4–7). However, the Judeans in Al-Yahudu remained much longer than "seventy years" (Jer. 29:10–14). Apparently, they did not, in fact, consider their life abhorrent, as Moses had announced (Deut. 29:64–67), nor did they hope day and night for a return to Judah—though a return would have been possible, as evidence from Neirab demonstrates (Eph'al 1978; Stökl and Waerzeggers 2015, 58–93).

Analysis of the documents from Al-Yahudu along with the other archives on their own terms ultimately raises the question as to whether the Judeans in

Babylonian exile even knew the warnings of Moses and the biblical prophets in the first place. Unlike Elephantine, no evidence emerges from Al-Yahudu on religious life, a temple or any other cultic institution, priests, festivals, or domestic cultic practice. Equally absent is any apparent knowledge of literature like the narrative and proverbs of Ahiqar or the Bisutun Inscription, which Elephantine has preserved. This absence does not mean Al-Yahudu and other places of the Babylonian exile had no cult or literature at all; it only indicates nothing more can be said.

In hopes of discerning more of the situation, some have drawn a connection between the Judeans of Al-Yahudu and the prophet Ezekiel, who—according to tradition—sojourned among the exiles in Tel Aviv at the Chebar canal, in the land of the Chaldeans, at the beginning of the Babylonian exile, in 597 BCE, and received his visions and prophecies there (Ezek. 1:1, 3; 3:16). Most commentators locate the Chebar canal in the region of Nippur, that is, in the same region the editors have searched for Al-Yahudu and the other places named in the Babylonian documents. Various records—two texts from the Murashu archive, a document from the Zababa-šar-uṣur archive, and an undated letter from Uruk—mention the Chebar canal and various villages along the canal, thereby offering an ostensible confirmation of the location as well as the Ezekiel connection (Pearce 2014, 171, 179–84). According to this assessment, the Al-Yahudu texts, then, seem to provide the geographical and economic context for Ezekiel's prophecies, whether or not he himself visited Al-Yahudu or not. Since the book named for him does demonstrate a few Akkadian loanwords, some have even concluded that he "enjoyed a degree of familiarity with the Babylonian scribal curriculum and scholarly traditions because of his direct experience with the elementary and intermediate level of cuneiform scribal education" (Pearce 2014, 183).

While such an historical combination is, indeed, quite tempting, it is equally daring and, in the end, indemonstrable. The dated records of the Chebar canal stem from the Persian period, not the Babylonian. Moreover, there is no certainty as to whether these records describe one and the same location or even one and the same canal. Even further, no evidence confirms the historicity of information given by the book of Ezekiel: when, or even whether, Ezekiel resided in Babylonia; whether Tel Aviv along the Chebar canal is identifiable as one of the places mentioned in the Babylonian documents; when the book bearing Ezekiel's name emerged and materialized; or which addresses the book has in mind. Thus, one cannot conclude that the authors of the book of Ezekiel knew the Judeans of Al-Yahudu or, conversely, that the Judeans of Al-Yahudu knew the book of Ezekiel—or any other biblical book for that matter. The same questions apply to the book of Jeremiah, which asserts the prophet conducted his activities until the year 586 BCE and announced the fall of Babylon (Jer. 50–1). More than Ezekiel and Jeremiah, this lack of knowledge appertains to the prophet known as "Deutero-Isaiah"

(Isa. 40–55 or 40–66), whom scholarship has dated to the late Babylonian or early Persian period, as well as other traditions like the Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy–Kings) or the Priestly Writing in the Pentateuch, which some scholars have localized in Babylonia. The biblical books may indeed have the Jewish settlements of the Babylonian exile in mind. However, whether their respective messages were delivered or known there remains uncertain too. The extant primary evidence—more specifically, the authentic documents from the three Babylonian archives (Al-Yahudu, Nashar, and Zababa-šar-uṣur)—does not imply they did.

Had the inhabitants of Al-Yahudu received the various communications of the biblical literature, they would almost certainly have wondered why the biblical tradition did not appeal to their most fundamental identity as Judeans—to which they, like the colonists at Elephantine, held quite firmly—but rather spoke to them as "Israel." Just as, if not more, perplexing would have been the sin ascribed to them so liberally, especially in the book of Ezekiel. The "first year of Cyrus" in Babylon brought an end to those "seventy years" in which, according to Jer. 25 and 29, the Judeans were supposed to establish themselves in Babylonia (2 Chron. 36; Ezra 1). Yet the family of Ahiqam and the other Judeans of Al-Yahudu lived on—and, indeed, continued to do so.

3. QUMRAN

Approximately 200 years separate the papyri from Elephantine (as well as the documents from Al-Yahudu) and the Dead Sea Scrolls, discovered near the settlement of Khirbet Qumran and its vicinity in the middle of the twentieth century and now finally published in full.[33] These manuscripts grant, for the first time, genuine insight into the life and thought of a Jewish community fully dedicated to biblical literature. As a consequence, this community shows that biblical Judaism—not least thanks to Greek translation of the biblical texts—gradually spread in the course of the Hellenistic period and ultimately gained acceptance.

The nigh epic history of the Dead Sea Scrolls' discovery has enjoyed frequent repetition. A shepherd boy putatively searched for a goat that went

---

[33] DJD; DSSP; DSSR; DSSSE; QIMRON; MAIER A and B; QUMRAN 1–2; an overview of all available texts is provided by Tov (2002; DJD 39) and (2010*a*). Valuable, though more popular, introductions include Stegemann (2007; ET 1998) and VanderKam (2010); on particular writings and subjects, see Schiffman, Tov, VanderKam, and Marquis (2000); Brooke and Hempel (2015); on the main writings, see the very useful introductions by Knibb (1987) and in the series "Companion to the Qumran Scrolls" (T&T Clark International); on the history of research, see Collins (2012*b*); Dimant (2012). A solid and comprehensive introduction into the biblical manuscripts is offered by Lange (2009), into the non-biblical writings by Xeravits, Porzig (2015), both of which should be published in English translation.

astray or—here the accounts diverge—enjoyed throwing stones into hidden caves, whereupon he came across stoneware jugs filled with mysterious scrolls. A footrace then ensued between local Beduins and professional archaeologists, which resulted in the discovery of eleven caves at the northwestern edge of the Dead Sea, near the settlement of Khirbet Qumran, between 1947 and 1956. Fragments of Hebrew, Aramaic, and even a few Greek manuscripts, written on either leather or papyrus, materialized here and in Qumran's surroundings, all the way down to Masada. Quite quickly, the significance of these findings was clear. The texts comprised, presumably, the most spectacular trove of Jewish manuscripts discovered in the twentieth century. As determined by paleographic analysis and scientific measurements, these materials were written at the turn of epochs, between ca. 250 BCE and 150 CE, and bear witness to texts that are much older in some cases. Scholarly convention designates each item according to its provenance and either a number or an abbreviated title (e.g., IQIsa[a] for manuscript A of the book of Isaiah from Cave 1 at Qumran; 1Q8=1QIsa[b] for the manuscript B of the book of Isaiah from Cave 1 at Qumran). After the principal denomination then comes numeration of fragments, columns, and lines.

In essence, three classes of texts have emerged from the eleven caves at Qumran and neighboring sites.

One class comprises manuscripts of biblical books, the oldest known thus far.[34] Up until sixty years ago, the text of the Hebrew Bible came only from medieval manuscripts, its greater antiquity attested only indirectly. Confirming these deductions, the Dead Sea Scrolls trace back close to the formation of the Hebrew Bible during the pre-Christian period. Biblical manuscripts have materialized not only in the caves of Qumran but also at other scattered locations.

Fragments of para-biblical writings in their original language constitute a second class of texts discovered in the Dead Sea vicinity.[35] Originally composed in Hebrew or Aramaic, these works otherwise survived only in ancient translation—i.e., second- or third-hand—if previously known at all. Such texts, classified as the Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha, were "not held equal to the Scriptures but are useful and good to read," as the German reformer Martin Luther eloquently wrote. Some of these writings, like Ben Sira and Tobit, appear as addenda to Luther's translation or the King James Version and enjoy canonical status in the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches. Others—such as Jubilees or the books of Enoch—belong to the canonical material of eastern national churches (viz. the Syrian, Ethiopian, and Coptic Churches) and have been transmitted in this way. Still other compositions, e.g., the texts called Apocryphon of Jeremiah, Apocryphon of Ezekiel,

---

[34] Lange (2009); cf. Cross and Talmon (1975); Ulrich (1999); VanderKam (2012).

[35] See Part B *Tradition* IV 6 and the editions in n. 33. The relevant material, excluding the rewritten scripture texts, is collected in DSSR 3 and 6. See Dimant (2014), 153ff.

and Pseudo-Daniel,[36] had vanished into oblivion until their remains materialized nearly sixty years ago among the caves in the Dead Sea area. Significantly, the second class of texts surfaced only in the caves of Qumran and at Masada. Some of them actually stand between the two classes of "biblical" manuscripts, on the one hand, and the "Apocrypha," on the other. They belong to the genre denominated *rewritten bible* or *rewritten scripture*, which provides the "biblical" text—in different variations—with additions, omissions, and reformulations.[37]

The third class of texts found in the Dead Sea area contains the writings of the community reflected in the texts themselves. For the sake of simplicity, I designate the collective according to the provenance of the findings, namely "the Qumran Community," without advancing any further claims concerning the origin or historical localization of the community itself. Prominent examples of the literary class include regulations for organization and communal life—i.e., the Community Rule or Manual of Discipline (*Serekh ha-Yahad*) (QS) along with its complement, the Rule of the Congregation (*Serekh ha-ʿEdah*) (1QSa), and the Damascus Document (QD)—in addition to a collection of prayers called the Thanksgiving Hymns (*Hodayot*) (QH), a description of a holy apocalyptic war hence titled the War Scroll (*Serekh ha-Milhamah*) (QM), and, last but not least, commentaries on the biblical prophets, *Pesharim* (Qp), which receive their appellation from a formula employed in the commentaries themselves, *pishro*, meaning "its interpretation."[38] With the exception of the Damascus Document, which surfaced in medieval copies among the texts discovered in the Cairo Geniza, all these works were unknown until their recent discovery. They, too, were unearthed

---

[36] For the Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q383–4, 385a, 387, 387a, 388a, 389, 390), see DJD 19; for the Pseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385, 385b, 385c, 386, 388, 391), see DJD 30; for the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242) and Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243–5, 246), see DJD 22. Cf. G. Brooke in Flint and VanderKam (1998), i. 271–301.

[37] Significant examples include Reworked Pentateuch 4Q158 (DJD 5) and 4Q364–7 (DJD 13), which is more a "biblical" manuscript than rewritten scripture; Genesis Apocryphon 1QapGen (FITZMYER; MACHIELA); Pseudo-Jubilees 4Q225–7 (DJD 13); Commentary on Genesis A 4Q252 (DJD 22); Jubilees (APOT ii. 1–82; OTP ii. 35–142; AOT 1–140; VANDERKAM; DJD 1, 3, 13, 23, and 36); Temple Scroll (YADIN; DSSP 7; DJD 25). On this material, see Crawford (2008) as well as Zahn (2011*b*) for the Reworked Pentateuch; Segal (2007) for Jubilees; Crawford (2000) and Schiffman (2008) for the Temple Scroll; Bernstein (2013) for the Genesis Apocryphon and other writings; furthermore Dimant and Kratz (2009); (2013); Feldman (2013); Dimant, Feldman, and Goldman (2014). For the fluidity between textual and compositional history in these compositions, see Tov (2008); (2009); (2010*b*); (2012); Ulrich (1999) as well as Schiffman, Tov, VanderKam, and Marquis (2000), 111–34; for further discussion see Dávid and Lange (2010); Dávid, Lange, De Troyer, and Tzoref (2012); on the term and phenomenon of rewritten bible or scripture, see Vermès (1973); Brooke (2002); Segal (2005); Crawford (2008); M. Zahn in Lim and Collins (2010), 323–36; M. Zahn (2011*a*); (2011*b*); (2011*c*); (2012); Bernstein (2013), 39–62; Zsengellér and Gáspár (2014).

[38] For editions of the text, see n. 33; for QS, QD, QM, and Qp, see esp. DSSP, for QH the edition in DJD 40; for an introduction, see Knibb (1987) as well as Metso (2007; QS); Hempel (2000; QD); Duhaime (2006; QM); Lim (2002) and Campbell (2006; Qp and other exegetical texts); Harrington (2006; Purity texts).

only in the caves of Qumran and at Masada and provide essential information about the religious group's life and thought. Beyond the particular Qumranic texts, this community likely bore responsibility for transmitting other texts and depositing them in the caves of the Dead Sea vicinity.

A fourth and final division encompasses economic and administrative texts as well as letters derived from various epochs and written in different languages. Almost exclusively found among neighboring sites of discovery (e.g., Ketef Jericho, Wadi Murabba'at, Nahal Hever, Masada), some texts of this type materialized in the caves of Qumran and the settlement of Khirbet Qumran in the form of ostraca as well.[39] The precise relationship between such practical materials—supposing they even stemmed from the same point in time—and the other three textual classes is elusive and not yet fully analyzed. Indeed, some of these documents related to daily live might have emanated from members of the Qumran community as well.

Who was this community, and whence come the numerous manuscripts of so many different works? Modern scholarship has puzzled over such questions.[40] Some envision a library of the Qumran community, which would have intermittently inhabited the settlement at Khirbet Qumran—a site in immediate proximity to the caves containing the texts—and itself produced and recorded the manuscripts. Others hypothesize an inventory from the Jerusalem temple's library. Owing to multiple copies of one and the same literary work, still other scholars assert such manuscripts were used in different locations throughout the land, perhaps by different groups and only secondarily collected in the caves near the Dead Sea.

Quite certainly, not all the manuscripts arose in Khirbet Qumran itself. Many predate either the settlement's foundation or use by the Qumran community. Moreover, the manuscripts were likely deposited in the caves only secondarily, to conceal them from the advancing Roman army in the first century CE. All other explanations depend on historical questions with respect to the identity of the community reflected in the texts and to possible connections between the manuscripts found in the caves, the community described in the texts, and the archaeological site of Khirbet Qumran. Unfortunately, actual certitude is far less than commonly believed.[41]

Early scholarship identified the Qumran community with one of the religious factions of ancient Judaism known from the Hellenistic–Roman

---

[39] See DJD 2, 104–9, 122–34; DJD 27, 34–7, 65–70; JDS 3, 72–108; TUAT.NF i. 270–8; cf. Lange (2003), 1891–4.

[40] See, e.g., Collins (2010*a*); Dimant (2014); on methodology, see Brooke (2013); on the manuscripts, see Lange (2006); Popović (2012); also the contributions of E. Tov and E. Ulrich in Metso, Najman, and Schuller (2010), 151–72, 209–55.

[41] For the traditional view, see Stegemann (1971); concerning more recent discussion, see Grossman (2002); Metso and Najman (2009); M. Goodman in Lim and Collins (2010), 81–91; Davies (2010); Collins (2010*a*) and (2011); VanderKam (2011); on the archaeological evidence, see Magness (2002).

period. The New Testament attests four such parties: the priestly caste (Sadducees), the scribes and Torah teachers (Pharisees), the insurrectionists revolting against Roman foreign rule (Zealots), and—last but not least—the disciples of Jesus and early Christians, stemming from the movement of John the Baptist. In addition, the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus and other ancient sources mention yet another group: the Essenes.[42] According to ancient sources, the Essenes distinguished themselves through a kind of biblical fundamentalism and concomitant radical, pious lifestyle, which strictly conformed to the precepts of Jewish law, and they displayed other peculiarities.

In terms of lifestyle and ideas, several points of contact between the Dead Sea Scrolls, on the one hand, and reports from ancient historians, on the other, have led scholars to believe the Essenes and the Qumran community were one and the same faction. Pliny the Elder and Dion Chrysostom seemed to support such equation with their reference to an Essenic settlement on the Dead Sea's northwestern coast, thereby suggesting a connection between the caves along with their texts and the settlement of Khirbet Qumran. Yet neither identification with the Essenes nor connection with the settlement can simply be assumed. Already criticized in the early years of Qumran scholarship, both assumptions have now fallen into heated controversy. For this reason, the texts should first be read on their own so that a portrait of the community depicted can appear on its own terms; afterwards—and only afterwards—can this portrait then be compared with and, if appropriate, related to reports from ancient sources concerning the Essenes, on the one hand, and the findings of modern excavators concerning the settlement's archaeology, on the other.

To delineate this profile, the third class of texts—i.e., writings from the Qumran community—demands initial scrutiny. Within their own compositions, the community calls itself *ha-Yahad*, which means nothing more than "the community" in Hebrew. This group broke away from other forms of contemporary Judaism and claimed to represent the one true Israel. Perhaps separated as early as the end of the third or beginning of the second century BCE, the division probably resulted from social and religious dislocations instituted by the Hellenization of Judaism.[43] Through distinction between the just and the wicked, such dislocation already occurs in later texts of the Hebrew Bible itself.[44] The first psalm in the biblical collection formulates this contrast in short and memorable form:

> Happy are those who do not follow the advice of the wicked, or take the path that sinners tread, or sit in the seat of scoffers; but their delight is in the law of the Lord, and on his law they meditate day and night. (Ps. 1:1–2, NRSV)

---

[42] See Part A *History* III 2.   [43] Ibid.

[44] On the relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament), see Kratz (2013c).

Preserved in 1QS V–VII, the oldest version of the Community Rule (*Serekh ha-Yahad*) builds on this passage: accordingly, the "men of the community" establish their own order:

> to convert from all evil and to keep themselves steadfast in all he commanded in compliance with his will. They should keep apart from the congregation of the men of injustice in order to constitute a Community in law (*torah*) and possessions. (1QS V:1–2, DSSSE)

The community, organized in the style of Hellenistic associations, seems to have grown steadily over time and spread itself across numerous localities throughout the land, as suggested by the diverse ordinances in QS and QD. The regulations for communal life underwent multiple adaptations to new conditions as well as greater differentiation.[45] In these particular texts, the community and its offshoots provide themselves with strict ordinances for admission and expulsion, segment themselves hierarchically into leading officials and various other member classes, and prescribe themselves a stringent *modus vivendi* under penalty of sanctions. While they certainly betray temporal and regional differences, in the course of time these regulations continued to draw closer and closer to the biblical ideal—especially as formulated in the book of Numbers—of the people of Israel as a military camp and collective dominated by priests.

This differentiation in directives involved an increasingly sophisticated means of legal interpretation (*Halakha*), both formally and substantially, that oriented itself toward the Hebrew Bible's juridical tradition as expressed in the Torah. A more or less linear path thus led from the oldest legal corpus of the Hebrew Bible, the so-called Covenant Code in Exod. 20–3, through its rewriting in the book of Deuteronomy along with the Holiness Code of Lev. 17–26, to the stipulations in the so-called Penal Code (1QS VI–VII) as well as its own updating (*Fortschreibung*) in the regulations of QS and QD.[46] Perhaps the most impressive example of *Halakha* as developed in this trajectory, an instructional letter composed by an unknown author, addressed to an anonymous recipient, written on behalf of a certain "we"-group, and preserved in several copies, concerns "some precepts of the Torah" (*Miqtsat Maʿaseh ha-Torah*; 4QMMT), i.e., cases of legal interpretation. Most notably, the letter considers questions of purity debated among different schools of thought.[47]

Alongside the study and praxis of Torah, the community at Qumran created its own tradition of prayer. Presumably, it replaced the sacrificial cult of the temple in Jerusalem, from which the community had distanced

---

[45] Cf. the divergent versions of QS and QD in DSSP 1–3; on this topic, see Metso (1997); Hempel (1998); (2013); for a "new paradigm," see Schofield (2009).

[46] Kratz (2011*c*); (2013*d*); Steudel (2012).

[47] DJD 10; see Kampen and Bernstein (1996); further Kratz (2006*b*); Von Weissenberg (2009).

itself both inwardly and outwardly. Represented by multitudinous manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Psalter provided a prominent model. One particular exemplar (11Q5 = 11QPsᵃ), which encompasses approximately the Psalter's final third (Pss. 100–50), reproduces the individual psalms at times in a different order and also contains additional compositions.[48] In the style of the Psalms, the Thanksgiving Hymns (*Hodayot*; QH) comprise a collection of individual hymns and prayers.[49] Consistently commencing with "I thank you, O Lord," or "Praised be you, O Lord," they center on the supplicant's distress and deep despair as well as his deliverance in addition to the insight and enlightenment that befall him.

Not all of the songs are the same, however. Some display greater individuality while others exhibit a more collective character. On the basis of these and other features, scholarship often distinguishes between songs of the "Teacher of Righteousness" and those of the community. Yet the *Hodayot* never mention the teacher explicitly. Rather, the supplicating "I" may only mean the pious "I" in each of its occurrences, an entity with which each member of higher rank in the community could have identified himself. Substantial differences might have originated from the multifarious positions of the members or the various stages of awareness that a member may have attained. Even more, the collection is hardly a unity; rather, it contains songs from different phases of the community's own history: the more speculative and instructional the song, the more recent it seems to be.

The hymns themselves reflect the link of law and prayer. Imparted to him by God, the supplicant's thought targets a proper understanding of Torah and conformity to the Qumran community as distinct from certain "enemies"— those who despise or misinterpret the Torah and persecute the community. Thus, a hymn styled on the *Hodayot* appends one of the community ordinances, which govern life in the collective according to Torah prescriptions. This hymn (1QS X–XI) portrays life in accord with the Torah, on the one hand, and the rules of the community as well as personal prayer and praise of God, on the other, as but two sides of the same coin. In doing so, the text follows a concept already observable in the final version of the biblical Psalter, framed by Ps. 1 (Torah) and Ps. 150 (universal praise of God), and divided— like the Torah—into five "books" through four doxologies (Pss. 41:14; 72:18–19; 89:53; 106:48).[50]

As already outlined above, adherence to the Torah and prayer alike signifies life in the presence of God. This mode of life may have abandoned the daily

---

[48] On manuscripts of the psalms, see Flint (1997); Dahmen (2003); Jain (2014); on 11QPsᵃ (DJD 4), see also Kratz (2011*b*).

[49] DJD 40; on the *Hodayot*, see G. Jeremias (1963); Lohfink (1990); Newsom (2004); Harkins (2012*a*); on hymns and prayers in general, see Nitzan (1994); Falk (1998); Penner, Penner, and Wassen (2012).

[50] Kratz (2004*a*), 280–311.

cult of the Jerusalem temple, but it did not reject the temple and temple cult as such. To the contrary, numerous calendrical and liturgical texts suggest considerable interest in the precise calculation and observation of festal seasons and times of prayer, even if cultic implementation within the community itself persists in some obscurity. The greatest amount of detail concentrates on the angels' veneration of God in heaven, ostensibly as compensation for the real temple cult and perhaps even as a final escape from chaotic reality altogether. Undertaken by divinities, saints, and spirits, a veritable liturgy emerges in the "Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice" (*Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*, abbreviated ShirShabb). Though preserved fragmentarily in several different copies, they render the adoration of the heavenly hosts to their king, the sole and highest god.[51] Similar to the rule texts and legal literature (1QSa), a growing tendency toward isolation of the community appears in the liturgical literature too, the group imagining itself as a saintly collective and preferring communion with the angels in heaven to engagement with their own contemporaries.

The particular reception and acquisition of the biblical portrait of history, as evident in these writings, reveal that the community understood itself, in fact, as the "true" and real Israel. In some passages—especially the introduction to the Damascus Document (CD I–VIII) along with the admission ritual of 1QS I–III, stylized as a feast of covenant renewal—the community sketches its own history into the biblical portrait of God's specific covenant with Israel. Accordingly, the group casts itself on the stage of sacred history.[52] This history not only aims toward, but also continues through, the community itself, in contrast to the second temple's hosts of priests and Levites (Chronicles, Ezra–Nehemiah) or the Maccabees and Hasmoneans (1–2 Maccabees). With this interpretation of history, there is an increasing convergence of community rules and legal interpretation with the biblical tradition.

All three areas of tradition explored thus far—i.e., juridical, liturgical, and historical—along with the gradual alignment of their respective writings with the biblical tradition grant increasing emphasis to the community's purported enemies. The community seems to have fallen into doctrinal controversies and even schism. In the Damascus Document as well as other texts, particularly the commentaries on the Prophets (*Pesharim*), this internal cleavage correlates with a figure whom the sources call the "Teacher of Righteousness" and who supposedly sparked division.[53] The identity of this figure remains unknown today. Most often, scholars suspect a high priest expelled from office sometime

---

[51] See Newsom (1985) as well as the revised edition in DSSP 4B.
[52] See Collins (2012*a*).
[53] G. Jeremias (1963). For recent discussion, see Jokiranta (2006); (2013); Stuckenbruck (2007) and (2010); Brooke (2009) and (2010); Collins (2010*b*), 110–48; García Martínez (2010); M. Grossman in Lim and Collins (2010), 709–22; Fabry (2012); Harkins (2012*b*); O'Brien (2012); Baumgarten (2013). A promising but not yet fully developed approach is the

between Alcimus (died in 159 BCE) and Jonathan the Maccabee (seized office in 152 BCE). The historicity of this person has come into question, however. As a result, other scholars suppose the character was styled on a specific founder or teacher, if not entirely fictitious in the first place. The "Man of Lies" and the "Wicked Priest" both feature as opponents to the Teacher in the relevant texts. Their identities also unknown, they appear only in cipher. According to the "Groningen Hypothesis," these two expressions function as metaphors for any layman or priest in the Hellenistic–Roman period who opposed the Qumran community. The "Teacher of Righteousness" may be a cipher, too, for leading authorities within the community.

Also written in cipher—albeit a simpler one to decipher—the texts describe other groups who have entangled the community in strife.[54] Designated through the biblical names "Ephraim and Manasseh," the (proto-)Pharisees and (proto-)Sadducees figure as principal adversaries, these factions having established themselves at the temple in Jerusalem during the Hasmonean dynasty after the successful Maccabean insurrection against the partisans of Antiochus IV. The internal and external struggles reflected in these texts were probably related to one another and were connected, even further, to the turbulence under Antiochus IV and its social and political consequences. Such strife probably began in the second half of the second century BCE and extended into the first century BCE.

Amidst these internal and external altercations, the books of the Prophets— next to the Torah—also earned a prominent position within the community at Qumran. The community depicted an eschatological conception of itself. In fact, the members of the community believed they lived in the eschaton, "the end of days," when prophetic prognostications would finally be fulfilled and God would judge the wicked and save the righteous. The members would rank among the righteous, of course. To understand their circumstance and even interpret themselves, they studied the biblical and para-biblical (viz. apocryphal and pseudepigraphic) literature and derived their own conceptions there.

As a consequence, literary works arose that either undertook cosmological speculation on the divine ordering of the world in a manner shaped by sapiential thinking or depicted the eschatological battle between good and evil spirits in heaven and on earth. Written into the Community Rule (1QS III–IV), the "doctrine of the two spirits" offers a good example. The text attributes the antithesis of justice and wickedness to two cosmic principles,

---

application of the "Gronigen Hypothesis" to the "Teacher of Righteousness"; for this hypothesis, see García Martínez (1988); (1990); (2011).

[54] Most relevant are the historical retrospectives in CD I–VIII and the allusions in the *Pesharim* on Habakkuk (1QpHab), Nahum (4QpNah), and the Psalms (4QpPs); see the texts in DSSSE and in DSSP 6B; for historical evaluation, see the literature set out on p. 156 n. 41.

the "Spirit of Truth" from the source of light and the "Spirit of Wickedness" from the source of darkness. Moreover, the text states that God himself created these elements at the beginning of time and planted them in the very heart of humanity. Under the guidance of the "Prince of Light" and "Prince of Darkness," this antagonism governs the world, determining even human action. At a fixed time of visitation, however, God will intervene and annihilate darkness and wickedness forever and implement the triumph of light and truth for eternity. The War Scroll (*Serekh ha-Milhamah*; QM), delineates this clash of good and evil and connects it to the community's foes from outside. The core of the text portrays the war as waged by the holy collective of Israel— organized as military camp—against its foes. Later parts of the work have since added the national or patron angels known from the book of Daniel, who convey into heaven the battle raging on earth and ultimately decide its fate.

Alongside cosmological and eschatological speculations, the community began to elaborate sacred history up to the "end of days" and define its own position in this sequence of events. Above and beyond the biblical history as told in the Torah and Former Prophets, the Latter Prophets—i.e., the prophetic books including Daniel and the Psalms of David, the latter considered prophecy—also played a decisive role for the community's self-understanding. The abundant copies of Prophetic books of the Bible, the scattered citations from the prophets, the composition of prophetic apocrypha, and the interpretation of the prophets in thematic *Midrashim* and *Pesharim* all reveal their eminence.[55]

The *Pesharim* represent the earliest known commentaries on the biblical books. Of all these commentaries, the *Pesharim* of Nahum and Habakkuk have benefited from particularly good preservation. Verse by verse or paragraph by paragraph, a prophetic book undergoes citation and interpretation following the formula *pishro 'al*, which means, roughly, "its interpretation refers to." Such explanation relates sayings of the prophets (and psalms) to the community and alludes to its conflicts with enemies internal and external alike—namely apostates, Pharisees, Sadducees, Seleucids, or Romans. Described in biblical metaphors and with biblical citations, contemporary experience thus receives a place in sacred history. Such a history, however, encompasses not only the Qumran community but also the "end of days" and the final judgment, whereby the antagonism of the just and the wicked will be abolished and eliminated for eternity.

Despite their great expectations, the Qumran community did not experience the judgment at the "end of days." Although they refrained from any active engagement in the Jewish revolts of 66–74 and 132–135 CE, they

---

[55] DSSP 6B; see Brooke (1985); (1994); (2006); (2008); Steudel (1994); Kratz (2011*a*), esp. 99–145; (2013*b*); see also De Troyer and Lange (2009); DSD (2012); Frahm (2014) and Gabbay (2014).

nonetheless fell victim to the Roman legion that blanketed the western bank of the Dead Sea and quelled the insurrections. To spare their sacred scriptures from destruction, members of the community concealed their writings among the caves of Qumran and its vicinity. There they lay for nearly 2,000 years, rotting away despite two chance discoveries in antiquity. Only in the middle of the twentieth century did they see the light of day again.

Having surveyed the most significant writings of the Qumran community, we return to questions of history, i.e., the community's connection to the archaeological site of Khirbet Qumran and to the Essenes.[56] As demonstrated by this overview—and further demonstrable by more detailed consideration of individual aspects with respect to its organization, thought, and praxis—points of contact undoubtedly exist between the community's own texts, on the one hand, and the reports of ancient historians concerning the Essenes and the isolated finds of archaeological excavation at the settlement of Khirbet Qumran, on the other. Whether the uncompromising dedication to the law and a correspondingly radical lifestyle, the specific examination procedures and rituals of admission for potential members, the stark dualism, the divine determination, or the interpretation of the prophets and their various revelations applied to contemporary times, characteristic traits of the Qumran community are also present in ancient descriptions of the Essenes. Some kind of historical connection between the two groups, therefore, cannot be denied altogether.

Nevertheless, as evident in this survey of the most important texts, the Qumran community was no erratic bloc but underwent specific developments in the course of time. Thus far, I have consciously avoided any explicit dates and chosen, instead, to provide a relative chronology—however approximate or rough—that comes from a literary analysis of the texts themselves. As a conclusion to this investigation, the Qumran community—in specific, particularly late phases of its history—seems to have been thoroughly identical or otherwise related to the group designated the Essenes. The proximity of the caves to the settlement itself as well as clear archaeological indications, most of all the assessment of ceramics, both create substantial problems for any swift denial of the community—or at least portions of it—having inhabited and utilized the settlement of Khirbet Qumran at one time or another.[57] Furthermore, the community almost certainly had multiple settlements and other sites, each having its own local character and changing over time.

With respect to the texts deposited in the caves, they likely constitute a multifaceted collection from the community's various branches, which spread across peripheries near and far alike. This assumption probably appertains not only to the community's own compositions but also to the manuscripts of biblical and para-biblical literature. Indeed, the Qumran community

---

[56] See n. 41.   [57] Magness (2002).

transmitted the latter literature too. First, they employed it in their own productions, with reception of and reference to the biblical literature attested in all spheres of tradition, from legal and liturgical through historical and sapiential to eschatological and prophetic. Analysis of the history of literature unveils an increase in this activity over time. Second, the biblical manuscripts reflect occasional readings from the Qumran community itself. In the great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaᵃ), for instance, the personal pronoun in Isa. 8:11 undergoes alteration so that instead of the prophet the community is persuaded against "the way of this nation" and set on the right path by God. As for para-biblical literature, the distinction between texts composed inside and those composed outside of Qumran proves often difficult to determine, the boundaries being quite fluid.

Though more information could arise, the current state of affairs suggests the manuscripts of biblical and para-biblical literature were produced, transmitted, and employed in the community of Qumran (in the wider sense) and its vicinity, thereby suggesting a genuine connection between the Qumran group and biblical Judaism. No canon of holy scripture had yet achieved normativity, but the books of the later Hebrew canon doubtless had an authoritative status already, indicated by both citation and commentary. Other books, such as Jubilees and Enoch, accommodated the Qumran community's sentiment and hence enjoyed considerable repute. Still other texts prima facie incommensurate with the thought of the Qumran community—like a *brontologion* (4Q318) and additional divinatory material—found preservation as well, no matter their potential importation from elsewhere or transcription in the community itself. Within the biblical and para-biblical literature, too, much emerges that seems potentially incongruent with the community's conceptions, yet the group received and honored it as well.

In this particular context, linguistic choice carries some significance. Biblical books underwent transmission not only in the Hebrew language but also in Greek translation on occasion. Remains of such translation have materialized in both the Qumran caves and an adjoining riverbed, Naḥal Ḥever.[58] In addition to this discovery, attestation of books from the eventual Greek canon along with other apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature—all in their Hebrew or Aramaic original—reflect a broad spectrum of reception, which implies some interconnection with the Septuagint and the biblical Judaism of Alexandrian provenance in particular. Whether the fragments of Greek and Latin pagan literature discovered in Murabbaʿat and Masada also bear on this correspondence remains ambiguous so far.

The foregoing presentation confirms that biblical Judaism provided a foundation for the community at Qumran, but the two cannot simply be equated.

---

[58] Lange (2009).

Rather, Qumran represents an advanced yet radicalized stage of biblical Judaism. Though almost entirely immaterial to the Jewish (or "Judean") colony on the Nile island of Elephantine around 400 BCE, the Torah and the rest of the biblical and para-biblical literature occupied center stage in the Qumran community. This incongruity accounts, in part, for the relative ease with which archaeological excavation and epigraphic finds can be explained historically in the case of Elephantine and, by contrast, for the difficulty—if not impossibility—in securing any definite connection between the historical character of the community at Qumran and the archaeological evidence uncovered at Khirbet Qumran, which has left much to speculation.

In the case of Elephantine, the epigraphic and literary sources constitute historical documents from the time, despite all ideological and propagandistic tendencies, which themselves necessitate proper consideration too. With respect to the Dead Sea Scrolls, the texts comprise literary sources, almost exclusively so. The latter texts, moreover, seek connection to the biblical tradition and further project contemporary circumstances onto the biblical portrait of history. Substantial challenges therefore plague any detailed historical reconstruction, even when based on the concrete stipulations for communal life at Qumran (which most likely reflect an authentic portrait of the Qumran community's organization), on a document like the Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan (4Q448),[59] or on other scant references to historical persons.[60]

The two archives from Qumran and Elephantine—and to the latter we can now add the archive of Al-Yahudu—thus represent two divergent forms of Judaism: biblical and non-biblical. Somewhere between these two poles moves the biblical tradition itself, which literary sources connect to three other locations of literature: Mount Gerizim in Samaria, Jerusalem in Judah, and Alexandria in Egypt. With respect to the biblical literature, these localities provide only indirect information, but they can potentially shed further light on the relationship of biblical and non-biblical Judaisms and help determine, historically, how one evolved from the other.

4. GERIZIM

"Our ancestors worshiped on this mountain, but you say the place where people must worship is in Jerusalem" (John 4:20, NRSV). The question of the Samaritan woman, in John 4, refers to Mount Gerizim, near Shechem in the

---

[59] The addressee is either Jonathan the Maccabee or Alexander Jannaeus; see Steudel (2006).

[60] Demetrios (III) and Antiochos (IV) in 4Q169 (4QpNah), Schlomzion (Salome Alexandra) and Hyrkanos (II) in 4Q322.

province of Samaria, which maintained a Yhwh sanctuary during the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Though an archive has yet to surface there, a group of dedicatory inscriptions has emerged that seems to refer to this very sanctuary. Moreover, the Samaritan community, which has transmitted the Samaritan Pentateuch as its holy scripture, continues to dwell on Mount Gerizim even to the present day. Unresolved, however, are the time and conditions in which the Pentateuch gained a foothold among the Samaritan Yhwh-devotees on Mount Gerizim and how, exactly, the Samaritan community established itself in the course of history. This inquiry therefore seeks to consider the epigraphic and literary evidence from Mount Gerizim within the wider context of literary finds from the entire region of the former northern kingdom of Israel and later province of Samaria. Although this material usually receives separate treatment, we will evaluate each piece of literary evidence on its own, then relate them to one another, and finally connect them to the biblical tradition more generally. This procedure thus yields cumulative evidence. Concerning the texts themselves, they come in three distinguishable groups: economic and administrative texts from the city of Samaria and Wadi Daliyeh, inscriptions with religious content from Mount Gerizim, and, lastly, the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The earliest testimony has its origins near Samaria, the capital city of the Israelite kingdom from the reign of Omri onward, and dates to the eighth century BCE.[61] Around 100 inscribed ostraca have come from the floor of a storeroom, apparently no longer needed in their previous capacity and hence employed as rubble to help level out the floor. With regard to content, the inscriptions record deliveries of wine and oil from districts and villages throughout the vicinity of Samaria and so reveal their original use: e.g., "In the ninth year from QṢH to GDYW a pitcher of old wine," "In the tenth year from ḤṢRT to GDYW a pitcher of purified oil," and "In the fifteenth year from ḤLQ to 'S', 'ḤMLK, ḤLṢ from ḤṢRT."

The preserved ostraca issued from the years 9, 10, and 15, whereby the ones from years 9 and 10 follow a different schematic structure than those from year 15. The dates themselves presumably refer to one or multiple kings, the identity presupposed at the time and therefore hidden today. As for delivery and accounting, their occasion and purpose likewise persist in obscurity. While some experts consider them to be tax and tribute to the king, others believe them to be provisions for palace personnel from the crown estate or for clan members serving in the palace.

The geographic and personal names scattered throughout the ostraca dated to year 15 bear especial significance. They emanated from the city of Samaria's proximity—the region ascribed to the tribe of Manasseh in the biblical literature—and almost all their district denominations also appear in the

---

[61] AḤITUV 258–312; ANET 320–1; HI 423–98; SSI i. 5–15; HAE i. 79–109; HTAT 278–84.

genealogies of Num. 26:29–34 and Josh. 17:1–3. In biblical genealogies, the names of districts become the names of persons: the geographic designations were original, the familial a derivation and later development. Personalization, on the one hand, and genealogical correlation within the systematic framework of the twelve tribes of Israel, on the other, undoubtedly represent a secondary innovation, a plan attributable to the scribal activity of the biblical tradition.

After the kingdom's demise in 722 BCE, Israel became the province of Samaria, first under Assyrian hegemony and then those of the Babylonians, Persians, Ptolemies, Seleucids, and Romans.[62] Aramaic papyri, clay bullae, and coinage—next to an abundance of human skeletons—have come from Wadi Daliyeh, approximately 14 kilometers north of Jericho, and trace back to the vicinity of the city of Samaria during the Persian period.[63] How the material reached this specific location still remains unknown, but many scholars conceive of refugees fleeing Samaria after the failed insurrection against Andromachus, prefect of Samaria under Alexander the Great.[64] Though rather poorly preserved, the papyri contain formulaic expressions that allow for considerable reconstruction. They, along with coinage from varied locations in the province of Samaria,[65] date to the fourth century BCE, more specifically to the period from Artaxerxes II to Darius III (i.e., 375–332 BCE).

The papyri represent private contracts, which range in theme from slave sales (the majority) through immovable properties, loans of money, and deposit trades, perhaps even to the protocol for a legal dispute in one particular instance. Clay bullae and coinage hold particular interest with respect to iconography. The imprints betray many different influences—Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Persian, and Greek—and display remarkable motifs, like portrayals of divinities and of naked men. Most significant of all, one particular coin features the likeness and inscription of the god Zeus on one side and a personal name with Yhwh as the theophoric element on the other.[66] At least in Samaria, Antiochus IV's later reassignment of two separate temples devoted to Yhwh—in Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim—into temples pledged to Zeus fell on fertile ground.

The onomasticon (i.e., personal names) evident in the papyri as well as other inscriptions paints a colorful portrait too.[67] Among the various

---

[62] See Part A *History* III 1. A few finds from the Assyrian period are presented in HTAT 310–25. Overviews of the epigraphic material from Judah and Samaria in the Persian period are provided by Stern (1982); Lemaire (2002); (2007); Grabbe (2004), 54–69; HTAT, 495–501; on the iconography and material culture, see Cornelius (2011); Frevel, Pyschny, and Cornelius (2014); on discussion of the religious consequences, see Frevel (2013).

[63] DJD 24 and 28; DUŠEK A; on the bullae from Wadi Daliyeh, see S. Schroer and F. Lippke in Frevel, Pyschny, and Cornelius (2014), 305–90.

[64] Kippenberg (1971), 44–7; DUŠEK A 450–1.

[65] MESHORER/QEDAR A and B.   [66] Lemaire (2002), 223.

[67] DUŠEK A 486–95; Lemaire (2002), 221–2.

contractual partners, proprietors, and slaves, Israelite–Judahite names either with or without a theophoric element (Yhwh or El) constitute the majority, although a plethora of Aramaic, Phoenician, Edomite, Akkadian, and Persian names also manifests itself, found mostly among the contractual witnesses and officeholders. With all the precaution due to any interpretation of onomastic data, the situation here recalls that of Elephantine and further suggests a similarity in historical constellation: coexistence and cooperation of diverse ethnicities who—in the context of the Persian empire's political structures— did not demarcate their identities through ethnic and religious boundaries but engaged with one another even as they preserved their own individual ethnic and religious identities. As at Elephantine, the extant evidence shows no impact of biblical norms on everyday life, be it in matters of slavery or ethnic engagement.

The political structure evokes that of Elephantine too, as reflected in epigraphic material. Indeed, the two localities had direct historical contact. Throughout the epigraphic sources, the name Samaria occurs in both tendered (*šmryn/šmrn*) and abbreviated (ŠMR, ŠM, ŠN, Š) form, the latter typical for coinage. Samaria fell beneath the Persian satrapy of Transeuphratia, the superior political formation then under the leadership of Mazday (Mazaios, MZ in abbreviation), whom epigraphic sources mention specifically by name: "Mazday, who stands above Ebir-Nari and Cilicia." Holding the status of province (*šmryn mdynt'*), Samaria was subject to a provincial governor (*pḥt šmryn/šmrn*) and had a same-named capital, denominated as a "stronghold" (*byrt'*). Accordingly, the papyri were issued "in the stronghold of Samaria, which [lies] in the province of Samaria." Like the papyri of Elephantine, moreover, the coinage assigns subordinate authorities titles such as "judge" (*dyn*) and "prefect" (*sgn*). Although other administrative officials may appear without their titles, they probably possessed the right to mint as well—perhaps even including the priests, who numbered among the elite of the "stronghold" also at Elephantine and in the province of Judah.

The figure of Sanballat, governor of Samaria, testifies to a direct historical connection between the province of Samaria and the Judean "stronghold of Yeb" (Elephantine). Named in both epigraphic material from Samaria and papyri from Elephantine, Sanballat also had sons—attested in both corpuses— who either represented their father or succeeded him in office. One son bearing a Yahwistic appellation, which occurs on a seal found in Samaria, and two others in Elephantine, Deliah and Shelemiah, all involved themselves with Bagohi (Bagoas), governor of the province of Judah (Yehud) in the process of the temple's reconstruction at Elephantine.[68] The abbreviations DL and ŠL on Samarian coinage probably signify these two figures. A certain Hananiah materializes as yet another governor in a papyrus from Samaria,

---

[68] TAD A 4.7–8 and A 4.9; see II 1.

dated to 354 BCE. From all such documentation, then, a list emerges that comprises those governors of Samaria who served between Darius II (424–404 BCE) and Darius III (336–331 BCE): Sanballat and his sons Deliah, Shelemiah, and *]YHW (= Delayahu?) in the first and Hananiah in the second half of the fourth century BCE. The usual proliferation of governors, accomplished by dividing the evidence among multiple persons of the same name in light of Nehemiah (Neh. 2:10, 19, e.g.) and Josephus (*A.J.* 11.7.2, 302–3), cannot sustain critical examination—a superfluous venture in any case.[69]

The province of Samaria has yielded yet another corpus of epigraphic evidence: Aramaic and Hebrew dedicatory inscriptions from the temple on Mount Gerizim, which lies adjacent to Shechem (Nablus today).[70] Such inscriptional material illuminates the Yhwh-devotees from the province of Samaria. Although archaeologists tend to attribute some of these inscriptions to the fifth or fourth century BCE, the majority in all likelihood originated first in the Hellenistic era, more specifically at the end of the third and beginning of the second century BCE. With regard to writing, inscriptions have surfaced in Aramaic, Paleo-Hebrew, Samaritan, and Greek scripts, some with a mixture of Aramaic and Paleo-Hebrew.[71]

The preponderance of inscriptions (nos. 1–381) are written in Aramaic, script and language alike. With only a few exceptions, this epigraphic material follows one of two formulae. While the basic scheme reads, "What NN, son of NN (from the place NN) offered, for himself, his wife, and his children," the other formula proceeds the same way but ends with the phrase ". . . for good remembrance before God at this place." These private dedicatory inscriptions, formulated both by men and by women, were originally written on the temple's stones. Yet since the stones were eventually reused, the inscriptions themselves did not surface in situ. Some of these stones reveal lines inscribed to guide writing along with a red-colored residue, which indicates professional work lies behind the epigraphy. While the inscription could have come before or after installation of the stone into the building, the sheer quantity of material lends greater probability to dedications written on the stones after they had already been installed into the walls of the temple. Their function also poses problems. The verb "to offer" generally refers to sacrifice rather than donation or commemorative stones. However, in two inscriptions (nos. 147 and 148) "this stone" alludes to itself as the votive offering, which may well imply the inscription's installation as the subject.

---

[69] See Kratz (2004*a*), 93–106; DUŠEK A 516–49.

[70] MAGEN/MISGAV/TSFANIA; Magen (2008*a*), 227–42; further DUŠEK B; De Hemmer Gudme (2013). The numbering follows the edition of MAGEN/MISGAV/TSFANIA.

[71] The Aramaic inscriptions show two types of scripts. Magen (in MAGEN/MISGAV/TSFANIA and Magen (2008*a*)) distinguishes between "lapidary" and "proto-Jewish script," while DUŠEK B 5 speaks—more properly—of "monumental" and "cursive script." Magen calls the Paleo-Hebrew script "Neo-Hebrew."

Otherwise, the inscription could appertain to a sacrifice offered at the temple or another kind of offering.

Throughout the Aramaic inscriptions, the generic appellative *'ælaha'* ("God") consistently designates the deity. Only on two occasions (nos. 150 and 151) does the denomination *'adonay*, "Lord," occur—a pronunciation of the divine name Yhwh that ultimately prevailed. One of the two inscriptions (no. 150) features an Aramaic script ("Proto-Jewish" or "cursive") and yet the Hebrew language, which was almost always written in the Paleo-Hebrew script. Furthermore, instead of "before God at this place," the inscription reads "before *'adonay* ("Lord") in the sanctuary."[72]

As for onomastics, the Aramaic inscriptions contain a majority of Hebrew names, many with theophoric elements, especially Yhwh and El (e.g., Yeho-natan, El-natan, Dela-yahu, Yishma-el). Greek names also appear, as do those of Persian, Arabic, and otherwise unknown origin—albeit rather infrequently. While such trends correspond to the larger portrait depicted through analysis of the rest of Samarian and Judean inscriptions dating from the Hellenistic period, one important difference does emerge: the inscriptions from Mount Gerizim include various titles and professions, but the appellation "priest" (*khn*) holds pride of place, even as other political designations occur (e.g., prince, satrap, steward).[73] In terms of priestly names, Pinhas appears with frequency, possibly denominated as the high priest in one particular instance. Eleazar likewise occurs as a priestly name, on an object written in Paleo-Hebrew script, which could have been a seal.[74] With regard to geography, Samaria, Shechem, and other locales surrounding the temple of Mount Gerizim all represent the homes of the inscriptions' donors.

This increased attestation of priests in general and Pinhas and Eleazar in particular throughout the Paleo-Hebrew inscriptions (nos. 382–8, 389) seems to indicate a certain connection between script and profession. The only appearance of the divine name Yhwh comes from a Paleo-Hebrew inscription (no. 383). Based on such correspondence, the inscriptions' editors have deduced a priestly parentage for the Paleo-Hebrew epigraph. Yet even this material follows the Aramaic formulae—with one example (no. 389) presumably written even in the Aramaic language. Conversely, the priest Pinhas (nos. 24–5, 61) as well as the name Eleazar (no. 1, perhaps 32) occur in not only Paleo-Hebrew but also Aramaic inscriptions.[75] Thus, the findings would seem to indicate less a differentiation between laity and priesthood than a conscious Hebraization or Israelitization of the form of Yhwh veneration, which was customarily conducted in the Aramaic language and script.

---

[72] The same could hold for the other inscription as well (no. 151); the poor state of preservation, however, does not allow for any final decision with respect to language.

[73] Cf. "priests" in Aramaic nos. 24; 25; 389 (Aramaic in Aramaic/Paleo-Hebrew script); in Hebrew nos. 382; 388; the other titles in nos. 26 and 34.

[74] Cf. Pinhas in nos. 24; 25; 61; 384; 389; "the great" in no. 384; Eleazar in no. 390.

[75] MAGEN/MISGAV/TSFANIA 253–61.

Inscriptions composed in Samaritan script and written much later in time, i.e., during the post-Christian period, move further in this direction (nos. 392–5, perhaps 391). Not only do they eschew the divine name Yhwh, but they also cite the biblical commitment to a solitary god, professed in the form of the Decalogue as well as the *Shemaʿ Yisrael* ("Hear, O Israel"). Showing a citational collage from the book of Deuteronomy, no. 395 follows the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch in its quotation of Deut. 10:17 ("Lord of lords").

Two other epigraphs found on Delos and written in Greek range chronologically between the Paleo-Hebrew and the Samarian inscriptions. The Delos inscriptions allude to "Israelites" on the island, who "offer sacrifices in/at the (holy) temple on Mount Gerizim (*Argarizein*)." The gentilic "Israelites" (*oi Israeleitai/Israælitai*) occurs in the Septuagint only in singular form, save for a single, late instance in 4 Macc. 18:1.[76] Extraordinarily seldom, the plural arises only here—pending further finds—for Samarians in the Greek diaspora. The plural "Israelites" designates either descendants from the former northern kingdom or members of the biblical people Israel, designated "the sons of Israel" in the biblical texts themselves. In the case of the Delos inscriptions, the gentilic pertains to Greek-named individuals—Serapion, son of Jason, from Knossos and Menippos, son of Artemidoros, from Heracleion—who felt a connection to the temple on Mount Gerizim. In fact, one of them even endowed a synagogue (*proseuche*) on Delos. Possible, though uncertain, these two inscriptions together with the (Samarian) synagogue they both mention may have had some association with a building discovered nearly 100 meters south of the inscriptions' own place of discovery, which the archaeologists, for their part, have identified as a (Jewish/Judean) synagogue and dated to the second century BCE. Judean and Samarian Yhwh-devotees seem to have venerated their highest god side by side, perhaps in the same house, no less.

The differences in the Samarian inscriptions' language, script, and content pose certain questions about their implications for the temple on Mount Gerizim and the population in its vicinity as well as its relationship to the biblical tradition.[77]

Concerning the first line of inquiry—that is, the temple and its people—the Samarian inscriptions are clearly witness to a temple devoted to the god Yhwh. Founded already by the fifth century BCE, this temple had apparently served as the central sanctuary for Yhwh-devotees in the province of Samaria ever since. The holy site saw two distinct phases, revealed through numismatics: an initial one under Persian and Ptolemaic rule (fifth to third centuries BCE) and then a second under Seleucid domination (second to first centuries BCE). During this second period, the temple underwent expansion and then extension of the sacred precinct. The bulk of the dedicatory inscriptions come from this point

---

[76] Kartveit (2009), 216–25; DUŠEK B 77–9.   [77] See Becking (2011), 109–17.

in time. Following foundation and expansion of the Hasmonean kingdom, John Hyrcanus I completely destroyed the temple, around 110 BCE.[78] Though robbed of their central holy site as well as their pilgrim destination, the Samarian Yhwh-devotees (or "Samaritans") prevailed as a cultic community in the province of Samaria along with the diaspora, and they even recovered their cultic and legal autonomy during the Roman era. These efforts were met with success largely thanks to the Samaritan Pentateuch, which likely helped compensate for such a loss and fostered a transportable practice of religion.

   Although many scholars correlate destruction of the temple on Mount Gerizim with controversy among Jews and Samaritans concerning the legitimate location of Yhwh-veneration, the true cause lay in political turmoil far more than religious disagreement. The longer the Maccabean revolt and the Hasmoneans' expansionist policy persisted, the more they directed themselves against anyone who cooperated with foreign power—actual or potential, Seleucid or Ptolemaic. Such opposition included the Oniads and the Tobiads (the two related by marriage), who occasionally changed sides, as well as the elites on Mount Gerizim, who, like their Jerusalem counterparts, cooperated with the Seleucids. While the Hasmoneans surely appreciated and instrumentalized the religious argument as an additional reason for their politics of expansion—i.e., which location was truly the chosen place for proper cultic service to Yhwh—such concern had hardly constituted a political dispute up to that point in time.

   Neither archaeological nor epigraphic material suggests religious strife. No evidence has emerged for any special status accorded to the temple on Mount Gerizim or any altercation with Jerusalem—let alone any other location—concerning the proper cultic place. The designation "god," common throughout the Aramaic inscriptions, does not intimate a veneration of other divinities, nor does the inscriptional denomination of the temple merely as "the place" hint at any isolation of Mount Gerizim from other holy sites. Rather, the inscriptional material provides evidence for an important temple devoted to the god Yhwh for Yhwh-devotees in the province of Samaria as well as the diaspora, alongside which other holy sites—dedicated to Yhwh or even other deities—had their place as well.

   Instead of showing some kind of singularity, the names and titles mentioned in these inscriptions conform to the portrait painted by mintage along with the material from Wadi Daliyeh. A certain continuity in social structure can safely be assumed. The onomastics betray an outstanding proportion of Yahwistic names—an expected allotment given the dedicatory inscriptions' provenance and genre. Residing in the province of Samaria generally and the vicinity of Shechem specifically, these Yhwh-devotees commissioned the

---

[78] Magen (2008*a*), esp. 167–80; for the subsequent history in Roman and Byzantine times, ibid. 234–73; Magen (2008*b*).

inscriptions at the temple on Mount Gerizim. Yet Yhwh-devotees did not constitute the entirety of the population; rather, they comprised only a portion of the ethnic and religious diversity preserved in the Samarian epigraphic materials. The Yhwh-adherents from Mount Gerizim were first and foremost "Samarians" or "Samaritans," which—like the "Judeans" in the Elephantine papyri—indicates nothing more than mere association with the populace of a particular religion or a political entity. The written sources mark no distinction between "Samarians" and "Samaritans": both denominations pertain to the population from the province of Samaria or the Samaritis, independent of any ethnic or religious affiliation.[79]

The Yhwh-adherents on Mount Gerizim thus comprised a genuine component of Samaria's population. Still, the dedicatory inscriptions show just as little affinity or intermixture with the religions of other ethnicities domiciled within the province of Samaria as they contrast with the Yhwh veneration practiced within Judah. Instead, the Samarian situation evokes that of Elephantine, even despite the scarcity of sources. As opposed to Elephantine, however, the province of Samaria has yielded no epigraphic evidence that attests to manifold manifestations of the divinity Yhwh or any number of numinous entities in the context of Yhwh veneration. Pragmatic coexistence with other religions and ethnicities in the course of everyday life has only indirect evidence.[80] Otherwise, the degree of convergence between Yhwh religious practice and that devoted to Zeus or other high gods remains unclear, though it may indeed loom in numismatic iconography and behind the popular divine epithet "highest god." Under Antiochus IV, such developments doubtless gathered steam. The rededication of the Gerizim temple from Yhwh to Zeus, as reported by 2 Macc. 6 and Josephus (*A.J.* 12.5), could hardly have proceeded without agreement and cooperation from preeminent Yhwh-adherents. Even if Hellenization was already quite advanced, Yhwh-devotees in the province of Samaria were no less devout or legitimate than those at Elephantine or in Judah.

---

[79] On the evidence found in the inscriptions from the Hellenistic period, see Kippenberg (1971), 33–4, n. 1, and, more precisely, DUŠEK B 71–2, 79–81, esp. 80 n. 153, as well as Kartveit (2009), 220–1. In the Jewish tradition of the Roman period, and only there, both names are used specifically for the religious community of the Samaritans. There and there alone are the designations used against them in line with 2 Kgs. 17:29.

[80] According to Josephus, *A.J.* 11.8.6, 344, the Samaritan Shechemites referred to themselves as "Hebrews," also called Sidonians; according to *A.J.* 12.5.5, 259 and 262, they presented themselves before Antiochus IV as Sidonians by ancestry for tactical reasons. In view of these passages, scholars have concluded that members of the Sidonian colony in Shechem joined the Yhwh-adherents on Mount Gerizim. However, the historical validity of this information is disputed; see DUŠEK B 101–4. Alongside the Yhwh sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, at least one Greek temple is attested for Samaria; this temple was dedicated to Isis and Serapes; see DUŠEK B 81–2. The coexistence is much better attested for the diaspora; see, e.g., with regard to Delos Hengel (1973), 83 n. 327 (ET 1974, i. 43 with ii. 34 n. 337); Kartveit (2009), 220–1.

All in all, the precise relationship between the Yhwh-adherents recorded in the dedicatory inscriptions from Mount Gerizim, on the one hand, and their more immediate environment or their descendants with Yahwistic names in the epigraphic material from the Persian period, on the other, remains ambiguous. According to the extant evidence, however, difference in terms of demographics, sociology, and religion could not have been all that great. Against this broader backdrop, yet another question arises: the relationship between the form and the religious content of these dedicatory inscriptions and the literature usually linked with Samaria, Shechem, and Mount Gerizim during the Persian period, namely the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The Samaritan Pentateuch constitutes the holy scripture of the religious community that considers itself—not without historical legitimacy—(the true) "Israel" and continues to identify, even in the present day, not Jerusalem's Temple Mount but rather Mount Gerizim near Shechem (Nablus today) as the cultic place chosen by Yhwh according to Deut. 12.[81] In substance, this particular Pentateuch consists of nothing more than the "five books of Moses," a division recognized in all of Judaism as well as Christianity and still printed as such in many modern bibles. The text itself, by contrast, displays a plethora of variants great and small, which diverge from the common (i.e., Masoretic) version of the Pentateuch. Even more, in passages of great importance—such as the Decalogue in Exod. 20 and Deut. 5 or the selection formula in Deuteronomy (e.g., Deut. 12:5, 14)—the text contains explicit reference to Mount Gerizim as the chosen cultic site. Given this specific interest, scholars often call such passages "Samaritan glosses."[82] Although the terminology does not conform to the sources themselves, a certain distinction has gained currency: while "Samarians" refers to the members of the region and province of Samaria, the term "Samaritans" denominates the religious community as such.[83]

Like the Qumran community, the Samaritans belong to biblical Judaism. With their feet firmly planted on the ground of the Torah of Moses, both communities separated from the cult in Jerusalem, though the Qumran community expressly adhered to Jerusalem as the only legitimate cultic place.[84] Yet the connections may be closer than expected. Indeed, the Samaritan Pentateuch preserves a form of the text also attested in the Qumran manuscripts, the dates of which range from the third century BCE up to the first century CE. While these particular manuscripts do not exhibit the typical Samaritan glosses, they do display many of the variants that distinguish the

---

[81] Anderson and Giles (2012); for the history of the community, see p. 177 n. 89.

[82] Tov (2012), 74ff.

[83] Kippenberg (1971), 33–4. The Samaritan community rejects the designation "Samarians" or "Samaritans" (*šmrwnym*) and instead refers to itself—drawing on the sound of the gentilic—as "keepers" (*šmrym*) of the Torah or simply "Israel."

[84] Kratz (2007*c*).

Samaritan from the Masoretic text, the latter commonly used in contemporary Judaism. As a result, designations such as "proto-Samaritan" or "a harmonizing text type" are rather imprecise. In addition to many other types of texts—such as the proto-Masoretic or that of the Septuagint's Hebrew template (*Vorlage*)—this particular one coexisted among the varied communities of biblical Judaism in Judah and Samaria before it was supplemented with the Samaritan glosses and therefore transformed into a distinct shape known as the Samaritan Pentateuch.[85]

Given the great antiquity and long textual history of the proto-Samaritan Pentateuch, one is tempted to speculate that the Yhwh-adherents encountered in various inscriptions from Mount Gerizim and the island of Delos knew this specific text and the biblical tradition as a whole or even constituted the very progenitors of the Samaritan community, from which the Samaritan Pentateuch proceeded.[86] As attractive as this hypothesis may be, the actual relationship requires greater nuance: like the Pentateuch's textual history, the Samaritans' epigraphic corpus and history demand distinction in multiple phases.

First and foremost, the Aramaic dedicatory inscriptions show little if any knowledge of the biblical tradition. Neither the reference to "this place," where votive offerings should be brought, nor the formula "for good remembrance," which recalls the book of Nehemiah and also occurs in inscriptions from other cultures, presupposes a knowledge of the biblical tradition.[87] These inscriptions readily reveal the practice of Yhwh-religion not yet influenced by the biblical tradition. The inscriptions may have flowed in the stream of biblical Judaism, yet this conclusion receives neither confirmation nor contradiction in the extant evidence. In any case, the epigraphic material substantiates no competition, let alone hostility, between Mount Gerizim and Jerusalem.

The few inscriptions in the Hebrew language and the Aramaic (nos. 150 and 151) or Paleo-Hebrew (nos. 382–8 and 389) script demonstrate somewhat greater proximity to the biblical tradition in general and the Pentateuch in particular. More specifically, they incorporate the divine designation *'adonay* ("Lord") or Yhwh as well as, increasingly, the priestly names Pinhas and Eleazar—both attested in the biblical literature (Num. 25:7, 11) and firmly fixed in later Samaritan tradition. Again, these phenomena offer no clear evidence of any association with the members of biblical Judaism or even the Samaritans. Both divine and priestly names derived from religious tradition and only later passed into the biblical tradition. In consequence, they could have entered the inscriptions directly from religious practice without any detour through biblical tradition at all.

---

[85] Tov (2012), 90ff. The main witnesses are 4QpaleoExod^m; 4QExod-Lev^f; 4QNum^b.

[86] Kartveit (2009), 259–312; DUŠEK B 86–96.

[87] Cf. the commemorative formula in Neh. 5:19; 13:31 as well as 13:14; negatively, 6:14; 13:29; further 2:20; for the epigraphic material, see De Hemmer Gudme (2013), 91–134.

However, the detectable tendency towards a certain Hebraization in form and content alike may indeed correlate with the growing influence of biblical tradition on the ancestral pre-biblical or non-biblical cult of Yhwh in the province of Samaria. The designation of the Delos Samaritans as "Israelites" may point in this direction as well. So long as the endonym "Israelites" does not represent the traditional ethnicon of the former northern kingdom's inhabitants, biblical tradition alone could have mediated this designation, which gave rise to the conceptualization of a single people, Israel, comprising both Samaria and Judah.[88] Had the Pentateuch already achieved the status of holy scripture for Mount Gerizim's Yhwh-adherents, only the proto-Samaritan version—i.e., without the Samaritan glosses—could have been the possible manifestation, for here, too, no controversy between Mount Gerizim and Jerusalem emerges, even though biblical tradition would eventually pose the question of the one true chosen cultic site (Deut. 12).

The later, post-Christian inscriptions (nos. 391 and 392–5) show an altogether different picture. Unequivocally originating from the Samaritan community, these inscriptions clearly presuppose a knowledge of the biblical tradition and already offer citations of the Samaritan Pentateuch verbatim, thus reflecting the same level as the Samaritan glosses. These inscriptions certainly postdate the separation between Mount Gerizim and Jerusalem—or Samaritans and Jews—as encapsulated in the question the Samaritan woman brings before Jesus in John 4:20.

In sum, Mount Gerizim's dedicatory inscriptions and the Samaritan Penta-teuch's textual history, which the history of the epigraphic material corrobor-ates, delineate a certain religious development over the course of time. The Samarians initially inhabited Shechem and other localities in the province of Samaria and venerated the deity Yhwh on Mount Gerizim, much like the Judeans did with Yhwh at the temple in Jerusalem, the Judeans of Elephantine did with Yahu at the temple in Elephantine, and other ethnicities did with their own divinities at their local temples. The Hellenistic period, which yielded the Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions on Mount Gerizim, hence reflects the same situation as the Persian period, which produced the papyri from Wadi Daliyeh. Nevertheless, some inscriptions show a tendency toward Hebraization or Israelitization, which may have already emanated from the influence of biblical tradition. Over time, this influence must have increased continuously, thereby sparking the dispute between Judean and Samarian Yhwh-devotees with respect to the legitimate cultic site, which resulted in their rejection of one another.

---

[88]　DUŠEK B 73, 77 assumes Samarians as well as Judeans considered themselves members of the people of Israel and therefore called themselves "Israelites." Regarding the Judeans, however, this designation is neither attested in the epigraphic material nor to be expected. 1 Macc. and Josephus, *A.J.* 14.10.8, 213 ("the Jews on Delos") depend on the biblical tradition and already presuppose the separation of Judeans (i.e., Jews) and Samaritans.

As of yet unanswered by scholarship, the fundamental question remains as to when and why the biblical tradition—and especially the Torah of Moses—won influence over the cult devoted to Yhwh that was practiced in Samaria as well as Judah and the diaspora and how it became the foundation of Samaritan and Jewish religion. In other words, when and under which circumstances did the Yhwh-adherents among the Samarians become the Samaritan community, specifically?

Scholarly investigation tends to concentrate primarily on historical reconstruction of the Samaritans' emergence along with the Samaritan schism, although the proto-Samarian version of the Pentateuch has become more and more important in this discussion.[89] Two assumptions prevail, both of which prove highly problematic and methodologically questionable when confronted with the epigraphic evidence.

First, the distinction between "Samarians" and "Samaritans"—a contradistinction embedded in scholarly convention and not the sources themselves—all too often sees projection onto the epigraphic material without proper critical scrutiny. This (rather dubious) move then associates the Yhwh-adherents of the epigraphic sources with the tradents of the proto-Samaritan Pentateuch and disassociates them from the inhabitants of Samaria (Samarians) and the Samaritis (Samaritans). As a result, the Yhwh-devotees mentioned in the inscriptions appear as antecedents to the religious group denominated "Samaritans." Contrary to this assumption, the Yhwh-adherents depicted in the inscriptions may well have been Samarians—i.e., inhabitants of the province of Samaria and the region of the Samaritis—before they or certain portions of them ultimately merged into that religious community commonly called the "Samaritans." The latter faction referred to themselves as "Israelites" and withdrew from regional Samarians and Samaritans. Rather, their Judean (or Jewish) antagonists designated them Samarians or Samaritans in the literary tradition.

Second, the usual reconstruction proceeds from the assumption that the biblical tradition in general and the Torah of Moses in particular not only existed as ancient, traditional material but even enjoyed widespread acceptance among the Israelites and Judeans in addition to the priests and the Levites at the temples in Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim. Some experts go so far as to interpret the proto-Samaritan version of the Pentateuch attested at Qumran as a compromise between Mount Gerizim and Jerusalem that was negotiated in the context of Persian religious politics.[90] Many commentators thus explain the Jerusalem/Gerizim controversy on the assumption of the Pentateuch's

---

[89] Cf. DUŠEK B as well as the contributions by R.G. Kratz, C. Nihan, and R. Pummer in Knoppers and Levinson (2007); for discussion of the available material and the history of the Samaritans, see Pummer (1987); (2002); (2009); Crown, Pummer, and Tal (1993); Crown (1989); (2001), and the bibliography Crown (2005); Knoppers (2005); (2006); (2013); Magen (2008*a*) and (2008*b*); Kartveit (2009); Mor and Reiterer (2010); Frey, Schattner-Rieser, and Schmid (2012).

[90] See II 5.

general cognizance and official recognition. Yet next to nothing is known, let alone certain, about the place of the Pentateuch's composition and transmission, and any proposed religio-political compromise during the Persian period is, in truth, nothing more than speculation. The question remains unanswered: how did the Pentateuch, along with the rest of the biblical tradition, attain such great significance among the various authoritative literature for the Yhwh cult in Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim that it could trigger a conflict over the identity of the chosen cultic place?

Without these problematic presuppositions, the epigraphic and literary evidence leaves quite a different impression. Much in the relevant literary sources points to the second century BCE as the time frame in which the Torah of Moses and the rest of biblical tradition gained considerable influence at the sacred sites in Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim. To avoid any misunderstanding, the question does not revolve around the formation of biblical tradition—which is, of course, much older—but rather the dissemination and status of biblical tradition: the impact of biblical tradition, not its very formation, would date to the second century BCE. During this period, the Samarians became Samaritans, and the Judeans became Jews. Admittedly, however, this conclusion comes from only indirect evidence.

As far as the literary sources are concerned, one must recognize they comprise—without exception—texts either associated with or influenced by the biblical tradition. A polemic against Samaria in general and Samarian Yhwh-adherents in particular runs like a red thread throughout the biblical tradition, essentially drawn from 2 Kgs. 17:14–41 and woven through Chronicles and Ezra–Nehemiah[91] as well as Sir. 50:25–6 and 2 Macc. 5–6. Supported by biblical tradition along with other sources, Josephus projects this specific conflict back onto the entire time span of the Second Temple period and portrays the construction of the temple on Mount Gerizim, in the fifth or fourth century BCE, as the decisive historical rupture.[92] Yet as evinced not least by the very designation of the adversary throughout the literary sources from Ezra–Nehemiah up to Josephus, the confrontation first became acute in the second and first centuries BCE (2 Macc.; Josephus) and reached its zenith with Josephus's portrayal in the first century CE.[93]

Concerning the epigraphic evidence, from the Elephantine papyri at the end of the fifth century BCE to the Mount Gerizim inscriptions in the third and

---

[91] See Ezra 4; Neh. 2:10, 19–20; 3:33–4:17; 6:1–14, 16–19 as well as 13:1–3, 4–9, 23–9 corresponding to Ezra 9–10. The older literary layers of Ezra–Nehemiah, i.e., the temple construction in Ezra 5–6 and the building of the wall in Neh. 1–6, have no knowledge of this conflict.

[92] For the early history, see Josephus, *A.J.* 11.2.1, 19; 4:3, 84ff.; 4.9, 114ff. (following Ezra 4:1ff.); for the schism *A.J.* 11.7.2–8.7, 302–47 (following Neh. 12–13); see also *A.J.* 12.5.5, 257–64; 13.9.1, 254–5; *B.J.* 1.2.6, 63.

[93] Egger (1986); Pummer (2009).

second centuries BCE, it attests no such conflict whatsoever. All this material presupposes two distinct provinces hardly distinguishable with respect to religious concerns. Both in Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim, domestic Yhwh-adherents maintained Yhwh cults at their respective sacred sites beginning in the fifth century BCE—just like the Judeans at Elephantine. The divergent portraits conveyed by literary and epigraphic materials could have two different implications: either the reports in biblical and para-biblical literature were freely contrived, or they reflect a historical rivalry between two provinces that originally rose from political and economic rather than specifically religious interests and subsequently underwent construal as a religious controversy only at a later stage.

The thesis of a rivalry motivated by politics and economics would explain equally well the early polemics evident in the books of Chronicles, Ezra–Nehemiah, and Ben Sira, all of which issued from a time when both provinces and their sanctuaries established themselves and had to vie for the favor of their respective rulers—be they Persian, Ptolemean, or Seleucid. In this particular context, the polemics in Sir. 50:25 against the "foolish people who live in Shechem," an undeniable allusion to the Yhwh-adherents on Mount Gerizim, may have had a specifically political background. Subsequent to Ben Sira's "Praise of the Ancestors" (Sir. 44–9), the text extols the high priest Simon II (Sir. 50). In doing so, Ben Sira sides with the Oniad party, whose shrewd and surely successful maneuver between standing ties to the Ptolemies and a new balance of power amid the shift from Ptolemean to Seleucid dominion over Palestine could not have gone unquestioned in either Judah or Samaria.[94] Not by coincidence does the praise culminate yet again (Sir. 45:23–4) in Pinhas, son of Eleazar, (Sir. 50:24) rather than Aaron (Sir. 50:13, 16) as the prototype of the priesthood, whose name also appears in a dedicatory inscription from Mount Gerizim. To this encomium Ben Sira adds his own polemic against the three hostile peoples in the south, the west, and the north. He clothes political conflict in biblical vestment and defames the Shechemites—like the Babylonians, in Sir. 49:5—as a foreign people, in line with Deut. 32:21.

With regard to origins, the root of the biblical and post-biblical polemic against both Samaria and Samarian adherents to Yhwh may therefore lie in a religious—more specifically, biblical—interpretation of the political and economic contest between the provinces of Judah (*sc.* Yehud, Judaea), on the one hand, and Samaria, on the other. Such biblical interpretation delineates an alternative perspective apart from any political and economic reality as well as the religious

---

[94] Not long thereafter, the Oniads were superseded—first by pro-Seleucid ("Hellenists"), then by anti-Seleucid elites (Maccabees, Hasmoneans)—changed sides, and eventually escaped to Egypt (Leontopolis). According to extant evidence, the pro-Seleucid position prevailed in Samaria, which explains the conflict with the Maccabees and Hasmoneans that led to the destruction of the temple on Mount Gerizim. See Haag (2003), 49–53.

practice common to Yhwh-devotees throughout Samaria and Judah. Rather than two separate political entities and two separate cultic places with a shared veneration of Yhwh, this standpoint promotes the biblical notion of a single people of Israel, a single Yhwh, and a single sacred site chosen by Yhwh himself. Here, the crucial criterion for assessing the two provinces is not the historical situation but the Torah of Moses, which construes a unity of the people of Israel out of Israel (Samaria, Shechem, Mount Gerizim) and Judah (Jerusalem).

The proto-Samaritan Pentateuch serves as a witness to such a biblical perspective. This particular Pentateuch circulated in both provinces— presumably even apart from cultic practice dedicated to Yhwh—and survived in manuscripts from Qumran and in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Even further, those circles that transmitted the Pentateuch may have also been familiar with the rest of the biblical literature, at least insofar as it existed at the time. In light of this tradition, the politico-economic rivalry between the two provinces of Samaria and Judah must have seemed like a religious conflict and an opposition over the legitimate cultic place of the one people, Israel.

Yet independent of political reality, the biblical and para-biblical literature not only recognizes this religious opposition but even discusses it with contention and conviction. This discourse manifests itself, for instance, in the variants of Deut. 27:4, where one tradition reads, "on Mount Ebal," and the other, "on Mount Gerizim." Similar cases include the transfer of Abraham's encounter with Melchizedek onto Mount Gerizim (*Argarizein*) in Gen. 14, which Alexander Polyhistor ascribes to the historian Eupolemos, or the designation of Shechem as a "holy city" and its inhabitants as "Hebrews," attested in the writings of the epic poet Theodotos.[95] As in Judah (represented by Chronicles, Ezra–Nehemiah, Ben Sira, and Qumran), Yhwh-adherents from Samaria appealed to the Torah of Moses in their claims to represent Israel and to sacrifice on Mount Gerizim as the chosen and only authorized cultic site. The tendency toward Hebraization or Israelitization in the Paleo-Hebrew inscriptions from Mount Gerizim may converge with such deductions.

Religious opposition between the two cultic places, on the one hand, and political and economic rivalry between the two provinces and their sanctuaries, on the other, are in fact worlds apart. Each of these spheres must have had a separate existence sociologically as well: if the political and religious elites of both provinces along with their sanctuaries on Mount Gerizim and in Jerusalem— within their respective religious and theological contexts—struggled with one another for recognition from foreign rulers and for fiscal revenues, scribal circles responsible for the biblical tradition concerned themselves with the unity and legitimacy of the sacred site. As far as the extant evidence indicates, only biblical tradition (namely Ezra–Nehemiah, Ben Sira) explains political rivalries through

---

[95] OTP ii. 880–1; JSHRZ i. 142 (Pseudo-Eupolemus) as well as OTP ii. 790–1, 792; JSHRZ iv. 165, 168 (Theodotus).

religious opposition. The politico-economic competition first became a religio-political matter when the Maccabees and later Hasmoneans discovered religious antagonism as a political tool and deployed it against the Jerusalem priesthood along with the province of Samaria and its pro-Seleucid stance.

This conflict may have prompted the elevation of the Torah of Moses to holy scripture at each holy site. Precisely because the indigenous Yhwh-veneration of both provinces bore striking similarity, the identity of the chosen cultic site required clear adjudication once the Torah determined politics: i.e., Mount Gerizim near Shechem or Mount Zion in Jerusalem. The increasing influence that the Torah of Moses exercised on politics furthered the separation of Yhwh-venerators in Judah and Samaria, all of whom claimed to represent the one Israel and to worship the one Yhwh according to the Torah and in the one chosen place. After the Hasmoneans had gained the upper hand in this religio-political strife, Hyrcanus I concluded the conflict with destruction of the Gerizim sanctuary around 110 BCE. In 70 CE, the Romans then destroyed the temple in Jerusalem. Thanks in large part to the Torah of Moses—which arose outside of the temple cult's own politics and praxis and therefore endured and enabled a religious practice far beyond it—both religious communities of the Jews and the Samaritans have been able to exist without a central cultic site and still exist today.

5. JERUSALEM

"Thus Jerusalem is the place that he (*sc.* God) has chosen from all the tribes of Israel." This declaration comes from the epistle of an otherwise unknown but presumably prominent member of the Qumran community to a leader in Jerusalem, which bears the title "Some Precepts of the Torah" (*Miqtsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah*; 4QMMT). Conforming to the prevailing testimony of the biblical and para-biblical tradition, this statement identifies the selected sacred site of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 with Jerusalem and the temple in Jerusalem both explicitly and unambiguously for the very first time.[96] Hence, scholars often associate Jerusalem with the production and transmission of the Hebrew Bible.[97] Based on the Hebrew Bible and written in Hebrew and Aramaic alike, the para-biblical tradition of Palestinian Judaism has surfaced alongside biblical manuscripts in the caves of Qumran and other sites alongside the Dead Sea. However, the connection between Jerusalem and the biblical tradition is much less evident than commonly assumed. A survey of the epigraphic material from Judah and Jerusalem should offer greater clarity in this regard.

---

[96] See Kratz (2007*c*); for the edition and further literature on 4QMMT, see p. 158, n. 47.
[97] See, e.g., Ben Zvi (1997).

As in the case of Samaria, epigraphic documentation for Judah and its more immediate surroundings in southern Palestine begins in the pre-exilic period. Assessed in Part A, *The History of Israel and Judah*, the finds comprise predominantly administrative texts (Arad, Horvat 'Uza, Lachish, etc.) and inscriptions pertinent to religious history (Khirbet el-Qom, Kuntillet 'Ajrud, etc.). Three kinds of epigraphic sources have survived from the Persian and early Hellenistic eras, the focus of inquiry here: stamp seals, coins, and ostraca, including the large body of Aramaic ostraca coming from the antiquities market, which seems to constitute one and the same collection.[98] Iconographic and onomastic study of the epigraphic material reveals the presence and suggests the coexistence of various ethnic groups, themselves all subject to a diversity of influences—i.e., West Semitic, Mesopotamian, Persian, and Greek—among which the Judeans represent but one specific ethnic group.

Reflective of "foreign commerce" all the way to Babylon, inscribed *stamps*, *bullae*, and *seals* emanated from Jewish economic life and thus prove quite informative for analysis of the political structure in the province of Judah too. In light of such assessments, Judah already constituted an autonomous administrative entity at the beginning of the Persian period, most likely as a province answerable to some provincial governor. This conclusion draws from the designations *YH*, *YHD*, and *YHWD* for the province of Yehud (i.e., Judah) as well as the title *PḤW'* for the associated "governor."[99] Some stamp seals bear proper names with either the specific title *PḤW'* or no title at all but the name or abbreviation of the province. Although these seals indicate no sequential order, they do attest a number of governors for the end of the sixth and beginning of the fifth century BCE, before Bagohi/Bagoas (manifest in the Elephantine papyri) and Yehezkiah (evinced in Judean mintage) became governors of the Judean province in the fourth century BCE, contemporaneous with Sanballat and his sons along with Hananiah in Samaria. By analogy with Samaria and Elephantine, Judah's administrative center—probably Mitzpah first and then Jerusalem later—should have had the status "stronghold" (*hbyrh* in Hebrew, *byrt'* in Aramaic), yet only with Nehemiah does Jerusalem begin to receive this designation in the literature (Neh. 2:8; 7:2). In the Seleucid era, Antiochus IV had erected an *akra*—a kind of fortification—in Jerusalem that helped transform Jerusalem, like Samaria, into a military outpost. As for other officials, correspondence from the Judeans at Elephantine mentions, with respect to Judah in particular, "the high priest and his priestly colleagues in Jerusalem" (*khn' rb' wknwth khny' zy byrwšlm*) along with the "nobles of the Judeans" (*ḥry yhwdy'*).[100]

---

[98] For an overview, see p. 167 n. 62, esp. the comparative studies on both Judah and Samaria in Frevel, Pyschny, and Cornelius (2014). For the seals, see AVIGAD; ARIEL; LIPSCHITS/VANDERHOOFT; on the coins, see AJC and TJC; regarding the ostraca, see EPH'AL/NAVEH; NIAI as well as Lemaire (2002); (2006); (2007); Porten and Yardeni (2006) and (2007).

[99] LIPSCHITS/VANDERHOOFT 77–80.

[100] TAD A 4.7–8; cf. Neh. 2:16–18, where the "prefects" (*sgnym*) are also mentioned.

Coinage provides information not only on financial matters for the fourth century BCE but also certain cultural influences manifest in the mintage. Two specimens, especially illuminative, shed light on succession of the high priests in Jerusalem. Up to their discovery, only the list from Neh. 12:10–11, 22, 26 bore witness to this sequence, which generated all kinds of speculation about potential duplication, triplication, and even quadruplication of high priests by the same name—all in an attempt to fill the time frame from the end of the Judahite state to the start of the Hellenistic era. Now, however, the epigraphic material bears witness to at least two and perhaps three different high priests for the period in question: Yohanan (I), who figures in the Elephantine papyri around 400 BCE;[101] his son and successor, Yaddua, who appears on a Judean coin from the second half of the fourth century BCE and may be identical to a high priest of the same name mentioned in Neh. 12:11–12, 22;[102] and Yohanan (II), who features on another Judean coin from the end of the Persian period. Given the date on the latter coin, this Yohanan cannot be identical with the Yohanan mentioned in the Elephantine papyri, which dates to the early fourth century BCE; he may well be identified, instead, with Onias I (Josephus *A.J.* 11.8.7, 347).[103] Consideration of the epigraphic testimony and the possibility of lengthy tenure makes further speculation superfluous and confirms the list in Neh. 12 to be complete.[104] Depicting a god on a winged wheel, one additional coin holds especial interest with regard to religious history, but the deity's identity remains unknown and controversial.[105]

Further light on the economic situation in the province of Judah along with its neighboring regions in the south of Palestine issues from the *ostraca*. In addition, the ostraca convey a host of personal names—both with and without theophoric elements—that elucidate the population's diverse ethnic composition as well as the region's great religious diversity. The theophoric element in Judean onomastics seems limited to two divinities, namely El and Yhwh (abbreviated as Yah or Yahu), but the corpus also contains numerous Aramaic, Phoenician, Edomite, and Arabic divine and personal appellations. In this respect, an ostracon of uncertain origin, presumably Khirbet el-Qom, proves particularly relevant, for it enumerates the properties and sanctuaries of three distinct divinities seated at these localities: "House of 'Uzza," "House of Yahu," and "House of Nabu."[106] Evidently, cultic veneration of the Judean–Samarian god Yahu did not (yet) confine itself, as late as the fourth century BCE, to the one "place that Yhwh has chosen" (Deut. 12). The epigraphic data therefore demonstrates no fundamental

[101] Jehohanan TAD A 4.7–8; Jonathan/Johanan in Neh. 12:11, 22.
[102] SPAER.   [103] BARAG.
[104] VanderKam (1991); Kratz (2004*a*), 106–11; DUŠEK A 549–91.
[105] AJC i. 21–30; see Grabbe (2004), 66–7.
[106] Porten and Yardeni (2007), 87; NIAI (2002) no. 283; HTAT 513–14.

difference in historical constellation from the Judeans at Elephantine or the Samarian (Israelite) Yhwh-adherents on Mount Gerizim.

In view of the epigraphic evidence, the question again emerges—for Judah and Jerusalem as for Samaria and Mount Gerizim—as to where the Torah of Moses along with the remaining biblical and para-biblical literature had their principal location before their attestation in the manuscripts of Qumran. Where were they produced, transmitted, and studied before the Maccabean insurrections and the Hasmonean period and, furthermore, when were they installed from the temple on Mount Gerizim through the sanctuary in Jerusalem to the synagogues of Alexandria so as to become the common foundation of Yhwh-religion? To answer these questions, scholarship has typically advanced two different hypotheses to determine the legal status of the Torah of Moses—*sc.* the Pentateuch—in Judah, Jerusalem, and Judaism as a whole.[107] While the first finds its bearings in external evidence and analogy with Persian religious politics, the second orients itself to literary analysis of the Pentateuch, i.e., internal evidence. At times, these two modes of explanation are combined with one another.

The first hypothesis follows certain documentation indicative of the Persian central government's recognition of local privileges and legal practices. Peter Frei, an ancient historian, has collected the extant evidence and argued for a firmly established instrument of Persian religious politics, which he designates "imperial authorization."[108] It is in this particular context that Frei interprets Ezra 7, the commission from King Artaxerxes for Ezra to apply "the law of the God of Heaven" as the "law of the king" for the Jews throughout Judah and the entire Transeuphratean satrapy. This "law of the God of Heaven"—none other than the "law of your [*sc.* Ezra's] god"—could only stand for the Torah of Moses, which Ezra implements in Ezra 9–10 and reads in front of the people in Neh. 8 before they ceremoniously pledge themselves to observe the Torah in full.[109] By analogy with various epigraphic evidence from other regions in the Persian empire and on the basis of the literary testimony in Ezra 7, some scholars have concluded that the Pentateuch was formed by the instigation or at least the involvement of the Persian central power and hence achieved a legally binding status through Persian imperial authorization.[110]

The second hypothesis, by contrast, proceeds from historical investigation of the literature on its own and appeals to the Pentateuch's proto-Samaritan version, discovered at Qumran, along with other indicators in an attempt to reveal Samarian influence alongside the Judean perspective. As a result, the Pentateuch's redactional history receives interpretation and explanation as a compromise both religio-political and theological in nature—a compromise

---

[107] See Knoppers and Levinson (2007).
[108] Frei (1996); for the larger discussion, see Watts (2001) and K. Schmid (2007).
[109] Kratz (1991*b*), 225ff.   [110] Blum (2010), 177–205.

that brought balance to the divergent Judean and Samarian interests, perhaps in the framework of or under pressure from Persian religious politics.[111]

Both of these theories merit serious consideration, but neither one has gained consensus up to now. As for the first hypothesis, substantial questions assault not only the historical value of Ezra 7 and Neh. 8 but even the fundamental proposition, namely Persian imperial authorization.[112] Concerning the second proposal, it depends on conjectural, at times speculative, literary analysis in addition to certain historical assumptions rather open to dispute; moreover, literary analysis provides only a relative chronology that cannot be easily correlated with specific historical events. The main problem with both these theories lies in their unquestioned premise that the Torah of Moses prevailed in temples and scribal schools across Judah and Samaria and, even further, constituted a common knowledge on which each and every group in the two provinces and across the Jewish diaspora could draw at will for all their various interests. The premise has no clear proof, however—at least thus far. Consequently, these hypotheses do not address the fundamental question: that is, the place of the Torah of Moses prior either to its elevation as Persian imperial law or to its negotiation as some kind of compromise.

Alternative explanations must therefore be considered. Judah as well as Samaria may have had no Torah of Moses or any other biblical tradition prominent among its leading institutions and widespread among its Yhwh-devotees. Instead, Judah and Samaria alike may have had a common torah practiced at the temple—priestly regulations for cultic practice and daily life—with the Torah of Moses and the rest of biblical literature solely restricted to study and observation by certain scribal circles. Alongside the temple and its personnel, together with the great band of Yhwh-adherents who felt themselves close to the temple and its cultic practice, yet another group may have committed itself to the biblical tradition—in the strict sense—and only under certain historical circumstances, i.e., the Maccabean revolt and its aftermath, which exercised substantial influence in the development of the Jewish religion. Both the epigraphic material and the pre-history of biblical tradition, which converge with inscriptional evidence considerably more than the biblical text's current form, indicate this scenario has much greater probability than the other theories hitherto advanced.

Which circles devoted themselves to the biblical tradition? Again, in Judah as in Samaria the exact identity of these circles is hard to ascertain. They must have been literate and well-educated individuals. Perhaps they came, originally, from scribal schools and other such institutions within the two provinces, only to distance themselves later, at the very least internally. The mass of biblical and

---

[111] Blum (1990), 333–60; (2010), 177–205; Otto (2000), 234–73; Nihan (2007); DUŠEK B 90–2.

[112] See Part B *Tradition* IV 5.

para-biblical literature along with the great diversity of opinions and ideas it contains do not contradict such description; rather, marginal groups—like the community of Qumran, the early Christians, and the various gnostic factions—distinguish themselves through immensely diverse and polyphonic traditions and a wide range of literary production. Furthermore, the group may not have been particularly small but scattered across all of Syria–Palestine and throughout the diaspora, a situation, then, similar to the Qumran community and the early Christians. With respect to politics and social status, however, the group would have been marginal. Such circles eventually merged into the Qumran community or the faction later called the "pious" (*Hasidim*). They exerted significant political influence for a short while, during the Maccabean insurrections, but deliberately separated themselves again from the leading political parties and official institutions, like the temple, later on.

With origins perhaps at the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century BCE, these circles—firmly committed to the Torah of Moses and the rest of biblical tradition—may have issued from the political upheavals and social dislocations that caused the power transfer from the Persian empire to the Hellenistic Diadochi states and then from Ptolemean to Seleucid supremacy. What festered in the third century BCE erupted in the second. The shift from Ptolemean to Seleucid hegemony over Palestine brought with it tremendous unrest and upset throughout the Samarian and Judean provinces. Forced to choose between one or the other political power, the ruling priestly classes and elites—i.e., the Oniads, the Tobiads, and others—encountered enormous internal strife and, depending on their choices, with the new Seleucid power too. The dispute culminated in the Maccabean revolt against pro-Seleucid politics and the cultic changes in Jerusalem under Antiochus IV, and it ended with the foundation of the Hasmonean dynasty.[113]

This historical development had nothing to do with the Torah of Moses and the biblical tradition, even if biblical and para-biblical polemic—which champions the Maccabean–Hasmonean cause—does suggest as much. Instead, the Maccabean insurrections and the subsequent Hasmonean kingdom availed themselves of the circles promoting biblical Judaism and its specific religious convictions and exploited them for its cause. A power struggle became a war of religion. As demonstrated by the biblical and para-biblical tradition, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the documents from Qumran, and the historiography of Josephus, the various groups of the "pious" initially supported the insurgent priests, but the alliance quickly dissolved. After rededication of the temple in Jerusalem, the short-lived unity disintegrated and gave rise to a new religious constellation.

In this specific constellation, the Torah of Moses was and remained the religious foundation of the Maccabean revolt and the Hasmonean dynasty.

---

[113] See Part A *History* III 2.

Based on these politics, biblical Judaism became, for the first time, a religion of the state and therefore fell into a predicament. Controversy surrounded the proper interpretation and application of the Torah of Moses, with cleavages appearing among the various factions depending on their disposition toward the Hasmonean dynasty—dominated by Judeans—and toward the temple in Jerusalem. The multitudinous groupings of the "pious"—including the Qumran community, the Essenes, and, of course, the Samaritans, whose temple the Hasmoneans had destroyed—confronted the Sadducees and Pharisees, who more or less came to terms with the Hasmoneans and exercised influence, alternately, in the temple and the royal court alike. However the Hasmoneans and their partisans are judged in the final analysis, they ultimately bear responsibility for the legacy of biblical Judaism, the Torah of Moses, and the rest of biblical tradition having achieved a fixed legal status and a firm foundation throughout the various manifestations of Judaism. Yet the strength of biblical tradition lay not in its legal standing for a state religion or its practice in the temple but rather its ability—after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE—to survive without either temple or kingdom in Judaism and Judaism's derivative, Christianity, up to the present day.

6. ALEXANDRIA

Alongside the Samarian sanctuary on Mount Gerizim and the Judean temple on Mount Zion in Jerusalem—in other words, the two centers of Palestinian Judaism in the provinces of Samaria and Judah—Alexandria stood at the core of Hellenistic Judaism in the orbit of Egypt. Indeed, the biblical literature exhibits a special connection to this city. Alexandria saw translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek, the Septuagint, which then served as the foundation for Hellenistic Judaism's plethora of subsequent literary production. Assessment of this literature, however, will only follow a careful study of the epigraphic material and the city's own history, which reveals the presence of a large Jewish community along with many synagogues. The Judean colony in Leontopolis (Heliopolis) also merits some attention, for this community, too, maintained a temple from the second century BCE.

After the Judean colony at Elephantine, whose traces disappear in the fourth century BCE, inscriptions from the middle of the third century BCE bear witness to the existence of Jews in Alexandria and the rest of Egypt.[114] Yet their origins remain unknown. While some may have emigrated from Palestine, others

---

[114] See Schürer (1973–87), iii. 46–7 and the material in HORBURY/NOY, esp. No. 1–21. For the larger historical context, see Fraser (1972), esp. 1:35, 54ff., 74–5, 83–4, 85, 281–6; Kasher (1985); Barclay (1998); Georges, Albrecht, and Feldmeier (2013).

could have come to Egypt as prisoners of war. A substantial number, however, may have simply descended from the Judean population that already lived there during the Persian period. An Aramaic papyrus from the late fourth or early third century BCE provides the missing link. More concretely, it contains a list of personal names—mostly Greek but also Hebrew—that confirms a Jewish presence within the region of Edfu. Among these names, the papyrus attests two different priests explicitly and thus implicitly, perhaps, the existence of a temple too.[115] Soon, these Jews living in Egypt no longer spoke Aramaic but Greek instead—the language of Alexander and the Ptolemies as well as that of the inscriptions and literary sources composed by the Jews themselves. Their names and self-designation, i.e., "the Judeans" (*oi Ioudaioi*), reveal their identity and, beyond their own ancestry, imply a certain feeling of solidarity among each other and with their homeland.

The Jews of Leontopolis (i.e., Tell el-Yehudiyeh), in the district of Heliopolis, also called themselves "Judeans." Epigraphically traceable and literarily attested from the middle of the second century BCE onward, this community, by contrast, did leave a clear trail back to its point of origin.[116] Around 160 BCE, a member of the Jerusalemite high priest's family—namely, the Oniads (and presumably Onias IV)—founded a military colony with its own temple, which endured for almost two hundred years until the Romans closed it soon after 70 CE.[117] Ptolemy IV Philopator allocated the land to him, hence denominated the "land of Onias."[118] As for the garrison itself, it constituted but one of many military colonies in Hellenistic Egypt, comparable to the Persian base at Elephantine.

Not only Leontopolis but also Alexandria bears striking resemblance to Elephantine, in several different respects. First and foremost, such correspondence appears in the social and political structure. According to literary sources, Alexandria had a Jewish quarter, from which the Jewish community gradually dispersed throughout the city.[119] Rather than marginalization or even separation, this concentration in a single district simply expressed the community's consciousness of its distinct identity, a phenomenon prevalent among other ethnicities as well. The Jews of Alexandria organized themselves into a territorial association (*politeuma*) by "elders" (*presbyteroi*) and "leaders" (*hegoumenoi*), an organization that finds ample epigraphic attestation for

---

[115] TAD C 3.28:85, 113–14; for the specific location, see line 119.

[116] HORBURY/NOY No. 29–105; Josephus, *A.J.* 12.9.7, 387–8; 13.3.1ff., 62ff.; 10.4, 284–7 (following Strabo); 20.10.3, 236–7; *B.J.* 1.1.1, 33; 9.4, 190; 7.10.2–4, 421–36. See Schürer (1973–87), iii. 47–9 as well as Noy (1994); Frey (1999), 186–94; Ameling (2008).

[117] The tradition alternates between Onias III, son of Simon (*B.J.* 1.1.1, 33; 7.10.2, 423), and Onias IV, son of Onias III (*A.J.* 12.5.1, 237; 9.7, 387; 13.3.1, 62).

[118] Josephus, *B.J.* 1.9.4, 190; *A.J.* 14.8.1, 131.

[119] Josephus, *A.J.* 12.1.1, 8; 14.7.2, 117 (following Strabo); *B.J.* 2.18.7, 488; *C.Ap.* 2.35; Philo *Flacc.* 55; *Legat.* 132. See Schürer (1973–87), iii. 43–4; Barclay (1998), 27–34.

different ethnic groups and other Jewish communities scattered across different parts of contemporary Egypt.[120] Varying from place to place, the terminology for specific political constitution as well as individual offices diversified even more in the course of time. Nevertheless, the extant evidence *in toto* indicates that diverse ethnicities, including the "Judeans," were fully integrated into the Ptolemean state and, to a certain extent, sustained their own legal rights, with some even possessing full citizenship.[121] This state of affairs also holds true for the "land of Onias" in Leontopolis. If the dedication of synagogues to the Ptolemean ruling couple in Alexandria as well as other sites across Egypt—witnessed already in the third century BCE—demonstrates Judeans' full integration into and their steadfast loyalty to the Hellenistic state, military service rendered by the Jews indicates the same in Leontopolis.[122]

Concerning political status, too, a conspicuous continuity ran from Elephantine in the Persian period to Jewish settlements in the Hellenistic era. Identity and integration lived in harmony. The two ostensibly yielded a close synthesis in the early years of Ptolemean domination. Although such consolidation did not preclude local conflicts, like destruction of the Yahu temple at Elephantine or participation of the Jewish population in inner-Ptolemeic power struggles, only in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods did ongoing conflicts emerge. Triggered not least by developments in Palestine, national ethnic and religious tensions exploded in the form of pogroms against the Jews and, in turn, Jewish revolts against the Romans.[123]

Epigraphic material also suggests a certain comparability between daily life at Elephantine and that of the Hellenistic–Roman period.[124] Apart from funerary and dedicatory inscriptions, hardly any documents pertaining to everyday life have materialized in Alexandria or Leontopolis. Still, testimony from the rest of Egypt paints a portrait similar to those depicted in the Elephantine and Samarian papyri. Legal cases, contracts, business transactions, and tax payments all comprise the content of these inscriptions, which connect to the Jewish communities of Egypt through either onomastic or ethnic associations.

No difference obtained in lifestyle between Jews and the rest of the population. Daily life proceeded according to the same precepts standard for the Hellenistic–Roman world, be it within the Judean colonies themselves or

---

[120] See *Let. Aris.* 310 as well as COWEY/MARESCH; further Schürer (1973–87), iii. 88–9, 92; Hengel (1996), 298; Honigman (2002) and (2003*a*); Cowey and Maresch (2003); Kruse (2008) and (2010). The papyri of the Jews in Heracleopolis bear witness to phrases that relate contracts to a "paternal oath" (*orkos patrios*) and declare any breach of contract an infringement of the "paternal law" *(patrios nomos)*. These texts, however, do not demonstrate any explicit reference to the Torah of Moses. Rather, the formulae allude to Jewish customs (COWEY/MARESCH 26). In this sense, the "paternal law" is also mentioned with regard to the Idumeans of Memphis (OGIS ii. 737,15, p. 480). For the epigraphic material, see further Schröder (1996), 200–6.

[121] Schürer (1973–87) iii. 126–37; Barclay (1998), esp. 60–71.

[122] Schürer (1973–87) iii. 46–7 and Hengel (1996), 171, 173.

[123] Schäfer (1997).   [124] HORBURY/NOY; Schürer (1973–87) iii. 46–60.

between Jewish and non-Jewish members of society. In contrast to the biblical tradition along with the Qumran community, no objections seem to have been raised. References to Jewish political status and citizenship only appear in individual inscriptions from the Roman era, not least in Alexandria.[125] Acknowledgement of the two-drachma tax, imposed on the Jews following the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE (Josephus, *B.J.* 7.6.6, 218), implies a certain cleavage in the otherwise close synthesis of identity and integration—a cleavage that broke into massive riots against "the Judeans," which betrays both ethnic and religious motives.

Only within the realm of religion does any sizable shift seem to have occurred during the transition from the Persian to the Hellenistic epochs. Alexandria and many other places of the Jewish diaspora within the sphere of Egypt saw the proliferation not of temples but synagogues, designated "houses of prayer" (*proseuche*).[126] Many a scholar has interpreted this arrangement as adherence to the biblical command for centralization, which prohibits any temple outside Jerusalem. Others have proposed such a transformation indicates the Jewish community's intention to dissociate itself from the surrounding pagan cults, whereby it substituted the sacrificial cult outside the Jerusalem orbit with obedience to the Torah and liturgy of scripture more locally. Often connected to Isa. 19:18–22 in accordance with Josephus (*A.J.* 13.3.1, 64, etc.), the temple of Leontopolis therefore seems to serve as the exception that proves the rule.

Yet the situation was likely more complex. Religious services in the synagogue appear to have included, at least initially, prayers and hymns instead of the reading and interpretation of sacred texts, such as the Torah of Moses. This state of affairs by no means implies a knowledge of the biblical tradition's standards and ideals, let alone its universal acceptance and prestige. Purely financial and practical reasons may well have warranted the establishment of such houses of prayer, perhaps even modeled on Orphism's non-sacrificial mystery practices. Having eventually established themselves, these institutions became the norm and assumed the traditional functions of temples, like the granting of asylum. As revealed by their customary dedication to the ruling dynasty, the synagogues also enjoyed an official status corresponding to that of the temple. Such dedication further suggests the synagogues did not operate primarily as some kind of insulation from the pagan world. Nevertheless, a status equal to that of the temple does not imply these houses of prayer were intended to replace the temple in Jerusalem or any other temple in Egypt or Palestine.

The temple of Leontopolis fully conforms to this religious context. Its foundation rested on political and economic—crucially, not religious—grounds.[127] After pro-Seleucid circles deposed the Oniads in Jerusalem, the latter earned their

---

[125] Schürer (1973–87) iii. 50, 128–9.
[126] Hengel (1996), 171–95; see also Rajak (2002*a*) and (2003).   [127] Frey (1999), 191–4.

livelihood among their old confederates in Ptolemean Egypt.[128] Although the temple exercised no great influence beyond the "land of Onias"—at least so far as we can tell—such circumscription does not mean the temple was unimportant or controversial.[129] No epigraphic evidence implies any competition whatsoever between the temple and the synagogues, nor does any intimate that the temple in Leontopolis provided a religious alternative to the one in Jerusalem. Rather, as the center of a military colony, the temple served Ptolemean interests in the same way the temples in Jerusalem and Samaria advanced those of the Seleucids.[130]

Synagogues and temples were not mutually exclusive. In the Egyptian diaspora, both these institutions ensured the Jewish community could exercise its proper ritual veneration of the deity, Yhwh—whether through prayer or sacrifice. At the same time, each entity had deep roots in the Ptolemean body politic. The synagogue may indeed exhibit a Jewish peculiarity, yet its implementation did not necessarily depend on the biblical command for centralization, nor did its observance originally include the reading of scripture.

Epigraphic evidence for religious practice among the Judeans in Alexandria and Leontopolis—so far as they can be identified—points in the same direction.[131] Though following Greek conventions, grave inscriptions indubitably converge with the Jewish faith of the Egyptian diaspora. As with the synagogue, the necropolis and ossuaries have revealed, through archaeological excavation, several distinctive features of the Jewish community, yet even these features flow in the greater stream of religion's more conventional differentiation.[132] No influence from specifically biblical expressions or conceptions is immediately discernible. Jewish onomastics prove equally insignificant. Indeed, only observation of the Sabbath as a day of rest on each week's seventh day would clearly presuppose the biblical command.[133]

---

[128] See Josephus, *B.J.* 7.10.2, 422–5; *A.J.* 13.3.1–3, 62ff. The same can be said for the Tobiads, who had always sided with the Ptolemies: see Hengel (1996), 178 n. 35; Frey (1999), 194–5.

[129] Ameling (2008), 120–1.

[130] Owing to the bias of the extant sources, the relationship between the three Egyptian places (Elephantine, Alexandria, Leontopolis) and Jerusalem is not easy to determine. The Judeans of Elephantine corresponded with both Jerusalem and Samaria (TAD A 4.7–8)—at least on the level of Persian bureaucracy. No competition can be discerned in the available material. It is, however, striking that no letters addressed to the priests on Mount Gerizim are mentioned. As far as Alexandria is concerned, the literary sources speak of a special relationship with the temple in Jerusalem (*Let. Aris.*; 2 Macc. 1:1–2:18) and enmity against the Samaritans (Josephus, *A.J.* 13.3.4, 74ff.). According to Josephus, the temple of Leontopolis was modeled on the Jerusalem temple (*B.J.* 1.1.1, 33; slightly different 7.10.3, 427; *A.J.* 12.9.7, 388; 13.3.1, 63, 67; 3.3, 72). However, it is considered just as much a rival to the Jerusalem temple as the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim (Josephus, *B.J.* 7.10.3, 431; slightly different *A.J.* 13.3.1, 67); at least, there was the excuse of Isa. 19:18–19 (Josephus, *B.J.* 7.10.3, 432; *A.J.* 13.3.1, 64, 68; 3.2, 71).

[131] Blischke (2007), 223–63; Noy (1994); Ameling (2008).   [132] Blischke (2007), 230–2.

[133] Hengel (1973), 80 (ET 1974: i. 41–2); (1996), 297–8; on the papyri, see Doering (1999), 289–94. The counting of days in the Zenon papyrus in question (CPJ i. 10) refers to the month Epeiph (following the Seleucid, not the Jewish–Babylonian calendar!), not the specific week.

Only the late Hellenistic and Roman periods saw any marked mutation. Under the influence of Palestine in general and Maccabean–Hasmonean politics in particular, the houses of prayer increasingly transformed into a type of Pharisean synagogue, morphing into an institution that helped expand adherence to the Torah and the study of the scripture. In opposition to the imperial cult, a sense of the synagogue's sanctity waxed while dedications to the ruling household flagged then ceased.[134] Grave inscriptions alone seem uninfluenced by this development. In this respect, comparison with those of Palestine—which evoke the conceptual horizon of biblical tradition—proves especially instructive.[135] Owing to the lack of sources, any shift in circumstance at the temple in Leontopolis remains entirely obscure. As the intellectual center of the Egyptian diaspora in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, Alexandria has yielded the greatest finds in terms of religious change.

With its legendary royal library, which boasted writings from all around the world, Alexandria stood as the central place of literature in the ancient world.[136] No archaeological remains have survived from the library itself, but we know, at least approximately, the treasures that it held. According to legend, the library of Alexandria included a Greek version of the Hebrew Bible, more specifically, the Greek translation of the Torah of Moses. At the request of King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BCE) and the orchestration of a courtier named Aristeas, a delegation of seventy-two priests from Jerusalem—six from each of the twelve tribes of Israel—completed the translation in the course of seventy-two days.[137] This legend ultimately granted the Greek translation of the (entire) Hebrew Bible its name, which it in fact received from the Christians: namely the Septuagint or "Seventy." Initially, however, only the five books of Moses—i.e., the Torah—underwent translation. Such rendition of the Torah was—and remained—the template for translation of the rest of the biblical books, a long process that proceeded little by little and lasted until the first century CE.[138]

The Septuagint's greatest achievement consisted of sustaining and disseminating biblical Judaism in the Hellenistic–Roman world.[139] Even further, the Septuagint provided the common linguistic and ideological foundation that underlay the Hellenistic Judaism prevalent throughout the enormous quantity

---

Unfortunately, the fourteenth day is not registered, so the kind of "Sabbath" conceptualized remains altogether uncertain.

[134] Hengel (1996), 171–95, esp. 173, 179, 180–9, 190–4.

[135] Blischke (2007), 250–60.   [136] Georges, Albrecht, and Feldmeier (2013).

[137] The legend is first told in the pseudepigraphic Letter of Aristeas (APOT ii. 82–122; OTP ii. 7–34; JSHRZ ii. 35–87). Josephus (*A.J.* 12.2, 11–118) and likely Philo (*Mos.* 2:25–44) already depend on this text. The dating of Aristobulus in the quotation by Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 13.12:1–2; JSHRZ iii. 261–79) is uncertain.

[138] M. Hengel in Hengel and Schwemer (1994), 182–284; Hengel (2002).

[139] Hanhart (1999); Seeligmann (2004).

of Greek-language Jewish writings from the Hellenistic–Roman period.[140] Besides the biblical and para-biblical scriptures—viz. the so-called apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature—the scholar Philo of Alexandria and the historian Flavius Josephus of Rome composed their works on the basis of biblical tradition. Yet their compositions differ from the other literature in that their identities are known. Admittedly, not all such productions simply fall under the general category of Alexandrian Jewish literature; the literature actually stemming from Alexandria began comparatively late and did not represent all phases of Alexandrian history across the board.[141] Nevertheless, the entire movement commenced with translation of the Torah into Greek.

The literature of Hellenistic Judaism has one foot firmly planted in the biblical tradition and the other equally so in the Hellenistic world.[142] More than its language and genre alone, the literature's very spirit betrays the impact of the latter. The pseudepigraphic Letter of Aristeas, which has erected an impressive monument to the Torah's Greek translation along with its origins in Alexandria, serves as a good exemplar of this phenomenon. The work discusses the philosophical streams of its age with considerable sympathy to the Ptolemean state and Hellenistic culture alike.[143] Relating biblical traditions to Hellenistic (popular) philosophy in a positive way, the Letter of Aristeas— like Aristobulus and Philo—deploys Alexandrian exegesis to interpret the Jewish law "tropologically" (*Let. Aris.* 150–1) or, more specifically, ethically (*Let. Aris.* 128–71, esp. 168–9) and creates, in turn, a Hellenistic mirror for rulers on the premise of divine origins (*Let. Aris.* 187–294, esp. 200, 235). The text therefore classes Judaism with the Hellenistic world without relinquishing Jewish identity. In this way, the Letter of Aristeas proceeds within the framework of a synthesized identity and an integration typical of the Jewish diaspora in Egypt. Henceforth, this synthesis of identity and integration would transition into "a synthesis of Judaism and Hellenism."[144] New is the very definition of identity. Instead of solely resting on a common Judean background and a shared Yhwh veneration, the sense of identity now issues from the Torah of Moses, which encompasses Judaism with "impenetrable ramparts" and "iron walls."[145] The sacred history of the Israelite people supplants a collective ancestry and Judean history. The law, i.e., the Torah of Moses, supersedes an ancient religious tradition of Yhwh veneration.

---

[140] Good introductions to the Septuagint include Jobes and Silva (2000); Dines (2004); Fernández Marcos (2009); see also Hengel and Schwemer (1994) and Hengel (2002); Rajak (2008) and (2009); Kreuzer, Meiser, and Sigismund (2012); Law (2013); Aitken (2014) and (2015). For the related literature, see Stone (1984); Mulder and Sysling (1988); Maier (1990); Schürer (1973–87) iii; and Part B *Tradition* IV 6.

[141] See J. Dochhorn in Georges, Albrecht, and Feldmeier (2013).

[142] Hengel (1973; ET 1974) and (1976; ET 1980); Gruen (1998) and (2002).

[143] APOT ii. 82–122; OTP ii. 7–34; JSHRZ ii. 35–87; see Honigman (2003*b*); Gruen (2008); Rajak (2002*b*); (2008).

[144] Tcherikover (1958), 70.   [145] *Let. Aris.* 139. See Feldmeier (1994).

Most scholarship imagines the biblical tradition—at the very least in substance—as established and pervasive throughout Israel and Judah from the very start and thus sees the situation at Alexandria as self-explanatory. However, both the state of affairs at Elephantine and the epigraphic evidence from the Hellenistic period pose crucial questions of rule and exception with regard to the literature, as they did with the relationship between synagogue and temple. The absence of evidence does not, of course, exclude the possibility of general acquaintance with the biblical tradition. However, such cognizance cannot simply be assumed and deployed for interpretation of the epigraphic and archaeological material.

Since no literary tradition has surfaced at Leontopolis, the site offers little recourse as a benchmark.[146] Still, both the temple and the epigraphic evidence from Leontopolis demonstrate stronger connections to Elephantine than Alexandria, which bears some significance for historical appraisal of the Oniads and the reconstruction of events under Antiochus IV in Palestine. Thus, the difference between Elephantine and Alexandria, palpable in the literary inventory—namely the Bisutun Inscription and "Words of Ahiqar" versus the Torah of Moses and the rest of biblical tradition—demands an explanation. Yet this question does not center on genres or types of sources alone; as already described, the two entities display enough intersection to warrant comparison. Likewise, sociological explanation—whereby Elephantine would represent the general population's practiced religion while Alexandria would epitomize the intellectual elites' reflected theology—falls far too short. The epigraphic testimony indicates that such practiced religion also characterized the upper classes, whereas biblical tradition in the Hellenistic–Roman age—especially in the wake of Maccabean–Hasmonean religious politics—extended or at least should have extended to the broader population.

What, then, explains the difference between Elephantine and Alexandria? Or, more precisely, how did the biblical tradition enter Egypt so as to undergo Greek translation in Alexandria and thereby prepare the ground for such an extensive literary production as that of Hellenistic Judaism? An unequivocal answer is impossible at present, and given the dearth of sources, it may never be possible. Only careful delineation of the historical horizon and contemporary circumstance can promote a proper understanding of this process.

Elephantine around 400 BCE and Alexandria from the middle of the second century BCE onward provide two fixed points for such an assessment. Like the transition from temple to synagogue, the literature likely experienced a decisive impact, too, from the changes in Palestine following the Maccabean–Hasmonean insurrections and the establishment of an "Israelite" kingdom founded on the Torah of Moses. Between these two poles lay translation of the Torah into Greek. Though usually dated to the middle of the third century

---

[146] See, however, Horbury (1994).

BCE under Ptolemy II (285–246 BCE), this chronological attribution rests upon exceedingly thin support. The only evidence comes from the Jewish pseudepigraphic Letter of Aristeas from the first century BCE, which scholarly analysis has unanimously judged a fiction, with the exception of the date for translation of the Torah. A more promising approach is perhaps comparison between the Septuagint and the Greek papyri, on the one hand, and inscriptions from Egypt of the third to the first century BCE, on the other. The language points to a date of translation between the mid-third and mid-second century.[147]

Citations from the pagan, Greek-speaking historians Hecataeus of Abdera, Berossus, and Manetho may provide a certain point of reference for dissemination of the biblical tradition in the time between Elephantine and Qumran, thereby intimating a certain familiarity by the third century BCE.[148] Preserved in secondary or even tertiary transmissions by later Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian authors, the citations of these historians provide a deceptively firm footing, though. In the vast majority of cases, the authenticity of such sources remains controversial, as authors of the Roman era almost certainly reworked them in the course of time. Yet another question surrounds the means by which these historians could possibly have known the material of Hebrew tradition so soon after the Persian period, which they paraphrase in Greek.

Since many essential issues still remain unsolved, only an approximate temporal assignment is possible. Sometime between Alexander the Great and Judas Maccabaeus, the biblical tradition must have found a way—as of yet unknown—to the Judeans of the Egyptian diaspora, where it underwent translation into Greek. In Egypt, as among the Judeans and Samarians in Palestine, knowledge of the biblical tradition spread during the third century BCE without necessarily gaining a firm place in the collective consciousness or an official authority in the temples or synagogues.

The Greek prologue to Ecclesiasticus (i.e., Ben Sira, also called Wisdom of Sirach) highlights the conditions of the early second century BCE. In this context, the grandson of Ben Sira, who translated the book into Greek at the end of the second century, declares that knowledge of the biblical tradition—i.e., the Law and the Prophets as well as the other books of the ancestors—was by no means a given at the time of his grandfather. Ben Sira, so says his grandson, had written his book specifically so "not only those who can read should acquire understanding but also those who love learning should be able to help the outsider in word and writing alike."[149] The "Praise of the Ancestors" (Sir. 44–9) therefore serves as a kind of small catechism designed to introduce the ignorant to the principles of biblical tradition. In addition, the adulation of Simon II, whom Sir.

---

[147] For the vocabulary see Aitken (2014).
[148] STERN; see Bar-Kochva (1997) and (2010); Gmirkin (2006); Kratz, "Biblical History" (forthcoming).
[149] Sir. Prol. 4–6.

50 depicts in all his cultic splendor and magnificence, creates the impression that even the high priest himself and the rest of his priestly entourage in Jerusalem still needed elementary instruction in the biblical tradition.

As hinted in the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, dissemination of the biblical tradition came from wisdom teachers like Ben Sira, not the temple with its incumbent priests. Presumably, the gravity of Hellenism prompted certain scribal circles to preoccupy themselves more intensely with the biblical tradition. Though not everyone in the Jewish community was willing or able to escape the undertow of Hellenism, the longer it persisted and the stronger it grew, the more such groups felt the need, perhaps, to produce something of their own to contrast if not counter it completely. Such developments may have commenced during the third and early second centuries BCE in Palestine and maybe even more acutely in the Egyptian diaspora.

The pervasiveness of and engagement with the biblical tradition during this period of time remains rather open to question. Nonetheless, translation of the Torah into Greek and vigorous interaction with the Greek-speaking world—as reflected in citations from Hecataeus, Berossus, and Mantheo—may have had their place within the intellectual circles that studied and heeded the biblical tradition. As a late reflex of this very situation, the pseudepigraphic Letter of Aristeas may rightly describe an erudite debate of philosophy. Still, its particular portrayal—like those in 2 Kgs. 22–3, Ezra 7, and the Greek prologue to Ecclesiasticus—assigns the Torah of Moses a prevalent authority it surely did not yet possess, an authority only gained gradually over time and thanks, not least, to such foundation legends as 2 Kgs. 22–3, Ezra 7, Pseudo-Aristeas, and other propagandistic writings similar to the work of Ben Sira. In accord with the extant evidence, popularization of the biblical literature as a normative tradition pertinent to every Jew or "Judean" in Palestine and across the diaspora probably started to see a sweeping success only in the middle of the second century BCE, under the influence of Maccabean–Hasmonean religious politics. A powerful history of biblical interpretation then ensued in the Hellenistic Judaism of Alexandria as well as the Palestinian and then Babylonian forms of Judaism. This tradition has endured over centuries and on to this very day.

III

Israel and Judaism

1. NON-BIBLICAL AND BIBLICAL JUDAISM

Their Jewish archives poles apart both geographically and temporally, Elephantine and Qumran represent two substantial extremities, as Part C has described thus far: the non-biblical Judaism of the Egyptian diaspora in the Persian period (and Al-Yahudu as a possible analogy from the Babylonian diaspora), on one end, and the rigorous champions of biblical Judaism in Palestine of the Hellenistic–Roman period, on the other. Somewhere in between lie the writings of the Hebrew Bible, which received their final form sometime during the Persian and early Hellenistic epochs, saw gradual translation into Greek, and inspired a mass of para-biblical literature. The names Mount Gerizim, Jerusalem, and Alexandria signify the transition from one pole to the other. Although the epigraphic finds from these locations show an affinity to non-biblical Judaism, the literary tradition ultimately brought them into the fold of biblical tradition.

Comparison of the archives among one another and comparison of the inscriptional evidence with the literary testimony—namely the biblical tradition—unveils a fundamental difference, not to say an opposition, within the Judaism of the Persian–Hellenistic period.

On the one side stands a Judaism both in Palestine and the diaspora that features a common veneration of the deity Yhwh but otherwise defines its identity through its origin either in Samaria (*sc.* the realm of the former kingdom of Israel) or in Judah. More specifically, Samarian (viz. Israelite) and Judean Yhwh-adherents both in Palestine and throughout the diaspora require firm distinction, as do the two ethnicities, regardless of the extensive exchanges between both regions and their populations. According to extant documentation, the two ethnicities lived in continuity with the populations of the pre-exilic kingdoms of Israel and Judah and retained their ancient customs and practices under the new circumstances of an Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Ptolemean, Seleucid, and, finally, Roman province or their respective colonies in the diaspora. Here and there, the two ethnicities clearly maintained their own regional sacred spaces: the Samarian Yhwh-adherents a temple on Mount Gerizim, and Judean Yhwh-adherents their own in Jerusalem,

Elephantine, and Leontopolis. Archaeological and epigraphic indicators verify the presence of further Yhwh shrines during the Persian period: the sanctuary in Bethel and a Yahu sanctuary in southern (i.e. Edomite) Judah. Over the course of the Hellenistic–Roman epoch, houses of prayer (synagogues) eventually supervened.

As we have already seen in Part B, *The Biblical Tradition*, much of what is either discernible in Samarian (Israelite) and Judean culture and religion or attested in epigraphic material and onomastic data also found entrance into the biblical tradition: the preferential veneration of Yhwh in addition to diverse judicial, priestly, cultic, prophetic, sapiential, and narrative traditions, conceptions, and speech forms. For this reason, both ethnicities can and should fall beneath the designations "Israel" and "Judaism." Such interchange corroborates a certain continuity between historical Israel and historical Judah, on the one hand, and biblical Israel and Judaism, on the other. Outside the biblical tradition, however, neither the Samarian (Israelite) nor Judean Yhwh-devotees presupposed the biblical tradition as such, nor did they conceptualize it as some greater binding norm. Consequently, I prefer the appellation "non-biblical Judaism."[1]

More or less concurrently, biblical tradition testifies to another form of post-monarchic Judaism. Here, too, Samaria (both ancient Israel and the province of Samaria) remains distinct from Judah, though the two are idealized as a unity denominated "(all) Israel." To exaggerate for effect, one might say the biblical tradition reckons not with Samaria and Judah but with Israel and the other nations. From this perspective, both Samarians and Judeans can stand beneath the designation Israel or that of the other nations, depending on whether or not certain individuals or groups belong to the adherents of biblical "Israel." In addition to the Hebrew language, which figured alongside spoken Aramaic as the language of holy scripture, and the common veneration of the deity Yhwh, genealogical connection serves as a unifier in the biblical tradition, binding together not specifically Samarian (Israelite)

---

[1] Since this form of Judaism lacks connection not only to the priestly or deuteronomic–deuteronomistic legislation but also to the pre-priestly and pre-deuteronomistic narrative as well as to the prophetic tradition, with which—to my mind—the biblical tradition begins after 720 BCE, the term "non-biblical" seems to me the most appropriate. Some scholars might object this conclusion is drawn only from *argumentum e silentio*. Against such an objection, I would emphasize how I have described and evaluated what is attested in primary (epigraphic) sources and further compared this material to the secondary (literary) sources of the biblical tradition—a procedure frequently practiced in and widely accepted across many other academic fields, such as the history of Aram, Ammon, Moab, and Edom. I disagree with any characterization of the external evidence here or elsewhere as "silent." To the contrary, I would contend that arguing either only or primarily on the basis of the biblical narrative—even if it can be dated to the period under discussion—and at the same time neglecting or nivellating the epigraphic evidence is an "argument from silence": the biblical sources are indeed "silent" with respect to the Jews at Elephantine, Al-Yahudu, Mount Gerizim, Alexandria, Leontopolis, and Qumran.

or Judean tribes but the twelve tribes of Israel and their families and, even further, circumscribing them from others. Moreover, commitment to tradition—and most of all the Torah of Moses—institutes a new identity and marks a contrast to the other nations and even other compatriots in Samaria and Judah who did not adhere to biblical "Israel."

Examination of the historical evidence and abandonment of any further speculation reveals this form of Judaism—following a pre-history that reaches back to the monarchic period—first emerged in the post-monarchic period, more specifically, in the Hellenistic era. This strand of Judaism finds attestation in the proto-Samaritan Pentateuch, Greek translation of the Torah, texts from the Dead Sea region, and literary traditions both concerning and from Jerusalem as well as Alexandria. Beyond all regional, linguistic, and cultural distinctions, these witnesses show a fundamental conviction shared by broad portions of the Samarian and Judean population throughout Palestine and the diaspora. Alongside a common veneration of Yhwh, this fundamental conviction becomes manifest in a consistent reference to the biblical tradition and all that issued from it, whether a certain self-understanding or specific religious praxis. Accordingly, I designate this form of Judaism "biblical Judaism."

Regarding the precise relationship between non-biblical and biblical Judaism during the post-monarchic period—i.e. in the Babylonian, Persian, and Hellenistic–Roman epochs—the issue is riddled with difficulty. Assuming no sizable variation, many scholars fill the epigraphic lacunae with the biblical tradition and, in turn, the biblical lacunae (in terms of sure historical data) with the epigraphic evidence.[2] The deviating data—whether the numerous sanctuaries in Palestine and throughout the diaspora that defy the command of centralization in Deut. 12, the numerous deities whom the Judean colony at Elephantine esteemed and even venerated, or the political, social, and personal relationships between Judeans and their neighbors as well as foreign rulers—then count as exceptions that prove the rule.

An adequate assessment of this relationship, however, demands no rash harmonization of sources or automatic equation of these two forms of Judaism, each having its own diversity as well. Instead, biblical Judaism and non-biblical Judaism almost certainly coexisted alongside one another—and, to a certain extent, both with and in one another—over a long period of time, before biblical Judaism ultimately prevailed. Ben Sira offers important testimony in this regard, for the prologue to its Greek translation discloses that the book was written at the end of the second century BCE specifically to help implement a greater awareness and broader dissemination of biblical Judaism. As discussed already, the Maccabean uprising and the subsequent Hasmonean dynasty may constitute the historical caesura after which the biblical tradition experienced discernible diffusion and gained an authority

---

[2] For further discussion, see Huddleston (2012), 74–120.

guaranteed by ruling political power. Nevertheless, up to this point, non-biblical Judaism probably preponderated, with biblical Judaism then having rather marginal historical weight.

Significantly, this antithesis between non-biblical Judaism and biblical Judaism results not only from an analysis of the archives and a comparison of the epigraphic and literary sources, i.e. from external evidence alone, but also proceeds from an internal literary analysis and a differentiation within the biblical tradition itself. As demonstrated in Part B through examination of the tradition's emergence and development, this latter form of investigation (i.e. internal analysis) yields fruitful distinction between the remains of a pre-biblical or non-biblical scribal culture, which found partial entrance into the biblical tradition as well, and the biblical tradition, which itself grew over time and hence shows multiple layers.

Internal analysis of the biblical tradition includes the whole tradition. Such examination therefore extends beyond the post-monarchic epochs of the provinces of Samaria and Judah, which comprise the extent of the archives, and encompasses the pre-exilic eras of the two kingdoms as well, when Israel had already become an Assyrian province but the kingdom of Judah still stood. Though much more meager in magnitude, external evidence in the form of archaeological excavation and epigraphic sources also sheds light on both kingdoms in the pre-exilic eras, as described in Part A's survey of Israelite and Judahite history. The few inscriptional sources confirm the literary evaluation. Furthermore, they confirm that a discernible distinction between non-biblical Judaism and biblical Judaism—or, in other words, a coexistence of the historical entities Israel and Judah, on the one hand, and the biblical "Israel" of literary tradition, on the other—did not commence in the post-exilic period but obtained already in the pre-exilic era.

This conclusion evokes, with good reason, Julius Wellhausen's fundamental distinction between "ancient Israel" and "Judaism," which he established in his *Composition of the Hexateuch and the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (1876–77) and *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (2nd edn., 1883, first under the title *History of Israel, Volume I*, 1878) and explained historiographically in *Israelite and Jewish History* (1894). Wellhausen was not the first to institute this division. Already in 1806–7, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette had published his *Contributions to the Introduction of the Old Testament* and questioned the historical value of biblical texts, thereby inaugurating an historical understanding of the biblical tradition. In his *Textbook of Christian Dogmatics in Their Historical Development* (1813–16), de Wette further distinguished between the two epochs and manifestations of Israel before and after the Babylonian deportation, for which he introduced the terms "Hebraism" and "Judaism."[3]

---

[3] De Wette (1813–16). On de Wette's contribution, see Perlitt (1994).

Yet de Wette lacked a clear criterion to distinguish these two epochs of Israel, which he intuited more than defined with any real precision.

Julius Wellhausen discovered that very criterion, and he employed it as the foundation for his inquiries into the Old Testament. For Wellhausen, as for Karl Heinrich Graf and Abraham Kuenen, along with the others he followed, the decisive criterion was the "Mosaic Law"—i.e. the literary stratum now called the Priestly Source or Priestly Writing—which he considered the Pentateuch's youngest layer, not the oldest as previously thought. In the first edition of his *History of Israel*, later issued as *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, Wellhausen immediately questions "whether the Mosaic Law is the starting point for the history of ancient Israel or for the history of Judaism, i.e. the sect [2nd edn. of 1883; ET 1994: "the religious communion"; 6th edn. of 1905: "community of religion"] that survived the nation's destruction by the Assyrians and Chaldaeans."[4] Wellhausen answers this initial question through his investigation of the cult. He demonstrates how this religious community— which biblical tradition designates "Israel" and conceptualizes as a single people chosen by their god, the one and only Yhwh—evolved from their rather unspectacular origins in the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah, i.e. from Hebrew "paganism," only after the demise of both monarchies in 722 and 587 BCE, respectively.[5] As he himself contends, "The Israelite religion worked its way up out of paganism only gradually; that is precisely the substance of its history."[6]

If "the law" operates as the decisive criterion—especially in the form of the Priestly Writing and its secondary portions in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, which concern themselves with the cult's specifics[7]—then the conclusion is inescapable: "ancient Israel" and "Judaism" constitute a sequence, instead of a concurrence, in both biblical tradition and the correlated history of Israel and Judah. Our investigation, by contrast, has revealed that not only the (priestly) "law" but also the biblical tradition as such represents the *differentia specifica* to historical Israel. Such qualitative opposition begins with the prophets as the "founders of the religion of the law,"[8] extends to the sacred history of the people of Israel as recounted in the narrative literature about early

---

[4] On page 1 of all editions: "ob das mosaische Gesetz der Ausgangspunkt sei für die Geschichte des *alten Israel* oder für die Geschichte des *Judentums*, d.h. der Sekte [2nd edn. (1883; ET 1994): "der religiösen Gemeinde"; 6th edn. (1905): "der Religionsgemeinde"], welche das von Assyrern und Chaldäern vernichtete Volk überlebte."

[5] Wellhausen (1905*a*).

[6] Wellhausen (1914), 32: "Die israelitische Religion hat sich aus dem Heidentum erst allmählich emporgearneitet; das eben ist der Inhalt ihrer Geschichte"; see Kratz (2004*c*). The reverse development—i.e. with monotheism and "the law" as the starting point—follows the biblical narrative and has found its greatest advocate in Yehezkel Kaufmann; see Elrefaei (2015).

[7] For the distinction between the basic layer of the Priestly Writing and its secondary additions, see Kratz (2000*b*), 102–17 (ET 2005, 100–14).

[8] Wellhausen (1914), 109–10.

Israel and the two kingdoms, which could not have been composed apart from the prophets, and reaches into the various stages of that "law" revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai (i.e. the Covenant Code, Deuteronomy, Decalogue, Priestly Writing).

As a further consequence of our examination, "ancient Israel" or Hebrew "paganism"—viz. the historical manifestations of Israel and Judah, especially with regard to religion—cannot be confined to the pre-exilic epoch of the two kingdoms, Israel and Judah, but existed throughout the entire history of Israel and Judah. The historical phenomenology of "ancient Israel" or Hebrew "paganism" therefore exerted substantial influence even in the post-monarchic period of the provinces of Samaria and Judah. Initially, the development of "Israelite religion work[ing] its way up out of paganism only gradually" transpired in the history of biblical tradition, not the history of Israel and Judah. Historically traceable from the Hellenistic era onward, this tradition of biblical Judaism made history "only gradually" in the post-exilic period and generated a new, fundamentally different religious practice.

In the final assessment, Wellhausen's portrait of "ancient Israel" and "Judaism" necessitates two alterations, though his own works imply them already. Firstly, the biblical tradition in and of itself serves as the crucial criterion for any differentiation between "ancient Israel" and "Judaism"—that is, historical Israel and biblical Israel—rather than the priestly law alone.[9] Secondly, coexistence, not succession, characterizes the relationship between these two manifestations of Israel. Whereas "ancient Israel" still obtained in the post-exilic provinces, "Judaism" already started in the pre-exilic biblical tradition. The succession Wellhausen identified with respect to the law concerns first and foremost the biblical tradition,[10] not the history of Israel and Judah.[11] Indeed, the biblical tradition cannot simply be correlated, let alone identified, with the history of Israel: it took full historical effect "only gradually."

On the whole, Wellhausen's portrayal of Israelite and Judahite history in the first millennium BCE proves correct. From Israel's first attestation, in the stele of Merneptah, through the existence of both northern and southern kingdoms up to the Hasmonean kingdom, a metamorphosis from "ancient Israel" to "Judaism" undoubtedly took place. Between these two poles, much transpired and transformed in the history of both kingdoms and provinces, especially in the field of religion. Yet this metamorphosis from "ancient Israel" to "Judaism" first materialized in biblical tradition, not history itself. In the framework of Israelite and Judahite history and as a component of the same, biblical tradition

---

[9] For the transition between the two, see Part B *Tradition*.

[10] See Part B *Tradition*.

[11] See Part A *History*. The historical coexistence results from succession in the tradition, so Wellhausen (1914), 371: "The stages of religion, as the stages of history in general, continue to coexist." ("Die Stufen der Religion, wie die Stufen der Geschichte überhaupt, bleiben neben einander bestehen.")

embarked on a separate path alongside—not after—everything else that history brought with it in Palestine and the diaspora. Critical analysis of the biblical tradition can discern the various stages and numerous ramifications along the way from the historical manifestation of Israel and Judah in the pre-exilic as in the post-exilic period (i.e. non-biblical Judaism) to the formation of "Israel" in tradition (i.e. biblical Judaism). Over the course of the Hellenistic period, this tradition gained momentum and actually prevailed in the end.

2. HISTORY AND TRADITION

Modification of Wellhausen's delineation in the development from "ancient Israel" to "Judaism," which many follow knowingly or not, entails an array of further questions and consequences. Though impossible to treat extensively in this particular context, they deserve some final discussion, or in the very least allusion.[12]

In the previous chapters of Part C, concerning the Jewish archives, as in the earlier chapters of Part B, which centers on tradition, one question has continued to arise: the historical place of biblical tradition in the context of Israelite and Judahite history.[13] The distinction between history and tradition does not, by any means, imply a tradition loosed from time and place and situated beyond the events and confines of history. First, corresponding data, conceptions, and traditions entered biblical tradition from history itself—especially from Israelite and Judahite religious history, like that of the ancient Near East more broadly. Second, the formation and history of biblical tradition, in spite of all its differences in practiced religion and daily life, constituted a part of Israel's (Samaria's) and Judah's history during both the pre-exilic and post-exilic periods. In this way, the history of tradition has a place in the history of Israel and Judah.

Yet one tremendous difficulty plagues any study of the biblical tradition and demands sincere acknowledgement: to a large extent, the necessary benchmarks for an absolute dating, on the one hand, and verifiable information concerning authors, places of origin, and institutional as well as sociological contexts, on the other, simply do not exist. Exactly who bore responsibility for the biblical tradition's genesis, maintenance, and transmission, and where those parties responsible—the so-called tradents (*Trägerkreise*)—stood in Israelite and Judahite society remains thoroughly obscure. The customary procedure of deducing historical and sociological positions based on statements within the biblical tradition and then harmonizing those

---

[12] On the many problems at stake, see, e.g., Halpern (1988).
[13] See I and II 1–5.

statements with archaeological and epigraphic evidence wherever feasible is certainly one possible route to foster at least some kind of explanation.[14] However, this procedure can boast no true legitimacy and lacks any real foundation. Such operations are also eminently circular insofar as they explain the biblical tradition almost exclusively with the biblical tradition itself. Although no one can escape circular argumentation altogether, it should be avoided as much as possible nonetheless.

The lone historical attestation of a group living completely both with and in the multifarious biblical and para-biblical traditions is the community of Qumran. Clearly comprised of trained scribes and other educated persons, this community ostensibly stemmed from the various institutions of the Samarian and Judean provinces (i.e. temples, administrative centers, private and official scribal schools) and may have even worked within them. Nonetheless, these individuals distanced themselves at the very least internally and withdrew themselves into the world of their selected texts. Cultivation of the biblical tradition did not necessarily occur only in small and isolated groups. Indeed, the community of Qumran, the *Yahad*, was no mere marginal sect on the furthest edge of society but a network of locations scattered across the land of Palestine, where members presumably led normal lives but also followed the rules of the community to the best of their ability. Further investigation must determine whether this historical situation in particular had any pertinence to the biblical tradition's genesis and history before Qumran existed and whether it explains the developments in Alexandria, with Ben Sira, among the Samaritans, and along with the establishment of biblical tradition as an official religion under the Maccabees and Hasmoneans.

Even more important than the tradents is the question of time and circumstance for the biblical tradition's success in gaining universal prominence among the Israelite (Samarian) and Judean populations and biblical Judaism's triumph in becoming the norm for all Yhwh-adherents across Palestine and the diaspora. As already indicated, historical evidence of this process emerges only in the Hellenistic period. The Maccabean revolt marks a clear caesura. Subsequent to this juncture, biblical tradition belonged to national interest and appertained to the entire population of the Hasmonean kingdom. Before that point in time, Ben Sira proves to be a pivotal figure, even if his exact origin and social location still remain unknown.

In the Hellenistic era, sapiential teachers, perhaps private or public sapiential schools, and/or associations like the early *Yahad* (i.e. the community of Qumran) seem to have dedicated themselves to the study, practice, and transmission of biblical tradition, in keeping with the motto of Ps. 1, "Blessed is the one whose delight is in the law of the Lord, and on his law meditates day and

---

[14] See, e.g., Albertz (1996–7; ET 1994); Otto (1998); Veijola (2000); also Huddleston (2012), 74–120.

night." The tradition must have reached the diaspora through networks such as these, appearing for the first time in Egyptian Alexandria. When and how it arrived in the Babylonian diaspora remains dubious at best, the only extant evidence found within the biblical tradition. Chronologically, no available sources exceed the Hellenistic period, though biblical Judaism and the tradition it propagates was certainly produced and could possibly have emanated even further in space and earlier in time, as in the Persian or even Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian period. The record simply lacks any evidence of such an emanation, however, either spatially or temporally. Recognition of this fact warrants neither bristling nor struggle despite the understandable desire to know and say more about an earlier time. What this earlier time has actually bequeathed—namely the biblical tradition and its memories of the past—is already quite a lot. The tradition still carries tremendous worth and historical significance, no matter the unfortunate limits of knowledge concerning the precise historical context of its development and transmission.

With these reflections in mind, we arrive at certain hermeneutical questions that arise from this new sketch of Israel and Judaism in the first millennium BCE. For many, such a portrait could affect specific confessional or theological sensitivities. In essence, these concerns ensue from a single problem: the truth and trustworthiness of the biblical and para-biblical tradition if it does, in fact, consist predominately of literary reflections and fictions and if it correlates with the history of Israel and Judah neither certainly nor consistently. For the historian, the matter is historical in nature. For the members of one of the three religious communities that consider the biblical tradition to be holy scripture revealed by God, the problem is fundamentally theological and existential.

As an attempt to escape the problem, one sort of objection might argue that such a portrait of Israel and Judaism in the first millennium BCE proceeds from a modern, rational, and—worse yet—rationalistic logic produced only by the Enlightenment, a logic incommensurate with the thought of the ancient texts themselves. This line of argument does not necessitate an absolute renunciation of historical criticism, a mere paraphrase of the biblical tradition alone, or a contentment with pre-critical interpretations, which, of course, have their own value and abiding significance. Rather, such argumentation may simply characterize critical inquiry as exaggerated, as "hypercritical," and propose instead a middle way. This middle course could then seek to follow both a moderate historical criticism and a biblical tradition leveled by historical criticism, supposing the two are reconcilable in the first place. Does this procedure really do justice to the historical and, even more, the existential concerns, though?

Yet another objection seems more material to me. Distinction between historical Israel and biblical Israel, non-biblical Judaism and biblical Judaism, history and tradition, and the like must then address whether the historical

and substantial relationship between the biblical tradition, on the one hand, and the reality from which it historically proceeds, with which it deals, and from which it draws, on the other (i.e. the relationship of the biblical tradition to the real form of Israel and Judah in the pre-exilic and post-exilic eras), ultimately disappears or even sees intentional negation. Indeed, this objection merits careful consideration, for such distinction carries the danger of a reckless or malicious distortion of history. Present in many guises, this distortion might sever the tradition of the Hebrew Bible from its Israelite–Judean and Jewish origins and monopolize it as some separate tradition in the name of special interests, be they Christian, Muslim, or whatever else. Such falsifications of history and all the theological, political, and ideological intentions they imply deserve emphatic and decisive contradiction. The Hebrew Bible, or Old Testament, is a Jewish book and the foundation of the Jewish religion. Both proceeded from the religion of Israel and Judah during the pre-exilic as well as the post-exilic period and further constitute the foundation of Christianity and Islam. Historically and theologically, this fact rests far beyond dispute: whoever fails to recognize and appreciate this reality is neither an historian nor a Christian or a Muslim.

Nevertheless, a fundamental difference does obtain between the historical form of Israel and Judah in the first millennium BCE—i.e. in the pre-exilic and post-exilic epochs—and the "Israel" of biblical tradition. The metamorphosis from the Israel of history to the Israel of the Hebrew Bible resembles the transformation from the historical Jesus to the post-Easter Christ in the New Testament tradition. "Understandable only post factum and not a priori,"[15] both these metamorphoses finally gave rise to a rewriting or overwriting of one's own past: a radical self-criticism and, equally, a radical innovation of Jewish self-understanding along with religious praxis resulted in each of the two cases. Yet who would claim the post-Easter Christ was not identical to the historical Jesus? Though not afterwards the same as before, Jesus Christ is nevertheless seen as one and the same. The same dynamic pertains to the pre-biblical and biblical Moses, the historical Israel and the biblical Israel, and all such oppositions—perhaps even the pre-Islamic and Islamic Muhammed. In all three religions, God is not the same before and after the Jewish, the Christian, or the Islamic tradition, and yet in one way or another, he is considered the one and only, beside whom there is no other.

Revealing both continuity and discontinuity, history and tradition do not compel an either/or decision. The question of the truth of biblical tradition—historical and/or theological—cannot be answered in this way. In fact, such a question cannot be answered at all since this truth—for the believer and for the religious community to which he or she belongs—can only come by "faith," be it a faith through personal experience and conviction or, as is probably most

---

[15] Wellhausen (1911), 81: "läßt sich nicht a priori, sondern nur post factum verstehen."

often the case, through the religious tradition of the community in which he or she is born and educated.

More recent scholarship in history, literature, and culture offers some aid in understanding this conception of "truth." It provides theoretical models for describing and interpreting cultural, historical, and literary developments— developments that include the genesis and formation of sacred history in both biblical and para-biblical literature.[16] Whether construction, reception, discourse, intertextuality, or collective (cultural) memory, the theories summoned by such catchwords help illuminate the literary interpretation of history as history or, conversely, history as an always interpreted, always constructed, or always imagined history. The difference between history and the conception of history—in other words, fact and fiction—undergoes no abrogation but decisive relativization. A history interpreted, constructed, or imagined is also a reality, one that can become historically efficacious and, in fact, make history.

Even when unconscious and perhaps even undesired, theories from historical and cultural studies therefore converge with a truth as understood by humble faith. For the sake of truth, faith can and must partake in historical criticism and deconstruction of the biblical tradition, and yet faith has nothing to fear or lose in such endeavors. Its truth includes the question of historical truth and thus rational historical criticism, but its truth does not depend on these conclusions. Faith has no historical evidence, and faith requires no such evidence. Indeed, faith subsists on the truth and the historical potency of constructions, fictions, receptions, discourses, intertextual connections, citations, recollections, and cultural memories: in short, faith lives on a truth *which passeth all understanding.*

---

[16] See Barstad (2008), esp. 25–38; also Brooke and Römer (2007).

Timeline

Early History

14th–12th centuries BCE—Late Bronze Age, city states in Syria–Palestine (Amarna Period), de-urbanization, settlement in the highlands.

1224–1204—Pharaoh Merneptah. "Israel" mentioned for the first time epigraphically.

Ca. 1200—Collapse of the Late Bronze Age empires and city states in Palestine.

The Epoch of the Two Kingdoms, Israel and Judah

10th century—Formation of the Israelite and Judahite kingdoms along with their neighboring states. Saul and his son Eshbaal/Ish-boshet; David and his son Solomon.

927–907—Jeroboam I founds the kingdom of Israel. Attempts to establish a dynasty (Jeroboam I and his son Nadab; Baasha and his son Elah; Zimri; Tibni and Omri).

9th–8th centuries—Assyrian campaigns in the West, with Syro-Palestinian states forced to pay tribute. Israel and Judah amidst Egypt and Assyria.

880–845—Omride dynasty in Israel (Omri, Ahab, Ahaziah, Joram/Jehoram); Judah (House of David: Rehoboam son of Solomon, Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Ahaziah) related to Israel by blood (Athaliah from the House of Omri becomes the wife of Jehoram and mother of Ahaziah). The anti-Assyrian coalition of Syro-Palestinian states is shattered at the battle of Qarqar in 853.

845–747—Jehu's dynasty in Israel (Jehu, Jehoahaz, Joash/Jehoash, Jeroboam II, Zechariah). Mesha of Moab breaks with Israel (cf. Mesha Inscription). Jehu from Israel or Hazael from Damascus kills Ahaziah of Judah and Joram/Jehoram of Israel, the last of the Omride dynasty (cf. Tel Dan Inscription). Jehu submits to Assyria's Shalmaneser III and sends the necessary tribute (cf. Black Obelisk). In Judah, Athaliah exterminates the Davidic dynasty, save for Joash/Jehoash, who inherits the throne, followed by Amaziah, Uzziah/Azariah, and Jotham.

747–722—Throne succession in Israel: Shallum, Menahem and his son Pekahiah, Pekah, Hoshea. Throne succession in Judah: Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah.

745–727—Tiglath-Pileser III of Assyria gains dominion over all of Syria–Palestine.

734–732—Raids on Judah from Aram-Damascus and Israel under Pekah: "Syro-Ephraimite War." Israel becomes an Assyrian vassal state under Hoshea; Ahaz of Judah submits to Tiglath-Pileser III and sends tribute.

727–722—Shalmaneser V of Assyria conquers Israel, besieging and sacking Samaria.

722–705—Sargon II of Assyria conquers Samaria, and Israel becomes an Assyrian province. End of the Israelite kingdom. Outbreak of anti-Assyrian revolts across Syria–Palestine.

705–681—Sennacherib of Assyria conquers Judah and besieges Jerusalem in 701 under Hezekiah. Judah becomes an Assyrian vassal state.

696–640—Period of rest for Judah under Manasseh, followed by his son Amon.

639–609—King Josiah breaks away from Assyrian and Egyptian hegemony.

612—Nineveh falls at the hands of the Medes and the Neo-Babylonians. End of the Neo-Assyrian Empire.

609—Josiah moves toward Pharaoh Necho II of Egypt and dies at Megiddo. Egypt replaces his son and successor, Jehoahaz, with Jehoiakim (Eliakim).

605—Battle of Carchemish. Nebuchadnezzar II of Babylon vanquishes Necho II and wins power over Syria–Palestine. Outbreak of anti-Babylonian revolts and negotiations across Syria–Palestine.

597—Nebuchadnezzar II subdues Jerusalem. Jehoiachin is deported to Babylon and replaced with Zedekiah (Mattaniah).

587—Nebuchadnezzar II subdues Jerusalem for a second time. The city and temple are destroyed, the population deported. End of the Judahite kingdom.

562–560—Amel-Marduk (Evil-Merodach) of Babylon grants Jehoiachin provisions from the royal house in Babylon.

The Epoch of the Two Provinces, Samaria and Judah

6th–3rd centuries—Samaria and Judah between Babylonia and Egypt during the Neo-Babylonian, Persian, and Hellenistic periods. Diaspora in Egypt (Elephantine, Alexandria, Leontopolis) and Babylon (cf. Murashu documents, Al-Yahudu tablets).

556–539—Nabonidus of Babylon, the final Neo-Babylonian ruler.

539—Cyrus II of Persia conquers Babylon and wins dominion over Syria–Palestine. Samaria and Judah become Persian provinces.

525—Cambyses II of Persia takes over Egypt; Judean colony and temple to Yahu on the Nile island of Elephantine (cf. Elephantine papyri).

520–515—Reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem under Darius I.

486–465—Xerxes I of Persia. Revolts in Egypt and Babylonia.

465–425—Artaxerxes I of Persia dispatches Nehemiah to Jerusalem for restoration of the wall around Jerusalem.

425–404—Darius II of Persia. Mission of Hananiah, destruction and reconstruction of the temple to Yahu at Elephantine (cf. papyri). Temple on Mount Gerizim.

336–323—Alexander the Great achieves world dominion. Beginning of the Hellenistic period. Diadochi (Ptolemies and Seleucids) battle for control of Syria–Palestine.

301—Battle of Ipsus. The Ptolemies win control of Palestine.

198—Battle of Panium. The Seleucids gain control of Palestine.

3rd–2nd centuries—Qumran: Dead Sea Scrolls (biblical books, para-biblical books, writings of the Qumran community). Samaria: dedicatory inscriptions at the temple of Yhwh on Mount Gerizim (near Shechem); Samaritan Pentateuch. Alexandria: translation of the biblical books into Greek (Septuagint, abbreviated LXX). Leontopolis (also Heliopolis, "land of Onias"): Jewish colony with a temple of Yhwh, founded by a member of the Oniads—the high priestly family in Jerusalem—either Onias III or Onias IV.

169–167—Antiochus IV intervenes in Jerusalem and prompts cultic changes.

166–164—Maccabean revolt. Revocation of the cultic changes, purification, and rededication of the temple.

As of 160—Hasmonean kingdom and its dominion.

63—Pompey conquers Jerusalem. Beginning of Roman rule of Syria–Palestine.

As of 37—Herodian kingdom.

66–74 CE—First Jewish–Roman War (also called The Great Revolt).

70—Titus occupies Jerusalem and destroys the second (i.e., the third, Herodian) temple.

72—Shechem and Mount Gerizim become Roman settlements (establishment of Flavia Neapolis, or Nablus).

74—Capture of Masada.

115–117—Second Jewish–Roman War (also called The Kitos War or Rebellion of the Exile).

132–135—Third Jewish–Roman War (also called the Bar Kokhba Revolt). Jerusalem becomes a Roman colony; Jews are forbidden to enter the city.

List of Kings and High Priests

Israelite and Judahite Kings (chronology according to Donner 2007–8)

Israel (ca. 1000–720 BCE)	Judah (ca. 1000–587 BCE)
Saul (since 1000)	
Eshbaal/Ish-bosheth (10th century)	
	David (10th century)
	Solomon (10th century)
Jeroboam I (927–907)	Rehoboam (926–910)
Nadab (907–906)	Abijah (910–908)
Baasha (906–883)	Asa (908–868)
Elah (883–882)	
Zimri (882)	
Tibni (882)	
Omri (882–871)	
Ahab (871–852)	Jehoshaphat (868–847)
Ahaziah (852–851)	Jehoram (852/847–845)
Joram/Jehoram (851–845/841)	Ahaziah (845)
Jehu (845/841–818)	Athaliah (845–840)
Jehoahaz (818–802)	Joash/Jehoash (840–801)
Joash/Jehoash (802–787)	Amaziah (801–773)
Jeroboam II (787–747)	Uzziah/Azariah (773–736)
Zechariah (747)	Jotham (756–741/759–744)
Shallum (747)	
Menahem (747–738)	Ahaz (741–725/744–729)
Pekahiah (737–736)	
Pekah (735–732)	
Hoshea (731–722)	Hezekiah (725–697/728–700)
	Manasseh (696–642)
	Amon (641–640)
	Josiah (639–609)
	Jehoahaz (609)
	Jehoiakim/Eliakim (608–598)
	Jehoiachin/Jeconiah (598–597)
	Zedekiah/Mattaniah (597–586)

High Priests and Hasmonean–Herodian Kings

High Priests (539–159 BCE)

   Jeshua/Joshua (after 539)
   Joiakim (5th century)
   Eliashib (5th century)

Joiada (5th century)
Johanan (after 410, 4th century)
Jaddua (4th century, until ca. 330)
Onias I (after 330)
Simon I (Eleazar, Manasseh) (3rd century)
Onias II (3rd century)
Simon II (218–185)
Onias III (185–175, murdered 170)
(Onias IV, murdered 170?)
Jason (175–172)
Menelaus (172–162)
Alcimus (162–159)

Hasmonean Dynasty (160–37 BCE)

Judas Maccabeus (167–160)
Jonathan (seized power in 160, office of high priest 152–142)
Simon (142–134)
John Hyrcanus I (134–104)
Aristobulus I (104–103)
Alexander Jannaeus (103–76)
Alexandra Salome (76–66; John Hyrcanus II high priest)
Aristobulus II (66–63)
John Hyrcanus II (63–40)
Antigonus (40–37)
Aristoluos III (36)

Herodian Dynasty (37 BCE–100 CE)

Antipater the Idumean (47–44)
Herod the Great (47 BCE–4 CE, seized throne 37 BCE)
Herod Archelaus (4–6)
Herod Antipas (4–39)
Herod Philip II (4–34)
Agrippa I (37–44)
Agrippa II (50–100)

Glossary

Achaemenids—Members of the Persian dynasty, named for their ancestor Achaemenes.

Amarna—Tell el Amarna, archaeological site on the eastern bank of the Nile River, around 300 km south of Cairo; ancient city founded by Pharaoh Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV), ruler of the Eighteenth Dynasty of the New Kingdom, who introduced religious worship centered on the sun-god Aten (Amarna period). The archives cover diplomatic correspondence (Amarna letters) between the Egyptian administration and the rulers of Syria–Palestine under Amenhotep III and IV (fourteenth century BCE).

Amphictyony—An association of tribes who *settle around* a common sanctuary.

Aniconic cult—A cult without pictorial representations.

Annals—Royal chronicles, usually *structured by year* (Latin: *annum*).

Apocalyptic—Literature, considered revelation, that centers on the end of time.

Apocrypha—*Arcane* writings not accepted into the→canon.

Archaeology—The study of antiquity, especially *excavated finds.*

Asidaioi→Hasidim

Astral Symbols—Emblems from the cult of *heavenly bodies.*

Brontology—The study of *thunder* as→omens.

Canon—*Rule*, the collection of authoritative holy writings, here the Hebrew Bible the →Septuagint, or the Old and New Testaments.

Chronistic history—The scholarly hypothesis of a literary continuity between the books of 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah (established by Leopold Zunz, 1832).

Covenant Code—The law book in Exod. 20:24–23:33, named after Exod. 24:7.

Decalogue—*The Ten Words*, or Ten Commandments (Exod. 20; Deut. 5).

Decapolis—*Ten Cities*, a political network or district of ten Palestinian cities between Damascus and Philadelphia (Amman) during the Roman period.

Deutero-Isaiah—*Second Isaiah*, a scholarly designation for the second part of the book of Isaiah (Isa. 40–66 or 40–55 with Trito-Isaiah following in Isa. 56–66).

Deuteronomistic—Texts oriented toward and dependent on the book of Deuteronomy in terms of language and content (as opposed to genuinely deuteronomic language and theology).

Deuteronomistic History—The scholarly hypothesis of a literary continuity from the books of Deuteronomy to Kings (established by Martin Noth, 1943).

Diaspora—*Dispersal* of a people or religious community, the Israelites and Judahites in this particular context.

Divination—Techniques to determine the *divine* will.

Doxology—*Adulation*, praise of God.

Enneateuch—The book or work *produced from nine* books or scrolls, i.e., Genesis–Kings.

Epigraphy—The study of inscriptions.

Eschatology—A component of theology centered on death, judgment, and the fate of the human soul (→Apocalyptic).

Essenes—A rigorist Jewish religious party during the Hellenistic–Roman period (the *Pious*→Hasidim or *Doers* of the law?), often identified with the community of Qumran (*ha-Yahad*).

Exile—*Expatriation*, residence among foreigners abroad; in this context, principally the Babylonian exile of 597/587 BCE as the boundary between the pre-exilic monarchic period (first half of the first millennium BCE) and the post-exilic period (second half of the first millennium BCE).

Forensic—Relating to the sphere of legal courts.

Geniza—*Depository*, a place of storage for used holy scriptures that cannot be destroyed; here, the Geniza of the Ben Sira synagogue in ancient Cairo, where thousands of medieval manuscripts were found.

Gnomic—A tradition of aphorisms, adages, and proverbs (→Wisdom).

Golah—*Expatriation, banishment*, with special reference to the Babylonian→exile.

Haggadah—*Stories*, retellings, and resumptions of biblical material in the building and instruction of rabbinic tradition.

Halakhah—*Way of life*, legal interpretation and instruction in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Qumran) and rabbinic tradition (e.g., Mishnah, Talmud).

Hasidim—A group called the *Pious*, a Jewish religious party.

Hasmoneans—The leaders of the Maccabean insurrection (→Maccabees) and members of the dynasty from the house of Hasmon.

Hexateuch—The book or work *produced from six* books or scrolls, i.e., Genesis–Joshua.

Historia sacra—*sacred history*, here the biblical narrative from Adam to Nebuchadnezzar (Genesis–Kings) or to Artaxerxes (thus including Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah).

Holiness Code—A legal corpus in Lev. 17–26, named from the motto in Lev. 19:2.

Iconography—The study of pictorial evidence, here the ancient Near Eastern world or representation.

Idolatry—Worship of idols or "false gods."

Ketuvim—*Writings*, the third part of the Hebrew→canon: Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles.

Literary history—The formation and growth of a literary (biblical or non-biblical) book or work.

Lunar symbols—Emblems from the cult of *the moon*.

Maccabees—The leaders and members of the Maccabean insurrection under Antiochus IV, descendants of the house of Hasmon (→Hasmoneans), named for the leader of Judah, who had the byname Maccabaeus ("the hammer").

Magic—*Theurgy*, techniques to mobilize or influence natural and supernatural (divine) forces.

Mantic—*Soothsaying*, techniques to receive and interpret indications of the divine will.

Masoretic text—The biblical text vocalized and annotated by the Masoretes (*tradents*), which underlies most modern editions of the Hebrew Bible.

Mazzot, Feast of Unleavened Bread—A feast at the beginning of grain harvest.

Midrash (pl. Midrashim)—*Interpretation* in the Dead Sea Scrolls, a literary genre of rabbinic tradition.

Mishpatim—A collection of *legal propositions* in Exod 21:1–22:19 within the framework of the→Covenant Code.

Monolatry—The *veneration of a single* (i.e., the highest) God without any negation of the existence or legitimate veneration of other deities.

Monotheism—Belief in the existence of *only a single* God and therefore denial of all "other gods" as idols (→Idolatry).

Nevi'im—*Prophets*, the second half of the Hebrew→canon, divided into the Former Prophets (Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings) and the Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel as well as the Book of the Twelve or the Minor Prophets, which includes Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi).

Numinous beings—*Mystical*, i.e., supernatural, divine creatures and powers.

Omen—*Signs* of the divine will, in many different forms.

Oniads—Members of the family of Jerusalem's high priest in the Hellenistic period, who stemmed from the priestly line of→Zadok (the Zadokites) and received their name from Onias I (ca. 300 BCE).

Onomastics—The study of *personal names*, the collection of such names.

Ostracon (pl. ostraca)—Inscribed *potsherds*.

Pantheon—The temple, assembly, and collection of *all gods together*.

Para-biblical—Closely associated with the biblical writings.

Paraenesis—*Admonition*, an exhortative manner of speaking.

Passover—A feast of uncertain origins and significance, perhaps beginning in the family and later combined with→Mazzot.

Pentateuch—The book or work *produced from five* books or scrolls, i.e., the→Torah of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.

Pesher (pl. pesharim)—*Interpretation*, works of commentary among the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially on the Prophets and the Psalms.

Pharisees—Group called the *Set Apart*, a Jewish religious party in the Hellenistic–Roman period.

Polytheism—Belief in the existence of *multiple gods*.

Priestly Writing—A literary layer in Genesis–Numbers (viz. the→Tetrateuch), clearly distinct from the book of Deuteronomy in terms of language, style, and content and literarily distinguishable from the non-Priestly text in Genesis–Numbers.

Pseudepigraphy—The *false*, i.e., fictive, attribution of a work to a known, usually significant person.

Ptolemies—Members of the Macedonian (Greek) dynasty in Egypt, named after Ptolemy I, son of Lagos (and therefore also called the "Lagides").

Redaction, redaction history—The history of literary revision, namely the composition, reworking, and updating of a literary (biblical or para-biblical) book or work; see also→literary history.

Rewritten Bible—The paraphrasing or reformulation of a biblical writing.

Sabbath—Originally the Day of the Full Moon (often named alongside the Day of the New Moon), later combined with the commandment for rest on the seventh day of the week (Exod. 23:12) and explained as a day "for Yhwh" (see→Decalogue).

Sadducees—A Jewish priestly (Zadokite?) religious party in the Hellenistic–Roman period (→Zadok).

Samaritan Pentateuch—The biblical text of the→Pentateuch or→Torah as transmitted by the→Samaritan community.

Samaritans—Members of a Jewish community in the province of Samaria, who feel a close connection to the temple on Mount Gerizim, near Shechem (modern Nablus), instead of the temple in Jerusalem and only recognize the Torah (i.e., the→Pentateuch) as holy scripture (as opposed to the "Samarians," inhabitants of the city of Samaria as well as the kingdom or, later, province of Samaria).

Satrapy, satrap—The second-highest political administrative body for a province in the Persian–Hellenistic period; a governor bore responsibility for the province, the satrap for the satrapy.

Seleucids—Members of the Macedonian (Greek) dynasty in Syria and Mesopotamia, named for Seleucus I.

Septuagint (LXX, G)—*The Seventy*, the *Greek* translation of the Torah and the rest of the Hebrew Bible, the canonical version of the Greek Old Testament (including the→Apocrypha).

Solar symbols—Emblems from the cult of *the sun.*

Syncretism—A mixture of religious traditions and conceptions.

Terminus a quo—The point in time *from which* something has happened.

Terminus ad quem—The point in time *up to which* something has happened.

Terminus post quem—The point in time *after which* something has happened.

Tetrateuch—The book or work *produced from four* books or scrolls: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers.

Textual history—The transmission and history of a literary book or work's text along with its ancient translation, be it biblical or para-biblical.

Theophoric element—The *divine name* incorporated into a personal name (e.g, Yeho-natan, "Yhwh has provided," or El-natan, "God has provided").

Theriomorphic—Divine images in *animal form*.

Tobiads—Members of the family of Tobias, an influential family in the Hellenistic period.

Torah—The *Law*, the first part of the Hebrew→canon: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy (→ Pentateuch).

Transeuphratia/Transeuphrates (Ebir-Nari)—The region *beyond the Euphrates River*, which encompasses Palestine.

Vulgate—*The standard* Latin translation of the Old Testament, completed by Hieronymus around 400 CE.

Wisdom—The sphere of quotidian and orientational knowledge, a tradition of ancient Near Eastern and biblical wisdom literature in the form of adages, sayings, and stories (e.g., Ahiqar, Proverbs, Job, and Qoheleth).

Yahad—Community, the self-designation of the Qumran community in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Yhwh—The Tetragrammaton, i.e., the four consonants of God's personal name, which Jewish tradition does not pronounce, the Hebrew Bible vocalizes as either *'adonay* ("Lord") or *'elohim* ("God") and the→Septuagint translates with (*o*) *kyrios* ("(the) Lord").

Zadok, Zadokite—Jerusalem priests under David and the priestly family named for him.

Zealots, Sicarii—The *Zealous/Dagger Men*, a Jewish insurrectionist movement during the Roman period.

Bibliography

I. Sources

AEL [Lichtheim, Miriam (2006), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings*, 3 vols. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press)].

AHI [Davies, Graham I. (1991), *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions: Corpus and Concordance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)].

AḤITUV [Aḥituv, Shmuel (2008), *Echoes from the Past: Hebrew and Cognate Inscriptions from the Biblical Period* (Jerusalem: Carta)].

AI [Aharoni, Yohanan and Naveh, Joseph (1981), *Arad Inscriptions* (Judean Desert Studies; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society)].

AJC [Meshorer, Yaʿakov (1982), *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2 vols. (Dix Hills, NY: Amphora Books); Meshorer, Yaʿakov (1990–1), "Ancient Jewish Coinage: Addendum I," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 11, 104–32].

ANET [Pritchard, James B., ed. (1969), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd edn. with supplement (Princeton: Princeton University Press)].

AOT [Sparks, Hedley F.D., ed. (1984), *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press)].

AP [Cowley, Arthur (1923; repr. 1967), *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)].

APAT [Kautzsch, Emil, ed. (1900), *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr)].

APOT [Charles, Robert H., ed. (1913), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press)].

ARE [Breasted, James Henry (1906), *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest*, 5 vols. (Ancient Records, 2nd series; Chicago: University Press; reprint, New York, 1962)].

ARIEL [Ariel, Donald T. (2000), *Excavations at the City of David: 1978–1985, Directed by Yigal Shiloh. VI: Inscriptions* (Qedem 41; Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University)].

ARM [Parrot, Andrè, et al., eds. (1950–), *Archives Royales de Mari*, so far 32 vols. (Paris: Impr. Nationale)].

AVIGAD [Avigad, Nahman (1976), *Bullae and Seals from a Post-Exilic Judean Archive* (Qedem 4; Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology; Hebrew University)].

BaAr [Wunsch, Cornelia with contributions by L. Pearce (2015), *Judeans by the Waters of Babylon: New Historical Evidence in Cuneiform Sources from Rural Babylonia. Texts from the Schøyen Collection* (Babylonische Archive 6; Dresden: ISLET).

BARAG [Barag, Dan P. (1986–7), "A Silver Coin of Yohanan the High Priest and the Coinage of Judea in the Fourth Century B.C.," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 9, 4–21].

CII [von Voigtlander, Elizabeth N. (1978), *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great: Babylonian Version* (CII 1.2.1; London: Lund Humphries); Greenfield, Jonas C. and Porten, Bezalel (1982), *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great: Aramaic Version* (CII 1.5.1; London: Lund Humphries); Schmitt, Rüdiger (1991), *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great: Old Persian Version* (CII 1.1.1; London: Lund Humphries)].

COGAN A [Cogan, Mordechai (2008), *The Raging Torrent: Historical Inscriptions from Assyria and Babylonia Relating to Ancient Israel* (Jerusalem: Carta)].

COGAN B [Cogen, Mordechai (2013), *Bound for Exile: Israelites and Judeans under Imperial Yoke: Documents from Assyria and Babylonia* (Jerusalem: Carta)].

COS [Hallo, William W. and Younger, K. Lawson, eds. (2003), *The Context of Scripture*, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill)].

COWEY/MARESCH [Cowey, James M.S. and Maresch, Klaus (2001), *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3–133/2 v.Chr.): Papyri aus den Sammlungen von Heidelberg, Köln, München und Wien* (Papyrologica Colonensia 29; Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag)].

CPJ [Tcherikover, Victor A. and Fuks, Alexander (1957), *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* I (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)].

CUSAS [Pearce, Laurie E. and Wunsch, Cornelia (2014), *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer* (Corenell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 28; Bethsaida: CDL Press].

DJD [(1955–2010), *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 40 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press; Clarendon Press)].

DSSHW [Qimron, Elisha (2010–14), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*, 3 vols. (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi)].

DSSP [Charlesworth, James H., ed. (1994–), *The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project*, so far 7 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck)].

DSSR [Parry, Donald W. and Tov, Emanuel (2004–5), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 6 vols. (Leiden: Brill)].

DSSSE [García Martínez, Florentino and Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. (2000), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols., 2nd edn. (Leiden: Brill)].

DUŠEK A [Dušek, Jan (2007), *Les manuscrits araméens du Wadi Daliyeh et la Samarie vers 450–332 av. J.-C.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 30; Leiden: Brill)].

DUŠEK B [Dušek, Jan (2012), *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 54; Leiden: Brill)].

EPH'AL/NAVEH [Eph'al, Israel and Naveh, Joseph (1996), *Aramaic Ostraca of the Fourth Century BC from Idumaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press)].

FITZMYER [Fitzmyer, Joseph A. (2004), *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*, 3rd edn. (Biblica et Orienatalia 18B; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico)].

GRIFFITH [Griffith, Francis L., ed. (1909; reprint 1972), *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, 3 vols. (Manchester: Manchester University Press)].

HAE [Renz, Johannes and Röllig, Wolfgang (1995–2003), *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik*, 3 vols. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft)].

HI [Dobbs-Allsopp, Frederick W., et al. (2005), *Hebrew Inscriptions: Texts from the Biblical Period of the Monarchy with Concordance* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press)].

HORBURY/NOY [Horbury, William and Noy, David (1992), *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt. With an Index of the Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica* (New York/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)].

HTAT [Weippert, Manfred (2010), *Historisches Textbuch zum Alten Testament: Mit Beiträgen von Joachim F. Quack, Bernd U. Schipper und Stefan J. Wimmer* (Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)].

IZRE'EL [Izre'el, Shlomo (1997), *The Amarna Scholarly Tablets* (Cuneiform Monographs 9; Groningen: Styx)].

JDS 3 [Yadin, Yigael (2002), *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri* (Judean Desert Studies 3; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society)].

JOSEPHUS [Niese, Benedictus (1955), *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, 5 vols. (Berlin: Weidmann); Thackeray, Henry S.J., Marcus, Ralph, Wikgren, Allen P., and Feldman, Louis H. (1926–65), *Josephus*, 9 vols. (Loeb Classical Library; London: W. Heinemann)].

JSHRZ [Kümmel, Hermann, et al., eds. (1973–99), *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, 6 vols. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus)].

JSHRZ.NF [Lichtenberger, Hermann and Oegema, Gebern S., eds. (2005–), *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Neue Folge*, 2 vols. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus)].

KAI [Donner, Herbert and Röllig, Wolfgang (1969–2002), *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*, vol. 1, 5th. edn. 2002; vol. 2, 3rd edn. 1973; vol. 3, 2nd edn. 1969 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz)].

KNUDTZON [Knudtzon, Jørgen A. (1915), *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln. Mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen*, 2 pts. (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 2; Leipzig: Hinrichs)].

KRI [Kitchen, Kenneth A., ed. (1975–90), *Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical*, 8 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell)].

LAE [Simpson, William K. (1972), *Literature of Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press)].

LIPSCHITS/VANDERHOOFT [Lipschits, Oded and Vanderhooft, David S. (2011), *The Yehud Stamp Impressions: A Corpus of Inscribed Impressions from the Persian and Hellenistic Periods in Judah* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns)].

LOZACHMEUR [Lozachmeur, Hélène, et al. (2006), *La Collection Clermont-Ganneau: Ostraca épigraphes sur jarre, étiquettes de bois* (Mémoires d l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 35; Paris: Diffusion de Boccard)].

MACHIELA [Machiela, Daniel A. (2009), *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 79; Brill: Leiden)].

MAGEN/MISGAV/TSFANIA [Magen, Yitzchak, Misgav, Haggai, and Tsfania, Levana (2004), *Mount Gerizim Excavations I: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (Judea and Samaria Publications 2; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority)].

MAIER A [Maier, Johann (1995–6), *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, 3 vols. (München: Reinhardt)].

MAIER B [Maier, Johann (1997), *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das "Neue Jerusalem": 11Q19 und 11Q20, 1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554–555, 5Q15 und 11Q18. Übersetzung und Erläuterung. Mit Grundrissen der Tempelhofanlage und Skizzen zur Stadtplanung*, 3rd edn. (München: Reinhardt)]. [English translation of 2nd German edn.: *The Temple Scroll: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985)].

MC 12 [Heimpel, Wolfgang (2003), *Letters to the King of Mari: A New Translation, with Historical Introduction, Notes, and Commentary* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 12; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns)].

MESHORER/QEDAR A [Meshorer, Yaʿakov and Qedar, Shraga (1991), *The Coinage of Samaria in the Fourth Century* BCE (Jerusalem: Numismatic Fine Arts International)].

MESHORER/QEDAR B [Meshorer, Yaʿakov and Qedar, Shraga (1999), *Samarian Coinage* (Numismatic Studies and Researches 9; Jerusalem: Israel Numismatic Society)].

MORAN [Moran, William L. (1992), *The Amarna Letters* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)].

NIAI [Lemaire, André (1996), *Nouvelles inscriptions araméennes d'Idumée au Musée d'Israël* (Supplément à Transeuphratène 3; Paris: Gabalda). Lemaire, André (2002), *Nouvelles inscriptions araméennes d'Idumée 2: Collections Moussaïeff, Jeselsohn, Welch et divers* (Supplément à Transeuphratène 9; Paris: Gabalda)].

OBCA [Goodman, Martin, Barton, John, and Muddiman, John, eds. (2012), *The Apocrypha* (Oxford Bible Commentary; Oxford: Oxford University Press)].

OGIS [Dittenberger, Wilhelm (1905), *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae: Supplementum Sylloges Inscriptionum Graecarum*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: S. Hirzel)].

OTP [Charlesworth, James H., ed. (1983/1985), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday)].

OTPar [Matthews, Victor H. and Benjamin, Don C. (2006), *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East*, fully revised and expanded 3rd edn. (Mahwa, NJ: Paulist Press)].

PHILON [Cohn, Leopold and Wendland, Paul (1896–1915), *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, 6 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter); Cohn, Leopold, et al. (1962–4), *Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, 6 vols., 2nd edn. (Berlin: De Gruyter)].

PORTEN/LUND [Porten, Bezalel and Lund, Jerome A. (2002), *Aramaic Documents from Egypt: A Key-Word-in-Context Concordance* (The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project 1; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns)].

QUMRAN 1 [Lohse, Eduard (1981), *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch, mit masoretischer Punktation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen*, 3rd edn. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft)].

QUMRAN 2 [Steudel, Annette (2001), *Die Texte aus Qumran II: Hebräisch/Aramäisch und Deutsch, mit masoretischer Punktation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen. Unter Mitarbeit von Hans-Ulrich Boesche, Birgit Bredereke, Christoph A. Glaser und Roman Vielhauer* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft)].

RAINEY A [Rainey, Anson F. (1978), *El-Amarna Tablets 359–379: Suppl. to J.A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 8; Kevelaer: Butzon und Bercker)].

RAINEY B [Schniedewind, William M. and Cochavi-Rainey, Zipora, eds. (2015), *The El-Amarna Correspondence: A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters of el-Amarna Based on Collations of All Extant Tablets, Collected, Transcribed and Translated by Anson F. Rainey*, 2 vols. (Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies I/110; Leiden: Brill)].

RANE [McNeill, William H. and Sedlar, Jean W., eds. (1968), *The Ancient Near East* (Readings in World History 2; New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press)].

RIM [Grayson, Albert K. (1987–96), *Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia*, 3 vols. (Toronto: Toronto University Press)].

SAA 9 [Parpola, Simo (1997), *Assyrian Prophecies* (State Archives of Assyria 9; Helsinki: Helsinki University Press)].

SPAER [Spaer, Arnold (1986–7), "Jaddua the High Priest?," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 9, 1–3].

SSI [Gibson, John C.L. (1971), *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press)].

STERN [Stern, Menahem (1974), *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism I: From Herodotus to Plutarch* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities)].

TAD [Porten, Bezalel and Yardeni, Ada (1986–99), *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: Newly copied, edited, and translated into Hebrew and English*, 4 vols. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns)].

TGI [Galling, Kurt (1979), *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels*, 3rd edn. (Tübingen: Mohr)].

TJC [Meshorer, Yaʿakov (2001), *A Treasury of Jewish Coins from the Persian Period to Bar Kochba* (Jerusalem: Yad ben-Zvi Press)].

TUAT [Kaiser, Otto, ed. (1981–2001), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments*, 3 vols. and suppl. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus)].

TUAT.NF [Janowski, Bernd and Wilhelm, Gernot, eds. (2004–13), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments: Neue Folge*, 7 vols. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus)].

VANDERKAM [VanderKam, James C. (1989), *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2 vols. (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 510–11; Scriptores Aethiopici 87–88; Leuven: Peeters)].

WAGNER [Wagner, Christian J. (2003), *Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse: Griechisch—Lateinisch—Syrisch—Hebräisch—Aramäisch, mit einem Index zu den Tobit-Fragmenten vom Toten Meer* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/258; Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 28; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)].

WAW 5 [Murnane, William J. (1995), *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt* (Writings of the Ancient World 5; Atlanta: Scholar's Press)].

WAW 12 [Nissinen, Martti (2003), *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*, with contributions by Choon L. Seow and Robert K. Ritner (Writings of the Ancient World 12; Leiden: Brill)].

WAW 14 [Lindenberger, James M. and Richards, Kent H. (2003), *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 2nd edn. (Writings of the Ancient World 14; Leiden: Brill)].

WSS [Avigad, Nahman and Sass, Benjamin (1997), *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals*
    (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities/Israel Exploration Society/
    Hebrew University)].
YADIN [Yadin, Yigael (1983), *The Temple Scroll*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration
    Society) (Hebrew: 1977)].

II. Additional Literature

Abraham, Kathleen (2005–6), "West Semitic and Judean Brides in Cuneiform Sources
    from Sixth Century BCE: New Evidence from a Marriage Contract from Al-Yahudu,"
    Archiv für Orientforschung 51, 198–219.
Abraham, Kathleen (2007), "An Inheritance Division among Judeans in Babylonia
    from the Early Persian Period," in Meir Lubetski (ed.), *Seals and Inscriptions,
    Hebrew, Idumean and Cuneiform* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 8; Sheffield:
    Phoenix), 206–21.
Abraham, Kathleen (2011), "The Reconstruction of Jewish Communities in the
    Persian Empire: The Al-Yahudu Clay Tablets," in Hagai Segev and Asaf Schor
    (eds.), *Light and Shadows—The Catalog—The Story of Iran and the Jews*
    (Tel Aviv: Beit Hatfutsot), 261–4.
Achenbach, Reinhard (2012), "The Protection of Personae miserae in Ancient
    Israelite Law and Wisdom and in the Ostracon from Khirbet Qeiyafa," *Semitica*
    54, 93–125.
Adrom, Faried and Müller, Matthias (2013), "Das Tetragramm in ägyptischen
    Quellen—eine Bestandsaufnahme," *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift* 30, 120–41.
Ahlström, Gösta W. (1993), *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palaeolithic
    Period to Alexander's Conquest*, with a contribution by Gary O. Rollefson, edited by
    Diana Edelman (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 146;
    Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Aitken, James (2014), *No Stone Unturned: Greek Insriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*
    (CSHB 5; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).
Aitken, James, ed. (2015), *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (London/
    New York: T&T Clark).
Albertz, Rainer (1996–7 [1994]), *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit*
    (2nd edn.; Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 8.1–2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
    Ruprecht). [English translation: *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament
    Period*, vols. 1–2, translated by John Bowden (Louisville, KY: Westminster John
    Knox, 1994)].
Albertz, Rainer (2001 [2003]), *Die Exilszeit: 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische
    Enzyklopädie 7; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer). [English translation: *Israel in Exile: The
    History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* (Biblical Encyclopedia 7; Atlanta,
    GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003)].
Albertz, Rainer, Nogalski, James D., and Wöhrle, Jakob, eds. (2012), *Perspectives on the
    Formation of the Book of the Twelve: Methodological Foundations—Redactional
    Processes—Historical Insights* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche
    Wissenschaft 433; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Albertz, Rainer and Schmitt, Rüdiger (2012), *Family and Household Religion in Ancient Israel and the Levant* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Alt, Albrecht (1953–9 [1967]), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3 vols. (München: Beck). [English selection: *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday 1967)].

Ameling, Walter (2008), "Die jüdische Gemeinde von Leontopolis nach den Inschriften," in Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (eds.), assisted by Martin Meiser, *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 117–33.

Ameling, Walter (2012), "Seleukidische Religionspolitik in Koile-Syrien und Phönizien nach der neuen Inschrift von Maresha," in Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 286; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 337–59.

Anderson, Robert T. and Giles, Terry (2012), *The Samaritan Pentateuch: An Introduction to Its Origin, History, and Significance for Biblical Studies* (Resources for Biblical Study 72; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Aurelius, Erik (2003), *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 319; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Avigad, Nahman (1975), "The Priest of Dor," *Israel Exploration Journal* 25, 101–5.

Avigad, Nahman (1997), "The Contribution of Hebrew Seals to the Understanding of Israelite Religion and Society," in Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank M. Cross* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press), 195–208.

Avishur, Yitsḥaḳ and Heltzer, Michael (2000), *Studies on the Royal Administration in Ancient Israel in the Light of Epigraphic Sources* (Tel Aviv: Archaeological Center Publication).

Azzoni, Annalisa (2013), *The Private Lives of Women in Persian Egypt* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Baden, Joel S. (2009), *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Baden, Joel S. (2012), *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Baden, Joel S. (2013), *The Promise to the Patriarchs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Barclay, John M.G. (1998), *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: Clark).

Bar-Kochva, Bezalel (1989), *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Bar-Kochva, Bezalel (1997), *Pseudo Hecataeus "On the Jews": Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 21; Berkeley, CA: California Press).

Bar-Kochva, Bezalel (2010), *The Image of the Jews in Greek Literature: The Hellenistic Period* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 51; Berkeley, CA: California Press).

Barstad, Hans M. (2008), *History and the Hebrew Bible: Studies in Ancient Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 61; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Barthel, Jörg (1997), *Prophetenwort und Geschichte. Die Jesajaüberlieferung in Jes 6–8 und 28–31* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 19; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Barton, John (2007), *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Baumgarten, Albert I. (1997), *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 55; Leiden: Brill).

Baumgarten, Albert I. (2013), "What Did The 'Teacher' Know?: Owls and Roosters in the Qumran Barnyard," in Shani Tzoref and Ian Young (eds.), *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown* (Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts 20; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press), 235–57.

Beaulieu, Paul-Alain (2011), "Yahwistic Names in Light of Late of Babylonian Onomastics," in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 245–66.

Becker, Uwe (1997), *Jesaja—von der Botschaft zum Buch* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 178; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Becking, Bob (1992), *The Fall of Samaria: A Historical and Archaeological Study* (Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 2; Leiden: Brill).

Becking, Bob (2003), "Die Gottheiten der Juden in Elephantine," in Manfred Oeming and Konrad Schmid (eds.), *Der eine Gott und die Götter: Polytheismus und Monotheismus im antiken Israel* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 82; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag), 203–26.

Becking, Bob (2009), "The Identity of Nabu-sharrussu-ukin, the Chamberlain. An Epigraphic Note on Jeremiah 39, 3. With an Appendix on The Nebu(!)sarsekim Tablet," *Biblische Notizen* 140, 35–46.

Becking, Bob (2011), *Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Construction of Early Jewish Identity* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 80; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Beit-Arieh, Itzhaq, ed. (2007), *Horvat 'Uza and Horvat Radum: Two Fortresses in the Biblical Negev* (Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University 25; Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University; The Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology).

Ben Zvi, Ehud (1997), "The Urban Center of Jerusalem and the Development of the Hebrew Bible," in Walter E. Aufrecht, Neil Arnold Mirau, and Steven W. Gauley (eds.), *Urbanism in Antiquity: From Mesopotamia to Crete* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 244; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), 194–209.

Ben Zvi, Ehud and Levin, Christoph, eds. (2010), *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Concepts* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 404; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Berlejung, Angelika, ed. (2012), *Disaster and Relief Management/Katastrophen und ihre Bewältigung* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Berlejung, Angelika (2013), "Die Anfänge und Ursprünge der Jahweverehrung: Der ikonographische Befund," *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift* 30, 142–65.

Berlejung, Angelika and Frevel, Christian, eds. (2006; repr. 3rd edn. 2013), *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe zum Alten und Neuen Testament* (HGANT; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Berner, Christoph (2010), *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 73; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Bernstein, Moshe (2013), *Reading and Re-Reading the Scripture at Qumran*, vol. 1: *Genesis and its Interpretation*, vol. 2: *Law, Pesher and the History* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 107; Leiden: Brill).

Bertrand, Jean-Marie (1982), "Sur l'inscription d'Hefzibah," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 46, 167–76.

Betlyon, John W. (2005), "A People Transformed: Palestine in the Persian Period," *Near Eastern Archaeology* 68, 4–58.

Bezzel, Johannes (2007), *Die Konfessionen Jeremias: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 378; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Bickermann, Elias (1937), *Der Gott der Makkabäer*: *Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung* (Berlin: Schocken).

Blanco-Wißmann, Felipe (2008), *"Er tat das Rechte...": Beurteilungskriterien und Deuteronomismus in 1Kön 12—2Kön 25* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 93; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag).

Bleek, Friedrich (1886), *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, edited by Johannes Bleek and Adolf Kamphausen, arranged by Julius Wellhausen (5th edn.; Berlin: Reimer).

Blenkinsopp, Joseph (1977), *Prophecy and Canon* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press).

Blenkinsopp, Joseph (1996), *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (2nd edn.; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press).

Blenkinsopp, Joseph (2000), *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday).

Blischke, Mareike (2007), *Die Eschatologie in der Sapientia Salomonis* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/26; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Bloch, Yigal (2014), "Judeans in Sippar and Susa during the First Century of the Babylonian Exile: Assimilation and Perseverance under Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Rule," *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 1, 119–72.

Blum, Erhard (1984), *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft).

Blum, Erhard (1990), *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 189; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Blum, Erhard (1996), "Jesajas prophetisches Testament. Beobachtungen zu Jes 1–11 (I)," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108, 547–68.

Blum, Erhard (1997), "Jesajas prophetisches Testament. Beobachtungen zu Jes 1–11 (II)," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 109, 12–29.

Blum, Erhard (2008*a*), "Die Kombination I der Wandinschrift von Der ʿAlla: Vorschläge zur Rekonstruktion mit historisch-kritischen Anmerkungen," in Ingo Kottsieper, Rüdiger Schmitt, and Jakob Wöhrle (eds.), assisted by Ruth Ebach, *Berührungspunkte: Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt. Festschrift für Rainer Albertz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 350; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 583–601.

Blum, Erhard (2008*b*), "Israels Prophetie im altorientalischen Kontext. Anmerkungen zu neueren religionsgeschichtlichen Thesen," in Izak Cornelius and Louis Jonker (eds.), *From Ebla to Stellenbosch*: *Syro-Palestinian Religions and the Hebrew Bible* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins 37; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 81–115.

Blum, Erhard (2010), *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten*, edited by Wolfgang Oswald (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Blum, Erhard (2012), "Der historische Mose und die Frühgeschichte Israels," *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 1, 37–63.

Blum, Erhard (2013), "Die Wandinschriften 4.2 und 4.6 sowie die Pithosinschrift 3.9 aus *Kuntillet ʿAǧrūd*.," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästinavereins* 129, 21–54 (including illustrations 1–7).

Boda, Mark J. and Redditt, Paul L., eds. (2008), *Unity and Disunity in Ezra–Nehemiah: Redaction, Rhetoric, and Reader* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 17; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press).

Botta, Alejandro F. (2009), *The Aramaic and Egyptian Legal Traditions at Elephantine: An Egyptological Approach* (Library of Second Temple Studies 64; London/ New York: T&T Clark).

Brettler, Marc Z. (1995), *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London: Routledge).

Bright, John (1960), *A History of Israel* (London: SCM).

Bringmann, Klaus (1983), *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa: Eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte (175–163 v. Chr.)* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/132; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Brooke, George J. (1985), *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 29; Sheffield: Continuum).

Brooke, George J. (1994), "The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Michael O. Wise, et al. (eds.), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences), 339–53.

Brooke, George J. (2002), "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: British Library), 31–40.

Brooke, George J. (2006), "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards," in Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak (eds.), *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (Library of Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament Studies 427; London/New York: T&T Clark), 151–65.

Brooke, George J. (2008), "The Place of Prophecy in Coming out of Exile: The Case of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raja Sollamo* (Leiden: Brill), 535–50.

Brooke, George J. (2009), "Was the Teacher of Righteousness Considered To Be a Prophet?," in Kristin de Troyer, Armin Lange, and Lucas L. Schulte (eds.), *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 52; Leuven: Peeters), 77–97.

Brooke, George J. (2010), "The 'Apocalyptic' Community, the Matrix of the Teacher and Rewriting Scripture," in Mladen Popović (ed.), *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 141; Leiden: Brill), 37–53.

Brooke, George J. (2013), *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Brooke, George J. and Hempel, Charlotte, eds. (2015), *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (forthcoming).

Brooke, George J. and Römer, Thomas, eds. (2007), *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography—L'historiographie biblique, ancienne et modern* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 207; Leuven: Peeters).

Bunge, Jochen G. (1971), *Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch: Quellenkritische, literarische, chronologische und historische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch als Quelle syrisch-palästinensicher Geschichte im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (PhD Thesis: Friedrich-Willhelms-Universität Bonn).

Bunge, Jochen G. (1975), "Zur Geschichte und Chronologie des Untergangs der Oniaden und des Aufstiegs der Hasmonäer," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 6, 1–46.

Bunge, Jochen G. (1979), "Die sogenannte Religionsverfolgung Antiochus IV. Epiphanes und die griechischen Städte," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 10, 155–65.

Camp, Ludger (1990), *Hiskija und Hiskijabild: Analyse und Interpretation von 2 Kön 18–20* (Münchener Theologische Abhandlungen 9; Altenberge: Telos-Verlag).

Campbell, Jonathan G. (2006), *The Exegetical Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 4; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Carr, David M. (2005), *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Carr, David M. (2011), *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Carter, C.E. (1999), *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 294; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Cholewinski, Alfred (1976), *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium: Eine vergleichende Studie* (Analecta Biblica 66; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).

Clarysse, Willy (2009), "The Zenon Papyri Thirty Years on," in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (eds.), *100 anni di istituzioni fiorentine per la papirologia* (Firenze: Istituto Papirologico G. Vitelli), 31–43.

Collins, John J. (2010a), *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Collins, John J. (2010*b*), *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Collins, John J. (2011), "Reading for History in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 18, 259–315.

Collins, John J. (2012*a*), "Historiography in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19, 159–67.

Collins, John J. (2012*b*), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Cornelius, Izak (2011), "'A Tale of Two Cities': The Visual Imagery of Yehud and Samaria, and Identity/Self-Understanding in Persian-period Palestine," in Louis Jonker (ed.), *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/53; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 213–37.

Corzilius, Björn (2015), *Michas Rätsel: Eine Untersuchung zur Komposition des Michabuches.* (PhD Thesis: Georg-August-Universität Göttingen; forthcoming in BZAW).

Cotton, Hannah M. and Wörrle, Michael (2007), "Seleukos IV to Heliodoros: A New Dossier of Royal Correspondence from Israel," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 159, 191–205.

Cowey, James M.S. and Maresch, Klaus (2003), "'A Recurrent Inclination to Isolate the Case of the Jews from their Ptolemaic Environment'? Eine Antwort auf Sylvie Honigman," *Ancient Society* 22, 307–10.

Crawford, Sidnie White (2000), *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Crawford, Sidnie White (2008), *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Cross, Frank M. (1973), *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Cross, Frank M. (1998), *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Cross, Frank M. and Talmon, Shemaryahu, eds. (1975), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press).

Crouch, Carly L. (2014*a*), *Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon, and the Nature of Subversion* (Ancient Near East Monographs; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Crouch, Carly L. (2014*b*), *The Making of Israel: Cultural Diversity in the Southern Levant and the Formation of Ethnic Identity* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 162; Leiden: Brill).

Crown, Alan D., ed. (1989), *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Crown, Alan D. (2001), *Samaritan Scribes and Manuscripts* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 80; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Crown, Alan D. (2005), *A Bibliography of the Samaritans: Revised, Expanded and Annotated* (3rd edn.; American Theological Library Association. Bibliography Series 32; Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press).

Crown, Alan D., Pummer, Reinhard, and Tal, Abraham, eds. (1993), *A Companion to Samaritan Studies* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Crüsemann, Frank (1992), *Die Tora: Theologie und Sozialgeschichte des alttestamentlichen Gesetzes* (München: Kaiser).

Dahmen, Ulrich (2003), *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs^a aus Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 49; Leiden: Brill).

Darby, Erin (2014), *Interpreting Judean Pillar Figurines: Gender and Empire in Judean Apotropaic Ritual* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Dávid, Nóra and Lange, Armin, eds. (2010), *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leuven: Peeters).

Dávid, Nóra, Lange, Armin, De Troyer, Kristin, and Tzoref, Shani, eds. (2012), *The Hebrew Bible in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Davies, Philip R. (1992; repr. 1995), *In Search of "Ancient Israel"* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Davies, Philip R. (2007), *The Origins of Biblical Israel* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 485; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Davies, Philip R. (2010), "What history can we get from the Scrolls, and how?," in Charlotte Hempel (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 90; Leiden: Brill), 31–46.

Davies, William D. and Finkelstein, Louis, eds. (1984–9), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 1 1984, vol. 2 1989 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Day, John, ed. (2004; repr. 2006), *In Search of Pre-exilic Israel*: *Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (London/New York: T&T Clark).

Day, John, ed. (2010), *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (London/New York: T&T Clark).

Delkurt, Holger (1993), *Ethische Einsichten in der alttestamentlichen Spruchweisheit* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 21; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Demsky, Aaron (2012), "An Iron Age IIA Alphabetic Writing Exercise from Khirbet Qeiyafa," *Israel Exploration Journal* 62, 186–99.

Dequeker, Luc (1993), "Darius the Persian and the Reconstruction of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem (Ezra 4,24)," in Jan Quaegebeur (ed.), *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the International Conference from the 17th to the 20th of April 1991, organized by the Katholiek Universiteit Leuven* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 55; Leuven: Peeters), 67–92.

Dietrich, Walter (1972), *Prophetie und Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Dietrich, Walter (1987; 2nd edn. 1992), *David, Saul und die Propheten: Das Verhältnis von Religion und Politik nach den prophetischen Überlieferungen vom frühesten Königtum in Israel* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 122; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Dietrich, Walter (1997 [2007]), *Die frühe Königszeit in Israel: 10. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 3; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer). [English translation: *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.* (Biblical Encyclopedia 3; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007)].

Dietrich, Walter, Mathys, Hans-Peter, Römer, Thomas, and Smend, Rudolf (2014), *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Theologische Wissenschaft 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Dimant, Devorah, ed. (2012), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 99; Leiden: Brill).

Dimant, Devorah (2014), *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Essays* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Dimant, Devorah, Feldman, Ariel, and Goldman, Liora (2014), *Scripture and Interpretation: Qumran Texts that Rework the Bible* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 449; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Dimant, Devorah and Kratz, Reinhard G., eds. (2009), *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Dimant, Devorah and Kratz, Reinhard G., eds. (2013), *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 439; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Dines, Jennifer M. (2004), *The Septuagint* (London/New York: T&T Clark).

Doering, Lutz (1999), *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Donner, Herbert (1976), *Einführung in die Biblische Landes- und Altertumskunde* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Donner, Herbert (2007–8), *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*, 2 vols. (4th edn.; Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 4/1–2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Dozeman, Thomas B., Evans, Craig A., and Lohr, Joel N., eds. (2014), *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 164; Leiden: Brill).

Dozeman, Thomas B., Römer, Thomas, and Schmid, Konrad, eds. (2011), *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis Through Kings* (Society of Biblical Literature/Ancient Israel and its Literature 8; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Dozeman, Thomas B. and Schmid, Konrad, eds. (2006), *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (Society of Biblical Literature. Symposium Series 34; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Dozeman, Thomas B., Schmid, Konrad, and Schwartz, Baruch J., eds. (2011), *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research, Proceedings of the Symposium "The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research," which was held on January 10–12, 2010 in Zurich, Switzerland* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

DSD (2012), "The Rise of Commentary: Commentary Texts in Ancient Near Eastern, Greek, Roman and Jewish Culture," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19, 249–484.

Duhaime, Jean (2006), *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Dupont-Sommer, André (1960), *Die essenischen Schriften vom Toten Meer unter Zugrundelegung der Original-Texte*, translated by Walter W. Müller (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Du Toit, Jaqueline S. (2011), *Textual Memory: Archives, Libraries and the Hebrew Bible* (Social World of Biblical Antiquity 2/6; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix).

Eberhart, Christian (2002), *Studien zur Bedeutung der Opfer im Alten Testament: Die Signifikanz von Blut- und Verbrennungsriten im kultischen Rahmen* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 94; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Eck, Werner (2007), *Rom und Judaea: Fünf Vorträge zur römischen Herrschaft in Palästina* (Tria Corda: Jenaer Vorlesungen zu Judentum, Antike und Christentum 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Eckardt, Benedikt, ed. (2012), *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 155; Leiden: Brill).

Eckardt, Benedikt (2013), *Ethnos und Herrschaft: Politische Figuration judäischer Identität von Antiochus III. bis Herodes I* (Studia Judaica 72; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Ede, Franziska (2014), '*Und Israel liebte Josef mehr als alle seine Söhne.' Literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der alttestamentlichen Josefsgeschichte (Gen 37–50).* (PhD Thesis: Georg-August-Universität Göttingen; forthcoming in BZAW).

Edelman, Diana V., ed. (1991), *The Fabric of History: Text, Artifact, and Israel's Past* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 127; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Edelman, Diana V. (2005), *The Origins of the "Second" Temple: Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem* (Bible World; London: Equinox).

Edelman, Diana V. and Ben Zvi, Ehud, eds. (2009), *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud* (Bible World; London/Oakville, CT: Equinox).

Egger, Rita (1986), *Josephus Flavius und die Samaritaner: Eine terminologische Untersuchung zur Identitätsklärung der Samaritaner* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 4; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg).

Elrefaei, Aly (2015), *The History of Ancient Israel in the Works of Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918) and Yehezkel Kaufmann (1889–1963).* (PhD Thesis: Georg-August-Universität Göttingen; forthcoming in BZAW).

Emmendörffer, Michael (1998), *Der ferne Gott. Eine Untersuchung der Volksklagelieder auf dem Hintergrund der mesopotamischen Literatur* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Eph'al, Israel (1978), "The Western Minorities in Babylonia in the 6th–5th Centuries B.C.," *Orientalia* 47, 74–90.

Eshel, Esther and Levin, Yigal, eds. (2014), *"See, I will bring a scroll recounting what befell me" (Ps 40:8): Epigraphy and Daily Life from the Bible to the Talmud. Dedicated to the Memory of Hanan Eshel* (Supplements to the Journal of Ancient Judaism 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Evans, Paul S. (2009), *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings: A Source-Critical and Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings 18–19* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 125; Leiden: Brill).

Fabry, Heinz Josef (2012), "Der 'Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit'—eine Gestalt zwischen Ablehnung und Vollmacht: Überlegungen zur frühjüdischen Rezeption der Leidensknechts-Thematik," in Sebastian Fuhrmann and Regina Grundmann

(eds.), *Martyriumsvorstellungen in Antike und Mittelalter: Leben oder sterben für Gott?* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 80; Leiden: Brill), 21–43.

Falk, Daniel K. (1998), *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 27; Leiden: Brill).

Faust, Avraham (2012), *The Archaeology of Israelite Society in the Iron Age II* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Feldman, Ariel (2013), *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran: Texts, Translations, and Commentary* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 438; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Feldmeier, Reinhard (1994), "Weise hinter 'eisernen Mauern': Tora und jüdisches Selbstverständnis zwischen Akkulturation und Absonderung im Aristeasbrief," in Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 20–37.

Finkelstein, Israel (1988), *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).

Finkelstein, Israel (2008*a*), "Archaeology and the List of Returnees in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 140, 7–16.

Finkelstein, Israel (2008*b*), "Jerusalem in the Persian (and Early Hellenistic) Period and the Wall of Nehemiah," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32, 501–20.

Finkelstein, Israel (2008*c*), "The Settlement History of Jerusalem in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BC," *Revue Biblique* 119, 499–515.

Finkelstein, Israel (2011), "Saul, Benjamin and the Emergence of 'Biblical Israel': An Alternative View," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 123, 348–67.

Finkelstein, Israel (2013 [2014]), *The Forgotten Kingdom: The Archaeology and History of Northern Israel* (Ancient Near East Monographs 5; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature). [German translation: *Das vergessene Königreich: Israel und die verborgenen Ursprünge der Bibel* (München: C.H. Beck, 2014)].

Finkelstein, Israel and Fatalkin, Alexander (2012), "Khirbet Qeiyafa: An Unsensational Archaeological and Historical Interpretation," *Tel Aviv* 39, 38–63.

Finkelstein, Israel and Perevolotsky, Aviram (1990), "Process of Sedentarization and Nomadization in the History of Sinai and the Negev," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 279, 67–88.

Finkelstein, Israel and Silberman, Neil A. (2001 [2007]), *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of its Sacred Texts* (New York: Touchstone). [German translation: *Keine Posaunen vor Jericho: Die archäologische Wahrheit über die Bibel* (4th edn.; München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2007)].

Finkelstein, Israel and Silberman, Neil A. (2006*a* [2006]), *David and Solomon: In Search of the Bible's Sacred Kings and the Roots of the Western Tradition* (New York: Free Press). [German translation: *David und Salomo: Archäologen entschlüsseln einen Mythos* (München: Beck, 2006)].

Finkelstein, Israel and Silberman, Neil A. (2006*b*), "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of Pan-Israelite Ideology," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 30, 259–85.

Finkelstein, Israel, Mazar, Amihai, and Schmidt, Brian B. (2007), *The Quest for the Historical Israel: Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel* (Society of Biblical Literature. Archaeology and Biblical Studies 17; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Fischer, Thomas (1980a), *Seleukiden und Makkabäer: Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte und zu den politischen Ereignissen in Judäa während der ersten Hälfte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Bochum: Brockmeyer).

Fischer, Thomas (1980b), "Zur Seleukideninschrift von Hefzibah," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 33, 131–8.

Fishbane, Michael (1985; repr. 1986), *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Flint, Peter W. (1997), *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 17; Leiden: Brill).

Flint, Peter W. and VanderKam, James C., eds. (1998), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment I* (Leiden: Brill).

Floyd, Michael H. and Haak, Robert D., eds. (2006), *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Frahm, Eckart (2014), "Traditionalism and Intellectual Innovation in a Cosmopolitan World: Reflections on Babylonian Text Commentaries from the Achaemenid Period," in Uri Gabbay and Shai Secunda (eds.), *Encounters by the Rivers of Babylon: Scholarly Conversations Between Jews, Iranians and Babylonians* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 160, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 317–34.

Fraser, Peter M. (1972), *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Frei, Peter (1996), "Zentralgewalt und Lokalautonomie im Achämenidenreich," in Peter Frei and Klaus Koch (eds.), *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich* (2nd edn.; Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 55; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 5–131.

Frevel, Christian (2004), "Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk oder Geschichtswerke? Die These Martin Noths zwischen Tetrateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch," in U. Rüterswörden (ed.), *Martin Noth aus der Sicht der heutigen Forschung* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 58; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft), 60–95.

Frevel, Christian (2011), "Die Wiederkehr der Hexateuchperspektive: Eine Herausforderung für die These vom deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk," in Hermann-Josef Stipp (ed.), *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (Österreichische Bibelstudien 39; Frankfurt: Peter Lang), 13–53.

Frevel, Christian (2012), "Grundriss der Geschichte Israels," in Erich Zenger and Christian Frevel (eds.), *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (8th edn.; Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 1/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer), 701–870.

Frevel, Christian (2013), "Der Eine und die Vielen? Monotheismus und die materielle Kultur in der Perserzeit," in Christoph Schwöbel (ed.), *Gott—Götter—Götzen. XIV. Europäischer Kongress für Theologie (11.-15. September 2011 in Zürich)* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 38; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt), 238–65.

Frevel, Christian, Pyschny, Katharina, and Cornelius, Izak, eds. (2014), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehud? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 267; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Frey, Jörg (1999), "Temple and Rival Temple—The Cases of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis," in Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum/Community without Temple* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 171–203.

Frey, Jörg, Schattner-Rieser, Ursula, and Schmid, Konrad, eds. (2012), *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und samaritanischen Traditionen/The Samaritans and the Bible: Historical and Literary Interactions Between Biblical and Samaritan Traditions* (Studia Judaica 70, Studia Samaritana 7; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Fried, Lisbeth S. (2014), *Ezra and the Law in History and Tradition, Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press).

Fritz, Volkmar (1996 [2011]), *Die Entstehung Israels im 12. und 11. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 2; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer). [English translation: *The Emergence of Israel in the Twelfth and Eleventh Centuries B.C.E.* (Biblical Encyclopedia 2; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011)].

Gabbay, Uri (2014), "Actual Sense and Scriptural Intention: Literal Meaning and Its Terminology in Akkadian and Hebrew Commentaries," in Uri Gabbay and Shai Secunda (eds.), *Encounters by the Rivers of Babylon: Scholarly Conversations Between Jews, Iranians and Babylonians* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 160; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 335–70.

Gärtner, Judith (2012), *Die Geschichtspsalmen. Eine Studie zu den Psalmen 78, 105, 106, 135 und 136 als hermeneutische Schlüsseltexte im Psalter* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Gallagher, William R. (1999), *Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah: New Studies* (Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 18; Leiden: Brill).

Galling, Kurt (1964), *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: Mohr).

Garbini, Giovanni (1988), *History and Ideology in Ancient Israel* (London: SCM).

García Martínez, Florentino (1988), "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *Folia Orientalia* 25, 113–36.

García Martínez, Florentino (1990), "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *RevQ* 14, 521–41.

García Martínez, Florentino (2010), "Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The 'Voice of the Teacher' as an Authority-Conferring Strategy in Some Qumran Texts," in Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 92; Leiden: Brill), 227–44.

García Martínez, Florentino (2011), "The Gronigen Hypothesis Revisited," in Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

and Contemporary Culture, Proceedings of the International Conference held at the
Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008) (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of
Judah 93; Leiden: Brill), 15–30.

Georges, Tobias, Albrecht, Felix, and Feldmeier, Reinhard, eds. (2013), *Alexandria*
(Civitatum Orbis Mediterranei Studia 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Gerhards, Meik (2006), *Die Aussetzungsgeschichte des Mose: Literar- und traditions-
geschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Schlüsseltext des nichtpriesterschriftlichen
Tetrateuch* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
109; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Gerstenberger, Erhard S. (2005 [2011]), *Israel in der Perserzeit: 5. und 4. Jahrhundert*
(Biblische Enzyklopädie 8; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer). [English translation: *Israel in
the Persian Period: The Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.E.* (Biblical Encyclopedia 8;
Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011)].

Gertz, Jan C. (2000), *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchun-
gen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des
Alten und Neuen Testaments 186; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Gertz, Jan C. (2002), "Mose und die Anfänge der jüdischen Religion," *Zeitschrift für
Theologie und Kirche* 99, 3–20.

Gertz, Jan Christian, Berlejung, Angelika, Schmid, Konrad, and Witte, Markus, eds.
(2010 [2012]), *Grundinformation Altes Testament: Eine Einführung in Literatur,
Religion und Geschichte des Alten Testaments* (4th edn.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
Ruprecht). [English translation: *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An
Introduction to the Literature, Religion and History of the Old Testament* (London/
New York: T&T Clark, 2012)].

Gertz, Jan Christian, Witte, Markus, and Schmid, Konrad, eds. (2002), *Abschied vom
Jahwisten*: *Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (Beihefte zur
Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 315; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Gilmour, Rachelle (2011), *Representing the Past: A Literary Analysis of Narrative
Historiography in the Book of Samuel* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 143;
Leiden: Brill).

Gmirkin, Russell E. (2006), *Berossus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic
Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament
Studies 433, Copenhagen International Series, 15; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Görg, Manfred (2007), *Ägyptische Religion: Wurzeln, Wege, Wirkungen* (Religionen in
der Umwelt des Alten Testaments 3, Kohlhammer-Studienbücher Theologie 4/3;
Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Gordon, Robert P. and Barstad, Hans M., eds. (2013), *"Thus Speaks Ishtar of Arbela":
Prophecy in Israel, Assyria, and Egypt in the Neo-Assyrian Period* (Winona Lake, IN:
Eisenbrauns).

Goren, Yuval, Finkelstein, Israel, and Na'aman, Nadav (2004), *Inscribed in Clay:
Provenance Study of the Amarna Tablets and Other Ancient Near Eastern Texts*
(Monograph Series of the Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology 23; Tel
Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology).

Grabbe, Lester L., ed. (1998), *Leading Captivity Captive: "The Exile" as History and
Ideology* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 278;
Sheffield: Academic Press).

Grabbe, Lester L. (2003), *"Like a Bird in the Cage": The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 363, European Seminar in Historical Methodology 4; London: Sheffield Academic Press, T&T Clark).

Grabbe, Lester L. (2004), *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, Vol. 1: *Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (Library of Second Temple Studies 47; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Grabbe, Lester L. (2007), *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* (London/New York: T&T Clark).

Grabbe, Lester L. (2008*a*), *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, Vol. 2: *The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175 BCE)* (London/New York: T&T Clark).

Grabbe, Lester L., ed. (2008*b*), *Israel in Transition: From Late Bronze II to Iron IIa (c. 1250–850 B.C.E.)*, Vol. 1: *The Archaeology* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 491, European Seminar in Historical Methodology 7; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Grabbe, Lester L. (2013*a*), "Elephantine and the Torah," in Alejandro F. Botta (ed.), *In the Shadow of Bezalel: Aramaic, Biblical, and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Bezalel Porten* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 60; Leiden: Brill), 125–35.

Grabbe, Lester L., ed. (2013*b*), *Israel in Transition: From Late Bronze II to Iron IIA (ca. 1250–850 BCE)*, Vol. 2: *The Texts* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 521, European Seminar in Historical Methodology 8; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Grabbe, Lester L. and Lipschits, Oded, eds. (2013), *Judah Between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400–200 BCE)* (Library of Second Temple Studies 75; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Grätz, Sebastian (2004), *Das Edikt des Artaxerxes: Eine Untersuchung zum religionspolitischen und historischen Umfeld von Esra 7, 12–26* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 337; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Grätz, Sebastian (2006), "Die Aramäische Chronik des Erabuches und die Rolle der Ältesten in Esr 5–6," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 118, 405–66.

Grätz, Sebastian (2009), "Gottesgesetz und Königsgesetz: Esr 7 und die Autorisierung der Tora," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 106, 1–19.

Graham, M. Patrick, Hoglund, Kenneth G., and McKenzie, Steven L., eds. (1997), *The Chronicler as Historian* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 238; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Graham, M. Patrick and McKenzie, Steven L., eds. (1999), *The Chronicler as Author* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 263; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Graham, M. Patrick, McKenzie, Steven L., and Knoppers, Gary N., eds. (2003), *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 371; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Granerød, Gard (2013), "'By the Favour of Ahuramazda I Am King': On the Promulgation of a Persian Propaganda Text among Babylonians and Judaeans," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 44, 455–80.

Granerød, Gard (forthcoming), *Dimensions of Yahwism in the Persian Period: Studies in the Religion and Society of the Judaean Community at Elephantine*.

Graupner, Axel (2002), *Der Elohist. Gegenwart und Wirksamkeit des transzendenten Gottes in der Geschichte* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 97; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Grossman, Maxine L. (2002), *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 45; Leiden: Brill).

Gruen, Erich S. (1998), *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 30; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Gruen, Erich S. (2002), *Diaspora: Jews Amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Gruen, Erich S. (2008), "The *Letter of Aristeas* and the Cultural Context of the Septuagint," in Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 134–56.

Haag, Ernst (2003), *Das hellenistische Zeitalter: Israel und die Bibel im 4. bis 1. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 9; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Haas, Volkert and Koch, Heidemarie (2011), *Religionen des Alten Orients 1: Hethiter und Iran* (Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 1/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Hadjiev, Tchavdar S. (2009), *The Composition and Redaction of the Book of Amos* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 393; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Haider, Peter W., Hutter, Manfred, and Kreuzer, Siegfried, eds. (1996), *Religionsgeschichte Syriens: Von der Frühzeit bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart/Berlin: Kohlhammer).

Hallaschka, Martin (2011), *Haggai und Sacharja 1–8: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 411; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Halpern, Baruch (1988; reprint 1996), *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press).

Hamilton, Gordon J. (2006), *The Origins of the West Semitic Alphabet in Egyptian Scripts* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Monograph Series 40; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America).

Hanhart, Robert (1999), *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Hardmeier, Christof (1990), *Prophetie im Streit vor dem Untergang Judas: Erzähl-kommunikative Studien zur Entstehungssituation der Jesaja- und Jeremiaerzählun-gen in II Reg 18–20 und Jer 37–40* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 187; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Harkins, Angela Kim (2012a), *Reading with an "I" to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot through the Lens of Visionary Traditions* (Ekstasis, Religious Experience from Antiquity to the Middle Ages 3; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Harkins, Angela Kim (2012b), "Who is the Teacher of the Teacher Hymns? Re-examining the Teacher Hymns Hypothesis Fifty Years Later," in Eric F. Mason (ed.), *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, vol. 1 (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 153; Leiden: Brill), 449–67.

Harrington, Hannah (2006), *The Purity Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 5; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Hartenstein, Friedhelm (1997), *Unzugänglichkeit Gottes im Heiligtum: Jesaja 6 und der Wohnort JHWHs in der Jerusalemer Kulttradition* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 75; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Hartenstein, Friedhelm (2003), "Religionsgeschichte Israels—ein Überblick über die Forschung seit 1990," *VF* 48, 2–28.

Hartenstein, Friedhelm (2004), "JHWH und der 'Schreckensglanz' Assurs (Jesaja 8,6–8): Traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur 'Denkschrift' Jesaja 6–8*," in Friedhelm Hartenstein, Jutta Krispenz, and Aaron Schart (eds.), *Schriftprophetie: Festschrift für Jörg Jeremias zum 65. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag), 83–102.

Hartenstein, Friedhelm, ed. (2008), "Geschichte Israels und biblische Geschichtskonzepte," *VF* 53/1.

Hartenstein, Friedhelm (2011), *Das Archiv des verborgenen Gottes: Studien zur Unheilspropetie Jesajas und zur Zionstheologie der Psalmen in assyrischer Zeit* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 74; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag).

Hasegawa, Shuichi (2012), *Aram and Israel During the Jehuite Dynasty* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 434; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Hausmann, Jutta (1995), *Studien zum Menschenbild der älteren Weisheit (Spr. 10ff)* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Hayes, John H. and Miller, James M., eds. (1977), *Israelite and Judean History* (London: SCM).

Heltzer, Michael (1989), "Epigraphic Evidence Concerning a Jewish Settlement in Kition (Larnaca, Cyprus) in the Achaemenid Period (IV cent. B.C.E.)," *Aula Orientalis* 7, 189–206.

De Hemmer Gudme, Anne Katrine (2013), *Before the God in this Place for Good Remembrance: A Comparative Analysis of the Aramaic Votive Inscriptions from Mount Gerizim* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 441; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Hempel, Charlotte (1998), *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 29; Leiden: Brill).

Hempel, Charlotte (2000), *The Damascus Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Hempel, Charlotte (2013), *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 154; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Hengel, Martin (1973 [1974]), *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jhs v.Chr.* (2nd edn.; Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 10; Tübingen: Mohr). [English translation: *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1974].

Hengel, Martin (1976 [1980]), *Juden, Griechen und Barbaren: Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlicher Zeit* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 76; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk). [English translation: *Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians: Aspects*

of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1980)].

Hengel, Martin (1996), *Judaica et Hellenistica: Kleine Schriften 1*, assisted by Roland Deines (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Hengel, Martin (2002), *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*, with the assistance of Roland Deines. Introduction written by Robert Hanhart, translated by Mark E. Biddle (Old Testament Studies; Edinburgh/New York: T&T Clark).

Hengel, Martin and Schwemer, Anna M., eds. (1994), *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Hensel, Benedikt (2014), "Von 'Israeliten' zu 'Ausländern': Zur Entwicklung anti-samaritanischer Polemik ab der hasmonäischen Zeit," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 126, 475–93.

Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen (1965), *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult. Zur "Spiritualisierung" der Kultbegriffe in Alten Testament* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 19; Neukirchen-Vluyen: Neukirchener Verlag).

Hezser, Catherine (2001), *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Hoftijzer, Jacob and van der Kooij, Gerrit, eds. (1976), *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 19; Leiden: Brill).

Hoglund, Kenneth G. (1992), *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria–Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah* (Society of Biblical Literature. Dissertation Series 125; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press).

Holland, Glenn S. (2009), *Gods in the Desert: Religions of the Ancient Near East* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield).

Honigman, Sylvie (2002), "The Jewish Politeuma at Heracleopolis," *Scripta Classica Israelia* 21, 251–66.

Honigman, Sylvie (2003*a*), "Politeuma and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt," *Ancient Society* 33, 61–102.

Honigman, Sylvie (2003*b*), *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge).

Honigman, Sylvie (2014), *Tales of High Priests and Taxes: The Books of the Maccabee and the Judean Rebellion Against Antiochus IV* (Hellenistic Culture and Society; Oakland, CA: University of California Press).

Horbury, William (1994), "Jewish Inscriptions and Jewish Literature in Egypt, with Special Reference to Ecclesiasticus," in Jan W. van Henten and Pieter W. van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 21; Leiden: Brill), 9–43.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar (1982), *Der Dekalog. Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 45; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Houtman, Cornelis (1997), *Das Bundesbuch: Ein Kommentar* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 24; Leiden: Brill).

Hübner, Ulrich (1992), *Die Ammoniter. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Kultur und Religion eines transjordanischen Volkes im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins 16; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Huddleston, Jonathan (2012), *Eschatology in Genesis* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/57; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Hutter, Manfred (1996), *Religionen in der Umwelt des Alten Testaments I: Babylonier, Syrer, Perser* (Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 4/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Jacobs, Mignon R. and Person, Raymond F., eds. (2013), *Israelite Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic History: Portrait, Reality, and the Formation of a History* (Society of Biblical Literature. Ancient Israel and its Literature 14; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Jain, Eva (2014), *Psalmen oder Psalter? Materielle Rekonstruktion und inhaltliche Untersuchung der Psalmenhandschriften von Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 109; Leiden: Brill).

Jamieson-Drake, David W. (1991), *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Juda: A Socio-Archaeological Approach* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 109, The Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series 9; Sheffield: Almond Press).

Janowski, Bernd (2000), *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur priesterschriftlichen Sühnetheologie* (2nd edn.; Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 55; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Janowski, Bernd and Köckert, Matthias, eds. (1999), *Religionsgeschichte Israels: Formale und materiale Aspekte* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 15; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus).

Japhet, Sara (1989), *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums 9; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang).

Jepsen, Alfred (1953), *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer Verlag).

Jeremias, Gert (1963), *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Jeremias, Jörg (1996), *Hosea und Amos: Studien zu den Anfängen des Dodekapropheton* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 13; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Jeremias, Jörg (2013), "Das Rätsel der Schriftprophetie," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 125, 93–117.

Joannès, F. and Lemaire, André (1996), "Contrats babyloniens d'époque achéménide du Bît-abi Râm avec une épigraphe araméene," *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 90, 41–60.

Joannès, F. and Lemaire, André (1999), "Trois tablettes cunéiformes à l'onomastique ouest-sémitique," *Transeuphratène* 17, 17–34, 2 plates.

Jobes, Karen H. and Silva, Moisés (2000), *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic).

Johnston, Sarah Iles, ed. (2004), *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide* (Harvard University Press Reference Library; Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press).

Joisten Pruschke, Anke (2008), *Das religiöse Leben von Elephantine in der Achämenidenzeit* (Göttinger Orientforschungen III. Iranica 2; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Jokiranta, Jutta (2006), "The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: a social-identity approach," in Philip E. Esler (ed.), *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press), 254–63.

Jokiranta, Jutta (2013), *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 105; Brill: Leiden).

De Jong, Matthijs J. (2007), *Isaiah Among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets: A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 117; Leiden: Brill).

Jonker, Louis, ed. (2011), *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/53; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Jursa, Michael (2008), "Nabû-šarrūssu-ukīn, rab ša-rēši, und 'Nebusarsekim' (Jer. 39:3)," *Nouvelles Assyriologique Brèves et Utilitaires* 2008/1, 9–10.

Kalimi, Isaac (1990), *The Books of Chronicles: A Classified Bibliography* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Kalimi, Isaac (1995), *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 226; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Kalimi, Isaac, ed. (2012), *New Perspectives on Ezra–Nehemiah: History and Historiography, Text, Literature, and Interpretation* (Journal of Hebrew Scriptures 12; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Kalimi, Isaac (2013), *Das Chronikbuch und seine Chronik: Zur Entstehung und Rezeption eines biblischen Buches* (Fuldaer Studien: Schriftenreihe der Theologischen Fakultät 17; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder).

Kampen, John and Bernstein, Moshe J., eds. (1996), *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (Society of Biblical Literature. Symposium Series 2; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press).

Kartveit, Magnar (2009), *The Origin of the Samaritans* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 128; Leiden: Brill).

Kasher, Aryeh (1985), *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Keel, Othmar (2007), *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus* (Orte und Landschaften der Bibel IV/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Keel, Othmar and Uehlinger, Christoph (1994), "Der Assyrerkönig Salmanassar III. und Jehu von Israel auf dem Schwarzen Obelisken aus Nimrud," *Zeitschrift für Katholoische Theologie* 116, 391–420.

Keel, Othmar and Uehlinger, Christoph (2001 [1998]), *Göttinnen, Götter und Gottessymbole: Neue Erkenntnisse zur Religionsgeschichte Kanaans und Israels aufgrund bislang unerschlossener ikonographischer Quellen* (5th edn.; Questiones Disputatae 134; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder). [English translation: *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*, translated by Thomas H. Trapp (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998)].

Kippenberg, Hans G. (1971), *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 30; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Klein, Anja (2008), *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Ez 34–39* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 391; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Klein, Anja (2014), *Geschichte und Gebet. Die Rezeption der biblischen Geschichte in den Psalmentexten des Alten Testaments* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 94; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Knauf, Ernst A. (1994), *Die Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar. Altes Testament 29; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk).

Knauf, Ernst A. (2002), "Elephantine und das vor-biblische Judentum," in Reinhard G. Kratz (ed.), *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 22; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus), 179–88.

Knibb, Michael A. (1987), *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200, vol. 7; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Knohl, Israel (1995), *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*, translated by J. Feldman and P. Rodman (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press).

Knoppers, Gary N. (2005), "What has Mt. Zion to Do with Mt. Gerizim? A Study in the Early Relations between the Jews and the Samaritans in the Persian Period," *Studies in Religion* 34, 307–36.

Knoppers, Gary N. (2006), "Revisiting the Samarian Question in the Persian Period," in Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 265–89.

Knoppers, Gary N. (2013), *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Knoppers, Gary N. and Levinson, Bernard M., eds. (2007), *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Knoppers, Gary N. and McConville, J. Gordon, eds. (2000), *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Koch, Christoph (2008), *Vertrag, Treueid und Bund: Studien zur Rezeption des altorientalischen Vertragsrechts im Deuteronomium und zur Ausbildung der Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 383; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Koch, Klaus (1978; 3rd edn. 1995 [1983]), *Die Propheten*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer). [English translation: *The Prophets*, Vol. 1: *The Assyrian Period*, translated by Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983)].

Koch, Klaus (1980; 2nd edn. 1988 [1982]), *Die Propheten*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer). [English translation: *The Prophets*, Vol. 2: *The Babylonian and Persian Period*, translated by Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1982)].

Köckert, Matthias (1998), "Von einem zum einzigen Gott: Zur Diskussion der Religionsgeschichte Israels," *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift* 15, 137–75.

Köckert, Matthias (2000), "Literargeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Ps 104," in Reinhard G. Kratz, Thomas Krüger, and Konrad Schmid (eds.), *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift: Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 300; Berlin: De Gruyter), 259–80.

Köckert, Matthias (2002), "Wie kam das Gesetz an den Sinai?," in Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin (eds.), *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik. Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 13–27.

Köckert, Matthias (2005), "Wandlungen Gottes im antiken Israel," *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift* 22, 3–36.

Köckert, Matthias (2007), *Die Zehn Gebote* (München: Beck Verlag).

Köckert, Matthias (2009), "Vom Kultbild Jahwes zum Bilderverbot. Oder: Vom Nutzen der Religionsgeschichte für die Theologie," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 106, 371–406.

Köckert, Matthias (2010), "YHWH in the Northern and Southern Kingdom," in Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann (eds.), *One God—One Cult—One Nation*: *Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 405; Berlin: De Gruyter), 357–94.

Köckert, Matthias and Nissinen, Martti, eds. (2003), *Propheten in Mari, Assyrien und Israel* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 201; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Kottsieper, Ingo (1990), Die Sprache der Aḥiqarsprüche (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 194; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Kottsieper, Ingo (1991), "Die Geschichte und die Sprüche des weisen Achiqar," in Otto Kaiser, et al. (eds.), *Texte zur Umwelt des Alten Testaments*, vol. 3.2. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus), 320–47.

Kottsieper, Ingo (2001), "Zwei aramäische Texte aus dem Papyrus Amherst 63," in Otto Kaiser, et al. (eds.), *Texte zur Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Ergänzungsband* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus), 200–2.

Kottsieper, Ingo (2002), "Die Religionspolitik der Achämeniden und die Juden von Elephantine," in Reinhard G. Kratz (ed.), *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 22; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus), 150–78.

Kottsieper, Ingo (2009), "'Look, son, what Nadab did to Ahikaros …': The Aramaic Ahiqar-Tradition and its Relationship to the Book of Tobit," in Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz (eds.), *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 145–67.

Kottsieper, Ingo (2013), "Aramäische Archive aus achämenidischer Zeit und ihre Funktion," in Michele Faraguna and Graeca Tergestina (eds.), *Legal Documents in Ancient Societies IV: Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies, Trieste 30 September–1 October 2011* (Trieste: EUT), 169–93.

Krapf, Thomas M. (1992), *Die Priesterschrift und die vorexilische Zeit: Yehezkel Kaufmanns vernachlässigter Beitrag zur Geschichte der biblischen Religion* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 119; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (1991*a*), *Kyros im Deuterojesaja-Buch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (1991*b*), *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 63; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (1994), "Der Dekalog im Exodusbuch," *Vetus Testamentum* 44, 205–38.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2000*a*), "Der literarische Ort des Deuteronomiums," in Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann (eds.), *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Lothar Perlitt* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 101–20.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2000*b* [2005]), *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments: Grundwissen der Bibelkritik* (UTB 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht). [English translation: *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, translated by John Bowden (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005)].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2000*c*), "Israel als Staat und als Volk," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 97, 1–17.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2001 [2004*a*]), "The Visions of Daniel," in John J. Collins and Peter Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 83/1; Leiden: Brill), 91–113. [German: 2004*a*, 227–44].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2002*a*), "Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch," in Jan C. Gertz, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte (eds.), *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 315; Berlin: De Gruyter), 295–323.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2002*b* [2004*a*]), "From Nabonidus to Cyrus," in A. Panaino and G. Pettinato (eds.), *Ideologies as Intercultural Phenomena, Melammu Symposia II: Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project Held in Chicago, USA, October 27–31, 2000* (Milano: Università di Bologna & Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente), 143–56. [German: 2004*a*, 40–54].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2002*c*), "Noch einmal: Theologie im Alten Testament," in Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin (eds.), *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik. Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 310–26.

Kratz, Reinhard G., ed. (2002*d*), *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 22; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2003*a*), "Der Mythos vom Königtum Gottes in Kanaan und Israel," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 100, 147–62.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2003*b* [2015]), *Die Propheten Israels* (Beck'sche Reihe Wissen 2326; München: Beck). [English translation: *Prophets of Israel* (CSHB 2; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015)].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2004*a*; study edition 2006; 2nd rev. edn. 2013), *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2004*b*), "Das *Sch^ema*ʿ des Psalters: Die Botschaft vom Reich Gottes nach Psalm 145," in Markus Witte (ed.), *Gott und Mensch im Dialog: Festschrift für Otto Kaiser zum 80. Geburtstag* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 345/II; Berlin: De Gruyter), 623–38.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2004*c*), "Reste hebräischen Heidentums am Beispiel der Psalmen," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 2004/2, 25–65.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2005), "'Höre Israel' und Dekalog," in Christian Frevel, Michael Konkel, and Johannes Schnocks (eds.), *Die Zehn Worte: Der Dekalog als Testfall der Pentateuchkritik* (Questiones Disputatae 212; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder), 77–84.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2006*a* [2011*a*]), "Israel in the Book of Isaiah," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31, 103–28. [German: "Israel im Jesajabuch," in Rüdiger Lux (ed.), *Die unwiderstehliche Wahrheit: Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie. Festschrift für Arndt Meinhold* (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte; Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006), 85–103; repr. in 2011*a*, 160–76].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2006*b*), "Mose und die Propheten: Zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C," in Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar (eds.), *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 61; Leiden: Brill), 151–76.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2006*c* [2004]), "The Second Temple of Jeb and of Jerusalem," in O. Lipschitz and M. Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 247–64. [German: 2004, 60–78].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2007*a* [2009]), "Geschichten und Geschichte in den nordwestsemitischen Inschriften des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.," in Ludwig Morenz and Stefan Schorch (eds.), *Was ist ein Text? Alttestamentliche, ägyptologische und altorientalistische Perspektiven* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 362; Berlin: De Gruyter), 284–309. [English: "Memoria, Memorabilia, and Memoirs: Notions of the Past in North West Semitic Inscriptions," in Hans M. Barstad and Pierre Briant (eds.), *The Past in the Past: Concepts of Past Reality in Ancient Near Eastern and Early Greek Thought* (The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture B/130; Det Norske Videnkaps-Akademi, II. Hist.-Filos.; Klasse, Skrifter og avhandlinger 5; Oslo: Novus Press, 2009), 111–31].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2007*b*), "Temple and Torah: Reflections on the Legal Status of the Pentateuch between Elephantine and Qumran," in Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson (eds.), *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 77–103.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2007*c*), "'The Place Which He Has Chosen': The Identification of the Cult Place of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 in 4QMMT," in Moshe Bar-Asher and Emanuel Tov (eds.), *Meghillot V–VI: A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute; Haifa: Haifa University Press), *57–*80.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2008*a* [2011*a*]), "Chemosh's Wrath and Yahweh's No: Ideas of Divine Wrath in Moab and Israel," in Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann (eds.), *Divine Wrath and Divine Mercy in the World of Antiquity* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/33; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 92–121. [German: 2011*a*, 71–98].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2008*b*), "Ezra—Priest and Scribe," in Leo G. Perdue (ed.), *Scribes, Sages, and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 219; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 163–88.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2009*a* [2011]), "Judäische Gesandte im Achämenidenreich: Hananja, Esra und Nehemia," in Christine Allison, Anke Joisten-Pruschke, and Antje Wendtland (eds.), *From Daena to Din: Religion, Kultur und Sprache der iranischen Welt. Festschrift Philip Kreyenbroek zum 60. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 377–98. [English: "Judean Ambassadors and the Making of Jewish Identity. The Case of Hananiah, Ezra, and Nehemiah," in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 421–44].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2009*b*), "Eyes and Spectacles: Wellhausen's Method of Higher Criticism," *Journal of Theological Studies* 60, 381–402.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2010*a* [2011*a*]), "Rewriting Isaiah: The Case of Isaiah 28–31," in John Day (ed.), *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel, Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (London/New York: T&T Clark), 245–66. [German: 2011*a*, 177–97].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2010*b*), "The Idea of Cultic Centralization and its Supposed Ancient Near Eastern Analogies," in Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann (eds.), *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 405; Berlin: De Gruyter), 121–44.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2010*c*), "Zwischen Elephantine und Qumran: Das Alte Testament im Rahmen des Antiken Judentums," in André Lemaire (ed.), *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 133; Leiden: Brill), 129–46.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2011*a*), *Prophetenstudien. Kleine Schriften 2* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 74; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2011*b*), "'Blessed Be the Lord and Blessed Be his Name Forever': Psalm 145 in the Hebrew Bible and in Psalms Scroll 11Q5," in Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen (eds.), *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 98; Leiden: Brill), 229–43.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2011*c*), "Der 'Penal Code' und das Verhältnis von *Serekh ha-Yachad* (S) und Damaskusschrift (D)," *Revue de Qumran* 25/98, 199–227.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2011*d*), "The Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate," in Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz (eds.), *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 31–61.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2012*a*), "The Headings of the Book of Deuteronomy," in Konrad Schmid and Raymond F. Person, Jr. (eds.), *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 31–46.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2012*b*), "The Two Houses of Israel," in Iain Provan and Mark J. Boda (eds.), *Let us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the*

Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 153; Leiden: Brill), 167–79.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2013*a*), "Elephantine und Alexandria: Nicht-biblisches und biblisches Judentum in Ägypten," in Tobias Georges, Felix Albrecht, and Reinhard Feldmeier (eds.), *Alexandria* (Civitatum Orbis Mediterranei Studia 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 193–208.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2013*b* [2014]), "Text und Kommentar: Die Pescharim von Qumran im Kontext der hellenistischen Schultradition," in Peter Gemeinhardt and Sebastian Günther (eds.), *Von Rom nach Bagdad: Bildung und Religion in der späteren Antike bis zum klassischen Islam* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 51–80. [English: "Text and Commentary: The Pesharim of Qumran in the Context of Hellenistic Scholarship," in Thomas L. Thompson and Philippe Wajdenbaum (eds.), *The Bible and Hellenism: Greek Influence on Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Durham: Acumen, 2014), 212–29].

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2013*c*), "Das Alte Testament und die Texte vom Toten Meer," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 125, 198–213.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2013*d*), "Laws of Wisdom: Sapiential Traits in the Rule of the Community (1QS 5–7)," in Steven E. Fassberg, Moshe Bar-Asher, and Ruth A. Clements (eds.), *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 108; Leiden: Brill), 133–45.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2013*e*), "Rewriting Torah in the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Bernd Schipper and Andrew Teeter (eds.), *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of "Torah" in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 163; Leiden: Brill), 273–92.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2013*f*), "'The peg in the wall': Cultic Centralization Revisited," in Anselm C. Hagedorn and Reinhard G. Kratz (eds.), *Law and Religion in the Eastern Mediterranean from Antiquity to Early Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 251–85.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (2015), "Isaiah and the Siege of Jerusalem," in Rannfrid Thelle, Terje Stordalen, and Mervyn R.J. Richardson (eds.), *New Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy and History: Essays in Honour of Hans M. Barstad* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 168; Leiden: Brill), 143–60.

Kratz, Reinhard G. (forthcoming), "Aḥiqar and Bisitun: Literature of the Judeans at Elephantine?"

Kratz, Reinhard G. (forthcoming), "Biblical History in the Excerpts of Hecataeus, Berossus, and Manetho."

Kratz, Reinhard G. (forthcoming), "Bibelhandschrift oder Midrasch? Zum Verhältnis von Text- und Literargeschichte in den Samuelbüchern im Licht der Handschrift 4Q51 (4QSamᵃ)."

Kratz, Reinhard G. (forthcoming), "Judean and Samarian Sources," in Bruno Jacobs and Robert Rollinger (eds.), *A Companion to the Achaemenid Persian Empire* (Blackwell's Companions to the Ancient World; Hoboken, NY: Wiley Blackwell).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (forthcoming), "*Mille Ahiqar*: 'The Words Ahiqar' and the Literature of the Jewish Diaspora in Ancient Egypt" (The Anis Makdisi Program in Literature; Beirut: American University of Beirut).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (forthcoming), "Nahash, King of the Ammonites, in the Deuteronomistic History," in Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala (eds.), *Insights into Editing* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology; Leuven: Peeters).

Kratz, Reinhard G. (forthcoming), "Reworked Pentateuch and Pentateuchal Theory."

Kratz, Reinhard G. (forthcoming), "Sources, Fragments, and Additions: Biblical Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls."

Kratz, Reinhard G., Krüger, Thomas, and Schmid, Konrad, eds. (2000), *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift: Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 300; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Kratz, Reinhard G. and Spieckermann, Hermann, eds. (2006), *Götterbilder—Gottesbilder—Weltbilder: Polytheismus und Monotheismus in der Welt der Antike 2. Griechenland und Rom, Judentum, Christentum und Islam* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/18; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Kratz, Reinhard G. and Spieckermann, Hermann, eds. (2010), *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 405; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Krause, Joachim K. (2014), *Exodus und Eisodus: Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1–5* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 161; Leiden: Brill).

Kreuch, Jan (2011), *Unheil und Heil bei Jesaja. Studien zur Entstehung des Assur-Zyklus Jesaja 28–31* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 130; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Kreuzer, Siegfried, Meiser, Martin, and Sigismund, Marcus, eds. (2012), *Die Septuaginta—Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 286; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Krüger, Thomas (2004), *Qohelet* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press).

Kruse, Thomas (2008), "Das *politeuma* der Juden von Herakleopolis in Ägypten," in Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (eds.), assisted by Martin Meiser, *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 166–75.

Kruse, Thomas (2010), "Das jüdische Politeuma von Herakleopolis in Ägypten: Zur Methode der Integration ethnischer Gruppen in den Staat der Ptolemäer," in Vera V. Dement'eva and Tassilo Schmitta (eds.), *Volk und Demokratie im Altertum* (Bremer Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 93–105.

Küchler, Max (1979), *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen: Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 26; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Lambert, Wilfred George (2007), "A Document From a Community of Exiles in Babylonia," in Meir Lubetzki (ed.), *Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumean and Cuneiform* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 8; Sheffield: Phoenix), 201–5.

Lange, Armin (2003), Art. "Qumran," in Hans Dieter Betz, et al. (eds.), *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (4th edn.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), vol. 6, 1873–96.

Lange, Armin (2006), "The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls—Library or Manuscript Corpus?," in Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar

(eds.), *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 61; Leiden: Brill), 177–93.

Lange, Armin (2009), *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer I: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Law, Timothy M. (2013), *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Lehmann, Gustav A. and Schmidt-Glintzer, Helwig, eds. (2009), *WBG-Weltgeschichte: Eine globale Geschichte von den Anfängen bis ins 21. Jahrhundert 2: Antike Welten und neue Reiche: 1200 v. Chr. bis 600 n. Chr.* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Lemaire, André (1981), *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible dans l'ancien Israël* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 39; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Lemaire, André (2002), "Das Achämenidische Juda und seine Nachbarn im Lichte der Epigraphie," in Reinhard G. Kratz (ed.), *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 22; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus), 210–30.

Lemaire, André (2004), "Hebrew and West Semitic Inscriptions and Pre-Exilic Israel," in John Day (ed.), *In Search of Pre-Exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 406; London/New York: T&T Clark), 366–84.

Lemaire, André (2006), "New Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea and Their Historical Interpretation," in Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 413–56.

Lemaire, André (2007), "Administration in Fourth-Century B.C.E. Judah in Light of Epigraphy and Numismatics," in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 53–74.

Lemche, Niels P. (1996), *Die Vorgeschichte Israels: Von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des 13. Jahrhunderts v.Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Leuenberger, Martin (2008), *Segen und Segenstheologien im alten Israel: Untersuchungen zu ihren religions- und theologiegeschichtlichen Konstellationen und Transformationen* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 90; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich).

Levin, Christoph (1985), *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 137; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Levin, Christoph (1993), *Der Jahwist* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Levin, Christoph (2001[2005]), *Das Alte Testament* (Beck'sche Reihe Wissen 2160; München: Beck). [English translation: *The Old Testament: A Brief Introduction*, translated by Margaret Kohl (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005)].

Levinson, Bernard M. (1997), *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Levy, Thomas E., ed. (1995), *The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land* (London: Leicester University Press).

Lim, Timothy H. (2002), *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Lim, Timothy H. and Collins, John J., eds. (2010), *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Lipschits, Oded and Blenkinsopp, Joseph, eds. (2003), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Lipschits, Oded, Knoppers, Gary N., and Albertz, Rainer, eds. (2007), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Lipschits, Oded, Knoppers, Gary N., and Oeming, Manfred, eds. (2011), *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Lipschits, Oded and Oeming, Manfred, eds. (2006), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Liverani, Mario (2006), *Israel's History and the History of Israel*, translated from Italian by Chiara Peri and Philip R. Davies (BibleWorld; London: Equinox).

Lohfink, Norbert (1990), *Lobgesänge der Armen: Studien zum Magnifikat, den Hodajot von Qumran und einigen späten Psalmen, mit einem Anhang, Hodajot-Bibliographie 1948–1989 von Ulrich Dahmen* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 143; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk).

Lohfink, Norbert (1991), *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium*: *Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 111; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Ma, John (2002), *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Ma, John (2012), "Relire les institutions des Séleucides de Bikerman," in Stéphane Benoit (ed.), *Rome, a City and its Empire in Perspective: The Impact of the Roman World through Fergus Millar's research* (Leiden: Brill), 59–84.

Ma, John (2013), "Re-Examining Hannukkah. Marginalia Review of Books," no pages, cited 9 January 2015. Online: <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/re-examining-hanukkah/>.

MacDonald, Burton and Younker, Randall W., eds. (1999), *Ancient Ammon* (Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 1; Leiden: Brill).

Magen, Yitzhak (2008*a*), *Mount Gerizim Excavations II: A Temple City* (Judea and Samaria Publications 8; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority).

Magen, Yitzhak (2008*b*), *The Samaritans and the Good Samaritan* (Judea and Samaria Publications 7; Jerusalem: Jerusalem Antiquities Authority).

Magness, Jodi (2002), *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Maier, Johann (1990), *Zwischen den Testamenten: Geschichte und Religion des Zweiten Tempels* (Supplements to Neue Echter Bibel. Altes Testament 3; Würzburg: Echter Verlag).

Marcos, Natalio Fernández (2009), *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Marttila, Marko (2006), *Collective Reinterpretation in the Psalms* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/13; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Mason, Steve (2007), "Jews, Judaea, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38, 457–512.

McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. (1996), *Ancient Inscriptions: Voices from the Biblical World* (Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeological Society).

McKane, William (1986), *Jeremiah: Volume 1:1–25* (The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

McKane, William (1996), *Jeremiah: Volume 2:26–52* (The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

McKenzie, Steven L. (1991), *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Books of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 42; Leiden: Brill).

Meshel, Zeev (2012), *Kuntillet 'Ajrud (Horvat Teman): An Iron Age II Religious Site on the Judah–Sinai Border* (Jerusalem: IES).

Metso, Sarianna (1997), *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 21; Leiden: Brill).

Metso, Sariana (2007), *The Serekh Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Metso, Sarianna and Najman, Hindy, eds. (2009), "The Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16/3.

Metso, Sarianna, Najman, Hindy, and Schuller, Eileen, eds. (2010), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 92; Leiden: Brill).

Mildenberg, Leo (1984), *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War* (Aarau: Sauerländer).

Millard, Matthias (1994), *Die Komposition des Psalters: Ein formgeschichtlicher Ansatz* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 9; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Miller, James M. and Hayes, John H. (1986; 2nd edn. 2005), *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox).

Mor, Menachem and Reiterer, Friedrich V., eds. (2010), *Samaritans: Past and Present: Current Studies* (Studia Judaica 53, Studia Samaritana 5; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Muffs, Yochanan (2003), *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine, with Prolegomenon by Baruch A. Levine* (Handbook of Oriental Studies 66; Leiden: Brill).

Mulder, Martin J. and Sysling, Harry, eds. (1988), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum 2.1; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press).

Müller, Reinhard (2004), *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Müller, Reinhard (2008), *Jahwe als Wettergott: Studien zur althebräischen Kultlyrik anhand ausgewählter Psalmen* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 387; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Müller, Reinhard (2012), *Ausgebliebene Einsicht: Jesajas "Verstockungsauftrag" (Jes 6, 9–11) und die judäische Politik am Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 124; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Müller, Reinhard, Pakkala, Juha, and ter Haar Romeny, Bas, eds. (2014), *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible: A New Perspective on Editorial Activity in the Hebrew Bible for Research and Teaching* (Society of Biblical Literature. Resources for Biblical Study 75; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Na'aman, Nadav (2005a), *Ancient Israel and its Neighbors: Interaction and Counteraction* (Collected Essays vol. 1; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Na'aman, Nadav (2005b), *Canaan in the Second Millennium B.C.E.* (Collected Essays vol. 2; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Na'aman, Nadav (2006a), *Ancient Israel's History and Historiography: The First Temple Period* (Collected Essays vol. 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Na'aman, Nadav (2006b), "Review on Mario Liverani, *Israel's History and the History of Israel*," *Review of Biblical Literature* 7, no pages, cited 13 January 2015. Online: <http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/5069_5342.pdf>.

Na'aman, Nadav (2009), "Saul, Benjamin and the Emergence of 'Biblical Israel'," part 1, *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 121, 211–24; part 2, *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 121, 335–49.

Na'aman, Nadav (2012), "A New Look at the Epigraphic Finds from Horvat 'Uza," *Tel Aviv* 39, 212–29 (39/2, 84–101).

Najman, Hindy (2003), *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 77; Leiden: Brill).

Najman, Hindy (2012), "The Vitality of Scripture Within and Beyond the 'Canon'," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 43, 497–518.

Naveh, Joseph (1979), "Graffiti and Dedications," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 235, 27–30.

Nelson, Richard D. (1981), *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 18; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Newsom, Carol (1985), *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 27; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press).

Newsom, Carol (2004), *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52; Leiden: Brill).

Niehr, Herbert (1998), *Religionen in Israels Umwelt: Einführung in die nordwestsemitischen Religionen Syrien-Palästinas* (Supplements to Neue Echter Bibel. Altes Testament 5; Würzburg: Echter).

Nihan, Christophe L. (2007), *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Nissinen, Martti, ed. (2000), *Prophecy in its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamien, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives* (Society of Biblical Literature. Symposium Series 13; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Nissinen, Martti (2005), "How Prophecy became Literature," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 19/2, 153–72.

Nissinen, Martti (2014), "Since When Do Prophets Write?," in Kristin de Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström (eds.), *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes:*

Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 72; Leuven: Peeters), 585–606.

Nissinen, Martti and Carter, Charles E., eds. (2009), *Images and Prophecy in the Ancient Eastern Mediterranean* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 233; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Nitzan, Bilha (1994), *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, translated from Hebrew by Jonathan Chapman (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 12; Leiden: Brill).

Nogalski, James D. (1993a), *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 217; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Nogalski, James D. (1993b), *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 218; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Noort, Ed, ed. (2012), *The Book of Joshua* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 250; Leuven: Peeters).

Noth, Martin (1943 [1981/1987]), *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer Verlag). [English translation (Part 1): *The Deuteronomistic History* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981). (Part 2): *The Chronicler's History* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 50; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987)].

Noth, Martin (1948 [1972]), *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer). [English translation: *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, translated by B.W. Anderson, with Introduction (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972)].

Noth, Martin (1950; 2nd edn. 1954 [1960]), *Geschichte Israels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht). [English translation: *The History of Israel*, translated from the 2nd German edition 1954 (London: revised trans. Peter Ackroyd, A. & C. Black; New York: Harper & Row, 1960)].

Noth, Martin (1962 [1966]), *Die Welt des Alten Testaments: Einführung in die Grenzgebiete der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft* (4th edn.; Berlin: Töpelmann). [English translation: *The Old Testament World* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1966)].

Noth, Martin (1971), *Aufsätze zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde*, 2 vols. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Noy, David (1994), "The Jewish Communities of Leontopolis and Venosa," in Jan W. van Henten and Pieter W. van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 21; Leiden: Brill), 162–82.

O'Brien, Kelli S. (2012), "Runner, Staff, and Star: Interpreting the Teacher of Righteousness Through Scripture," in Eric Mason (ed.), *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 153; Leiden: Brill), vol. 1, 429–47.

Osumi, Yuichi (1991), *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Ex 20,22b–23,33* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 105; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Otto, Eckart (1988), *Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel: Eine Rechtsgeschichte des "Bundesbuchs" Ex XX 22–XXIII 13* (Studia Biblica 3; Leiden: Brill).

Otto, Eckart (1994), *Theologische Ethik des Alten Testaments* (Theologische Wissenschaft 3/2; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Otto, Eckart (1998), "Die Ursprünge der Bundestheologie im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 4, 1–84.

Otto, Eckart (1999), *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 284; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Otto, Eckart (2000), *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Otto, Eckart (2009), *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 9; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Otto, Eckhart and Achenbach, Reinhard, eds. (2004), *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Paget, James C. and Schaper, Joachim, eds. (2013), *The New Cambridge History of the Bible I: From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Pakkala, Juha (2004), *Ezra the Scribe: The Development of Ezra 7–10 and Nehemiah 8* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 347; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Parker, Simon (1997), *Stories in Scripture and Inscriptions: Comparative Studies on Narratives in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions and the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Pearce, Laurie E. (2006), "New Evidence For Judeans in Babylonia," in Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 399–411.

Pearce, Laurie E. (2011), " 'Judean': A Special Status in Neo-Babylonian and Achemenid Babylonia?," in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 267–77.

Pearce, Laurie E. (2014), "Continuity and Normality in Sources Relating to the Judean Exile," *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 3, 163–84.

Penner, Jeremy, Penner, Ken, and Wassen, Cecilia, eds. (2012), *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of her 65th Birthday* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 98; Leiden: Brill).

Perlitt, Lothar (1994), "Hebraismus—Deuteronomismus—Judaismus," in Lothar Perlitt, *Deuteronomium-Studien* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 8; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 247–60.

Person, Raymond F., Jr., ed. (2009), "In Conversation with Thomas Römer, The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction," *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9, 2–49.

Pestman, Pieter W. (1981), *A Guide to the Zenon Archive (P.L. Bat. 21)*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill).

Pfeiffer, Henrik (2005), *Jahwes Kommen von Süden: Jdc 5; Hab 3; Dtn 33 und Ps 68 in ihrem literatur- und theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 211; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Pfeiffer, Henrik (2013), "Die Herkunft Jahwes und ihre Zeugen," *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift* 30, 11–43.

Piejko, Francis (1991), "Antiochus III and Ptolemy Son of Thraseas: The Inscription of Hefzibah Reconsidered," *Antiquité Classique* 60, 245–59.

Pietsch, Michael (2013), *Die Kultreform Josias: Studien zur Religionsgeschichte Israels in der späten Königszeit* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 86; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Von Pilgrim, Cornelius (1998), "Textzeugnis und archäologischer Befund: Zur Topographie Elephantines in der 27. Dynastie," in Heike Guksch and Daniel Polz (eds.), *Stationen: Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Ägyptens. Rainer Stadelmann gewidmet* (Mainz: von Zabern), 485–97.

Von Pilgrim, Cornelius (2003), "Tempel des Jahu und 'Straße des Königs'—ein Konflikt in der späten Perserzeit auf Elephantine," in Sibylle Meyer (ed.), *Egypt—Temple of the Whole World: Studies in Honour of Jan Assmann* (Leiden: Brill), 303–17.

Von Pilgrim, Cornelius (2013), "Die 'Festung' von Elephantine in der Spätzeit—Anmerkungen zum archäologischen Befund," in Alejandro F. Botta (ed.), *In the Shadow of Bezalel: Aramaic, Biblical, and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Bezalel Porten* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 60; Leiden: Brill), 203–8.

Pitard, Wayne T. (1987), *Ancient Damascus: A Historical Study of the Syrian City-State from Earliest Times until its Fall to the Assyrians in 732 B.C.E.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Pohlmann, Karl-Friedrich (1989), *Die Ferne Gottes—Studien zum Jeremiabuch: Beiträge zu den "Konfessionen" im Jeremiabuch und ein Versuch zur Frage nach den Anfängen der Jeremiatradition* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 179; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Pohlmann, Karl-Friedrich (1996), *Der Prophet Hesekiel (Ezechiel). Kapitel 1–19* (Altes Testament Deutsch 22/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Pohlmann, Karl-Friedrich (2001), *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel (Ezechiel). Kapitel 20–48. Mit einem Beitrag von Thilo Rudnig.* (Altes Testament Deutsch 22/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Pola, Thomas (1995), *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von Pg.* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 70; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Pongratz-Leisten, Beate (2014), *Religion and Ideology in Assyria* (Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 6; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Popović, Mladen (2012), "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis? A Comparative Perspective on Judaean Desert Manuscript Collections," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 43, 551–94.

Porten, Bezalel (1968), *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Porten, Bezalel and Yardeni, Ada (2006), "Social, Economic, and Onomastic Issues in the Aramaic Ostraca of the Fourth Century B.C.E.," in Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 457–88.

Porten, Bezalel and Yardeni, Ada (2007), "The House of Baalrim in the Idumean Ostraca," in Meir Lubetski (ed.), *New Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumean, and Cuneiform* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 8; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press), 99–147.

Porzig, Peter (2009), *Die Lade Jahwes im Alten Testament und in den Texten vom Toten Meer* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 397; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Provan, Iain W. (1988), *Hezekiah and the Book of Kings*: *A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 172; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Pummer, Reinhard (1987), *The Samaritans* (Iconography of Religions XXIII, 5; Leiden: Brill).

Pummer, Reinhard (2002), *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Pummer, Reinhard (2009), *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 129; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

De Pury, Albert, Römer, Thomas, and Macchi, Jean-Daniel, eds. (1996 [2000]), *Israël construit son histoire: L'historiographie deutéronomiste à la lumière des recherches récentes* (Le Monde de la Bible 34; Geneva: Labor et Fides). [English translation: *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000)].

Von Rad, Gerhard (1970 [1972]), *Weisheit in Israel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag). [English translation: *Wisdom in Israel* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1972)].

Radine, Jason (2010), *The Book of Amos in Emergent Judah* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/45; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Rahlfs, Alfred and Fraenkel, Detlef (2004), *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments 1: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. Supplementum I/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Rajak, Tessa (2002a), "Synagogue and Community in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora," in John R. Bartlett (ed.), *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (London/ New York: Routledge), 22–38.

Rajak, Tessa (2002b), *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Leiden: Brill).

Rajak, Tessa (2003), "The Ancient Synagogue," *Studia Philonica Annual* 15, 100–8.

Rajak, Tessa (2008), "Translating the Septuagint for Ptolemy's Library: Myth and History," in Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (eds.), assisted by Martin Meiser, *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 176–93.

Rajak, Tessa (2009), *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Rendtorff, Rolf (1976 [1990]), *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 147; Berlin: De

Gruyter). [English translation: *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990)].

Renz, Johannes (2009*a*), "Die vor- und außerbiblische Texttradition: Ein Beitrag der palästinischen Epigraphik zur Vorgeschichte des Kanons," in Joachim Schaper (ed.), *Die Textualisierung der Religion* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 62; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 53–81.

Renz, Johannes (2009*b*), "'Jahwe ist der Gott der ganzen Erde': Der Beitrag der außerkanonischen althebräischen Texte zur Rekonstruktion der vorexilischen Religions- und Theologiegeschichte Palästinas," in Michael Pietsch and Friedhelm Hartenstein (eds.), *Israel zwischen den Mächten: Festschrift für Stefan Timm zum 65. Geburtstag* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 364; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 289–377.

Ringgren, Helmer (1979), *Die Religionen des Alten Orients* (Grundrisse zum Alten Testament Sonderband; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Römer, Thomas (1990), *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der Deuteronomistischen Tradition* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 99; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Römer, Thomas, ed. (2000), *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 147; Leuven: Peeters).

Römer, Thomas (2005), *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London/New York: T&T Clark).

Römer, Thomas, ed. (2008), *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 215; Leuven: Peeters).

Römer, Thomas (2014), *L'invention de Dieu* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil).

Römer, Thomas and Schmid, Konrad, eds. (2007), *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 203; Leuven: Peeters).

Rösel, Hartmut N. (1999), *Von Josua bis Jojachin: Untersuchungen zu den deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testament* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 75; Leiden: Brill).

Rösel, Martin (2000), "Israels Psalmen in Ägypten? Papyrus Amherst 63 und die Psalmen XX und LXXV," *Vetus Testamentum* 50, 81–99.

Rogerson, John W. and Lieu, Judith M., eds. (2008), *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies* (2nd edn.; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Rohrmoser, Angela (2014), *Götter, Tempel und Kult der Judäo-Aramäer von Elephantine: Archäologische und schriftliche Zeugnisse aus dem perserzeitlichen Ägypten* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 396; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).

Rollston, Christopher A. (2010), *Writing and Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epigraphic Evidence From the Iron Age* (Archaeology and Bible Studies 11; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Rollston, Christopher A. (2011), "The Khirbet Qeiyafa Ostracon: Methodological Musings and Caveats," *Tel Aviv* 38, 67–82.

Rottzoll, Dirk U. (1996), *Studien zur Redaktion und Komposition des Amosbuchs* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 243; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Routledge, Bruce (2004), *Moab in the Iron Age: Hegemony, Polity, Archaeology* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Ruwe, Andreas (1999),*"Heiligkeitsgesetz" und "Priesterschrift": Literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Leviticus 17,2–26,2* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 26; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Samuel, Harald (2014), *Von Priestern zum Patriarchen: Levi und die Leviten im Alten Testament* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 448; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Sanders, Seth L. (2006 [2007]), *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures: New Approaches to Writing and Reading in the Ancient Near East* (Oriental Institute Symposia 2; Chicago: Oriental Institute Press). [Corrected reprint 2007. Online: <http://oi.uchicago.edu/research/pubs/catalog/ois/ois2.html>.]

Sanders, Seth L. (2009), *The Invention of Hebrew* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinos Press).

Sass, Benjamin (2014), "On Epigraphic Hebrew ʾŠR and *ʾŠRH, and on Biblical Ashera*," in Josette Elayi and Jean-Marie Durand (eds.), *Bible et Proche–Orient: Mélanges André Lemaire III* (Transeuphratène 46; Paris: Gabalda), 47–66; 189–90, pl. 4–5.

Sawyer, John F.A. (1983), *Midian, Moab and Edom: The History and Archaeology of Late Bronze and Iron Age Jordan and North-West Arabia* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 24; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Schäfer, Peter (1997), *Judeophobia: Attitudes Toward the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press).

Schäfer, Peter (2003 [2010]), *The History of the Jews in the Greco-Roman World* (2nd English edn.; London/New York: Routledge). [German: *Geschichte der Juden in der Antike. Die Juden Palästinas von Alexander dem Großen bis zur arabischen Eroberung* (2nd German edn.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010)].

Schams, Christine (1998), *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 291; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Schaper, Joachim, ed. (2009), *Die Textualisierung der Religion* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 62; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Schiffman, Lawrence H. (2008), *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 75; Leiden: Brill).

Schiffman, Lawrence H., Tov, Emanuel, VanderKam, James C., and Marquis, Galen, eds. (2000), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum).

Schiffman, Lawrence H. and VanderKam, James C., eds. (2000), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Schipper, Bernd U. (2005), "Die Lehre des Amenemope und Prov 22, 17–24, 22: Eine Neubestimmung des literarischen Verhältnisses," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 117, 53–72, 232–48.

Schipper, Bernd U. (2012), *Hermeneutik der Tora: Studien zur Traditionsgeschichte von Prov 2 und zur Komposition von Prov 1–9* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 432; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Schmid, Hans H. (1966), *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit: Eine Untersuchung zur altorientalischen und israelitischen Weisheitsliteratur* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 101; Berlin: Töpelmann).

Schmid, Konrad (1996), *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches: Untersuchungen zur Redaktions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von Jer 30–33 im Kontext des Buches* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 72; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Schmid, Konrad (1999 [2010]), *Erzväter und Exodus. Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 81; Neukrichen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag). [English translation: *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*, translated by James D. Nogalski (Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010)].

Schmid, Konrad (2007), "The Persian Imperial Authorization as a Historical Problem and as a Biblical Construct: A Plea for Distinctions in the Current Debate," in Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson (eds.), *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 23–38.

Schmid, Konrad (2008 [2012]), *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments. Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft). [English translation: *The Old Testament: A Literary History* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012)].

Schmid, Konrad (2013 [2015]), *Gibt es Theologie im Alten Testament? Zum Theologiebegriff in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft* (Theologische Studien. Neue Folge 7; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich). [English translation: *Is There Theology in the Hebrew Bible?*, translated by Peter Altmann (CSHB 4; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns)].

Schmid, Konrad and Person, Raymond F., Jr., eds. (2012), *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Schmidt, Brian B., ed. (2015), Contextualization Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production (Society of Biblical Literature: Ancient Israel and Its Literature 22; Atlanta: SBL Press).

Schofield, Alison (2009), *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 77; Leiden: Brill).

Schoors, Antoon (1998), *Die Königreiche Israel und Juda im 8. und 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Die assyrische Krise* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 5; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Schröder, Bernd (1996), *Die "väterlichen Gesetze": Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 53; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Schürer, Emil (1973–87), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, A new english version revised and edited by Geza Vermes, et al., vols. 1–3 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Schwiderski, Dirk (2000), *Handbuch des nordwestsemitischen Briefformulars: Ein Beitrag zur Echtheitsfrage der aramäischen Briefe des Esrabuches* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 295; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Schwiderski, Dirk (2013), "Epistolographische Elemente in den neuveröffentlichten aramäischen Ostrakon-briefen aus Elephantine (Sammlung Clermont-Ganneau),"

in Alejandro F. Botta (ed.), *In the Shadow of Bezalel: Aramaic, Biblical, and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Bezalel Porten* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 60; Leiden: Brill), 159–82.

Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger (1990), *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33): Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 188; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger (1996), "*Nicht im Menschen gründet das Glück*" (Koh 2,24): Kohelet im Spannungsfeld jüdischer Weisheit und hellenistischer Philosophie* (2nd edn.; Herders Biblische Studien 2; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder).

Seeligmann, Isac L. (2004), *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Segal, Michael (2005), "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in Mathias Henze (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans), 10–28.

Segal, Michael (2007), *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 117; Leiden: Brill).

Van Seters, John (1983), *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press) [repr. 1997: Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns].

Van Seters, John (1992), *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press).

Van Seters, John (1994), *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press).

Van Seters, John (2006), *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Van Seters, John (2013), *The Yahwist: A Historian of Israelite Origins* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Shectman, Sarah and Baden, Joel S., eds. (2009), *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich).

Silverman, Michael H. (1969), "Aramean Name-Types in the Elephantine Documents," *JAOS* 89/4, 691–709.

Silverman, Michael H. (1970), "Hebrew Name-Types in the Elephantine Documents," *Orientalia* 39, 465–91.

Silverman, Michael H. (1985), *Religious Values in the Jewish Proper Names at Elephantine* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 217; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Ska, Jean Louis (2015), "Questions of the 'History of Israel' in Recent Research," in Magne Sæbø in cooperation with Peter Machinist and Jean Louis Ska, SJ (eds.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation*, III.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 391–432.

Skehan, Patrick W. and Di Lella, Alexander A., ed. (1987), *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (Anchor Bible 39; New York: Doubleday).

Smend, Rudolf (1978), *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Theologische Wissenschaft 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Smend, Rudolf (1995 [2013]), "Mose als geschichtliche Gestalt," *Historische Zeitschrift* 260, 1–19 [= Smend, Rudolf, *Bibel, Theologie, Universität* (Kleine Vandenheock

Reihe 1583; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 5–20 = Smend, Rudolf, *Zwischen Mose und Karl Barth: Akademische Vorträge* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 1–25]. [English translation: "Moses as a Historical Figure," in Rudolf Smend, *"The Unconquered Land" and Other Old Testament Essays: Selected Studies*, edited by E. Ball and M. Barker (Farnham, Surrey/Burlington, VT: Ashgate 2013), 13–28].

Smith, Mark S. (2010), *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Snell, Daniel C. (2011), *Religions of the Ancient Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Soggin, J. Alberto (1984), *A History of Israel: From the Beginnings to the Bar Kochba Revolt, AD 135* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox [London: SCM, 1989]).

Spaeth, Barbette Stanley (2013), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Mediterranean Religions* (Cambridge Companions to Religion; New York: Cambridge University Press).

Spieckermann, Hermann (1982), *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 129; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Spieckermann, Hermann (1989), *Heilsgegenwart: Eine Theologie der Psalmen* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 148; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Stackert, Jeffrey (2007), *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Stackert, Jeffrey (2014), *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Land, and Israelite Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Stavrakopoulou, Francesca and Barton, John, eds. (2010), *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah* (London/New York: T&T Clark).

Steck, Odil H. (1988), "Der Kanon des hebräischen Alten Testaments: Historische Materialien für eine ökumenische Perspektive," in Jan Rohls and Gunther Wenz (eds.), *Vernunft des Glaubens: Wissenschaftliche Theologie und kirchliche Lehre. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Wolfhart Pannenberg* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 231–52.

Steck, Odil H. (1991a), *Der Abschluß der Prophetie im Alten Testament: Ein Versuch zur Frage der Vorgeschichte des Kanons* (Biblisch-Theologische Studien 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Steck, Odil H. (1991b), *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 203; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Steck, Odil H. (1992), *Gottesknecht und Zion. Gesammelte Aufsätze zu Deuterojesaja* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Steck, Odil H. (1996 [2000]), *Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis: Wege der Nachfrage und Fährten zur Antwort* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck). [English translation: *The Prophetic Books and Their Theological Witness*, translated by James D. Nogalski (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press 2000)].

Stegemann, Hartmut (1971), *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde. Inaugural-Dissertation vorgelegt von Dr. Phil. Hartmut Stegemann* (Bonn: Selbstverlag).

Stegemann, Hartmut (1993; 10th edn. 2007 [1998]), *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, mit einem Nachwort von Gert Jeremias (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder). [English translation: *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1998)].

Steins, Georg (1995), *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlußphänomen* (Bonner Biblische Beiträge 93; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum).

Stemberger, Günter (1991), *Pharisäer, Sadduzäer, Essener* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 144; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk).

Stern, Ephraim (1982), *Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period 538–332 B.C.* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society; Warminster: Aris & Philips).

Steudel, Annette (1994), *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a.b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 13; Leiden: Brill).

Steudel, Annette (2006), "4Q448—The Lost Beginning of MMT?," in Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar (eds.), *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 61; Leiden: Brill), 247–63.

Steudel, Annette (2012), "The Damascus Document (D) as a Rewriting of the Community Rule (S)," *Revue de Qumran* 25/100, 605–20.

Stipp, Hermann-Josef, ed. (2011), *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (Österreichische Bibelstudien 39; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang).

Stökl, Jonathan (2012), *Prophecy in the Ancient Near East: A Philological and Sociological Comparison* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 56; Leiden: Brill).

Stökl, Jonathan and Waerzeggers, Caroline, eds. (2015), *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context* (BZAW 478; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Stone, Michael E., ed. (1984), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum 2/2; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press).

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (2007), "The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold (eds.), *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004)* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 212; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 75–94.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (2010), "The Legacy of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Esther G. Chazon, Betsy Halpern-Amaru, Ruth A. Clements (eds.), *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January 2005* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 88; Leiden: Brill), 23–49.

Sweeney, Marvin A. (2005), *The Prophetic Literature* (Interpreting Biblical Text; Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press).

Tappy, Ron E. and McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. (2008), *Literate Culture and Tenth-Century Canaan: The Tel Zayit Abecedary in Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Tcherikover, Victor (1958), "The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas," *Harvard Theological Review* 51, 59–85.

Tcherikover, Victor (1961), *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (2nd edn.; Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society of America).

Teeter, David A. (2014), *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Tertel, Hans J. (1994), *Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 221; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Thomas, Benjamin D. (2014), *Hezekiah and the Compositional History of the Books of Kings* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Tigay, Jeffrey H. (1975), "An Empirical Basis for the Documentary Hypothesis," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, 329–42.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. (1982; repr. 2002), *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Tigay, Jeffrey H., ed. (1985), *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Tilly, Michael and Zwickel, Wolfgang (2011), *Religionsgeschichte Israels: Von der Vorzeit bis zu den Anfängen des Christentums* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Timm, Stefan (1982), *Die Dynastie Omri: Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Israels im 9. Jahrhundert vor Christus* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 124; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Timm, Stefan (1989), *Moab zwischen den Mächten: Studien zu historischen Denkmälern und Texten* (Ägypten und Altes Testament 17; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Van der Toorn, Karel (1986), "Herem-Bethel and Elephantine Oath Procedure," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98, 282–5.

Van der Toorn, Karel (1992), "Anat-Yahu, Some Other Deities, and the Jews of Elephantine," *Numen* 39, 80–101.

Van der Toorn, Karel (1996), *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life* (Leiden: Brill).

Van der Toorn, Karel (2007), *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press).

Tov, Emanuel (2002), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 39; Oxford: Clarendon).

Tov, Emanuel (2004), *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54; Leiden: Brill).

Tov, Emanuel (2008), *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Tov, Emanuel (2009), "The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture. Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch," in Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold, and József Zsengellér (eds.), *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 11–28.

Tov, Emanuel (2010a), *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill).

Tov, Emanuel (2010*b*), "From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch," in Mladen Popović (ed.), *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 141; Leiden: Brill), 73–91.

Tov, Emanuel (2012), *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd edn.; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press).

De Troyer, Kristin and Lange, Armin, eds. (2009), *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 52; Leuven: Peeters).

Tyson, Craig W. (2014), *The Ammonites: Elites, Empires, and Sociopolitical Change (1000–500 BCE)* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 585; London/New York: T&T Clark).

Ulrich, Eugene C. (1999), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Vanderhooft, David S. (2011), "ʾel-mĕdînâ ûmĕdînâ kiktābāh: Scribes and Scripts in Yehud and in Achaemenid Transeuphratene," in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 529–44.

VanderKam, James C. (1991), "Jewish High Priests of the Persian Period: Is the List Complete?," in Gary A. Anderson and Saul M. Olyan (eds.), *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 125; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), 67–91.

VanderKam, James C. (2010), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (2nd edn.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

VanderKam, James C. (2011), "The Pre-History of the Qumran Community with a Reassessment of CD 1:1–11," in Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture, Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 93; Leiden: Brill), 59–78.

VanderKam, James C. (2012), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).

Van der Veen, Peter, Theis, Christoffer, and Görg, Manfred (2010), "Israel in Canaan (Long) Before Pharao Merenptah? A Fresh Look at Berlin Statue Pedestal Relief 21 687," *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 2, 15–25.

Veijola, Timo (1975), *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia).

Veijola, Timo (1977), *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia).

Veijola, Timo (2000), "Die Deuteronomisten als Vorgänger der Schriftgelehrten: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung des Judentums," in Timo Veijola, *Moses Erben: Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 149; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer), 192–240.

Vermès, Géza (1973), *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (2nd edn.; Studia post-biblica 4; Leiden: Brill).

Vielhauer, Roman (2007), *Das Werden des Buches Hosea: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 349; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Waerzeggers, Caroline (2014), "Locating Contact in the Babylonian Exile: Some Reflections on Tracing Judean–Babylonian Encounters in Cuneiform Texts," in Uri Gabbay and Shai Secunda (eds.), *Encounters by the Rivers of Babylon: Scholarly Conversations Between Jews, Iranians and Babylonians* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 160; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 131–46.

Watts, James W., ed. (2001), *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch* (Society of Biblical Literature. Symposium Series 17; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Weigl, Michael (2010), *Die aramäischen Achikar-Sprüche aus Elephantine und die alttestamentliche Weisheitsliteratur* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 399; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Weingart, Kristin (2014), *Stämmevolk—Staatsvolk—Gottesvolk? Studien zur Verwendung des Israel-Namens im Alten Testament* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Weippert, Helga (1972), "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher," *Biblica* 53, 301–39.

Weippert, Helga (1988), *Palästina in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Handbuch des Orients Vorderasien II/1; München: Beck).

Weippert, Manfred (1967), *Die Landnahme der israelitischen Stämme in der neueren wissenschaftlichen Diskussion* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 92; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Weippert, Manfred (1971), *Edom: Studien und Materialien zur Geschichte der Edomiter auf Grund schriftlicher und archäologischer Quellen*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Selbstverlag).

Weippert, Manfred (1993), "Geschichte Israels am Scheideweg," *Theologische Rundschau* 58, 71–103.

Weippert, Manfred (1997), *Jahwe und die anderen Götter: Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des antiken Israel in ihrem syrisch-palästinischen Kontext* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 18; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Weippert, Manfred (2014), *Götterwort in Menschenmund: Studien zur Prophetie in Assyrien, Israel und Juda* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 252; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Von Weissenberg, Hanne (2009), *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 82; Leiden: Brill).

Wellhausen, Julius (1874), *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer: Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte* (Greifswald: Bamberg [repr. 1967, 3rd edn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht]).

Wellhausen, Julius (1880), "Geschichte Israels," in Rudolf Smend (ed.), *Julius Wellhausen: Grundrisse zum Alten Testament* (Theologische Bücherei 27; München: Kaiser, 1965), 13–64.

Wellhausen, Julius (1883), see Wellhausen (1905*b*).

Wellhausen, Julius (1899), *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (2nd edn.; Berlin: Reimer [repr. 1963; 4th edn. Berlin: De Gruyter]).

Wellhausen, Julius (1905*a*), "Israelitisch-jüdische Religion," in Rudolf Smend (ed.), *Julius Wellhausen: Grundrisse zum Alten Testament* (Theologische Bücherei 27; München: Kaiser, 1965), 65–109.

Wellhausen, Julius (1905*b*), *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (6th edn.; Berlin: Reimer [repr. 2001, Berlin: De Gruyter]). [English translation of 2nd German edn. (1885 [repr. 1994]): *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, translated from 2nd edn. 1883, with a reprint of the article *Israel* from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, preface by W. Robertson Smith, foreword by Douglas A. Knight (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press)].

Wellhausen, Julius (1911), *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (2nd edn.; Berlin: Reimer [repr. 1987, together with the commentaries on the Gospels, as *Evangelienkommentare*, edited by M. Hengel, Berlin: De Gruyter]).

Wellhausen, Julius (1914), *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (7th edn.; Berlin: Reimer [repr. 2004; 10th edn. Berlin: De Gruyter]).

De Wette, Wilhelm M.L. (1806–7), *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 2 vols. (Halle: Schimmelpfennig und Compagnie).

De Wette, Wilhelm M.L. (1813–16), *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik: In ihrer historischen Entwicklung dargestellt*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung).

Whisenant, Jessica N. (2008), *Writing, Literacy, and Textual Transmission: The Production of Literary Documents in Iron Age Judah and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible.* (PhD Thesis, University of Michigan. Retrieved from Deep Blue Dissertations and Theses. Cited 12 January 2015. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/58435>).

Wilke, Alexa F. (2006), *Kronerben der Weisheit: Gott, König und Frommer in der didaktischen Literatur Ägyptens und Israels* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/20; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Willi, Thomas (1972), *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Willi, Thomas (1995), *Juda—Jehud—Israel: Studien zum Selbstverständnis des Judentums in persischer Zeit* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 12; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Williamson, Hugh G.M. (1977; repr. 2007), *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Williamson, Hugh G.M. (1994), *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Williamson, Hugh G.M. (2004), *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 38; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Williamson, Hugh G.M., ed. (2007), *Understanding the History of Ancient Israel* (Proceedings of the British Academy 143; Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Williamson, Hugh G.M. (2013), "Weal and Woe Isaiah: Prophet of Weal or Woe?," in Robert P. Gordon and Hans M. Barstad (eds.), *"Thus Speaks Ishtar of Arbela": Prophecy in Israel, Assyria, and Egypt in the Neo-Assyrian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 273–300.

Wilson, Gerald H. (1985), *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press).

Wilson, Kevin A. (2005), *The Campaign of Pharao Shoshenq I into Palestine* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/9; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Witte, Markus (2010), "Von der Analyse zur Synthese—Historisch-kritische Anmerkungen zu Hermann Gunkels Konzept einer israelitischen Literaturgeschichte," in Ute E. Eisen and Erhard S. Gerstenberger (eds.), *Hermann Gunkel revisited: Literatur- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Exegese in unserer Zeit 20; Berlin/Münster: Lit-Verlag), 21–51.

Witte, Markus, Schmid, Konrad, Prechel, Doris, and Gertz, Jan C., assisted by Johannes F. Diehl, eds. (2006), *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 365; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Wöhrle, Jakob (2006), *Die frühen Sammlungen des Zwölfprophetenbuches: Entstehung und Komposition* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 360; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Wöhrle, Jakob (2008), *Der Abschluss des Zwölfprophetenbuches: Buchübergreifende Redaktionsprozesse in den späten Sammlungen* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 389; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Wright, Jacob L. (2004), *Rebuilding Identity: The Nehemiah-Memoir and its Earliest Readers* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 348; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Wunsch, Cornelia (2013), "Glimpses on the Lives of Deportees in Rural Babylonia," in Angelika Berlejung and Michael P. Streck (eds.), *Arameans, Chaldeans, and Arabs in Babylonia and Palestine in the First Millenium B.C.* (Leipziger Altorientalistische Studien 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 247–60.

Würthwein, Ernst (1984), *Die Bücher der Könige: 1. Kön 17–2. Kön. 25* (Altes Testament Deutsch 11.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Xeravits, Géza, Porzig, Peter (2015), *Einführung in die Qumranliteratur: Die Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (Berlin: De Gruyter).

Yee, Gale A. (1987), *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea: A Redaction Critical Investigation* (Society of Biblical Literature. Dissertation Series 102; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).

Younger, K. Lawson (1998), "The Deportations of the Israelites," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117, 201–27.

Zadok, Ran (2014), Judeans in Babylonia—Updating the Dossier, in Uri Gabbay and Shai Secunda (eds.), *Encounters by the Rivers of Babylon: Scholarly Conversations Between Jews, Iranians and Babylonians* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 160; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 109–30.

Zahn, Molly M. (2011*a*), "Building Textual Bridges: Towards an Understanding of 4Q158 (4QReworked Pentateuch)," in George J. Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven (eds.), *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revisioning Texts from Cave Four* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 96; Leiden: Brill), 13–32.

Zahn, Molly M. (2011*b*). *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 95; Brill: Leiden).

Zahn, Molly M. (2011*c*), "Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology," in Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila (eds.), *Changes in Scripture: rewriting and interpreting authoritative traditions in the Second Temple period* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 419; Berlin: De Gruyter), 93–119.

Zahn, Molly M. (2012), "Genre and Rewritten Bible," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131, 271–88.

Zenger, Erich and Frevel, Christian, eds. (2012), *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (8th edn.; Studienbücher Theologie 1/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Zsengellér, Jószef and Gáspár, Károli, eds. (2014), *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Géza Vermès* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 166; Leiden: Brill).

Zwickel, Wolfgang (2002), *Einführung in die biblische Landes- und Altertumskunde* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Index of Sources