

Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible:  
State of the Field, Desiderata, and Research Perspectives  
in a Necessary Debate on the Formative Period of Judaism(s)<sup>1</sup>

BENEDIKT HENSEL

The following essay reviews and proposes new avenues in the historical analysis of early Judaism and its impact on identity-building processes in the southern Levant. Its crucial interest lies in demonstrating that the ideas responsible for the emergence of Judaism were developed in a context of Yahwistic diversity. The underlying perspective of this essay concerns the observation that a broad variety of different Yahwistic groups existed inside and outside Judah during the sixth to first century BCE. As recent scholarship has increasingly recognized, this period had a major impact on the theological and literary histories of early Judaism. This epoch also witnessed the shaping of other central identity markers, such as the institution of the central temple and the Torah. This leads to the main thesis of the essay: Contrary to the current majority view, the formation process of early Judaism takes place less as an inner-Judean development than as the complex and multilayered process of negotiation between diverse groups.

The essay provides a critical discussion of the current paradigm of the emergence of Early Judaism (section 1), and a detailed, critical review of the recent critical objections against this theory from the perspective of exilic and postexilic diversity (section 2). Additionally, the essay presents the author's cornerstones that result from this very debate and provides a perspective for future research in this matter that attempts a comprehensive description of the a) religious, b) sociological, and c) literary history of the phenomenon of diversification within ancient Yahwism (sections 3–5). The essay will conclude with an overview of the studies in this volume (section 6). This program results in the following detailed structure for the essay:

---

<sup>1</sup> This essay is the result of a broader project entitled "The History of the Pentateuch: Combining Literary and Archaeological Approaches," funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Sinergia project CRSII1 160785). The project – a joint venture of the universities of Zurich, Lausanne, and Tel Aviv – is directed by Konrad Schmid (Zurich), Christophe Nihan and Thomas Römer (Lausanne), and Israel Finkelstein and Oded Lipschits (Tel Aviv).

1. Judean Perspectives on Israel's History: State of the Field
2. Towards a Paradigm Shift: Four Critical Objections from Recent Religious-Historical, Historical, and Exegetical Research
  - 2.1 Plurality Rather Than a Monoculture
  - 2.2 Contact and Interaction Rather Than Exclusivity
  - 2.3 Judean Perspectives in the Hebrew Bible: The Concepts of Exilic Discontinuity, Golah-Judean Continuity, and Exclusivity
  - 2.4 Samaritan Involvement Prior to the Exilic and Persian Period: Bringing "the First Exile" (722 BCE) into Discussion
3. "Binnen-israelitische Ausdifferenzierungsprozesse": A Matrix for Future Research
  - 3.1 The Nexus of Yahwistic Diversity and Formational Processes of Early Judaism
  - 3.2 A Question of Terminology: Judaism(s) – Yahwism(s) – "Israel"
4. The Hebrew Bible as a Reflection of Exilic and Postexilic Yahwistic Diversity
  - 4.1 Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and Deuteronomistic History: Traces of Judean-Samaritan Relations
  - 4.2 The Pentateuch as an Inclusive Foundational Document of Israel for Different Yahwistic Groups: A Modification of the Theory of the Common Pentateuch/Torah
  - 4.3 Different Ideas of "Israel" within the Hebrew Bible
  - 4.4 Textual Traditions and Yahwistic Variety
5. Conclusion and Perspectives for Future Research
6. Overview of This Volume

### 1. Judean Perspectives on Israel's History: State of the Field

The period spent by Judah in the Babylonian Exile – the period *after* Babylon's conquest of the small state of Judah and its capital city of Jerusalem until the Persian takeover of Babylon in 550 BCE and the establishment of the basic character of the Persian Empire – has served as a decisive turning point in the history of Judaism and the establishment of the scriptures of the Hebrew Bible at least since the commendable works by the German biblical and ancient Near Eastern scholar Julius Wellhausen in his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*.<sup>2</sup> According to Wellhausen's seminal insights, the majority of the biblical tradition emerges *not* from the preexilic monarchic period, but rather from the scribal work of

---

<sup>2</sup> Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*.

later generations of Judean, and later Jewish, groups. These groups reflect the demise of Jerusalem in 586 BCE and the end of Judah's political-territorial history in their transmission, literary supplementation, and re-conceptualizations.

As is widely recognized in modern scholarship, the central event of Judah's demise and exile led to innovative movement a) in the theological and ideological reflections of Israel's faith, b) in its literary traditions, and c) even in its socio-cultural search for a communal identity. These movements merge in the formational processes within the rise of Judaism in the postexilic period (beginning in the final third of the sixth cent. BCE). This epoch attests to the decisive *theological innovations* and *identity-forming directions*. These include, among others, the development of monotheism as the dominant and later normative guiding principle of Judaism and the functionally connected emergence of the notion of an exclusive cult centralization in Jerusalem (*one* location for Israel's *one* God). In addition are the formation of specific *identity markers* that become significant for later developments in Judaism, such as the use of Torah and the establishment of Judaism as a *religion of the book*, as well as circumcision, dietary prescriptions, and sanctification of the Sabbath. Especially the shaping of the identity of early Judaism in the Second Temple period has received increasing attention in recent years, as, e.g., the monograph by Weingart (2014),<sup>3</sup> Ben Zvi and Edelman's *Imagining the Other: Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period* (2015), Grohmann's *Identität und Schrift: Fortschreibungsprozesse als Mittel religiöser Identitätsbildung* (2017), and the volume *Denkt nicht mehr an das Frühere! Begründungsressourcen in Esra/Nehemia und Jes 40–66 im Vergleich* (Häusl, 2018) illustrate.

As a result, especially the Persian period (ca. sixth to fourth cent. BCE) has been also characterized as the *formative phase* of early Judaism and its normative scriptures. The basic idea is that these innovations already existed in full upon the return of the displaced Judeans from exile in the second half of the sixth century or (as the most recent scholarship tends to conclude) that they reached their final form in the Persian period. In this way, one also expresses that the biblical texts dated in the exilic and postexilic periods appear exclusively to represent the interests of the *Judeans* returning from exile. The diversity of different Israelite groups in the description of Israel's monarchic period (until 586 BCE) appears to give way to something of a "Judean monoculture."

One envisions that those elites responsible for the development of innovations in the Judean exile then carried them out beginning in 539 BCE in a comprehensive, rigorous, and prompt manner (sixth to early fifth cent. BCE) in Judah (and with some delay in Samaria as well). One might think here especially of cult centralization in contrast to the implied uncontrolled proliferation

---

<sup>3</sup> Weingart, *Stämmevolk*.

by those remaining in the land, as well as the introduction of the Torah edited in the exile as a normative religious element. Scholars such as the Israeli archaeologist Ephraim Stern have called this process a “religious revolution,” a view adopted by many others.<sup>4</sup> Stern argues that Jerusalem functioned as the only center during the Persian period of what would later become Judean orthodoxy. This view follows from the biblical, or more precisely, the *Judean* scribal reflection of the history of Israel presented, for example, in the so-called Deuteronomistic History (that is, the biblical books from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings), the book of Ezra-Nehemiah, or the book of Chronicles.

Jan Assmann has subsequently popularized this interpretation of the history of the emergence of Judaism through the matrix of his culture-historical model.<sup>5</sup> He draws on fundamental elements concerning the *formation of memory* and *identity construction* in ancient cultures as comparative examples for the *genesis of Judaism* in this very period for support. His approach has opened the discussion of Judaism’s origins to broad and interdisciplinary culture-historical debates.

## 2. Towards a Paradigm Shift: Four Critical Objections from Recent Religious-Historical, Historical, and Exegetical Research

Present scholarship only views the various *Judean groups of Mesopotamian provenance* – that is, those parts of the population that underwent exile to Mesopotamia after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BCE – as the guiding social, religious, and ideological entities responsible for the formative and constitutive elements of the postexilic development and formational processes of Judaism. While fully agreeing with regard to the impact of the early postexilic period on the formative processes of early Judaism and the general hermeneutical key provided by Wellhausen in his historical distinction between historical and biblical Israel for study of the Hebrew Bible, the primary focus on the Judean exiles proves quite reductionist. The following discussion will identify four major objections from recent historical and biblical scholarship that erode the classical paradigm and point to a necessary reevaluation of the emergence of early Judaism and the Hebrew Bible in the exilic and postexilic period. If accorded their full weight, attention to these circumstances could result in a completely different understanding of the emergence of Judaism.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Stern, “Religious Revolution,” 199–205; idem, “Many Gods,” 395–403.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Assmann, *Exodus*.

## 2.1 Plurality Rather Than a Monoculture

Likely the most important fundamental scholarly realization in recent years is the following: A growing body of archaeological data suggests that there was not one monolithic Judean community in postexilic Judah/Yehud. Archaeological evidence demonstrates the existence of a variety of “Jewish” communities inside and outside of Judah itself. Temples or cultic installations dedicated to YHWH provide good indications for the presence of such communities of Yahwistic belief (meaning the veneration of mainly YHWH, the god of Israel). The *Persian period* attests to YHWH temples not only in Jerusalem, but also on Mount Gerizim in the province of Samaria – the former kingdom of Israel (fifth to second cent. BCE). Another is attested on the Egyptian island of Elephantine (around 407 BCE according to literary and archaeological evidence;<sup>6</sup> TAD A4.7/4.8/4.9). There are also indications of a sanctuary in Idumea to the south of Judah (maybe in Maqqedah or in Maresha; mentioned on an ostrakon in fourth cent. BCE, ISAP 1283/AL 283).<sup>7</sup> The *Hellenistic period* provides evidence for the additional temples of Judean groups: one in Tell Yahûdiye (Leontopolis, Egypt; founded 163 BCE; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.388; 13.62–73; 20.236; *B. J.* 1.33; 7.426–436; and ceased service 72 CE: Josephus, *B. J.* 7.426–436). The second – though debate continues<sup>8</sup> – concerns a temple or some sort of cult location in Transjordan, namely, in the Ammanitis in *’Araq el-Emir* (29 km east of Jericho). Support comes from two inscriptions found close to it – possibly at the home of the Judean family of the Tobiads of the third or second century BCE. Research along the line of this “Yahwistic diversity” was done especially by Grabbe (2010),<sup>9</sup> Zsengellér (2011),<sup>10</sup> Frevel (2016),<sup>11</sup> Hensel (2016),<sup>12</sup> and Granerød (2016),<sup>13</sup> who offered a broad (yet preliminary) view of the collective evidence known to us today together with a religious-historical evaluation of this phenomenon.

<sup>6</sup> On the Elephantine temple see Pilgrim, “Jahwe-Tempel,” 142–145 and Rosenberg, “Jewish Temple at Elephantine,” 4–13. On religion and society of the Judeo-Aramaean community at Elephantine see Granerød, *Dimensions*; and Rohrmoser, *Judäo-Aramäer von Elephantine*.

<sup>7</sup> *Editio princeps*: Lemaire, “Nouvelles Inscriptions araméennes,” text 283, table XLVIII, 149–156. The most recent edition (2016) of this ostrakon is in Yardeni, *Jesselsohn Collection*, 114–115. In 2015 Lemaire presented his most recent reading of the ostrakon: Lemaire, “Levantine Epigraphy,” 118–119 (with fig. 3.25) – applying several changes in reaction to critical remarks on Lemaire’s readings and reconstructions of the text by Porten and Yardeni, see, e.g. Porten/Yardeni, “Unprovenienced Idumean Ostraca,” 87 fig. 8, with page 77; Porten/Yardeni, “House of Baalrim,” 142 fig. 21, with page 112–113; Porten/Yardeni, *Textbook*, liii fig. 40, and page xxxi.

<sup>8</sup> See for the discussion Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 213–214. A critical voice in this debate about identifying the remains is Frevel, *Geschichte Israels*, 343.

<sup>9</sup> Grabbe, “Many Nations Will Be Joined,” 175–187.

<sup>10</sup> Zsengellér, “Egytemplomáság,” 130–187.

<sup>11</sup> Frevel, *Geschichte Israels*, 323–326.

<sup>12</sup> Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 210–214.

<sup>13</sup> Granerød, *Dimensions*.

Meanwhile, documents (mainly private certificates from late sixth / early fifth cent. BCE) published by Pearce and Wunsch prove the existence of larger Yahwistic communities in the otherwise unknown *al-Yahudu* (“town of Judah”) in Mesopotamia.<sup>14</sup> No Yahweh temple or shrine is attested in Mesopotamia, though Knauf refers very cautiously to a cuneiform archive from Iraq that may mention such a Judean temple.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, there is good reason to assume that the Judean communities had one or even several sanctuaries.<sup>16</sup>

Additionally, Yahwism *within* the provincial borders of Judah was by no means singularly dominated by the version found in Jerusalem. Evidence that was brought to scholarly attention through, e.g., the treatment of the respective material by Knowles (2006),<sup>17</sup> Pummer (2007),<sup>18</sup> Valkama (2010),<sup>19</sup> Edelman (2010),<sup>20</sup> Becking (2011),<sup>21</sup> Lynch (2014),<sup>22</sup> Frevel/Pyschny (2014),<sup>23</sup> and Frevel (2016)<sup>24</sup> point to numerous (possible) sanctuaries in the area of Judah – though most of them remain disputed. Especially the historical case of “Bethel” and its possible influence in the exilic and Persian period is heavily debated.<sup>25</sup> As suggestive as the explanatory models of scholarship might be, they rest almost exclusively on specific textual interpretations, and historical probabilities especially for the Judean commissioning of Bethel in the Babylonian era lack archaeological support. The path through the extensive archaeological evidence from Judah requires further exploration in order to grasp the complex details of the religious-sociological relationships in the Persian province of Judah. One outstanding study along this line is Frevel and Pyschny’s pioneering volume

---

<sup>14</sup> Pearce/Wunsch, *Documents*; see also Knauf/Guillaume, *History*, 153–156. For a rich comparison of the *al-Yahudu* evidence with the biblical sources see Rom-Shiloni, “Untold Stories,” 124–134.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Knauf, “Glorious Days,” 273, with note 84.

<sup>16</sup> If we are right in assuming that there is strong literary activity amongst the exiles, then the existence of a temple would be a plausible pre-condition for this. For further considerations see Knauf/Guillaume, *History*, 155.

<sup>17</sup> Knowles, *Centrality Practised*, 44–48.

<sup>18</sup> Pummer, “Pentateuch,” 250–251.

<sup>19</sup> Valkama, “Archaeological Remains,” 39–59.

<sup>20</sup> Edelman, “Cultic Sites,” 82–103.

<sup>21</sup> Becking, “Identity,” 71.

<sup>22</sup> Lynch, *Monotheism*, 60–61.

<sup>23</sup> Frevel/Pyschny, “Introduction,” 1–22.

<sup>24</sup> Frevel, *Geschichte Israels*, 325–326.

<sup>25</sup> That Bethel was intact after 722 is proposed by Knauf, “Bethel,” 291–349; idem, “Glorious Days,” 273. Referencing Knauf’s proposal and with literary-critical consequences for the Bethel episodes of the Jacob cycle see Becker, “Jakob,” 159–185; see also Davies, “Monotheism,” 31–33. On the missing archaeological evidence for the sixth to fourth century BCE, see Finkelstein/Singer-Avitz, “Reevaluating Bethel,” 33–48. But see now Lipschits, “Bethel Revisited,” 233–245, with a presentation of yet unpublished findings at E.P. 915 that may indicate activity in Bethel after 722 BCE. I interpret Bethel as a “Samaritan” site for the time after 722 BCE and until the building of Mount Gerizim as the new Samaritan main sanctuary, see Hensel, “Cult Centralization,” 254–257.

A “Religious Revolution” in Yehûd? *The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case*, published in 2014.<sup>26</sup> The essays gathered in this volume can prove the local distinctions between YHWH cults in the Persian province Yehud and its neighboring regions by means of very specific and detailed historical case studies of Judah’s material culture. Frevel/Pyschny are to be merited for describing the phenomenon of *regional pluriformity of Yahwism* with a regionally concentrated and therefore detailed scope on the historical and cultural development of regional cults and their complex interactions.

The general conclusion that arises from these studies is that after the demise of Judah and the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, the YHWH cult was carried on at various sanctuaries on an interim basis. Local Yahwistic cults are assumed in Lachish, Mizpah, or Bethel as compensating for the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem and over time taking on independent shapes that then confronted the community returning from exile.<sup>27</sup>

The Yahwistic group in the province and region of Samaria with its cultic center at Mount Gerizim is certainly the most prominent group among the non-Judean groups. These Samaritan Yahwists – later known as “Samaritans” – have returned to a place of central interest in Hebrew Bible research only in recent years. Significant work on the nature of this community includes the recent monographs on the Samaritans by Kartveit (2009),<sup>28</sup> Dušek (2012),<sup>29</sup> Knoppers (2013),<sup>30</sup> Pummer (2016),<sup>31</sup> Heckl (2016),<sup>32</sup> Hensel (2016),<sup>33</sup> and Nocquet (2017).<sup>34</sup> A long-desired critical edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch is currently in process under the auspices of Schorch (2018).<sup>35</sup>

New evidence for Samaritan communities outside of Samaria comes from the Greek inscription on a sundial that dates to the fourth to second century BCE and was found on the site of the Samaritan sanctuary of Mount Gerizim. Hensel recently published and discussed the text of the inscription.<sup>36</sup> This inscription could be a “little sensation,” as it is the first attestation of Samaritans in Egypt

---

<sup>26</sup> Frevel/Pyschny, *A “Religious Revolution” in Yehûd?*

<sup>27</sup> Valkama, “Archaeological Remains,” 39–59.

<sup>28</sup> Kartveit, *Origin*.

<sup>29</sup> Dušek, *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions*. Dušek concentrates primarily on the Gerizim inscriptions. In two of the study’s three chapters, however, he seeks to identify the YHWH-worshippers of Mount Gerizim (*ibid.*, 65–118; Chapter 2), and to outline a history of the southern Levant between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV (*ibid.*, 119–151; Chapter 3).

<sup>30</sup> Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans*.

<sup>31</sup> Pummer, *Profile*.

<sup>32</sup> Heckl, *Neuanfang und Kontinuität*.

<sup>33</sup> Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*.

<sup>34</sup> Nocquet, *Samarie*.

<sup>35</sup> The first volume of this edition (“Leviticus”) was published in 2018: Schorch, *Samaritan Pentateuch*.

<sup>36</sup> Hensel, “Cult Centralization,” 236–239.

besides the (often polemical) mentions of Samaritans by Josephus: the donator of the sundial, a Samari(t)an, clearly designates himself as “Ptolemaios ... of Egypt” (Πτολεμαῖ[ος] (...) τῶν ἀπ’ Α[ιγ]ύπτου ἁγίων δ[...], lines 2–3). The line is broken after the ἁγίων in line 3. The substantive ἅγιον is also well known as the translation of the Hebrew מִקְדָּשׁ or שְׁמֵרָה in the LXX. So this inscription could refer to a Samaritan sanctuary in Egypt in the Hellenistic Period, which would syntactically make the most sense of line 3, translating: “(Ptolemaios) from the sanctuary in Egypt.”<sup>37</sup> The clear plural of ἅγιον does not present a problem because the rendering of a sanctuary is well known from other Greek (pagan and Jewish-Christian) literature<sup>38</sup> and the translation of the Hebrew equivalents (in singular!) in the LXX (e. g., Exod 36:1; Lev 19:30 LXX; cf. Jdt 4:12; 1 Macc 3:43; Heb 8:2, 9).

In short, one can conclude that the Judean community consisting of exilic returnees with its supposed main center Jerusalem was *not the only Yahwistic community* in the postexilic period.

## 2.2 Contact and Interaction Rather Than Exclusivity

Even if the biblical texts *in no way* contained explicit mention of the existence of these groups in the exilic and postexilic periods, the evidence for the contact between these groups continues to increase. The Judean group in Jerusalem, therefore, certainly also *knew of these groups*. Several observations concerning the test case of Samaria lead to this conclusion.

(1.) The well-researched material culture of Samaria and Judah reveals a high degree of *mutual influence* of both regions on a cultural-historical level (Knoppers, Hensel).<sup>39</sup> The commonalities between the groups are such that their common basis goes beyond merely the shared cultural past of Israel and Judah in the monarchic period. It instead points to contact and interaction taking place between the two Yahwistic communities across the full gamut of human activity. The two groups remained in continuous contact with each other, interacting with each other on the most diverse levels (though interaction took place especially among religious elites and scribes). I have dealt with the relationship of Judah and Samaria in a monograph published in 2016.<sup>40</sup> Building on the dis-

<sup>37</sup> Another possibility would be that ἁγίων functions as an adjective here for the following substantive, in this way referring to some “holy goods” or the like (probably ἁγίων δ[ωρῶν] [= “holy goods”]), which Ptolemaios brought to Mount Gerizim, as has been suggested by Meerson, “One God Supreme,” 46–47.

<sup>38</sup> See the examples given in Bauer, *Wörterbuch NT*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, s. v. ἅγιος, 19; and Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s. v. ἅγιος, 68.

<sup>39</sup> For a detailed analysis of all the evidence referenced here see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 35–162; idem, “On the Relationship”; and Knoppers, “Aspects,” 159–174; idem, *Jews and Samaritans*, esp. 103–109.

<sup>40</sup> See Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*; and (with additional considerations) idem, “On the Relationship.”

cussions there, I would argue that describing the relations between Samaritans and Judeans first in terms of competition and then as separation are inadequate. I suggest instead an alternative *model of mutual contacts* for the period between the sixth and the second century BCE. Samaritan-Judean relations were in fact not constantly marred by bitter conflict, but rather reflected a state of parallel co-existence. This is especially true for the Persian period, not least because the two groups of YHWH-worshippers dwelled in different provinces. It was not before the late fourth or third century BCE that relations between Judah and Samaria slowly began to sour, initially due to political and economic rivalries resulting from the unification of Judah and Samaria into one larger province, meaning that two official Yahwist sanctuaries were – for the first time – forced to compete for the favor of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid potentates.<sup>41</sup> In the later historical development, this potential conflict increasingly affected both groups of YHWH-worshippers. The Jewish polemic against Samaritan YHWH-worshippers serves as an indication for existing tensions and conflicts between both denominations of “Israel.” Polemics against the Gerizim-community are attested *outside* the biblical canon only from the second half of the second century BCE, and then dramatically increased in the frequency of attestation and in the nature and variety of polemical statements. Corresponding religious conflicts between Samaritan and Jewish YHWH-worshippers most likely developed over the course of the fourth and third centuries.

(2.) The Elephantine correspondence TAD A.4.7–4.9 (407 BCE) indicates that the religious and literate elites had at least semi-regular contact with each other.<sup>42</sup> There are also certain biblical texts (see the following point and section 3.3 for the discussion about the concepts of different imagination of “Israel” in postexilic biblical literature) that implicitly display various contacts between the other groups in question.

(3.) It is essential in terms of the *religious-historical perspective* to move away from reducing the contacts to the currently favored binary paradigm consisting of the poles of orthodoxy and deviation or sects. This represents exactly Stern’s widely accepted view of a “religious revolution” that judges the historical situation against the backdrop of the biblical narratives, such that the Judean groups constitute the guiding orthodox community. In light of this orthodox community, scholars have thus understood all other groups (to the degree that scholars even notice them) as *deviations* from this norm. The Samaritans, for example, were widely viewed as an Israelite or Jewish sect.<sup>43</sup> Most modern schol-

<sup>41</sup> For the details see my *Juda und Samaria*, 218–229, and idem, “Cult Centralization,” 253–254.

<sup>42</sup> A comprehensive description of the contacts and interactions between Judah and Samaria is given by Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 163–229.

<sup>43</sup> See Pummer, “Samaritanism,” 1–24.

ars suggest that there were serious religious conflicts as well as economic and political rivalries between Judah and Samaria throughout the entire Second Temple period – starting with the erection of the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, which scholars identify as a rival sanctuary. Some biblical texts do imply such a scenario (such as Ezra 4:1–5, 6–24; Neh 1–6; 2 Kgs 17:24–41<sup>44</sup>); and Josephus’ *Antiquitates*<sup>45</sup> (first cent. CE) and export it to the postexilic and especially the Persian period.

Within this paradigm, the Judeans on Elephantine are likewise considered a “Jewish sect.” Interpreters depict them as a group that fled to the Elephantine prior to the demise of the southern kingdom of Judah. As a result, they were unaware of the innovations brought about by the exile, so they remained polytheistic. They remained unfamiliar with the Torah,<sup>46</sup> and therefore atavistic from a religious-historical point of view. The fact that this simplistic scenario is quite erroneous has been pointed out by several thorough studies on the complex relationship of Judeans and Samaritans in this period from recent scholarship.<sup>47</sup> This problematic approach extends to the general scholarly view of the religious history of this epoch as a whole. The complexity of the various interdependencies remains insufficiently unraveled in a number of ways. To give just one example, the Yahwistic group from the Egyptian island of Elephantine – a group that identifies themselves as “Judeans” – wrote a petition to Samaria and to Jerusalem regarding the reconstruction of their YHWH-temple (TAD A4.7/4.8; dated 407 BCE). The Elephantine community later received answers from both Bagohi, the governor of Judah, and Delaiah, probably the governor of Samaria (TAD A4.9). Although the existence of a text like Deut 12, which heavily promotes the idea of cult centralization, can be presumed for this time, the officials from both provinces offer no real objections based on the law of cult centralization, when they authorized the rebuilding of the Elephantine temple.<sup>48</sup> This evidence indicates that the cultic and theological boundaries were less clear or even quite undefined in this period, as was stressed in a recent study by Granerød on the diversity of Yahwism in the Persian period.<sup>49</sup> Thus, the pluriformity of

<sup>44</sup> For an overview of how these texts influenced tradition and research, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 12–13 (there with further literature).

<sup>45</sup> For essential reading on this subject: Pummer, *Samaritans in Josephus*.

<sup>46</sup> See Kratz, “Elephantine und Qumran,” 129–146.

<sup>47</sup> See especially the works of Hensel and Heckl cited in this essay.

<sup>48</sup> They did not, however, explicitly authorize the holocausts in this sanctuary. This could bear the notion that Jerusalem and (Mount Gerizim) had the status of central sanctuaries – and the sanctuaries on the periphery like Elephantine did not have the same status, see Dušek, “Mt. Gerizim Sanctuary,” 118; Rütterswörden, *Deuteronomium*, 36–37. Another possibility cannot, however, be ruled out, that the explicit exclusion of animal sacrifices offers the Egyptian satrap a bribe in exchange for the support in rebuilding the temple; this could have been mandatory to pacify the local Egyptian worshippers of the ram-god Khnum, see Kottsieper, “Religionspolitik,” 150–178.

<sup>49</sup> Granerød, *Dimensions*, 324–340.

postexilic Israel with its central element of the worship of the deity YHWH, “can only be insufficiently described through schemas such as the orthodoxy/heterodoxy, syncretism, sects or similar categories because a *single referent* for ‘Judaism’ did not exist,” as Frevel puts it.<sup>50</sup> While Frevel develops this scenario explicitly for the Persian period, it seems likely in light of the evidence above that *diversity* on the one hand, and *mutual contact and interaction* between the various groups on the other, are crucial for understanding the Hellenistic period as well. This view is supported by the biblical evidence. The assumed “Judean exclusivity” (especially regarding the case of “cult centralization”) is – as I have shown elsewhere – probably only a late, namely, a late Persian or (more probably) a Hellenistic development in the biblical texts. Earlier Persian-period biblical texts testify to a more open perspective on Yahwistic diversity (see the next paragraph on the biblical evidence).<sup>51</sup>

### 2.3 Judean Perspectives in the Hebrew Bible: The Concepts of Exilic Discontinuity, Golah-Judean Continuity, and Exclusivity

The historical evidence outlined above stands in glaring contrast to the biblical picture. For a while now, voices have occasionally noted that the above-sketched paradigm of a Judean Golah-centered perspective on the formation of Judaism is clearly influenced by the *interpretation* of history *within* the Hebrew Bible. It was already lamented by Weippert in 1993 that reconstructions of the history of Israel in the twentieth century followed this specific biblical view, which he fittingly called “Sub-Deuteronomism.”<sup>52</sup> From today’s perspective, one may also add the Chronistic view amongst this reception history, which Schmid most recently termed “Sub-Chronicism.”<sup>53</sup> Additionally, Diebner pointed already in 1983 to the *Golah-group* centered character of the (Judean) Masoretic biblical canon.<sup>54</sup> The canon parts of the *Nevi'im* and the *Ketuvim*, which are exclusive to what Diebner calls the “Judean Hebrew Bible,” pave the way to a Judean-centered perspective on the history of Israel. The Torah, on the other hand, is not only part of the Judean but also of the Samaritan tradition (cf. the Samaritanus). According to Diebner, this shared tradition therefore documents a Judean and Samaritan perspective. While Diebner’s very late, *Hasmonean* dating for the main parts of the biblical literature is a serious problem for his thesis and quite unlikely, his basic *hermeneutical observations* on Judean-exclusive and

<sup>50</sup> My translation of: “Die regionale Diversität und interne Pluriformität kann mit Schemata wie ‘Orthodox/Heterodox’, ‘Synkretismus’, ‘Sekten’ etc. nur unzureichend beschrieben werden, da es die eine Referenzgröße noch nicht gibt.” (emphasis added; Frevel, *Geschichte Israels*, 327).

<sup>51</sup> See Hensel, “Cult Centralization,” 239–258; idem, “Deuteronomium 12,13–19,” 9–43.

<sup>52</sup> Weippert, “Geschichte Israels am Scheideweg,” 71–103 (the term: *ibid.*, 73).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Schmid, “Overcoming,” 17–29, esp. 19.

<sup>54</sup> See Diebner, “Genesis,” 81–98. His further work is building on these basic insights.

Judean-Samaritan perspectives in the Hebrew Bible are very helpful for grasping the historical and redactional developments of the Hebrew texts from the exilic period onwards.

It should generally be recognized that the majority of the biblical literature from the exilic and postexilic periods transmits *the perspective of the Judean group(s)* that became emergent Judaism. The generation of a growing *exclusionary exclusivity*, which intensifies the impression of a *uniformly monolithic Judaism* (one God – one sanctuary [Jerusalem] – one people of “Israel”) might be identified as one defining feature of the general development in the redactional processes of the Hebrew Bible. Three basic lines of inner-biblical argumentation can be identified as shaping this view of Israel’s history and the biblical (Judean) interpretation of the exile as the linchpin of (later) Jewish existence: a) the conceptual *discontinuity* on the one hand, b) its *continuity* on the other, as well as c) the *ideological demarcation* and *exclusivity*. This observation is detailed in the following:

a) *Discontinuity*: The notion of the exile as a cultural and historical milestone for Judaism turns out to be a literary construct and theological concept emerging from those groups that returned from exile, as has convincingly been pointed out by the different essays gathered in the volume *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts*, edited by Ben Zvi and Levin (2010).<sup>55</sup> The Judean exile is purposely construed as an event of historical, political, cultural, and religious *discontinuity*.<sup>56</sup> It serves to overemphasize the innovative powers of the elites living in exile and starting to return in 539 BCE.<sup>57</sup> The fictive character of the biblical reflection of the exile has been recognized: the land was neither empty nor completely destroyed (“myth of the empty land”).<sup>58</sup> Neither a massive resettlement to Mesopotamia<sup>59</sup> nor a mass return around 539 BCE in the early Persian period took place. The return was instead only slowly successful.<sup>60</sup>

b) (*Golah-Judean*) *Continuity*: The notion of discontinuity goes hand in hand with the idea of *continuity*: in several biblical traditions the Judean community is viewed as the rightful heir of the former “biblical Israel.” It is especially various strands of the literary development of the text in the book of Ezra-Nehemiah that generate a line of unbroken continuity between the Judeans exiled after 596 BCE to the exilic community and the group of returnees. In a very exclusive

<sup>55</sup> Ben Zvi/Levin, *Concept of Exile*.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Ben Zvi, “Total Exile,” 155–168.

<sup>57</sup> See also Frevel, “Der Eine oder die Vielen,” 238–239, 248–251.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Valkama, “Archaeological Remains”; Lipschits, “Persian-Period Judah,” 195, 205; and Wöhrle, “Un-Empty Land,” 189–206.

<sup>59</sup> Frevel, *Geschichte Israels*, 278–282.

<sup>60</sup> See Pakkala, “Exile and Exiles,” 91–101; and the works of Heckl and Hensel cited here in this essay on the political and religious-historical background of Ezra-Nehemiah.

manner, only the group of returnees in the lists of Esr 2/Neh 7 is qualified as “all Israel” (Ezra 2:2, 59, 70; 3:1; 6:21–22,<sup>61</sup> cf. לְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל in Ezra 2:70). Furthermore, the exodus tradition is applied as a typology for this image of Israel<sup>62</sup> in order to show continuity to the Israel of old and to construct a “history of salvation”<sup>63</sup> leading exclusively to the Golah community in Jerusalem. Continuity is also key for the description of the restoration of the temple in Jerusalem: The temple is granted its legitimate dignity by the continuity of the *place* (Ezra 3:3, 6, 7) and its *cult instruments* (Ezra 1:7–11; 6:5). Additionally, the gift of the Torah is exclusively tied to the Aaronide priest and Judean scribe Ezra (Ezra 7:1–6), bringing the Torah back “from the exile” (Ezra 7:6, cf. verses 12–26).<sup>64</sup> With Ezra’s genealogy reaching back to the high priest Aaron (Ezra 7:1–6), this concept realizes an idea of unbroken and exclusive continuity for the Torah as well as for the Judean Torah community envisioned by Ezra-Nehemiah.<sup>65</sup> As was shown recently by Bortz, the lists of returnees seem to be reminiscent of the book of Numbers, which according to Bortz would imply that the Ezra-Nehemiah group strongly defines its identity in terms of the Israel of old.<sup>66</sup> Similar but less exclusive strategies of *continuity* can also be found in Isa 40–66 and other parts of biblical literature.<sup>67</sup>

c) *Demarcation and exclusivity*: The idea of continuity is often accompanied by ideas of *exclusivity*. Again, the book of Ezra-Nehemiah may serve as an outstanding example. The continuity of the temple location and therefore its legitimacy, as well as the continuity of the Torah and Torah-community in Jerusalem, creates a demarcation line with the Yahwistic neighbor, the Samaritans. As was shown by Heckl and Hensel in several in-depth studies,<sup>68</sup> especially different Hellenistic reactionary layers de-legitimize the northern YHWH-worshippers and their sanctuary by placing it in opposition to the legitimate Judean cult. For example, the political controversy of Nehemiah with Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, Tobiah, and Geshem displayed in, e. g., Neh 2:10, 19<sup>69</sup> is a rather late,

<sup>61</sup> For a detailed discussion of the Golah-centered imagination of Israel see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 290–292, 332–343 (with literature).

<sup>62</sup> The fact that various exodus motives are attributed to the Golah community in Jerusalem has often been noticed; this is especially true for Ezra 1–3; see Bänzinger, “Jauchzen und Weinen,” 125–150, esp. 126–138, for a review of current research; many of the basic insights in this matter go back to Blenkinsopp, “Theological Reading,” 26–36.

<sup>63</sup> Williamson, *Torah and History*, 160–161.

<sup>64</sup> On this see Becking, “Idea,” 273–286.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Heckl, “Composition,” 123; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 304–306.

<sup>66</sup> Bortz, *Identität und Kontinuität*, esp. 184–223.

<sup>67</sup> See Häußl, *Einleitung*, 9–31.

<sup>68</sup> See Heckl, “Composition,” 115–132; and my own studies on this (which differ in several points from Heckl): Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 283–366, esp. 363–365; idem, “Cult Centralization,” 246–247.

<sup>69</sup> On the opposition of Nehemiah’s building campaign in Ezra-Nehemiah and the historical background see Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans*, 135–168.

Hellenistic re-writing of a quite neutral *Bericht*<sup>70</sup> describing Nehemiah's building campaign, the so-called Nehemiah-memoir of the fifth century BCE.<sup>71</sup> The Hellenistic redactional additions portray the Samaritan, Sanballat, as the main leader of a political campaign against Nehemiah and thus against the rebuilding of Jerusalem.<sup>72</sup> It is unlikely that the three adversaries of Nehemiah ever had any dealings with each other. As has been shown by Kratz, Grätz, and Hensel,<sup>73</sup> the adversaries seem to be symbols of the most important neighbors of Yehud, who now, in the Hellenistic narrative, act in a concerted manner against the people of Judah and its representatives.<sup>74</sup> The reworking of Neh 1–6 may have caused the interpolation of Ezra 4:1–24\* into the context Ezra 1–6\*.<sup>75</sup> The Samaritan objections and accusations surrounding the restoration of the Second Temple in the (in itself multi-layered) addition of Ezra 4<sup>76</sup> in the context of the temple restoration narrative of Ezra 5–6\* portray Samaritan-Judean conflicts of the Hellenistic times. As Lux has convincingly pointed out, the time of the temple restoration (and the delay of the temple construction) was caused by *inner* conflicts (see Haggai/Zechariah),<sup>77</sup> not by external factors (like the intervention by the Samaritan officials in Ezra 4:6–16, 24). It seems that with the interpolation of Ezra 4\*, the temple building narrative has “in mind the denial of the legitimacy of the temple on Mount Gerizim.”<sup>78</sup> The Samaritans, represented by their officials (Ezra 4:8–10) are characterized as acting *against* the Judean people (Ezra 4:1) and the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem. On the other hand, the Second Temple on Mount Zion is depicted as *the only one* that is commanded to be built by both God (Ezra 1:2, 7; 5:1; 6:14) and the Persian emperor (Ezra 6:14). Furthermore, it is characterized by the continuity of the location – all these attributes are denied to the Samaritan sanctuary according to Ezra 1–6.

As an additional and final example, the book of Chronicles may be mentioned. Chronicles follow a comparable, yet different concept of Judean *exclusivity*. Chronicles combines a certain Jerusalem-centered interpretation of Deuteronomy and the tabernacle of the Priestly Writings (P): 2 Sam 7:12 (cf. v. 16) mentions the election (בחר) of the מקום in Jerusalem. The peculiar combination of בחר and מקום is never used in the Chronicler's *Vorlage*, the books of Samuel and Kings, where the city of Jerusalem is chosen. The assertion that YHWH has

<sup>70</sup> See Grätz, “Adversaries,” 73–88.

<sup>71</sup> See Wright, *Rebuilding Identity*.

<sup>72</sup> See Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 284–301 for the details.

<sup>73</sup> Kratz, “Statthalter, Hohepriester und Schreiber,” 104; Grätz, “Adversaries,” 73–88, esp. 81–82; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 314–323, 327–331 (with further literature).

<sup>74</sup> Finkelstein proposed an even later (Hasmonean) dating of the theme of the three named adversaries, Finkelstein, “Nehemiah's Adversaries,” 47–55.

<sup>75</sup> This has been argued by Eskenazi, *Age of Prose*, 79; and Edelman, *Origins*, 194.

<sup>76</sup> In detail on this, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 284–301.

<sup>77</sup> See, Lux, “König als Tempelbauer,” 99–122; idem, “Zweite Tempel,” 145–172.

<sup>78</sup> Heckl, “Remembering Jacob,” 73.

“chosen” the “place” to put his name is unmistakably reminiscent of the language of cult centralization in Deuteronomy. What happens here is that Chronicles purposely dismisses the – according to my thesis outlined elsewhere<sup>79</sup> – *concessive, Judean-Samaritan concept* in Deuteronomy by combining the election of Jerusalem in the Former Prophets with the election of the one *maqom* in Deuteronomy, and presents the temple of Jerusalem as the only legitimate representation of this cultic site. There is also evidence that Chronicles takes up the concept of the tabernacle in the Priestly writings, as has recently been shown by Nihan, and in doing so emphasizes a general *continuity* between the institutions of the tabernacle and the temple in Jerusalem. This is interesting in so far as the Priestly concept of the tabernacle provides a narrative legitimation for the Judean and the Samaritan sanctuaries.<sup>80</sup> Yet, this view is definitely not supported within Chronicles.<sup>81</sup> By combining the interpretation of Deuteronomy 12, in which the only legitimate representation of the *maqom* is in Jerusalem, with the Priestly concept of the “movable tabernacle,” the Chronicler combines two concessive yet different pentateuchal traditions, and points them exclusively to Jerusalem. Overall does Chronicles bear a strong anti-Samaritan connotation, as Samaritan Yahwism, the Northern Kingdom (that is in this historical projection: the province of Samaria and its contemporary inhabitants) are depicted as ultimately illicit entities.<sup>82</sup>

To sum up the discussion, the mainly *Judean* presentation of Israel’s history ultimately led to a picture of Israel’s past where a broader spectrum and variety of Israelite remnants after 586 BCE were *deliberately ignored*. It can be held that the *Judean exclusivity* formulated there does not automatically correspond to the historical *exclusivity* of the Judean group. On the contrary, the legitimation strategies in late biblical texts attest to the significance of other groups, especially the Mount Gerizim community that confronted the various Judean traditions.

#### 2.4 Samaritan Involvement Prior to the Exilic and Persian Period: Bringing “the First Exile” (722 BCE) into Discussion

Two fundamental insights from recent scholarship on the Samaritans concern the fact that a) northern Israel did not completely disappear after 722 BCE, but ethnic, cultural, and cultic *continuity* remained predominant for the region – as

<sup>79</sup> See Hensel, “Cult Centralization,” 247–249; idem, “Deuteronomium 12,13–19,” 9–43.

<sup>80</sup> On this concept see Hensel, “Temple and Torah” (with further literature).

<sup>81</sup> See Nihan, “Cult Centralization,” 267–275.

<sup>82</sup> On this see my “Polemics,” 35–47. For the role of Jerusalem and the temple within the narrative of Chronicles and its theology see Kartveit, “Temple,” 229–242. On the conception of centralization in Chronicles, and how this conception receives its *Vorlage* in Kgs by combining it (and thereby changing it) with the conceptions from P and Deuteronomy see Nihan, “Cult Centralization,” 253–288; and Nihan/Gonzalez, “Competing Attitudes,” 93–114.

well as for the South approximately 150 years later.<sup>83</sup> It is only in the *historical reflections* of certain biblical texts that the North is said to have disappeared completely. Furthermore, b) contrary to the traditional depiction (Josephus; Ezra 4; 2 Kgs 17:24–41; etc.), the population of the region and later the Persian province of Samaria was neither predominately syncretistic, multi-religious, nor multi-ethnic. Its culture instead was hardly distinguishable from that of Judah of the same period.<sup>84</sup> The supposed multi-ethnic heritage of the Samaritans is very clearly a literary invention by Judah towards the Yahwism in the North. This phenomenon is well known in sociology as “othering,”<sup>85</sup> and in the case of Judah has its roots in the Hellenistic period. The polemic in non-biblical sources is only found in the late second century BCE (the first reference is the Greek review in Sir 50:25–26,<sup>86</sup> sometime after 129 BCE), and in biblical sources from Hellenistic times (cf. 2 Kgs 17:24–41<sup>87</sup> and Ezra 4:1–5<sup>88</sup>). In Josephus at the very latest, this polemic became the dominant narrative regarding Samaritan identity from an outside perspective.<sup>89</sup> Thus, it is possible that the so-called northern tradition was not simply adapted by the Judeans after 722, as commonly held. It is plausible that further Samaritan involvement took place in the shaping of their tradition for much longer. This observation opens up the discussion regarding the impact of the exile on the formation of Judaism to the fate and history of the first exile of the former Northern Kingdom and later Samaritan Yahwists.

### 3. “Binnen-israelitische Ausdifferenzierungsprozesse”: A Matrix for Future Research

#### 3.1 *The Nexus of Yahwistic Diversity and Formational Processes of Early Judaism*

To sum up, the indicators point toward the significantly more multifaceted and regionally diverse early period of Judaism than typically assumed in scholarship. From a methodological perspective, a questionable mix of biblical, archaeological, and historical arguments continue to characterize the discussion. The basic

<sup>83</sup> Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans*, 103–109.

<sup>84</sup> Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 91–161, esp. 153–155.

<sup>85</sup> The term “othering,” which has been borrowed from sociology, describes the use of distancing or differentiation from other groups in order to confirm one’s own “normality.” The term was originally coined by Spivak, “The Rani of Sirmur,” 128–151. To date, there remains no generally accepted German translation of this term, cf. Reuter, *Ordnungen des Anderen*.

<sup>86</sup> See Schorch, “Samari(t)an Identity,” 136–137.

<sup>87</sup> For the text-critical arguments in this discussion see Robker’s essay in this volume.

<sup>88</sup> On the interpretation of these texts as anti-Samaritan and on the dating of the texts see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 283–343 (esp. 334–336), 367–389, 391–396.

<sup>89</sup> For this historical development see Hensel, “Von ‘Israeliten’ zu ‘Ausländern,’” 475–493.

problem with these approaches arises, on the one hand, from hasty conclusions about the literary history of certain biblical books. On the other hand, scholars presume a certain religious-political enforcement of the biblical texts in postexilic period, though little data on this question exists. The deviating historical data outlined above – whether the numerous sanctuaries inside and outside Judah and throughout the diaspora that seem to defy the command of centralization in Deut 12, also the numerous deities whom the Judean colony at Elephantine venerated – then only counts as *exceptions* that prove the rule.

The evidence of regional distinctions in postexilic Yahwism is nearly completely ignored in current depictions of the “history of Israel” and resulting discussions in related disciplines (archaeology, Iranian studies, Hellenistic studies) as well as in general discussions of cultural history concerning the formative processes in ancient cultures.<sup>90</sup> Recent exceptions are the *Geschichte Israels* by Frevel (2016), who dedicates a whole chapter to the “Heiligtümer in der Perserzeit und die pluriforme Gestalt der JHWH-Verehrung;”<sup>91</sup> and develops a complex interaction model (“interferente Formation”<sup>92</sup>) of the religious-historical development of Judaism in the Persian period. He explains the meaning of the neologism “interferente Formation” in an earlier work: “The entangled development of Judaism can rather be described by a twisted and interdependent formation paradigm than by a monolithic or entirely parallel development. By emphasizing the regional differences, one has to take into account also the special characteristics of Galilee, the Bet-Shean lowlands, the coastal strip, the Shephelah, the Beersheba valley, the Negev and Transjordan, etc. Regional particularities and peculiarities have to be contextualized in diachronic respect.”<sup>93</sup>

Kratz also contributes to the historical phenomenon of Yahwistic diversity. His *Historical and Biblical Israel* (2015, German: 2013<sup>94</sup>) investigates “the Jewish archives” of Mount Gerizim, Elephantine, al-Yahudu, Qumran, Jerusalem, and Alexandria for his presentation of the history of Israel.<sup>95</sup> Employing the term “archive” in this context, Kratz encompasses extra-biblical material: the official or private storehouses of sundry business transactions, as well as libraries and archaeological sites. According to Kratz, it is necessary “to investigate the localities known either by archaeology or by literary reference as locations of preservation and transmission of non-biblical and biblical texts” in order to “pursue the portrait of Israel and Judaism that arises from these very sources.”<sup>96</sup> The

<sup>90</sup> See, e.g., Tilly/Zwicker, *Religionsgeschichte Israels* (2011); Schmitz, *Geschichte Israels* (2014); Oswald/Tilly, *Geschichte Israels* (2016); Tiwald, *Frühjudentum und Christentum* (2016).

<sup>91</sup> Frevel, *Geschichte Israels*, 323–326.

<sup>92</sup> Frevel, *Geschichte Israels*, 322.

<sup>93</sup> Frevel/Pyschny, “Introduction,” 19.

<sup>94</sup> Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel*; trans. from *Historisches und biblisches Israel. Drei Überblicke zum Alten Testament* (2013).

<sup>95</sup> Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel*, 133–194.

<sup>96</sup> Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel*, 134.

discussion and comparison of the material results in a helpful differentiation between “non-biblical” and “biblical Judaism.”<sup>97</sup> In Kratz’s view, his so-called “biblical Judaism” became the norm for all YHWH-adherents across Palestine and the diaspora only late, namely, in the Hellenistic period. The timespan before this was characterized by the parallel existence of various groups that featured a common veneration of the deity YHWH but otherwise defined and specified their identities in different ways.

Schipper’s *Geschichte Israels in der Antike* (2018) describes the religious-historical and political developments of Persian-period Judah with a focus on the interactions between Elephantine, Mount Gerizim, and Jerusalem.<sup>98</sup> In a similar way, Elephantine and Samaria are taken into account for the Persian-period development of early Judaism in *A History of Biblical Israel: The Fate of the Tribes and Kingdoms from Merenptah to Bar Kochba* by Knauf/Guillaume (2016).<sup>99</sup>

As a result of the observations made so far, the following four aspects guide the inquiry into the horizon of Yahwistic diversity, as well as the emergence of Judaism and the Hebrew Bible:

1.) The cultural and social-historical milestone of the exile is in essence the identity-formational construction of only a small slice of the exilic and postexilic Yahwistic spectrum, that is, mainly of the Judean Golah returnees. It completely suppresses the historical diversity within Yahwism and the complex socio-religious factors at play in Judaism’s formation.

2.) Contrary to the current paradigm, Israel’s YHWH worship in whatever form imagined in exilic, Persian, and Hellenistic periods was neither *uniform* nor *intolerant*. The general picture that underlines the current paradigm is primarily influenced by certain biblical texts and traditions that imply a certain “orthodoxy.” But these texts only constitute *one* voice in a multifaceted dialog of tradition within the Hebrew Bible as a debate from a later biblical period. As I have shown elsewhere in detail, the traditions and redactional layers that imply a certain anti-Samaritan polemic do not arise before the late Persian (fourth cent. BCE), and in my eyes more probably: from the early Hellenistic period (third cent. BCE). Even if Judean exclusive traditions exist in the Hebrew Bible by then, they have yet to reach the whole Judean community.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>97</sup> See Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel*, 197–203.

<sup>98</sup> Schipper, *Geschichte Israels*, 71–93.

<sup>99</sup> See Knauf/Guillaume, *History*, 143–196 (chapter entitled “The formation of biblical Israel in Yehud and Samaria in the Persian Period”).

<sup>100</sup> See Hensel, “Cult Centralization,” 239–257, for a detailed study on how the perception of Mount Gerizim changes throughout the various biblical traditions in the postexilic period; cf. also Hensel, “Relationship”; and idem, *Juda und Samaria*, 283–389, and Heckl, *Neuanfang und Kontinuität*, for details on the development of anti-Samaritan polemics in Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, and 2 Kgs 17.

3.) One should additionally expect that the various groups not only existed side by side, but that contact and interaction between the groups took place *on a variety of levels*. In contrast to the biblical depiction, scholars must grapple at least with Samaria's political, cultural, and especially *theological* relationship with Judah from the Persian period onward.<sup>101</sup> This very interaction largely remains under-investigated and should receive sustained attention in future research.

4.) *Each of these various groups could at least potentially* serve as primary influencers in the interplay of early Judaism's history of a) theology, b) religion (both formation of identity markers of early Judaism and religious-social group formation), and c) biblical and extra-biblical Judean/Jewish literature. It can therefore be concluded that the formation process of what later emerged as early Judaism took place as a complex and multilayered process of negotiation between the various groups. Frevel fittingly called this interplay "interferente Formation des Judentums" when looking at the historical and religious-historical aspects of the regional diversification of Judaism (see above). Others have developed the idea of concordant identity shaping of Judeans and Samaritans reflected *in* and resulting *in* a common Samaritan-Judean Pentateuch.<sup>102</sup> In my works, I called the overall process "binnen-israelitische Ausdifferenzierungsprozesse"<sup>103</sup> (which can be roughly translated as "negotiating processes *within* Israel"). The biblically loaded term "Israel" seems appropriate here, as I would stress the literary-historical and theological-historical aspects significantly more than is usually the case in recent research. I identify the discussion of who belongs to "Israel" in whatsoever form imagined in the various exilic and postexilic biblical traditions as *the* dominating debate in the Second Temple period (I will come back to this aspect later). This very debate leads to the theological and ideological shaping of early Judaism as reflected in the various late biblical traditions, and also to text production within the Hebrew Bible. Additionally, the term "Israel" can (at least potentially) serve as a *collective term* for the various Yahwistic groups (especially for Judah *and* Samaria) – which is not *per se* the case with the semantics of "Judaism." The *negotiation process* only solidified in the time of the Hasmonean Jewish kingdom (second/first cent. BCE) in such a way that characteristic tradition-forming and group-specific markers operated as differentiating criteria to set off the Judaism of Jerusalem. As I have shown elsewhere, from this point in time, the related group of the Samaritans was degraded as foreign, and the other sub-groups disappeared.<sup>104</sup> The distinctive point my thesis makes here is that the formation of Judaism in the Hasmonean

<sup>101</sup> Hensel, "Bedeutung Samarias," 20–48.

<sup>102</sup> For the idea of the common Pentateuch see the research overview in Hensel, "Temple and Torah"; and idem, *Juda und Samaria*, 187–194 (with literature).

<sup>103</sup> Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 312 (for details on this matter see pp. 302–349 in the same monograph).

<sup>104</sup> See Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 241–247.

period is not so much a process of distinction and demarcation from the *outside* (Greco-Roman culture, politics, etc.; cf., e. g., Boccaccini, Nodet, and Cohen),<sup>105</sup> but the differentiating criteria of Judaism were primarily applied in order to part ways from the other Yahwistic group, the Samaritans. By this time, both main groups developed their group specific markers (like their own specific version of Torah: Masoretic Text and Samaritanus; their own characteristic script and distinctive oral traditions;<sup>106</sup> etc.) as part of the parting of the ways between Judeans and Samaritans. One should speak from this moment on of “Judaism” on the one hand, and of “Samaritanism” on the other.

### 3.2 A Question of Terminology: Judaism(s) – Yahwism(s) – “Israel”

At this point, a terminological desideratum still persists in scholarship that is also symptomatic for the present desideratum in scholarship itself. For while these other groups have connections to Judaism, they are neither simply the same thing as Judaism nor can they be easily derived from it (as, e. g., “Jewish sects”). Even when one sometimes finds this terminology in the introductory literature, Samaria was neither a *part* nor a subgroup of Judaism, but rather an independent branch of a super-ordinate category.<sup>107</sup> The description of the phenomenon of Yahwistic diversity in the Second Temple period first appears in the discussion in Edelman (1995) through the term “Yahwisms.”<sup>108</sup> Edelman adopts the thinking on display in the recently intensified debate within Jewish studies concerning the polymorphous nature of (later) rabbinic Judaism that the term “Judaisms” has come to characterize (used programmatically for the first time by Neusner/Green/Frerichs, 1987).<sup>109</sup> The neologism “Yahwisms” has its weaknesses in that it attempts to define religion solely in terms of its doctrine of divinity, while the religious resources for the basis of a religious community are usually significantly more multifaceted (relationship to scriptures and their authority; relationship to tradition; ethnic, social, or political components of the community; etc.). The choice of terminology admittedly finds its justification in the fact that one can primarily identify the adherents of the relevant religion through the theophoric element *yhw(h)* in onomastic evidence or the divine name alone that does not appear in the other, non-biblical religious literature. Edelman has recently changed her terminology to the more general “emerging Judaisms,”<sup>110</sup> which

<sup>105</sup> See Boccaccini, *Roots*; Nodet, *Search of the Origins*; and Cohen, *Beginning of Jewishness*.

<sup>106</sup> Schorch, “Samari(t)an Identity,” 135–149; Boccaccini, *Roots*.

<sup>107</sup> For a recent discussion about the status for “Samaritanism” within Judaism, see, e. g., Pummer, *Profile*, 9–25.

<sup>108</sup> Edelman, *Triumph*.

<sup>109</sup> See Neusner/Green/Frerichs, *Judaisms*.

<sup>110</sup> See Edelman’s “Introduction,” 1–5 in her volume *Religion in the Achaemenid Persian Empire*.

once again assumes the above-mentioned lack of clarity. The degree to which or whether Samaria, the various diaspora groups, and other regional “Yahwisms” like the Elephantine community or the Judeans in Mesopotamia belong to that implied “Judaism” in a narrow sense remains an issue requiring clarification.

In the light of the complex nature of the postexilic formation processes, the term “Judaism” – even in the plural – should be abandoned if used as *general term* for the whole phenomenon of Yahwistic diversity. Judaism is one branch of “Israel” as is “Samaritan.” For this reason, I have elsewhere introduced the terminology of “Israel denominations” into the discussion.<sup>111</sup> The term has its strength in the fact that various late biblical traditions use a certain, yet not identical, conception of “Israel” to define the respective in-group (more on this in the next section). However, it has its weakness in the fact that the extra-biblical evidence attests to the use of the name “Israel” *only* for the Samaritans and Judeans.<sup>112</sup> In light of the current state of the discussion, I would provisionally still favor the, in my eyes most neutral, terms “Yahwism(s)” or “YHWH-groups” over “Judaism(s)” and the inner-biblically shaped term “Israel.” Future research should aim to provide more precision with regard to appropriate conceptual language.

#### 4. The Hebrew Bible as a Reflection of Exilic and Postexilic Yahwistic Diversity

##### 4.1 *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and Deuteronomistic History: Traces of Judean-Samaritan Relations*

Noting the variety of postexilic Yahwisms and the beginning realizations of the importance and significance of the Samaritans during the time of much of the formation period of the Hebrew Bible literatures, these observations lead to the corollary that the late texts of the Hebrew Bible *reflect* different groups. This observation cannot be stressed enough, as recent research – where it perceives the diversity within postexilic Yahwism – mainly focuses on the historical, cultural, religious-historical, and political aspects of the process of the formation of Judaism. In fact, little attention has been given to the role of these other non-Judean groups during the scribal processes of the Hebrew Bible. Exceptions are the works of Heckl (2018)<sup>113</sup> and Hensel (2018),<sup>114</sup> which *systematically* identified the question of when and how Samaritans contributed to the literary his-

<sup>111</sup> See Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 152–162.

<sup>112</sup> For a comprehensive overview of all epigraphical evidence of Israel, Israelites etc. from the eighth century BCE to the first century CE, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 159–161.

<sup>113</sup> Heckl, “Rolle Samarias,” 1–31.

<sup>114</sup> Hensel, “Bedeutung Samarias,” 20–48.

tory as a major task for future research. There are also good grounds for concluding that Judeans as well as Samaritans *participated in the formation of the Pentateuch* – at least in the time of its supposed finalization, in the late Persian period – thereby creating what is currently termed a “Common Pentateuch” or “Common Torah.” This would reflect the interest of both groups. See – amongst others – Diebner (1983),<sup>115</sup> Nihan (2007),<sup>116</sup> Pummer (2007),<sup>117</sup> Hensel (2011, 2016, 2019),<sup>118</sup> Nocquet (2017)<sup>119</sup> and his essay in this volume on Gen 31,<sup>120</sup> Römer (2018),<sup>121</sup> and Kühn (2019).<sup>122</sup>

The whole theory of a Common Torah is not uncontested due to the historical implication that such a compromise document would presume a much more important role of Torah in the Persian period than it actually had.<sup>123</sup> This case definitively needs more in-depth research, explicitly into the redactional work of the various pentateuchal traditions and literary layers. For most part, the theory of a Common Pentateuch rests on the shoulders of single, yet important exegetical observations, esp. regarding the redactional work in Deut 11:29–30 and 27:1–12 (“Mount Gerizim”). One would need a much broader literary historical focus<sup>124</sup> that takes into account the interdependent redactional processes of the Pentateuch<sup>125</sup> as well as of the Hexateuch (on the complex discussion see especially Achenbach in this volume<sup>126</sup>),<sup>127</sup> and – regarding the special role

<sup>115</sup> Diebner, “Genesis,” 81–98.

<sup>116</sup> Nihan, “Torah between,” 187–223.

<sup>117</sup> Pummer, “Pentateuch,” 239–247.

<sup>118</sup> Hensel, *Vertauschung*, 290–314, esp. 305–312; idem, *Juda und Samaria*, 170–178; idem, “Temple and Torah.”

<sup>119</sup> Nocquet, *Samarie*.

<sup>120</sup> Nocquet, “The Question of Israel’s Kinship with the Arameans: Rachel and Laban in Gen 31:1–32:1: A Samaritan Contribution?” (in this volume).

<sup>121</sup> Römer, “Cult Centralization,” 79–92.

<sup>122</sup> See Kühn, “Abraham in Sichem,” for a recent adaptation and discussion of the idea of a common Pentateuch, with several insightful ideas regarding the role of Gen 12:6–7 in this scribal interaction.

<sup>123</sup> See, e.g., Kratz, *Historisches und biblisches Israel*, 243–244.

<sup>124</sup> Fertile ground for future discussion is laid with the volume edited in 2018 by Kartveit and Knoppers: *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*. The volume comprises several in-depth studies on (postexilic) biblical texts showing possible Samaritan involvement.

<sup>125</sup> For a case study on the different, yet *concessive* concepts of cult centralization in the pentateuchal traditions in P and in Deuteronomy, see my “Debating Temple and Torah”; for P’s centralization idea, cf. also Nihan, “Cult Centralization,” 267–275.

<sup>126</sup> Achenbach, “Die Integration der heiligen Orte der Provinz Samaria in das Narrativ des Hexateuch.”

<sup>127</sup> It is open for discussion whether one should reckon with a Samaritan influence on the Hexateuch. If Römer is right that Josh 24 dates to the Persian period with its prominent northern “Samaritan” location, and it was created in order to produce a Hexateuch in the Persian Period and to integrate the book of Joshua into the Torah (Römer, “Doppelte Ende,” 523–548; Römer/Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 401–419), then this work could probably also be seen as a Judean-Samaritan co-production. In this scenario, Hexateuch and Pentateuch could be under-

of the book of Deuteronomy – also in the Deuteronomistic History.<sup>128</sup> This is especially clear if one does not limit Samaritan influence to the postexilic period alone, but reckons with a possible influence of the post-722 Samaritan group as outlined in section 2.4 above.<sup>129</sup>

Additionally, the current discussion of Samaritan involvement in the formation of the pentateuchal traditions should take the *complex negotiation process* of Judean – Samaritan interests more seriously. It is not just by small redactional additions or glosses that Samaritan interests are added here and

---

stood as competing book conceptions. Although the idea of a Hexateuch did not materialize in the end in a Torah containing six scrolls, the post-biblical traditions about Joshua amongst the Samaritans remained popular, as the Samaritan Chronicles of Joshua demonstrate (see Hjelm, *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty*, 195–210). Otto has a comparable concept of competing Hexa- and Pentateuch ideas in mind that propose competing concepts of “Israel” in the Persian Period: a “klein-judäische Lösung,” that is, the Pentateuch, and a “groß-israelitische Lösung,” that is, the Hexateuch with a notion of “Israel” that comprises Judean and Samaritan interests (see Otto, *Deuteronomium* 12,1–23,15, 1132–1133; in a similar way Achenbach, “Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch,” 122–154, differentiates between a “Hexateuch” redactor and a later “Pentateuch” redactor.

<sup>128</sup> One illustrative example is the different conceptual approach towards cult centralization in Deuteronomy and in DtrH. As argued in a detailed exegetical study on Deut 12:13–19 and related texts within Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History, I remain skeptical whether the first edition of the Deuteronomy (“Ur-Deuteronomy”) really does promote *pure Judean interests* as is commonly presumed (see Hensel, “Deuteronomium 12,13–19,” 9–43). This is mainly the case because of the historical connection of Ur-Deuteronomy’s core of Deut 12\* (and related texts) with Josiah’s cultic reform in the late monarchic era of Judah (cf. 2 Kgs 22–23\*), which was originally proposed by de Wette in the nineteenth century and had major impact on critical research of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The one *maqom* is not mentioned or named even in the presumably oldest core, Deut 12:13–19. Ur-Deuteronomy does *not* transmit an *exclusivist Judean* perspective. There is a lot that should be debated here – especially regarding what can be said about the historicity of the presumed cultic reforms in the late monarchic era and regarding the interrelation between Deuteronomy and the so-called Deuteronomistic History (Josh, Sam, and Kgs), to which Deuteronomy was subsequently linked (see Achenbach, “Die Integration der heiligen Orte der Provinz Samaria in das Narrativ des Hexateuch” in this volume), and which features a significantly Jerusalem-centered perspective on cultic affairs (on the first edition of Deuteronomy see now Achenbach, “Überlegungen,” 211–254). Despite many open questions there, I propose that already Deut 12:13–19 demonstrates a *certain awareness* or willingness to integrate Samaritan interests within the idea of centralization that might have developed in the time of late monarchy, or – a date to which I am more inclined – in the early exilic period. This concept of Ur-Deuteronomy, which I would call *concessive*, is even maintained when Deuteronomy was successively linked with the first editions of the Former Prophets (esp. Sam – Kgs; on the [possibility of] different and independent origins of Deuteronomy and DtrH see Schmid, “Deuteronomy,” 8–30), the latter of which presents a very Jerusalem-centered view. Deuteronomy is at every stage of the *Fortschreibung* left open for Samaritan contexts despite the deepened connections with (Josh –)Sam – Kgs Jerusalem perspective. Deuteronomy *does not adapt* to these specifications. Within Deuteronomy, the identification of the *maqom* with the temple in Jerusalem remains (also and especially because of the *qatal* form of the centralization formula) always a possible, but at no time an *exclusive* interpretation.

<sup>129</sup> This idea of a pre-Samaritan and post-722 BCE involvement in the pentateuchal traditions had been worked out in the case of Deut 12 (Hensel, “Deuteronomium 12,13–19,” 9–43; idem, “Temple and Torah”).

there to a more or less *predominantly Judean text*, as, e.g., Nihan<sup>130</sup> and Knoppers<sup>131</sup> maintain in the current debate. They argue in the case of the redactional additions Deut 11:29–30 and 27:1–12\* that Mount Gerizim is added to the list of *other legitimate sanctuaries*. This allowed, according to Nihan, “the coexistence of both cultic sites, *despite* the centralization law.”<sup>132</sup> I doubt the plausibility of this argument. This effectively implies a specific hierarchy, with Deuteronomy’s central shrine in Jerusalem being the “real temple” and Mount Gerizim being just another shrine included among the “several shrines” from the older altar law of the Exodus tradition in Exod 20:24–26 that is quoted in Deut 27:4–8\*. The opposite may be the case here. Of importance is the compositional emphasis accorded to Mount Gerizim, for the public ceremonies mentioned in Deut 11:26–32 and Deut 27:1–26 on Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal bracket the central legal collection (Deut 12–26; 28\*).<sup>133</sup> The redactional insertion of Deut 27:11–13 transfers the ceremony of blessing in Deut 28, which was originally located in Moab (Deut 28:69), to *inside* the land: to Mount Gerizim. Moab in this way becomes, as Otto fittingly formulated, “a gateway station on the way to Mount Gerizim” (“eine Durchgangsstation auf dem Weg zum Berg Garizim”).<sup>134</sup> In this way, the Samaritan sanctuary becomes the actual *destination of Deuteronomy*. With Mount Gerizim standing at such strategic positions, it seems clear that the interpolation is not only a *concession* towards Samaritan interests. It is more so an *acknowledgment of the importance* of the northern sanctuary. This suggests that Samaritan leaders or scribes were able to promote their interests subtly but effectively through the common redaction of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy’s redactional additions articulate specific *Samaritan interests*, with which Judeans *had to* or *wanted to* agree. Within the pentateuchal traditions, the Priestly document also seems to bear several concessionary strategies. But as Rhyder demonstrates,<sup>135</sup> the Priestly writings promoted *Judean interests* and implied a certain Judean-Samaritan hierarchy in cultic issues.<sup>136</sup> Additionally, as Heckl argues in this volume,<sup>137</sup> a process of transformation of cultic conceptions took place within the redactional work of the Priestly texts of the Pentateuch, which effectively rendered cultic affairs in the existing postexilic sanctuaries located in Palestine.

<sup>130</sup> See Nihan, “Torah between,” 190–193.

<sup>131</sup> Knoppers, “Northern Context,” 162–183.

<sup>132</sup> Nihan, “Torah between,” 216; regarding Deut 27:1–12 see also Knoppers, “Northern Context,” 162–183 with similar observations.

<sup>133</sup> For a similar observation see Knoppers, “Northern Context,” 162–183.

<sup>134</sup> Otto, *Deuteronomium* 23, 16–34, 12, 1930.

<sup>135</sup> Rhyder, *Centralizing the Cult*.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. also Rhyder’s essay in this volume: “Unity and Hierarchy: North and South in the Priestly Traditions.”

<sup>137</sup> Heckl, “The Temple within the Book and Its Function: Considerations on the Cultic Conception of the Composition of the Torah” (in this volume).

A further example that promotes Samaritan or Judean interests under the surface for the “Concessive Torah” is the Joseph-Judah narrative in Gen 37–50.<sup>138</sup> One could interpret this narrative (at least at its latest redactional layer) as an ideological text negotiating Samaritan–Judean interests during the Persian period. Joseph (= Samaria) is the blessed firstborn and thus privileged among his brothers in Israel. The key passage Gen 50:15–21 states that Joseph/Samaria is responsible for the survival of the whole Israel (and thus also for Judah). Judah, on the other hand, the Davidic tribe (!), never receives an explicit blessing. This is also true for the whole Torah (no explicit blessing is stated in Deut 33 either). But, as a sort of compensation, Judah receives “political power” among his brothers (cf. Gen 49:8–12).

To sum up the discussion here: the emphasis on unity, concessions, or collaboration in the current debate on a Common Pentateuch/Torah *does not simply mean* that the scribes imagined total *equality* between Samaria and Judah. This complexity should be taken into account when developing redactional models of the genesis of the Pentateuch and Hexateuch.

The cases presented here demonstrate that the idea of a Common Pentateuch needs some necessary clarification and modifications. Nevertheless, the fundamental theory that the Pentateuch should be understood as a co-production is still a viable model that acknowledges the historical roles of Judeans and Samaritans as well as several observations in the text itself.

#### 4.2 *The Pentateuch as an Inclusive Foundational Document of Israel for Different Yahwistic Groups: A Modification of the Theory of the Common Pentateuch/Torah*

One modification of the theory that comes from the observations made in this essay is that the theory should probably be extended to the whole phenomenon of diversity. The Pentateuch thus promotes a *pan-Israelite* notion of “Israel” (including not only Judah, Samaria, and other groups). The Torah ultimately offers a *diaspora perspective* between Egypt and Mesopotamia, which is only interrupted by a short “guest appearance by the patriarchs as foreigners in their own land.”<sup>139</sup> The Joseph story also appears to integrate the Egyptian diaspora into the conception of Israel in Genesis and the Torah as a whole.<sup>140</sup> According to Schmid (in this volume), also the redactional work in Gen 28\* (Gen 28:14) offers a seemingly *pro-diaspora* perspective, as the exiles are positively framed

<sup>138</sup> Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 183–187.

<sup>139</sup> Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte*, 141; see also Edelman et al. (ed.), *Religion in the Achaemenid Persian Empire: Emerging Judaism and Trends*.

<sup>140</sup> Römer, “Joseph Story,” 185–201.

as “blessing for the nations.”<sup>141</sup> Furthermore, the integration of Esau/Edom into the Israelite family (Gen 33:1–17\*) may reflect the existence of an Edomite/Idumean Yahwistic group in existence from the exilic period onwards. The positivity *towards Edom* observed here adds to similar cases of supposedly late origin found in other parts of the pentateuchal traditions, such as Num 20:14; Deut 2:4–5; 23:7–8; cf. also Amos 1:11, which have not yet received a satisfactory explanation. One may add here the exilic redactional insertions into the Abraham narrative (e. g., Gen 12:10–20; 16\*)<sup>142</sup> that strongly connect Abraham with the Idumean/Edomite region. This could be interpreted as several yet different traditions of exilic or early-Persian origin that reflect a concessive strategy towards the neighboring Yahwistic community in Idumea. One gets the impression that the Pentateuch creates a kind of a *counter-image* to the overwhelmingly negative exilic and postexilic picture of Edom in other parts of the biblical literature, thereby emphasizing the “Israel” – Edom connection in a positive way, resulting (esp. in Gen 33:9–11) in the *theological integration of Edom* (meaning Edomite/Idumean Yahwists, non-Judean Yahwists, or whatever we might call the Yahwists outside the Judean territory) into the pentateuchal conception of pan-Israel.<sup>143</sup>

It can therefore be concluded that the Torah attempts to establish an *inclusive* foundational myth of Israel for the *different Yahwistic groups*. The fact that the redactional closure of the Torah takes place in the Persian period appears to determine the essential existence of Yahwistic diversity within the final form of the Torah. This perspective sees the Pentateuch as creating a *normative account* or narrative presentation of characteristics and criteria common to all groups on the “Israelite” cultural spectrum. The Torah is formulated in such a way that each group can find their interests represented by leaving gaps when it comes to specific cultic issues. The various groups could fill in the gap in the context of their respective community. The most illuminating example for this concessive strategy concerns the location of the legitimate cultic site, which is never specified in Deuteronomy, the Priestly writings, or the overall Pentateuch.

#### 4.3 Different Ideas of “Israel” within the Hebrew Bible

*Outside the Torah*, this compromise was disputed. What is more, the mainly Judean traditions of the Nevi'im and Ketuvim show rather different opinions, such as when the Deuteronomistic History (Josh – Kgs) clearly points to Jerusa-

<sup>141</sup> See Schmid, “The Diaspora as a Blessing for the Nations: The Case of Gen 28:14” (in this volume).

<sup>142</sup> See Lipschits/Römer/Gonzalez, “The Pre-Priestly Abraham Narratives,” 292–296.

<sup>143</sup> See Hensel, “Tightening the Bonds between Edom and Israel” for a detailed redactional-critical analysis of Gen 33:1–17\*, the formation of pre-Priestly Jacob cycle, and the first edition of the Patriarchal Narrative (Abraham-Jacob).

lem as the *only* legitimate *maqom* (see above, section 4.1) – a view that is even further sharpened in Ezra – Nehemiah and Chronicles (see above, section 2.1). Also, the “Israel” imagined in Ezra – Nehemiah is not the pan-Israel of the Pentateuch, but an exclusivist concept comprising only the Judean returnees from exile.<sup>144</sup> On the other hand, the Common Torah is also consistent with various postexilic texts, in particular from the prophetic tradition, which nourished hopes of the restoration of “all Israel” following the exile (see, e. g., Jer 30:3, 8–9; 31:27–28, 31–34; Ezek 34:23–21; 37:15–28; Obad 18–21; Isa 11:11–16; Jer 3:18; Zech 9:9–13; 10:6–10). Also Chronicles provides a pan-Israelite notion of “biblical Israel” (all twelve tribes, therefore *including* Samaria; and maybe also referring to other diaspora groups) comparable to that in the Pentateuch.<sup>145</sup> There are even some strong indicators that the book of Chronicles might share a similar positive perspective on the “Edomites” (Idumeans?; Yahwists inside Edom/Idumea?; ex-Judeans?) as found in the Pentateuch (see above). As Tebes recently argued, the book of Chronicles – written in the late Persian or early Hellenistic period – exhibits genealogical lists linking Judean and Edomite families or clans through the repetition of their eponyms’ names. Standing prominently in these lists are names of members of Judean and Simeonite clans that are paralleled in the names of the descendants of Esau and Seir (cf., e. g., Gen 36:11 with 1 Chr 4:15).<sup>146</sup> There are also some hints that may indicate conflict and negotiation over the holding of cultic positions in the Jerusalem temple by personnel of Edomite (Idumean?) origin, such as the presence of characters within the Chronicler’s narrative of “Edomite” or – as Tebes terms it – “Edomizing” names (e. g., “Obed Edom” from 2 Sam 6:10–12, repeated several times in 1 Chr 13:13–14; 15:18, 21, 24–25; 16:5, 38; 26:1–19; 2 Chr 25:24; “Kushaiah” in 1 Chr 15:17, cf. 1 Chr 6:44; 2 Chr 29:12, and “Barkos” in Ezra 2:53; Neh 7:55). There are certainly many open questions with regard to the details in the case of Chronicles, and not all cases discussed by Tebes are compelling, but Tebes (also in his discussion of earlier scholarship) generally makes a good case that the (Judean) book of Chronicles offers a very clear intention of “including at least some Edomite clans within the realm of the larger Israelite family, thus echoing the picture given by the contemporary Idumean Aramaic ostraca.”<sup>147</sup>

Detlef Jericke’s contribution in this volume offers the intriguing thesis that the complex literary-historical and textual-historical development of 1 Sam 1–4 might be the result (at least at the latest stages of the text) of a literary construction combining elements of the temple in Jerusalem (the temple building

<sup>144</sup> On the postexilic concepts of “Israel” within Ezra – Nehemiah, see Weingart, *Stämmevolk*, 67–94; and Häusl, “Einleitung,” 9–31, esp. 19–22.

<sup>145</sup> Jonker, “Defining All-Israel in Chronicles.”

<sup>146</sup> Tebes, “Memories of Humiliation,” 124–154, esp. 133–136.

<sup>147</sup> Tebes, “Memories of Humiliation,” 133.

at Shiloh) with aspects of the Samaritan cult on Mount Gerizim (the Shilonite priesthood). According to Jericke, several observations in the text elucidate why the place names Shiloh, Shechem, and Jerusalem/Salem were interchangeable in the LXX tradition (cf. Josh 24 and Jer 41 [Jer 48 LXX]).<sup>148</sup>

Overall, the discourse surrounding the definition of “Israel,” its “cultic affairs,” and whether it did or did not include Samaria and other diaspora groups shows that the external borders of “Israel” – together with its internal structures and distinctions – were still undergoing a process of negotiation at this time. Apparently, for Judah there was no getting around these other Yahwisms (especially Samaria) during this period – at least for the time being. The identification and then total equation of “Israel” with its denomination “Judah” became the prevalent term in religious history and politics from the Hasmonean time onwards (at the latest), as Ska (in this volume) has demonstrated.<sup>149</sup>

#### 4.4 *Textual Traditions and Yahwistic Variety*

The negotiation process of “Israelite” identity not only affects the literary production of the Hebrew Bible but also its textual transmission. As this is a wide field, I will limit myself to a few illuminating examples from the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua that demonstrate the ongoing discussion about the legitimacy of Samaritan cult in the textual transmission of the text form that eventually becomes the Masoretic Text – examples from other areas of the Hebrew Bible are explored in the essays by Achenbach (on Josh 8 and Deut 27),<sup>150</sup> Schorch (on Josh 8/MT),<sup>151</sup> Kartveit (on Deut 18:18),<sup>152</sup> Dinkelaker (on Gen 2:2),<sup>153</sup> and Robker (on 2 Kgs 17)<sup>154</sup> in this volume.

A later reworking of the concessive Pentateuch in favor of the Jerusalem temple would be the change in Deut 27:4 from “Gerizim” to “Ebal” in the Judean traditions, which is then taken up by the even later addition of Joshua 8:30–35

<sup>148</sup> Jericke, “Shiloh between Shechem and Jerusalem” (in this volume).

<sup>149</sup> See Ska, “Why is the Chosen People Called Israel and Not Judah?” (in this volume). Additionally, for the development of the “Israel” designation among Judeans and Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman period see Böhm, “Wer gehörte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit zu ‘Israel’?” 181–202.

<sup>150</sup> Achenbach, “Die Integration der heiligen Orte der Provinz Samaria in das Narrativ des Hexateuch” (in this volume).

<sup>151</sup> Schorch, “Where is the Altar? Scribal Intervention in the Book of Joshua and Beyond” (in this volume).

<sup>152</sup> Kartveit, “The Tension between the Law and the Prophets as a Background to the Formation of the Samaritan Pentateuch” (in this volume).

<sup>153</sup> Dinkelaker, “Gen 2:2 Reconsidered: Marginal Notes on a Peculiar Variant in Samaritan, Greek, and other Manuscripts” (in this volume).

<sup>154</sup> Robker, “Die Texttraditionen von 2. Könige 17 als Spiegel der Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Juden und Samaritanern” (in this volume).

MT.<sup>155</sup> The change in Deut 27:4 effectively dismisses the positive connotation of the altar building on Mount Gerizim in Deut 27 (see above, section 4.1). The change is made *after* the main redaction of the Torah. As I have explored before,<sup>156</sup> the replacement of Mount Gerizim by Mount Ebal may have happened in the context of the parting of the ways of the Samaritan and Judean groups in the second century BCE; but this is also possible at an earlier point in the Hellenistic period, when the Samaritan-Judean relations began to sour.

The anti-Samaritan change of Mount Gerizim/Mount Ebal could be connected with the change from the past tense בָּחַר (*qatal*) in reference to the “chosen place” in Deut 12:1–31 and in the centralization formula<sup>157</sup> to the futuristic formula in the MT (יִבְחַר/Q). Schenker has shown that the use of the past tense is supported in Greek manuscripts, which are unrelated to the Samaritan traditions, and which therefore may reflect to original reading of Deuteronomy.<sup>158</sup> The original past tense allows the identification of the further unnamed *maqom* with either Jerusalem or Mount Gerizim – in my view the name of the one *maqom* was purposely left open, as the whole Torah is a Samaritan–Judean compromise document. The later change to the future tense in the Judean textual tradition makes it very clear that only Jerusalem is the chosen place, as יִבְחַר points *explicitly* to the election of Jerusalem and Judah reported – outside Deuteronomy (and the whole Torah, where Jerusalem is not mentioned) – in Samuel and 1–2 Kings.<sup>159</sup> Jerusalem is exclusively interpreted as “the place that I will choose” – Mount Gerizim is delegitimized.

However, the Samaritans also added group-specific textual layers to their versions of the Torah which later became the Samaritan Pentateuch. Certain textual changes expand the Ten Commandments by adding after Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:18 a range of texts taken from Exod 13:11a; Deut 11:29b; 27:2b–3b, 4a (SP), 5–7,<sup>160</sup> which all emphasize the legitimacy of Mount Gerizim as the place that YHWH has chosen. By means of these changes, Mount Gerizim or Mount Zion were interpreted as the only legitimate representation of the one cultic place in Israel. The Hasmonean destruction of Mount Gerizim is a tangible manifestation of this interpretation process.

<sup>155</sup> On Josh 8:30–35 see Nihan, “Torah between,” 217–222; for the secondary character of Josh 8 cf. Müller, “The Altar on Mount Gerizim,” 214.

<sup>156</sup> See Hensel, *Juda und Samaria*, 244–245.

<sup>157</sup> Deut 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16; 17:8, 10; 18:6; 26:2; 31:11.

<sup>158</sup> See Schenker, “Le Seigneur,” 339–351; idem, “Textgeschichtliches zum Samaritanischen Pentateuch,” 105–121; cf. Schorch, “The Samaritan Version of Deuteronomy and the Origin of Deuteronomy,” 23–37. For a different view see Heckl, who argues for the *yiqtol* of the MT as the original reading, see Heckl, “Überlegungen,” 191–208.

<sup>159</sup> See, e.g., 1 Kgs 14:21; cf. Ps 78:68 on the election of the Davidic Dynasty, king of Judah in Jerusalem.

<sup>160</sup> See Pummer, *Samaritans in Josephus*, 25–26 for a discussion of the text.

## 5. Conclusions and Perspectives for Future Research

One underlying perspective of this essay concerns the observation that a *broad variety* of different Yahwistic groups existed *inside* and *outside* Judah during the sixth to first century BCE. As has been proposed in this essay, this period had a major impact on the religious, theological, *and* literary histories of early Judaism as well as on Samaritanism. This leads to the main observation: the formation process of early Judaism takes place as the *complex and multilayered process of negotiation between diverse Yahwistic groups*. Most important are the groups within the Judean and the Samaritan spectrum. Current research has seen several important and fruitful studies that address the phenomenon of exilic and postexilic diversity. Yet, those works primarily focus on historical aspects. The field of Hebrew Bible studies would need further research into how this diversity influenced the *history of theology* – as the epoch in question here also witnessed the shaping other central identity markers, such as the institution of the central temple and the Torah – and the *literary history of the Hebrew Bible*. Each of the various groups could at least potentially serve as primary influencers in the interplay of early Judaism's history of a) theology, b) religion (formation of identity markers of early Judaism, religious-social group formation), and c) biblical and extra-biblical Judean/Jewish literature.

Overall, one would wish to see more research done attempting a *comprehensive description* of the religious, political, literary, and sociological history of the phenomenon of diversification within exilic and postexilic Yahwism. The guiding question concerns the appropriate comprehension of the emergence of early Judaism as one leading Yahwistic group in this diverse context, but also an illumination of the literary history of the Hebrew Bible in the Second Temple period. In order to address the question, it is essential to separate the overall understanding of the formative phase of early Judaism, Samaritanism, Yahwism(s), and the Hebrew Bible from the image mirrored in the Bible, which itself was determined by the Jerusalem scribal elite of postexilic Yahwism in Judah. One must also take *the different levels of importance* for the various types of Yahwism into account. Samaria and Judah were certainly more influential and formative than other diaspora groups. Three goals should be pursued in this enterprise:

- 1) descriptions of the various Yahwistic groups in the southern Levant through discussion of the available archaeological, epigraphic, iconographic, and literary sources;
- 2) an in-depth investigation of the relationships and interactions between these groups; and
- 3) an evaluation of the nature of participation by the various groups in the scribal processes of Judaism's formative period on display in its religious literatures.

## 6. Overview of This Volume

This volume offers a comprehensive overview and several in-depth case studies on the phenomenon of Yahwistic diversity and its influence on the formation of the Hebrew Bible. The essays focus upon a wide range of important topics regarding the relation of regional diversity of Yahwism on the one hand, and the formation of biblical literatures at the other. This volume is intended to be the first of several volumes addressing this very phenomenon. To start with, the essays gathered here address variations of Yahwisms, specifically Samaritans and Judeans, and how their interactions and relations are displayed and reflected in biblical traditions. This horizon explicitly includes the *textual history* of biblical texts. Despite its Samaria – Judah focus, the essays place their observations within the broad perspective of Yahwistic diversity. Especially the essays by *Konrad Schmid*, *Jean Louis Ska*, and *Veit Dinkelaker* focus on different forms of “Israel” – outside the Palestine heartland (Samaria and Judah).

The first part of this volume deals with the “negotiation processes” of the identity of “Israel” and the different Judean, Samaritan, and diaspora perspectives that become tangible within various pentateuchal traditions and within the corpora of the Pentateuch and the Hexateuch itself. *Reinhard Achenbach’s* essay, “Die Integration der heiligen Orte der Provinz Samaria in das Narrativ des Hexateuch,” offers a big-picture outline of the genesis and pragmatics of the hexateuchal composition from Genesis to Joshua, which in particular poses the question of the centralization law (with its original version – according to Achenbach – in Deut 6:4–5; 12:14\*, 15–18, 21, 26) against the historical background from the fifth century BCE, when a sanctuary on Mount Gerizim existed alongside the one in Jerusalem. Achenbach offers a detailed literary-historical reconstruction of the development of the idea of cult centralization and the integration of Mount Gerizim into the framework of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic narrative (e.g., in case studies of the texts of Deut 11:26–32; 12:2–7; 27:1–13, 14–25; Exod 20:24–25; Josh 8:30–35; and their textual variants). In light of these observations, Achenbach develops a detailed picture of how the position of the Gerizim sanctuary was repeatedly negotiated in different periods.

*Konrad Schmid* focuses in his essay, “The Diaspora as a Blessing for the Nations: The Case of Gen 28:14,” on the literary growth of Gen 28:10–22 (Jacob’s dream at Bethel) and its historical contexts. In terms of literary formation, the Jacob cycle (Gen 25–35) is one of the most complex texts of the Hebrew Bible. It probably grew into its current shape over several centuries (ca. ninth to fourth cent. BCE). The story about Jacob’s dream in Bethel (Gen 28:10–22) mirrors that complexity within a short passage. It is commonly acknowledged that the promise in Gen 28:13–15 does not belong to the original core of the story, but is an exilic or postexilic redactional supplement that – in conjunction

with Gen 12:1–3 – serves to establish the overall composition of the ancestral story in Gen 12–50. Genesis 28:13–15 formulates a promise to Jacob in Bethel that his offspring will spread out to the cardinal directions of the world and all people will be blessed by this offspring. According to Schmid, this idea is remarkable in two ways. Firstly, it seems to evaluate Israel's diaspora existence positively – which stands in stark contrast to the Hebrew Bible's prophetic tradition that usually identifies it as a curse. Secondly, it is striking that Jacob's dream vision of the diaspora is located in Bethel, i. e., in the North. This essay strives to elucidate the theological program of Gen 28:13–15 and to offer a historical explanation for this text.

In his essay, “The Question of Israel's Kinship with the Arameans: Rachel and Laban in Gen 31:1–32:1: A Samaritan Contribution?” *Dany Nocquet* deals with Gen 31:1–32:1, an episode that belongs to the Travel Narratives of the Pentateuch, emphasizing the importance and the vital necessity of the return to Canaan for Jacob and his family. A first reading of Gen 31 points out how Rachel's theft of the teraphim of Laban, her father, is the center of the text. In Nocquet's understanding of this episode, it highlights one of the major issues of Jacob's departure from Harran. The separation between the family of Laban and the family of Rachel/Leah/Jacob is not only a territorial separation, but also a religious rupture between Aram and Israel. Nocquet's analysis evaluates the history of the text and the different levels of scripture of Gen 31 in order to establish the different periods of redaction. He concludes that the final stage of Gen 31 is a late one. Focusing on the issues related to the relationships between Jacob and his wives, the theft of the teraphim by Rachel, and the kinship between Aram and Israel, these thematics are seen as late additions in the text. Nocquet therefore suggests that the overall development of Gen 31 – describing in quite positive terms the unity between Rachel, Leah, and Jacob, the ancestors of the northern Israel, separating themselves from the cultic behavior of Laban the Aramean with his teraphim – is probably a production of the Samaritan community on Mount Gerizim during the late Persian period.

*Julia Rhyder* in her essay, “Unity and Hierarchy: North and South in the Priestly Traditions,” examines selected Priestly texts that describe the roles of leaders from the northern and southern tribes in the wilderness cult: the texts of Exod 25–31; 35–40 that concern the sanctuary artisans Bezalel (from the tribe of Judah) and Oholiab (from the tribe of Dan), chosen to lead the construction of the wilderness shrine; the description in Num 1–10 of the positions assumed by the tribes and their leaders in the wilderness camp; and the reference to the Judahite chief Nahshon in the genealogy of Phinehas preserved in Exod 6:13–27. On the basis of this analysis, the essay argues that the Priestly materials preserve subtle evidence of “Judean bias” in the description of the foundational cult, in which southern leaders are subtly affirmed and the north is given a secondary role. This observation presents a challenge to recent studies

which have argued that Samaritan and Judean priestly scribes played equal roles in the shaping of the Priestly materials, or that northern scribes were principally responsible for their composition. It rather suggests a reduced influence of cultic leaders from Gerizim on the formation of the Priestly materials when compared to the influence exercised by scribes from Judah, even at very late stages of their development. Rhyder concludes by considering the significance of this evidence for reconstructing possible scribal interventions by both Samaritan and Jerusalem authorities in different pentateuchal traditions, and for interpreting the Pentateuch as the common scriptures of diverse groups of YHWH-worshippers in the Persian period.

In his essay, “The Temple within the Book and Its Function: Considerations on the Cultic Concept of the Composition of the Torah,” *Raik Heckl* focuses on the pentateuchal conceptualization of cultic affairs and the temple itself. In Heckl’s view, Neh 10:33–34 presupposes the restoration of rites of reconciliation like Lev 16 at the Second Temple. However, the Bible also testifies that the cultic devices that served at the First Temple to convey the gift of reconciliation remained lost. Heckl argues against theses which assert that the beginning of a process of transformation of cultic concepts already took place in the pentateuchal description of the sanctuary and its cult *before* the reconstruction of the Second Temple. Instead, the Pentateuch was neither intended to replace the cult nor did its composition create a process of metaphorization and transformation. The description of the wilderness shrine and the description of the cultic institutions within the Priestly texts of the Pentateuch rendered the cult effective in the existing postexilic sanctuaries located in Palestine, that is: in Jerusalem and on Mount Gerizim.

The second part of the volume treats the ongoing debates outside the Pentateuch and Hexateuch (thus within a mainly Judean environment) and their historical developments as well as their literary, text-historical, and theological reflections in the formation processes of the Hebrew Bible. *Jean Louis Ska* in his essay, “Why is the Chosen People Called Israel and Not Judah?” starts his inquiry with the initial observation that the name “Israel” appears in many places where one would expect the name “Judah.” Beginning with Ezra – Nehemiah and going mainly through prophetic texts such as Isa 40–55, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Micah, and Isa 1–39, Ska explores the origin(s) of this phenomenon. It is in some Isaianic oracles that one finds the most interesting statements about the new relationship between Israel and Judah, specifically in Isa 5:1–7, the song of the vineyard. “Israel” is the vineyard and “Judah” becomes the choice vine. A short survey of the historical background of these affirmations concludes the study and shows that the kingdom of Judah was subordinate to the kingdom of Samaria for a long time, up to the latter’s integration into the Neo-Assyrian Empire.

*Hervé Gonzalez* and *Marc Mendoza*’s essay, “What Have the Macedonians Ever Done for Us? A Reassessment of the Changes in Samaria by the Start of the

Hellenistic Period,” reassesses the socio-political changes that affected the city of Samaria and its surroundings by the start of the Hellenistic period. They argue in particular that the recurrent idea – based on Eusebius and George Syncellus – that Alexander the Great transformed the city of Samaria into a Macedonian colony does not fit with Alexander’s well-known settlement policies. Alexander punished the Samarian rebels, but he did not deeply transform the city; at most he may have left a non-Macedonian garrison – either Greek or Asiatic. And, therefore, neither Shechem nor the city on Mount Gerizim would have been rebuilt by Samaritans unwilling to live in a Macedonian colony immediately after Alexander’s punishment. During the Diadochi wars, the region changed hands many times. The city could have undergone some changes under Perdiccas and/or, more probably, under the Antigonids, although some of them could have been only temporary. In 312/1 BCE, military intervention by Ptolemy had a more lasting impact, since he not only destroyed the city but also displaced some local population to Egypt during his retreat. Later, new policies of land distribution and exploitation reshaped its settlement in order to maximize agricultural production, especially in western Samaria. Together with cultic factors, they provoked movements of the local population, especially to Shechem and the city on Mount Gerizim, as well as to southern Samaria, where rural settlements increased. Hence, rather than a punctual, radical transformation of the city right after Alexander’s arrival as scholars usually envisage, the analysis proposed here points to a process marked by a series of war events, as well as the enforcement of military and agricultural policies, especially in the third century, which progressively transformed the city of Samaria and the settlement patterns of its region.

*Stefan Schorch’s* essay, “Where is the Altar? Scribal Intervention in the Book of Joshua and Beyond,” addresses the complex history of the altar account and its re-localization in the different textual traditions of Josh 8:30–35 (Masoretic Text), the Greek version, and 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> (= 4Q47). It explores the literary context of the altar account (especially the connection with the altar law in Deut 27), as well as the relationships between the three textual traditions. Schorch investigates whether the literary re-localization of Joshua’s altar attested in 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> took the proto-MT or the *Vorlage* of the Greek versions as its point of departure. Among the three different literary embeddings of the altar account, it is highly likely that the MT preserved the oldest version, while 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> – dependent on the edition preserved in the Greek version – exhibits the latest stage. It is Schorch’s thesis that the profound reworking of the altar account and its literary embeddings point to an extraordinary motivation, most probably aiming at different conceptions of sacred geography in the Hellenistic period.

In “Shiloh between Shechem and Jerusalem,” *Detlef Jericke* deals with the various and changing (with the textual transmission of the text) meanings of “Shiloh” in the biblical traditions of 1 Sam 1–4 and related texts. According to Jericke,

the story of 1 Sam 1–4 describes a sanctuary at Shiloh in pre-monarchic times (eleventh cent. BCE), including a temple building, the ark of the covenant, and the tent of meeting. The archaeological finds at the site of biblical Shiloh show no evidence of such a sanctuary or a holy place. Following Jericke, it would therefore seem likely that the sanctuary mentioned in 1 Sam 1–4 is the result of a literary construction combining elements of the temple in Jerusalem (the temple building at Shiloh) with aspects of the Samaritan cult on Mount Gerizim (the Shilonite priesthood). The different appraisal of Phinehas, the priest, in the text of 1 Sam 1–4 and in the Gerizim inscriptions indicate that the biblical story can be understood as part of the constructive dispute between the two Yahwistic sanctuaries in Judah and Samaria in the Persian and Hellenistic periods. These observations elucidate why the place names Shiloh, Shechem, and Jerusalem/Salem were interchangeable in the LXX tradition, cf. Josh 24 and Jer 41 [Jer 48 LXX].

In “The Tension between the Law and the Prophets as a Background to the Formation of the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *Magnar Kartveit* explores the expression and the historical origins of “the Law and the Prophets,” a standard expression for the Hebrew Bible around the turn of the era, which represented something like a name. In the prologue to the book of Sirach and in the New Testament, this phrase refers to the core of the Bible as it then existed.<sup>161</sup> In both instances, a reference to the third part of the emerging Tanakh may be added: in the prologue to Sirach, “the others [i. e., books] that followed them,” “the other books of our ancestors,” “the rest of the books,”<sup>162</sup> and in the New Testament, “Psalms.”<sup>163</sup> Also in Qumran, the “Law” and the “Prophets” together referred to Scripture.<sup>164</sup> “The Law and the Prophets” in these texts is a phrase used as if the two parts of Scripture were companions, residing peacefully together. With a look at earlier and contemporary texts, however, Kartveit sketches a scenario where the two seem to have been competitors. This competition concerned the paramount question of revelation: Who is the legitimate mediator between God and the people? Moses and the Prophets offered different answers to this question. Kartveit traces this struggle between the Law and the Prophets in texts from the Pentateuch, Malachi, Qumran, and the Samaritan Pentateuch.

*Veit Dinkelaker* explores the different textual traditions of Gen 2:2 in his essay, “Gen 2:2 Reconsidered: Marginal Notes on a Peculiar Variant in Samaritan, Greek, and other Manuscripts.” The reading “God finished his works on the sixth day” (Gen 2:2) – attested in LXX and SP – contrasts the MT reading “God

<sup>161</sup> In the prologue to the book of Sirach, the verses 1, 8–10, 24–25; cf. Matt 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 20:40; Luke 16:16, 29, 31; 24:44; John 1:45; Acts 13:15, 39–41; 24:14; 26:22; 28:23; Rom 3:21.

<sup>162</sup> Sir verse 1: διὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων; Sir verses 8–10: τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατριῶν βιβλίων; 20:24–25: ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων.

<sup>163</sup> Luke 24:44: ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς.

<sup>164</sup> CD VII, 14–18; 1QS VIII, 15–16.

finished his works on the seventh day.” It may reflect ancient cultic calculations of diverse groups of Judaism and Samaritanism in the Palestinian heartland and in the diaspora, as attested in the book of Jubilees as well as calendar texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls discovered in the Qumran caves. That God finished all his works on the sixth day is also of significance in Philo’s theology of creation and other Jewish literature of that period. The variant in Gen 2:2 is a key text-critical issue in critical editions of the Hebrew Bible. This underlines the diversity of texts and traditions in emerging Judaism(s) and beyond in the Second Temple period.

Finally, the essay by *Jonathan Miles Robker*, “Die Texttraditionen von 2. Könige 17 als Spiegel der Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Juden und Samaritanern,” elucidates the complex textual history of the textual variants of 2 Kgs 17 – a text well known and used (especially by Josephus) for its anti-Samaritan polemics. Some variants in the versions of 2 Kgs 17 suggest later editorial activity in that chapter. Of particular interest in this capacity are variants within the Greek tradition and between the Greek versions and the Masoretic Text that suggest a later, more negative stance towards Samaritans than in the older versions. After introducing general issues surrounding this phenomenon, Robker focuses on variants in 2 Kgs 17:2, 5–7, 14, 19–20, 24, which demonstrate the development of the negative characterization of Samaritans.

With its broad variety of disciplinary aspects and positions, the present volume both sheds new light on an important topic and offers valuable perspectives for future research.

## Bibliography

- Achenbach, R., “Die Integration der heiligen Orte der Provinz Samaria in das Narrativ des Hexateuch,” in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
- , “Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch: Eine Verhältnisbestimmung,” *ZABR* 11 (2005): 122–154.
- , “Überlegungen zur Rekonstruktion des Urdeuteronomiums,” *ZABR* 24 (2018): 211–254.
- Assmann, J., *Exodus: Die Revolution der Alten Welt* (Munich, 2015).
- Bänzinger, T., “Jauchzen und Weinen”: *Ambivalente Restauration in Jehud. Theologische Konzepte der Wiederherstellung in Esra-Nehemia* (Zurich, 2014).
- Becker, U., “Jakob in Bet-El und Sichem,” in: *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition: Festschrift Matthias Köckert* (ed. A. C. Hagedorn/H. Pfeiffer; BZAW 400; Berlin, 2009), 159–185.
- Becking, B., “On the Identity of the ‘Foreign’ Women in Ezra 9–10,” in: *Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Construction of Early Jewish Identity* (idem; FAT 80; Tübingen, 2011), 58–73.
- , “The Idea of Torah in Ezra 7–10: A Functional Analysis,” *ZABR* 7 (2001): 273–286.

- Ben Zvi, E., "Total Exile, Empty Land and the General Intellectual Discourse in Yehud," in: *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts* (ed. E. Ben Zvi/C. Levin; BZAW 404; Berlin, 2010), 155–168.
- /Levin, C. (ed.), *Centres and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period* (FAT 108; Tübingen, 2016).
  - /Levin, C. (ed.), *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts* (BZAW 404; Berlin, 2010).
  - /Edelman, D.V. (ed.), *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period* (LHBOTS 591; New York, 2015).
- Blenkinsopp, J., "A Theological Reading of Ezra-Nehemia," *PIBA* 12 (1989): 26–36.
- Boccaccini, G., *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids, 2002).
- Böhm, M., "Wer gehörte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit zu 'Israel'? Historische Voraussetzungen für eine veränderte Perspektive auf neutestamentliche Texte," in: *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und samaritanischen Traditionen* (ed. J. Frey et al.; SJ 70/SSam 7; Berlin, 2012), 181–202.
- Bortz, A., *Identität und Kontinuität: Form und Funktion der Rückkehrerliste Esr 2* (BZAW 512; Boston, 2018).
- Cohen, S. J. D., *The Beginning of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 31; Berkeley, 1999).
- Davies, P. R., "Monotheism, Empire, and the Cult(s) of Yehud in the Persian Period," in: *Religion in the Achaemenid Persian Empire: Emerging Judaisms and Trends* (ed. D. V. Edelman/A. Fitzpatrick-McKinley/P. Guillaume; ORA 17; Tübingen, 2016), 24–35.
- Diebner, B. J., "Genesis als Buch der antik-jüdischen Bibel: Eine unhistorisch-kritische Spekulation," *DBAT* 17 (1983): 81–98.
- Dinkelaker, V., "Gen 2:2 Reconsidered: Marginal Notes on a Peculiar Variant in Samaritan, Greek, and Other Manuscripts," in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
- Dušek, J., *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes* (CHANE 54; Leiden, 2012).
- , "Mt. Gerizim Sanctuary: Its History and Enigma of Origin," *HBAI* 3 (2014): 111–133.
- Edelman, D. V., "Cultic Sites and Complexes beyond the Jerusalem Temple," in: *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah* (ed. F. Stavrakopoulou/J. Barton; London, 2010), 82–103.
- , "Introduction," in: *The Triumph of Elohim: From Jahwisms to Judaisms* (ed. D. V. Edelman; CBET 3; Kampen, 1995), 15–26.
  - , *The Origins of the 'Second' Temple: Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem* (London, 2005).
  - (ed.), *The Triumph of Elohim: From Jahwisms to Judaisms* (CBET 3; Kampen, 1995).
  - , et al. (ed.), *Religion in the Achaemenid Persian Empire: Emerging Judaisms and Trends* (ORA 17; Tübingen, 2016).
- Eskenazi, T. C., *In an Age of Prose: A Literary Approach to Ezra-Nehemiah* (SBLMS 36; Atlanta, 1988).

- Finkelstein, I., "Nehemiah's Adversaries: A Hasmonaean Reality?," *Transeu* 47 (2015): 47–55.
- / Singer-Avitz, L., "Reevaluating Bethel," *ZDPV* 125 (2009): 33–48.
  - Frevel, C., "Der Eine oder die Vielen? Monotheismus und materielle Kultur in der Perserzeit," in: *Gott – Götter – Götzen: XIV. Europäischer Kongress für Theologie (11.–15. September 2011 in Zürich)* (ed. C. Schwöbel; VWGTh 38; Leipzig, 2013), 238–265.
  - , *Geschichte Israels* (KStTh; Stuttgart, 2016).
  - / Pyschny, K., "A 'Religious Revolution' in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case: Introduction," in: *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (ed. C. Frevel/K. Pyschny; OBO 267; Fribourg, 2014), 1–22.
  - / Pyschny, K. (ed.), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case* (OBO 267; Fribourg, 2014).
  - Grabbe, L. L., "Many Nations Will Be Joined to YHWH in That Day': The Question of YHWH outside Judah," in: *Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah* (ed. F. Stavropoulou/J. Barton; London, 2010), 175–187.
  - Granerød, G., *Dimensions of Yahwism in the Persian Period: Studies in the Religion and Society of the Judaean Community at Elephantine* (BZAW 488; Berlin, 2016).
  - Grätz, S., "The Adversaries in Ezra/Nehemiah: Fictitious or Real?" in: *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers* (ed. R. Albertz/J. Wöhrle; JAJSup 11; Göttingen, 2013), 73–88.
  - Grohmann, M. (ed.), *Identität und Schrift: Fortschreibungsprozesse als Mittel religiöser Identitätsbildung* (BTS 169; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2017).
  - Häusl, M., "Einleitung: Begründungen für die Neukonstituierung des nachexilischen Israel," in: *Denkt nicht mehr an das Frühere! Begründungsressourcen in Esra/Nehemia und Jes 40–66 im Vergleich* (ed. M. Häusl; BBB 184; Göttingen, 2018), 9–31.
  - (ed.), *Denkt nicht mehr an das Frühere! Begründungsressourcen in Esra/Nehemia und Jes 40–66 im Vergleich* (BBB 184; Göttingen, 2018).
  - Heckl, R., "The Composition of Ezra – Nehemiah as a Testimony for the Competition Between the Temples in Jerusalem and on Mt. Gerizim in the Early Years of the Seleucid Rule over Judah," in: *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (ed. M. Kartveit/G. N. Knoppers; SJ 104/SSam 10; Berlin, 2018), 115–132.
  - , *Neuanfang und Kontinuität in Jerusalem: Studien zu den hermeneutischen Strategien im Esra-Nehemia-Buch* (FAT 104; Tübingen, 2016).
  - , "Remembering Jacob, in the Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Era," in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination* (ed. D. V. Edelman/E. Ben Zvi; Oxford, 2013), 38–80.
  - , "Die Rolle Samarias bei der Entstehung des Judentums: Auf dem Weg zu einer neuen Sicht der nachexilischen Geschichte Israels," *BZ* 62 (2018): 1–31.
  - , "The Temple within the Book and Its Function: Considerations on the Cultic Concept of the Composition of the Torah," in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
  - , "Überlegungen zu Form und Funktion der Zentralisationsformel im Konzept des samaritanischen Pentateuchs, zugleich ein Plädoyer für die Ursprünglichkeit der masoretischen Lesart," *ZABR* 23 (2017): 191–208.

- Hensel, B., "Die Bedeutung Samarias für die *formative Period* der alttestamentlichen Theologie- und Literaturgeschichte," *SJOT* 32 (2018): 20–48.
- , "The Chronicler's Polemics towards the Samaritan YHWH-Worshippers: A Fresh Approach," in: *The Samaritans in Historical, Cultural and Linguistic Perspectives* (ed. J. Dušek; SJ 110/SSam 11; Berlin, 2018), 35–47.
  - , "Cult Centralization in the Persian Period: Biblical and Historical Perspectives," *Sem* 60 (2018): 221–272.
  - , "Debating Temple and Torah in the Second Temple Period: Theological and Political Aspects of the Final Redaction(s) of the Pentateuch," in: *Construction of Ancient Judaism(s)* (ed. J. Schröter/M. Witte; TSAJ; Tübingen) (forthcoming).
  - , "Deuteronomium 12,13–19: Zur Lokalisierung des einen Maqom," *BN* 182 (2019): 9–43.
  - , *Juda und Samaria: Zum Verhältnis zweier nach-exilischer Jahwismen* (FAT 110; Tübingen, 2016).
  - , "On the Relationship of Juda and Samaria in Post-Exilic Times: A Farewell to the Conflict Paradigm," *JSOT* 44.1 (2019): 19–42.
  - , "Tightening the Bonds between Edom and Israel (Gen 33:1–17\*): On the Further Development of Edom's Role within the *Fortschreibung* of the Jacob Cycle in the Exilic and Early Persian Periods," *VT* (forthcoming).
  - , *Die Vertauschung des Erstgeburtsegens in der Genesis: Eine Analyse der narrativ-theologischen Grundstruktur des ersten Buches der Tora* (BZAW 423; Berlin, 2011).
  - , "Von 'Israeliten' zu 'Ausländern': Zur Entwicklung anti-samaritanischer Polemik ab der hasmonäischen Zeit," *ZAW* 126 (2014): 475–493.
- Hjelm, I., *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition* (JSOTSup 404; London, 2004), 195–210.
- Jericke, D., "Shiloh between Shechem and Jerusalem," in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
- Jonker, L. C., *Defining All-Israel in Chronicles: Multi-levelled Identity Negotiation in Late Persian-Period Yehud* (FAT 106; Tübingen, 2016).
- Kartveit, M., *The Origin of the Samaritans* (VTSup 128; Leiden, 2009).
- , "The Temple of Jerusalem as the Centre of the Affairs in the Book of Chronicles," in: *Centres and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period* (ed. E. Ben Zvi/C. Levin; FAT 104; Tübingen, 2016), 229–242.
  - , "The Tension between the Law and the Prophets as a Background to the Formation of the Samaritan Pentateuch," in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
  - /Knoppers, G. N. (ed.), *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (SJ 104/SSam 10; Berlin, 2018).
- Knauf, E. A., "Bethel: The Israelite Impact on Judean Language and Literature," in: *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (ed. M. Oeming/O. Lipschits; Winona Lake, 2006), 291–349.
- , "The Glorious Days of Manasseh," in: *Data and Debates. Essays in the History and Culture of Israel and Its Neighbours in Antiquity* (ed. H. M. Niemann/K. Schmid/S. Schroer; AOAT 407; Münster, 2013), 251–275.

- /Guillaume, Ph., *A History of the Biblical Israel: The Fate of the Tribes and Kingdoms from Merenptah to Bar Kochba* (Worlds of the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean; Sheffield, 2016).
- Knoppers, G. N., “Aspects of Samaria’s Religious Culture During the Early Hellenistic Period,” in: *The Historian and the Bible: Essays in Honour of Lester L. Grabbe* (ed. R. P. Davies/D. V. Edelman; LHBOTS 530; London, 2010), 159–174.
- , *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (New York, 2013).
- , “The Northern Context of the Law-Code in Deuteronomy,” *HBAI* 4 (2015): 162–183.
- Knowles, M. D., *Centrality Practised: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud and the Diaspora in the Persian Period* (Atlanta, 2006).
- Kottsieper, I., “Die Religionspolitik der Achämeniden und die Juden von Elephantine,” in: *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden* (ed. R. G. Kratz; VWGTh 22; Gütersloh, 2002), 150–178.
- Kratz, R. G., *Historical and Biblical Israel* (trans. P. M. Kurtz; Oxford, 2015).
- , *Historisches und biblisches Israel: Drei Überblicke zum Alten Testament* (Tübingen, 2013).
- , “Statthalter, Hohepriester und Schreiber im perserzeitlichen Juda,” in: *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (R. G. Kratz; FAT 42; Tübingen, 2004), 93–119.
- , “Zwischen Elephantine und Qumran: das Alte Testament im Rahmen des antiken Judentums,” in: *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 133; Leiden, 2010), 129–146.
- Kühn, D., “Abraham in Sichem (Gen 12,6–7): Der Pentateuch als theologisches Gemeinschaftsprojekt im entstehenden Judentum,” *TQ* 199 (2019): 19–33.
- Lemaire, A., *Collections Moussaïeff, Jeselsohn, Welch et divers*, Vol. 2 of *Nouvelles Inscriptions araméennes d’Idumée* (Suppléments à Transeuphratène 9; Leuven, 2002).
- , *Levantine Epigraphy and History in the Achaemenid Period (539–332 BCE)* (Oxford, 2015).
- Lipschits, O., “Bethel Revisited,” in: *Rethinking Israel: Studies in the History and Archaeology of the Ancient Israel in Honor of Israel Finkelstein* (ed. O. Lipschits/Y. Gadot/M. J. Adams; Winona Lake, 2017), 233–245.
- , “Persian-Period Judah: A New Perspective,” in: *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Post-exilic Literature: Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts* (ed. L. Jonker; FAT II/20; Tübingen, 2011), 187–211.
- /Römer, T./Gonzalez, H., “The Pre-Priestly Abraham Narratives from Monarchic to Persian Times,” *Sem* 59 (2017): 261–296.
- Lux, R., “Der König als Tempelbauer: Anmerkungen zur sakralen Legitimation von Herrschaft im Alten Testament,” in: *Sakralität von Herrschaft: Herrschaftslegitimierung im Wechsel der Zeiten und Räume: Fünfzehn interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu einem weltweiten und epochenübergreifenden Phänomen* (ed. F. R. Enkers; Berlin, 2002), 99–122.
- , “Der zweite Tempel von Jerusalem: ein persisches oder prophetisches Projekt?” in: *Das Alte Testament: ein Geschichtsbuch? Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsüberlieferung im antiken Israel* (ed. U. Becker/J. van Oorschot; ABG 17; Leipzig, 2005), 145–172.
- Lynch, M., *Monotheism and Institutions in the Book of Chronicles: Temple, Priesthood, and Kingship in Post-Exilic Perspective: Studies of the Sofja Kovalevskaja Research Group on Early Jewish Monotheism*, Vol. 1 (FAT II/64; Tübingen, 2014).

- Meerson, M., "One God Supreme: A Case Study of Religious Tolerance and Survival," *JGRChJ* 7 (2010): 32–50.
- Müller, R., "The Altar on Mount Gerizim (Deuteronomy 27:1–8): Center or Periphery?," in: *Centres and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period* (ed. E. Ben Zvi/C. Levin; FAT 104; Tübingen, 2016), 197–214.
- Neusner, J./Green, W.S./Frerichs, E. (ed.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Nihan, C., "Cult Centralization and the Torah Traditions in Chronicles," in: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of Torah* (ed. P. Dubovský/D. Markl/J. P. Sonnet; FAT 107; Tübingen, 2016), 253–288.
- , "The Torah Between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua," in: *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G. N. Knoppers/B. M. Levinson; Winona Lake, 2007), 187–223.
- /Gonzalez, H., "Competing Attitudes toward Samaria in Chronicles and Second Zechariah," in: *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (ed. M. Kartveit/G. N. Knoppers; SJ 104/SSam 10; Berlin, 2018), 93–114.
- Nocquet, D., *La Samarie, la Diaspora et l'achèvement de la Torah: territorialités et internationalités dans l'Hexateuque* (OBO 284; Fribourg, 2017).
- , "The Question of Israel's Kinship with the Arameans: Rachel and Laban in Gen 31:1–32:1: A Samaritan Contribution?" in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
- Nodet, É., *A Search for the Origins of Judaism: From Joshua to the Mishnah* (JSOTSup 248; Sheffield, 1997).
- Oswald, W./Tilly, M., *Geschichte Israels: Von den Anfängen bis zum 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Darmstadt, 2016).
- Otto, E., *Deuteronomium 12,1–23,15*, Vol. 1 of *Deuteronomium 12–34* (HThKAT; Freiburg, 2016).
- , *Deuteronomium 23,16–34,12*, Vol. 2 of *Deuteronomium 12–34* (HThKAT; Freiburg, 2017).
- Pakkala, J., "The Exile and the Exiles in the Ezra Tradition," in: *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts* (ed. E. Ben Zvi/C. Levin; BZAW 404; Berlin, 2010), 91–101.
- Pearce, L. E./Wunsch, C. (ed.), *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer* (CUSAS 28; Bethesda, 2014).
- Pilgrim, C. von, "Der Jahwe-Tempel," *MDAIK* 55 (1999): 142–145.
- Porten, B./Yardeni, A., "The House of Baalrim in the Idumean Ostraca," in: *New Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumean, and Cuneiform* (ed. M. Lubetski; HBM 8; Sheffield, 2007), 99–147.
- , "Why the Unprovenienced Idumean Ostraca Should be Published," in: *New Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumean, and Cuneiform* (ed. M. Lubetski; HBM 8; Sheffield, 2007), 73–98.
- , (ed.), *Dossiers 1–10: 401 Commodity Chits*, Vol. 1 of *Textbook of Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea* (Winona Lake, 2014).
- Pummer, R., "Samaritanism: A Jewish Sect or an Independent Form of Jahwism?," in: *Samaritans: Past and Present: Current Studies* (ed. M. Mor/F. V. Reiterer; SJ 53/SSam 5; Berlin, 2010), 1–24.

- , *The Samaritans: A Profile* (Grand Rapids, 2016).
- , “The Samaritans and Their Pentateuch,” in: *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G. N. Knoppers/B. M. Levinson; Winona Lake, 2007), 237–269.
- , *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus* (TSAJ 129; Tübingen, 2009).
- Reuter, J., *Ordnungen des Anderen: Zum Problem des Eigenen in der Soziologie des Fremden* (Bielefeld, 2002).
- Rom-Shiloni, D., “The Untold Stories: Al-Yahūdu *and* or *versus* Hebrew Bible Babylonian Compositions,” *WO* 47 (2017): 124–134.
- Rhyder, J., *Centralizing the Cult: The Holiness Legislation of Leviticus 17–26* (FAT 134; Tübingen, 2019).
- , “Unity and Hierarchy: North and South in the Priestly Traditions,” in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
- Robker, J. M., “Die Texttraditionen von 2. Könige 17 als Spiegel der Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Juden und Samaritanern,” in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
- Römer, T., “Cult Centralization and the Publication of the Torah Between Jerusalem and Samaria,” in: *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (ed. M. Kartveit/G. N. Knoppers; SJ 104/SSam 10; Berlin, 2018), 79–92.
- , “Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um ‘deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk’ und ‘Hexateuch,’” *ZAW* 118 (2006): 523–548.
- , “The Joseph Story in the Book of Genesis: Pre-P or Post-P?” in: *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (ed. F. Giuntoli/K. Schmid; FAT 101; Tübingen, 2015), 185–201.
- /Brettler, M. Z., “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 401–419.
- Rohrmoser, A., *Götter, Tempel und Kult der Judäo-Aramäer von Elephantine* (AOAT 396; Münster, 2014).
- Rosenberg, S. G., “The Jewish Temple at Elephantine,” *NEA* 67 (2004): 4–13.
- Rütterswörden, U., *Deuteronomium* (BKAT V/3.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2011).
- Schenker, A., “Le Seigneur choisira-t-il le lieu de son nom ou l’a-t-il choisi? L’apport de la Bible grecque ancienne à l’histoire du texte samaritain et massorétique,” in: *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitila/J. Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden, 2008), 339–351.
- , “Textgeschichtliches zum Samaritanischen Pentateuch, und Samareitikon,” in: *Samaritans: Past and Present: Current Studies* (ed. M. Mor/F. V. Reiterer; SJ 53/SSam 5; Berlin, 2010), 105–120.
- Schipper, B. U., *Geschichte Israels in der Antike* (Beck Wissen 2887; München, 2018).
- Schmid, K., “The Diaspora as a Blessing for the Nations: The Case of Gen 28:14,” in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).

- , “Deuteronomy within the ‘Deuteronomistic Histories’ in Genesis–2 Kings,” in: *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. K. Schmid/R. Person; FAT II/56; Tübingen, 2012), 8–30.
- , *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung (Studienausgabe)*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 2014).
- , “Overcoming the Sub-Deuteronomism and Sub-Chronicism of Historiography in Biblical Studies: The Case of the Samaritans,” in: *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (ed. M. Kartveit/G.N. Knoppers; SJ 104/SSam 10; Berlin, 2018), 17–29.
- Schmitz, B., *Geschichte Israels*, 2nd ed. (Grundwissen Theologie/UTB; Paderborn, 2014).
- Schorch, S. “The Construction of Samari(t)an Identity from the Inside and from the Outside,” in: *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers* (ed. R. Albertz/J. Wöhrle; JAJSup 11; Göttingen, 2013), 135–149.
- , “The Samaritan Version of Deuteronomy and the Origin of Deuteronomy,” in: *Samaria, Samaritans and Samaritans: Studies on Bible, History and Linguistics* (ed. J. Zsengellér; SJ 66/SSam 6; Berlin, 2011), 23–37.
- , “Where is the Altar? Scribal Intervention in the Book of Joshua and Beyond,” in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
- , (ed.), *Leviticus*, Vol. 3 of *The Samaritan Pentateuch: A Critical Editio Maior* (Berlin, 2018).
- Ska, J.L., “Why is the Chosen People Called Israel and Not Judah?,” in: *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions* (ed. B. Hensel/D. Nocquet/B. Adamczewski; FAT II; Tübingen) (in this volume).
- Spivak, G. C., “The Rani of Sirmur,” in: *Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature, July 1984*, Vol. 1 of *Europe and Its Others* (ed. F. Barker et al.; Colchester, 1985), 128–151.
- Stern, E., “From Many Gods to the One God: The Archaeological Evidence,” in: *One God – One cult – One nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (ed. R. G. Kratz/H. Spieckermann; BZAW 405; Berlin, 2010), 395–403.
- , “The Religious Revolution in Persian-Period Judah,” in: *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (ed. O. Lipschits/M. Oeming; Winona Lake, 2006), 199–205.
- Tebes, J. M., “Memories of Humiliation, Cultures of Resentment towards Edom and the Formation of Ancient Jewish National Identity,” *Nations and Nationalism* 25 (2019): 124–145.
- Tilly, M./Zwickel, W., *Religionsgeschichte Israels: Von der Vorzeit bis zu den Anfängen des Christentums* (Darmstadt, 2011).
- Tiwald, M., *Das Frühjudentum und die Anfänge des Christentums: Ein Studienbuch* (BWANT 208; Stuttgart, 2016).
- Valkama, K., “What Do Archaeological Remains Reveal of the Settlements in Judah during the Mid Sixth Century BCE?,” in: *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts* (ed. E. Ben Zvi/C. Levin; BZAW 404; Berlin, 2010), 39–59.
- Weingart, K., *Stämmevolk – Staatsvolk – Gottesvolk? Studien zur Verwendung des Israel-Namens im Alten Testament* (FAT II/68; Tübingen, 2014).
- Weippert, M., “Geschichte Israels am Scheideweg,” *TRU* 58 (1993): 71–103.

- Wellhausen, J., *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6th ed. (Berlin, 1905).
- Williamson, H. G. M., "The Torah and History in Presentations of Restoration in Ezra-Nehemiah," in: *Reading the Law. Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham* (ed. J. G. McConville/K. Möller; London, 2007), 156–170.
- Wöhrle, J., "The Un-Empty Land: The Concept of Exile and Land in P," in: *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts* (ed. E. Ben Zvi/C. Levin; BZAW 404; Berlin, 2010), 189–206.
- Wright, J. L., *Rebuilding Identity: The Nehemiah-Memoir and Its Earliest Readers* (BZAW 348; Berlin, 2004).
- Yardeni, A., *The Jesselsohn Collection of the Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea* (Jerusalem, 2016).
- Zsengellér, J., "Egytemplomúság – a kultushely kizárólagossága Izrael teológiájában és vallásgyakorlatban," in: *Textus és kontextus: Az Ószövetség megértésének lehetőségei* (ed. J. Zsengellér; Budapest, 2011), 130–187.