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Introduction

Unwittingly or not, (Andrew) Jackson himself touched on this feeling in a proclamation he ordered read at the head of each corps of his army near New Orleans on January 21, 1815…Jackson proclaimed: ‘Natives of different states, acting together, for the first time, in this camp; differing in habits and in language, instead of viewing in these circumstances the germ of distrust and division, you have made them the source of an honorable emulation, and from the seeds of discord itself have reaped the fruits of an honorable union.’”

--Walter Borneman, “1812: The War that Forged a Nation”. ¹

The Purposes of Ethnicity

It is not easy to create an identity, and once created, it is probably impossible to make it stand still, as Andrew Jackson would eventually discover to his deep regret. In this speech, given after the Battle of New Orleans, and well before his presidency, Jackson was clearly gesturing towards the transformative power of shared conflict to dissolve differences, a power demonstrated again and again.² But within 20 years, Jackson would find himself so opposed to the Southern sympathies of his own Vice President, the fierce South Carolinian John C. Calhoun, that he would force the latter’s

² Certain recent approaches to ethnicity actually give considerable credit to conflict for its creation. As Miller notes, referring specifically to ancient Israel “although one often thinks of ethnic conflict taking place between quite different groups, studies show that ethnic conflict often occurs between similar groups, sparked by internal debates over who is truly ‘one of us’ and who is not” (Miller, J.C., 2008, 174). Brubaker adds “it seems to be mere common sense to treat ethnic struggles as the struggles of ethnic groups, and ethnic conflict as conflict between ethnic groups….I agree that this is the—or at least a—commonsense view of the matter. But…apart from the general unreliability of ethnic common sense as a guide of social analysis we should remember that participants’ accounts…often have what Pierre Bourdieu has called a performative charter. By invoking groups, they seek to evoke them, summon them, call them into being” (Brubaker 2004, 9–10).
resignation, serving without a Vice President for an entire year. And this collision of sympathies was only a prelude, of course to Civil War, an event in which the identity, “American”, like America itself, was a category taken apart and put back together. The point, where this introduction is concerned, is not that American identity was unstable in the early 19th century, but quite the opposite: that where identity is concerned, this fluidity represents business as usual.

The subject of this study is biblical history, largely the narrative spanning from Genesis to the end of 2 Kings, as well as the same story, presented differently, in the books of Chronicles. The term “biblical” history is, of course, a problem, and it is worth stating at the outset why I will use it, despite difficulties, and what I mean by it, and by the related term “biblical identity”. What I am particularly concerned about is two common but contradictory definitions of the term “biblical literature”. On the one hand there are those for whom material which ultimately appears in the finished Bible is in some sense always biblical, and for whom there is no reason to imagine a considerable difference between how an 8th century B.C.E. text might be read in the 8th century and how it is read in its biblical context. Others are troubled by the other end of biblical history, in which context what matters is that the full, fixed canon of biblical literature did not appear until centuries later, and even the Dead Sea Scrolls, largely dating from

---

3 In this he may have done a little better than Thomas Jefferson, whose Vice President, Aaron Burr, is still, and presumably forevermore, the only one to have killed a political opponent in a duel while in office.

4 As Lincoln puts it, “because there are virtually infinite grounds on which individual and group similarity/dissimilarity may be perceived and the corresponding sentiments of affinity/estrangement evoked, the borders of society are never a simple matter. In practice there always exists potential bases for associating and for dissociating one’s self and one’s group from others, and the vast majority of social sentiments are ambivalent mixes…such borders being neither natural, inevitable, nor immutable, affinity may in the course of events come to predominate over estrangement, with the consequent emergence of a new social formation in which previously separate social groups are mutually encompassed” (Lincoln, Bruce 1989, 10).
the 2nd century B.C.E to the first century C.E., make clear that though its major components had all been written by that point, a “biblical” canon remained in considerable flux, still. Thus, using the term “biblical” literature even in the Persian period, which is largely the focus of this study, is fairly fraught.

There is more merit, in my opinion, in this cautious second approach than the first. We now seem to know that even the same story told in two different contexts can have considerably different meanings, a phenomenon which Stephen Greenblatt has called “representations”, noting that these are “relational, local, and historically contingent” and that they are “not only products but producers, capable of decisively altering the very forces that brought them into being” (Greenblatt 1991, 6). Irad Malkin has already applied the idea of representations to ancient Mediterranean myth, to, in my opinion, brilliant effect. In this important sense, both retelling and preserving a narrative or tradition in and into dramatically new contexts produces different meanings meant to serve different purposes. Thus, our confidence as scholars that we can read an early text as it was read in its pre-biblical form should be low, even if we acknowledge that the Bible does indeed contain early texts.

However, as I hope to demonstrate, the evidence suggests that at least the biblical historical narrative, the arc of history from Genesis through 2 Kings, was largely intact by the end of the Persian period, something we can see particularly in two observations: 1) Malkin notes “representations change throughout the centuries,” and in this book he describes investigating the Return of the Herakleidai charter myth of Spartan colonization, in his words, “at one point in terms of continuous validation of the Spartan royal houses, at another in terms of its impact on and use for legitimating the attempts of the Spartan Dorieus to settle in western Sicily at the end of the sixth century, at a third point in terms of its relationship to the religious festival of the Karneia, and at a fourth in relation to the Dorian invasion” (Malkin 1998, 22–23).
this narrative sequence appears in nearly identical form in the books of Chronicles and 2) the primeval history and other key elements of the narrative arc do not appear anywhere else in biblical literature. Thus, it seems to be the case that “biblical history”, defined in this way, appeared at the latest at the time of the construction of the Chronicles genealogy which will be a significant focus of the following study (1 Chron 1:1-9:1a) and that it may have appeared in full for the first time in this period. Given how distinct this sequential vision is from what came before and how similar to what comes after, even if its ultimate home is within a much larger canon, it is possible to talk about “biblical history” already at this period and the identity articulations present within this historical vision as “biblical identity”, if we are cautious to note that the Bible contains many conflicting identity statements within and without the Genesis-2 Kings collection.

What I am most interested in with respect to this narrative arc are the ramifications of the increasingly visible intentionality of its creation. While many of the traditions used in the construction of biblical history are likely to be quite old, with substantial texts dating to the exilic period and certain other elements to perhaps considerably before, if the connections between this material are late additions, we can nevertheless credit the creation of these connections with considerable disruptive power towards the earlier purposes and meanings which inspired the composition of these older elements. 6 In this sense, we can imagine that the construction of the biblical historical narrative serves a single purpose and is meant to present a single vision of Judahite identity even as the peculiar methodology of biblical construction (through the

---

6 Indeed, as Carr notes, even in the time of Ben Sira in the 2nd century B.C.E., “it appears that he knows of a Judean literary complex much like the later Hebrew Bible, but its constitution and status are still in flux” (Carr 2011, 193). A crucial point is that “Persian-period texts…lack strong reflections of the broader Pentateuch we now have” (212). For another useful discussion see Satlow 2014, 69–84.
juxtaposition of texts rather than free compositions) preserved multiple visions thereof. This singular vision, created in a period subsequent to most of its contents, was probably crafted to serve the needs of that late period, not the former one, and in cross-cultural comparison usually does so.\(^7\) More than that, as I will discuss more fully in a moment, modern studies of ethnicity seem continually to suggest that we should see the expression of continuity with previous epochs visible in biblical literature as itself aimed towards an ethnogenetic purpose, and probably altered by that purpose.\(^8\) The apparent stability of ethnic identities over time is a well-known feature of ethnicity called “primordialism.” The functionality of primordialism should be a serious check on our efforts to derive Israelite history from biblical literature.

It is in this sense that what I will refer to as biblical identity is the product of an active project of what we might call “biblicization,” the strategic handling of biblical texts through an encompassing genealogical system which is the product of the Persian period, of the 5\(^{th}\) and 4\(^{th}\) centuries B.C.E.\(^9\) This system, I believe, operates as a kind of taxonomy, and both smoothes out the disjunction between the identity articulations which arise out of previously independent narratives and imposes order and new meaning on the whole, as a whole. This study takes aim at the import of actively marking the distinction

\(^7\) Barth noted, in his seminal study of ethnicity, “we give primary emphasis to the fact that ethnic groups are categories of ascription and identification by the actors themselves” (Barth 1998, 10). These tend to be moving targets over time.

\(^8\) As Bayart puts it, “everyone is given to tinkering with his or her identity, depending on the alchemy of circumstances. To that extent, the idea of continuity is debatable. It suggests too strongly that we belong to one, aggregate identity, which is supposed to dictate our interests and passions, whereas we tend to situate ourselves with respect to a ‘plurality of partially disjunctive, partially overlapping communities’” (Bayart 2005, 95).

\(^9\) Satlow argues, as I and others argue, that “the story of Jacob’s twelve sons…is an etiological one,” and notes that “the myth of the ‘children of Israel’ served a necessary strategic function” (Satlow 2014, 20). As will become clear, we do not necessarily agree on what that function is, but the evidence for its functionality is crucial to many new directions in biblical literature.
between the biblical, as an *inclusio*, and the histories of its narratives prior to becoming biblical. Is “the biblical” something that developed slowly over time? Or is it rather the name of a process acting *upon* narratives which developed over time, selecting, supplementing, orchestrating, and curating them, in the process granting them new meanings, perhaps even ones that would be unrecognizable to their original authors? Throughout this study, I will approach this question from many directions, but, obviously, I lean towards the latter interpretation.

In this introduction, however, I intend only to take up the conceptual issues relating to fluidity in ethnic formulations and their bearing on how we understand the Bible as a performative ethnic charter.

**“Conversational” Ethnicity**

If the Bible, at least the historical narratives described above, is an ethnic charter, then genealogy is its frame. As a book, genealogy is its spine, or perhaps its table of contents. There have been, especially in the ancient world, other attempts to organize an ethnic history through genealogy, notably in the Greek world, and the two are a good match for each other: large, segmented genealogies have many of the same conceptual issues as ethnicity itself.\(^{10}\) Just as ethnic articulations tend to be both primordialist and

\(^{10}\) Genealogy has largely lost its currency for ethnic articulations in the western world, but it remains a major mechanism of social ordering in certain other places. In anthropological research, the complex tribal structures of tribes like the Nuer and the Dinka are a common object of study. As Brubaker notes, “one could…argue that all the lineages connected through intermarriage constitute the ‘Nuer’ as an identity distinct from ‘Dinka.’…but recent work in African history offers a more nuanced perspective. The genealogical construction of relatedness offers possibilities for extension that are obscured by the contemporary scholars’ tendency to look for a neat boundary between inside and outside…Strangers—
instrumentalist, so too myth genealogies seem to be unstable combinations of an overt stability and an implicit fluidity. But, if this contradiction is surmountable in ethnic formulations because these gain a great deal of their functionality through stressing the stability and hiding the fluidity, the problem, as many scholars have noted, is that in genealogy both flexibility and stability are inherently, constantly, and seemingly counter-productively visible.\(^{11}\) And yet, this difference is more apparent than real. Ethnicity, too, constantly demonstrates its own fluidity and nowhere is this more visible than in what we might call the mutual intelligibility or “conversationality” of certain ethnic articulations. In other words, ethnicity may be nearly as malleable, and in similar ways, as genealogy.

Just as in genealogies, while distinction is consistently at the heart of many ethnic articulations, if we examine them more closely we can often see a species of outreach across distinctions which should not exist if those distinctions are to be taken at face value.\(^{12}\) In many cases, indeed, ethnic articulations sometimes seem to derive their power from their ordering of other, as much as self.\(^{13}\) It is common enough for ethnic formulations to appear to reach across constructed ethnic borders to express a kind of encountered via trade, migration, or other form of movement—could be incorporated as fictive kin” (Brubaker 2004, 50).

\(^{11}\) As Brubaker puts it, “The problem with subsuming these (genealogical) forms of relational connectedness under the ‘social construction of identity’ is that linking and separating get called by the same name, making it harder to grasp the processes, causes, and consequences of differing patterns of crystallizing difference and forging connections.”

\(^{12}\) As Barth writes, in his seminal study of ethnicity “the term ethnic group is generally understood in anthropological literature to designate a population which…has a membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order” (Barth 1998, 11). Miller adds “ethnicity is not a thing or a collective asset of a particular group; it is a social relation in which social actors perceive themselves and are perceived by others as being culturally distinct collectivities” (Miller 2008, 12; Malešević 2004, 4).

\(^{13}\) Bayart argues that this is generally the case, that “we identify ourselves less with respect to membership in a community or a culture than with respect to the communities and cultures with which we have relations. Well known to theoreticians of ethnicity and nationalism, this phenomenon is more widespread. In the Cevennes region of southern France, for instance, Catholic and Protestant identities are defined much more in relation to each other than in themselves and in relation to their own doctrines” (Bayart 2005, 95).
relationality which ethnicity itself would seem to forbid, what Barth called “embracing social systems (Barth 1998, 10–11).\textsuperscript{14} In other cases, some formulations of internal identity seem deliberately meant to be comprehensible externally.\textsuperscript{15} The idea that ethnic ideas can be shaped, at least to some degree, by the desire to be in conversation with the ethnic ideas of contemporaries, whether directly or through defining them as well, reveals the negotiable nature of ethnic distinctions. As Miller puts it,

The fact that boundaries are created that discriminate between social groups does not mean boundaries are impermeable…the permeability of ethnic boundaries stems from the situational, dynamic social process of identity formation. Group identity is always being redefined in subtle ways. In the process, boundaries can be opened as well as closed (J. C. Miller 2008, 174).

We can call this “conversational” because it reveals certain ethnic articulations as the product of inputs from both insiders and outsiders. In certain cases “conversational” ethnicity is, all things considered, fairly one-sided; it is quite possible for an invitation to social belonging to be refused, or even for it to be merely aspirational or imagined, never actually extended.\textsuperscript{16} But in many cases, ties extended across purported borders are accepted, with diverse consequences.

\textsuperscript{14} As Barth puts it, “it is clear that boundaries persist despite a flow of personnel across them. In other words, categorical ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact and information, but do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation whereby discrete categories are maintained \textit{despite} changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories. Secondly, one finds that stable, persisting, and often vitally important social relations are maintained across such boundaries, and are frequently based precisely on the dichotomized ethnic statuses. In other words, ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of social interaction and acceptance, but are quite to the contrary often the very foundation on which embracing social systems are built” (Barth 1998, 10).

\textsuperscript{15} Geary, for example, has drawn attention to the fact that many modern European nationalist groups locate their origins in a shared theater of action, in medieval population movements, and this is hardly likely to be coincidence: “The first century for the Germans, the fifth for the Franks, the sixth and seventh centuries for the Croats, the ninth and tenth for the Hungarians…” (Geary, Patrick J. 2002, 12).

\textsuperscript{16} It is worth asking how often a desire for mutual intelligibility across borders is a component of an ethnic articulation and it is worth wondering whether it is, in its own way, as influential as primordialism in shaping the construction of ethnicities. Mutual intelligibility is far from a constant concern, which can also be said about primordialism.
And importantly, what extended ties ultimately, in the words of Malkin, “gain historical force” is not always based on visible logic, though this is not to say it is entirely random (Malkin 1998, 8). It might seem to us perfectly reasonable for the Persians, for example, to reject a Greek etiology extended to them by Greeks through the figure of Perseus (Hdt 7.61.3 for example), as it is perfectly reasonable that, as we will see, the Spartans chose to extend the narrative of Herakles as historical progenitor from Argos to their own monarchy. The former appears to transgress some natural boundary, between Persians and Greeks, the latter to confirm one, between two groups of Greeks. But this is a product of the success of ethnic claims, not a reflection of an objective reality. We can note, for example, that the Etruscans do seem to have accepted the narrative of descent from Odysseus extended to them by Greeks, through no logic which could not also justify Persian subscription to Perseus (Malkin 1998, 8–9). And what are we to think of a group such as the Macedonians? In the fourth century B.C.E., in Athens, Demosthenes furiously attacked Phillip for being a barbarian, and Isocrates lauded him for his descent from Herakles, a starting point for somewhat recent debates in modern Macedonia. As Hall notes,

Herodotos personally guarantees the Hellenic pedigree of both the Macedonian rulers and...their subjects…Thucydides (2.99.3) appears to accept the Hellenic

---

17 Although, according to Herodotus, the Persians were not above using this narrative to compel Greek surrender (Hdt 7.150.2). It is, as always, necessary to take Herodotus with several grains of salt.

18 “The question of the historical identity of the Macedonians has in recent years assumed particular salience in the wake of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia’s declaration of independence on 8 September 1991…The starting point for this debate is inevitably the political melee waged by fourth-century Attic orators over the merits or dangers of an ‘alliance’ with the Macedonian king Philip II. Demosthenes (3.16, 24) castigated Philip for failing to display the obeisance that the Greeks expected of a barbarian and characterized him as ‘neither a Greek nor a remote relative of the Greeks, nor even a respectable barbarian, but one of those cursed Macedonians from an area where in former times you could not even buy a decent slave’ (9.31). Conversely, Isocrates defended Philip’s lineage by drawing attention to his ancestors’ origins in Peloponnesian Argos and his descent from the Panhellenic hero Heracles (Isocrates Philippus 32-34, 76-77)” (Hall 2001, 159).
descent of the Macedonian rulers but not of their subjects…Brasidas’s speech to his Peloponnesian troops…tells them that their previous encounters with the Macedonians should dispel any fear of fighting with the barbarians (4.126.3). Less than a century earlier, Hecataeus of Miletus (FGrH 199) observed that much of northern Greece was inhabited by “barbarians” (Hall 2001, 160).

Indeed, it seems quite clear that even in the time of Plato, the “Greekness” of groups we might consider much more stably “Greek” than the Macedonians was still sometimes in question. The implication, as Bayart puts it, is that “there is no natural identity capable of imposing itself on man by the very nature of things” (Bayart 2005). This is a finding which, on the whole, scholars of the ancient world have not been particularly apt at grappling with.

At any rate, it seems that in-group and out-group logic has a habit of disappearing when convenient, even between groups which we are accustomed to thinking of as particularly far flung. As Cohn notes,

Otherness…is less an objective reality…than it is a way of relating, a consequence of interaction. While there are clear phenotypal, ethnic, social, cultural and religious differences among various human groups, the perception of difference is not essential, but functional; the same qualities that bind us together today may distinguish us from each other tomorrow. (Cohn 2003, 148–149).

---

19 As he further notes, “the supposition that Macedonia was ‘peripheral’ to the Greek world assumes that there existed a core of Hellenic identity, but such a simplistic spatial conception of Greekness immediately encounters grave obstacles” (Hall 2001, 166).

20 “…Populations such as the Dryopes, who inhabited parts of Euboea, the Cyclades, and the Peloponnes…and the Caucones, who were thought to have occupied the western Peloponnesian prior to their expulsion and migration to Ionia…were not considered Hellenic by the ancients. Thucydides (2.68.5–6) vies the inhabitants of Amphilochian Argos as barbarians who, alone among the Amphilochians, learned the Greek language from the Ambracians… In the third century B.C., Heraclides Criticus could still define Greeks as those who not only spoke the Greek language but also traced their descent back to Hellen; a century earlier, Plato’s Aspasia denied the Greekness of the Boeotians and Peloponnesians on the grounds of their descent from “barbarians” such as Cadmus, Pelops, and Danaus (Plato Menexenus 245.c-d)” (Hall 2001, 166–167).

21 Another example is the Molossians of Epirus, who adopted Neoptolemus, son of Achilles as their ancestor, apparently to assert a newfound Greek ethnicity (Malkin 2001, 10).
This is not to say that all ethnic claims are utterly transient, only rhetorical, consistently fluid, though they are at times all three. On the contrary, however, ethnicity can be extraordinarily stable and enduring; although we can expect that a given ethnic idea does not necessarily consistently possess the same set of meanings through time (even as its strength comes from appearing to). Ancient Greek and Israelite identity has consistently exerted influence throughout history, while most of those discussed here have fallen by the wayside, and it is of course the case that for the Bible to appear as a document it was necessary for Judahite identity to survive many perils, as it has, in transmuted forms, continued to. But the volatility of ethnic articulations matters, and just as it is not always predictable what connections will be offered, it is not always clear what articulations will be enduring, or that they endure for reasons which are eminently logical and comprehensible.

The traditional view of the Bible’s account of Israelite and Judahite history has been that it is essentially a description of a people with a largely permanent sense of self across great turmoil, whose borders with other groups are the products of natural and comprehensible processes. In this way, Biblical Studies is largely out of step with current theories about what ethnicity is and how it operates.

**Primordialism and Instrumentalism**

Above, I described “primordialism”. The idea that ethnicities exist to achieve a purpose is called “instrumentalism”. The central conflict of ethnicity is simply that both primordialism and instrumentalism seem to be operational at once, and more than that it seems clearer than ever that since ethnicities are not naturally occurring, they exist where
evoked, and are evoked nearly exclusively for instrumentalist purposes, while at the same time they are usually received as natural, biological, and historical facts, in which context the idea that they are performative would seem not only strange but offensive. As Brubaker notes,

The evidence suggests that some commonsense social categories—and notably commonsense ethnic and racial categories—tend to be essentializing and naturalizing (Rothbart and Taylor 1992; Hirschfield 1996; Gil-White 1999). They are the vehicles of what has been called ‘participants’ primordialism’ (A. D. Smith 1998, 158) or a ‘psychological essentialism’ (Medin 1989, 1989)...We obviously cannot ignore such commonsense primordialism, but that does not mean we should simply replicate it in our scholarly analyses....As ‘analysts of naturalizers’ we need not be ‘analytic naturalizers’ (Gil-White 1999, 803)” (Brubaker 2004, 9).

How are we to talk about something that seems an inheritance from earlier periods, that in many cases is built around actually inherited materials, but that nevertheless would not exist if it did not contain the seeds of a present functionality?

Jonathan M. Hall, who, unlike many scholars of ethnicity, engages with the problem of ethnicity in the ancient world on a profoundly theoretical level, is particularly drawn to Bentley’s evolution of Bourdieu’s “theory of practice”.22 Here, an ethnicity

---

22 Another noteworthy attempt to grapple with ethnicity in the ancient world appears in the work of Smith, who directly criticizes what he calls the “modernist” position of scholars such as Benedict Anderson and Ernest Gellner who consider modern ethnicity to be essentially a product of processes associated with nationalism (A. D. Smith 1986, 10). As Smith notes “we find in the pre-modern areas, even in the ancient world, striking parallels to the modern idea of national identity and character” (A. D. Smith 1986, 11) Indeed, many modern theorists of identity and ethnicity falter when discussing the ancient world because of a tendency to take the scant testimony of a handful of ancient ethnopolitical entrepreneurs far more seriously, and with less critical distance, than those of more modern ethnic informers. Geary, for example, suggests that Herodotus had a “value-neutral” approach to ethnicity to which many later historians were reacting, one way or the other (Geary, Patrick J. 2002, 43–46), and that he “invented” ethnography, ignoring several earlier efforts (Geary, Patrick J. 2002, 43). It is unclear to me whether Herodotus’ opinion of ethnic differences makes his identification of them a fundamentally different species of activity than later efforts, but more important, by ignoring several less well-known examples of ethnographic literature, Geary gives Herodotus a monolithic importance which would have been quite out of step with the realities of his own time, and gives his presentation of ethnic difference a supposed audience far greater in size and extent than could have been the case, effectively making Herodotus the sole spokesman of the whole of the ancient Mediterranean, for many centuries.
may be passively (at least unconsciously) inherited “through an ethnic *habitus*”, but at the same time participants in an ethnic identity “are equally capable of modifying that *habitus* instrumentally in the pursuit of various goals” (Hall, Jonathan M. 1997, 17–18; Bentley 1987; Bourdieu 1977). This is a very useful idea and seems a quite reasonable expression of the dynamic between stability and volatility which characterizes ethnicity: it is something as much (or more) received than invented, often handed down over long periods of time, but invariably modified in ways great and small. In my own thinking, I also follow Brubaker who describes ethnicity largely as something done to groups of people by ethnopolitical entrepreneurs engaged in political projects, but received by those people as cognitive phenomena. As he puts it,

> The phenomena we call race, ethnicity, and nationality surely count among the most significant social and cultural structures…yet they continue to exist only by virtue of being reproduced daily in and through quotidian ways of thinking, talking, and acting” (Brubaker, Rogers 2004, 87).

And indeed, how we think and act in order to reify the ethnic is highly conditioned by quotidian experience which accounts for its transient, but very real stability: that is, as long as America *lasts*, there will be Americans, and they will imagine themselves in the mode of their forebears. This much is offered them by their participation in American social structures.

> The delicate balance between *habitus* and modification is, I think, in some ways a quite literal articulation of how I understand biblical literature and how I think it ought to be understood. The more ancient traditions of which biblical literature is composed are, in a sense, literary *habitus*, and their co-ordination into biblical literature, the, again, “biblicization” of these traditions, represents modification. And here we can re-state the
problem with which this study is largely concerned: in the history of biblical literature it has been common to minimize the transformative potential of modification (often to an extraordinary degree) and to, essentially, identify the Bible with its tradition histories, as if these traditions were always in the process of becoming biblical. I think, and will attempt to demonstrate, that the series of edits and framing effects that I will isolate as instrumentalism-related modifications is what makes biblical literature, imposing truly new readings on what has been received, while what came before is better understood as unincorporated Israelite and Judahite literatures. The apparent dominance of habitus instead, according to traditional scholarship, is related not to a literary reality but rather to the discursive power of primordialism, which has everywhere been so effective in naturalizing ethnic claims.

The implications of this section and the previous one gain an increased urgency if a new idea in biblical studies should turn out to be viable. By and large, biblical history is dominated by a connection, nearly always presented as perfectly natural, between the historically separate kingdoms of Israel and Judah. This new idea, called “Panisraeliteism,” by analogy to Panhellenism, suggests that the ethnic unity the Bible presupposes between these two is rather an invention of a period just after the fall of the

23 An extraordinary example of this kind of thinking is Joel Baden’s recent attempts to revive a rather traditional Documentary Hypothesis. He suggests, for example, that “the idea of the redactor(s) of the Pentateuch is necessitated only by the existence of four continuous, coherent, originally independent documents that have been combined into a single story in the canonical text” and “all that we can and should ask of the compiler is the combination of sources into a single story—no more, no less” (Baden 2012, 218). But even in more nuanced pictures, it is common to dismiss the power of rearrangement and superficial efforts to change meanings. Carr, for example, suggests that “Hellenistic period authors limited themselves to rearranging older materials…and/or expanding older material with new trans historical visions that fit in and extended their contexts through a tissue of terminological and symbolic connections” (Carr 2011, 191). The species of activity that I will focus on is more probably a product of the Persian period, but where I differ with Carr is that I do not consider the activity described here to be limiting. Quite the contrary, I believe such actions can be utterly transformative.
Northern Kingdom of Israel. Since it seems to be the case, as demonstrated in the previous section, that the sphere of ethnic connections can indeed shift, even far beyond what seems logically possible or likely, and since it is the job of those who articulate ethnic identities to make articulated connections seem natural and primordial, something like “Panisraeliteism” would at least be conceptually entirely unsurprising.

Indeed, there are much more considerable alterations in the history of ethnic articulations than the creation of a connection between a kingdom and its neighbor to the north. In the ancient Mediterranean, genealogical ties were often pursued proactively as part of ancient Mediterranean diplomacy, what Lee Patterson calls “kinship diplomacy”. While many of these must have been acknowledged or denied solely for economic or prestige advantage, it is certainly imaginable that the establishment of a trade tie, in this way, helped shape a new ethnic identity (Patterson, Lee E. 2010). We can imagine the case of the Lampsacans, described by Patterson, who sent a delegation to Rome to request an alliance based on shared Trojan descent, which was denied by the Romans (Patterson, Lee E. 2010, 7). I wonder whether the Lampsacans had had much cause to

24 See discussions in, for example, Na’aman, Nadav 2010; Na’aman 2014; R. Kratz 2006; R. G. Kratz 2005; Fleming, Daniel 2012; Finkelstein 2013; Finkelstein and Silberman 2006; Knauf 2006.

25 Patterson begins his discussion of the subject with an anecdote about the Magnesians of Magnesia-on-the-Meander, elevating the status of their yearly festival, after a disappointing turn out in 221 B.C.E., by, in 208, appealing to kinship claims based on their shared descent from Aiolos, son of Hellen with, for example, the Samaeans of Same on Cephellania (Patterson 2010: 1). The idea of an objectively, hierarchically superior, “real” version of a myth system is belied by the constancy of this process of negotiation. I suspect these Cephellanians had not been given much cause to consider their ties with the Magnesians previously, but their 208 acceptance of this tie may not have been the end of the story—particularly if this newfound connection was re-ratified at an annual festival. Indeed, while it may be the case that this was the only time in the history of these two cities that this relationship was explored, though that is presumably unlikely, the tie between the two was not invented, but is derived from the “Hellenic Genealogy” in which Magnes, father of the Magnesians, and Deion, father of Cephalus, are brothers and sons of Aiolos. I suspect that the Magnesians may have had similar luck with the Minyans of Boeotia, sons of Minyas, another ethnonymous son of Aiolos—and if not, not because the tie was less valid, but because it did not persuade the Minyans. (Patterson 2010:7).
think of their Trojan ancestry prior to their interest in allying with Rome, and whether it continued to matter to them after their failure. If, hypothetically, the Trojan ties had been brought out of mothballs to entice the Romans, we can also imagine that Roman acceptance might have given it considerable strength and in the process, perhaps, altered official Lampsacan identity articulations.

If we wonder whether even such outlandish ties could have been possible in the history of Judahite ethnic narratives, we do not even need to rely on the suggestive power of cross-cultural comparison because we have direct evidence that this form of activity was at least explored, if perhaps only imaginatively, by Judahite authors. The Book of Maccabees includes an exchange of letters between Jonathan, the high priest, and the Spartans in which it is claimed that the Spartans had declared themselves to be of the line of Abraham (1 Mac 12:6-23). These letters, presumably, were never sent, but we should take care before dismissing the connection explored within them as too outlandish to have ever been considered or conceived. This claim would not have been made without the imagination that it might have some effect, however unlikely that the Spartans, at least, ever knew of it. Clearly, it never took hold, and there is no evidence that it was ever even a popular claim. But circumstances might have made it so, and this, as a general concept, should have considerable impact on how we discuss biblical ethnicity.

**The Bible and Genealogical Ethnicity**

Now we turn to genealogy. Generally speaking, it is possible to say that ethnic articulations co-ordinated through segmented genealogies operate like Borges’ Garden of
Forking Paths: they lead in many directions at once. The problem, where biblical studies is concerned, is that there are senses in which the biblical account of history follows this pattern and senses in which it doesn’t. Scholars are quite clear on the prevailing genealogical fact of this history, the primacy of the line of Jacob which is more or less consistently emphasized throughout. But there has not been much discussion, or really any discussion at all, of the fact that biblical history contains enormous potential genealogical fluidity. The question is why it hasn’t been much explored, and much depends upon the answer.

What the Bible contains, as genealogical discourse, is much more familiar to us from Greek myth than from anything in the ancient Near Eastern or Northwest Semitic canons. This could be no more than a stylistic choice. I believe and will attempt to

26 A classic example of what we are talking about is the distinction, in the Greek world, between Ionians and Dorians. Certainly, during the Peloponnesian War, when Ionian Athens and Dorian Sparta were at arms against each other, it was not at all uncommon to see speeches in which this division was buttressed through reference to significant cultural differences between the groups. We can count among these speeches by Brasidas and Hermocrates who describe Dorians as courageous and free and Ionians as weak and slavish (Hall, Jonathan M. 1997, 37). But, of course, the Peloponnesian War occurred in the immediate aftermath of the Persian War which (probably apocryphally) largely began when, according to Herodotus, the Athens swore that they would stand with the Persians because of the “Greek (or Hellenic) thing” (Hdt 8.144). It is important that the participants in these etnē probably really felt the connections and distinctions that were articulated in each case. But their mutability, too, is quite visible. As we will see, in a comparison I will pursue in chapter 2 (and to a certain degree throughout), between the biblical narratives of Jacob and his sons and the Greek narrative of the conquest of the Peloponnese by Herakles’ sons, Herakleid descent was either extended to or claimed by such far-flung groups as the Macedonians, the Lydians, and others. When Ionians and Dorians were at each other’s throats, what are we to make of the purported genealogical relationships between the Dorian royal houses and those abroad?

27 For the uniqueness of biblical genealogy see Wilson 1977, 114–132. As he notes specifically, ANE genealogies do not seem to have been created, generally, to write history. They often appear in narrative texts but “in no case, however, were there indications that the genealogies were used to provide the structure of the larger narratives or to link smaller narrative units…Genealogies were apparently never used as the skeleton of the narratives” (Wilson 1977, 135). Elsewhere, he writes “most of the genealogies in Mesopotamian texts are found in royal inscriptions. As early as 2500 B.C.E., some of the Sumerian kings gave their genealogies along with their royal titles, and this practice was continued, particularly by the Assyrian kings, until the Persian period (538-331 B.C.E.). The inscriptional genealogies are all linear and usually contain no more than three names, although they occasionally record as many as eight generations” (Wilson 1979, 13). He points out that Phoenician genealogies reaching beyond three generations occur only after the Persian period and that Aramean genealogies are generally linear with little depth (Wilson 1977, 124). As Knoppers puts it, “there is, in fact, nothing in earlier biblical literature
demonstrate that Genesis was largely constructed in the Persian period, and it is possible to imagine the authors of this text aping a popular literary mode without taking very seriously the claims inherent in what they subsequently produced. On the other hand it could be the case that the fluid genealogical discourses present in biblical literature exist for the same reason they exist in other places that we find them: to provide options for fluid ethnic articulations. In this case, the kind of play within categories quite familiar to us in cross-cultural comparison would not appear in biblical literature not because it did not exist in Persian Yehud, but merely because the Bible is, after all, finally one book. So, whatever competition the biblical vision may have faced from related literature is now lost. The line of Jacob does indeed dominate the biblical narrative. But why should Genesis make a point of discussing Abraham’s sons with Keturah including several apparent eponyms (Medan, Midian)? What, for example, can we suppose Jacob’s relationship with Esau, with his uncle Ishmael, is doing in the final form of biblical literature? What are we to make of Lot’s parentage, however shameful, of Ammon and Moab? Why does Genesis 10 and 1 Chron 1 describe the relationship between Jacob’s line and entities such as Cush, Egypt, Canaan, and others? And why, after all, do the sons of Abraham represent two distinct ethnicities (Isaac and Ishmael), as do the sons of Isaac (Jacob and Esau), while the sons of Jacob are collectively the progenitors of a unified Israelite identity?

directly comparable to the intensive and sustained interest in Israel’s lineages found in 1 Chron 1-9. The closest analogies that I am aware of stem from the classical world. But within the Bible the form and structure of Chronicles are unparalleled by any other work” (Knoppers 2004, 132). “Linear” genealogies are those that express descent from a line of ancestors, and we might think here of lists of kings or priests. “Segmented” genealogies are a kind of written or oral family tree.
As a thought experiment, we can well imagine that where it seems as if biblical literature may be auditioning non-Israelite pasts, it may in fact be doing so. If it is making available Aramean and Edomite and Moabite hybrid identities, that is, identity articulations where Aram, Edom, or Moab were as intertwined with the Judahite ethnos as Israel is in the completed narrative, it is possible that these were, at least by some ancient Judahites, actually entertained as ethnographic possibilities. I mentioned above the concept of “PanIsraeliteism”, and in this light we may at least entertain the idea that the connection articulated between Israel and Judah is not conceptually distinct from the other connections derived above; it was merely more popular and ultimately more persuasive. What if, at one point, Judah and Edom, or Judah and Aram, was a more popular connection to articulate than Israel and Judah?28 The Bible certainly allows for these possibilities, and more. Indeed, in both Genesis and Deuteronomy an Aramean heritage for Israel is explicitly articulated, a data point that does not cohere as neatly with the rest of biblical ethnic articulations as is apparently supposed.29

I will argue at length subsequently, that biblical history is composed of three distinct independent narrative traditions – that of the patriarchs, Moses, and David—and

28 We can point, in this respect, to the difference between Deut 23:4-8, which marks a distinction between Edomites on the one hand and Ammonites and Moabites on the other (presumably) because of the genealogical narrative of the relationship between Jacob and Esau, and the Table of Nations in Genesis 10, largely repeated in 1 Chron 1, which provides a genealogical charter for connections between Israel and many groups, including Egypt and Canaan. This ethnic relationality is already evidence of greater fluidity than is often supposed.

29 Indeed, the repeated references to an Aramean heritage in the Genesis narrative and in that famous verse in Deuteronomy 26:5: “A [Perishing? Wandering?] Aramean was my father” suggests that either or both of Israel and Judah may have one time indulged this possibility. We can imagine, in this respect, the difference between Deuteronomy 23:4-8, which marks a distinction between Edomites on the one hand and Ammonites and Moabites on the other (presumably) because of the genealogical narrative of the relationship between Jacob and Esau, and the Table of Nations in Genesis 10, largely repeated in 1 Chron 1, which provide a genealogical charter for connections between Israel and many groups, including Egypt and Canaan.
that these share little in terms of their conception of Judah’s history except for a subscription to Panisraeliteism. But here, I think even scholars who subscribe to the Panisraelite idea have done a poor job distinguishing between the concept, as a concept, and the multiplicity which might appear in its iterations. That is, if it is the case that Panisraeliteism was indeed invented as an idea in the late 8th century B.C.E., that doesn’t mean the biblical narrative would mirror the form in which 8th century Panisraeliteism was expressed, any more than proving the existence of an older Panisraeliteism would indicate that the biblical account is therefore a passive record of the 10th century B.C.E. We can as easily imagine that the narratives which were to become biblical were selected because they shared this concept, which indicates that biblical editors were well aware that Panisraeliteism could be explained in diverse ways.

What we might imagine, as a thought experiment, is a similar circumstance as in Britain where we can see pretty clearly a historical fluctuation of interest in Britain’s Celtic and Germanic backgrounds respectively writ large through the figures of King Arthur and King Alfred. Arthur was particularly popular under the Tudor dynasty, because of the Tudors’ desire to emphasize their Brythonic (Welsh) heritage. Subsequently, Alfred remained quite popular until World War I rendered the German ancestry of the British royal family suspect. Both these narratives had been around for a very long time, but their use varied over time and their meanings as well. If the Israelite ethnicity of Judahites was indeed a Judahite invention of the late 8th century B.C.E., an Israelite prehistory served one set of purposes at that time, probably related to the arrival of considerable numbers of Israelite refugees in Judah and Hezekiah’s imperial
ambitions. But it probably served a completely different one in the 5th and 4th century B.C.E, in an entirely new set of geopolitical circumstances.³⁰

For all we know, the various connections that biblical genealogical discourse offers Judah are a reflection of the fact that Judahite ethnicity remained unsettled in its alliances for far longer than has ever been supposed.

**History, Myth, and Meaning**

Wendy Doniger describes her concept of the “micromyth” in this way: “The multivocality of myths is a quality that we encounter in actual texts...the micromyth is the neutral structure...the nonexistent story with no point of view.” The crucial thing about the micromyth is that it doesn’t really exist. It is intended rather as a critique of how we talk about narratives. It is “an imaginary text, a scholarly construct that contains the basic elements” (Doniger 2011, 99–100). Doniger continues:

The nonexistent, uninflected micromyth that the scholar constructs of the actually occurring, inflected myth constructed in any analysis of a text is like a condensed soup cube: the scholar confronts the soup (a particular variant of the myth) and boils it down to the soup cube, the basic stock (the micromyth), only to cook it up again into all sorts of soups (Doniger 2011, 105).

What she is referring to, specifically, here is the work of folklore scholars comparing variant versions of their tales, but this is, in my opinion, nevertheless a very useful idea for biblical studies. The “micromyth” describes very well the activity scholars are engaged in when they over-identify the Bible with its tradition histories, and in so doing ignore the specific and time-bounded nature of the biblical effort.

³⁰An account of the archaeological evidence for these refugees can be found, for example, in Finkelstein 2013, 47.
That is, the Bible simply isn’t every version of biblical myths, or histories, there ever was. It’s a specific soup. Various ingredients might be old, but that doesn’t mean these couldn’t have been made into another “soup”, imbued with different meanings in a context other than the biblical one. It doesn’t make it meaningless which old ingredients were selected and which weren’t, what proportions were employed and to what end. Biblical scholars have tended to cook up biblical narratives into a kind of ur-soup, and there are ways in which this is a necessity if we are to learn anything of ancient Israel and Judah. But that doesn’t mean we are even capable of reading biblical narratives in the same way as we would have read them when they were not yet biblical, when they were combined in different ways for different reasons, by different authors.

Insisting on the specificity of biblical efforts-- as opposed to Judahite literature, a category which would embrace both Judahite texts which ultimately entered the biblical orbit and presumably many that did not-- as neither actually transformed *from* Judahite (and Israelite) literature *into* biblical literature by a very specific and historically contingent effort and vision, is not mere fussiness, nor is it a minimalist position. I do not believe many of the Bible’s major narratives and characters, let alone its concepts, were first composed and created in the post-exilic period. However, given the chronological distance between the world in which the Bible was completed and the world in which it describes, biblical history must inevitably be understood as a form of memory. And as Alcock notes, “recent work on the creation of social memory points in a new direction, towards accepting an incessantly dynamic process of remembrance and oblivion,
As ethnic narrative, the antiquity of many of the traditions employed served a valuable purpose completely apart from what data they preserved. They were useful for the authors engaged here in dynamic remembrance and forgetting, they served a primordializing and therefore legitimizing purpose, and the result is one of the most persuasive and enduring primordialist ethnic charters in history. But, the editors who created the nearly finished Bible, at least the arc of narrative from Genesis-2 Kings, were nevertheless instrumentalists, and probably consciously instrumentalists. The brick and mortar of their efforts may have been largely, but not entirely older materials, but this does not change what the Bible is.

And so this is a study of the efforts which make the Bible specific, which set it apart and inflect it from what it has received and what its final editors, or editors along the way, chose not to receive. It is a statement of the difference between biblical literature and Judahite or Israelite literature, in that the Bible is only the Bible after, of course, “biblicization”. It is also a statement of biblical history as myth, and here we are aided by the fact that it is unlikely that history can ever serve ethnic articulations without first being mythicized. In America, July 4th, for example, is considered by many to be America’s moment of ethnogenesis, but the date itself is no more than inert data. July 2nd is when the Congress voted for independence from Britain, the Revolution ended in 1783, the Constitution was finally ratified in 1790, and so on. John Adams memorably wrote to his wife, Abigail, that “the second day of July 1776 will be the most memorable

31 She adds that “this more fluid modeling of ‘how societies remember,’” is “current today across several academic disciplines” (Alcock 1999, 338–339).

32 “Most authors attack primordialism by showing that ethnic formations change continually despite ideological pronouncements about their essential nature and great antiquity” (Levine 1999, 166).
epocha in the history of America”. He was not wrong because of the objective course of
events, but because of their reception. I am particularly fond, in my work, of Russell
McCutcheon’s definition of myth as “not so much… a kind of narrative identifiable by its
content…not so much a genre with relatively stable characteristics (but)…a class of
social argumentation found in all human culture…not things akin to nouns, but active
processes akin to verbs” (McCutcheon 2000:200).” 33 What I am suggesting here is
merely that the biblical, too, is an active process, an argument tailor made for the society
in which it appeared and not its predecessors.

This is a study of what I take to be the major mechanism of biblicization. My
argument will be that though both tribes of Israel and narratives about Jacob pre-existed
the fall of Jerusalem, the “twelve tribes of Israel” were, from beginning to end a literary
fiction, and couching them in a genealogical mode was an innovation of the 5th and 4th
centuries B.C.E. This genealogical system, extended backward to the primeval history
and forward to the fall of Jerusalem (indeed, in Chronicles, occasionally farther still),
provides the structure of a new vision of the Israelite past of Judah, itself an invention of
the 8th century B.C.E, and provides a coherence between narratives, which coherence
does not pre-exist its imposition. But I would also argue that even if the Bible’s history
were wholly accurate, and not invented in any sense relating to its salient facts, this

33 Indeed, a growing body of literature recognizes myth as an active, dynamic process, as a species of
ideology production (McCutcheon, Russell T. 2000; Lincoln, Bruce 1989; Lincoln, Bruce 1999; Malkin,
Irad 1998; Malkin, Irad 2001, 2). As McCutcheon notes, “the reciprocal relationship between social
formation and mythmaking was made clear as early as Durkheim” (Durkheim, Emile and Karen E. Fields
1995, 425) and that, “in keeping with the Durkheimian tradition of sociological studies on religion and
myth, we could say that social formation is the activity of experimenting with, authorizing or combating,
and reconstituting widely circulated ideal types, idealizations or…mythifications” (McCutcheon, Russell T.
2000, 203).
would not be a sufficient explanation for its deployment as ethnic narrative in the period after the destruction of the kingdoms whose history is related.

The next chapter will largely be taken up with an extended comparison between the large, segmented genealogy which begins the books of Chronicles and the most famous genealogical effort in classical Greece, the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. As West notes, “the Hesiodic Catalogue…is not to be thought of simply as a codification of what the Greeks knew or believed about their past. It represents one particular construction made at a particular epoch from a particular vantage point” (West, M.L. 1985, 11). So, too, with biblical literature.
Chapter One: Chronicles and the Catalogue

Tribal discourse in biblical literature is genealogical in the sense that filiation in tribes was presumably always conceptualized as a result of consanguinity. However, whether it was always conceptualized as genealogical in specifically the way the book of Genesis proposes is another question altogether. Were the names of the tribes always identified as the names, also, of the sons of Jacob? Do all iterations of the tribes of Israel understand them in the same way? It is this question which this chapter will attempt to answer, and which will serve as an introduction to many of the issues at the center of this study.

To begin with, the idea that the body of tribal discourse can be characterized as a whole in any sense depends, in my opinion, on an assumption of its internal consistency which I do not believe to be borne out by the evidence we have. As I will attempt to demonstrate in this and future chapters, the genealogical inflection of tribal discourse through the narrative of Jacob and his sons, which I will call the “tribal-genealogical” material, is a product, only, of the latter half of the book of Genesis and the book of Chronicle. This genealogical modality has been read into instances of tribal iteration where it does not appear thanks to a fairly circumscribed series of edits which will be the subject of a later chapter. In this chapter what I intend to do is to describe the potential of the genealogical system of biblical literature, expressed in Genesis but best expressed in the nine chapters long genealogy which begins the books of Chronicles, to redescribe inherited materials in service to a new ethnic idea through analogy with the Catalogue of
Women, a Greek genealogical effort which may be said to do the same. But, as introduction, it seems best to offer a few comments on the variability of tribal discourse.

In general, the variability between tribal lists is well known, but its meaning has been treated in ways that are not ultimately consistent with discoveries in the fields of anthropology, ethnicity, and historical memory. The clearest statement I can make about the treatment of variance between tribal lists in biblical literature is that scholars have often imagined them to be reflections of actual historical changes. That is, scholars have believed it possible to pin down the time period of one tribal list in comparison with another and to extract from the differences between them a record of historical events which caused the change. We can think, for example, of Noth suggesting that the placement of Gad alongside Reuben in what he considers to be “later attempts” is “probably” due to the fact that “there were families in the vicinity of Gad who called themselves Reubenites” (Noth 1958, 6). We can think of Cross arguing that the place of Reuben at the head of many tribal lists indicates that they are all representative of a time so early in Israelite history that Reuben had, in Cross’s words, “a role that warranted his pre-eminence”, a period which is not otherwise preserved in biblical texts (Noth 1958, 65; Cross 1998, 53; Wilson 1977, 19). We can think of Wilson suggesting an origin for many tribal lists at a time “near the end of the period of the Judges” because “the Joseph tribes have a superior position in the genealogy [and]...the Joseph tribes were in a position of political power immediately before the rise of kingship in Israel” (Wilson 1977, 19).
This sort of thinking continues into the present period of scholarship. But is it useful to investigate tribal lists in this way? Is it reasonable to expect their differences to mirror historical events? Unfortunately, given how useful any additional source of information about ancient Israel and Judah is, probably not. In cross-cultural comparison, such differences are much more likely to present claims than history, the aspirational rather than the objective. What if, rather than representing a historical development, the difference between two lists is due instead to different imaginations of Israel in different regions? What if rather than two different time periods, two conflicting lists are the product of the same period produced by groups in competition with each other? The specter of such possibilities evaporates the feasibility of this kind of historical

---

34 A particularly notable recent example appears in (Zevit 2001), who argues that it is more or less possible to establish, archaeologically, which gods were worshipped in which tribal region and therefore by which tribe. While on the one hand Zevit should be applauded for his willingness to take seriously the evidence of archaeology, his faith in the historicity of biblical accounts of territory division requires, in my opinion, more justification than it receives here. See especially Zevit 2001, 603–621. Indeed, Noll singles out Zevit’s “textbook”, as well as another recent effort by Patrick Miller to “illustrate” how a “usually unconscious assumption” of the viability of depending on biblical claims about the dissemination of biblical literature can distort conclusions. He notes, “writing about the religion of Iron Age Israel, the authors of these textbooks fail to distinguish between the two aspects of biblical data I am emphasizing—data indicating that texts derive from local sources, and passages suggesting the context of texts were disseminated back to those local settings” (Noll 2008, 01–402).

35 As McInerney has noted in a discussion of Greek ethnicity, “the third area in which African studies have opened new ground has been in the study of mechanisms by which an ethnic identity is promoted and legitimized. In the case of the Acholi of Uganda, some of the ways in which a dominant ethnic identity emerged will look strikingly familiar to the Greek historian. For example, king lists…were manufactured to connect lesser tribes such as the Patiko with more highly esteemed groups such as the Lwo….The Salaminian saga is a particularly clear example of the appropriation of another body of myth and heroic genealogy, in this case from Aegina, in order to legitimize a distinct ethnic identity…The Salaminians first coped the figures of Aeacus from Aegina and Cecrops from Attica, then forged a genealogical link with the Aeacid house by making Telamon a son of Aeacus and the founder of their community” (McInerney 2001, 62–63). As Malkin puts it, “one should hardly expect systems in all this. Such genealogies, ever popular, must have been continually changing; variability of genealogies was common among the Greeks. Hekataios…who sought to bring some order to them seems to have protested especially against the variability. From the point of view of the genealogy-lover he must have cut the same ridiculous figure as did, for example, the British in Nigeria, who invested enormous effort in putting the genealogies in order, only to find them changing even before their registration books were complete” (Malkin 1994, 17–18).
excavation. Although it certainly seem as if some aspects of some tribal lists, such as Genesis 49, Deuteronomy 33, and Judges 5, are older than others it is possible, it has often been suggested—it will even be explored here in a later chapter—that in these cases what is very old is merely the core of an articulation of the tribes which is nevertheless relatively new.

Which brings us to a perhaps more important point: I think that scholars have dramatically underrepresented the amount of variance which exists between tribal articulations. Obviously, there are different ways of counting tribal lists, but if, conflating lists and genealogies for a moment, one chooses to consider any related group of texts that list nearly all the traditional tribes of Israel a “tribal list”, including the six-chapter-long narration of conquest of Israel in Joshua 13:15-19:48, one would arrive at 21 lists in biblical literature. As it happens, exactly zero is entirely like any other one, as we can see below:

---

36 Fowler notes, “A common use of genealogy is to support a claim of rightful succession of power. Conflicting claims are backed up by conflicting genealogies…this information is already enough to make one very doubtful of the historical accuracy of such genealogies. They are far more important in their social function to early societies than they are as records that would satisfy a modern scholar” (R. L. Fowler 2000, 3). Why should biblical genealogies be different in this respect?

37 De Geus notes, for example, that Noth and other, including De Geus himself, ascribed to an “A” and “B” system of the tribes, one including Levi and Joseph, and the other without Levi and with Joseph split into Ephraim and Manasseh. He suggests Helga Weippert has shown that a third system, a “B2” can be reconstructed which has Judah in the first position, Benjamin in the third, and Asher-Naphtali at the end in some order (de Geus 1976; Weippert 1973; Noth 1930). As we will see, this is a massive underreporting of variance.
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|

|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|

|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|

| Dan Dan Dan Dan Dan Dan Dan Dan | | | | | | |
While these are all a little bit different from each other, we can also see, of course, that the idea that these clearly distinct lists can be grouped into just a few basic arrangements is not exactly unreasonable. There are far more similarities across these than there are differences. But even minor differences, especially appearing as consistently as we can see above, show the fallacy of expecting history, rather than a subjective imagination of history, to be always to blame for variability.

Of course, too, none of this is to say that Israel was never divided into tribes. I will argue in a subsequent chapter that the tribal system is a legacy of the north, that the 9-11 tribe list (depending on how it is counted) which appears in Judges 5, the only list to begin with Ephraim, and the only one which fails to include all of the southern tribes, Judah, Simeon and Levi, is by and large a reflection of a historical reality. But I will also argue that the twelve tribes of Israel only ever existed as a literary concept, as an idealized social order developed as a mechanism for connecting Judah’s history with Israel’s. Originally, again, I do not believe that this tribal system was intended to be genealogical, but that it became so in the Persian period in imitation of largely contemporaneous modes of ethnic articulation occurring elsewhere in the Mediterranean. It is through the re-creation of this tribal system as a genealogical system, hooked backwards into the narratives of the patriarchs and forwards through Moses and David that the coherent narrative of biblical history was finally constructed.

38 That is, Levi may or may not have been a “southern tribe”, originally, but it certainly appears to be the most important tribal entity in the literature of the post-Exilic period, in which only the south survived.
For this chapter, however, my intention is only to demonstrate the plausibility of this suggestion through cross-cultural comparison. First, however, it is necessary to grapple with the connection between Genesis’ tribal-genealogical discourse and that of the Chronicles genealogy which is the larger subject of this chapter.

**Chronicles and Genesis**

Whatever else is true about the Chronicles genealogy and Genesis, they share considerably more with each other, in terms of their visions of the tribes, than either shares with any other biblical narrative. Crucially, for example, we should note that although Genesis’ various tribal lists are not exactly alike, they do share a considerably important introductory sequence: each begins with Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah. This sequence appears only two other times in the entirety of the Bible, in Exodus 1:1-6 and in 1 Chronicles 2:1-2. The former case will be discussed substantially in later chapters, but suffice it to say here that besides these verses, obviously the very first verses of Exodus, both Exodus or Leviticus are nearly entirely devoid of references to any of the tribes whatsoever. Thus, it is likely an insertion to counteract the impression conveyed by this absence. In the latter case, what follows the statement in 1 Chron 2:1-2 is a segmented genealogical effort extending to 1 Chron 9:1a, which actually does not follow this picture particularly well. The tribes are presented in 1 Chron 2:3-9:1a in an order in which they are never otherwise articulated, Dan doesn’t appear at all, and

---

39 Lists in Genesis are organized in two ways, through the birth order of the tribal ancestors or through maternity, the descent from four different women (Leah, Rachel, Bilhah and Zilpah), but in all cases the list begins with the same four tribes. The tribes are listed by birth in Gen 29:32-30:24, and by birth mother in Gen 35:22-26, and Gen 46:8-27.
Zebulun is never given a genealogy. The fact that even an already largely extant book of Chronicles may have been edited to impose the systematic vision I am describing here indicates the possible time horizon of our discussion. It obviously should not escape our notice, either, that this Reuben-Simeon-Levi-Judah sequence includes one tribe consistently found at the head of tribal lists (Reuben), and three tribes, the three tribes, most associated with the south. But again, these are subjects for a later chapter.

There is another major difference between how Genesis and Chronicles approach the tribes and how other biblical texts do. This is that though the tribes exist, in one form or another, throughout the biblical historical narrative, in both Genesis and the Chronicles genealogy the tribes are just part of an overall picture and much larger picture. Both Genesis generally and the Chronicles genealogy specifically present a sequencing of historical epochs from the primeval history through the patriarchs, to the tribes, that is the tribal ancestors, expressing the descendants of these as the inherent social order of ancient Israel. What is interesting here is how rarely this holistic vision appears in biblical text outside of Genesis and Chronicles. We will see that there are virtually no references to primeval figures elsewhere in the Bible, but more strikingly, and more to the point here, the discourse of tribes as the descendants of the eponymous tribal ancestors is far more circumscribed than is generally realized. In his seminal 1977 study of biblical genealogy, Robert Wilson observed that “in view of the important role that the twelve-tribe ideal played in Israelite tradition, it is striking that the twelve tribes are related in explicitly genealogical terms in only four passages”, namely Gen. 29:31-30:24;
Wilson considered this of little importance because he was operating from a scholarly perspective which assumed that many of the narratives of Genesis were considerably older than other biblical material and that they were largely foundational to biblical mythology generally.

Since these assumptions, and the fact that the twelve tribe ideal played an important role in Israelite tradition for a considerable period of time, are no longer clear, particularly if the concept of Panisraeliteism is accurate, this is considerably more than merely striking. The paucity of what we can call “tribal-genealogical” material will provide the basis for my claim above: that the genealogization of tribal discourse (in this respect) occurred fairly late in the history of biblical traditions. Here, however, it is more important for another reason: all these elements Genesis and the Chronicles genealogy share with each other that they share with no other texts, is likely to be indicative of a considerable relationship between the two. Of course, the most reasonable and possibly the most likely explanation of this relationship is that what the Chronicles genealogy represents is, at least, a ratification of the vision of Genesis over visions found elsewhere.

This would still indicate a more dramatic role for the Chronicles genealogy in the

---

40 Though he singles these out, he also mentions “the more detailed Israelite genealogies” of Gen 46:8-27, Exod 6:14-27, Num 26:5-61 and 1 Chron 1-9. In my opinion, a genealogical portrayal of the tribes is also strongly implied in Genesis 49:1-27, the pericope often called the Blessing of Jacob, and in Exodus 1:1-6. However, he is wise to point out that most of the mentions of the twelve tribes, of which there are many more, do not necessarily indicate that they are to be viewed as de facto descended from Jacob. The twelve tribes appear, by name, additionally, in Genesis 35:22b-26, Num 1:5b-15, Num 2:3-31, Num 7:12-83, Num 10:14-28, Num 13:4-15, Num 26:5-58, Deut 27:12-13, Deut 33:6-29, Joshua 13:15-19:48, and 1 Chron 2:1-2. The tribes of Judah, Simeon, Joseph, Zebulon, Asher, Naphtali and Dan appear in Judges 1:1-34, while Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir, Zebulon, Issachar, Reuben, Gilead, Dan, Asher, Zebulon, Naphtali and Meroz are mentioned in Judges 5:1-23. However, of these mentions, Gen 35:22b-36, Exod 1:1-5, Num 1:5b-15, Num 2:3-31, Num 7:12-83, Num 10:14-28, Num 26:5-58, Deut 27:12-13 and 1 Chron 2:1 are either lists or little more than lists. This leaves Gen 49:1a-27, the blessing of Jacob, and Deut 33:6-29, the blessing of Moses, which actually does not mention Simeon, and Joshua 13:15-Josh19:48, the allotment of the land, as instances in which each tribe is mentioned in a context that provides them with agency and personality as well as gesturing to their collectivity. Then, only the six passages mentioned so far deserve to belong in the category of tribal-genealogical myth.
reception history of the Bible than is often supposed, as we can well imagine that the certainly Persian period (or later) authors of this text might have chosen instead to emphasize, say, the exodus, which receives little attention in Chronicles generally, if indeed Genesis is not necessarily foundational to all biblical narratives.41

However, there is another, more dynamic possibility, for there are many ways in which the Chronicles genealogy represents a considerable improvement in cohesion and scope from the Genesis narrative in non-negligible ways. The fact of the matter is that the Chronicles genealogy does many things that Genesis does not. That this has not generally been noticed is a reflection of how Chronicles as a whole is generally treated, as a pallid reflection, an essentially passive receptacle for other biblical narratives.42 It is often regarded as a late, particularly unreliable recapitulation of the history given, as well, in the books of Samuel and Kings and because of this, as Knoppers notes, “there has been a predilection of scholars to begin with Samuel-Kings as a base in any cross-biblical

---

41 As Knoppers notes, “it would be an exaggeration to say that the Chronicler deliberately ignores Israel’s liberation from Egypt, because the Chronicler reproduces some passages from his Vorlage in which the Exodus is mentioned (1 Chr 17:21; 2 Chr 6:5, 7:22) and directly alludes to the Exodus himself (2 Chr 20:7-11). Nevertheless, he does not associate the Exodus with the crystallization of Israel’s corporate identity” (Knoppers 2004, 71).

42 There have been a number of unusual suggestions lately about the relationship between Chronicles and other biblical material, that have, at least, served as a basis for re-evaluating the nature of Chronicles. The most unique suggestion is probably Auld’s, that a great deal of Chronicles is actually derived from a third, unknown source which also formed the backbone of the Books of Kings. Auld and others have produced some interesting evidence for this idea, but, as McKenzie puts it, “[though] Auld seems justified when he contends that by privileging Samuel-Kings over Chronicles, scholars have tended to overlook interests and issues that shaped the former… one can cultivate a great sensitivity to the interests and biases and a greater skepticism…without adopting Auld’s view of a shared source” (McKenzie 1999, 81). One should indeed cultivate this greater sympathy. Rather than Chronicles as a late, somewhat unimportant recapitulation of the material of Kings, both Kings and Chronicles would therefore be best considered versions of the same source material (Auld 1994; Auld 1992; Auld 1998; Auld 1999). This viewpoint has been taken up by Ho, as well (Ho 1995; Ho 1999).
continues to support the idea that Chronicles was composed not necessarily as a replacement of, but as an inspiration to Ezra (Knoppers 2004, 133). In fact, there are few traditions of biblical exegesis with as long a history as neglecting Chronicles as an important biblical source: In the LXX, Chronicles is called παραλειπόμενον, “the things left out”. Most striking about the judgment of history in this case is how often Chronicles does not relate things left out, but rather retells stories already present in basically identical form, the implication of which is that Chronicles and Kings were not originally composed to occupy the same book. What would have been the point?

As Sparks notes, “Since the reader may already be familiar with an account that is in many respects similar to the text of Chronicles, he/she will be tempted to read Chronicles as a supplement to that with which they are already familiar…often with the reader making the text of Chronicles subordinate to the texts of Samuel/Kings” (K. L. Sparks 1998, 1). In my opinion, the connection between the three books is no less than Chronicles does not necessarily imply joint authorship. The confusion comes from the fact that the Greek book of 1 Esdras, which Cross describes as having a “shorter, better text” of Ezra, vindicating “the importance and priority of the Hebrew recension of Ezra underwriting the Greek of 1 Esdras” (compared to the MT) (Cross 1975, 7–8), begins with the last two chapters of Chronicles (2 Chron 35-36), just as the MT of Ezra begins with a repetition of the last verse of 2 Chronicles (2 Chron 36:22, Ezra 1:1-3), as well as the fact that Ezra also includes Neh 7:73-8:12. However, this does not, to my mind, constitute a positive argument that the three documents were composed by the same hand, so much as it does an argument that Chronicles and Ezra were taken to be part of the same history. Knoppers cites a group of scholars who believe that 1 Esdras is a “compilation of biblical texts extracted from Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah” which seems more likely than supposing that elision between the ending of one and the beginning of another implies shared composition. These include Williamson 1977; Eskenazi 1986; Gardner 1986; Blenkinsopp 1988 and others. In my opinion, the connection between the three books is no more than what one might expect from books that have been coordinated, not written together. As Knoppers notes, “it is by no means to be assumed that the book of Ezra-Nehemiah stems from a single hand” (Knoppers 2004, 75), which would further complicate the notion that the three were written as one document. Additionally, though Knoppers cautions against making too much of the focus on Exodus in Ezra-Nehemiah, and the lack of focus upon it in Chronicles, the two (or three) books certainly seem to have different interests. I think it is more likely that a coherency was imposed upon these books than that it inspired them. Knoppers entertains the idea that Chronicles might fit into the genre of literature sometimes called the “rewritten Bible” genre, but ultimately rejects this possibility on the grounds that “Chronicles was composed not necessarily as a replacement of, but as an alternative to the primary history” (Knoppers 2004, 133). This seems to me exactly right, but this study will take the point a step further. What Knoppers...
way in which the books of Chronicles generally are not merely are repetition of the
history presented in the books of Samuel and Kings where the exodus seems to have a
considerably higher profile than the patriarchs and certainly higher than the primeval
figures, who are totally absent. But what if it is this Chronicles genealogy, rather than
Genesis which offers us the connected and coherent picture most associated with
Genesis?

We will discuss many iterations of this question throughout this study. But in this
chapter we will stick with the genealogical issue and here is perhaps the least we can say:
the nine chapter Chronicles genealogy represents an enormous improvement on the book
of Genesis in terms of internal cohesion. A striking fact about the book of Genesis is that
there is no single genealogical effort anywhere within it which presents all the relevant
aspects of this primordial-patriarchal formulation at once. In fact, not only is there no
genealogy which explicitly connects Adam and Jacob, there isn’t a single genealogy
which presents both Noah and Abraham, and there is exactly one small pericope which
could even conceivably be defined as a genealogy which mentions all three apparently
central figures, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in one place, the short narrative of the birth of
Jacob and Esau (Gen 25:19-23). A related point is that the overall picture of primordial
and patriarchal Israel is, in Genesis, built in stages. Genesis 5:1-32 narrates the
descendants of Adam until the birth of Shem, Ham and Japheth. Genesis 10:1-31 pursues
the descendants of Noah’s children to the fifth generation of children of Shem. That these
connections are built, rather than simply relayed in a piecemeal fashion is indicated by
the fact that the genealogy which introduces Abraham, Genesis 11:10-27 begins again

fails to note is that without chapters 1-9, Chronicles completely fails to be a national epic of anything but the monarchical period.
with Shem before finally reaching, and terminating at, Abram and Lot. Then, in later narratives, Isaac and Ishmael are born and finally in Genesis 25:19-26 we read “these are the generations of Isaac son of Abraham, Abraham became the father of Isaac”, and Jacob and Esau are born. It seems unlikely that these genealogies would repeat themselves if they were always intended to be cumulative.

And not only is Chronicles, by its nature, more coherent, we can see it actively engaged in *making* Genesis’ narratives more coherent. How? 1 Chron 1:2:2 is the major aspect of the Chronicles genealogy dealing with Genesis’ narratives specifically, even if the whole genealogy is essentially a picture of Genesis’ vision of Israel. And, specifically, 1 Chron 1:1-28 is essentially a quotation of Genesis 10, the so-called Table of Nations, with two crucial exceptions. This Genesis 10 genealogy begins with Noah. 1 Chronicles 1, instead, begins with a list of names drawing the genealogical line between Adam and Noah. Similarly, while Genesis 10 ends with the descendants of Joktan, six generations from Shem, 1 Chron 1:24-28 completes this portion of the genealogy with another list of names, following the descendants of Joktan, which draws that line from Shem to Isaac and Ishmael. What is, in one case, an unusual statement of ethnic relationality, becomes in the other a map of Israelite history, a full mirror held up to Genesis. One can see this clearly in the following diagram:

---

45 Indicating, presumably, that even in whatever form these genealogies took prior to their inclusion in Genesis, these figures were not well integrated. Why wouldn’t this second genealogy begin with the fifth generation after Shem, where the last one left off?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter and Verse</th>
<th>Genesis Chapter and Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron 1:1-3</td>
<td>Gen 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Seth, Enosh, Kenan, Mahlalel, Jared, Enoch, Methusaleh, Lamech</td>
<td>Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron 1:4</td>
<td>Gen 10:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth</td>
<td>Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron 1:5</td>
<td>Gen 10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Japheth</td>
<td>Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, Tiras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Gomer</td>
<td>Gen 10:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron 1:6</td>
<td>Gen 10:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Javan</td>
<td>Ashkenaz, Diphtah, Togarmah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Ham</td>
<td>1 Chron 1:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, Rodanim</td>
<td>Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, Rodanim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Cush and Raamah</td>
<td>Gen 10:7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seba, Havila, Sabta, Raama, Sabteca/ Sheba and Dedan/ Nimrod</td>
<td>Seba, Havila, Sabta, Raama, Sabteca/ Sheba and Dedan/ Nimrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Egypt</td>
<td>Gen 10:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludim, Amamim, Lehagim, Naphtuhim, Pathrusim, Casluhim, Caphtorim</td>
<td>Ludim, Amamim, Lehagim, Naphtuhim, Pathrusim, Casluhim, Caphtorim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Canaan</td>
<td>Gen 10:15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidon, Heth, the Jebusites, Amorites, Gargashites, Hivites, Arkites, Sinites, Arvdites, Zemarites, and Hamathites</td>
<td>Sidon, heth, the Jebusite, Amorites, Gargashites, Hivites, Arkites, Sinites, Arvdites, Zemarites and Hamathites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Shem</td>
<td>Gen 10:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam, Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud, Aram, Uz, Hul, Gether, Meshech</td>
<td>Elam, Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud, Aram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Aram</td>
<td>Gen 10:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uz, Hul, Gether, Mash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shemite descendants</td>
<td>Gen 10:24-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron 1:24-28</td>
<td>Gen 10:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem, Arpachshad, Shelah, Eber, Peleg, Reu, Serug, Nahor, Terah, Abraham, Isaac, Ishmael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Genesis does slowly, aggregatively, and by accumulation, Chronicles does at once, in one chapter. And one of the more interesting facets of this phenomenon is that while scholars have tended not to notice the peculiar disconnect between the elements of Genesis, the evidence suggests that the Chronicler, as I will call the author or authors of this Chronicles genealogy, did notice it and took proactive steps to address it. And there is more aggregation in 1 Chronicles 1, which continues to borrow a genealogy of Esau, from Gen 36:1-17 (1 Chron 1:35-37), a genealogy of Seir son of Lotan, from Gen 36:20-28 (1 Chron 1:36-42), and finally a list of the kings and chiefs of Edom from Gen 36:31-43 (1 Chron 1:43-54). The first chapter of the books of Chronicles is not merely an improvement on Genesis 10, it is meant to be ten thousand foot perspective on the history Genesis relates, in stops and starts.46

The questions we will have to answer in later chapters relate to explaining Genesis’ disjunction, whether the juxtaposition of elements which form it may be not the inspiration for the Chronicles genealogy but a connected effort. For now, however, it is necessary to focus on the extent to which the Chronicles genealogy represents innovation, and this is, in my opinion, considerable. Scholars have generally reduplicated, in assessing this question, a rather prejudicial distinction between Genesis as creative work and Chronicles as passive iteration such that to date nearly every scholarly effort to compare biblical and Greek genealogical discourses focuses largely on Genesis rather

46 As Ben Zvi puts it, “one of the most fundamental social and ideological roles of Chronicles…was to shape, communicate and encourage its readers to visit and vicariously relive through their reading a somewhat different past than the one shaped, communicated, and relived through the reading of the Deuteronomistic History, and for that matter, the Primary history. A related social and ideological role of Chronicles was to create a set of complementary histories in such a way that the readers of each would approach a relevant text in a way informed by the other” (Ben Zvi 2009, 60). How the way in which we read Genesis might be informed by Chronicles is an under-researched question.
than Chronicles. However, this does a considerable disservice to the Chronicles
genealogy both in terms of its uniqueness and in terms of how much better it maps on to
Greek parallels than Genesis. As Knoppers puts it,

The collections of genealogies… found in the Yahwistic and Priestly sources of
the genealogical prologue in Chronicles…yet, from a literary perspective, the
Yahwistic and Priestly works are not particularly helpful as analogies…the short
lineages the Yahwist employs in the course of his work lend structure to his
stories…The Priestly writers are more systematic in their genealogical
speculations…what one finds in Chronicles, however, are large collections of
lineages standing by themselves. In short, one can readily acknowledge the
Chronicler’s indebtedness to the Yahwistic work and especially the Priestly
writing, while recognizing that the author has moved beyond these earlier works
in a number of different ways (Knoppers 2003, 632–633)

And, moreover, as Knoppers additionally notes, “over half of the genealogies in 1 Chr 1-
8 have no biblical source” (Knoppers 2003, 633).

This, then, is the Chronicles genealogy. It begins with Genesis, a dynamic choice,
one duplicated in the biblical canon as a whole but not necessarily constant throughout
Judahite history. Indeed, what I will argue in later chapters is that at a fairly late date,

---

47 Van Seters has performed a considerable analysis of the role of such genealogies in cross-cultural
comparison between biblical and classical historiography (Van Seters 1992). As Darshan himself notes,
“early on, Samuel Rolles Driver, Edward Meyer, and Hermann Gunkel noted the parallels between the
Table of Nations in genesis 10 and the Greek traditions concerning Hellen…these, however, were only
preliminary attempts to deal with the Greek genealogical material (Darshan 2013, 516). Referring to Van
Seters’ study specifically, Darshan notes, accurately, “Van Seters’ treatment…still leaves many stones
unturned” (518). This comparison has also appeared in the works of classicists: M.L. West suggests that,
compared to other Near Eastern genealogies, “the genealogies of the Old Testament, especially the book of
Genesis, are much more closely comparable to the Hesiodic ones, both in their multilinearity and in their
national and international scope” (West, M.L. 1985, 13). In his book about Nostoi myths as ethnic charters
in the Mediterranean, Malkin refers to “the biblical genealogy of the sons of Noah” as an example of fluid
relatedness in genealogical discourse (Malkin, Irad 1998, 61)

48 The comparison between Greek literature and Genesis’ genealogical narratives is useful, but the failure to
note that what the Chronicles genealogy shares with the Catalogue that Genesis does not makes the
innovation of the Chronicles effort all the more striking is unfortunate. And, there is much in the
comparison to follow that is specific to the Chronicles genealogy. Darshan, referring to Genesis 10, notes
that “as in the biblical Table of Nations, the genealogical traditions of Argos feature the incorporation of
the fathers of many nations outside the extended Greek space most prominently, the majority concentrating
upon the Eastern Mediterranean” (Darshan 2013, 520). But this is precisely the point. The Argos genealogy
is just one element of the Catalogue, and the Table of Nations, re duplicated, enhanced, made more
cohesive in 1 Chron 1, is just one element the Chronicles genealogy.
many of the major biblical traditions were still accessible as independent narratives of
Israelite ethnogenesis, and neither the narrative of David or Moses initially subscribed to
Genesis’ vision of either the tribes or of Israelite prehistory. Thus, the fact that the
beginning of Chronicles mirrors the beginning of the Bible in these two aspects may be a
sign not that Chronicles is responsive to biblical literature but that the same interests were
involved in composing this Chronicles genealogy and in constructing the biblical canon. ⁴⁹

Regardless its major contribution is articulating the idea of Israel as a tribal
society to an extent absolutely unparalleled in biblical literature. The genealogies of
Chronicles are longer, far more inclusive, and, particularly but not exclusively in 1
Chronicles 1, considerably (at once) more aggregative and coherent than anything else in
biblical literature. In this, Chronicles as project is powerfully reminiscent of the greatest
of Greek genealogical projects, the pseudo-Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Again, this is
something that scholars have addressed before, although often in comparison with
Genesis rather than Chronicles, and again, as Darshan puts it “the need for a full and
comprehensive comparison with such Greek compositions as the Catalogue of Women
remains unmet” (Darshan 2013, 518). If indeed the Chronicles genealogy is a project of
similar nature to the Catalogue, then its reinventive and redescriptive potential is
considerable, even if significant aspects of Genesis pre-existed it, and this may be
brought out by an extended comparison. I believe that the Chronicles genealogy does
indeed represent a dynamic new vision of Israel, one evolved out of what I take to be the
late coalescence of the book of Genesis and concomitant with the series of edits I will
investigate in later chapters which transformed various independent traditions into the

⁴⁹ Otherwise, we might expect Genesis’ various discourses to have left more of an impact on biblical
literature as a whole.
coherent, specifically biblical account. But we begin here by exploring the realm of the possible where Chronicles is concerned.

**Prefatory note: Dating**

Prior to beginning our comparison, it seems useful to address the issue of dating both Chronicles in general and Chronicles 1:1-9:1a specifically. And, on the whole, it is easier to date the latter than the former. As Knoppers puts it,

> Chronicles is a postexilic work that depicts the pre-exilic period. There are no specific references, no absolute synchronisms, and no extra biblical citations that could definitively situate the work within a given decade or century...the classification of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) only provides scholars with a broad range of dates to associate with the writing of the work (Knoppers 2004, 102).

Japhet adds that “Chronicles displays no signs of Greek-Hellenistic influence in either language or theology” and “no trace of the Persian administrative system is evidenced in Roughly the 6th through the 3rd century B.C.E. An earlier generation of scholars (Cross, Freedman, et. al.) took the focus on monarchy that so marks Chronicles’ history as an indication that it was composed in the 6th century when monarchic concerns were more proximate than they would later be. As Japhet notes, “an early dating of the book must entail a very specific view of the literary work, with extensive parts of it regarded as secondary or of later editions. A very late date for the book’s composition is overly often commended by a scholar’s general view of the chronology of biblical literature” (Japhet 1993, 24).

Scholars who have attempted to reconstruct the date of Chronicles through its subject material have been pulled in several directions. Certainly, the book’s emphasis is the Davidic line, which is why, as Japhet puts it, “the eschatological expectations linked with the figure of Zerubbabel” have served to place the book at the end of the Exile for many prominent scholars. The fact that the absolute last historical event of Chronicles is the decree of Cyrus releasing the Judahites from Babylonian captivity serves certain scholars as a terminus a quo (Knoppers 2004, 106) while also serving others, generally, as an argument against a particularly late date. However, as Stott notes, there are very good reasons why the construction of biblical history, with the return from Exile serving as a kind of finial to the whole, should not be taken as a sign of the date of those texts because of the way social memory functions. There is, for example, no narrative in the Bible of Exile although “to be sure, certain passages have been understood by some as compositions that reflect an exilic perspective” (Stott 2009, 41). Therefore, the whole must be considered uncertain.

---

50 Roughly the 6th through the 3rd century B.C.E. An earlier generation of scholars (Cross, Freedman, et. al.) took the focus on monarchy that so marks Chronicles’ history as an indication that it was composed in the 6th century when monarchic concerns were more proximate than they would later be. As Japhet notes, “an early dating of the book must entail a very specific view of the literary work, with extensive parts of it regarded as secondary or of later editions. A very late date for the book’s composition is overly often commended by a scholar’s general view of the chronology of biblical literature” (Japhet 1993, 24). Scholars who have attempted to reconstruct the date of Chronicles through its subject material have been pulled in several directions. Certainly, the book’s emphasis is the Davidic line, which is why, as Japhet puts it, “the eschatological expectations linked with the figure of Zerubbabel” have served to place the book at the end of the Exile for many prominent scholars. The fact that the absolute last historical event of Chronicles is the decree of Cyrus releasing the Judahites from Babylonian captivity serves certain scholars as a terminus a quo (Knoppers 2004, 106) while also serving others, generally, as an argument against a particularly late date. However, as Stott notes, there are very good reasons why the construction of biblical history, with the return from Exile serving as a kind of finial to the whole, should not be taken as a sign of the date of those texts because of the way social memory functions. There is, for example, no narrative in the Bible of Exile although “to be sure, certain passages have been understood by some as compositions that reflect an exilic perspective” (Stott 2009, 41). Therefore, the whole must be considered uncertain.
The same ambiguity does not completely extend to the Chronicles genealogy. The best terminus ad quem in the Books of Chronicles comes from here, a genealogy of the descendants of Jehoiachin (1 Chron 3:17-24) which extends to either 7 or 14 generations after this exiled king (Japhet 1993, 26). At a conservative twenty years a generation, this is a record of a time 140-280 years after Jehoiachin, or between 460-320 B.C.E. The question then is whether this genealogy and the rest of Chronicles are of one piece. Japhet certainly thinks so, but as McKenzie notes, for scholars who do not think all of Chronicles is a unified composition, 1 Chronicles 1-9 is certainly among the most cited as originally independent material (McKenzie 1999, 78; Japhet 1993, 7). In my opinion, this latter view is likely correct, because there is a significant conceptual disconnect between the information offered by these genealogies and the interests of the

---

51 A fact that Japhet takes as a sign of its post-Persian period construction, but can also, of course, be taken as a sign of its early Persian period construction, or even as a sign of a deliberate desire to avoid acknowledging Persian hegemony in this respect.

52 The most prominent “dateable” issue in Chronicles outside of 1 Chronicles 1-9 is probably the question of whether the Second Temple had yet been built by the time of this work. In Knoppers’ opinion, if the Temple had been under construction when Chronicles was written, it would have devoted more attention its specifications which, to him, suggests that the Temple was indeed already standing (Knoppers 2004, 111). This line of argument presupposes that the Temple would inevitably be a pre-eminent concern in any biblical work, but this is reasonable enough.

53 The Hebrew, as Japhet notes, is difficult in this respect.

54 She notes, in part “while the possibility of secondary elaboration during the course of transmission was not ruled it seemed that a better explanation of the book’s variety and composition is the view that it is one work, composed essentially by a single author, with a very distinct and peculiar literary method. The author’s penchant for citing existing texts, for expressing his own views through elaboration and change of such texts, and his being influenced by both the Pentateuch, the Deuteronomistic Historiography and a plethora of earlier sources, yet going his own way, account for the varieties of the book (Japhet 1993, 6).
rest of the books of Chronicles. By beginning with Adam and continuing as far as Jehoiachin’s descendants, these genealogies envision a narrative world fully as varied as the whole of the Hebrew Bible, while the actual narrative of the books of Chronicles is more or less a purely monarchical history.

There is little evidence that, as Chronicles is a more or less purely monarchical history, the Chronicler had reason to feel compelled to offer this additional material, not offered in Kings for example. If the Chronicler had felt the need to be comprehensive, it seems unlikely that the greatest part of the history would be narrated in 9 chapters, and in a different genre than the rest of the book. Therefore I will indeed, in what follows treat 1 Chron 1:1-9:1a as an essentially distinct document from the rest of the books of Chronicles, but I imagine few of my findings will be challenged by different understandings of the date of Chronicles or of the relationship between the narrative of Chronicles and its earliest chapters.

Finally, it seems clearly the case that the author of 1 Chronicles 1:1-2:2 is distinct from the authors of much of the subsequent material in the Chronicles genealogy, given that this pericope conforms to the vision of Genesis in the important ways mentioned above and what follows does not. However, it is presumably also the case that the author of the introduction to the genealogy is also the one who incorporated the materials which follow into it and perhaps made other changes throughout, a species of activity we will see paralleled below. In that sense, it is reasonable to consider the author of 1 Chron 1:1-2:2 the author of the genealogical project in all of these chapters, even though the latter stages of this construction relied more on incorporation than composition.
The Catalogue of Women

Here it is necessary to briefly introduce the Catalogue. Despite its importance and immense popularity in the ancient world, this literary work exists now only as a reconstruction although, presumably because of that same importance, there are a great many sources to reconstruct it from. Osborne notes that in fragmentary form we now possess 1,300 or so lines and estimates from West’s speculation that Book 1 was around 900 lines in length that “the total length of the work is unlikely to have been substantially less than, or substantially more than, 4000” (Osborne 2005, 6). It was, in antiquity, consistently supposed to have been authored by Hesiod, though it is now generally believed that this is not the case, and if it is still occasionally supposed to have evolved from a Hesiodic original, the mechanism of this evolution is unclear (West 1985, 125–128; R. L. Fowler 2000, 1).

---

55 Hall notes “if the pseudo-Hesiodic ‘Hellenic genealogy’ was not unique in antiquity, we can at least be fairly confident of its dominance in the construction of Hellenic identity during the archaic period” (Hall 2002, 28).

56 This is, of course, speculation based on the assumption that all the books were of the same length.

57 As West notes, “After the Theogony and the Works and Days, the poem in five books known as the Catalogue of Women or Ehoiai was, until the fifth century A.D., the most widely read of the poems that anciently went under the name of Hesiod, and the one most constantly attributed to him” (West 1985, 1). There seems hardly any way to know, but this strikes me as unlikely. A Hesiodic original is not requisite to explaining Hesiodic attribution, and it seems difficult to maintain both the extraordinary centrality of northern Greek interests to the overall effort and authorship by the Boiotian (or Aiolian) Hesiod. West argues that “it is quite possible that (Hesiod) followed or intended to follow his Theogony with a genealogy of heroes. And indeed the Theogony as it has come down to us ends on that road. At 963 the poet says farewell to the gods, and with a new invocation of the Muses embarks upon a short Catalogue of those goddesses who lay with men….At 1019 another very similar transition leads into the Catalogue”. He suggests that F1 of the Catalogue was designed from the start as a transition to the Catalogue “But…the separation…of the one continuous text into two was made by something other than the author of F1. It may have been made at any date down to the early third century BC.” (West 1985, 125–126). However, as West additionally notes, the end of Theogony from line 900 on, is clearly not from the same hand as what precedes it, as it has dramatic differences in style, vocabulary, and contains obviously late eponyms such as the Medes and Latins (West 1985, 127). Therefore, the argument that there is anything “Hesiodic” about the pseudo-Hesiodic Catalogue of Women would have to rest on the assumption, simply, that Hesiod had once written a similar poem that we no longer possess, which may have inspired the inclusion of an additional similar, but not Hesiodic, poem in the text of the Theogony as it has been handed down.
thought to have a connection to the *Catalogue*, including the (also) Pseudo-Hesiodic
*Aspis* or "Shield of Herakles," which, as Haubold notes, "purports to be an expansion of
the Alcmene-ehoie" of the *Catalogue* (Haubold 2005, 99). There was also a "Megalai
Ehoiai", which has sometimes been considered to be a revised or extended version,
although most scholars now seem to regard it as a separate work altogether (D’Alessio
2005). The alternate title of the *Catalogue*, the *Ehoiai* comes, as West notes, "from the
recurrent formula ἥ οἶη, ‘a woman such as’".  

Much is owed, in terms of understanding the structure of the *Catalogue*, to the
work of M.L. West, whose 1985 reconstruction is by far the most important effort in this
direction, as well as to a previous effort by West and Reinhold Merkelbach to assemble
the various papyrus fragments that were available at that time in one place (Reinhold
Merkelbach and West, M.L. 1967). The complete *Catalogue* was a work of 5 books,
composed, in West’s opinion, from a series of once independent genealogies (for which
he proposes various completion dates). The first four books are of a type, relating the
genealogies of several prominent families and regions, but the final book, breaking from
the model, relates the genealogies of the heroes of the Trojan War setting the stage for

---

58 Martin suggests that the *Aspis* was "as much a part of the *Catalogue*" as the description of Achilles’
shield was within the *Iliad*, which, in his opinion, is to say not necessarily of a piece with what surrounds it,
but as an instance of "ekphrasis", or a literary description of a work of art, which he considers to be
generally a species of literary expansion that rhapsodes often turned to in oral performances. He suggests
that "one can easily imagine there being in the repertoire of rhapsodes a class of such expansions" (R.
Martin 2005, 172–173). In his view, though the two texts do not then have the same authors, the *Shield*
nevertheless forms a part of the finished poem in the same fashion as many other famous instances of
*ekphrasis* in Greek myth.

59 West notes that the standard Greek title for the work is Γυναικών Κατάλογος, but that the Ἠοῖαi name is
used by "Philodemos, Pausanias, Athenaeus, Eunapius and a scholiast on Sophocles" (West 1985, 1).
60 These include genealogies from Elis, finished in 776 B.C.E. (West supposes this was completed to
commemorate the first Olympic games), Amyclae (before 760), Aulis-Hyria (before 750), Malis (Before
750), Pisatis (before 740, Messene (before 740), Argos (between 750-720) and Lesbos (between 750-700)
epic.\textsuperscript{61} West has suggested an Attic origin for the \textit{Catalogue}, as well as a 6\textsuperscript{th} century date of completion, but the former, at least, even if accurate, seems beside the point with respect to what the genealogy is attempting to accomplish.\textsuperscript{62}

The segregation the \textit{Catalogue}'s structure imposes between families and regions breaks down at several times--Herakles, for example, as Haubold notes, seems to live backwards through the \textit{Catalogue}.\textsuperscript{63} But, taken as a whole it covers nearly every conceivable base and is an impressively cumulative effort regarding a body of myth literature probably much larger and more varied than could have been the case in Israel and Judah, given comparative size, population, and geographical extent. One of the most striking aspects of this genealogy is its durability. As Hall notes, referring to the particulars of the births of Ion, Doros, Akhaios and so forth, “the pseudo-Hesiodic version is rehearsed unaltered in the works of Strabo (8.7.1), Konon (26 FGrH 1.27) and pseudo-Apollodoros (1.7.3), while Hellanikos of Mytilene (4 FGrH125) simply adds

\textsuperscript{61} As West puts it, “Menelaos is born; Helen is born; everyone needed for the Trojan War is born” (West, M.L. 1985, 114). It’s a departure in more ways than one, if West’s reconstruction is correct. West suggests that of the many other instances in Greek mythology in which heroes gathered from far and wide--“the sailing of the Argo, the funeral games for Pelias, the Calydonian boar hunt”—this is the only one in which the Catalogue poet shows a particular interest (West, M.L. 1985, 114–115), although this may represent overconfidence in what is and is not preserved in the fragments.

\textsuperscript{62} Hall argues, referring directly to West’s theory of Attic origins, “the poem was not, however, simply a vehicle for Athenian propaganda. It was rather a compilation of pre-existing genealogical traditions and legends intended to unite what had formerly been local tales with a purely regional function and significance within a broader Hellenic frame of reference” (Hall 2002, 28). Where I differ from Hall is only in my supposition that previous, now lost efforts had probably already begun the process of turning “local tales with a purely regional function” into more encompassing genealogies.

\textsuperscript{63} “The first major fragment that we can place deals with his death and apotheosis (fr. 25), the last one with his birth (fr. 195). In between, we move from the sack of Oechalia (fr. 26) back to that of Pylos (frr. 33-5), Cos (fr. 43a) and Troy (fr. 165). Finally we arrive at the labours imposed on Heracles by Eurystheus (Fr. 190). Then he is born….The order of Heracles’ adventures in the \textit{Catalogue} is the exact reverse of that in Apollodorus” (Haubold 2005, 84).
Xenopatra to the children of Hellen” (Hall 2002, 29).\textsuperscript{64} Thus, the Catalogue’s influence spanned a considerable number of centuries.

Again, most Catalogue scholarship proceeds from the work of West, and West’s assumption was that the Catalogue artist combined as many as nine once independent genealogies, as noted above. It is perhaps more likely, given the level of integration between these genealogies that the Catalogue already displays, that some regional aggregation had already taken place prior to this effort. Fowler and Rutherford have suggested, given the pre-eminence and prevalence of northern figures in the Catalogue, that some not inconsiderable portion of the final product was worked out in northern regions before its combination with other genealogies (Rutherford 2005, 115; Fowler 2000, 12-13).\textsuperscript{65} Other observations suggest at least two large, pre-existing efforts

\textsuperscript{64} As he further notes, however, “Herodotos only mentions Hellen’s paternity of Doros (1.56.3) and Ion’s filiation from Xouthos (7.94), while Thoukydides refers anonymously to the ‘sons of Hellen’ (1.3.2) and Pausanias (7.1.2) derives the descent of Akhaios and Ion from Xouthos, son of Hellen, without mentioning Aiolos or Doros (Hall 2002, 29). The point is not that the genealogy was universal; it is that this particular version was influential for centuries.

\textsuperscript{65} As Rutherford notes, while “in theory, all these stemmata might have been presented as entirely independent, both of the Deucalionid stemma and each other…in fact, we find a tendency towards overlaps between the different stemmata, and towards combination of traditions from different parts of Greece” (Rutherford 2005, 100). Conceptually, it does seem more likely that certain genealogies used by the Catalogue artist had already been combined than that this artist found more than a half-dozen pristine, independent genealogies to combine when it came time to do so. Fowler has suggested the completion of this portion of the Catalogue in the aftermath of the First Sacred War, around the Delphic Amphictyony. I am in general very much distrustful of explanations which rely on very specific historical situations, especially in this case where virtually nothing is known (R. L. Fowler 2000, 13). So, too, West’s suggestion that the Elean stemma dates from 776 B.C.E., the founding of the Olympic festival is hard to believe (West, M.L. 1985, 143). In my opinion, the sheer number of potential contexts from just the bare portion of ancient history which has been preserved, for the composition of nearly any text, measured against the vast scope of what we do not know should provide a powerful disincentive for such speculation. There are reasonable methods to approximate dates and regional contexts, and it seems somewhat irresponsible to go farther. Given the extraordinary paucity both of known, dateable events in the distant past, and written material that survives from it, the odds that one of those texts and one of those events could happen to coincide seem prohibitive, even as I recognize that the types of events which survive in history and the types of events which generate documentation are often one and the same. As Aren Maeir notes in a recent review, “bluntly put, even if a sack of Philistine foreskins were found in an early Iron Age Judahite site, this does not prove that the story of David occurred as described in the book of Samuel or that all the stories in this book are true!” (Maeir 2013, 7–8). There are just too many unknowns. However, the
contributed dramatically to the construction of *Catalogue* material. The two largest components of the genealogy appear to have been the northern stemma of the Deukalionids (including the Aiolids) and a southern, Theban-Argive stemma (the Inachids), which was probably also worked out largely before its inclusion here. Still, few doubt that some singular individual or group had a great deal to do with the creation of such an integrated whole, whatever its forebears, just as the author of 1 Chron 1:1-2:2 seems to have done with the material which forms 2:3-9:1a.⁶⁶

**The Catalogue and the Chronicles Genealogy**

This brings us at last into the range of our comparison. First, I should note that there are considerable reasons to imagine that the Chronicles genealogy, in form and concept, though not of course content, is a direct product of Greek influence (and, indeed, includes the Greeks, in the entity “Javan”). As Knoppers puts it

> It has become almost axiomatic to say that the composition of Chronicle bears no signs of either Hellenic or Hellenistic influence…there is no relationship whatsoever between the literary conventions found within classical historiography and those found in the Chronicler’s work (Knoppers 2003, 627).⁶⁷

However, if “genre” is a sign of Hellenic influence, then it seems likely that in this case this is exactly what it is going on here. Nor does it seem likely that the possibility of

---

⁶⁶ This, too, is dramatically in contrast to traditional understandings of biblical text. The so-called “Documentary Hypothesis” more or less demands, as many scholars have observed, a largely quiescent, passive editor and compiler. We can consider, in this light, the fairly recent statement of Joel Baden that “the compiler is not an author: he does not create new material, but rather uses the words and phrases of his sources where he makes insertions” (Baden 2012, 223–224). For an extensive study, and rejection, of the idea of an active editor in biblical literature, see Van Seters 2006.

⁶⁷ This assumption, as he further notes, has had bearing on the dating of the *Catalogue* (it is not supposed to be very late, because it must be pre-Hellenistic).
Hellenic or Hellenistic influence arrived in the region only with Alexander. As Knoppers additionally notes, “analysis of the material remains from ancient Palestine no longer supports the use of 332 B.C.E. as the threshold for Greek influence on Judah.

Archaeological and written evidence for Greek contacts with the eastern Mediterranean predates the Macedonian conquest by centuries” (Knoppers 2003, 648).

Of course, as Darshan notes, “[even though] it is difficult to contend that this parallel between the two cultures is merely coincidental…it cannot be argued that the Hebrew Bible was known to the Greek authors…or that Greek writings influenced the biblical texts” (Darshan 2013, 530–531). However, the similarities between the Chronicles genealogy and Greek efforts, and the differences between Chronicles (and certain parts of Genesis) and everything else from the region and time period are pretty explicit. In other words, the construction of the Chronicles genealogy is itself likely evidence of Hellenic influence, despite the absence of a particular text which might be at work here.

The tendency to imagine that all Aegean influence on the region originated with Alexander is lamentable.

Nevertheless, it is important to note, and rarely noted, that even if the Chronicles’ manner of dealing with biblical genealogy is not borrowed from Greek exemplars,

---

68 As Knoppers puts it, “He mentions as an example an Athenian decree, dating to around 367 B.C.E., honoring “King Strato of Sidon” and offering his people considerable trading rights (649).

69 Nor need we assume that the Greek-Judah connection here must have been related only to well-known and surviving Greek narratives. As Knoppers notes, the Phoronis of Hellanicus of Lesbos is “dominated” by a “segmented, multilinear system of lineages” in which “the author sketches separately the stories of each one of the principal descendants”, a fashion very similar, obviously, to biblical literature (Knoppers 2003, 635). He adds “it has to be acknowledged that juxtaposing a large network of genealogies with a long sequence of narratives in the context of a single historiographic work is a rarity; however, the Troika, authored by Hellanicus, may offer analogy. As reconstructed by modern scholars…the first book…contained genealogies of many prominent Greeks and Trojans, while the second book dealt with the Trojan war” (Knoppers 2003, 63). Darshan ultimately concludes, wisely, only that “the affinities between the Greek and Israelite traditions appear to indicate that these two cultures possessed unique traditions that developed in the eastern Mediterranean” (Darshan 2013, 531).
comparison with Greek with these, at second-order, would still be quite useful.\(^70\) As Knoppers puts it,

Cross-cultural studies offer the benefits of comparing similar phenomena in a plurality of social settings, illuminating otherwise odd or inexplicable traits of certain literary works, exploring a set of problems in different societies and calling attention to the unique features of a particular era or writing (Knoppers 2003, 628–629)

In biblical studies, the problem will always be that there is not enough evidence, and though this is certainly also true of Greek myth it is very much less true. What we are wanting, which can be supplied by comparison even where a direct relationship cannot be clearly demonstrated is examples through which to think, alternate models to consider. Since ancient Greek literature, with or without a direct relationship, in the words, again, of Knoppers, “does offer national histories that may be compared with the Deuteronomistic History and the Chronicler’s History” there is much that the clearer

---

\(^70\) As J.Z. Smith notes, the idea of a distinction between analogical and genealogical comparison dates to at least the work of Adolf Deissmann in the early twentieth century and has a somewhat fraught history (Deissmann 1923). Generally, genealogical comparison is comparing two texts or objects because of the assumption of a pre-existing relationship between them, with the result that this form of comparison is alternately treated as something to be mined for historical information or to be rejected as an ontological threat, depending on who is doing the comparison. For example, with respect to religious, generally Christian, discussions of genealogical comparison, “the thought appears to be that, from a standpoint of protecting the privileged position of early Christianity, it is only genealogical comparisons that are worthy of note, if only, typically, insistently to be denied” (J. Z. Smith 1990, 47–48). He continues, with respect to champions of genealogical comparison, “similarities are to be explained as either the result of the ‘psychic unity’ of humankind, or the result of ‘borrowing’” (J. Z. Smith 1990, 47). The opposite happens to have been the case for much of the 20th century in biblical studies, where potential genealogical parallels with Near Eastern literature were greedily consumed, sometimes even invented, and often with little sense of caution. However, Smith calls our attention to an essential aspect of the act of comparison which challenges the existence of this dichotomy. As he puts it, “similarity and difference are not ‘given’. They are the results of mental operations…comparison, in its strongest form brings differences together within the space of the scholar’s mind for the scholar’s own intellectual reasons. It is the scholar who makes their cohabitations—their ‘sameness’—possible, not ‘natural’ affinities or processes of history” (J. Z. Smith 1990, 51). The purpose, therefore, is always illustration which means that, functionally, as Smith puts it, “all comparisons are properly analogical”. In short, whether one compares the Noah narrative with the Babylonian *Atrahasis* myth which may have informed it, or with the Greek flood myth of Pyrrha and Deucalion which has a less clear relationship, the aim of the comparison is the same. Functionally speaking, there may be a sense in which genealogical comparison doesn’t exist.
picture of processes in the evolution of Greek narratives may offer biblical scholars (Knoppers 2003, 629).

The similarity between the two texts in terms of their construction becomes more obvious the more in-depth the analysis performed and this extends to the organization of each. As noted, the Catalogue begins with a northern Greek group, the Deucalionids, centered around East Lokris, Oita, southern Thessaly and probably Euboea (West, M.L. 1985, 139). The Aiolian genealogy represents what Fowler calls “the Aiolian heartland of south Thessaly, Boitoia and Korinth as well as the outlying region of Aitolia...and the western Peloponnese”, which the poet has carefully accounted for (R. L. Fowler 2000, 8–9). The Inachid genealogy is essentially a genealogy of Argos, though with some gestures towards an interesting internationalism. A key figure in this genealogy is Phoroneus, the “urmensch” of Argive tradition, born from Inachos himself, a river. The Arkadian stem is much less extensive or complex, “local in scope” and including the fifty

---

71 These include the children of Salmoneus, Perires, and the Neleids, through Neleus’ mother Tyro, daughter of Salmoneus.

72 As it splits nearly immediately into the descendants of Belos, including Aigyptos and Danaos and the descendants of Agenor including Kadmos, Adonis, and eventually Oidipous and the children of Zeus and Europa (West, M.L. 1985, 177–178). West suggests that the peculiarly long linear genealogy which begins the Inachid genealogy has been stretched to accommodate foreign attachments, and that a sign of this is the presence of the “duplicate eponyms”, four generations apart, of Danaos and Danae (West, M.L. 1985, 145). Fowler rejects the idea that Danaos and Danae—who is not mother to the Danaans, but to the Perseids-- are parallel and offers instead a fascinating explanation for this “stretching”. Homer, as he notes, “calls these people both Argives and Danaans so there must have been both an Argos and a Danaos. Since nothing else is known about them...they are simply put in a straight line as vertical descendants” (R. L. Fowler 2000, 7–8). The implications of this attempt, by the Catalogue artist, to rationalize Homeric myth through genealogy would be a fascinating insight into the kind of pressures this genealogy was susceptible to.

73 West and Fowler both suggest, very reasonably, that this tradition has already undergone an aggregation which brought into contact two traditions which lie somewhat uneasily alongside each other. As West puts it, “the Inachid genealogy has a different character from the Deukalionid. It has a greater vertical extension...but less lateral extension; there is nothing to match the breadth of Aiolos’ family. It is more strictly local...essentially an Argive genealogy form which a Theban line branches off nearly half way down. But various overseas countries are attached to it, as they were not to the Deukalionid stemma: Crete, Libya, Egypt, Phoenicia, Arabia, Lycia” (West, M.L. 1985, 144).
sons of Lykaon and probably not much else, but nevertheless according to West, it is possible to see in this genealogy a system of local eponyms covering nearly all of Arcadia, “containing both eponyms and saga heroes” (West, M.L. 1985, 154). It is somewhat less easy to make geographic claims for the Asopids which probably, in any case, included a number of figures who were “kept” until the Trojan War genealogy, but the Attic heroes and the Pelopids have obvious, secure geographical valences in Attica and the Peloponnese. Through a kind of itinerary, the first four books essentially narrate the entire genealogy of Greek myth from Deukalion to the Trojan War, and possibly slightly beyond (West, M.L. 1985, 119).  

Scholars have long grappled with the particulars of the organization of the Chronicles genealogy, but in general it is clear that it, too, is basically geographic. The genealogy begins in 1 Chronicles 2-4 with southern genealogies, those of Judah, Simeon and the line of David, continues in 1 Chronicles 5 with the Transjordanian tribes, Reuben, Manasseh and Gad, moves on to the purportedly universal tribe, Levi, in 1 Chron 5:27-6:66, and finally narrates the genealogies of the tribes of the northern kingdom in 1 Chron 7, Issachar, Benjamin, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim and Asher. Why, exactly it is arranged in such a way is less clear, as is why Dan and Zebulun are not included and why the genealogy actually concludes with an extended investigation of Benjamin in 1 Chron 8 that would seem to disturb the organization of the rest. This is true whether or not

---

74 Although Deukalion is treated as the first man, it should be noted that it’s not clear the Catalogue is aware of the narrative which makes him the survivor of the flood (West, M.L. 1985, 55–57).

75 Knoppers argues that Dan was, at one time, listed in 1 Chron 7:12. This appears neither in the MT nor the LXX, but as Knoppers point out, 7:12 certainly seems to have been disturbed and “Hushim”, here the son of Aher, is in Gen 46:23 a son of Dan’s. If one were to accept the further textual emendation that should be read as  the line would therefore read “The descendants of Dan: Hushim his son—one” (Knoppers 2004, 454). Additionally the chapter continues with the tribe of Naphtali, and then in
Benjamin is considered to be a southern or northern tribe. However, this singular disturbance does not change the overall picture that much. Indeed, rather than a problem,
this may actually be another similarity between the two documents. While the *Catalogue* genealogy departs, in its 5th and final book, from its geographical organization to present the figures of the paramount epic of Greek myth, the *Iliad*, the Chronicles genealogy does the same with the tribe of Benjamin. This out of place genealogy in 1 Chronicles 8, and another genealogy in 1 Chronicles 9, including the ancestors and descendants of Saul, immediately leads into a narrative about the end of the reign of Saul which opens the narrative material of Chronicles in 1 Chron 10.

Another important shared characteristic of these two efforts is that each seems to feature a diversity of genres, and it is worth reflecting what this might indicate. There are substantive stylistic differences, for example, between the long genealogies of the Inachids and Deucalionids, and others such as the “regional” Arkadian genealogy and the strangely liminal Attic genealogy.\footnote{The genealogy of the Deucalionids includes the Aiolid stemma, so detailed that Fowler has suggested the author of the *Catalogue* was himself an Aiolid (R. L. Fowler 2000, 9). West argues that Arcadia “had no real genealogical tradition of the kind we have found in central and north-western Greece” (West, M.L. 1985, 155) but it seems just as likely to me that the issue was the accessibility of Arcadian legends, rather than anything meriting an absolute statement about what did and did not exist in Arkadia. It is interesting, in this regard, as West notes, that “the Arkadis stemma relates to only a fringe of the (Arcadian) country: it represents Arcadia as seen from Argos. And it connects with Argive legends” (West, M.L. 1985, 155). The Attic genealogies have, as West puts it, “a character of their own. There is no virtually no saga here, only an unstable combination of cult myth…political myth…clan and parish antiquarianism…and folk tale. The stemma has neither breadth, depth, nor strength. We feel we are in a region that possesses plenty of uncoordinated story material but no tradition of putting it together in a connected account” (West, M.L. 1985, 164).} In the Chronicles genealogy, we have several instances in which the text seems to explicitly refer to physical, extra-biblical genealogies that were in the possession of the Chronicler, sometimes with a given historical context for their origin. This occurs in 1 Chron 5:7, with respect to the Reubenites (“and his

---

12). There seems to be a particularly strong tradition of an association between Benjamin and Jerusalem, both before and after the exile (Josh 18:28, Judges 1:21, Ezra 1:5, Neh 11:4, et al). Jeremiah seems to have come from Benjamin (Jer 1:1), and the Chronicles version of Josiah’s reform includes Benjamin by name (2 Chron 34:9, 32) although Benjamin does not appear in either the account of Hezekiah’s Passover (2 Chron 30) or Josiah’s (2 Chron 35).
relations by their families, when they were enrolled in the genealogy of their
generations”), with respect to the Gadites in 1 Chron 5:17 (“all of these were enrolled in
genealogies in the days of Jotham, king of Judah and the days of Jeroboam king of
Israel”) and with respect to Simeon in 1 Chron 4:33 and 1 Chron 4:41 (“These were their
settlements and they made their genealogy”, “and these recorded by name came in the
days of Hezekiah, king of Judah”). In other cases, we have quite distinct kinds of
sources appropriated for use in this holistic genealogical effort.

We have, for example, “roll-call” genealogies of Issachar, Asher and Benjamin,
which Sparks calls “military musters”, that very probably represent a completely distinct
genre, largely borrowed from a census of the fighting men of Israel in Numbers 26 (J. T.
Sparks 2008, 172). In all probability, these were not originally intended as genealogies,
but have here been repurposed. In neither Numbers 26 or 1 Chron 7 do we see many
people who are related to each other, although more so in 1 Chron 7 where most extend
to two generations after the eponymous tribal ancestor. In some cases we seem to have

78 The verb used in these instances, the hitpael of שִׁיח, is rarely used outside of this Chronicles genealogy. It
is used also, for example, in 2 Chron 31:17-19 where it describes an effort by Hezekiah (apparently) to
enroll all the Levites and their children in genealogies in order to establish their rights in perpetuity.
Though the Manassehite genealogy in 1 Chron 5:23-26 doesn’t use this verb, it does indicate a historical
context, indeed, the same one as in the genealogy of Reuben, which is just before or perhaps just after
Tiglath-Pileser—mentioned by name in both cases—took them into exile.

79 That is, while the census of Asher in Numbers 26 records the Imnites, Ishvites, Berites, Heberites,
Malchielites, and mentions Asher’s daughter Serah, the Chronicles version adds the descendants of Beriah
to three generations, and some additional names which are hard to place. Where Numbers 26 mentions the
Issachar clans, the text refers to the Tolaites, Punites, Jashubites, and Shimronites while the Chronicles
version includes the descendants of Tola to the fourth generation. In the case of the Benjaminites, there are
more considerable differences as the Benjaminite clans of the Belaites, Ashbelites, Ahriamites, Suphamites,
Huphamites, and the sons of Bela, Ard and Naaman in Numbers 26, are matched, in the Chronicles version
only by Bela. Benjamin’s other children, and their descendants (Becher and Jedediael) are not mentioned in
Numbers 26.

80 These genealogies also use שִׁיח, but their Numbers 26 parallels use, instead, פָּקַד. This verb, with its
resonance of counting, is very probably more accurate. That is, a reckoning of fighting men is not a
genealogy, it is an accounting, and a verb with the resonance of counting is therefore more appropriate to
very long genealogies, evidence, presumably, of well-maintained sources, and in other cases they are very short. The “genres” of the Chronicles genealogies would then be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Artifactual” genealogies denoted by a form of שׂ</th>
<th>“Census” genealogies</th>
<th>Long genealogies</th>
<th>Other short genealogies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simeon (1 Chron 4: 24-33)</td>
<td>Issachar (1 Chron 7:1-5)</td>
<td>Judah (1 Chron 2:3-4:23)</td>
<td>Naphtali (1 Chron 7:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gad (1 Chron 5:11-21)</td>
<td>Asher (1 Chron 7:30-39)</td>
<td>Benjamin (1 Chron 8:1-40)</td>
<td>Ephraim (1 Chron 7:20-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh (1 Chron 5:23-26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And, as an aside, we can certainly notice the potential logic of which genealogies derive from which categories. It makes eminent sense that long genealogies should be

---

81 Knoppers argues that the length of the genealogies of Judah, Levi and Benjamin compared to the other ones has to do with their importance, that they are “pivotal tribes” in the post-Exilic period (Knoppers 2004, 261), but the implications of Knoppers’ argument make it difficult to maintain. Recall again that if we view Chronicles not as a passive attempt to reiterate Israel, but an active attempt to reimagine it in a way meaningful for the people of Yehud, the organization of Israel in Chronicles should be a product of Yehudite sensibilities. This speaks to Knoppers’ argument. However, there is a more pragmatic issue, which is that it also means that what went into the Chronicles genealogy was what was available to Yehudite mythographers. What continued to exist after the fall of the northern kingdom, namely Judah and its environs, would have been more easily available for reasons having little to do with their prestige. If it were the case that the length of the material dealing with a tribe in the Chronicles genealogy was a reasonable measure of its importance, then we would have to suggest that Naphtali was the least important of the tribes, since it has only a single line of genealogy. Does the fact that the genealogy of Naphtali takes only a single verse mean it is the least important, less important than Reuben or Issachar? Does the fact that Manasseh has two genealogies mean it is particularly important? Additionally, while 1 Chron 8 is a long genealogy about Benjamin, it is not in fact a long genealogy of Benjamin. It stops and starts, and is in fact several closely related, but non-continuous genealogies. My argument, therefore is that the availability of
available from entities which seem still to be vibrant, that artifactual genealogies might still be available from the nearby Transjordan region, while improvisation might be necessary to account for groups lost longer ago, and farther from view.  

What the aggregation of genres in the Chronicles genealogy and in the Catalogue presumably indicates is the species of effort each is. That is, both represent a dynamic series of interactions with already extant material, something widely acknowledged with respect to the Catalogue, but not the Chronicles genealogy. And, again, since so much of the Chronicles genealogy does not appear elsewhere in the Bible, it is quite clear that these are not merely biblical sources. The use of various sources of different types indicates that these are constructed through editorial efforts as much as they are free compositions, and probably much more so. But what we can see in the dynamism of the transformation of the military musters of Numbers 26 into genealogical data, what we are arguing for in macrocosm, is that editorial efforts can produce considerably new material mattered more to the Chronicler than displaying certain tribes to greater advantage. After all, had the glorification of Judah, Levi, and Benjamin been the aim, there is absolutely no reason the Chronicler had to include the other tribes at all. Knoppers himself points out, the Chronicler went well above and beyond “the circumscribed borders of Yehud” to “hold on to a larger Israelite ideal” (Knoppers 2004, 262).

Sparks’ suggestion that the genealogies of Ner the Benjaminite, in 1 Chron 8:33-39 and Sheshan the Judahite in 1 Chron 2:34-41 may extend into the Exilic period is unlikely, since the sons of Ulam are just 10-13 generations from Saul, so between 200-260 years at 20 years a generation, and Sheshan is just 23 generations from Judah, 460 years or so. It is nevertheless clear that these genealogies, along with the genealogies of Jehozadak the Levite and of Jehoiachin do indeed extend by far the longest (J. T. Sparks 2008, 13). This presumably does indicate that Benjamin continued as a going concern for nearly as long as Judah and Levi. As Wilson notes, “the genealogies in Chronicles in particular are highly complex….Still, the comparative data now available suggests that at many points the Bible’s genealogical views are quite similar to those of living societies where genealogies are still created, preserved, and used” (Wilson 1979, 21). Hall further notes that myths of ethnic origin “function as cognitive artefacts which both circumscribe and actively structure corporate identity so that whenever the relationships between groups change, then so do the accompanying genealogies (Hall, Jonathan M. 1997, 41).

Knoppers suggests that the Chronicles genealogy is “more conservative” than Greek genealogies because “while Greek counterparts worked with oral traditions, the Chronicler worked with written materials” but it would certainly seem as if the failure to smooth out differences between genres in the Catalogue bespeaks either written texts or oral traditions of such structure as to make little difference (Knoppers 2004, 259).
meanings in what is being edited. And, indeed, this is a good vantage point from which to observe that the dynamism of combination is a considerable challenge to traditional documentary analyses, not in the sense that it intimates that biblical literature was not largely constructed through the combination of pre-existing narratives but that such activity does not inevitably preserve the sense of those narratives. With respect to the Chronicles genealogy specifically, it seems much less controversial to suggest that the purpose of gathering different material from different genres and different locations is to systematize them within a system that imposes upon them a specific, overall meaning.

And this brings us to what it is, specifically, that the Chronicles genealogy has gifted biblical literature with, just as the Catalogue gifted it—with a little help—to Greek mythography: the creation of an encompassing ethnic system out of constituent parts through subscription to a single ancestor. Overall, the overwhelming focus of the Catalogue is on establishing a Panhellenic identity, literally, through descent from and relationship to Hellen, thus, Panhellenism. It is not that the Catalogue created this ethnic idea—Panhellenism is generally considered a product of the early 5th century B.C.E., often of the pressures created by the Persian Wars, and the Persian Empire

84 As Hall notes, “clearly the point here is to express the degree of relatedness between various Greek ethnic groups which are represented here by eponymous ancestors...[and] the Hellenic genealogy employs the metaphor of kinship to construct a system of ranked relationship between the groups that are represented by their eponyms” (Hall 1997, 43). He also suggests that, “the function of the ‘Hellenic genealogy’ is to express the relationships between Dorians, Aiolians, Akhaians and Ionians...as well as to signal the participation of all four groups within a broader Hellenic identity embodied in the figure of...Hellen” (Hall 2002, 27). As he additionally puts it, “it is virtually certain that Greeks of the Bronze Age did not call themselves ‘Hellenes’. There is no need to make an argument from silence, as ‘the name is an Attic-Ionic dialect form for ‘Hellenes’, and the –anes suffix appears to be typical of areas of northern and western Greece such as Aitolia, Akarnania, Epeiros, Kephallenia and Thrake. It is then, highly unlikely that a name employed beyond the periphery of the Mycenaean world could have taken root in central and southern Greece prior to the disturbances which ensued upon the collapse of the palaces” (Hall 2002, 47–48). It has, of course, been noted at least since the time of Thucydides (1.3.2-3) that Homer never refers to the Greeks, collectively, as Hellenes, but as Akhaioi, Argeioi, and Danaoi.
generally-- but it describes and mirrors it and in later periods would serve as a map of it.\textsuperscript{85} As Hall notes, referring to a larger phenomenon of genealogical efforts related to the \textit{Catalogue} in their major claims, “the function of the ‘Hellenic’ genealogy is to express the relationship between Dorians, Aioli and Akhaians, and Ionians...as well as to signal the participation of all four groups within a broader Hellenic identity embodied in the figure of...Hellen” (Hall 2002, 28).\textsuperscript{86}

Just so, as Knoppers notes, the Chronicles genealogy shares with the \textit{Catalogue} “the attention devoted to the development of humanity from a single source and the attention devoted to the relationships among a variety of nations”.\textsuperscript{87} These “establish a context within which to view the origins of the people of Israel. The Israelites are related directly and indirectly to a host of other peoples, most of whom preceded Israel on the world stage” (Knoppers 2003, 630). It is a full ethography, not merely a picture of the

\textsuperscript{85} It is widely assumed that the development of a panhellenic idea was a long process, and was not a feature of early Hellenic ethnic articulations (Hall 1997; Hall 2002; Malkin 2001; Malkin 1998; Cole 2004; Lopez-Ruiz 2010). As Malkin notes, “In the Archaic period we will find no Greeks in the sense of self-contrasted with non-Greek as absolute others” (Malkin, Iraad 1998, 18). “Greek” identity seems to have aggregated slowly, beginning in perhaps the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, and was finally, as Konstan notes, “to some extent...undoubtedly a consequence of the Persian invasion” (Konstan 2001, 33). Some scholars have argued for an even later date: Morgan, for example, suggests that it is not until the 5\textsuperscript{th} century odes of Pindar that we find “the most powerful statement of the new pan-Hellenic ideology” (Morgan 2001, 33).

\textsuperscript{86} In the words of Darshan, “in his study of Greek ethnic identity, Jonathan Hall has demonstrated how the \textit{Catalogue of Women} directly reflects the process whereby Hellenic identity was shaped during the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.E.” (Darshan 2013, 522; Hall 1997, 43–110; Hall 2002, 25–26).

\textsuperscript{87} An inert understanding of such a genealogical form, obviously, does not tend to reflect how such genealogical systems operate in cross-cultural comparison, even with respect to minor changes, let alone the major improvements in coherence described above. As Knoppers notes, “details about settlements and kinship relationships may strike modern readers as inconsequential, but such particulars can establish precedents for later times. The Athenians, for example, could cite their participation in the Trojan expedition depicted in Homer (Il. 2.557-67) to show that they had as good a claim to Sigeum as the Mytilenians did (Herodotus 5.94). Those Benjaminites living in the late Persian-early Hellenistic period could cite the Benjaminite lineages in Chronicles to lay claim to their habitation of sites not registered as belonging to them in earlier (biblical) texts” (Knoppers 2003, 636). This seems quite reasonable. Rutherford, for example, investigates a series of minor alterations to \textit{Catalogue} myth which may indicate the geopolitical aspirations of Athens (Rutherford 2005).
line of Jacob, but it is at the same time the most comprehensive statement there is with respect to the belonging of the elements of the imagined social order of Israelite within Israelite (here, meaning Jacob) ethnicity, and the place of that *ethnos* in a broader ethnic world.

It is worth noting that in both cases, the relationship of the relevant patriarch—Jacob and Hellen respectively—to those who come after is, upon closer examination, very much incomplete. Finkelberg suggests that “the remarkable fact about Greek genealogy…is that the stemma of Hellen does not cover the entire nomenclature of mythological personages associated with the Heroic age…by no means all the heroes of Greek legend were regarded as descendants of Hellen” (Finkelberg 2005, 33). 88 In the Chronicles genealogy there are many such breaks. 89 This is another important observation, because it dramatically underscores the extent to which the integration visible in both places is something new: it is being performed on bodies of literature which were not originally intended to be organized in this way, which in a significant sense resist such organization. It is no surprise that in the 6th century B.C.E., the Greeks had still to create a truly cohesive account of a collective past, and therefore had to rely

---

88 She makes the claim, probably somewhat overstated, that “in the final analysis, the standard Greek genealogy emerges as an aggregate of mutually unconnected stemmata, each of them traced to a separate progenitor of its own: a far cry indeed from a unified genealogical tree” (Finkelberg 2005, 35). While this is certainly true in many cases, there are a great many interconnections between the stemmata, farther down, which counteract this impression to a great extent. West notes, with respect to the *Catalogue*, “the initial position of the Deukalionids creates the illusion that Hellen with his sons Doros, Xouthos, and Aiolos stand over the whole complex, as if they were ancestors of the entire nation” (West, M.L. 1985, 166).

89 There is no obvious relationship between Reuben and his sons and Joel, father of a line of Reubenites ultimately taken into exile by Tiglath-Pileser (1 Chron 5:6) or between Gad and yet another Joel, the chief of the people 1 Chron 5:12 (and curiously Gilead appears in this list as the name of a Gadite (1 Chron 5:14) as well as a region inhabited by Gad (1 Chron 5:16)). There is no obvious relationship between Manasseh and the heads of the Manassehite families mentioned in 1 Chron 5:23-26. In 1 Chron 8, there is no relationship between Benjamin and Ehud (1 Chron 8:6), Shaharim (1 Chron 8:8), Beriah and Shema or Shemaiah (1 Chron 8:13, 16, 21), heads of ancestral houses, or Jeiel, an ancestor of Saul (1 Chron 8:29).
on one created through a kind of gestalt. That this may also have been necessary, with respect to biblical narratives, in the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.E. would be a surprise, but this is, I believe, the most logical explanation for the evidence presented so far. Each of these efforts is a profoundly creative, basically geographic effort to invent a cultural entity which was only imaginatively present at the time of the composition of each document.

What I would like to conclude with, in this chapter, is an exploration of some of the mechanisms through which the genealogization, so to speak, of myth-histories have been accomplished in each case, with an eye towards future discussions.

Genealogy, Ethnicity, and Fluidity revisited: The Techniques of the Genealogist

In suggesting that much was still possible in terms of redefining the Judahite ethnos at the time of the construction of the Chronicles genealogy, we revisit many of the topics explored in the introduction. What can we imagine the Chronicler still had to do, with respect to completing the biblical historical narrative, in the late fifth or fourth century B.C.E? How much was his, her, or their hands constrained by the weight of tradition? A first useful observation is that adding to a genealogical framework is a task easily accomplished. The framework is easily expanded by the addition of children, marriages, and other techniques through which whole new libraries of mythology

---

90 In neither case do these disconnects attract much attention, in my opinion, because of the success of the whole in appearing to erase them.
instantly integrate with the old. We can point to Hellanikos of Mytilene’s addition of Xenopatra to the children of Hellen, mentioned above or to the addition of a daughter of Hellen, a “Protogeneia,” first-born, who was made the ancestress of the Aetolians, at the same time asserting their superiority over the mothers of Graikos, Magnes, and Makedon (West, M.L. 1985). This is, fundamentally, what genealogies are, a superior technique for organization, a cutting-edge technology for synthesis, and it is probably this which explains their popularity in ethnic articulations.

That this kind of enlarging synthesis occurred in the Chronicles genealogy seems clear. There are several cases in which heroic figures from Israelite myth that are not elsewhere placed in a genealogical context, are integrated into this effort. These include the judges Othniel son of Kenaz (Judges 3:7-11, 1 Chron 4:13); Ehud, son of Gera (Judges 3:12-4:1, 1 Chron 8:6); and Tola, son of Puah, son of Dodo, who actually appears in Chronicles as a brother of Tola’s and a son of Issachar’s, dispensing with Dodo altogether (Judges 10:1-2, 1 Chron 7:1). We also have the figures “Ethan, Heman, Calcol and Darda” who all appear here as Judahites but in 1 Kings 4:31 appear as the sons of Mahol and as a group of sages, neither obviously Judahite nor Israelite, whom Solomon surpasses in wisdom (1 Kings 4:31). This is perhaps the easiest form of genealogical synthesis to recognize, and there is considerably more of this kind of aggregation in the Chronicles genealogy than has often been realized. Obviously, this gestures to the points made above.

However, there are other ways to build connections, the major one of which is actually something that disadvantages the Chronicles genealogy. That is, genealogical
connections and the subsequent creation of complex and fluid identities are often achieved through intermarriage. Hall suggests that the assumption of a “Dorian” identity by the Argives—an important subject for this particular study-- was achieved “in one of the final stages of composition of the Catalogue of Women by having Doros marry the daughter of Phoroneus” (Hall, Jonathan M. 1997, 107), that is, by having the patriarch of the originally separate “Dorian” ethnic group marry into the family of the father of the Argives.  

Rutherford notes the probable purpose of this alteration. As the Dorian Invasion includes the conquest of Argos, we might expect that the Dorians would be represented in the Catalogue as late arrivals in the Peloponnese, displacing earlier populations including the Argive line descended from Phoroneus. In fact, because of this marriage, “when the Dorians invade, they are really restoring the original Argive line” (Rutherford 2005, 100). Fowler points to other examples of such activity.  

Marriage does not play a considerable role in the aggregation of the Chronicles genealogy, though it is not entirely absent. We can consider, for example, the late-life marriage of Hezron, the grandson of Judah, to the daughter of Machir, in 1 Chron 2:21-24, or Abraham’s second marriage to Keturah, through whom Israel is connected to various nations including Midian. Overall, however, there are (of course) very few women with agency in biblical literature and the Chronicler’s resulting inability to forge exogamous connections results in severe disconnects throughout the genealogy. As Cole 

---

91 Here we see the paramount importance of women in genealogical narratives. Doros, of course, will always remain a Dorian and Phoroneus an Argive: in a patriarchal society, it is not possible for men to change their family identity. Thus, the mechanism is Phoroneus’ daughter. If the Greek myth was ultimately both more successful and internally more cohesive than the biblical myth, it is because of the absence of interest biblical literature generally shows in female protagonists.

92 He suggests, for example, the Herakles was made a Pelopid, as well as a Perseid, for the sake of the importance of Herakleid myth in the Peloponnese (Fowler 2000, 6-8).
notes, “marriage is a key to the narrative (of genealogies) because…females are the link to collateral branches of the family stem,” a point also made by Lyons (Cole 2004, 25; Lyons, 1997). There are many other crucial intermarriages in the *Catalogue*, which, of course, is a large part of the explanation for its name. In addition to Dorus’ marriage to the daughter of Phoroneus, we have Xouthos, son of Hellen, who, as West notes, becomes a son-in-law of Erechtheus, autochthonous founder of the *polis* of Athens and connects the Athenian genealogy to Hellen. The Asopid Lakedaimon’s daughter marries the Inachid Akriskios, and Leda, mother of Helen, wife of Tyndareus is a Deukalionid, creating a connection with several important Pelopid strands. And so on.

From these observations, and through the Bible’s lamentable gender politics, we can make another important observation. Exogamy seems to be particularly important to *living* systems of classification. As Elizabeth Irwin notes with respect to the *Catalogue* genealogy,

The *Catalogue* depicts in myth the dynamics and criteria underlying marriage exchange, topics of interest…and certainly contested within the fluid and fragile grouping within the polis known as the *agathoi*. Because the elite of a given polis were not a well-defined class, but a loose group of contenders asserting their entitlement to this label, while attempting to exclude its application to others, poetic texts were a crucial instrument for these competitions over self-

---

93 This is a somewhat obvious point, but since males retain membership in their own family, whatever they do, women serve a critical role in aggregative efforts. Lacking this mechanism for exogamous connection, the first major disruption in the Chronicles genealogy is the addition of the genealogy of the sons of Seir in 1 Chron 1:38-42. Seir is not given antecedents, he is not connected to the previous genealogical material except that we have just reached the end of the previous genealogical passage, culminating with Isaac and Esau and the sons of Esau, and Esau is in some conceptual way related to Seir, elsewhere described as a “Horite” and the father of “Horite chiefs” (Gen 36:20-21). Keturah is the only woman mentioned in 1 Chron 1. There are a number of women in 1 Chron 2, but none with lineages of their own. David’s children are listed according to the wives he had in 1 Chron 3, but the same issue pertains and only Shelomith, daughter of Zerubbabel is listed in the line of Jehoachin in 1 Chron 3: 17-24. For the rest of Chronicles, women are few and far between. Etam, apparently a descendant of Judah, has a daughter named “Hazzelelponi” in 1 Chron 4:3, and in 1 Chron 4:18 a woman with an actual genealogy, Bithiah, daughter of Pharaoh appears as a wife of Mered, a descendant of Judah. But nowhere in the genealogies is a woman used to connect otherwise unrelated genealogies, and few appear at all.
representation and self-definition of this group, for advancing a particular ideology amid contestations. There is no doubt that the Catalogue examines the valuation of various commodities, circumstances and implicit rules governing this most powerful and potentially empowering mode of archaic exchange, marriage (Irwin 2005, 83)

West has added to this point by pointing out that “late Geometric and Archaic Greece was a loose network of aristocratic communities in which rival clans and families competed for wealth and influence. Prestige... depended on a combination of factors” (West 1985, 8–9). As Brubaker notes, “contracting marriage alliances” is an essential part of “developing patrimonial relations with people from different lineages”, and “in almost all societies, kinship concepts serve as symbolic and ideological resources” (Brubaker, Rogers 2004, 51). As Fowler argues, genealogies that can’t change, in many ways are counter to all of the purposes they can be supposed to serve.94 The fact that the Chronicles genealogy presents so few opportunities for non-Judahite, Levite, or Benjaminite genealogies to fluctuate through marriage alignments may well have to do either with the real absence of many of the quantities narrated in the genealogy, specifically the northern tribes, or at least, if the account of their disappearance is overstated, their lack of participation in the politics of Yehud.

When we consider the absence of fluidity in so many of the tribal genealogies of Chronicles through an absence of exogamic connections, we note that there are in fact a few tribal genealogies which include a number of women, and that which tribes these are is not at all surprising.95 The genealogy of Judah in 1 Chron 2, for example, names many

---

94 As he puts it, “If [genealogies] were incapable of change, it would pose a serious problem” (Fowler 2000, 3).

95 In Karin Andriolo’s interesting “structural” analysis of biblical genealogy, which introduces certain concepts similar to those of this study, she refers to the “instrumental role allocated to descent” and notes “within the culture of ancient Israel kinship is still an important factor for the patterning of social
women-- including Bath-Shua, Tamar, Zeruiah, Abigail, Azubah, Ephrath, the unnamed daughter of Machir whom Hezron marries, and others--as does 1 Chron 3 and 1 Chron 4 (also about Judah and David’s line), while 1 Chron 5, the genealogy of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, names none. So, also, in 1 Chron 8, in the genealogy of Benjamin, there are several women named (Hodesh, Hushim, Maacah, Barrah). Lineages still capable of contesting claims, in the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.E., must have found such data very useful while those no longer capable would have had no use.96

Luckily for the author or authors of the Chronicles genealogy, though these may be the simplest ways of building internal complexity, they are not the only ones. The dynamism of Chronicles’ vision is largely achieved not through intermarriage, but through the rearrangement of male offspring. Knoppers suggests that the Judahite genealogy of 1 Chron 2 features “links with other Israelite tribes, in particular Reuben (2:9; 4:1), Manasseh (2:21, 22), Simeon (2:43) and Benjamin (4:4)” as well as intimating connections with “Midianites, Horites, Seirites and Edomites” and incorporating groups that were not necessarily Judahites originally, such as Qenizzites, Jerahmeelites and Calebites, through the attribution of the ancestors of these groups to Judah’s line (Knoppers 2001, 27). A particularly notable example of this comes from the inclusion of interaction. Likewise, within the context of mythology, kinship often functions as a matrix for the perception of origins and history...it is thus understandable that the Old Testament might project the intricacies of a worldview into the familiar medium of descent, and that descent, transcending its function of being a mere reckoning of generations, might be forged into a tool used to resolve certain inconsistencies in the world-view” (Andriolo 1973, 1663)

96 It is surprising, however, that the genealogy of Levi in 1 Chron 5-6 does not include any women, although the heavy emphasis on paternal descent for Levites throughout biblical literature may not make this so surprising after all. In 1 Chron 8, the genealogies of Issachar, Benjamin, and Naphtali contain no wives, while the genealogies of Manasseh and Ephraim actual contain several named women, despite being very short (Maacah, Hammoleceth, Sheerah), and several unnamed women (Manasseh’s Aramean concubine, wives he takes for his sons, Ephraim’s wife). The genealogy of Asher includes two women, Serah, and Shua.
Hezron and Karmi, elsewhere Reubenite clans, in Judah’s genealogy, but there are others.\(^{97}\) Samuel, an Ephraimite in the books of Samuel and Kings, becomes here a Kohathite and a Levite in 1 Chron 6:13. Joshua, a son of Nun and an Ephraimite in other books becomes a direct descendant of Ephraim himself in 1 Chron 7:27.\(^{98}\) The daughters of Zelophehad, who appear several times in the book of Numbers and in Joshua 17:3, as descendants of Manasseh who must inherit because there is no male heir, appear again in Chronicles with their situation improved: while Zelophehad is a son of Hepher (son of Gilead, son of Machir, son of Manasseh) in all the other texts to reference him, in Chronicles he has become a son of Manasseh himself, in 1 Chron 7:15. The effect is neither as pleasing nor as seamless as exogamic connections, but it does reveal the same motivation at work.

But this brings us to a discussion of a final technique, important for future discussions: that of eponymy.

---

\(^{97}\) It’s possible that this began with a conflation between two figures named “Hezron”. Genesis 46 mentions a Hezron, grandson of Judah (Gen 46:12) and a Hezron son of Reuben (Gen 46:9), but does not mention a Judahite Karmi. There is, elsewhere, a Judahite named Karmi, in Joshua 7, but here no Hezron is mentioned and it is no way clear that Karmi is supposed to be the founder of a clan. In fact, this (Joshua 7) Karmi is a grandson of Zerah, who in Gen 46 and 1 Chron 2 is a son of Judah (Gen 46: 12, 1 Chron 2:4). Whatever else is true about the appearance of both of these figures in 1 Chron 2, there seems little reason to doubt that their relationship to each other in 1 Chron 2 represents an absorption of the Reubenite concept of Hezron and Karmi. Probably the marriage mentioned above, the late-life marriage between Hezron and a daughter of Machir in 1 Chron 2:21-24, is a legacy of the Reubenite Hezron as it is far more likely traditions about this Hezron involved Transjordanian descendants than the Judahite Hezron, if they were ever really separate at all. Then, too, the Karmi of 1 Chron 2 is clearly the Karmi of Joshua 7, as he is still, interestingly, the father of Achan the thief, now called Achar (1 Chron 2:7). He is also not listed among Judah’s sons in 1 Chron 2:3-4, but is placed in parallel to Perez and Zerah in 1 Chron 2:5-7 indicating a somewhat clumsy aggregation, here.

\(^{98}\) It is possible that Nun is elsewhere considered to be a direct descendant of Ephraim and given the prominence of Joshua it may even be considered likely. However, it is never explicitly stated, elsewhere.
**Eponymy and Biblical History**

The technique of eponymy, is, very simply, taking a name which refers to something non-human, and treating it as if it is a human. So, for example, the appearance of figures named “Egypt”, “Aram” or “Canaan” in 1 Chronicles 1 are examples of eponymy. In the *Catalogue* we see figures such as Sparte, Lakedaimon, who then, through intermarriage and placement can provide nearly unlimited connective possibilities. In the long genealogy of the descendants of Inachos, a largely Argive narrative, we see some figures who either do feature or could feature in biblical genealogies as well: Libya, Egypt, “Arabos” and others.

Eponymy is a powerful technique, in my opinion the most useful of all for creating encompassing genealogical systems. It is particularly useful in erasing contradictions between narratives. Malkin, for example, consistently argues that the tales of the *Nostoi*, the return of heroes from Troy, is a more important method of articulating ethnicity in ancient Greece than is genealogy, and additionally noted that “the Nostoi provided an ethnographic model that must be distinguished from another kind of Greek ethnographic construct: that of the mass migrations in the age before the Trojan War. For example, such migration ethnography traced the origins of the Italian peoples to the migrations of Pelasgians, Arkadians, or Cretans” (Malkin 1998, 3). Whatever is true about the popularity, importance, and functionality of diverse methods of articulating self and other, it is true that, when employing eponymy, ethnic genealogies are the only system of articulating ethnicity in which such distinctions can be utterly erased. Drawing from Malkin’s example, we can note that Arkas and Pelasgos appear in the *Catalogue* as
human beings, with various careers. Pelasgos was autochthonous, and the great-grandfather of Arkas. We can note that Arkas’ great-grandchildren would have much to do with the Trojan War, particularly through his granddaughter, Auge, who would marry Herakles (West 1985, 42). Thus, both the Arkadian and Pelasgian ideas appear in this genealogy, but sense is made of them which allows for the Nostoi tales to also appear. In other words, while it may seem that there is a choice to be made between Nostoi ethnogenetic myths, autochthonous ones, and migration-related ones, the Catalogue is capable of gesturing towards all of these at once, and finding a place for them in which they are orderly and coherent.

If it is indeed the case that the names of the twelve tribes of Israel were not always viewed as the names of the sons of Jacob, then it is the technique of eponymy which has altered this reality. Clearly, eponymy was used in biblical genealogy—Aram, Edom, Egypt, Amalek, Israel, and Isaac all become quantities that can be, and are, fit into the Chronicles genealogy as individuals. We see other figures clearly eponymized,

---

99 Their son Telephus would be wounded by the Achaians on their way to Troy, and their grandson, Euryplus, according to the Odyssey, was apparently slain by Achilles’ son Neoptolemus (Od. 11.5-515-520). Herakles’ son Tlepolemus also appears in the Iliad.

100 In addition to migrations, and Nostoi tales, we have the narratives of autochthony, which in some sense stand in contrast to all genealogical articulations of identity, as true autochthons lack ancestors. The groups which, at one time or another, articulated their identity in autochthonous terms included the Argives through Phoroneus, son of Inachus and Argia; the Leleges, born from rocks; the Myrmidons from ants; the Arcadians (Scheer 2011); and to a certain degree, though this is not explicitly stated, the Spartans, who number among their Catalogue ancestors Eurotas (a nearby river), Taygetus (a nearby mountain), Lakedaimon and Sparte herself. But more or less all of these groups appear—as human individuals—in the Catalogue. Many scholars ascribe the liminal position of Athens in the Catalogue genealogy to difficulty in harmonizing Athens’ two identities, their Ionian and autochthonous identities, the former of which fit neatly and the latter of which did not. But this is not the case, as shown in the number of other supposedly autochthonous groups, for example the Argives, who are utterly central to this genealogical system. A strong tradition of autochthony could inhibit acceptance of genealogical traditions that argued otherwise, but by no means could it forbid enterprising genealogists from incorporating the entity in question.

101 Aram is a descendant of Shem in Gen 10:22 and 1 Chron 1:17, Egypt of Ham in Gen 10:6 and 1 Chron 1:8. Amalek is a descendant of Timna, and of Esau, in 1 Chron 1:36.
particularly in the genealogies of Judah, and sometimes in more than one way: Gilead, Hebron (1 Chron 2:43), Kiriath-Jearim (1 Chron 2:50), Ephratah (1 Chron 2:50, 4:4), Bethlehem (1 Chron 2:54, 4:4), Tekoa (1 Chron 4:5) and so forth. And, too, the idea that not all the tribes were viewed in the same way all the time has considerable support. Would it be so surprising if “Levi” were an appellative for a priestly order, ultimately subsumed into the genealogical system and then eponymized? Or if “Judah”, already the name of a kingdom and a tribe, became a tribe from a kingdom in order to fit the mode in which Israelite history was, at last, being recounted? What about a figure such as Dan, strangely excluded in Chronicles, strangely liminal in Num 26? More or less the only instance in the Bible in which Danites, acknowledging the existence of an individual named Dan, show agency is in their conquest of the city of Leshem (Joshua 19:47), which they rename Dan after their ancestor. What if the reverse happened, and they took their name from their region of habitation, as perhaps the Judahites did?

Although there will be much more to say on this topic, for the moment we can recall that, as noted above, explicit references to the tribal-genealogical are extremely rare in biblical literature, localized to Genesis and the Chronicles genealogy. We can recall that the vast majority of accounts, and perhaps all accounts, which treat the tribal ancestors as persons appear in either Genesis or Chronicles, which means that the question of when the tribes started being conceptualized in this way largely depends on

---

102 Many of the lists and genealogies of the tribes either include Levi in some capacity which marks them out as distinct, or do not include it at all (Numbers 1:5-15, 1:20-43; 7:12-83; 13:4-15; 26:5-62, for example).

103 It is, as we will see, often very hard to tell when one or the other is being referred to.

104 Or Laish, in Judges 18:7, 27, 29.
the date of these aspects of the book of Genesis. At this point, we will let these questions be merely evocative, but we will keep them in mind.
Chapter Two: The Return of the Herakleidae and the Sons of Jacob

Impressionistically, we might imagine the totality of genealogical connections biblical literature offers as a series of light bulbs connected through circuits. The narrative action of biblical history forms a current, “electrifying” a certain pattern, leaving others dark and dormant, but available through manipulation of these connections. What we see in Greek literature is a constant re-direction of currents. What we see in biblical literature is largely the potential thereof. What I would like to do in this chapter is explore the re-connectivity of narrative myths wedded to genealogical structures through a Greek mythological narrative which presents, over time, a considerably dynamic picture of connections explored, ignored, and rediscovered, as a way of investigating the realm of the possible when it comes to biblical myth. This exploration should outline a little better, prior to a discussion of the nuts and bolts of what I am suggesting, what the Bible’s genealogical treasury might indicate.

The narrative of the Return of the Herakleidae is particularly useful for this kind of discussion not merely because it presents a simpler dynamic of elective connections

---

105 This vocabulary of electrification is also used in a study by Malkin of ancient Mediterranean networks which will be useful later on in this chapter (Malkin 2011).

106 As Patterson notes, in his study of Greek “kinship myth”, “Kinship myth takes the matter a step further, prescribing a way to bring disparate peoples into a shared heritage, this time defined by a common ancestors…doors were opened to sungenesis that might otherwise have remained closed if a link of kinship, even if mythical, had not been found (or rather, invented). Moreover, despite the dichotomy of ‘the other’ that often informs discussions of Hellenic perceptions of non-Greeks, the concept of foreignness was not always so pronounced. Peoples like the Persians and the Thracians could be brought into the Hellenic family if a reason was needed, such as to account for their origins or to form an alliance with them….it is remarkable how most Greeks could be faced with a new version of a familiar myth or a personage ever before encountered and accept both as legitimate expressions of identity by the party claiming kinship” (Patterson, Lee E. 2010, 163). If the wealth of biblical genealogical detail was created in imitation of such a system, what might that mean?
but because it is in many ways similar to biblical narrative. What it is, basically, is the narrative of how the descendants of Herakles came to conquer and possess most of the Peloponnese, quite similar to the biblical account of the conquest of Canaan by the sons of Jacob. In each case, regions are assigned separate sons, rather than collectively, a non-negligible narrative trope which allows for greater separability.\textsuperscript{107} The interesting issue is that \textit{who} exactly are the relevant sons of Herakles for \textit{Return} myth is a moving quantity throughout Greek history, and in fact this is also the case, if to a somewhat lesser extent in biblical literature, as discussed previously and as will be discussed in the future. But because of the wide world of myths about Herakles, of which \textit{Return} myth represents only a small part, the borders of what is and isn’t \textit{Return} myth are considerably harder to establish than the borders of Jacob myth. And—something that is rarely suggested for biblical myth—the \textit{meaning} and purpose (or purposes) of \textit{Return} myth often shifted over time, even when the narrative facts stayed the same. Thus, there are considerable ways in which studying Jacob myth through the prism of the \textit{Return} may be an antidote to certain less-than-secure but long-enduring assumptions about the Jacob narrative. Certainly that the same story may be used in different ways is an evocative suggestion when we consider the far less visible world of biblical narrative interactions.

Here, in visual form, is a brief sketch of the problem of discussing \textit{Return} myth, which is especially useful as an introduction to one of the problems with how we think and talk about biblical genealogical myth. Traditional understandings, as we will see, generally treat \textit{Return} myth as having a core centered on Argos, Sparta, and Messene, and then extending outwards “artificially” to myths about Corinth and Elis, centered

\textsuperscript{107} We can easily imagine, in other words, the sons of Jacob acting collectively, instead.
around the Herakleid Aletes and his guide Oxylus, about which Jonathan Hall has suggested that “neither figure is intrinsic to the structure of the tradition” (Hall 2002, 81). This dynamic can be mapped in this way:

![Diagram showing the relationship between Temenus, Aristodemus, Cresphontes, Aletes, and Oxylus.]

However, the notion of an “authentic” core surmounted by “artificial” additions faces certain obvious complications. As we will see, Return myth seems to have originated in Argos, and therefore there is a sense in which it may be considered “artificial” everywhere else to at least the same degree, even before we discuss the fact that “artificial” is not a useful category in these matters.

---

108 That is, the most obviously artificial, the clearest evidence “that this tradition is the product of a cumulative aggregation of accounts” (Hall 1997, 57–58).

109 Among other things, as Hall notes, “what was innovation in one century, perhaps viewed with a raised eyebrow...sometimes became canonical in the next” (Patterson, Lee E. 2010, 164).
This is the greater issue: once we start talking about the expansion of the myth from Argos to elsewhere, we need to talk about the whole world of etiological myths which are ultimately derived from *Return* narratives, which include a great many more exemplars than these 5 “main” narratives. At that point, the picture turns out to look something like this:
And then we can ask, what separates *Return* myths from other narratives in which Herakles or his descendants founded or conquered dynasties and cities? On some level, the answer must be nothing. Thus we might see something like this (turned sideways for the purpose of visibility):

And then there is the larger world composed of all myths about Herakles that were used as etiological narratives of various places of which all of this is only a subset, which
would look something like this:

That all *Return* myth could fit as easily into the broader category of myths about Herakles and his descendants without being demarcated out in any clear way, or rather, while being demarcatable in multiple ways, tells us something of the nature of myth system boundaries. And then, of course, we would arrive at the deeply complex world of the vast genealogical network in which Herakles is embedded. The scope of this is very probably unmappable. As Fowler notes, Herakles’ complicated genealogy allows him to be an Argive, a Perseid, and a Pelopid at once (Fowler 2000, 6–7).

Meanwhile, the Spartans, for whom *Herakleid* myth achieved the highest importance, come out of the *Catalogue* even more multiform. They are, as Fowler additionally notes, “a curiously hybrid breed. One way or another they could lay claim to be Achaians, Pelopids, Tyndareids, Lakedaimonians (descended from Lakedaimon),
Heraklids, Perseids, Dorians and Hellens” (R. L. Fowler 2000, 7). And there were, at
times, even farther extensions of the Herakleid genealogy. In one notable narrative, the
Delphic oracle presented in Herodotus calling for the sacrifice of Leonidas at
Thermopylae, “a king of the house of Herakles”, also refers to the Persians, apparently, as
“the sons of Perseus” (αὐτῶν Περσείδῃσι) (Hdt 7.220.4).110 This would make the
Persians and their opponent at Thermopylae cousins of a sort, given Herakles’ descent
from Perseus. The distinction between myths involving family members of Herakles are
by no means as rigorously enforced as is claimed in the work of various ancient
mythographers.

Indeed, it will be something of an inspiration to the imagination of this chapter
that Josephus recounts a narrative supposedly borrowed from “Cleodemus the prophet,
who was also called Malchus” in which a granddaughter of Abraham himself marries
Herakles. It seems that one of Abraham and Keturah’s sons, an individual named Aphra--
fought with Herakles against Antaios in Libya. And from the union of his daughter and
Herakles a barbarian people called the “Sophacians” arose (Joseph Ant. 1.15). This direct
participation in Greek genealogical politics by a Judean writer, even one for whom it is as
fundamentally unsurprising as Josephus, points to the wider worlds and weaker borders
that inspire the analysis in this study. Referring to another instance of this kind of cross-
over, one I have mentioned previously, a letter preserved in the book of 1 Maccabees
purportedly from the Spartans and claiming kinship through descent from Abraham,
Patterson notes that though this is likely a fabrication, it may have been fabricated by the

110 As Patterson notes, this ethnic ascription also appears in Aesychlus’ Persians, where Xerxes and the
Persians are described as descendants of Danae (l.79-80) (Patterson 2010, 49).
High Priest Jonathan himself, sometime in the 140s. Either way, as he notes, “The main point is to note how authentically, whether successfully or not, Jonathan employed a hellenic institution, kinship diplomacy, in service to a nonhellenic agenda” (Patterson 2010, 157). Again, there is no evidence that this claim was considered broadly plausible, but whenever and however it originated it must have served some purpose.

What I hope to make visible in biblical literature is the same bordering we see in any successful variant of Return myth, in which the line of Jacob is outlined against a series of connections, of unlit light bulbs to use the imagery which introduced the chapter. While we have habitually focused on what is lit, in this paradigm, rather than what is not, it is worth wondering whether we are therefore doing a disservice to the utility of biblical genealogical discourse.

The Return of the Herakleidae: Introduction

Richard Buxton, in his textbook on Greek mythology—and so perhaps in a simpler register than he would use in scholarly literature-- states that what is unique about Herakleid myth is that, “Herakles’ descendants…compared with the offspring of other major heroes…have a collective destiny” (Buxton 2004, 123). But this is the problem. Every iteration of the myth is presented as if this is the case, but in Greek myth as a

111 Importantly, he notes that “accepting that Areus’ letter to the Jews was a forged document…we find that Abraham proved a useful tool for asserting Jewish identity in a hellenocentric world”, but also “attributing the diplomacy to Jonathan is in keeping with the conclusion we drew that Abraham could not command the sort of authority that we have seen bolstering and justifying Greek kinship diplomacy. This assumed we could even find convincing evidence that Areus was aware of Abraham, had some reason to reach out to the Jews, and acknowledged a genealogy such as that found in Cleodemus Malchus” (Patterson 2010, 157).
whole there are more descendants of Herakles than there are of just about anyone else, most of whom are never included in any version of Return myth. As early as Herodotus, Herakles’ direct descendants are portrayed as the kings of Scythia, Lydia, and Macedonia, in addition to the Peloponnese and one or two other places. He had 50 children with the daughters of Thespius alone. As Vannicelli notes, Herodotus’ ethnogenetic narratives of non-Greek peoples often involved Herakleids, presumably as part and parcel of Herakles’ role in the construction of universal histories mentioned above. We can include in this general phenomenon the Scythians, Lydians, and Macedonians as well, perhaps, as the Persians who are not descendants of Herakles but are, as mentioned above, sometimes described as descended from Perseus like Herakles (Vannicelli 2001, 230–231). Thus, each iteration of Return myth represents a subjective bordering off of a handful of elements within an objectively massive mythos but our ability to demonstrate that these are not in fact borders must alter how we consider them.

The basic outline of the Return narrative is as follows: after the death of Herakles, his sons, persecuted by Herakles’ old tormentor Eurystheus, flee to Trachis, then to Athens with the Athenians taking up their cause (an event mentioned in Euripides and in Herodotus); they together give battle to Eurystheus, resulting in Eurystheus’ death and the defeat of his army. The number of generations and the major figures involved in the narrative vary from telling to telling, but it is typically the case that a subsequent attempt to “reclaim” the Peloponnesian heritage of Herakles fails, resulting in a lapse of time, during which the Herakleids move to the north of Greece and become the leaders of a
Dorian people there.\textsuperscript{112} After these generations have passed, in all versions of the myth of which I am aware, a successful invasion takes place—although differently in different accounts—and several parts of the Peloponnesian are divided between the descendants of Herakles’ son Hyllus. In the late versions, Temenus is granted Argos, Cresphontes is given Messene and Aristodemus—who sometimes dies prior to the invasion—gets Laconia, including Sparta.\textsuperscript{113} Sometimes the conquest of Corinth under Aletes, another

\textsuperscript{112} Scholarly discussions about \textit{Return} myth have a history that may be familiar to scholars. That is, it was long regarded as a companion myth, or perhaps even a mythological justification, for the “Dorian Invasion”, a supposedly historical event in which the Peloponnesian was overrun by Dorian speaking invaders from the north. However, of late scholars have grown more skeptical of the Dorian invasion itself. If it, too, is to be considered a fiction—as it is sometimes supposed to be, because of a lack of archaeological evidence for disruption—then, obviously, the two myths, the Dorian invasion and the \textit{Return}, are probably better understood as a mythic aggregation of two narratives than as one mythological explanation for one historical event. That is, if the Dorian invasion actually occurred, then the \textit{Return} myth could be a partial exegesis of it, but if it did not occur then both are equally fictional, and their combination requires other explanation than exposition. However, as Jonathan Hall notes, the idea that the Dorian invasion is not evidenced archaeologically depends upon the idea that ethnic group movements must leave traces in the material record, something which is not always borne out in practice (Hall 1997, 129). Here we are talking about the replacement of items of one material culture, in the archaeological record, with those of another, rather than an archaeology of destruction. Hall notes, for example, that the Celtic invasions of Asia Minor and the Slavic migration into Greece, while more firmly historical events, left very few archaeological traces (Hall 1997, 129). As Hall puts it, “the tradition concerning the arrival of the Dorians and the return of the Herakleidai is best regarded as a composite and aggregative system of beliefs which had evolved from disparate origins and for the purposes of defining discrete ethnic groups. At the heart of the tradition it is possible to recognize the existence of two separate myths of ethnic origin—that of the Dorians of Erineos, perhaps developed first at Sparta, and that of the Herakleidai, engineered in the Argolid. Both were to be diffused throughout the Peloponnesian, where they came into contact with the constitutive myths of other ethnic groups who believed themselves to have originated outside the Peloponnesian. The end result of a series of mythological assimilations and syncretisms was the tradition of the Dorian invasion which is so familiar to us today” (Hall 1997, 64–65). Burkert adds “Heracles attained the highest social prestige through his appointment as official ancestor of the Dorian kings. This probably served as a fictional legitimization for the Dorian migrations…Hyllos, the eponymous hero of the one Dorian phyle, became the son of Heracles, who was native to the Argolid” (Burkert 1985, 322). If so, this happened early, since Hyllos features as Herakles’ son in such early works as Sophocles’ \textit{Women of Trachis}.

\textsuperscript{113} In the case of the Spartans, for example, we have a rather complex myth in which Aristodemus dies either before or during the invasion and has his place taken by his twin sons, Prokles and Eurysthenes, presumably to account for the two royal houses of Sparta. Agis and Eurypon, the eponymous founders of the Spartan houses, are either the sons or son and grandson of these figures. But if the Spartans were in the business of inventing figures to coordinate myths, why not just make Agis and Eurypon the sons of Aristodemus? Patterson suggests that this is a sign that Prokles and Eurysthenes were an Argive, not a Spartan invention, but the matter is certainly unclear. He suggests that Agis and Eurypon “may originally have been local figures or perhaps even real kings. They had been part of Spartan epichoric tradition before they became part of the Return story...If the brothers [Prokles and Eurysthenes] had been Argive inventions, we can at least account for the attitude. In such a circumstance the Spartans would not rewrite
Herakleid, is included, along with the gifting of Elis to Oxylus, a non-Herakleid, non-Dorian Aetolian who served as a guide. Beyond that, what exactly is conquered and who exactly does the conquering changes from narrative to narrative.

What we know about the details of the *Return of the Herakleidae* comes to us largely from three late authors, Pausanias (2.4.3-2.4.4; 2.18.6-2.19.2; 2.28.1-7; 3.1.3-9; 4.3.1-4.3.8; 5.3.7-5.4.3), Diodoros Siculus(4.57-58 ), and Apollodorus (2.8). The myth is much older, appearing first in the extant record in the work of Tyrtaeus, a probably mid-7th century Spartan poet, and additionally in Herodotus, Ephorus, Thucydides, Pindar, Strabo, Polyainos and others. Important early attestations include Pindar’s *Pythian* 1.60, Plato *Laws* 3.683d, Isoc *Speeches* 6.17-27, Thuc. 1.9. 1-3, 1.12, Euripides’ surviving *Heraclidae* and lost *Cresphontes*, and various places in Herodotus, especially

---

114 Or rather, Pseudo-Apollodorus, the author of the *Library*. Of our later authors, Diodoros’ account is the least useful, breaking off after the death of Hyllus, Herakles’ son. It presumably resumed elsewhere, but this is now lost to us. Between Apollodorus’ account, written sometime in the 1st century B.C.E., and Pausanias’, from probably the 2nd century CE, Apollodorus’ account is the easier to follow and Pausanias’ has the most detail. This is because Apollodorus approached the narrative as a whole (Apollod. 2.8) while Pausanias, in keeping with the style of his travelogue, referred to the myth only as his geographic approach warranted. So, for example, as his second book deals with Corinth, his first reference to the narrative relates the conquest of Aletes and the fate of his dynasty (2.4.3-4). After a brief reference to the whole narrative (2.18.6-2.19.2) Pausanias relates the conquest of Epidaurus (2.28.1), then the conquest of Sparta and Amyklai in his book about Laconia (3.1.3-9), the conquest of Messene in his book about Messene (4.3.1-8), and finally the conquest of Elis in his book about Elis (5.3.7-5.4.3). His account is therefore rich in detail, but not linear.

115 The Suda claims that Tyrtaeus was alive in the 35th Olympiad, or 640-637 but as Gerber notes this is probably a little early (Gerber 1999, 25). The Suda also claims that he was the conqueror of Messene, and that he was an Athenian. The former, at least, is almost certainly inaccurate. Plato (Laws 1.629a), Isocrates (Archidamus 6.21) and others repeat the claim that Tyrtaeus was an Athenian by birth, which is probably irrelevant except for establishing that biographical details of Tyrtaeus’ life were a topic of conversation already in the 5th century B.C.E.
Hdt 9.26.1-9.27.2. But none of these besides the three mentioned in the first sentence above gives much in the way of detail about what happened, with the slight exception of the *Heraclidae*. As a consequence, though we know that the myth has existed in some form at least since the middle of the 7th century, and was quite popular throughout its history, we know little about the details of the myth in the 7th and 6th centuries.

Still, there are meaningful ways in which we can divide our discussion between the myth as it seems to have existed in the 5th century B.C.E. and earlier, and as it existed in later periods. On the one hand, it is imperative to avoid the fallacy of characterizing myths as essentially progressing towards accuracy, fullness, completion. There almost certainly wasn’t just one 5th century form of the myth, any more than there was just one over the centuries. On the other hand, once certain details appear and become popular it is that much more likely that they will continue to appear. We can say with a certain amount of confidence that in surviving early versions of the myth, particularly in Pindar, Isocrates, Thucydides, Euripides Herodotus and Plato, there is no mention of either Oxylus or Aletes. These two figures, which, as we will see, seem to have been local figures of considerable antiquity prior to becoming part of *Return* myth, first appear as part of the *Return*, as far as we know, in the work of Ephorus of Kyme, who wrote a “universal history” sometime in the 4th century B.C.E., which actually began with the

---

116 In *Speeches* Isocrates depicts Archidamus launching an appeal to his Spartan countrymen to reclaim Messene through the narrative of the *Return*. Euripides’ *Herakleidae* and Herodotus’ account of Herakleid-related wrangling between the Tegeans and Athenians before the battle of Plataea (Hdt 9.26.1-9.27.2) are particularly notable early examples.

117 Aletes is mentioned in Pindar’s Olympian 13.17, but not in a Herakleid context, an issue that will be covered later.
This mostly lost history survives in fragments, of which FGrHist Jacoby F115 describes the career of Oxylus. It is short on details, but does relate that Oxylus was a friend of the Herakleids and that he received Elis as thanks for his service to them, which is an event consistently represented in later renditions.

It is not exactly a surprise that this form of Herakleid myth, which was to become apparently the best known form, seems to appear shortly after the conclusion of the Peloponnesian War, when Sparta’s Peloponnesian dominance, as well as the occasional pretensions of Corinth and Argos to usurp it, were the salient geopolitical facts of that region. It is possible that the inclusion of Corinth and Elis in the myth date as far back as the end of the 5th century, when Corinth and Sparta were the most powerful foes of Athens. However, given the lack of evidence for these myths in late 5th century contexts (Euripides’ *Heracleidae*, for example, seems to date from around 430 B.C.E. and *Cresphontes* only shortly thereafter), and given that Ephorus is reputed to have been born around 400 B.C.E., it is perhaps most likely that the addition of these narratives

---

118 Ephorus was one of many writers who seemed to view the *Return* as a kind of beginning of history (Andrewes 1951). As Vannicelli notes, there is a sense in which a “Greek way of dividing the past” treated what he called the “spatium historicum” as having three acts, “a most ancient period down to Heracles, a long Heraclid phase, and finally the more reliable traditions concerning archaic history” (Vannicelli 2001, 230). As we will see, the Heraclid phase was indeed, in many narratives, considered to be the bridge between myth and history to various mythographers as early as the time of Herodotus. As Vannicelli puts it, referring to Herodotus’ use of Herakles as the fulcrum between the mythic past and what he calls “a seamless and uninterrupted historical memory”: “Herodotus’ reduction of such evidence to genealogical terms is characteristic of the Greek approach to early history...which sees the past as being connected to heroic poetry rather than to a scribal tradition. This genealogical framework explains Herodotus’ choice of Herakles as a chronological turning-point” (Vannicelli 2001, 232).

119 It certainly seems less likely that such myths would be propagated during the Corinthian War (395 B.C.E.- 387 B.C.E.) in which Corinth and Argos were enemies of Sparta.
dates from the mid-4th century, sometime after the Battle of Leuctra when Spartan military power was crushed by Thebes, never to fully revive.\footnote{It certainly seems to be the case, as we will see, that the narrative about Messene which appears in our later authors can only have come from a post-Leuctra reality, that is, after the Messenians were freed from Spartan servitude by Theban victory in that battle. We therefore learn something interesting, which is that it seems the adoption of this later form of the myth was not motivated by a desire to placate the Spartans, but more probably to affirm an equality with them. In that case, it seems equally likely that the apparently late extension of the myth to Corinth and Elis occurred to express the same equality as it does that it occurred to express Peloponnesian solidarity. Perhaps indeed, although this would impinge upon the supposed dates of Ephorus’ effort, all these additions date to a time post-331 B.C.E., after the Spartans had been forced by Alexander to join the League of Corinth. Overall, I think an earlier 4th century context seems most likely for the addition of Aletes and Oxylus.}

In addition to the major narratives of Argos, Sparta, Messene, Elis, and Corinth it is important to recognize that return myth was always in the process of being extended. There are often additional etiologies in the work of authors like Apollodorus, Pausanias, and Strabo, specifically including the founding of cities and dynasties in such far flung places as Sikyon, Epidaurus, Amyklai, Crete and Rhodes.\footnote{In Pausanias (2.6.7, 2.26.2) and Apollodorus (2.8.5), and probably also Ephorus (BNJ 70 F 18c) Temenus’ grandsons supposedly quarreled resulting in the emigration of Althaimenes to Crete and then to Rhodes (Koiv 2000, 37–38). Amyklai was supposedly given to Philomenes, an Achaean who betrayed his people to help the Herakleidae (Koiv 2003, 49). According to other sources, Temenus’ sons become embroiled in a conflict because Temenus favored his son-in-law Depihontes, to whom he leaves Argos over them, but Kissos, one of Temenus’ sons, is victorious leaving Depihontes to found Epidaurus instead. Sikyon is founded by Temenus’ son Phalkes (Andrewes 1951, 39). Strabo (8.8.5) tells us that Ephorus additionally mentioned the founding of Corinth by Aletes, and the founding of Achaia by Tisamenos after being evicted by the Herakleids. He also may have mentioned the career of Agraios, another son of Temenus. Malkin refers to two other historical Herakleids, the “Corinthian founders of Corcyra (Cheriskrates) and Syracuse (Archias)” (Malkin 2011, 122). On a certain level, continued expansion of the Herakleid network through time seems inevitable.} There were historical Herakleids, that is, verifiably historical figures who considered themselves to be descendants of Herakles and the Herakleidae, and their interaction with the narrative mythos could be dynamic, using it and altering it both. Perhaps the most famous Herakleid of all time was Alexander the Great, whose Macedonian ancestors seem to have been considered Herakleids for some time, but certainly not from much earlier than
the fifth century B.C.E. This Macedonian claim, at one time very powerful, varied considerably over time, experienced major changes in its details (as we will see), and does not appear, for example, in Apollodorus “Library”, one of the most important efforts to systematize Greek myth.

Thus, in what follows, while I will attempt to trace the spread of the narrative throughout the Peloponnese, it is important to be aware of the fluid dynamics of the myth, that it was always growing and shrinking, that it defies stable description. We trace its evolution over time for the lessons it may offer but recognize the drawbacks inherent in the attempt.

**The Construction of the Return**

It is generally agreed that the *Return* myth originated in Argos. Although Sparta features both the oldest surviving reference to the Herakleids (Tyrtaeus Fr 2 Diehl) and apparently the narrative’s arena of longest relevance, the Argolid, which includes Argos, Tiryns and Mycenae, is both the epicenter of myths about Herakles and the only region included in the Herakleid narrative to which the Herakleidae, as descendants of Perseus, had a widely acknowledged dynastic blood right. Second, and perhaps more tellingly, Argos is the only city encompassed by the myth whose historiography featured a royal

---

122 As Patterson notes, “the earliest claim to the Temenid legacy that we know of was made by Alexander I (c.498-45)” (Patterson 2010, 171). According to Herodotus, an ancestor of Alexander the Great, Alexander I, was able to compete in the Olympics because he was able to demonstrate his Argive ancestry from Temenus (Hdt 5.22.2). And it seems that Alexander the Great’s father also made use of this myth. Apparently, sometime in the 350s B.C.E., when Philip convinced the Thessalians to elect him “hegemonic commander” of their forces, as Martin puts it, “the Thessalian barons apparently justified the choice of a Macedonian to lead their alliance by asserting that Philip was their kin as a descendant of the legendary Heracles and therefore perfectly qualified for the post” (T. R. Martin 1996, 189).
house actually named for their purported conqueror, the Temenids. On the other hand, Argos seems to have been a democracy from early times, and there is little historical room left over in which to imagine the operation of a dynasty.

123 As Patterson notes, “there is…general (if not universal) agreement that the propaganda…originated in Argos” (Patterson 2010, 31). Hall adds: “the legend of the Return of the Herakleidai was almost certainly forged in the Argolid…although the Herakleidai are supposed to have divided the Argolid, Lakonia and Messene between them, it was properly speaking only the Argolid to which they had rights of inheritance, since Lakonia and Messene had instead been granted to Herakles by virtue of conquest. Thirdly, the lineage of Herakles was rooted in a far more developed genealogical system in the Argolid, where the hero’s descent was derived from Perseus, than it was in either Lakonia or Messene” (Hall 2002, 81). This latter point is probably more important than the Herakleid blood right, since Greek myth does not consistently privilege blood right over other forms of right. As Isocrates notes, if Argos belonged to the Herakleidai by blood right, Sparta belonged to them by right of “gift”, thanks to Herakles’ aid to Tyndareus in keeping his throne, and Messene belonged to them by right of conquest since Herakles had defeated the house of Neleus and killed all but Nestor of the Neleidai (Isocrates Speeches 6.17-20). All of these “rights” seem more or less equivalent.

124 Despite this higher level of integration, I think it’s likely that neither the Temenid dynasty nor Temenus himself ever existed. Not too long ago, it was common to see scholars use the various dates put forth by the likes of Herodotus and Thucydides for all kinds of things rather uncritically. As time goes on---particularly thanks to advances in Mediterranean archaeology---scholars have grown increasingly skeptical of Greek accounts of the 9th-7th centuries B.C.E., Particularly with respect to the dates of the founding of various colonies given in authors such as Herodotus. Though Argos was large and powerful in the Bronze Age, it suffered a fall and, as Hall puts it, “Argos…appears to have been a collection of villages, rather than an urbanized metropolis, down to as late as ca. 700 B.C.” (Hall 1995, 581). If so, we should use the apparently better integration of this myth at Argos than elsewhere, exemplified by the Temenid dynasty, in conjunction with the heritage of Herakleid and Perseid myth in the region, to argue not for greater authenticity at Argos, but for greater antiquity. That is, the Temenids are likely as mythic at Argos as Aristodemus and his sons at Sparta, but the absence of a disjunction between dynasty name and dynasty founder may suggest that Temenus has been a part of the Argive landscape for longer than other Herakleids have been elsewhere. This supposition has bearing on one of the most interesting historical problem relating to Herakleid myth. Many discussions of the Temenids, and many arguments for their historicity, focus on a figure, Pheidon, who was supposedly an early king of Argos. Pheidon’s life is of particular interest to this discussion because of the extent of Return myth that his life maps. Strabo claims that Pheidon “recovered the whole inheritance of Temenus”, which, in this imaginary, apparently included Elis, where he is said to have strong-armed his way into administering the Olympian games instead of the Eleans (Strabo III:32), as well as Corinth (Plut Amatoriae 2). Pheidon’s life, then, would be the first evidence of a pre-6th century inclusion of Corinth and Elis in Herakleid myth, as well as providing us a plausibly historical Temenid. If, however, this is not evidence of the antiquity of the traditions of Elis and Corinth and the historicity of the Temenids, the argument might be flipped on its head. That is, the inclusion of Elis and Corinth in Pheidon’s career would instead be evidence that his narrative was invented at a considerably later time than he was supposed to have lived. Indeed, the major evidence for Pheidon’s activity comes from very late authors, and there is a great deal of confusion as to when exactly he ruled. As Hall puts it, “Opinions on when he is to be dated…are divided among three alternative periods: the second half of the eighth century (constructed from Pausanias, Aristotle, Plutarch, and Ephorus); the middle of the seventh century (based on information from Strabo and Eusebius and a textual emendation of Pausanias); and the late seventh or early sixth century (derived from Herodotus)”. He adds “the adoption of any one of these alternatives immediately disqualifies Pheidon from having accomplished many of the actions attributed to him” (Hall 1995, 586). As Koiv additionally notes, “the dating of…Pheidon…has long been one of the
In Sparta, Agis and Eurypon, the founders of the Agiad and Eurypontid dynasties are descendants of the Herakleid conquerors—not just Aristodemus, but his sons Prokles and Eurysthenes—and took no part in the conquest themselves. This is, as we will see, typical of non-Argive versions of the myth and is presumably indicative of the way in which pre-existing myth systems were “hooked” into Return myth in a way very similar to the taxonomic activity of Jacob’s genealogy in biblical literature. That is, the harmonization of narratives about Agis and Eurypon with the Return narrative was accomplished through the creation of a genealogical bridge. Despite that, here, again, Return myth had its most enduring floruit. The claim of the dual monarchy of Sparta to dual-Herakleid descent lasted at least from the time of Tyrtaeus (in the 6th century B.C.E.) until 221 B.C.E. when at the Battle of Sellasia, Macedon and the Achaean League triumphed over the Spartans, and the Herakleid monarchy was overthrown, never to be restored—and even then of course, the claim itself didn’t immediately fall into disuse. It seems that it is at least possible, too, that Herakleid ancestry in Sparta was not limited to the Spartan monarchs.125

most disputed questions in the history of Archaic Greece,” as “even in antiquity there was no agreement on this point” (Koiv 2000, 1). She continues “According to Herodotos, Pheidon’s son Leokedes was among the suitors of Agariste, the daughter of the Sikyonian tyrant Kleisthenes. Since the wedding must be dated to the 570s BC, this suggests that Pheidon must have lived roughly at the end of the seventh and the beginning of the sixth centuries BC. But all the authors who wrote after Herodotos dated him much earlier…According to Ephorus, Pheidon was the 10th descendant of Temenos…Since Ephorus dated the invasion of the Herakleids to 1069 BC…the 10th generation from Temenos should have fallen somewhere in the eight century BC…Ephorus’ younger contemporary, Theopompos, on the other hand, regarded Pheidon as Temenos’ 6th descendant (inclusively), which would lead roughly to the first third of the ninth century BC (Koiv 2000, 1). I would suggest that we can indeed take all of this as a sign of Pheidon’s own thoroughly mythical, rather than quasi-mythical, quasi-historical, or even historical character.

125 Plutarch notes that Lysander, the famous Peloponnesian War general, belonged to one of many Herakleid families who were not of the two royal families and that he once schemed, as Stafford notes, “to open up the kingship to all Herakleids, or even all Spartiates” (Stafford 2012, 140). This is from Lysander 24.3-5. Plutarch states that there were many Herakleid families in Sparta, but the rest had no special privileges. Plutarch, of course, was writing well after the fact, but the development of noble lines related
Spartan power is probably responsible for the original extension of *Return* myth to Messene, given that the subjugation of Messene to Sparta was one of the earliest and most important events in the geopolitical history of either region.\(^\text{126}\) Fascinatingly though, the Messenians seem to have modified, but kept, their *Return* narrative upon, finally, being made free of the Spartans after the battle of Leuctra in 371 B.C.E. That is, at least from what we can tell in the 5\(^{th}\) century version of the narrative, the successful Herakleid was a son of the original Cresphontes also named Cresphontes and the subject of an eponymously named play by Euripides. In the version which appears in the later mythographers, the murder of the original Cresphontes is followed by the ascension of a son named Aepytus.\(^\text{127}\) Aepytus seems not to have been an originally Messenian figure at all, but perhaps an Arcadian figure mentioned in Homer (II. 2.604).\(^\text{128}\) The adoption of Aepytus as both Herakleid and Messenian might have been motivated, as Patterson suggests, by the close ties between Arcadia and Messene after Leuctra, but of course this is speculation.\(^\text{129}\) Whether the Messenians keeping the myth that had long been an

---

\(^{126}\) Patterson suggests that the Argives invented the figures of Aristodemus and Cresphontes “to account for the Dorian divisions that currently existed in the Peloponnesus” (Patterson 2010, 33). However, since the Dorian divisions actually appear to be based on the sons of Aigimios, that is, Doros, Pamphylos and the adopted Hyllus, this suggestion seems somewhat unlikely.

\(^{127}\) Although an alternate account exists in which it is the Spartans who avenge Cresphontes and thus receive Messene for that reason (Isoc. *Archidamus* 6.23).

\(^{128}\) According to Patterson, Aepytus is absent both from the earliest narrative and as near as we can tell from Messene in general. As he puts it, the evidence is lacking “not only for a ruling family known as the Aepytids in the archaic period, but even the idea of Messene as a coherent entity before the Spartan conquest has been challenged, especially by Luraghi, whose analysis of archaeological and literary evidence belies the notion of an indigenous identity separate from Laconian, at least in the eight century” (Patterson 2010, 36; Luraghi 2002; Luraghi 2003).

\(^{129}\) Funke, however, expands this discussion with reference to the post-Leuctra relationships between Thebes, Messene, and Arcadia, and the appropriation, by these entities, of various supposedly ancient symbols of identity, such as the shield of Aristomenes, a Messenian hero, by the Thebans and the bones of
instrument of their subjugation is surprising I leave to others. By the time this transformation occurred, Return myth was the dominant Peloponnesian etiological paradigm, and it may have then been a very valuable tool through which to articulate a new Messenian equality with its geopolitical neighbors, despite its odium as a previous tool of Spartan oppression.

Then there is the highly interconnected narratives regarding Corinth and Elis. Here it is even more obvious that existing myth has been “Heraklized”. At Corinth, the supposedly Herakleid Bacchiadae are named for a descendant of Aletes who ruled, according to Pausanias, as many as five generations after the Return. The inclusion of Aletes, the Corinthian Herakleid, requires some narrative maneuvering as well. According to the narratives which include etiologies of these kingdoms, none of which dates to the earlier period of Return myth, some form of impiety occurs in the camp of the Herakleidae prior to the invasion, resulting in the expulsion of a Herakleid named Arkas by the Mantineans (Funke 2009, 2). Patterson does note that the transfer of bones and the consequent sharing of heroes was a feature of Greek kinship diplomacy (Patterson 2010, 38–44).

Issues relating to Messenian history and memory have been mentioned in previous chapters (Patterson 2010; Alcock 1999). As Koiv notes, Greek authors of the fourth century B.C.E. often compared the development of the three principal Dorian states, still at that time held to be Argos, Messene and Sparta, and tended to argue that while Herakleid rule resulted in disorder in Argos and Messene, the harsh subjection of the Helots and the intercession of Lykourgos’ legislation led to a successful and prolonged Herakleid monarchy at Sparta (Koiv 2003, 43–44). This notion is also found in Andrewes who suggests that in Ephorus, all three kingdoms had trouble controlling the demos but that Agis and Eurypon, by ruling justly, survived where the unjust Aepytsids and Temenids did not (Andrewes 1951, 40–41).

As Patterson notes, with respect to the Messenian acceptance and reinvention of Herakleid myth, the phenomenon of kinship diplomacy, the offering of alliance, trade, and friendship through kinship ties, “repeatedly reveal a capacity to accept different versions of myths, even alternate versions of a community’s own local myths, allowing the community to accept the proposed claim of kinship by one of the parties engaging in a diplomatic venture” (Patterson 2010, 35). This seems to be part of what is going on here.
Hippotes. It is this Hippotes’ son, Aletes, who somehow becomes leader of a band of independent Dorian and defeats the dynasty of Thoas at Corinth (Paus 2.4.4). And, his guide, Oxylus the Aetolian, receives Elis for his services. Thus, the two myths clearly depend upon each other.

It seems that Aletes was originally a native figure of Corinthian myth, as Oxylus was (and remains) of Aetolian myth. Aepytus is featured in an Olympian ode by Pindar (13.17), not in a Herakleid context, and possibly in Eumelus’ Corinthiaka, supposedly an 8th century epic (FGrHist 451). The story of Aletes the Herakleid appears for the first time in Theopompus (FGrHist 115 F 357), Ephorus (FGrHist 70F 18b-c), Duris (FGrHist

---

132 According to Apollodorus, while the army was waiting at Naupactus for the building of a fleet, a seer arrived reciting oracles and Hippotes killed him with a javelin, causing the destruction of the fleet and a famine (Apollod. 2.8.14-16). Pausanias actually suggests that this narrative of Hippotes and the seer is the inspiration for the cult of Apollo Carneus. In this version, the seer’s name is Carnus, he is an Acarnanian, and a seer of Apollo, and after his death at the hands of Hippotes the Dorian rite of propitiating the seer began (Paus 3.13.4).

133 It is a fifth generation descendant of Aletes, Bacchis, who gets the dynasty named after him (the Bacchidae). And it is another five generations before this Bacchidae dynasty is replaced by an oligarchy which supposedly remained Bacchidae until Cypselus supposedly removes them from power.

134 As Robertson points out, there hardly seems a plausible justification for the exile of Hippotes besides an independent grafting of the story on to the already extant Herakleid narrative. Unlike other misfortunes which had befallen the Heraklidae over the generations, as Robertson puts it, “Hippotes’ misadventure does not change his own or the others’ prospects; above all, it does not retard or magnify the advent of the Dorians at Corinth, for Hippotes himself still fares forth, and his son Aletes is untouched by the events at Naupactus” (N. Robertson 1980, 6–7) although, in Apollodorus’ version of the story, Hippotes’ slaying of the prophet did result in the loss of a fleet and an army (Apollod 2.8). Robertson also suggests that “it has always been obvious that this story [the Corinthian story] is largely independent of the comprehensive story of Dorian foundations in the Peloponnesus, whatever conclusions may be drawn from the independence.” He suggests that the “true believers” in the Dorian invasion take this independence only to mean that Corinth simply was settled independently of the rest, but it is probably more reasonable to read these issues as a sign of imperfect aggregation (N. Robertson 1980, 4). I doubt this point is controversial today.

135 A “substantial figure of Corinthian folklore” as Robertson puts it, who “was renowned as the founding father of Corinth before Heraclids and Doriens became an issue”. As he notes, the Suda claims that Corinth traced her synoecism and organization to Aletes, which are revealed as a territorial scheme with nothing apparently to do with the well-known Dorian tripartition (N. Robertson 1980, 5). Pausanias claims that Eumelus was a Bacchiad himself (Paus 2.1.2), but this is impossible to know. As Hall notes, there is no evidence that Eumelus suggested Aletes was a Herakleid (Hall 1997, 59).
76 F 84) and Aristotle (frag. 554 Rose), fourth century contexts. Oxylus, a native Elean or Aetolian hero, seems to have been implicated in the mythological narrative of the arrival of the Aetolians in Elis, well before he was subsumed into Return myth.

Then, it seems that the version of Return myth that appears in the work of late “systematizing” mythographers such as Apollodorus, Pausanias, and Diodorus Siculus has a remarkable capacity to reflect the interests of every region included. If the extension of Return myth to Messene was once master-minded by the Spartans as justification for conquest, in the form we are currently discussing, Messenian interests, NOT Spartan interests, seem to be responsible for replacing Cressphontes with Aepytus. The Corinthian and Elean additions presumably both were organized and developed in those respective regions, by native mythographers. The extension of Return myth from Argos to Sparta was no doubt to serve Spartan royal ideologies, while at Argos the myth was clearly developed independently from these other narratives. Thus, the later versions of the myth that we possess appear shockingly egalitarian, preserving to a certain degree the ideological interests of each individual narrative it aggregates. What processes of myth aggregation this might demonstrate are where the discussion of Return myth and our biblical subject once again grow closer together.

---

136 The existing fragments of the Corinthiaka apparently stop short of the Herakleid narrative (West 2002), a point Robertson makes as well (N. Robertson 1980, 4–5).

137 In addition to Oxylus, the figures Aethlius and the famous Endymion are also occasionally implicated in that arrival. In fact, as Patterson notes, if one attempts to make sense of the myths of Aetolian entry into Elis together “we have the Eleans/ Aetolians...moving into Elis from the north, then leaving Elis for Aetolia, and finally returning to Elis again” A typical genealogical solution is proposed for this problem, in which Aethlius is the first king, Endymion succeeds him, and was followed by his son Aetolus who, convicted of the murder of a family member (as so often the case), was exiled to the region which became called Aetolia after him. It is from this Aetolia that Oxylus and the Aetolians returned to Elis some generations later (Patterson 2004, 347). As I have argued throughout and will continue to, attempting to identify the “true” story, or failing to identify this genealogical justification as a post facto attempt to make sense of a very natural profusion of stories, shows an improper understanding of the nature of myth.
Natural, Inevitable, and Artificial

It should be clear, at this point, that the term itself, the *Return of the Herakleidae*, replicates the conceptual problems we have begun to discuss. “*Returns*” would be considerably better.\(^{138}\) The reason this has not often been clear is because successful myths, like successful ethnic narratives and successful genealogical aggregations, tend to be naturalizing with respect to their contents. In this sense, scholars have often reduplicated the emic discourse of the narratives they study.

*That* such naturalization is a tool, not a reality, is demonstrable in the case of the *Return* in many ways. Jonathan Hall has called the narrative of Aletes and Oxylus the “weakest” point of the tradition, in his (laudable) attempt to demonstrate “that this tradition is the product of a cumulative aggregation of accounts, rather than a dim reflection of genuine population movements” (Hall 1997, 58). But in avoiding one, Hall falls into another semantic trap. He ignores, for example, another Herakleid altogether, arguably a still weaker link: Tlepolemus, who is mentioned in both Diodoros Siculus and Apollodorus’ accounts of the *Return*. Tlepolemus is included presumably because he appears in the *Iliad*, which by the time of these late authors may have possessed a cultural cachet that was impossible to ignore, and in the Iliad we are told that Tlepolemus slew his uncle Licymnius, and therefore had to flee to Rhodes from which he led his troops.\(^{139}\) Both Apollodorus and Diodorus place this event in relation to *Return* myth, but they

---

\(^{138}\) It is for this reason that Malkin titled his seminal study of Archaic Greek Ethnicity “The Returns of Odysseus” (Malkin 1998).

\(^{139}\) Il. 2.653-665. This is presumably the reason for his inclusion here. Given how influential Homer was throughout the history of ancient Greek literature, it is not surprising that Diodoros and Apollodorus recognized that Tlepolemus would have been of the same generation of the first heroes of the *Return* and therefore desired to find him a place in the narrative.
place it differently, demonstrating the harmonizing character of these narratives. But why stop there? If this myth must make room for Tlepolemus, why not Telephus, or his 50 children with the daughters of Thespius? Why the Macedonian royal house, and not the Scythian or Lydian? Aletes does not begin his career as a Herakleid, but was subsequently Herakleized—why not any number of other local heroes?

The idea that *Return* myth can be separated out from the boiling cauldron of myths about Herakles suffers another check when we consider the boundary-breaking interventions of those who take or use myths as inspirations. In a particularly famous incident, Dorieus, a Spartan of the royal line, invaded Sicily in the 6th century B.C.E., justifying his (ultimately fatal) expedition through the adventures of Herakles in Eryx (Hdt 5.43). In what way and to what degree was this adventure based on *Return* myth? On the one hand, Dorieus’ power in Sparta was based on the *Return* etiology of his lineage, and his desire to follow in the footsteps of his ancestor is obviously due to the widespread belief that this ancestry was a historical fact, which belief is also derived from *Return* myth. But what is visible here is how *Return* narratives actually cannot be separated from the wider world of narratives they can connect to, the result of which is the dissipation of *Return* myth as a bordered category. One could hardly explain to a Spartan king, for example, that he had no right to Spain just because Herakles’ adventures there were not, strictly speaking, *Return* narratives. Thus, practically, the

---

140 In Apollodorus we are told that these events take place during the invasion of the Peloponnese by Hyllus, but prior to its failure (Apollod 2.8.5). In Diodoros we are told that it is not until after the failure of this invasion that Tlepolemus and Licymnius even moved together to Argos, let alone experienced the fatal accident (Diod 4.58.4). True, Tlepolemus apparently doesn’t participate in the successful *Return* invasion, but then, neither does Aletes’ father, Hippotes. True, he doesn’t appear in versions of the myth in the 5th century or prior, to my knowledge, but neither do Oxylus or Aletes.

141 Patterson describes a similar adventure in which a “Cnidian named Pentathlus” who claimed descent from Hippotes attempted to colonize the area around Lilybaeum around 580 B.C.E. (Patterson, Lee E.)
borders of Return myth and the rights it offers its participants break down. And, there is a two-way street here—had Dorieus’ adventure been successful, it would likely have impacted normative versions of Return myth subsequently.

The dynamism of myth as a living discourse is visible the instant we step down from the ten thousand foot view. We can consider Malkin’s discussion of the Nostoi, the Returns from Troy, again. He is both correct and perspicacious in noting that the similarities between the exemplars in this world of myth gave these narratives a special role in defining the lived experience of seafaring Greeks (Malkin, Irad 1998, 3). And yet, I doubt he would deny that as Nostoi myth was generally centered around figures about whom many other myths were known than how they managed to come back from war, the initial narrative of return was probably modified locally in countless ways through connections that may have been, in one sense, new and unique, but in another sense represented making use of available narratives rather than inventing new ones.

Audiences, and their interaction with the narratives they heard, are vital parts of our story. In his study of kinship myth, Patterson cites Fried’s conclusions on a 12th century German poet. Here, the audience

…accepted the distortion of memory that was part of the oral tradition simply because they didn’t realize that there was any distortion. They had no way of countering it, in spite of the fact that the literary sources contained the knowledge required to correct it, and scholars could actually have done so. The culture of oral memory and the literary tradition were in fact not two separate lines, but were intertwined, influencing each other and reshaping themselves (Fried 2007, 10; Patterson 2010, 11).
Another example of this is the Macedonian *Return* narrative, discussed above. One of the most interesting things about the *Return* etiology of the Argead dynasty is that it features a crucial name change after its appearance: the initial narrative seems to have identified the relevant Temenid Macedonian king as “Perdiccas”, but later narratives knew him as Caranus.\(^{142}\) Patterson suggests that the name Caranus, as opposed to Perdiccas, “appeared out of the blue shortly before or after 400” perhaps because at the time there were two royal lines with a considerable claim to the throne, one descended from a recent Perdiccas and one not. Ergo, the Temenid Perdiccas was deposed by Caranus—narratively—to reduce the power of the name. He continues, “we might expect eyebrows to be raised, but in fact he caught on, so much so that Plutarch eventually proclaimed a complete lack of controversy about the presence of Caranus in the lineage of Alexander the Great” (Patterson 2010, 172). We might often expect eyebrows to be raised, but the internal logic of instrumentalist narratives is always aimed at lowering them and is often successful. And, of course, the adventures of Alexander offered considerable opportunity for the practice of kinship diplomacy through the wider world of Herakles myth.\(^ {143}\)

This is the situation with Herakles. Here is a man at the heart of many a genealogical and narrative web. He has connections to previous generations of heroes.

\(^{142}\) Herodotus knew him as Perdiccas, one of three sons of Temenus banished to Illyria (8.137.1). Later, in the work of Theopomus for example, he became known as Caranus whose “introduction…to the royal line is clearly a fabrication made by one of Alexander’s predecessors” (Patterson 2010, 4).\(^ {142}\) And actually, this is not the end of the changes—while in the work of Plutarch and Diodorus it is Caranus who appears (Diod VII, Plut. Alex. 2.1), in the roughly contemporaneous work of Hyginus, a Roman author, his name seems to be “Archelaus” (Hyginus 219). And this is interesting because it is quite possible that the king who introduced Caranus instead of Perdiccas was named Archelaus (Patterson 2010, 172).

\(^{143}\) Patterson puts it “the tradition of the Argeads’ Heraclid descent could potentially serve him in the cases of Aspendus, Soli, and Mallus in Asia Minor. It also gave Alexander an opportunity to cite kinship with the Thessalians, n particular the ruling Aleuadae, who likely looked back to Aleuas the Red, son of Thessalus son of Herakles” (Patterson, Lee E. 2010, 159). That Thessalus never appears in *Return* myth but remains so clearly capable of responding to it with respect to the activity of kinship diplomacy makes very clear what we are dealing with here.
such as Perseus, Lynceus, and Danaus. His many children make many more. His journeys, labors, and conquests extend potential connections to Herakles all over the Mediterranean basin, and these were often explored. We can find him in Libya, fighting Antaios, conceptually making that area safe for colonization (Malkin, Irad 1998, 4). Along the route upon which he was eventually supposed to have driven the Cattle of Geryon, he founded the Gaulic city of Alesia, site of the last stand of Vercingetorix against Julius Caesar, and fathered Galates, who established the Gaulish kingdom of Galatia, with a princess of the Keltoi, a narrative which had historical currency even into the 16th century C.E. (Stafford 2012, 222). Elsewhere, he is said to have fathered the Celtic people through union with Celtine, resulting in the birth of Celtus, a story which appears in Diodorus Siculus and in Parthenius of Nicaea roughly around the time of Apollodorus.¹⁴⁴

Any number of these stories may have had real ideological functions at any number of historical junctures, and far beyond what is visible to us at this distance. It is very much imaginable that a Corinthian might express a Corinthian right to rule Thebes on the basis of the marriage of Herakles’ nephew Iolaus to Megara, daughter of Creon of Thebes, and their daughter’s marriage to Herakles’ son Phylus, Aletes’ grandfather, or that if a Spartan army were to encounter Celts they might attempt to remind them of their genetic relationship. It is true that the narratives we see most often and most stably are probably visible because of how often they were used. But it is also true that apparently mainstream Greek myths made Galates, Celtus and Temenus brothers. The geographic

¹⁴⁴ According to Diodorus, it was during his battle against Geryon that Herakles founded Alesia and fathered “Galates” (Diod V. 24). Once again, the union between his deeds and the extension of his bloodlines is made explicit.
extent of Herakles’ travels had the metaphorical result of lengthening the availability and instrumentality of his family tree. And again, what was found persuasive and not persuasive did not always follow what we would imagine to be logical. As scholars, we ought not to follow Hekataios, whose statement “the tales of the Greeks are many and absurd” served as an introduction to his attempt to bring order to the chaos. We ought, instead, to recognize that on levels of a granularity far beyond what we can now achieve with what evidence now survives, the activity performed by the authors we have discussed, that of wringing order out of the vast world of genealogical data presented here, must have been performed in countless, constant, and contradictory ways, and that these efforts in turn increased and altered the data in ways probably untraceable. Pausanias’ imagination of his own goal as an arbiter of mythology is explicable; our acceptance of it as critical scholars is not.

It is, of course, unlikely that the fluidity of biblical genealogical discourse ever had this kind of utility to the degree we find similar fluidity operational in the wider world of Greek myth. It is possible, even likely, that the generative interactions between narratives and audiences, between heroes and places, did not affect the Judahite world as it did the Greek world, particularly as the Greek world was so much larger and more varied, and as foreign trade seems far more the province of Greek sailors than Judahite. And, too, there is evidence that in both the Greek and biblical worlds the religious imagination of the elite and non-elite diverged considerably. As Stowers notes, the “religion of the literature cultural producer” formed large networks through “common literature practices” and was probably quite distinct in terms of the meanings assigned to various activities, and the perspective on various religious and cultic figures. For example, he notes, while “Zeus in epic poetry and comedy was often lusty, adulterous, and in a troubled marriage…in the religion of everyday social exchange…and in the religion of the polis, Zeus and Hera were most sober models of

145 As Stowers notes, the “religion of the literature cultural producer” formed large networks through “common literature practices” and was probably quite distinct in terms of the meanings assigned to various activities, and the perspective on various religious and cultic figures. For example, he notes, while “Zeus in epic poetry and comedy was often lusty, adulterous, and in a troubled marriage…in the religion of everyday social exchange…and in the religion of the polis, Zeus and Hera were most sober models of
explanation is there, for example, for the fact that the genealogy of Manasseh appears in both the Transjordanian and Cisjordanian portions of the Chronicles genealogy (1 Chron 5, 1 Chron 7), that Benjamin’s genealogy appears both in the northern portion and in the introduction to epic (1 Chron 8), than that there were diverse traditions which needed to be harmonized? What else are we to make of the dissonance between the discourse in Kings of the complete disappearance of the northern tribes, and of the inclusion in Hezekiah’s Passover of 2 Chron 30 which includes several of these tribes (Ephraim, Manasseh, Dan, Zebulun, Asher), let alone the claims of the Samaritans to continuity with an Israelite past, than that biblical genealogy also served fluidly as a buttress to many contrasting claims. It is likely that biblical “kinship diplomacy”, internally and externally, was far more limited than the Greek version thereof. And yet, it seems equally likely that the fluidity of biblical genealogical connections outside the line of Jacob, particularly in Genesis and Chronicles, served some purpose or, indeed, purposes.

The purpose of this extended discussion is not to argue that the variety of uses of Return mythology in Greek narrative articulations of self and other indicates that biblical genealogical discourse must have been used in the same way, but merely that we must entertain the possibility that it could have been. Because, in cross-cultural comparison, large segmented genealogies provide the backdrop for multiple and fluid expressions of self and other, it is reasonable to suppose that biblical exemplars were at least available as a source for diverse ethnic arguments and also to point out the flaws in scholarly approaches which accept the normative claims of individual mythographic efforts. That is, because segmented genealogies provide the basis for multiple and conflicting claims, marital propriety. Zeus in Homer or Aeschylus is remote from Zeus of the Possessions who had little or no myth and did not need personality” (Stowers 2011, 42).
it becomes ever more important to use caution in accepting a single articulation thereof as a reflection of historical realities. As we move forward, we can advance more specific answers about how the acceptance of normative claims of this nature has impacted biblical studies, what rejecting these may reveal, and how exactly the biblical system may have operated in society. But for now it is perhaps enough to say that here we see a clear example of how large segmented genealogies can be tremendously useful for the revision and reinvention of ethnic narratives, and how they have been useful.

In the next chapter, I intend to begin discussing the history of biblical traditions through some of the concepts developed here, but prior to that I would like to offer some conclusions about the nature of the interaction between mythographers and myths, again using *Return* myth as a lens, which will greatly enrich subsequent discussions. What I would like to conclude with, here, is the discussion of a potentially helpful paradigm for how myths aggregate, from the emerging field of network theory.

**The Herakles Network**

Irad Malkin, in a remarkable study, “A Small Greek World”, has suggested that the field of study known as network theory might have considerable explanatory power in the evolution of Greek mythological narratives and ethnic ideals. Basically, the idea seems to be that network effects, which are impersonal, are considerable actors in the production of narratives. Although somewhat difficult to accept at first blush, this would be an excellent answer to one of the mysteries proposed above: how it is that the five major narratives which ultimately composed the most popular form of *Return* myth seem to preserve in some small way the interests of all five regions. This is something that is
hard to imagine occurring even if it were possible to imagine someone such as Pausanias visiting all five regions, inquiring, and then doing his best to balance the interests of those he came across.\footnote{Although it is certainly the case that Pausanias visited many places and weighed many narratives, his \textit{métier} was more to seek out the “true” versions of narratives than to represent all interested parties fairly.} What this points to is the dramatic difficulties implicit in attempting to theorize the interaction of elements which shape elite narratives, given that these are not entirely conscious enterprises but impacted by dynamics of authority, authenticity, availability and others. As Malkin puts it, “network theory is really part of complexity theory, which seeks to understand emergent phenomena through the self-organization of large systems” (Malkin 2011, 31). Even without accepting the more challenging aspects of Malkin’s thesis, that there is a kind of scientific phenomenology at work here, the frame of network studies is another useful one to think through. That some aspects of narratives might be, to a degree, “self-organized” would be an interesting solution to certain relevant issues.

The “small world” of Malkin’s title refers to a network concept developed particularly by Stanley Milgram and recently re-explored by Watts and Strogatz, which takes its name from a well-known phenomenon, the common expression of surprise when two strangers discover a mutual acquaintance. These three thinkers, among others, have suggested that “the small world” phenomenon is in fact far less surprising than it seems. Since what is called the “average path distance” between two nodes in a network actually shrinks as the number of nodes grows—that is, the more participants in a system, the easier it is to bridge participants-- the probability that any two points can be linked through a surprisingly small number of connections grows too (Milgram 1967; Travers
and Milgram 1969; Watts and Strogatz 1998; Watts 1999; Watts 2003). This is combined, both in Malkin’s study and elsewhere, with another idea, the “strength of weak ties”. This concept evolves largely from the work of Granovetter, who published the idea in a 1973 article of that name, which led to a very useful 1974 study called “Getting a Job” (Granovetter 1973; Granovetter 1974).

The idea of the latter, colloquially, is that-- perhaps counter-intuitively--acquaintances add more connectivity to your network than close friends. In this particular study, Granovetter demonstrated that one’s close friends are not nearly as good at helping one get a job as one’s acquaintances because despite the strength of one’s qualitative relationship in one case and its absence in the other, your close friends know a lot of the same things that you know while your acquaintances connect you to worlds you otherwise would know little about. As John Scott puts it,

Those to whom a person is closest…have many overlapping contacts….Conversely, they are less likely to be the sources of new information from more distant parts of the network. The information received is likely to be ‘stale’…already received from someone else…What this means is that ‘acquaintances are more likely to pass on job information than close friends’ (Scott 2013, 37; Granovetter 1974, 53).

Thus, the “strength of weak ties”, a very useful concept. As Malkin puts it, “each acquaintance will also have a group of close friends, one of whom may be precisely the eye doctor you happen to need” (Malkin 2011, 27).

It is easy to see, then, that the proliferation of ties of any kind, strong or weak, leads pretty rapidly to the “small world phenomenon”, whereby “very large networks that

---

147 The (somewhat) popular party game, Six Degrees of Kevin Bacon, actually derives from a phenomenon observed by Milgram. He discovered that two randomly chosen strangers from anywhere in the world were likely connected to each other through no more than six connections.
extend over great distances…can have an all-encompassing, strong, and dynamic connectivity” (Malkin 2011, 27). Indeed, Malkin credits the distance over which the Greek network was made to stretch in the colonial period with considerably influencing the development of Panhellenism, arguing that it is not when people are close together but rather “when they are farther apart…when they condense their vision to some salient and common characteristic of identity”, that they begin to view each other as largely similar, obviously a very interesting idea (Malkin 2011, 53). But again I am not as interested, here, in actual networks as I am in the explanatory power of network effects. I am interested in networks as a model, or perhaps a metaphor, for the less visible constraints which shape narrative traditions.

Again, we arrive at the conflict between primordialism and instrumentalism. Again we are faced with a case in which the political usefulness of most narratives about Herakles’ descendants is quite apparent, but the selection and grouping of a few of these from the mass into such narratives as the Return is meant to appear governed by an objective, natural, and eternal logic. And again, we have an extraordinary multiplicity only ever channeled in forms which assure us of the absence of such multiplicity, of the natural and inevitable contours of the myth. The problem is that while such intricate arrangements seem planned to the last detail, in fact this does not seem to be the case at all. As Malkin puts it, in his example, “nobody planned, a priori, that which became the Greek network” (Malkin 2011, 31). That is:

As he puts it, “Greek civilization as we know it emerged…not in spite of distance but because of it” and that “it was distance and network connectivity that created the virtual Greek center (Malkin 2011, 5).
in an unprotected plain (around 728 B.C.E.). He would then have been busy building, tilling the land, participating in the new social order, and so on. It is unclear how aware he could have been that he was also participating in the creation of a Megarian network that eventually involved cities such as Chalkedon and Byzantion at the Bosporus and even Selinous...Moreover, he may not have been paying special attention to the fact that the foundation of Megara Hyblaia was also part of an overall process of exploration and city foundations in the Mediterranean by Phoenicians, Etruscans, and Greeks. (Malkin 2011, 31)

We have seen the challenges inherent in understanding the interplay between instrumentalism and consciousness before in our discussions of ethnicity and of genealogy. It simply is the case that the networks which provide multiple building blocks for narratives, such as genealogies, are shaped by the needs to which they are put without it being quite clear that to those putting articulations of these to work that shaping is ever wholly conscious. In this sense, of course, such constructions mirror the primordialist/instrumentalist nature of ethnicity itself.

In the expansion of what I am calling the Herakles network we see the strength of weak ties in action, in the sense that children ascribed to him, in genealogical traditions, are often largely functional, avenues for still further connections.\(^{149}\) The ability of narratives about Herakles to connect with other Greek myths is very high because the network is so far-flung and so de-centralized, extended genealogically and geographically. From Spain to Tyre, from Troy to the Argo, from Galatia to Argos, through multiple marriages and a vast number of sexual encounters, Herakles and his children move, interact with, and offer accessible ties suitable for a variety of interests, an

\(^{149}\) That is, if we were to conceptualize Herakles' children as *children*, as living and breathing figures who knew Herakles well, even with considerable differences in child-rearing between now and then, these would hardly be “weak” ties. However, the number of stories that exist in which Herakles shares a stage with any of his supposed children other than Hyllus would appear to be very small. This aspect of Herakleid myth is enhanced when the myths in question are couched in a genealogical paradigm, as genealogical narratives are far more often instrumentalist and etiological than reflective of objective history.
eloquent platform for the creative energies of mythographic entrepreneurs. Herakles was, ultimately, “stretched” across the Mediterranean world by such activities. The first six “labors” of Herakles to appear in Greek myth appear either in the Peloponnese or in a wholly mythic geography.\textsuperscript{150} But, in time, Herakles’ labors would take him as far as Spain, Anatolia, and North Africa, the mythic geography would be exchanged for a physical geography and the narratives would keep pace.\textsuperscript{151} In other cases, efforts that seem to have always taken place within a real geography like the narrative of the struggle between Herakles and Antaios in Libya which was, in the words of Malkin, “not invented for ‘political’ use…[but] acquired new political function for the sake of which it might undergo modifications and changes of emphasis” (Malkin 1994, 230). And, of course, all of this could not have been planned.

The point is both that connections beget connections and that we cannot imagine this expansion being masterminded from a writer’s garret in Athens. Those who extend narratives, especially etiological myths, to others have a purpose, but those to whom narratives are extended may have some role in the subsequent development of narratives, and as we have seen it is often on the periphery of Argive-Spartan Return myth that significant innovations were introduced. It is no surprise that by offering many avenues through which “weak ties” might be prosecuted, Herakles offered tremendous instrumentalist potential in the hands of local consumers. What is surprising is the role of those who accepted, naturalized, and popularized on local and regional levels in the re-

\textsuperscript{150} The fetching of Kerberos (Hades), slaying the Nemean Lion and Lernean Hydra, driving off the cattle of Geryon (Hesperides, Hes. Th. 27. ), the capture of the Kerynian Hind and the driving away of the Stymphalian birds.

\textsuperscript{151} As Gantz notes, subsequent narratives “…evolved...as the Greeks’ geographical horizons widened in the Archaic period” (Gantz 1993, 1:374).
shaping the original narrative. The Messenian transformation of a Crespontes into Aeptus is an example of this, as is probably the activity of Alexander the Great where his Herakleid ancestry was concerned.

Not surprisingly, Malkin discusses myths about Herakles specifically in his study of Greek networks for reasons that should now be obvious. Referring to the case of the colony of Kroton, he notes that the use of heroes as *ktïstes*, founders, appeared “in response to the challenge of national youthfulness” felt by colonies in contrast to their mother cities, and that Herakles was often a popular choice. He notes the particular usefulness of Herakles and the Herakleidai in such endeavors, arguing that “in network terms ‘founders’ could function as ‘ties’ by connecting a variety of ‘actions’ or ‘nodes’.” Herakles and his descendants (the Herakleidai) were particularly apt for this role. He points to the expansion of the myth through “historical herakleidai…such as the Corinthian founders of Corecyra (Cheriskrates) and Syracuse (Archias)”, and describes *Return* myth as “a charter myth as explicit as that of the Promised Land in the Old Testament” (which, of course, we are about to discuss (Malkin 2011, 121–122). Finally, he argues that the “use of Herakles helped integrate new colonies into Panhellenic networks of myth, thus enhancing the Greekness of these colonies” (Malkin 2011, 121).

Indeed, though it is somewhat outside the realm of this discussion, it has recently been suggested that certain biblical narratives might be directly based on these Greek *ktïstes* narratives. As Darshan notes,

---

152 “Although Herakles is characterized as ktïstes on the colony’s coins, the myth associated with Herakles relates a precedent and a prophecy rather than an actual foundation. Mourning his young friend Kroton, whom he had accidentally killed, Herakles prophesies the foundation of city to be named “Kroton.” But Kroton had a historical founder, a certain Myskellos of Rhyai. Why, then, was Herakles considered a *ktïstes*?” (Malkin 2011, 120).
The biblical texts contain two principal forms of the foundation narrative...the second type is exemplified by the central hexateuchal narrative—namely, the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan. According to this model, a large group of settlers migrates to a new country, and their settlement is achieved via warfare and dispossession of the native population. The closest Greek analogy to this type is found in the traditions regarding the migration of the Dorians and the returns of the Heraclid to the southern Peloponnese (Darshan 2014, 691).

When we consider the existence of active attempts to attach biblical genealogical discourse to Greek genealogical discourse in the not-so-post-biblical period, in the narrative of Herakles and Abraham’s grand-daughter, in the letter, in Maccabees, in which the Spartans claim Abrahamic descent; when we consider that neither the genealogical literature I described in chapter one nor the Greek-style *ktistes* of Genesis have much in the way of Near Eastern parallels, we can begin to wonder whether comparisons with Greek myth are not merely illustrative of issues in biblical scholarship. Since the time horizon of Greek colonial *ktistes* and the activity I am describing in biblical myth is much the same, these parallels are all the more evocative. As Malkin notes, “Herakles tends not to appear as a founder, *ktistes*, before the fifth century” (Malkin 2011, 120–121).

This, however, is speculative and beyond the scope of the current discussion. What I am suggesting instead for biblical myths about Jacob is something very similar to the role of Herakles described here. I believe Jacob myth in biblical literature functions to help integrate new entities into the Panisraelite network of myth, particularly the south, and I believe the purpose is to enhance—possibly invent—the “Israeliteness” of Judah.

---

153 As Darshan puts it, “neither Weinfeld nor subsequent biblical scholars appear to have paid any attention to other Greek traditions that recount the establishment of cities and the formation of ethnic groups within the homeland itself. Like the biblical traditions, these Greek sources relate to a primordial ‘mythic’ era and describe the foundation process in terms of migration rather than colonization…this issue is of particular interest in light of the fact that, while the great ancient Near Eastern kingdoms of the third and second millennia B.C.E. (in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Anatolia) were familiar with tribal and clan wanderings and migrations…they did not produce any examples of this literary genre” (Darshan 2014a, 691).
But with respect to the great debate about what it means that Persian period Judahites used authentically Israelite narratives, at times, to invent themselves in this way, what this comparison reveals is complexity. In using these narratives, Judahites came to think of themselves in a different way, while at the same time altering them by placing them in Judahite contexts. They also may have inadvertently provided their neighbors with a tool with which to contest their claims, perhaps visible, for example, in Nehemiah’s struggles with the local population or in the evidences which exist for a Samaritan opposition to the notion that all northern tribes were holistically relocated.

For the moment, it is enough to say, through the analogy of Return myth, this: where the Persian period authors of biblical history are concerned the idea of Jacob and his sons could have long existed, although I am not certain that it did, and their particular arrangement of it in biblical literature could still be unique, imbued with new meanings from any that came before. The replacement of Levi and Joseph with Ephraim and Manasseh, and perhaps vice versa, could have, for example, the same purposes and meanings which inspired the invention of Perdiccas as a Macedonian Herakleid and the subsequent substitution of Caranus for Perdiccas. And in this Persian period project of redefining Israel, from tradition and from new self-conceptions, the meaning of the deliberate situatedness of the family of Jacob at the center of a web extending outwards through Edom, Aram, Moab, Ishmaelites and others in Genesis’ vision of Israel is very unlikely to be irrelevant and inert data, any more than the extension of Herakleid myth to Lydia, Macedonia and elsewhere proved to be so. Indeed, as I will have better occasions to note below, it is very much not the case that the Bible contains only twelve tribes. Taking into account Judges 5’s reference to Meroz, the treatment there and elsewhere of
Gilead and Machir as independent tribes, there are at least 15, and possibly more elsewhere.\textsuperscript{154}

Finally, when we consider the plausibility of the premise that the tribes, as tribes, pre-existed the imagination of them as the names, also, of eponymous ancestors and sons of Jacob, we can think of numerous Greek parallels to this form of mythographic activity. Hall describes a situation, for example, in which the “‘tribal’ eponyms Geleon, Hopletes, Argades and Aigikores were imagined to be the sons of the Ionian eponymous archegete…Ion”. He notes, as well, the complex case of the Dorians who were led by the Herakleidae into the Peloponnese. In this case, the three tribes of the Dorians are the sons not of Doros, but of Doros’ son Aigimios, which in his opinion “suggests strongly that a tradition deriving descent from Aigimios and origins in Hestiaiotis has been conflated with another tradition, which told of the eponymous Doros of Erineos”, harmonized in this way (Hall 2002, 81–82).\textsuperscript{155} Thus, these four Ionian tribes as well as Ion and Doros themselves may well have been viewed, at times, without the suggestion that they were constituted by descent from individuals with those names. Indeed, one of the Dorian tribes is clearly named for Hyllus, son of Herakles, perhaps an innovation caused by the union of \textit{Return} myth with Dorian myth, while another, the Pamphyli may have existed as McInerney notes, “specifically for the assimilation of non-Dorian populations”

\textsuperscript{154} Machir elsewhere appears as a “subtribe” of Manasseh in a number of texts (Num 27:1, 32:29, etc.), while Gilead appears both as a clan of this subtribe (Num 36:1) and as a territorial region conquered by Machir (Num 32:39, Deut 3:15).

\textsuperscript{155} One of the Dorian tribes, the Hylleis, is clearly named for Hyllus, son of Herakles, which is perhaps an innovation caused by the union of \textit{Return} myth and Dorian myth.
In this we can see, at least, how much activity a stable-seeming genealogy can hide. \(^{156}\)

\(^{156}\) As Hall notes, the Dorian tribes Hylleis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanes often occurred in cities which considered themselves Dorian, but sometimes they would appear alongside a 4\(^{th}\) non Dorian phyloi (Hall 1997, 9–10).

\(^{157}\) The ultimate number of etiological stories about these tribes is astonishing. As Patterson notes “Tyrtaeus provides the names of the three Dorian tribes...Ephorus later identified two them as descended from Aegimius’ sons, Pamphilus and Dymas (FGrH 70 F.15). That the Hylleis were the sons of Hyllus can be explained by Aegimius’ adoption of Hyllus after Heracles had restored him...We should also note, keeping Strabo’s account in mind, that Diodorus...has Aegimius promising Heracles a third of the Dorian kingdom for his help, a debt on which the sons of Heracles later collected...it seems that by the time of Ephorus, the association of the Dorian Hylleis with the Heraclid Hyllus was established, even given the acknowledged distinction between the two races” (Patterson 2010, 31).
Chapter Three: Archaeological And Epigraphic Evidence

for Israelite Identity

It might be useful here to recapitulate what this study is intended to accomplish. What I hope to do is to describe the dominant identity articulation expressed through the biblical books Genesis-2 Kings, and through the Chronicles genealogy, as something which defines Judah as Israel, and as the product of the sequence of primeval, patriarchal, exodic, and monarchical ages, in the particular way that it does, for the very first time in the Persian period. Prior to the creation of biblical history, most of these narratives already existed, but as separate narratives, perhaps even separate attempts to define Judah as Israel through aggregations of different sizes, with different results. Indeed, other narratives may have existed which did not derive Judah’s heritage from Israel at all, even in fairly late periods. This sequence, from Adam to the fall of Jerusalem, appears both in what is sometimes called the Primary History, Genesis-2 Kings, and in the “Secondary” History in Chronicles identically, at least, with respect to grand outline. Indeed, the narrative components of both arcs may have been partially selected for the fact that each separate element individually articulates a mechanism through which Judah achieved an Israelite pre-history, so that collectively the arcs would have this character. As I’ll discuss in later chapters, I suspect that all of the elements of this arc may have been originally independent etiological myths for conferring upon Judah that Israelite identity. I think the narratives of the exodus did not originally presuppose the patriarchs, and the narratives of David did not presuppose either the patriarchs or the exodus. But this will be pursued in its place.
For now, what it is important to say is this: the Bible is a text composed, for the most part, out of pre-existing materials, which we might think of as artifacts. Whether we imagine the biblical authors’ interaction with these artifacts as something analogous to interactions in a museum, or more similar to the editorial action involved in the construction of either an anthology or a tabloid, a dynamic intentionality is quite visible in every case. Actually, “the Bible as museum” paradigm is particularly useful, given developments in the field of museum studies. Where once these, too, may have been considered, with respect to their contents, largely preservative and uninvolved on the level of producing meaning, now “newer studies constantly remind us that museums are not neutral. While they collect and conserve, classify and display, research and educate, they also deliver messages and make arguments” (Starn 2005, 70–71). If, instead of museum-like, we think of the Bible more on the order of an anthology, that is, a thematic collection of disparate sources, still further distortions of meaning are clearly possible. If we think of it in the tabloid model— which at times it undoubtedly is—we can note how often in such publications someone’s actual words can appear with completely different meanings. It is clear, then, that there are different degrees to which we can imagine the biblical use of pre-biblical materials—that is the use of “artifacts” by Persian period biblical authors and editors—altered what it used, and different scales of interaction we can imagine. But there is no possibility that this use did not alter the meanings of what was used at all.

\[158\] An important recent inquiry into how unique the Bible’s composition is, contrary to previous attempts to demonstrate similar practices, appears in Sanders 2014.
Moving forward, the model I will propose for the contours of biblical ethnicity will borrow heavily from the comparisons adduced so far: the *Catalogue* as an example of the dynamic use of earlier traditions, the *Return* as a framework for local narratives, not mutually dependent but made mutually coherent. I will argue that the combination of narratives about the patriarchs, Moses, Joshua, and David, is effected in similarly disruptive (and non-disruptive) fashion. I further suspect that Jacob functions in biblical literature both as a Herakles and as a Hellen, in that the frame of his descendants offers both an organizational structure for biblical history, as Herakles does for Peloponnesian history, while also defining a people in the way that Herakleid myth does not. In this chapter, however, we are going in a slightly different direction, a necessary one to prepare the grounds for that model, and we will switch registers, then, from the conceptual to the evidentiary. In short, when we consider how dynamic this vision might have been in the Persian period, we first have to consider what pre-biblical aggregations looked like, and how much work towards what we now have remained to be done at what time. Additionally, prior to presenting my own model, it is necessary to demonstrate why existing models are insufficient.

Unfortunately, the beginning of the story, with respect to the creation of the identities which biblical literature uses, is mired in an insufficiency of evidence and considerable controversy, which it is this chapter’s role to attempt to disentangle. Here we will talk about the archaeological and epigraphic evidence for what identity

---

159 There may be some problems with Jonathan Hall’s statement, for example, that “the lineage of the Herakleidai is, strictly speaking, a ‘family genealogy,’ rather than an ‘ethnic genealogy’” in that many Greek genealogies are both (Hall 1997, 60). But it does point to an important conceptual distinction between how Herakles myth and Hellen myth has historically been received—even the people led by the Herakleidae are *not* Herakleidae, but Dorians, whereas Jacob’s descendants are invariably (in biblical narratives) Israelites.
articulations existed in the pre-monarchical, united monarchical, and dual monarchical periods. In the next, I will discuss what emerges from the prophetic collections that are often supposed to have elements that date just prior to the fall of Israel, Hosea, Micah, Amos, and Isaiah of Jerusalem, and present a reconstructed history of the tribal system as an idea in which I will touch on other texts considered to have a very early date, including Judges 5, Genesis 49 (the Blessing of Jacob), and Deuteronomy 33 (the Blessing of Moses). At that point it will be possible to begin discussion of the specific sequence of Persian period editorial changes and additions that I see as ultimately resulting in the historical sequence described above and the creation, then, of “biblical” history.

**Introduction to the Pre-Monarchical Period: Traditional Views**

In this chapter it will be necessary to begin interacting significantly with a concept I mentioned in the introduction: Panisraeliteism. While technically the term could refer generally to the idea that both Israelites and Judahites share an Israelite ethnicity, it is typically used in studies which argue that this ethnic notion appeared for the first time after the fall of the northern kingdom and in many reconstructions right after this event.¹⁶⁰ While I both generally agree with the central idea articulated by scholars who have explored this point of view and think that the Persian period project I outline in later chapters is a unique Panisraelite expression, not necessarily related to the period emphasized in these studies, my focus is not explicitly on demonstrating the idea

---

¹⁶⁰ Notable recent treatments include Finkelstein 2013; Fleming, Daniel 2012; Knauf 2006; Na’aman, Nadav 2010; Na’aman 2014.
itself. However, it so happens that evidence for what we might call “Old Panisraeliteism”, that is a Panisraeliteism which pre-dates the fall of Israel, could also be evidence that the biblical vision of history was substantially intact very early. Thus, the Panisraelite question presents a useful frame for investigating biblical historiography generally.

Therefore, we begin with what little can be said about the pre-monarchical period. It is worth noting at the very outset that scholarly approaches which take for granted the historicity of an enduring “Panisraeliteism” must not merely be founded on assumptions about the historicity of events which occurred prior to the 10th century B.C.E., but of their nearly permanent effect on social imagination, and it is this latter which is becoming increasingly problematic. Given what we now think we know about ethnicity, memory, even about the anthropological concept the “invention of tradition”, all of which will be discussed at length in a later chapter, the relevance of a period prior even to the rise of monarchy to the identity articulations of a period, the Persian period, centuries after the large majority of the groups that monarchy contained had vanished from the historical record, after that Persian period group had experienced exile, return, and the Persian imperial system, simply does not seem likely to be very considerable.

And yet, even as it is more and more common to admit that the fluidity of ethnic articulations over time limits the relevance of pre-monarchical identities to later periods, the pre-monarchical period itself continues to hold a central place in discussions of Israelite ethnogenesis. This is probably not due to an ideological commitment to notions of permanent or biological ethnicity so much as it is due to the dominant role very particular ideas have played in the last 50 years of biblical scholarship. To scholars such as Noth and Cross, the pre-monarchical period did not just feature the ethnogenesis of
Israel, even to the point of theorizing a twelve-tribe league modeled on early Greek amphictyonies, it featured the genesis of the first biblical narratives, in the sense that traditional interpretations of the “J” and “E” sources imagined them to be by and large the crystallization of the League’s oral literature (Noth 1958; Noth 1930; Cross 1973a; Bright 1981). Some of these ideas, particularly the “amphictyonic hypothesis”, have long been abandoned, and other aspects relating to the dating of the biblical text are under siege. But I think it would be fair to say that the assertion that the pre-monarchical period was a period in which Judah and Israel were constituted by a unified group has remained unquestioned by a considerable number of scholars, even if those same scholars sometimes hold theoretically sophisticated beliefs about ethnicity and identity that should trouble this possibility.

The problem with the pre-monarchical period in short is that while it is universally agreed that the 12th and 11th centuries B.C.E. saw a vast increase in settlement

---

161 See particularly Cross 1973a, 1–189. Ironically, many of the Greek amphictyonies, real and potentially fictional, upon which this theory was originally modeled, are now understood to pre-date the appearance of Panhellenism as a Greek ethnic discourse. Thus, even in comparative examples, the tension between early social formations and later ethnic notions is visible. Another at-one-time typical account comes from Mayes, who offers a treatment of the amphictyonic concept from a time when “the theory of the amphictyony has in many minds become an unquestioned and perhaps also unquestionable fact of Israelite history” (Mayes 1973, 151). Yet, here he deals with many of the difficulties that subsequently made the amphictyonic hypothesis untenable, including key absences of tribes from various lists in Genesis, Numbers, and Judges 5. He suggests for example that the list of tribes in Numbers 26 “though now included in the context of P...reflects conditions between the time of the Song of Deborah and the rise of the monarchy”, while arguing that Gen 49, “although probably belonging in its present form to the time of David or Solomon, must depend on a system of tribes earlier than that presupposed in Nu. xxvi” (Mayes 1973, 151–152)—while nevertheless “it appears unlikely that Israel formed an amphictyony in the period of the Judges” because of the absence of Judah from the list in Judges (170). This he explains by suggesting that Judah could not come to the aid of the other tribes against Sisera because between them and the rest of Israel were several “Amorite” cities and other foreigners (167–168). In this model, the battle with Sisera “marks the end of the power of the city-states to obstruct common action by the northern and mid-Palestinian tribes” and, once followed by the “expulsion of the Philistines from the mountains in the time of Saul...opened the way for communication between Judah and its northern neighbours” (170).

162 Now, as de Geus notes, “it is easy enough to dismiss the [amphictyonic] hypothesis out of hand because of the lack of convincing evidence for it” (de Geus 1976, 70).
in the highlands of Israel, the meaning of this event has become increasingly less clear.\(^{163}\)

Until somewhat recently, it was quite usual even to connect these population movements with an exodus from Egypt.\(^{164}\) Now, as Fleming puts it,

> The entire discussion of ethnicity for the southern Levant before the ninth century is fraught with assumptions about identity that the evidence cannot sustain…It is almost certain that far more names were involved than just “Israel” for the twelfth to tenth centuries…and that we have no idea what these were…In the early Iron Age, the region was indeed inhabited by a “motley crew,” but this was not simply the raw material for eventual Israelite ethnicity (Fleming, Daniel 2012, 254).\(^{165}\)

But perhaps a still more considerable problem is how this period relates to subsequent periods of Israelite and Judahite history.

> Given the absence securely dateable texts, with just a few possible exceptions to be discussed shortly, the only “ethnic” evidence we are able to use for the pre-monarchical period emerges from the material evidence, and this is problematic.\(^{166}\) As

---

\(^{163}\) At this time, as Mazar puts it, “hundreds of new small sites were inhabited in the mountainous areas of the Upper and Lower Galilee, in the hills of Samaria and Ephraim, in Benjamin, in the northern Negev, and in parts of central and northern Transjordan” (A. Mazar 1992, 334). Stager adds, “after 1200 B.C. the number and density of permanent settlements in the Hill Country increased dramatically from 23 Late Bronze sites…to 114 Iron I sites…in the survey area of ca. 4200 km\(^2\). The LB settlements were larger…than those of the Iron I…But the total settled area was only 69 ha. in LB compared with 192 ha in Iron I. That translates into a nearly 2 percent per year increase in population between 1200 B.C. and 1150 B.C….Even more striking is the number of new foundations Iron I-97 settlements. Clearly there was a sizable influx of people into the highlands of central Palestine in the 12th century B.C.” (Stager 1985a, 3). Good descriptions of this influx can also be found in A. Mazar 2007b; Dever 1997a; Finkelstein 2013, 22.\(^{164}\) See, for example, D. Sperling who suggests that “in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries matters worsened when the turmoil of the western Mediterranean brought new peoples into the area. Among them were elements who carried with them traditions of escape from Egyptian servitude” (D. Sperling 1986, 10–11).

\(^{165}\) This point of view is echoed by Amihai Mazar, who notes that what we have here is really two separate questions: whether it is possible to assume “that the various groups who settled the hill country during the Iron Age I identified themselves as Israelites” and whether “we, as modern scholars” can identify them as Israelites (A. Mazar 2007a, 91). This sentiment is largely repeated by Kenton Sparks: “We must remember that the problem is not limited to the nature of ‘Israel’ and how its ethnic boundaries were defined but with ‘Israelites’ (and ‘Judeans’) and how their various definitions of ethnic identity played out on the stage of history” (K. L. Sparks 1998, 11). However, it still may be the case that compromise positions are more popular.

\(^{166}\) Judges 5, the major text to consider in this context, will be the subject of an extended discussion shortly, as will other seemingly early texts such as Genesis 49 and Deut 33. Exodus 15, another text sometimes
Na’aman has pointed out, “there are no exact rules about the relationship between material culture and ethnicity” (Na’aman and Finkelstein 1994, 243). Material arguments for ethnicity, the famous “pots are people approach”, have, of course, been made, but many of the material phenomena at one time associated with the emergence of an “Israelite” identity in this period, such as the four-room house and the collared rim jar, have subsequently been discovered in areas that are not associated with the Israelites (Ibrahim 1975; Ibrahim 1978). And this is again before we stop to consider the complex problem the fluidity of ethnic identity poses. As James C. Miller notes, addressing this problem specifically:

The fact that ethnic identity is a changing social phenomenon rather than a ‘thing’ possessed by a group means that no single configuration of Israel’s ‘ethnic identity’ existed. Rather; attempts to describe Israel’s ethnicity must ask, ‘How did these people understand themselves, and how were they understood by others in a particular time and place?’ (J. C. Miller 2008, 173).

We cannot, at this point, discover what percentage of this highlands group considered themselves to be “Israelite” or what this term would have meant to them as opposed to what it means in later periods. And we do not have the evidence to make positive conclusions of a significant kind.

The more and more tortured relationship scholars have with this period of history is particularly well-illustrated in a recent study of Israelite ethnogenesis by Avraham dated to the pre-monarchical period will not be discussed, as it does not offer a clear picture of how it imagines Israel.

Na’aman makes this observation with respect to understanding the extent to which changes in culture can be expressed archaeologically. As he notes, “sometimes migrants retain their original cultural traditions; in other cases they adopt the local culture and leave no sign of their origin in the material culture” (Na’aman and Finkelstein 1994, 243). As examples of instances in which resettled peoples seem to have maintained elements of their material culture, he cites “the Khirbet Kerak-people, the Hyksos (in Egypt) and the Philistines”, and as examples of those who assimilated more completely, he mentions various northern groups in Canaan, including the Hurrians, and the groups brought to Canaan by the Assyrians in the late 8th century (Na’aman and Finkelstein 1994, 243).
Faust.\textsuperscript{168} Faust begins his study with nuance and theoretical sophistication, noting that “until recently it has been taken for granted in most studies that the Israelites were in existence during the Iron Age I…for various reasons…this view is no longer widely accepted and today scholars use caution when referring to the identity of the settlers in the highlands” (Faust 2006, 3). Elsewhere he takes pains to indicate that “a people’s identity is not necessarily connected with their origins,” and quotes Larry Stager’s criticism of the “idol of origins”, an “obsessive concern for when a phenomenon first began to appear”. He refers to the work of Ibrahim mentioned above to demonstrate how few of the cultural markers once associated with Israelite ethnogenesis can now be considered solely the product of this highlands group (Faust 2006, 170–71; Stager 1985b, 86; Ibrahim 1975; Ibrahim 1978). And yet, somehow, after all of this, he emerges with the conclusion that the pre-monarchical period is indeed the moment in which Israelite ethnicity was born in an enduring fashion. He argues that the evidence for Israelite cultural traits such as the avoidance of pork, minimally decorated pottery, absence of ceramics, and even circumcision—for which of course there can be no evidence—indicates that “Israel”, in this period, was a project well under way. It is for this reason, among others, that Faust’s analysis has attracted significant criticisms (Maeir 2013; Fleming, Daniel 2012, 248–251).

One major focus of Faust’s analysis is particularly important to our discussion, because it is something that is always discussed and perhaps must always be discussed in

\textsuperscript{168} For another recent and quite different discussion of Israelite ethnogenesis see Killebrew 2005.
the context of the pre-monarchical period and Israelite ethnogenesis.\footnote{As Hasel notes, “every reconstruction of the origin of ancient Israel is inevitably faced with the widely discussed single mention of the entity Israel in Egyptian literature found on the Merenptah stela dated to ca. 1207 B.C” (Hasel 1994, 45).} This is an Egyptian artifact known as the Merenptah stele, discussions about which are a kind of microcosm of debates in the field more generally. The objective importance of this find, in brief, is that it is by far the earliest epigraphic artifact which seems to mention a people called “Israel,” in Canaan.\footnote{The first extra-biblical references of relevance after the Merenptah stele appear in the time of Omri (Grabbe 2007a, 54). As Na’aman points out, it is possible that Merenptah’s “Israel” should be located in the Transjordan, inasmuch as it is listed after Yeno’am, a Transjordanian city, or there may be no order at all and we may not really know where it is (Na’aman and Finkelstein 1994, 249). While most scholars agree that this is indeed a reference to Israel, there are some counter-arguments. See, for example, Nibbi 1989; Margalith 1990.} This triumphal, Pharaonic inscription, found in Egypt, is generally dated to the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century and describes Israel as a group that the pharaoh defeats. Faust is somewhat typical in suggesting that because this is evidence that “there was an ethnic (or ‘identity’) group by the name ‘Israel’ already at the beginning of the Iron I…it seems reasonable to assume that that group was extremely dominant in the formation process of the ‘full’ Israel” (Faust 2006, 173).\footnote{A similar point is made by Robert D. Miller III, who notes that even though the highlands group may have been a “mix of Anatolians, Hurrians, Danaioi, and others”, since the Merenptah stele seems to state that a people named Israel existed in the highlands already in the Late Bronze Age, once archaeology has established the continuity to Iron II, there seems to be no reason to retain the prefix ‘Proto’ when describing this highlands entity” (Miller 2004, 63). And yet, again, we have very little idea what “Israel” meant to this highlands group, or who exactly it referred to.} The problem is that it is not, in fact, necessarily reasonable to assume this and that the relevance of this “Israel” for later Israels remains mired in the complexity already described. From a non-positivistic point of view, what this evidence is useful for is far more limited than Faust and others suppose.

Consider, for example: What if the name “Israel” is like “Graikoi” or “Hellenes” in Greek history? This term for Greek identity does not appear in Homer. Indeed, despite...
their ultimate use as collective terms, the Graikoi appear originally to have been, as Malkin puts it “a negligible Boiotian group of hangers-on” (Malkin 1998, 148), whereas the Hellenes seem to have been a small group from either Thessaly, according to Thucydides (144), or from around Dodona, according to Aristotle (147) and possibly Hesiod (149). As Malkin notes, “somehow—and we shall never know how—the terms “Hellenes” and “Hellas” caught on” (149), as did “Greeks”. In neither case was it because these groups were “extremely dominant” in the formation of the whole or even that either exerted considerable influence in early periods. What if Merenptah’s Israel was like this, a small, negligible group whose name eventually came to be a referent for a larger ethne through processes no longer recoverable? And, of course, as Na’aman points out, “the maintenance of a name of a social organization does not necessarily imply any other sort of cultural continuity” (Na’aman and Finkelstein 1994, 248–249). One would hardly think the “British Israelites”, a group founded in the 19th century and popular in the early 20th, were “Israelite” on their say-so.

Without plausible evidence for an encompassing pre-monarchical social organization, without confidence in the historical reality of an exodus, and with a nuanced understanding of the relationship between material artifacts and ethnicity, as

---

172 To the Neo-Assyrians and biblical authors, Greeks were collectively known as Iauna, and Javan, based only on the Ionians with which these peoples were familiar, which shows again some of the difficulties involved in matching names to identities.

173 “Indeed, ‘Graikoi’ too seems to have been a term used by the neighboring Illyrians and Messapians” (Malkin 1998, 149).

174 Na’aman analogizes the situation of the Israelites to that of the Arameans: “There are a few ancient Near Eastern parallels to similarly early isolated occurrences of names of people/kingdoms which became well defined only at a much later time. Thus the name Aram appears in various late third and second millennium sources…However, the history of the Arameans begins with the earliest ascertained reference to them in a concrete historical context, namely the annals of Tiglath-Pileser I (1114-1076)…” (Na’aman and Finkelstein 1994, 249).
well as the fluidity of ethnicity, it is very hard to maintain considerable faith in this period as a significant one for the development of the ideas of Israel present in biblical literature, even as it is clearly a significant period for the region. Without such assumptions it is difficult to demonstrate that the people of the highlands group contributed more than their descendants, and more perhaps than a memory of existence in the land prior to monarchy, to biblical identity.

Panisraeliteism in Epigraphic Finds

Here we can begin to discuss periods for which there is slightly more evidence with an eye towards answering the question of how Judah may have thought about itself in the period of the United Monarchy and the period of the Dual Monarchies. The major focus of this investigation will, naturally, be the United Monarchy, a more plausible origin for “Old Panisraeliteism” than the pre-monarchical period for the reasons described above. There are, as we will see, some avenues through which we might imagine the creation of Panisraeliteism in the period of the Dual Monarchies, instead of the United Monarchy, including a more significant role in the politics of the independent but weaker kingdom of Judah for the more powerful kingdom of Israel in the late 10th and 9th centuries B.C.E than the Bible suggests. But in terms of arbitrating the meaning and import of biblical evidence, investigating the United Monarchy is a more pressing

175 As Grabbe notes, referring to revised dating issues we will discuss in a moment, “the monuments previously associated with the United Monarchy are re-dated from the second half of the tenth century to the early ninth….This means that the strong and historically attested Omri kingdom is the first state in Palestine and preceded the geographically weaker Judah. Taking a global perspective, this is what one would expect rather than the anomalous Jerusalem-centered and Judah-dominated kingdom of David and Solomon” (Grabbe 2007a, 61) This is, of course, speculative, but in this model we can see how events in the period of the dual monarchies may have set the pace for later Panisraelite articulations without the necessity of a United Monarchy as the Bible describes it.
question, particularly since if a Panisraeliteism were generated by events which unfolded differently than in the biblical account, the relationship between the biblical account and this notion would still be less significant than is often supposed. Prior, however, to embarking on that fairly extensive project, I think it is reasonable to survey the epigraphic evidence for Panisraeliteism generally, in a sense setting the scene for that complex discussion. Prior even to performing that survey we can note the conclusion: it is the case that none of the epigraphic evidence clearly supports an ethnic identification between the two kingdoms while both existed, either as a United Monarchy or subsequently. As Fleming puts it, “a handful of nonbiblical texts present two kingdoms that are first visible in the mid-ninth century….from these texts and the findings of archaeology alone, it is not clear how the two kingdoms were related” (Fleming 2012).¹⁷⁶

We have already discussed the Merenptah stele in this respect, a crucial find but also a very isolated one, chronologically speaking. The next relevant find, or rather finds, don’t appear until the 10th century B.C.E., and they are unfortunately beset by similar conceptual problems. Scholars have often focused considerable attention on two epigraphic references to the invasion of Pharaoh Sheshonq, a 10th century inscription found at Karnak and a fragment of a triumphal inscription found at Megiddo. This is confirmation of an event which the Bible relates early in its account of monarchical history, in 1 Kings 14 (and 2 Chronicles 12), and therefore has often been held up as

¹⁷⁶ Interestingly, the name “Judah” appears for the first time much later, in “Summary Inscription 7”, around the time of Tiglath-Pileser III (Grabbe 2007a, 86). The references described here are references to the “House of David”, which we are assuming, probably correctly, means Judah.
evidence of the historicity of the Deuteronomistic account more generally.\textsuperscript{177} In the biblical version, in the fifth year of Rehoboam’s reign, the pharaoh attacks Jerusalem and carries off considerable treasure. The stakes for this discussion are high: if the Bible is accurate with respect to a period so shortly after the collapse of the United Monarchy, it becomes fairly plausible that it is accurate with respect to a period which concluded half a decade earlier.\textsuperscript{178} However, there is a problem. The problem is that the Karnak inscription, which lists the places conquered and subdued by Pharaoh, fails to mention “Jerusalem, the entire Judean highlands, and northern Samaria” (Finkelstein 2013, 43).

This confluence of evidence which is to a certain degree in favor of the historicity of the biblical account and to a certain degree opposed to it, has led to many different conclusions, indeed, to two opposite conclusions. Israel Finkelstein, for example, has taken the absence of the Jerusalem region from the inscription as confirming evidence that this was not an important region at this time, an observation that as we will see is somewhat borne out in the archaeological evidence, while others have gone even farther and suggested that the absence of mentions of Judah or Israel as places implies their nonexistence as kingdoms at this point (Finkelstein 2002; Thompson 1992, 306; P. R. Davies 2004, 42–73; Gelinas 1995, 230–33). Some scholars have gone entirely in the other direction to argue that what Sheshonq was doing was “wiping out” Judah’s “Negebite expansion”, therefore targeting not Jerusalem but Jerusalem’s increasing power, in the process confirming that this power was indeed increasing (Blakely 2002; Halpern 2001, 462–463). The state of affairs is such that, as Knoppers notes, even “the

\textsuperscript{177} As Yigal Levin puts it, these finds make the pharaoh’s raid “the earliest event in biblical history which we have a contemporaneous reference in an extrabiblical source” (Y. Levin 2012a).

\textsuperscript{178} See for example Mazar 2007a, 123–124.
nonmention, and hence noncapture, of Jerusalem in the Karnak relief is cited as verification of 1 Kings 14:25-26 (and 2 Chr 12:1-12) by some scholars”, since in the biblical account Rehoboam successfully pays a ransom (Knoppers 1997).

There is, of course, ultimately little we can say about this inscription with confidence, but to my mind the most salient point is this: I think the possibility that the city’s surrender, by whatever means, would go entirely unmentioned in a triumphal inscription is a very small one. As Finkelstein puts it “had the pharaoh subdued the capital of Judah even without conquering it, he would certainly have boasted about it” (Finkelstein 2013, 43). The pharaohs were rarely bashful. Some, of course, have suggested that Jerusalem was originally part of the inscription, but that this part has disappeared and this is possible, although as Finkelstein notes, the area which would

179 Mazar is among these scholars, noting “the fact that Jerusalem is not mentioned in the inscription does not mean much—if the city surrendered, perhaps there would have been no reason to mention it; or alternatively, its mention could have appeared on one of the broken parts of the inscription” (A. Mazar 2007b, 124). Generally, as Finkelstein points out the basic reality underlying the Kings account has historically been accepted by a number of scholars (B. Mazar 1957, 61; Aharoni 1979, 326; Kitchen 1986, 298, 447; Na’aman 1992, 81; Ahlström 1993, 15; Finkelstein, Israel 2002, 109). A particularly notable example of this, in my opinion, is Redford, who presents as a historical fact that though we would “expect that the Tanite kings were greatly exercised about David’s presence in the Judean hills”, in fact, the ties between Egypt and “the incipient Hebrew King” grew closer because David opposed “two powerful ethnic blocks who were also the enemies of Egypt, viz. the Shashu of Transjordan and the Philistines” (Redford 1973, 3). He goes on to note that Joab’s decimation of the Moabites and Edomites was probably quite welcome news to Egypt (3-4), that these relations resulted in Solomon marrying Pharaoh’s daughter, as the biblical account suggests (5), and states that “it is not inconceivable that Sheshonk acted on the basis of a real or imagined request from Rehoboam to come and restore order in his country” (10). Such certainty with respect to the biblical account is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain.

180 He continues, “moreover, no Judahite town in the Shephelah appears in the list” (Finkelstein 2013, 43).

181 Mazar’s point that Sheshonq’s campaign is distinct from “any of the earlier Egyptian New Kingdom military campaigns” in that it does involve sites directly north of Jerusalem, like Beth Horon and Giveon, indicating the rise of a political power in the central hill country to such prominence that it got the attention of Egypt is both interesting and pertinent to understanding early Israel” (A. Mazar 2007b, 124). However, this question is only relevant to understanding early Judah if it can be proven that early Israel and Judah did indeed have a relationship. A good summary of arguments about the Karnak inscription can be found in Levin 2012a.
presumably mention Jerusalem is not particularly damaged. It is reasonable to suppose that this is not clearly negative evidence against the biblical account, but it certainly is not positive evidence for its historicity other than, of course, the indication that biblical authors had knowledge of surprisingly early events, which is a far from negligible observation.

The next two finds often discussed in the context of Panisraelite debates are the Tel Dan and Mesha steles, probably both dateable to the 9th century B.C.E. These are particularly exciting discoveries, whatever their evidence for Panisraeliteism or lack thereof, because both seem to mention the house of David and in so doing likely provide historical evidence for the early existence of a Davidic dynasty. We can even, here, go so far as to say that both seem to describe some kind of relationship between the two kingdoms, perhaps an alliance, since they are mentioned together, and that it is very plausible that in this sense the evidence of the steles matches the biblical account.

\[182\] Contra, for example Niemann 1997, 297, who argues that the toponym has merely not been preserved, Finkelstein argues “this is possible but not likely, as rows II and V in the list, which mention places in the highlands to the north of Jerusalem, do not have many damaged toponyms. Moreover, no other Judahite town—in the highlands or in the Shephelah—appears in this list. It would be difficult to put the blame for this broader phenomenon on the preservation of the Karnak scene. Finally, the few highlands settlements which do appear—Beth-Horon (No. 24), Gibeon (No. 23) and Zemaraim (no. 57)—are all located to the north of Jerusalem, not in Judah proper” (Finkelstein 2002, 111).

\[183\] The Tel Dan stele is widely supposed to mentioned the house of David; that the Mesha Stele does so as well was first proposed by Lemaire (Lemaire 1994a; Lemaire 1994b), and this idea has drawn support from certain scholars (Halpern 1994; Rainey 2000). However, it has also been challenged by, for example, Na’aman who notes, “I have recently suggested restoring הֵדְעַהוּ הַדָּעַהוּ (‘the House of Daudoh’) at the end of line 31. In the same year, Lemaire restored הֵדְעַהוּ הַדָּעַהוּ (‘The House of David’). However, the latter restoration, as attractive as it may seem, is not free of doubt. Firstly, why should Mesha note that the House (i.e., dynasty) of David ‘dwelt’ in Hauronen when its seat was at Jerusalem? And if he was referring to a certain king of Judah, why call him by a collective term (‘House of David’), rather than his proper name?...The translation ‘And Hauronen, there lived the House of [D]audo[h]’, in reference to a local Moabite dynasty long established in this area, is not burdened with similar problems” (Na’aman 1997a, 89). Few seem to have taken to heart the suggestion of Rainey that David also appears in line 12 of this stele, in a reference to a “Davidic altar hearth”, a phrase which in any case has no clear meaning (Rainey 2001, 300). There are, of course, some controversies in understanding the Tel Dan Stele. Since the initial publication of the two fragments of the stele, in (Biran and Naveh 1993) and (Biran and Naveh 1995), the translation of the crucial part of line 9 as “the house of David” has largely been upheld (Rendsburg 1995; Schniedewind
There are accounts of alliances between the independent kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the books of Kings which could very easily correspond to the events described here, including an alliance against Mesha of Moab and one against Hazael of Aram-Damascus (2 Kings 3, 2 Kings 8-9).\(^{184}\) But again we have to consider the limits of what this evidence suggests. It is important that Israel and Judah did actually ally with each other at times during the Dual Monarchy period. However, these are hardly the only military alliances in biblical literature. The books of Kings also record, for example, an early alliance between Asa of Judah and Ben-Hadad of Aram-Damascus that predates these inscriptions (1 Kings 15) and a later one between Pekah of Israel and Rezin of Aram-Damascus against Judah which seems to have precipitated the events leading to Israel’s fall (2 Kings 16). If Israel-Judah alliances are the result of their shared history, what are these Aramean alliances indicative of?\(^{185}\) Additionally, too, just as the grouping of Israel and Judah in these inscriptions may indicate a relationship, the fact that they are not referred to collectively, as say the בני ישראל, may point in the opposite direction.

\(^{184}\) For details, see especially Biran and Naveh 1993; Biran and Naveh 1995. Schniedewind has suggested that the Tel Dan Stele provides some evidence for an alliance between Hazael and Jehu of Israel (Schniedewind 1996).

\(^{185}\) Indeed, given repeated references to the Aramean ethnicity of Israel—for example, the fact that both Abraham and Isaac send their sons to find an Aramean wife, the famous statement in Deut 26:5, “my father was a (wandering? Perishing?) Aramean”—we can hardly even say that these alliances are consistently supposed to have had different effects with respect to biblical ethnic thinking.
Other well-known triumphal inscriptions, including Shalmaneser III’s “Kurkh monolith” which mentions King Ahab, and “Black Obelisk” which mentions “Jehu, son of Omri”, unfortunately contain no useful information about the relationship between the two kingdoms, and these more or less conclude our discussion of the major epigraphic finds from the period prior to the fall of Israel. There are other inscriptive finds which have begun to be discussed in the context of establishing the historicity of the biblical account of the early monarchical period, including the Tel Zayit “Abecedary” and the Khirbet Qeiyafa inscription (from a settlement in the famous valley of Elah). Unfortunately, whatever else is true about them, neither of these finds is clearly in Hebrew, and only the Tel Zayit abecedary can be “translated” with any confidence. The Qeiyafa ostracon is lengthy, which is exciting, but translators have faced

186 These are not the only epigraphic finds from this region, but as Carr notes “Most, but not all, epigraphic finds from the tenth century are brief labels or word fragments” (Carr 2011, 375). The two he cites as longer inscriptions include the Gezer Calendar and the Tel Zayit abecedary mentioned here. He suggests that these are written “in a form of the standardized Phoenician alphabet” (376). A summary of some of the more notable fragmentary inscriptions can be found in Lemaire 2012.

187 The Tel Zayit Abecedary is the subject of a collection, Literate Culture and Tenth-Century Canaan, which was generated by presentations at the 2007 annual meeting of the American Schools of Oriental Research. In the volume, Tappy and Carr argue strongly for the relationship between this inscription and an emergent Judahite state (Tappy 2008; Carr 2008), while McCarter locates the script as in the process of evolving from Phoenician to Hebrew, a claim he first made in a study with a number of other scholars, including Tappy (McCarter Jr. 2008; Tappy et al. 2006). Rollston identifies it as Phoenician (Rollston 2008), while, elsewhere, Finkelstein has used the designation “late proto-Canaanite” (Finkelstein 2013, 55). As Whisenant notes somewhat caustically in her review of this collection, “one of the primary motivations for such a project has to be the attempt to revive the widely discounted notion of an emergent tenth-century Judean state based in the highlands” (Whisenant 2009). I do not consider the notion of a tenth-century Judean state to yet be “widely” discounted, but I do think it is the case that the existence of such a volume presupposes that the most positive interpretation of the Tel Zayit evidence would be compelling evidence for the existence of extensive scribal culture in 10th century Judah, which would be, in turn, compelling evidence of a powerful Judahite state, something I do not think is justified by a simple alphabetic inscription, whatever its script. This “sweeping” interpretation of the evidence, as Whisenant notes, is most characteristic of the contribution by Carr who argues that it is indeed evidence of a “widespread system of scribal education and training connected with the founding of an ancient Judean state in the hill country during the tenth century B.C.E.” (Carr 2008, 123; Whisenant 2009, 551). As Rollston notes, the difference between his interpretation of the text as Phoenician and McCarter’s view of it as “transitional” is “small and technical. McCarter finds some elongation of certain letters that places them beyond Phoenician, but not yet distinctive Old Hebrew script. I find this elongation in certain Phoenician texts of this period” (Rollston 2012).
considerable difficulty in interpreting it, and the excavator’s interpretation of the site itself is the subject of deep controversy, as we will see.\footnote{188}{There is, in some translations of this inscription what seems to me to be a great deal of wishful thinking. For example, Puech, after determining that the text is quite incomplete, argues that it is the text of a message to a governor of the town, and that, startlingly, it announces the accession of Saul to the throne (Puech 2010). This outlandish assessment has found some support in a recent article by Gerard Leval (Leval 2012). However, as Rollston notes, in an article written in the same issue of BAR as Leval’s, “the five-line ostracon… is not well preserved and is subject to varying readings” (Rollston 2012, 32). Rollston’s article additionally provides an excellent summary of the difficulties inherent in describing any of the 10th century inscriptions discussed here as Hebrew, identifying the script of the Qeiyafa Ostracon as “Early Alphabetic”, and noting it is “certainly not Hebrew and it contains no distinctive linguistic features that would allow us to define the language as Old Hebrew” (Rollston 2012, 68). These articles point to the difficulty of the views of Garfinkel and Ganor who note “the five-line inscription uncovered at Khirbet Qeiyafa clearly indicates that writing was practiced in the region. Thus, historical memory could have been passed down for generations, until finally being summarized as biblical text” (Garfinkel and Ganor 2008, 6).}

Here we can introduce a major issue with many positivist approaches of epigraphic and archaeological evidence. In my opinion, scholars and archaeologists have often been far too quick to draw the line between the evidence that something is possible and that it certainly happened. A major part of the excitement of early epigraphic finds is that they demonstrate the potential for literacy in early periods, and of course, demonstrating such literacy is a necessary prior to the suggestion that any biblical literature was composed in early periods. But just because it is necessary to demonstrate literacy in order to demonstrate the possibility of biblical writing does not mean that demonstrating literacy demonstrates biblical writing. The evidence that exists is suggestive only, particularly in a region which has known literacy, continuously, for millennia.\footnote{189}{Including continuously in Egypt, which kingdom some scholars believe continued to exert influence on the Levantine coast into the 10th century B.C.E. (Lemaire 2012, 3).}

Even to the extent that it is suggestive, none of the items in the slowly growing corpus of 10th century B.C.E. epigraphy is narrative or even annalistic, and the major inscriptions relating to the pre-monarchical and monarchical periods generally, the Merenptah, Karnak, Mesha, Tel Dan, Kurkh Monolith, and Black Obelisk inscriptions...
are, of course, not Hebrew. This state of affairs could easily be overturned either by a new discovery or a plausible Hebrew translation of the Qeiyafa text, but even that would not prove that biblical narratives were composed at this time, only that they could have been. Either way, to date the epigraphic canon does not allow for positive assertions relating to the relationship between Israel and Judah during either the periods of the United Monarchy or the Dual Monarchies. We move, then, into a discussion of the archaeological evidence for the early monarchical period and a discussion of the United Monarchy generally.

**Prefatory note: Archaeological Dating**

Since what can be said about a United Monarchy and subsequent developments depends on how we date what little evidence we have, it seems reasonable to preface our discussion of archaeology with a general introduction to the vocabulary of archaeological dating and the specific problems the archaeology of Israel and Judah represent in this respect. It can of course be quite confusing for the non-specialist to wade through a mass of terms such as Iron IIC, and the crucial Iron I/IIA transition, but the problem is that

---

190 In terms of additional inscriptions, besides the ones discussed here, Tappy et al. adds “the ownership designation lnms found on the shoulder of a storage jar from Tel ’Amal….a rim sherd with a fragmentary inscription ([b]jn.ḥnn) incised before firing and found in a tenth-century…context at Tel Batash in the Judean Shephelah…the personal name ḫnn carved on a gaming board from Beth-Shemesh…and a short inscription, probably an ownership designation ([[]lnh[[]m]), incised after firing on a body sherd from a storage jar found on a floor belonging to Stratum VI (tenth century) at Rehob” (Tappy et al. 2006, 28). We can add to these the recent discovery of what is called the “Ophel inscription”, found on a potsherd, which Galil claims is a description of the quality of wine that the pot originally contained (Galil 2013). While there is a sense in which the seeming proliferation of Semitic inscriptions from the 10th century B.C.E. continues to make widespread literacy more likely, there is also a sense in which the nature of these inscriptions, now that there are more of them, seems mostly to indicate how limited that literacy was. That is, there is a significant disconnect between theorizing a number of people capable of composing the History of David’s Rise, and a number capable of writing their name or labeling a container. The likelihood of scribal education of some sort in the eighth through sixth centuries B.C.E. is explored, for example, by Rollston (Rollston 2006).
there is a reason these terms are often preferred by scholars to exact dates: the exact dates of these periods are a deeply contentious issue.

Very briefly, relative dates are always easier to establish than absolute dates in archaeological digs. Because of the principles of stratigraphy, the layering of the earth’s crust, it is a simple enough matter to place archaeological discoveries in a relative sequence, to establish what is older than what, provided the finds in question come from undisturbed contexts. Marking major transitions within strata—Ila, Ilb, and so on-- is a little more subjective and difficult, and seems to have more local variance than is often supposed, but for the purposes of this study it is enough to say that without “chronological anchors”-- securely dateable finds from secure contexts-- establishing “absolute” dating of any kind is very difficult.191 There have been, as we will see, certain radiocarbon studies pointing in certain directions but it is unfortunately the case, when it comes to Israel, that “there is no such anchor for the 10th century B.C.E. In fact, no such anchor exists between the mid 12th and the late 8th century B.C.E.” (Finkelstein 2010, 6–7). While this is only true if one discounts the evidence for Sheshonq’s raid, described above, it may safely be said that there are at least almost none. And while in many cases such uncertainty is merely annoying, in this case how one dates the Iron I/IIA transition and the start of the Iron IIA determines, to a great extent, the plausibility of the biblical account when it comes to early Judahite history.

Here is what we know. The Late Bronze Age is widely agreed to have ended around 1200 B.C.E., although there is now evidence that Bronze Age material culture

191 “Stratigraphy and pottery tell us nothing when it comes to absolute chronology” (Finkelstein 2010, 6–7).
continued in certain places in the region even as the Iron Age began in others. The pre-
monarchical period occurred in the Iron I period, associated with a vast increase of
settlements in the highlands—the Merenptah stele, again, appears at the very, very end of
the traditionally-dated Bronze Age— and when and how the Iron I ends (and where) is,
again, a subject of considerable controversy. Then, in the Iron IIa, something happens. In
the briefest and least controversial terms, we can say that the IIa period is the period in
which the urbanization of the lowlands commenced. It was once assumed that this was
because of the descent of the highlands culture into the lowlands, but now more complex
processes seem to have been involved.

---

192 The survival of a distinct material culture associated with Late Bronze Canaan, and distinct from the
material culture of the highlands, has been noted in a variety of Iron I contexts, particularly around
Shechem, and in, for example, Megiddo, where, as Finkelstein puts it, “the late Iron I city…is strikingly
similar—in almost all its characteristics—to the late Bronze II city”. This Bronze Age survival constitutes
what Finkelstein has called “New Canaan” (Finkelstein 2013). The issue here is that “Canaanite” is a term
that makes more sense in Bronze Age contexts and it is likely that both this lowlands community and a
significant portion of this highlands community are both “Canaanite” in origin. Thus, scholars who refer to
those whose material culture is consistent with the Late Bronze Age culture as “Canaanites” are using the
outdated notion of a distinction between Israelites and Canaanites in the Bronze Age to indicate the
evolution of a distinction in the Iron Age. Indeed, some scholars argue, as Finkelstein and Na’aman note,
that “there is a clear continuity in the material culture, especially in the pottery repertoire, between the Late
Bronze Age sites of the lowlands and the Iron I sites of the highlands; this indicates that the inhabitants of
the latter originated from the sedentary population of the former…Indeed, certain Iron I highlands pottery
types resemble Late Bronze vessels. But at the same time there are some fundamental differences between
them. In the case of the highlands of Canaan in Iron I, signs of continuity of Late Bronze traditions show no
more than peripheral influence from Iron I lowlands centers, which still practiced at that time the pottery
traditions of the previous period” (Finkelstein and Na’aman 1994, 9–11). Rather than “Canaanite” or
“Amorite” it is therefore probably appropriate to speak of “Lowlands” and “Highlands” culture in the Iron I
period, and to recognize their separation as a product of gradual differentiation.

193 What Finkelstein calls “the urban system of New Canaan”—that is, the lowlands material culture
harkening back to the LB period—collapsed in the Iron I, quite probably under pressure from the highlands
culture (Finkelstein 2013, 36–38). Scholars such as Dever and Faust have argued that the Iron I highlands
settlements were largely abandoned at this time, but, as Finkelstein notes, “the majority of Iron I sites in the
hill country continued to be occupied throughout the Iron Age” and as Maeir puts it, “it should be noted
that the distinct pattern that Faust notes (of sudden abandonment at the end of the Iron I and lack of rural
settlements throughout most of the Iron IIa….) is hardly that clear—and may actually be the result of a
faulty sample and analysis of data…even if one were to accept Faust’s proposal of a process of
abandonment of rural sites (not all scholars do), it may well have been a long, drawn-out, and continuous
demographic sequence in which some sites were abandoned while others were settled during a long time
span” (Finkelstein and Na’aman 1994, 9–11; Maeir 2013, 10–11; contra, for example, Faust 2006, 117–
120; Dever 1990; Dever 1992b; Dever 1991). This particular debate is actually the subject of a remarkable
article by Lester Grabbe who notes some of the many difficulties for literary scholars in reading
Regardless of the processes involved, the Iron IIa is clearly the period in which this new urbanized culture took hold, and the problem now is that who is to blame for it and exactly when it happened are both extremely controversial issues. Until very recently, the appearance of these foundations was unproblematically tied to the appearance of the United Monarchy, to building programs initiated by David and especially by Solomon, and this is where the trouble comes from. It’s not precisely correct to say that the traditional chronology, largely evolved by Yigael Yadin, dated these foundations to the time generally attributed to David’s monarchy, around 1000 B.C.E., merely because it fit the biblical picture. Yadin’s analysis included study of the excavations at Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer, certain stratigraphic evidence widely accepted at the time, and particularly a series of gates of comparable design, found at each of these sites and considered, in Yadin’s view, evidence of a Solomonic build program (Yadin 1970). However, Yadin’s analysis was certainly performed with the biblical picture in mind and it seems to be the case, as Finkelstein notes, that it was “haunted by several problems from the outset”:

First, the city gate at Megiddo seems to have been built later than the gates at Hazor and Gezer...Second, similar city gates have been discovered in other places in the region, among them sites that date to late-monarchic times, centuries after Solomon (Finkelstein 2007a, 110).

archaeological studies. He notes, “I am a historian, not an archaeologist, but I use archaeology a lot in my work. Knowing how important archaeology is for ancient history, I find the present situation very frustrating. Textual scholars largely ignore archaeology, and archaeologists seem to believe a flat, uncritical reading of the text is fine. The problem for non-archaeologists is the availability of archaeological information in usable form” (Grabbe 2007b, 13). Turning to this “debate between Israel Finkelstein and Avraham Faust”, Grabbe notes “it is frustrating because I am dependent on the data in these articles. Neither writer seems to make any concessions to the reader...the heart of the debate hinges on the two summary statements. Faust asserts ‘none of the Iron I highland villages excavated to date continued to exist as a rural site in the Iron II period’ (Faust 2003, 149). Finkelstein responds that ‘the excavated Iron I sites that were not inhabited in the Iron II are the exception. Most Iron I sites-surveyed and excavated sites alike—continue to be inhabited uninterruptedly in the Iron II (Finkelstein 2005, 204). How can I, as a poor benighted historian, evaluate these two statements?” (14).
Thus, Yadin’s “conventional” chronology has been called seriously into question.194

The current controversy really began in 1996 when, on the basis of preliminary carbon dating, particularly at Megiddo, Finkelstein proposed a revised chronology for the archaeology of Israel as a whole called the “Low Chronology” (Finkelstein 1996). What Finkelstein announced, at this time, was that the dates he had gathered from several archaeological levels that had been instrumental in the traditional dating scheme of Yadin and others suggested that the Iron I/IIA transition had occurred nearly a century later than had previously been thought, during the last quarter of the 10th century B.C.E.195 If true, this finding poses an immediate and significant challenge to the picture presented by biblical literature: rather than the work of David and Solomon, according to Finkelstein’s analysis, the new urban foundations were probably the work of the Omride dynasty.

More than that, these findings threw the United Monarchy as a whole into doubt.196

194 The Conventional Chronology, of Yadin and others is as follows:
Iron IA: 1200-1150 B.C.E.
Iron IB: 1150-1000 B.C.E.
Iron IIA: 1000-925 B.C.E.
Iron IIB: 925-720 B.C.E.
The Modified Conventional Chronology of Mazar:
Iron IA: 1200-1150/1140 B.C.E.
Iron IB: 1150/1140-980 B.C.E.
Iron IIA: ca. 980-ca.840/830 B.C.E.
Iron IIB: ca. 840/830-732/701 B.C.E.
The Low Chronology, in its most recent formulation:
Early Iron I: 1109-1047
Middle Iron I 1055-1028
Late Iron I: 1037-913
Early Iron IIA: 920-883
Late Iron IIA: 886-760 B.C.E.
(A. Mazar 2007b, 122; Finkelstein 2013, 7–8).

195 This discovery, as Grabbe notes, was particularly based on the “twin pillars” of the conventional chronology, the stratigraphy of Megiddo and Philistine Bichrome Ware, both of which Finkelstein felt had been inaccurately dated (Grabbe 2007a, 59).

196 Hendel describes the impact of the LC in this way: “In 1996, Israel Finkelstein proposed a revised chronology for the late Iron I and Iron IIA periods, lowering the conventional dates by 75-100 years. This means that the conventionally designated ‘Solomonic’ strata at Gezer, Megiddo, Hazor, and other sites are actually post-Solomonic, and that the evidence of fortifications, public buildings, site hierarchy, and other
Finkelstein is a gifted writer and rhetorician, and his presentation of his evidence is generally quite convincing. Additionally, many of his most virulent critics have done themselves no favors with pre-existing ideological commitments or evident preoccupation with establishing the historicity of biblical literature, so that at certain points the debate has seemed like one between science and an ideological biblical literalism. But this is in fact not the case and there are some serious critics of the Low Chronology whose proposals have been well received. Chief among Finkelstein’s opponents is Amihai Mazar, whose alternate proposal, the “Modified Conventional features usually taken to be indicative of the formation of a centralized state are works of later kings” (Finkelstein 2013, 7; Hendel 2005, 76). This idea may have been first suggested by Jamieson-Drake, though his attempt to establish it has been highly criticized (Jamieson-Drake 1991; criticisms in A. Mazar 2007a, 119; Grabbe 2007a, 65–66). Finkelstein has subsequently revised this date upwards to around 920 B.C.E., but the impact remains.

197 For example: “In a recent publication, Sharon et al. have dealt with this transition (Sharon et al. 2007), which was put by traditionalists in 1000 B.C.E., by Mazar’s Modified Conventional Chronology in 980 B.C.E. (Mazar 2005) and by me in the second half of the 10th century B.C.E. Based on 385 measurements, from 21 sites, measured in three laboratories by three different methods, Sharon et al. put the transition in the second half of the 10th century B.C.E. According to them, of the 36 possible statistical interpretations of these results, 35 fit the Low Chronology and one falls in between, without supporting the traditional chronology. A few years earlier Eliezer Piasetzky and I estimated a less than 1% probability that the High Chronology hypothesis is correct (Finkelstein and Piasetzky 2003). In a recent article, Mazar and Bronk Ramsey have attempted to retain a date for the Iron I/IIA transition in the first half of the 10th century B.C.E. But their selection of data for the study can be disputed. According to their own number, it is sufficient to exclude the charcoal samples (which introduce the ‘old wood effect’) and run the numbers with the short-lived samples (that is, grain seeds, olive pits, etc.) in order to place this transition in the second half of the 10th century B.C.E. To sum-up this point, all 12 Bayesian models…available today put the Iron I/IIA transition in the late 10th century B.C.E.” (Finkelstein 2010, 11).

198 Eilat Mazar, for example, whose discovery of what she calls “The Palace of David” in Jerusalem is the greatest challenge to Finkelstein’s dismissal of the United Monarchy, is underwritten, as Draper notes, by the City of David Foundation and the Shalem Center, which are “dedicated to the assertion of Israel’s territorial rights” (Draper 2010, 3). She is also guilty of a Heinrich Schliemannesque interest in her topic. For example, she published an article, in Jan/Feb 1997, in advance of beginning excavation, called “Excavate King David’s Palace!” a title with attractive symmetry to her Jan/Feb 2006 article in the same publication “Did I find King David’s Palace?” In a 2006 biography written in “Moment Magazine”, she described herself as working “with the Bible in one hand and the tools of excavation in the other” (Lefkovits 2006), an approach that may call into question not just this discovery, but her subsequent discoveries of a portion of “Nehemiah’s Wall”, of tenth century walls around the City of David and so on. Grabbe, in his article about the Iron I abandonment/non-abandonment issue, between Finkelstein and Faust, notes “I think Finkelstein is sincere in believing that Faust (or those whom he cites) have been unduly influenced by the biblical data. Indeed, it seems to me that Faust does not fully answer Finkelstein’s charge that Faust has relied on W.G. Dever—who in turn has relied on J.S. Holladay, who has relied on the Bible—in dating red-slipped and hand-burnished pottery” (Grabbe 2007b, 14).
Chronology” is the major challenge to Finkelstein’s among scholars who are not thoroughly biblical literalists. This is a fairly unique situation because these two scholars have, for the last decade and a half, been in constant, explicit conversation with each other in many of their publications, sometimes more respectfully than others.

Additionally, since 1996, both scholars have modified their positions somewhat in response to new evidence and at present, the major difference between them is a sixty year difference in the proposed start date for this crucial Iron IIa, which Mazar dates to 980 B.C.E. and Finkelstein, most recently, to 920 B.C.E. (Finkelstein 2013, 7; A. Mazar 2007b). Obviously, this difference matters a great deal, especially for the United Monarchy. There is also another important distinction, in that while both scholars now agree that the Iron IIA continued into the late 9th century B.C.E., or even later, Mazar, as opposed to Finkelstein, thinks it largely impossible to differentiate between phases of the Iron IIA. This has the result that “both the United Monarchy and the Omride dynasty are included in a single, more lengthy archaeological period…[which] revised periodization in turn creates a greater flexibility in the interpretation of the archaeological data” (A. Mazar 2007b, 123). At the same time, as he also notes, his MCC “makes life more difficult for those who wish to utilize archaeology for secure historical interpretations in the southern Levant during the tenth and ninth centuries B.C.E.” (A. Mazar 2007b, 123). If one can hardly tell the difference between something built in 950 B.C.E and something built in 850 B.C.E., one can hardly date them either.

---

199 Another article which adopts the MCC is Ben-Shlomo, Shai, and Maier 2004.

200 This trend has led, for example, to a 2007 publication, The Quest for Historical Israel, which collected a total of 12 lectures, 6 from each, delivered by these two scholars on each period of Israelite and Judahite history at a 2005 colloquium at the Institute for Secular Humanistic Judaism (A. Mazar and Finkelstein 2007).
It is in general very hard to adjudicate between the absolutes of these two
positions because they largely consist of different interpretations of the same evidence,
and often rely on highly specialized scientific evidence which I am not fully qualified to
interpret.\textsuperscript{201} It would, of course, be useful as well, if the debate were a good deal less
personal. So, for example, in addressing Finkelstein’s recent reassessment of his data (up
from the 900 B.C.E. mentioned above to 920 B.C.E. for the start of the Iron II), Mazar
accuses Finkelstein of maintaining his dedication to the LC only because of an
ideological commitment to eradicating the United Monarchy. As he puts it:

\begin{quote}
Even Finkelstein and Piasetzky (Finkelstein and Piasetzky 2003) admitted…that
the Iron IIA probably started around 920 B.C.E., higher than the general 9\textsuperscript{th}-
century B.C.E. date given to this period previously by Finkelstein. The difference
between us now is merely 60 years for the beginning of the Iron IIA….This
difference corresponds to the time-frame traditionally assigned to David and
\end{quote}

This is a manifestly unfair charge.\textsuperscript{202} 920 B.C.E. remains very far from 980 B.C.E. (60
years is more than 20\% of the conventional picture of the duration of the northern
kingdom), Finkelstein’s proposal, again, is corroborated by a large percentage of the
radiocarbon studies to date, and the ability to respond to new data is a strength, not a
weakness. This does not, however, make Mazar’s theory incorrect.

\textsuperscript{201} As Grabbe notes, with respect to “pottery assemblages and the dating of various strata… there is a
surprising difference of interpretation between professional archaeologists whom one would expect to
agree about the facts in the ground” (Grabbe 2007a, 61). In my opinion, different interpretations themselves
are not so surprising, but the insistence by one that pottery from two different places looks nothing alike, by
another that they are very similar—as, we will see, in the case of Khirbet Qeiyafa—is indeed surprising.

\textsuperscript{202} Though Mazar has pursued his own radiocarbon study and frequently deals with radiocarbon results, his
approach sometimes amounts to a dismissal of certain radiocarbon findings, particularly those in the largest
study to date, the Iron Age Dating Project, which is distressing (Sharon et al. 2007). The group which
performed this study is not affiliated with Finkelstein, and is also responsible for a study which dated
Kadesh Barnea to a “higher” date, even, than Mazar’s MCC: they do not appear to be biased (Gilboa et al.
2009).
What we can say at this point is that although both scholars have turned repeatedly to radiocarbon dating, the science has generally seemed to back Finkelstein more than Mazar, if also to present a more complex picture than the sequence of neat, time-bound ages is capable of explaining. This is particularly the case with respect to the most comprehensive study to date, the “Iron Age Dating Project in Israel” which is in fact subtitled “Supporting a Low Chronology” (Sharon et al. 2007).203 Recently, Mazar and Bronk Ramsey performed their own radiocarbon study which, according to them, resulted in dating the transition from Iron I to Iron II “between 964 and 944 B.C.E.,” with late 11th or early 10th century destruction dates from Megiddo, Tel Qasile and Yoqne’am (A. Mazar 2007b, 122–123; A. Mazar and Bronk Ramsey 2008). It is worth noting of course that this would bring the models closer together than they officially are, since 964-944 B.C.E. is not 980 B.C.E., the MCC’s official date for the start of the Iron IIA, and since 944 B.C.E., at least, is only a little more than two decades earlier than the LCC.204 And there is a somewhat underappreciated problem: even 964 B.C.E. is somewhat later than the traditional date for the beginning of David’s reign, as for that matter is 980 B.C.E.

---

203 Additionally, it seems as if attempts to correlate the LC with Aegean contexts, and with Philistine contexts, have been more successful than attempts to do so with the conventional chronology (Coldstream 2003; Killebrew 2008).

204 In fact, the last ten years has seen a considerable number of articles in the journal Radiocarbon and occasionally elsewhere, authored by Mazar, Finkelstein, and their collaborators, as well as by the scientists in the labs they’ve relied upon, with each directed rather explicitly at a previous publication. These include Gilboa and Sharon 2001; Finkelstein and Piasetzky 2003; Boaretto et al. 2005; A. Mazar 2005; Sharon et al. 2007; A. Mazar and Bronk Ramsey 2008; Finkelstein and Piasetzky 2006; Finkelstein and Piasetzky 2010. In terms of the I/IIA transition, the difference is really in Mazar’s interpretation of his results, not the results themselves. Mazar suggests that if some Iron I sites were destroyed in the early 10th century, as his radiocarbon dates show, then even if Iron IIA sites mostly date to the second half of the 10th century, there is a sense in which the Iron IIA began in the early 10th. This would, in his opinion, allow “sufficient time in the tenth century B.C.E. for the Iron Age IIA to be correlated with the Davidic/Solomonic era” (A. Mazar 2007b, 123), a claim Finkelstein has vigorously denied, and which, as Mazar has acknowledged at times, lies uneasily alongside the suggestion that the United Monarchy was a considerable geopolitical force. In certain cases, I think Mazar’s arguments sometimes show a lack of clarity on major issues: to support the possibility of a biblical Solomon it is not enough to argue that the Iron IIA had begun by the time he is supposed to have ruled, if all that is visible from that time is destruction layers. Solomon is not much of a conqueror in biblical text.
although in this case, in the conventional picture, he would still be ruling. There is, then, an interesting sense in which neither the MCC nor the LC supports the historicity of the traditional picture of the United Monarchy, although it should be noted that the biblical narrative itself is short on chronological detail and does not require a 1000 (or 1005) B.C.E. date for the beginning of David’s reign.

There is, at last, potentially a solution to all this, one which Finkelstein seems to have accepted and Mazar seems, at least, not entirely opposed to. A recent proposal by Herzog and Singer-Avitz suggests that it is in fact possible to divide the Iron IIa, into two phases, in other words, that it is in fact possible to differentiate between 10th and 9th century foundations. The relevance of this discovery to this study does not lie in the model itself—which Mazar suggests “may be correct to some extent, though I am not convinced that we can be so precise in dating certain Iron IIA strata to either before or after the critical line of ca. 900 B.C.E.” (A. Mazar 2005, 20)—but in another suggestion the two have made. In short, they suggest that only the later phase of the Iron IIA, beginning around 900 B.C.E., is significantly evidenced in the region associated with Judah. Again, what one needs to prove to support the historicity of the United Monarchy is not merely that urban foundations appeared in Israel at the right time, but

---

205 Recall that the major difference between the LC and the MCC is the MCC’s “long” Iron IIa, one which grants essentially the same material culture to the period from 980-900 B.C.E. as from 900-830 B.C.E. It is Herzog and Singer-Avitz’ contention that the late phase, which begins around 900 B.C.E., is the only one to see significant settlement activity in Judah.

206 Indeed, in recent works Finkelstein seems to have accepted Herzog and Singer-Avitz’ proposal as well. In his most recent effort he proposes a two-phase “long” Iron IIA stretching from 920-760 B.C.E., divided around 886-883 B.C.E. (Finkelstein 2013).

207 As they note “although the Early IAIIB and the Late IAIIB assemblages are quite similar, there are several pottery types that enable us to differentiate between them. In the Early IAIIB there are a number of forms that continue IAI traditions, which in the Late IAIIB the vessels with early traditions disappear. New types that appear first in the Late IAIIB become prominent in IAIIB” (Herzog and Singer-Avitz 2004, 20).
that these were at least related to developments in Judah. It has not perhaps always been realized in discussions of this proposal that an MCC with a two-phase Iron IIA, in which the earlier phase does not occur in Judah, offers only a little less difficulty to arguments in favor of the historicity of the United Monarchy than the LC itself.

Indeed, given that David and Solomon are, after all, Judahites, it is perhaps even more crucial for arguments in favor of biblical accuracy to demonstrate early processes in the south than the north. That the development of the south may have happened at a different time and perhaps as the result of different processes than the north is a considerable problem. Of course, this also has a ripple effect when we consider the viability of connecting Iron IA developments to biblical concepts, but for this discussion we can limit ourselves to saying that if there was a two-phase Iron IIa, and the first phase does not appear in Judah, than whether the first phase in Israel begins in 960 or 920 B.C.E. is basically irrelevant to the question of the historicity of the United Monarchy.

It should be said at this point that while far from established, it is seeming more and more possible that Judah as a whole developed later than Israel. Regardless of whether the first phase of the MCC occurred in Judah, it has long been generally agreed that prior to the Iron IIa, Judah was far less settled than Israel, which could be evidence of different settlement processes. Mazar, in his 1992 survey of the state of the field, pointed out that while at least 200 new Iron I sites had been discovered in the areas conventionally referred to as Manasseh and Ephraim--new in the sense of having been established in the Iron I--only one new Iron I foundation had been found in the region of Jerusalem, at Giloh, to the south (A. Mazar 1992, 335–336). Ofer’s survey of the Judean
hills suggested no more than 18 Iron I settlements in the entire region (Ofer 1994, 102).

Finkelstein, as usual, paints the picture even more starkly:

Archaeological surveys have revealed that at that time [the Iron I] the hill country of Judah to the south of Jerusalem was sparsely inhabited by only a few relatively small settlements (Ofer 1994). No less important, it seems that the expansion of Judah to the territories of the Shephelah and Beer-Sheba Valley did not take place before the second half of the ninth century B.C.E. (Fantalkin and Finkelstein 2006; Fantalkin 2008). Indeed, this is the moment when one can detect the first signs of statehood in Judah (Finkelstein 2013, 43).

Of course, the picture this paints is not thoroughly unchallenged. However, there have been some very interesting alternate formulations of Judahite ethnogenesis in

---

208 Ofer’s survey has been criticized, in terms of its methodology, by Lehmann and Herzog and Singer-Avitz, but for suggesting too much settlement, rather than too little; both conclude that the area of Judah was quite sparsely settled in the Iron I, much less so than the north (Lehmann 2003; Herzog and Singer-Avitz 2004, 220).

209 Fleming additionally notes that “archaeology indicates that the southern highlands remained relatively empty of settlement through the Iron Age I, while regions farther north began to grow in population (Finkelstein 1988, 336; Killebrew 2005, 165)” (Fleming 2012, 55).

210 Ze’ev Herzog’s survey of the Beer-Sheba Valley has indeed yielded some early sites, including early remains at Tel Masos (beginning of the 12th century B.C.E.), Beer-Sheba itself (middle of the 12th), and a series of fortified structures at Arad that have long been a source of contention among Israeli archaeologists, some of which may have Iron I occupation layers. Tel Masos seems to have continued into the Iron IIa and is therefore, along with Arad, Beersheba, and Lachish, one of the southern settlements identified by Herzog and Singer-Avitz as possibly belonging to the early Iron IIa in Judah (Herzog and Singer-Avitz 2004). And, as we have seen, there is considerable controversy about the site of Khirbet Qeiyafa. The existence of a few early Iron IIa sites in Judah however, does not change the general picture of a sparsely populated, little developed region. And, of course, when we open again the question of the identity of these early settlers, we have to note that this remains both conjectural and contested. As Herzog notes, for example, Tel Masos was long regarded as an Israelite center, but some scholars now suggest it is Canaanite, some Amalekite, some Geshurite, and others that the whole region was inhabited by desert tribes, while Herzog himself, along with Finkelstein and Na’aman accept the Amalekite hypothesis (Herzog 1994, 146), suggesting that the defeat of the Amalekites by King Saul resulted in a resettlement that then allowed Israelite occupation of the area. Part of the difficulty of analyzing the arguments for and against various interpretations of the material evidence for 10th century Judah is that few of these arguments are very clear about what they consider to be the borders of 10th century Judah. Several descriptions of 10th century Judah rely on activity in what is more probably Benjamin, an issue that is complicated, as noted in previous chapters, by a lack of clarity in Benjamin’s affiliation. In the books of Kings, this tribe generally appears as part of the kingdom of Judah, but it is often also treated as a northern tribe and many scholars believe that the area did not become Judahite until after the fall of the Northern Kingdom, or just before (Fleming 2012; Knauf 2006; Finkelstein 2013). This point of view is contra Na’aman 2009, who argues that Benjamin belonged to the south even in the Bronze Age (Na’aman 2009). Finkelstein critiques Na’aman’s argument by suggesting that it is overly reliant on biblical literature (Finkelstein 2013, 45).
recent years, based on the possibility that Judahite ethnogenesis—we might say the first Judahite ethnogenesis—might not depend upon events in the north. We can consider, for example, the very intriguing statement of Ofer, who suggests that “from the archaeological aspect, there is no justification for distinguishing between newcomer settlers and an ‘autochthonous’ population…no clear archaeological indication of the origin of the people” in Judah (Ofer 1994, 109). There have been certain criticisms of Ofer’s approach in recent literature, and the idea of “newcome” settlers as a distinction between the north and the south may rely on ideas about the external origin of the Israelites which are no longer universally subscribed to. But, very interestingly for our purposes, Ofer also revives an old study of the biblical onomasticon to note that Edomite names, along with the names of the Transjordanian tribes of Reuben and Manasseh, have far more in common with the Judahite onomasticon than with that of any northern tribe.\footnote{These groups have a 30\%+ identification with Judah, while all others have 15\% or less (Ofer 1994, 115–116; Meyer 1906).} Obviously, exactly what this means is unclear, but it is evocative of the possibility that Judah’s origins were of a different character, with more local attachments, than those which shaped the larger northern kingdom. This proposal seems to be gaining ground. Williamson, for example, suggested more than a decade ago that with respect to the pre-monarchical period “the origins of Judah are revealed by archaeological surveys to have been separate from those of the heartland of Israel” (Williamson 2001, 83–84). Such certainty may not yet be merited, but this seems to be the direction scholarship is headed. This solution would complicate how we approach even well-established evidence.
considerably. It has, for example, been common for scholars to assume that evidence
gathered from southern Iron II sites reveals something about life in the north, and vice-
versa, a transference only possible if some mechanism of unity between the two could be
proved in this period. As Fleming notes about Faust’s effort to describe the ethnogenesis
of Israel, “Faust cites southern locations without questioning whether Iron Age II Judah
must be joined into one ethnicity with Iron Age II Israel” (Fleming 2012, 249). Perhaps
we must begin treating these data sets separately.

In my opinion, a recent, summarizing proposal by Omer Sergi with respect to all
these issues is particularly persuasive:

The rise of Judah as a territorial kingdom is characterized by the expansion of
Jerusalem’s sovereignty from the southern hill country to the Shephelah and the
Beer-Sheba-Arad Valleys. The Judahite fortified towns and administrative centres
of Beth-Shemesh Level 3 (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2009) and Lachish Level Iv
(Ussishkin 2004, 78–82) represent the former while Beer-sheba Stratum V
(Herzog 2008) and the fortress of Arad Stratum XI (Herzog 2002, 11–4) represent
the latter. Scholars agree that these Judahite urban centres should be dated to the
late Iron IIA (Herzog and Singer-Avitz 2004; A. Mazar 2005; Fantalkin and
Finkelstein 2006). The absolute dating of this period is still debated but data from
archaeological excavations and radiocarbon dating indicate that it did not begin
before the early 9th century B.C.E.; in fact, it probably commenced only in the
second quarter of that century (Sergi 2013, 226).212

What this would mean is that neither the pre-monarchical nor United Monarchical
periods could be the mechanism through which Judahites began to describe themselves as
ethnically Israeliite. If this basic outline is correct, Judah emerged as a developed and
urbanized region too late to have been part of a United Monarchy, and too far distant
chronologically from the (northern) pre-monarchical period for northern processes to
have played a considerable role in the development of a Judahite ethnos.

212 The comparatively late date for the urbanization of Judah is supported, as well, by Fleming and
Killebrew (Killebrew 2005, 165; Fleming 2012, 55).
Prior, however, to offering a final settlement of these issues, it is necessary to
investigate the evidence often used to support the United Monarchy besides the
chronological issues explored here. Of course, it is by now clear that the archaeological
picture formed in this section is not very encouraging on this front, but it nevertheless
seems important to interact with arguments more directly for and against the United
Monarchy’s plausible historicity, as an institution through which “old Panisraeliteism” is
consistently articulated in biblical literature.

The United Monarchy and the Evidence

From the Tel Dan and Mesha inscriptions we know it is likely David existed, or at
least that he was considered the founder of a southern dynasty fairly near the time he’s
supposed to have lived, which is far from inconsequential. And it is clear enough that the
Deuteronomistic History in general is very far from a complete fabrication. Mazar is
typical of a certain type of approach, now more troubled than it used to be, arguing that:

Of the various approaches to the historicity of the biblical narratives, the most
justified one is in my view the claim that the so-called ‘Deuteronomistic History’
preserved kernels of ancient texts and realities. This core included components of
geo-political and socio-economic realia, as well as certain information on
historical figures and events….the authors and redactors must have utilized early
source materials, such as temples and palace libraries and archives, monumental
inscriptions perhaps centuries old, oral transmissions of ancient poetry and folk
stories rooted in a remote historical part, and perhaps even some earlier
historiographic writings (A. Mazar 2010).

The problem, I think, is not that the DH contains no “realia”; it is that scholars are less
able to determine what does and does not fit this distinction than has often been
supposed. We can recall in this respect the case of the Sheshonq Raid, in which an early,
verifiably historical event appears in the biblical account, but it may not be the case that it
happened at all as the Bible describes it. How the United Monarchy fits within this complex dynamic is a difficult question.

This portion of our discussion of the United Monarchy, and of “Old Panisraeliteism”, will begin with Jerusalem, because I think it is at once the easiest issue to discuss and the least definitive of any related discussion because of the difficulty in excavating Jerusalem, a still-bustling city. And because just as discussions of the Merenptah stele represent a kind of microcosm of debates about the pre-monarchical period, discussions of Jerusalem represent one for the United Monarchy. It is more or less universally agreed that the evidence for a powerful Jerusalem in the 10th century is on shaky grounds, though of course not everyone has therefore determined in the negative. We can consider in this light Mazar’s suggestion that 10th century Jerusalem was important, despite its size, based only on the (controversial) possibility that the architectural complex on the summit of the City of David dates to the 10th century, the “possible” continued use of Middle Bronze structures around the Gihon spring and the admittedly “virtual” evidence of the never-discovered, perhaps never-to-be-discovered First Temple (A. Mazar 2010, 34).

This is in many ways characteristic of archaeological approaches to the United Monarchy. Obviously, this evidence is underwhelming, and it doesn’t clearly point in any direction: the somewhat ambiguous evidence for the continued use of MB structures around the Gihon is the only hard evidence presented here. However, there are favorable interpretations for a United Monarchy which cannot be entirely dismissed. Grabbe’s

213 It does indeed seem reasonable to suppose a First Temple existed, but it is harder to date it with any accuracy.
challenge to all reconstructions of Iron I Jerusalem is, I think, quite apt: “Those who maintain that Jerusalem did not develop into a substantial city until Iron IIB have current archaeology on their side. Those who maintain an earlier development must argue on the basis of what is presumed to have disappeared or what might be found in the future” (Grabbe 2007a, 70). But, of course, many things have disappeared and many things may yet be found which will overturn everything we think we know, as has happened on many previous occasions.

This kind of “favorable thinking” is even more visible in most of the other evidence which scholars have turned to to defend the United Monarchy from an archaeological perspective. Generally, the problem with most approaches to demonstrating that a powerful 10th century empire was ruled from Jerusalem is that these put the cart before the horse, assuming as evidence what, without a United Monarchy, could be something completely different. What I mean by this is particularly visible in discussions of the discovery of a metallurgic center at Khirbet en-Naḥas in an area that has been associated with lower Edom by its excavators, Thomas E. Levy and Mohammad Najjar. This team has gathered radiocarbon dates in the 11th and 10th centuries B.C.E. (Levy and Najjar 2006; N. G. Smith and Levy 2008). So, in the reconstruction most favorable to the historicity of the biblical accounts, these may be a sign of the power of David’s kingdom to compel manufacture as far as Edom, as is suggested by the biblical

214 This seems to be broadly true. Although J.M. Cahill, as Grabbe additionally notes, “has been one of the most vociferous voices arguing for a substantial city as early as the tenth century” (Grabbe 2007a, 66; Cahill 2003; Cahill 2004), as Herzog and Singer-Avitz point out, Cahill’s 2003 summary of the Iron IIA remains, “although attempting to advocate the large city hypothesis…paradoxically verifies the most limited data” (Herzog and Singer-Avitz 2004, 219). Moreover, those who do argue on the basis of what may have been destroyed by later levels of occupation need to explain the fact that there are “abundant finds from the earlier MBII period, and later Iron Age IIIBIC” (Herzog and Singer-Avitz 2004, 219).
narrative and as was long ago argued by Nelson Glueck, who described this site as Edomite mines serving David and Solomon’s empire (Glueck 1940).\textsuperscript{215}

On the other hand, there is no actual evidence linking this site with Judah or even, for that matter, “Edom”, as traditionally understood. Early Edom has been traditionally supposed to be limited to the Edomite plateau, which does not appear to have developed until considerably later (Na’aman and Finkelstein 1994, 223; Finkelstein 2013, 135–137).\textsuperscript{216} While the excavators argue that there is continuity between the material culture at Khirbet en-Naḥas and the later development of the Edomite kingdom on the Edomite plateau, an important discovery, they themselves note that

For now, the lowlands of Edom and even the Late Iron Age highland settlement lack unambiguous evidence for a...government that was both highly centralized and internally specialized with the ability to wage war, exact tribute, control information...Thus, there may never have been a local ‘archaic state’ in Edom, but rather societies that grew and contracted due to processes of fusion and fission through time from tribal (segmentary) to complex chiefdom level societies (Levy and Najjar 2006, 10–11).

Additionally, while their approach is certainly more nuanced than Glueck’s, the excavators are far from cautious in their reliance on biblical text. Their argument that since something like “Edom” might have existed in the Iron I and IIA—even in the sense of these “societies that grew and contracted”—the historicity of the biblical narrative is not wholly debunked is accurate but very far, as they do not admit, from confirming the

\textsuperscript{215} Actually the biblical narrative never says that either David or Solomon built mines or a metallurgic center in this region but garrisons (2 Sam 8:14), and fleets (1 Kings 9:26). That this is rarely discussed shows fairly clearly the issue with positivist interpretations of the evidence.

\textsuperscript{216} Finkelstein suggests that there might be no settlement at all on the Edomite plateau until the 8\textsuperscript{th} or even 7\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E. (Finkelstein 2010, 15). Mazar points out that “the relationship of this ‘lower Edom’ to the development of the kingdom of Edom on the Edomite plateau...remains an enigmatic question” (A. Mazar 2010, 50–51).
biblical account. It is not clear to me that they have indeed demonstrated that this region is Edom as the Bible understands it, and their methodology, including citation of texts like Genesis 36: 31-43 in describing Iron Age Edom, does not seem likely to be helpful. As nuanced and speculative as their approach often is, statements such as the following are clearly less skeptical than they should be:

According to the traditional High Chronology…the rule of [David and Solomon] would be from ca. 1000-931 B.C.E. According to these data, and the suite of radiocarbon dates now available…several working hypotheses may be suggested for the possible builders and controllers of the Stratum A3 gate and fortress complex: (a) David, (b) Solomon, (c), David and Solomon; or (d) the local Edomite population. Clearly, more data and analyses are needed to clarify this working hypothesis (Levy et al. 2005, 159).

There is very obviously a fifth possibility, which is that local populations of an entirely different sort are responsible, and a sixth, which is that we understand too little of the interaction of groups in this region to have a clear idea of what was going on at so early a period. Again, even if these could be shown to be 10th century mines worked by self-identifying Edomites, if the only evidence of Davidic involvement in those mines is the biblical description—which in any case only mentions garrisons, not manufacture—we should still feel on very infirm ground.

217 “While the current dates push the occupational history of Edom back to the 12th-9th centuries B.C.E., the sample size is too small to confront the arguments concerning the High and Low Chronologies for the Iron Age in Israel/Palestine. These dates do bring the Iron Age archaeology of Edom back, to a certain degree, to historical questions raised long ago by Nelson Glueck concerning the Iron I and Iron IIA. While the lack of space prevents a detailed discussion here, the fact that Edom is mentioned no less than 99 times in the Hebrew Bible justifies a re-examination of some historical issues in relation to the new archaeological excavations in the lowland regions” (Levy et al. 2005, 158).

218 Indeed, the excavators’ own assessment that “lacking new epigraphic data, we still do not know how these Iron Age peoples of southern Jordan referred to themselves” is not nearly so meaningless an observation as they seem elsewhere to suppose (Levy and Najjar 2006, 12). For more information, see also Levy, Najjar, and Higham 2005; N. G. Smith and Levy 2008.
Similar problems attend the discovery of Khirbet Qeiyafa whose excavators, Yossi Garfinkel and Saar Ganor, are quite certain that they have found a massive, fortified Judahite site of the tenth century B.C.E., one that would indicate a strong centralized Judahite state merely by being part of it. They have identified the site with biblical Sha’arayim, merely, apparently, because it has two gates (though so far very little of the site has been excavated), and have performed radiocarbon dating at the site which they claim “supports an ‘ultra high’ chronology for the transition from Iron I to Iron II, ca. 1015-1010 B.C.E.”, and may even establish its foundation in the late 11th century B.C.E. (Garfinkel and Ganor 2008, 5). However, all of these claims have been disputed, often vociferously, in a number of ways, and it must be admitted that the radiocarbon dating, performed only on four olive pits, is uninspiring in comparison with the hundreds of radiocarbon dates found in other studies. In addition, Finkelstein and

219 Once again, this is playing somewhat fast and loose with dates. 1015 B.C.E. would, according to conventional chronologies, be prior even to David’s reign over Judah, let alone over the United Monarchy. Many scholars seem to have pursued arguments which assume that if anything can be dated early, compared to Finkelstein or even Mazar’s models, it is positive evidence for David and the United Monarchy, but of course there is such a thing, as well, as evidence that is too early. If the Bible’s account of David’s reign is correct, how early can we imagine him building a massive city like Qeiyafa?

220 The identification with Sha’arayim has been disputed, in different ways, by Dagan, Na’amani, and Levin (Dagan 2009; Na’amani 2008; Y. Levin 2012b). More critically, both the methodology of the excavators and their dating of the site have been strongly criticized by Singer-Avitz who suggests that, though Garfinkel and Ganor argue that the pottery assemblage they’ve discovered is from the Iron IIa period, in fact, it “belongs to the late Iron I horizon in southern Israel”, which would call into question its association with Judah (Singer-Avitz 2010, 79). She concludes, “to sum up, the pottery assemblage of Khirbet Qeiyafa consists of local Iron I pottery in the Late Bronze tradition with not even a single type that can be ascribed exclusively to the Iron Age IIA” (Singer-Avitz 2010, 8). In her critique of their methodology, she notes “Kang and Garfinkel maintain that ‘previous work on the Iron IIA pottery in Judah was not founded on a satisfactory database’ and add that ‘Khirbet Qeiyafa offers, for the first time, an important resource for our understanding of the pottery development of Judah in the early Iron Age IIA’ (Kang and Garfinkel 2009, 110). They state that the Khirbet Qeiyafa pottery assemblage is a point of departure ‘for clearer dating of early Iron IIA strata in tell sites in the Shephelah and Judah’ (ibid: 146). Based on the fact that Khirbet Qeiyafa was occupied during a brief period of time, they create a new phase at the beginning of the Iron Age IIa period (that is, earlier than the conventional early Iron IIA)—a phase that is unknown at other sites. This is methodologically wrong. Such a definition can be made only at a multi-layered site, where ceramic phases can be defined in superimposed strata and then compared to other sites. A single stratum site must be adjusted to the well-known, wider stratigraphic/chronological scheme and not vice versa” (Singer-Avitz 2010, 7). These rather serious allegations, if correct, would imply that Garfinkel and Ganor’s interest in
many others have suggested that this settlement should instead be connected with Philistine Gath, which, as Garfinkel and Ganor note, is only “12 km downstream” (Garfinkel and Ganor 2008, 6).221 Regardless of which view is correct, or neither, the inability of anyone to demonstrate the matter conclusively or even convincingly in either direction shows the nature of the evidence and the issue with relying upon it. Just like Khirbet en-Naḥas, then, if one assumes the biblical account is accurate, one can use it as a lens through which to view the evidence of Qeiyafa favorably for it. But all scholars, whichever position one inclines to, should take seriously the inability of anyone to demonstrate the existence of the United Monarchy and its role at Qeiyafa, Khirbet en-Naḥas, and elsewhere independently and without reference to the biblical account.222

This leads us finally to the most controversial and potentially most important discovery related to the United Monarchy, Eilat Mazar’s discover of what she calls “the Palace of David”, which is elsewhere called “The Large Stone Structure”. Unlike all the identifying a powerful regional center of the early Iron IIA has caused them to ignore a large number of issues in their analysis, calling into question their assessment generally. Additionally, the radiometric dating is based entirely on four burnt olive pits (Garfinkel and Ganor 2008, 5), an extraordinarily small sample compared to the several hundred involved, for example, in the Iron I dating project. On the other hand, given the dates of other sites in the region, if these radiocarbon dates are supported by a more comprehensive study they may in fact be too early to be part of Judahite kingdom, which few currently date to so early in the 11th century.

If Finkelstein is correct in suggesting that “plotting all late proto-Canaanite and Philistian inscriptions from southern Canaan on a map, it becomes evident that they are all concentrated in the southern coastal plain and the Shephelah, mainly in or near the territory of Philistine Gath” then he would also likely be correct that these inscriptions may be part of a non-Judahite legacy, a “lasting administrative and cultural tradition in the region” (Finkelstein 2010, 18). He claims that not one inscription has been found in Judah proper, but of course this depends on what one imagines to be Judah proper. The excavators of Khirbet Qeiyafa consider that site to be Judahite. Lemaire, like several other scholars, suggests that “from its location, this ostracon is probably connected with Philistia…rather than with Judah” (Lemaire 2012, 6)

A truly invaluable effort in this respect is Lester Grabbe’s synchronic study of the biblical history for this period and external evidence. This features an excellent, list-style summary of biblical data confirmed by external evidence, biblical data unconfirmed by not disproven, instances in which the biblical picture is incorrect and in which the biblical picture contains gaps (Grabbe 2007a, 87–90). This sketch confirms that there are a number of instances in which biblical history is largely confirmed by external evidence but more than a few in which the opposite is the case, or an inaccurate picture is presented.
other finds here, if it could be demonstrated even merely that this structure dated to the Iron IIA, all the criticisms of the evidence here would become void, there would be evidence for a significant, powerful entity headquartered in Jerusalem, and its ability to impact the surrounding regions would become considerably more plausible. Again, however, there are significant challenges to her identification of the site in this way. I mentioned above her positive identification of the site prior to her excavation of it, as well as her dedication to using the Bible as a source, neither of which is particularly comforting.\textsuperscript{223}

However, the most cogent counter-argument to her identification of her discovery is merely that she has mis-dated it.\textsuperscript{224} Extensive critiques of her methodology and approach, notably by Finkelstein, Herzog, and Ussishkin (2007), as well as Reich and Shukron (Reich and Shukron 2008), have revealed sufficient reason for doubt with respect to her dating.\textsuperscript{225} So, too, have studies by Amihai Mazar and Avraham Faust. As Faust noted in a 2010 survey of the available evidence, since the building seems to be

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[223] See note 198.
\item[224] Given the array of finds in the vicinity of the LSS, and uncertainty with respect to how they were connected to one another, the matter is simply very complex. As Ussishkin notes, “the following anecdote illustrates the difficulties involved. I remember discussing the Jerusalem pottery chronology with Alon De Groot, at the time Shiloh’s assistant in the City of David excavations, who told me that he could show me ‘trays of tenth-century B.C.E.’ red irregularly burnished Iron Age pottery found in the excavations. When I commented that what he defines as tenth century pottery is probably ninth-century pottery…he happily answered that in that case he would provide me with “other trays of earlier pottery.” When I asked Israel Finkelstein…what kind of pottery we have to expect, in his view, in tenth-century Jerusalem, he said that ‘we are not sufficiently familiar with the pottery of this hilly region in this period to answer that question’” (Ussishkin, 2003, 108).
\item[225] In their article, Reich and Shukron note that “in order to support her topographical interpretation of the biblical text and her identification of the “palace of King David”, Mazar suggested that the city’s boundaries in the Middle Bronze Age II terminated south of, and adjacent to, the boundaries of the ‘large stone structure’. In other words, she claimed that the ‘large stone structure’ was extramural to the Middle Bronze II city walls” (Reich and Shukron 2008, 114). However, they claim their excavation of Wall 501 indicated that it comes from the late 8\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E. and that Mazar “thus raised the wall’s date by nearly a millennium” (115).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
clearly Iron I, and David’s reign is traditionally understood to begin in the Iron IIA, in order to make the dates fit it has been necessary for E. Mazar to engage in both “lowering the date of the building to the very end of the Iron Age I, or even the transition to the Iron Age II…[and] raising the date of David to the same time slot” (Faust 2010, 124–125). By contrast, both A. Mazar and Faust have both independently both proposed that the structure could date to as early as the 12th century B.C.E., and have therefore suggested it may be a Jebusite fortress although, as Faust notes, this would not preclude David from having used it (A. Mazar 2010; Faust 2012). Clearly, E. Mazar has discovered something important, but it is not at this point clear what it is. And given the vituperative tenor of current archaeological debates, it seems reasonable to suggest that if Finkelstein, A. Mazar, and Faust all concur on such a crucial point, that point is probably well established.

What we are left with, then, is no substantive evidence for a United Monarchy. The “Palace” of King David seems considerably too early, the Qeiyafa inscription and Qeiyafa itself require considerable further study, Jerusalem was clearly a small settlement in any time we might ascribe to the United Monarchy, and finds such as Khirbet en-Naḥas require considerable faith in the accuracy of the biblical narrative to even be imagined as relevant to the question. All of this, in and of itself, certainly does not disprove the United Monarchy. David and Solomon could have both existed, and could both have been powerful kings, without having had a mighty capital. Jerusalem could have been a small city into the 9th century B.C.E without having been an unimportant
However, when we add the lack of evidence for significant activity in Judah as a whole, prior to 900 B.C.E, the second phase of Herzog and Singer-Avitz’ proposed Iron IIA, as well as the radiocarbon dates which continue to point towards a later date in the 10th century B.C.E. for most important developments in the region, even if not always so late as the Low Chronology suggests, maintaining the historical reality of the United Monarchy becomes quite difficult. Of course, as J.Z. Smith puts it, referring specifically to archaeology, “you can find any number of white swans but one black swan is enough to invalidate the hypothesis and it could always be out there” (J. Z. Smith 2002).

I should note that it is still plausible in my opinion that the early Judahite kingdom developed under the shadow, and often under the power, of its larger and stronger neighbor. Sergi’s suggestion that an only-slightly-pre-existing relationship with Israel which gave birth to the military alliance described in the Tel Dan Stele is what gave Judah its genesis as a polity is interesting, although quite speculative. More valuable in my opinion is his observation that “most of the historical data preserved in the Book of Kings regarding the kings of Judah in the 10-9th centuries B.C.E., deals with their Israelite counterparts (cf. 1 Kings 15:17-22; 22:1-38, 45, 48-50; 2 Kings 3:3-27; 8:18-19, 26, 28-29; 11:1-20)” (Sergi 2013, 233–239). There will be a more considerable

While Finkelstein argues that “new analyses of the archaeological data from Jerusalem have shown that in the tenth century B.C.E. it was no more than a small, poor highlands settlement without monumental construction (summary in Finkelstein 2010 contra A. Mazar 2010)” (Finkelstein 2013, 43), Mazar suggests that prior to the expansion of Jerusalem in the 8th century B.C.E., the city Jerusalem “could not include a population larger than ca. 1000-2000 persons,” but that “several exception structures set it apart from other urban centers of the southern Levant at that time” (A. Mazar 2010, 34)

Indeed, wherever the Books of Kings are treated somewhat unproblematically as lightly edited combinations of chronicle-like material, several crucial points are missed. One in particular is the fact that a plurality of the Books of Kings is devoted merely to the dynasty of Ahab and its extermination by Jehu. Prior to the death of Jehu in 2 Kings 10:35—of the 47 combined chapters of the books of Kings, 17 deal with Ahab, his son, Elijah, Elisha and the fall of his dynasty-- and that besides the possibly ahistorical description of Rehoboam’s capitulation to Shishaq, the kings of Judah are largely ignored in this account with the exception of precisely the two events for which there is extrabiblical, epigraphic evidence. That is,
discussion of these issues in later chapters, but it is worth noting that it has recently been suggested in a few quarters that there was a United Monarchy, but that it was ruled from the Omride north.228 I do not think there is enough evidence to imagine actual royal control over Judah, from Israel, but it is worth noting the biblical account of the reign of Athaliah, a daughter or granddaughter of Omri, is the sole interruption in the Davidic dynasty according to the books of Kings.229

Other avenues through which we might demonstrate “Old Panisraeliteism” are, not surprisingly, also becoming more complex. Whether, for example, there are linguistic grounds for imagining more of a connection between Israel and Judah than, say, Judah and Moab in the dual monarchical period is very difficult to say.230 And again, it should

from the moment of the division of the kingdoms in 1 Kings 12:18-19 the only time devoted to the Judahite kings prior to 2 Kings 10, a distance of some 20 chapters, is the very brief, detail-light account of Abijam’s reign in 1 Kings 15:1-8, the description of Asa’s apparently enormously long reign in 1 Kings 15:9-24 (including an alliance with Ben-Hadad against Israel), and these two events, the alliance with Israel apparently referred to by the Tel Dan stele (1 Kings 22:1-40), and the war with Moab referred to in the Mesha stele (2 Kings 3:4-26). What can it mean that even in the Judahite account of early monarchical history, a large percentage of the surviving material which narrates events prior to the reign of Jehoram and the second half of the 9th century B.C.E., relates solely to two moments of co-operation with Israel? The composition of the books of Kings is, of course, generally interesting to any discussion of Panisraeliteism and for that reason will be discussed in the next chapter. However, for the moment it seems worth saying that in addition to 17 chapters devoted to Ahab’s dynasty, 11 are focused on David and Solomon. This means that considerably more than half of these two books are absorbed with discussions of only two dynasties, and not with the chronicle-like presentation of reigns often considered to be typical of these books. It is possible that 2 Kings 11-25 may be a significantly different literary effort than what precedes it. This will be discussed in the next chapter.

228 This has been suggested by Finkelstein who argues that 2 Kings and the Tel Dan stele may both suggest that “the Omrides may have tried to take over Judah, perhaps even by annexing it, by a royal ‘diplomatic’ marriage of the Israelite princess Athaliah and the Davidide king Jehoram. For a few decades in the first half of the ninth century, Israel managed to establish a great United Monarchy…Yet, this United Monarchy was ruled from Samaria” (Finkelstein 2007b, 152). Mazar has also suggested that Judah was a vassal state of Israel at this time (A. Mazar 2007c, 164).

229 The confusion in biblical literature about the parentage of Athaliah has been noted for a long time (see Katzenstein 1955 for a treatment). Additionally, for a discussion of disturbances in the chronology of this period of biblical history, see Thiele 1974.

230 The possibility of significant linguistic differences between the two kingdoms, especially given how relatively close the various other languages of the region are, has also been investigated (Rendsburg 1992). As Fleming notes, “the resemblance between the languages [Israelite and Judahite Hebrew] does not demonstrate a common identity, in that linguistic variation may have a strong geographical component,
now be quite clear that all of the avenues through which “Old Panisraeliteism” was supposed to have arrived, whether through the highlands group, through the United Monarchy, or through events in the early history of the separate kingdoms, are now far more problematic than was once supposed. But that may be the limit of where this discussion can take us.

In the subsequent chapter, then, I will discuss evidence first in the seemingly early prophetic collections and in other texts deemed to be early, in the latter case especially in the context of establishing a history of the tribal system as a literary idea.

especially before the eighth century. As attested in the ninth-century Mesha inscription, the language of Moab is much like Hebrew, more so than the Deir ‘Alla text of the late eighth or early seventh century, which was found in territory that could once have belonged to Eastern Israel” (Fleming 2012, 24). Fleming, like Cross before him, has also emphasized what he takes to be differences in royal ideology in each kingdom (Cross 1973b; Fleming 2012, 162–163). Additionally, it has been suggested that the relations between Israel and Judah featured other moments of Israelite dominance, unrelated to an original United Kingdom. McCarter, for example, suggests that the context for the Kuntillet ’Ajrud inscriptions is “that which prevailed after the events described in 2 Kings 14, according to which Amaziah of Judah conducted a successful campaign against Edom (v7) shortly before his own defeat at the hands of Jehoash of Israel (vv 8-16). So at this time, roughly 790 B.C.E., the Northern Kingdom held sway over Judah and territories to the south…the desert west of Edom, where Kuntillet ’Ajrud was located, was probably controlled by Israel until about a decade later, when Azariah reasserted Judean authority in the region (2 Kgs 14:22) (McCarter Jr. 1987, 138–139).
Chapter Four: Israel and Judah in Biblical Literature

Here we begin our discussion of the biblical evidence for the historical development of ethnic ideas about Judah. Again, we can relate the project here to Panisraeliteism: I agree with those scholars who believe that Judah did not imagine itself in an Israelite mode until after the fall of Judah, but I believe that the biblical manner of presenting this did not develop until the late 5th or even 4th century B.C.E. Thus, this examination is something of a part one to a two part answer. Here I will attempt to demonstrate that in the early prophetic texts the idea of Judah as Israel had not yet emerged. Later, I will discuss the idea’s, in a sense, double emergence, a project which will actually begin in the second half of this chapter as I present a speculative history of the tribal system, whose development I think ultimately created the structure for the biblical historical narrative.

The books of Hosea, Micah, Amos, and Isaiah at least seem to contain material from just prior to the fall of Israel, and I am inclined to think that they in fact do. I have chosen to begin this investigation with these books not because they are certainly the oldest texts in the Bible but because given the historical interests of these authors, they more often present material that at least seems dateable than do other supposedly ancient texts. Of course, when one believes in the dramatic power of minor edits to

---

231 When I refer to “Israel” and “Judah”, I am simplifying the matter. We do not know the social valence of the biblical ideas about either, other than that they circulated in elite, literate circles. Perhaps even the Israelite narratives the Judahite authors of biblical literature used were never particularly popular.

232 Of course there have also been, in recent years, numerous efforts to suggest a later date for this material (for example, the work of Bos on Hosea (Bos 2013). These arguments will only receive peripheral treatment here. As the question I am dealing with here is whether Panisraeliteism can be demonstrated prior to the fall of the kingdom of Israel, the vital question is how early the material could be, not how late.

233 For an excellent treatment of the possibilities inherent here see Carr 2011.
recast meaning this becomes a complex issue. It is not, in fact, unlike the archaeological
issues mentioned above. It is quite possible, in biblical literature as in excavation, to
believe a context quite secure until something appears that is out of place, perhaps a coke
can or plastic wrapper. The problem with such discoveries in archaeology is that once
they occur, the entire context is called into question and this, unfortunately for us, should
be true of biblical texts as well. We can’t imagine that all late edits inevitably look like
late edits and even what seems archaic may, in fact, be archaising. And yet, it is still
necessary to attempt to date texts and with a certain amount of caution, the project may
be at least largely achievable.

Between these old prophetic books and tribal articulations such as Judges 5 and
the Blessings of Jacob and Moses (Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33), this chapter will
cover many of the most notable supposedly early texts, with discussions of a few others,
such as the History of David’s Rise, appearing in the subsequent chapter. As noted above,
Exodus 15 contains no significant information as to how Israel is to be imagined with
respect to our crucial questions—whether there were supposed to be twelve tribes, or what
they were called, how they were thought of, and whether Judah and Israel were here
combined—and is consequently not useful for our various inquiries. Thus, we begin.

The Four Early Prophets

Of the four books to be discussed in this section, the book of Amos is notable, in
my opinion, for its absence of Panisraelite sentiment. Whether this is really the case rests
on two features of the text. First, in Amos 1:2, the statement “YHWH roars from Zion,
and from Jerusalem he gives forth his voice,” may be considered an expression of
Panisraelite sentiment, the only one in the book of Amos, and second, in the section of Amos devoted to oracles against the nations (OAN), the oracles against Israel and Judah are presented one after another which may imply some notion of a relationship. The first case seems relatively easy to settle, as this verse has quite often been considered to be a later addition. As Hadjiev notes,

Although 1:2 is attributed by some scholars to Amos…it is usually taken as a later redactional addition from pre-exilic, exilic, or post-exilic times…v. 2 is loosely connected to its present context and its removal harms in no way the structure of the following OAN or the preceding superscription (Hadjiev 2009, 124). 234

As for the OAN, however, the matter is considerably more complex. We have to answer, if we can, both whether Amos himself is likely to be responsible for all of them, and second, whether their order, which is what expresses Panisraeliteism in this case, is likely to be the work of Amos himself or that of a later editor? Of course, the two questions are related inasmuch as, if Amos did not write (or speak) them all, he also could not have been the one to organize them.

Ultimately, it does seem likely that Amos is not the author of all of these oracles. As Blenkinsopp notes, most scholars agree that the OAN against Judah, Tyre, and Edom are late additions to the book (Blenkinsopp 1996, 75; Hadjiev 2009, 41). 235 First and foremost, scholars have often noted certain connections between the oracles against

---

234 He ultimately suggests that 1:2, along with 4:12, 5:8-9 and 9:5-6 are all part of “pre-existing hymnic materials” which were later incorporated into this book (Hadjiev 2009, 127). The composition history of Amos is complex, and as Hadjiev additionally notes, modern studies often begin with Wolff’s suggestions of six stages in the literary development of the book (Hadjiev 2009; Wolff 1977), while others have recognized as many as 12 layers (Rotzoll 1996). However, the stylistic difference between the material identified here and the rest of the book makes Hadjiev’s argument compelling.

235 Although see for example Hayes 1988, 52–55. Blenkinsopp specifically suggests that the oracles against Judah and Israel both are “reminiscent” of Deuteronomistic language and themes and this seems likely to me (Blenkinsopp 1996, 75). This argument is also made by Römer who suggests that “in the book of the Twelve, Hosea, Amos, as well as Micah are the most likely candidates for having undergone a deuteronomistic redaction” (Römer 2005, 35).

Second, an interesting feature of Amos’ prophecy is a tendency towards de-emphasizing the uniqueness of Israel and Judah altogether. This is clearly visible, for example, in Amos 9:7: “‘Are you not as the Kushites to me, Israel?’ an utterance of YHWH. ‘Have I not brought Israel up from Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Arameans from Kir?’”

Finally, after the OAN, which occupy the majority of Amos 1-3, Amos is quite consistent in referring only to Israel, Jacob, and Samaria. The only subsequent reference to Judah of any sort comes in Amos 7:12, where the prophet is evicted from Israel and sent home. This combination of factors makes it quite likely that at least the organization, and probably the composition of these oracles as well, were not the result of the prophet’s own activity, and that Amos’ imagination of Israel did not include Judah as conceptually part of it. Although this rich and varied book deserves a considerably longer discussion, and certain aspects of it will receive attention subsequently, for the present discussion it is reasonable to conclude that Amos does not seem conscious of the Panisraelite idea. It is possible that the simple fact of Amos’ career, that he went to Israel from Judah, is in some way evidence to the contrary, but we can consider similar

---

236 Amos’ “unique” vision of Israel may also appear in his use of the collective “House of Isaac” in 7:9, 16. Interestingly, the figure of Abraham does not appear in Amos, while Jacob and Joseph do.

237 Indeed, as Sparks notes, the fact that Amos refers to Jacob, Joseph, and Isaac, but never to Abraham, may also be an important observation (J. T. Sparks 2008, 191)
narratives in 2 Kings 8, where Elisha goes to Damascus, and Jeremiah 25:15-26, where a
great many peoples are described as those to whom YHWH has sent Jeremiah. 238

This brings us to the book of Micah. Assessing what material in the Book of
Micah is ancient is far from easy. First of all, it has often been suggested that Micah 4-7
are in their entirety 6th century additions, although this is not universally accepted. 239
Blenkinsopp, for example, suggests that chs. 4-5 “deal with a cluster of themes
encountered in the literature of the exilic and restoration periods”, but suggests that
elements of chapters 6-7 may come from the prophet himself (Blenkinsopp 1996, 92–
93). 240 It is also the case, as with Amos, that Micah’s references to Judah, Jerusalem and
Zion are relatively few. Three of his four references to Judah occur in the first chapter of
the work, one in the superscription, which is presumably not by his hand. The fourth, in
Micah 5:2, would read, in my opinion, as an addition even if 4-7 as a whole were not

238 אֲרִיחָלָנוּ נַעֲםֶכָּנִי, אֶל-אָדָם שֶׁלֹּא יָדַע הַאָדָם.
239 Carr, for example, suggests that Micah 4-7, along with Isaiah 40-66, parts of Isaiah 1-35, and much of
Jeremiah “appear to have been composed in the exilic and Persian post-Exilic periods”, and “the discussion
of potential late-eighth-century material in Micah will be brief, since the chapters containing such material,
Micah 1-3, are less extensive….Micah 4-7 consists of a mix of oracles added to the Micah collection in the
exilic and later periods” (Carr 2011, 329). For an argument to the contrary, see Andersen and Freedman
2000.

240 He also notes that “the occurrence of Micah 4:1-4 in Isa 2:2-4 is only the most obvious of the
indications that Micah and Isaiah at some point passed through the hands of the same tradents.”
Transmission issues are, of course, one of the major problems in understanding the prophetic books in
general (Blenkinsopp 1996, 93). We know that the book of the twelve prophets was in existence by the
time of Ben Sira, in the early 2nd century B.C.E., but much less about its formation over time (Blenkinsopp
1996, 74). The formation of what is called “the book of the twelve” has been the subject of much scholarly
discussion, and in fact, scholars have recently taken up the possibility of a pre-existing “Book of the Four”
composed of Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah (Nogalski 1993a; Nogalski 1993b; Schart 1998). With
respect to the book of the twelve, Albertz suggests that “the radical prophets of judgment of the eighth
century (Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Micah) and the seventh/sixth century (Jeremiah, Ezekiel)” had been largely
neglected until their gloomy prophecies “turned out to be, for the most part, bitterly true” (Albertz 2003,
206). While this is somewhat speculative, it does seem reasonable to suppose that prophets of doom gained
popularity in the wake of the great cataclysm of the fall of Jerusalem, and that this in part explains both the
fact that “the preaching of all the pre-exilic prophets of judgment underwent more or less extensive exilic
redaction” and their inclusion in the canon as it developed (206). For more recent discussion on the book of
the twelve, see Wöhrle 2006; Albertz, Nogalski, and Wöhrle 2012; especially Wöhrle 2012.
often treated in this way: “But you, Bethlehem Ephratah, one of the little ones among the clans of Judah, from you he will go out before me to be ruler of Israel”. The soteriological message here would hardly have resonated in 8th century Israel, which would not likely have been awaiting salvation from the South, nor is it likely to have come from the South until some time when the Davidic line was in peril, perhaps in the Exilic or even post-Exilic period.

In my opinion, Mic 1:5b is probably also an addition, or perhaps more accurately an exegesis, of Mic 1:5a.241 Here the statement “All this for the transgression of Jacob and for the sins of House of Israel” is queried: “What is the sin of the house of Jacob? Is it not Samaria? And what is the high place of Judah, is it not Jerusalem?” This addition seems to tie Judah to Samaria, but in the current text, there is no reference to “the high place of Judah” in 1:5a to which 1:5b is responding. As for Micah 1:9, if it is an authentic reference to Judah from the time of Micah himself, it is not, in my opinion, an expression of Panisraeliteism. The verses, beginning from 1:8 and continuing through 1:10a, read: “Because of this let me lament….because her wound is incurable. This has come to Judah; it reached even the gates of my people, as far as Jerusalem…do not tell it in Gath”. That is, bad news about Israel has come to Judah and may continue on to Gath, which is perfectly intelligible with or without imagining an ethnic relationship between the two kingdoms, particularly as Micah seems to be a Judahite whose focus is often Israel.

241 As Williamson notes, “the status of [1:5]…as a later, possibly exilic, reflection on the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem has been argued with some force” (Williamson 2001, 86).
Among the references, not to Judah, but to Jerusalem and Zion in Micah, Micah 3:9-12 stands out as an expression of Panisraelite sentiment. It reads: “Hear this, heads of the house of Jacob and chiefs of the house of Israel, the ones abhorring justice and who twist all that is straight, the ones building Zion with blood and Jerusalem with wrongdoing…therefore because of you Zion will be plowed as a field and Jerusalem will become a heap of ruins”. Here, the identification of Israel with Zion and Jerusalem is unequivocal. Andersen and Freedman, in their commentary on Micah, suggest that Micah 1-3 represents a discrete collection which they call the “Book of Visions”, in which Micah 1:1 first announces forthcoming prophecies about “Samaria and Jerusalem”, begins with Samaria and ends with Jerusalem (Andersen and Freedman 2000, 386). This is certainly possible, except that the symmetry of beginning and end obscures the fact that only 3:9-12 mentions Judah, Jerusalem, or Zion, other than the references in 1:5 and 1:9 which, as noted above, are of questionable authenticity. I will return to Micah 3:9-12, a crucial pericope, in a moment.

When it comes to the book of Hosea, understanding the composition of the book is in some ways even more difficult than understanding Micah. As Kelle notes, “virtually every major commentary from the modern period contains some statement that the text of Hosea is second only to Job in the Hebrew Bible in the number of textual problems, literary idiosyncrasies, unintelligible passages” (Kelle 2010, 318). There is a long

---

242 Many scholars seem to believe that “Israel” in Micah often refers to Judah (Wolff 1990, 95–97; Hillers 1984, 43; Andersen and Freedman 1980, 388; Fleming 2012, 50), but there is in my opinion no particular reason to suppose this. As Kratz notes, “Scholars agree that ‘Israel’ in Amos and Hosea refers primarily to the Northern Kingdom and includes both the people of Israel and Judah only in exceptional cases or in redactional passages, as it usually does in Micah” (Kratz 2006, 115).

243 So, for example, the description of the composition of this book in Andersen and Freedman: “During the Exile a substantial part of the prophetic corpus was assembled and edited to provide a complementary work
scholarly history of suggesting numerous redactions, including Willi-Plein’s suggestion of 8 redactional layers, Yee’s comparatively modest 4, or even R.E. Wolfe’s 13 (Willi-Plein 1971; Yee 1987; Wolfe 1935). There are certainly significant differences between the MT and LXX of the book (Kelle 2010, 318–319; G. I. Davies 1992; Andersen and Freedman 1980, 66). Despite all this, that the core of the book does indeed rest on 8th century foundations is best argued through two avenues: first, it is not uncommon for scholars today to point out dialectal features in Hosea which may be representative of a northern “Israelian” dialect (Mays 1969; G. I. Davies 1992; Macintosh 1997; Yoo 1999). Second, when we profile Hosea’s knowledge of biblical traditions, these are predominantly northern traditions, “especially those related to Jacob (e.g., 12.3-5, 13 [MT], the exodus (e.g. 11.1; 12.10-14 [MT]; 13.4), and wilderness (e.g., 9.10; 13.4), rather than those concerning Zion and David” (Kelle 2010, 325). However, scholars to the Primary History. The parallel between the fall of Israel in the latter part of the eighth century and the fall of Judah in the early part of the sixth century was drawn so often and so explicitly by the later prophets such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel that it became a commonplace of biblical and prophetic speech. Thus the denunciations of Israel by the eighth-century prophets became paradigms of Judah’s predicament more than a century later. The great prophets of the eighth century were co-opted by their successors, and also by the editors of their books for service in a larger cause involving the fate of Judah and not only Israel. We conclude from this that it was during the Babylonian Exile that the final shape of the Book of Hosea was worked out. While the orientation is similar to that of other prophetic books…it is difficult to say how much is owed to the sixth-century reenactment of defeat and captivity, and how much belongs to the original eighth-century composition” (Andersen and Freedman 1980, 56). This is in general, in my opinion, a very conservative work, which, for example, suggests that all form-critical problems can be circumvented by understanding Hosea’s prophecies not as “finished oracular utterances, ready for public delivery” but as “the actual deliberations of Yahweh in the divine council,” except without the council. “Liberating readers from the impasse and frustration of inconclusive form-critical studies” is offered as one of the primary graces of this theory (Andersen and Freedman 1980, 45). As Yee puts it, “Andersen and Freedman’s manner of dealing with the question of later redaction and composition is, from the first, to avoid it” (Yee 1987, 24–25), however “the authors implicitly modify their position of unity and authorship by admitting that a disciple composed Hos 1-3, that redaction was recognizable in Hos 4-14, and that the texts were reinterpreted for new historical situations” (Yee 1987, 23).

244 Kelle’s surveys of Hosea scholarship are tremendously useful and in-depth (Kelle 2009; Kelle 2010). As he notes, with respect to chapters 1-3, for example, “virtually every interpreter recognizes that these chapters are not of a single piece, and scholars draw their redactional conclusions from a variety of textual references: 1. Judean kings alongside Jeroboam (1.1); 2. Jezreel and the House of Jehu (1.4); 3. The House of Judah (1.7, 11); 4. The disappearance of kings and princes (3.4); and 5. David (3.5). From these references most interpreters conclude that portions of chs 1-3 come from the mid-eight century B.C.E.,
have also noted a considerable relationship between the book of Hosea and Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.²⁴⁵

Therefore, it is difficult to know what to make of the many references to Judah in Hosea (Hosea 1:1, 1:7, 2:2, 4:15, 5:5, 5:10-14, 6:4, 6:11, 9:14, 10:11, 12:1, 12:3).²⁴⁶ Stylistically, in my opinion, there is something curiously liminal about many of them. Some come in the very last or very first verse of a chapter (Hos 6:11, 8:14, 12:1-3), some seem to come as stray comments in the middle of oracles otherwise aimed at Ephraim (Hosea 6:10-12, 10:11, 12:1-3), which then resume their attack on Ephraim, and some come courtesy of a parenthetical ו, giving them—again, subjectively— a curiously “tacked on” quality (Hos 5:5, Hos 6:11). Obviously there is an element of special pleading to stylistic arguments, and we would not want to rely solely on them to build a case, but the liminal nature of these references has been noted before. In Yee’s examination of the 15 references to Judah, for example, she suggests that only the four likely around the time of the Syro-Ephraimite War (734-731 B.C.E.), while other portions are of exilic or even post-exilic provenance (e.g. (Wolff 1974)” (Kelle 2009, 189). He also cites the work of Emmerson, Yee, Mitchell, and Rudnig-Zelt, but notes “scholars reach differing specific redactional conclusions, and the diversity of views contributes directly to the multitude of divergent biographical reconstructions” (189) (Emmerson 1984; Rudnig-Zelt 2006; Mitchell 2004; Yee 1987).

²⁴⁵ As Kelle notes, “virtually all modern commentators emphasize numerous similarities between Hosea and Deuteronomy, ranging from specific references (‘Admah and Zeboiim’, Deut 29.23; Hos. 11.8) to the theological language, such as election (Deut. 4.37; 7.6-8; Hos. 9.10; 11.1) and calls to repent/ return (Deut 4.29-31; 30.1-10; Hos 6.1-3; 14.2-3[MT]. The shared northern provenance of Deuteronomy and Hosea provides the usual starting point for explaining these similarities, but modern scholars remain divided over the precise nature of the relationship between the books…While some recent works posit the primacy of Deuteronomy as a direct source for Hosea (Stuart 1987), or the activity of a Josianic redactor upon both books (Yee 1987, 305–13; Yee 1996), the majority of scholars continue to support the view that has been dominant since the time of Wellhausen, namely, that Hosea and Deuteronomy do not evidence direct literary dependence, but both draw upon a larger stream of northern tradition (Kelle 2010, 327). See also K. L. Sparks 1998, 126–127.

²⁴⁶ For a long time, it was common for scholars to mark a distinction between Hosea 1-3 and 4-14 (Andersen and Freedman 1980), but as Kelle notes, recent studies by Sweeney and Ben Zvi, among others, have attempted to restore focus to the whole as “an intentionally crafted prophetic ‘book’” (whose composition Ben Zvi at least places in the period of Yehud) (Sweeney 2000; Ben Zvi 2005; Kelle 2009, 189).
included in Hosea 5:10-14, as well as 10:11 and 12:3 are from Hosea himself (Yee 1987, 314–317), with the others arriving either courtesy of a redactor she associates with Cross’s Dtr1 (120-122), or a later “final” redactor of this collection, dated to the Babylonian exile for his focus on “recurring themes of exilic chastisement coupled with the hope of return” (90). Blenkinsopp has also suggested that 1:7, 3:1-5, 4:15, 5:5, 6:11, and 8:84 are all additions (Blenkinsopp 1996, 85).

Of the references which neither Yee nor Blenkinsopp seem to consider an addition, that is 5:10-14, 10:11 and 12:3, I would certainly suggest that 10:11 and 12:3 should be considered additions as well. In each case, the verse reads more smoothly without Judah, and in each case the prior and subsequent material refers only to Israel. So, for example, 10:11 reads “Ephraim is a trained heifer who loves to thresh. But I will pass over her good neck and I will harness Ephraim and Judah will plow and Jacob will harrow for himself”, and in 12:2-3 “Ephraim feeds itself on wind and pursues the east wind all its days; he multiplies falsehood and violence. They make a covenant with Assyria and oil is taken to Egypt. YHWH has a dispute with Judah and will punish Jacob according to his ways. He will be repaid according to his deeds”. Since in each case Ephraim resumes, after Judah, with Jacob, Judah appears indeed to be an addition in these verses, an impression buttressed by the singular pronoun which follows “Judah and

---

247 Yee’s fourth contributor is the “collector”, who supposedly formed the collection of Hosea oracles shortly after the fall of Israel (Yee 1987, 115).

248 Interestingly, Hosea 12:13-14 has been the subject of much debate the last few years. Sparks suggests that this is a negative portrayal of Jacob, which seems to me less certain than he supposes, but Römer and de Pury have both suggested that these two verses deliberately contrast the Exodus and Patriarchal traditions in favor of the Exodus tradition, and this could well be the case (Römer 1990; K. L. Sparks 1998, 130–132; de Pury 1992).

249 10:11 additionally seems as if it has been disturbed, inasmuch as there is presumably a missing noun, whatever it was that was to be placed on Ephraim’s neck.
Jacob” in Hosea 12:3. The major justification for assuming that the reference to Judah isn’t an addition is to assume that Jacob and Judah have already been identified with each other, which I do not think is the case. However, I think it is necessary to be agnostic about 5:10-14. Once again, 5:10, in which Judah is referred to directly, is bracketed by oracles leveled against Ephraim alone in 5:9 and in 5:11. However, 5:12, which refers to both, to a certain degree ameliorates the seeming incongruity of this reference to Judah in 5:10. Ultimately, in the case of Hosea it would be more comfortable to assume that the identification of Judah with Israel or Jacob is indeed part of the original collection if there were an instance where Judah was referred to without reference to Israel, which there isn’t.250

Thus, it is nearly possible to date every potential expression of Panisraeliteism in Amos, Micah, and Hosea, to a later period than the prophets themselves with the notable exception of Micah 3:9-12, which explicitly refers to the chiefs of the house of Israel as those who built Zion and Jerusalem. This verse therefore deserves an extended discussion. The problem, in brief, is this: while we cannot assume that all late additions to biblical text are obvious, or even discoverable, it is unreasonable (and positivistic in a negative way) to identify something as an addition merely because of its subject material, and therefore it is best to treat this pericope as if it were original to the collection. However, the fact that most other Panisraelite expressions identified above are probably additions has kept us from having to grapple with one of the thorniest issues in the

250 It is worth noting, as Blenkinsopp does, that “in Hosea, for the first time, we find an outline of the Hexateuchal narrative, if in fragmentary and rudimentary form and with many gaps. He is familiar with one version of the fate of the twin cities by the Dead Sea…and the Jacob Story (12:4-5, 13) though not quite as it is presented in Genesis 25-35. The liberation from Egypt under prophetic leadership is…for him of unique significance” (Blenkinsopp 1996, 89). It is indeed interesting to see here two of the primary narratives which would become vehicles of Panisraeliteism, although in neither case does it seem as if this identification had already taken place.
understanding of these prophetic collections. I will recall to the reader that what we are searching for here is evidence for whether Panisraeliteism had begun to develop prior to the fall of Israel, or whether, as scholars have recently argued in a number of different ways, it is that fall, and the arrival of refugees in Judah, as well, presumably, as the desire of Hezekiah to lay claim to a broader territory, that gave birth to it (Na’aman 2010; Fleming 2012; Finkelstein 2013). Unfortunately, the probability that Micah continued to operate after the fall of Israel makes answering this question rather complex even if these verses are from the hand of the prophet.

That these verses pre-date the fall of Israel has been argued by Andersen and Freedman, in their commentary, and proposed more cautiously by Wolff (Andersen and Freedman 2000, 387; Wolff 1990, 97). Both have keyed in on the crucial point, which is whether or not it is possible to situate a prophecy of doom for Judah in the encroachment of the Assyrians on Samaria even though the siege of Jerusalem did not occur until 701 B.C.E., well after the fall of Israel. In my opinion, it probably is not. Due to certain chronology issues in the text of Kings, scholars have sometimes suggested that Jerusalem was threatened prior to 701 B.C.E., but even in these cases the “first” Assyrian invasion is generally supposed to have occured around a decade after the fall of Israel.\(^{251}\) Even

\(^{251}\) There is a well-known issue in biblical chronology relating to the siege of Hezekiah’s Jerusalem. While the biblical account claims that Samaria fell in Hezekiah’s 6th year, and Sennacherib besieged Jerusalem in his 14th, or 8 years later, the dates of the fall of Israel (722/21 B.C.E.) and the siege of Jerusalem (701 B.C.E.) are fairly well established from Assyrian sources. As Jenkins puts it, “There can be no date as tantalizing to the Old Testament historian as “the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah...yet a date of 715 B.C. for the accession of Hezekiah, although widely adopted, is difficult to reconcile with the synchronisms of 2 K. xviii 1,9, 10 according to which Hezekiah was already on the throne when Samaria fell in 722 B.C” (Jenkins 1976, 284; Geyer 1971). Various solutions have been proposed, including Goldberg’s suggestion, based, among other things, on a fragmentary inscription discovered at Azekah, that “the massive Assyrian invasion of Judah in 701...has apparently been confused with an earlier, limited invasion in Hezekiah’s 14th year...this earlier campaign can be dated to 712, when Sargon II apparently led the Assyrian royal guard on a Palestinian campaign” (Goldberg 1999, 388). This inscription was first assigned to Sennacherib and supposed to commemorate the 701 invasion by Na’aman, who has recently defended this interpretation.
more compelling, in my opinion, is the fact that according to 2 Kings 16, the Assyrians first invaded the north on a southern invitation, and Ahaz seems to have become Tiglath-Pileser’s vassal. In this case, it would be fairly unlikely for the Assyrian invasion of Israel to represent a threat to Judah. As Wolff notes, to argue for an earlier date for this pericope it is necessary both for Micah to see in “the siege of Samaria a threat to Jerusalem”—which, given the geopolitical situation described in Kings would seem unlikely—and for him to already at this time identify the “Judaic authorities” as “Israel” (Wolff 1990, 97). Since this would appear to be the only such identification in the prophetic collections discussed so far, these are formidable qualifications. Wolff, interestingly, also suggests that these verses refer to the “vigorous building program in Jerusalem, which was enlarged to an extraordinary degree under Hezekiah” (Wolff 1990, 106). If so, this building program is unlikely to have taken place while Israel existed.252

Thus, even if this is an 8th century expression of Panisraeliteism, it is likely to have come from a time after the fall of Israel. Again, despite what has sometimes been argued, it is not, in my opinion, reasonable to suggest that references to Israel or to Jacob in these books are references to Judah without first being able to indicate this by other means.

All of this brings us to Isaiah of Jerusalem, the sole supposedly 8th century prophet to focus his attentions on Judah, and a focal point for burgeoning discussions of

---

252 Indeed, Schniedewind considers this verse among the most important pieces of evidence that Hezekiah attempted to incorporate the northern refugees into his kingdom (Schniedewind 2003, 39–; Schniedewind 2004, 94–95), although Na’aman criticizes this assertion on the grounds that “the passage in Micah is clearly addressed to the leadership of the kingdom of Judah, and the phrase ‘the rulers of the House of Jacob and the chiefs of the House of Israel’ is merely a derogatory expression, intended to compare it to the sinful leadership of the kingdom of Israel” (Na’aman 2007, 47). While I agree that the verse probably refers to Judahites, I think it is rather one of the first stages in the process of identifying Judahites as Israelites.
Panisraeliteism for a variety of reasons. As Fleming notes, besides, potentially, narratives of David, the few discussions of Panisraeliteism which currently exist tend to begin with Isaiah 8:14 (Fleming 2012, 14). Here a reference to שׁנֵי בֵיתֶם יִשְׁרָאֵל, the two houses of Israel, is, I think, an indisputable expression of Panisraelite sentiment.

The study of the book of Isaiah has reached an interesting juncture. As Blenkinsopp notes, the major divisions in the book have been apparent to scholars since the early 19th century. Gesenius identified Isaiah chapters 40-66 as a distinct unit, now called Deutero-Isaiah, in 1821, while Bernard Duhm identified 56-66 as a potential “Trito-Isaiah” in 1892, and it is largely this basic paradigm which has dominated to this day. However, scholars have begun to pay more attention to relationships between the sections, therefore calling into question the sharpness of these divisions.253 Although Seitz noted, in his 1991 study, that the “distinguishing feature” of scholarship on the three hypothetical independent Isaiah works is that “the relationship among the three Isaiah sections (1-39, 40-55, 56-66) is not a main topic of discussion”, already half a decade later Blenkinsopp could note, “the tendency in Isaiah studies today is to move beyond the tripartite division, standard since Duhm published his commentary, in search of

253 Of course, not all scholars acquiesce to this development. In a compelling recent treatment, Sommer argues not only for the uniqueness of “Deutero-Isaiah”, but argues that “no convincing evidence has yet been marshaled” to demonstrate the existence of Trito-Isaiah (Sommer 1998, 191). Sommer freely confesses that he is out of step with his contemporaries on many redaction-critical issues, noting “my approach to prophetic texts differs from that of many contemporary scholars. Where some of my colleagues detect composite writings and evidence of scribal hands over diverse periods, I usually find unified poems” (4). With respect to the connection between Isaiah of Jerusalem and Deutero-Isaiah, he notes “there is no evidence that Deutero-Isaiah himself appended his work to that of Isaiah ben Amos” (176-177).
structural, thematic and lexical clues to an underlying unity of the entire book at the redactional level” (Seitz 1991, 14–15; Blenkinsopp 1996, 99).²⁵⁴

Obviously, understanding the extent to which even Isaiah 1-39 represents a pre-Exilic collection is crucial to determining what can be about Panisraeliteism in Isaiah. It is clear that, as Seitz puts it, “First Isaiah chapters contain the most heterogeneous and historically disparate material in the entire Isaiah collections”, which makes this a serious challenge (Seitz 1991, 17). On the one hand, a hallmark of distinction between Deutero and Trito-Isaiah and Isaiah of Jerusalem, as Fleming puts it, is precisely relevant to our question here, that “after chapter 40, when the end of the kingdom is assumed, the name ‘Israel’ is appropriated for the Judahites without hesitation” (Fleming 2012). However, Panisraelite expressions are more frequent in Isaiah 1-39 than in the collections surveyed above, and it is not at all clear that we can dismiss all of these as later additions. On the other hand, since it is reasonable to suppose that the connection forged between Deutero-, Trito- and Isaiah of Jerusalem, and the subsequent enlargement and editing of Isaiah 1-39 which resulted from it, however substantial, was either performed by editors connected to these later traditions or sympathetic to them, then it may indeed be reasonable to suppose that Panisraelite sentiment is one of the major ways in which the Isaiah of Jerusalem collection was enlarged.

²⁵⁴ Seitz has an excellent discussion of the various stances on these three works. He identifies two types of redactional approaches to the book, with copious bibliography. In his opinion, there a substantial group (Type A), “still concerned to keep separate the origin and development in tradition in 1-39 from that in 40-55, if not 40-66, even as the search for redactional unity proceeds” (Seitz 1991, 18), while “Type B” scholars (among whom he lists Ackroyd, Becker, Brueggemann, Childs, Clements, Meade, Melugin, Rendtorff, and Sweeney) “all fundamentally agree that the tradition in 1-39 has remained fluid enough that at the time of Second Isaiah’s merger or earlier, this tradition received enrichment meant to key the reader to the themes and presentation of chapters 40-55” (Seitz 1991, 26–27). Seitz’ own study concludes that Isaiah 36-39, which to a certain degree recapitulate 2 Kings 18:13-20:19, is crucial to understanding the interplay between these sections, arguing that the “Hezekiah-Isaiah narratives” are “the pivot on which the entire tradition process turns”, guiding the shape of what comes (208).
Among the sites of Panisraeliteism in Isaiah 1-39, as noted above, the reference to the “the two houses of Israel” in Isaiah 8:14, echoed in the separation of Ephraim from Judah in 7:17, potentially represents a major challenge to the idea that Panisraeliteism was not already extant during Isaiah’s time. Kratz, one of the champions of what might by contrast be called “young Panisraeliteism”, has rejected the authenticity of these verses, but it is interesting to note that Kratz considers the presence of a kind of Panisraeliteism in the early prophets a basically settled mattered, on the strength of two references in Hosea which I think are probably spurious (Hosea 10:11, 12:1) and a questionable assumption about the book of Amos, namely, that Amos’ references to a “remnant” of Israel or Jacob in 3:13 and 9:8—and really just in 9:8—which will survive, are identifiable with Judah. Here he suggests that while “Israel” did not, in the eighth century, mean “Judah”, Jacob probably did (Kratz 2006, 116; Kratz 2005, 170–82). In my opinion, this is putting the cart before the horse. If it could be shown that Amos or Hosea are articulating a Panisraelite sentiment then it would be reasonable to suspect them of conceptualizing Judah as a remnant of Israel. Since this is not the case, I do not think Kratz’s argument is convincing. Additionally, a “remnant” of Israel did indeed survive the fall of the kingdom, and this remnant likely played a significant role in making Judah into a regional power, so it is hardly unlikely that it is these to whom this verse refers (Na’aman 2007). Thus, there is no compelling reason to imagine that Judah is the most likely referent of this phrase.

Aside from these verses, the major Panisraelite expression in Isaiah is theological, that is, the use of the epithet “Holy One of Israel” to refer to YHWH. Kratz considers all 12 uses of this epithet in Isaiah 1-39 additions, and of course this is possible (Kratz 2006,
Blenkinsopp suggests that this epithet appears in Hosea as well, but in my opinion this is unlikely. It is uncomfortable to contemplate the idea that 12 references, across 9 chapters, are all additions however, the nearly complete absence of the title outside of Isaiah, and its frequent use in what is often considered Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, may point in that direction. Although Williamson has defended the authenticity of the title in the earliest layers of redaction his defense, self-confessedly, encounters serious difficulties. As he notes, of the six occurrences of this title outside of the book of Isaiah “four are certainly of a later date (2 Kgs 19.22; Jer. 50.29; 51.5; Ps 71.22)” and “one of these is unlikely to convince those who are not already disposed to accept the position maintained here” (Williamson 2001, 89). Ultimately, his argument for an early date depends only on the antiquity of Psalm 78.

Here, following a suggestion of Day, he argues that the absence of a reference to the fall of Samaria in this psalm about the destruction of Israel, is “the single most telling argument” for an early dating of this text, which deals considerably with Israel’s punishment for transgression but does not seem to describe events after the destruction of Shiloh (Williamson 2001, 89; Day 1986). However, as I’m sure both Williamson and Day would concede, this is a conjectural argument only, and this psalm, like so many

---

255 Blenkinsopp suggests that this appears in Hosea 11:9 and perhaps 12:1 (Blenkinsopp 1996, 108). However, in Isaiah the phrase is consistently קדושׁ ישׂראל, while in Hosea 11:9 it is שׁבקרך קדום and in 12:1 קדושים נאמן. Inasmuch as the word “holy” is often applied to Yahweh without being part of an epithet, it seems unlikely that these different phraseologies would be expressions of the same epithet.

256 Outside of Isaiah, the phrase appears in the 2 Kings 19 pericope which is a quotation from Isaiah 37, in Psalms 78:41, 89:19, and in Jeremiah 50:29 and 51:5.
others, seems extremely difficult to date with any certainty.257 In that sense, then, Williamson’s argument may serve the opposite argument equally well. That is, he calls attention generally to the late date of uses of the epithet in most cases and the uncertain age of its use in remaining pericopes. However, it should be noted that the use of the epithet “the Holy One of Israel” in Judah, even before the fall of Israel, would not necessarily be an expression of Panisraelite sentiment, as YHWH seems clearly to have been, from very early times, the national god of both kingdoms. It is, at the very least, not impossible that one of the epithets of YHWH in Jerusalem, even before the fall of Samaria, was indeed “the Holy One of Israel”.258

Of course, just as in the case of Micah—in fact more certainly— it is also the case that the expressions of Panisraelite sentiment in Isaiah of Jerusalem could be quite original, but still might nevertheless come from after the fall of Israel, as Isaiah is supposed to have lived through this cataclysm and for many years thereafter. Thus Isaiah 8:4 and 7:17, for example, could be original to the collection, and still have been part of a Hezekian program to exert influence over the northern regions through the creation of Panisraelite sentiment. The narrative of the book certainly suggests considerable intimacy between Hezekiah and Isaiah. Indeed, even if 7:17 and 8:4 dated to before the fall of Israel, but still after the disturbances of the late 730s had resulted in a stream of refugees

257 Indeed, the argument could be turned on its head. The repeated references to rejecting Israel in this psalm may be evidence that this rejection has already occurred, whether or not the event is referred to explicitly.

258 Fleming has made more or less this argument as well, noting that “both Israel and Judah maintained traditions for the worship of Yahweh, and Yahweh is the focus of the Isaiah text. Yet this in itself does not define a political bond” (Fleming 2012, 48). On the question of whether Isaiah 8:14 dates to before or after the fall of Israel, Fleming remains agnostic but notes that “before the latest reevaluation of the whole ‘united monarchy’ tradition of David and Solomon…most interpreters found no reason to date Isaiah 8 after the fall of Israel” (Fleming 2012, 49).
to Judah, this may not considerably change the picture of how Panisraeliteism began.\textsuperscript{259}

Additionally, it is certainly the case that many of the references to Israel in Isaiah of Jerusalem are clearly meant to encompass the northern kingdom only.\textsuperscript{260}

Williamson suggests that Isaiah’s occasional “unsconscious references to his audience (evidently Judah) as Israel, even if a little later than the fall of Samaria, can be more naturally understood if the way had already been prepared for him in this regard” (Williamson 2001, 90).\textsuperscript{261} If so, Panisraeliteism would pre-date the fall of Israel by an uncertain amount of time. However, just as in the question of whether Micah saw doom for Judah in the approach of the Assyrians, an under-appreciated aspect of the biblical account is the apparent relationship between the two kingdoms at the time of the fall of Israel. That is, the account of 2 Kings 16 makes it clear that Judah was in fact complicit in the fall of Israel. According to this text, King Ahaz of Judah entreats Tiglath-Pileser III to intercede because of an alliance between Pekah, King of Israel and Rezin of Aram against Judah, an invitation which, if authentic, seems to have resulted in the conquest of Aram in 732 B.C.E. and set the stage for the destruction of Israel.\textsuperscript{262} In other words, in the ever-oscillating state of relations between the northern and southern kingdoms throughout their histories, the decades leading up to the fall of Israel seem among the

\textsuperscript{259} For an excellent, clear description of the pre-722 disturbances, see Barmash 2005.

\textsuperscript{260} For example, Isaiah 9:7-8, “the Lord sends a word against Jacob and it falls on Israel, and the people know it, all of them, Ephraim and the dwellers of Samaria” (השם חול אפרים ויוושב שמריה). As this latter clause appears as a gloss, perhaps the glossator is here emphasizing the identification of “Israel” as only the north.

\textsuperscript{261} This is quite similar to Kratz’s opinion that while the name Jacob “presents geographically the Northern Kingdom”, in pre-Fall texts, it nevertheless already represented, even in the earliest prophets, “genealogically the twelve tribes” (Kratz 2006, 116). Of course, about this, we entirely disagree.

\textsuperscript{262} Of course, the narrative of Judah’s complicity with Assyria could be an apologia for failing to join Israel and Aram in their defensive coalition against Assyria, or this aspect of the Dtr H may simply be inaccurate, but it is a very strange apologia that admits that the Judahites invited the Assyrians in to defend them against the Israelites.
least likely to foster considerable cultural exchange. If “the way” had been prepared, in
Williamson’s words, it seems like this must have occurred significantly earlier,
something overall much more difficult to prove (as this chapter hopefully indicates), than
that Panisraelite ideas were circulating in the late 8th century B.C.E. It does seem to be
the case, from the evidence presented above, that it is in this period that Panisraeliteism is
born, but on balance it seems much more likely to have occurred right after the fall of
Israel, as is conventionally argued by scholars of Panisraeliteism, than right before.

This formulation is in line with emerging scholarship on Panisraeliteism
generally, but not universally. For Knauf and for Davies, for example, this ethnic
notion did not begin in the 8th century B.C.E, even in a rudimentary form, but
considerably later. Knauf argues that the relevant traditions did not come to Judah until
the 6th century, when Bethel was incorporated into the South. Here, the dual identity of
Judah was created, by scribes, out of the dual history of Bethel itself, once an Israelite,
now a Judahite place (Knauf 2006). For Davies, these traditions were drawn from the
same region (Bethel), but from an extant Benjaminite history of Israel which, as
Williamson puts it, “was later incorporated (with many changes, of course) into the
Deuteronomistic history” (P. R. Davies 2007; Williamson 2011, 83). Both of these
arguments have their strong points and their weak points. My argument, again, is not that

---

263 This parallels the suggestion by Finkelstein, and Finkelstein and Silberman, who note the depopulation
of the area around Shechem and a concomitant significant rise in the population of Judah at the end of the
8th century (Finkelstein and Silberman 2006a). As Finkelstein notes, “all this indicates a major population
shift in the hill country over a short period of time in the second half of the eighth century. The only
possible reason for this is the fall of the northern kingdom and resettlement of Israelite groups from the area
of southern Samaria, including Bethel, in Jerusalem and Judah. Judah was consequently transformed from
an isolated, clan-based homogenous society into a mixed Judahite-Israelite kingdom under Assyrian
domination. This, in turn, brought about the rise of pan-Israelite ideas in Judah” (Finkelstein 2013, 155).
the idea is significantly later than the fall of Israel, but that the presentation of the idea in biblical literature depends upon Persian period developments.

For now, it is enough to say that it is quite clear that Panisraelite sentiment generally was deeply entrenched by the turn of the 6th century B.C.E., which seems to be one of the more crucial periods of biblical composition. As Fleming notes, “the book of Jeremiah does recall ‘Israel’ as a category distinct from Judah, yet a larger unity between Israel and Judah as one people is striking”, and “Ezekiel’s entire vision for a future hope is cast as a restoration of ‘the land of Israel’ for ‘the House of Israel’ (40:2, 4)” (Fleming 2012, 49–51). I noted above Fleming’s identification of Panisraeliteism as a central feature of Deutero- and Trito- Isaiah (50). Miller points out that “Deutero-Isaiah provides a much more complete picture of Israel’s ancestor traditions, speaking of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the Exodus”, and we can recall that in contradistinction, Abraham is absent from Amos, and Hosea seems to know only Jacob (J. C. Miller 2008, 194). Thus, whatever else is true, the development of Panisraelite narratives between the 8th and the 6th century B.C.E. seems, in certain ways, surprisingly clear which is as important to note as the fact that they did indeed develop, indicating that 8th century Panisraeliteism is not 6th century Panisraeliteism in terms of its modes of expression, again paving the way for my own analysis.

Now, however, we turn to the tribes of Israel, whose coherence-making activity within biblical literature I believe to be crucial to the construction of biblical history and whose presentation as the sons of Jacob I take to be among the most important of Persian period developments. Therefore, prior to presenting my construction model, I will
propose a significant portion of what I see as the history of the tribal ideal in biblical literature.

**The History of the Tribal System: Early Forms, Late Evolutions**

The major premise of this section is that it is likely that the tribal system, or rather a tribal system, was a historical reality in the kingdom of Israel, but not in the kingdom of Judah, at least not in the form the Bible presents. Therefore, I think Judges 5, as the only list not to include any southern quantities (Judah, Simeon, Levi), is the only “Israelite” tribal list in biblical literature. This is not to say that other lists do not incorporate Israelite material, merely that no other has escaped significant Judahite edits. The possibility that Judges 5 could preserve something such as a historical tribal system is buttressed by the fact that it has long been considered the oldest iteration of the tribal system, though this, of course, has been disputed. However, at the same time, the pre-eminence of Judges 5 as an ancient iteration of the tribes of Israel is challenged by the fact that there are two other tribal lists which are supposed by many specialists to be quite old, the “Blessing of Jacob” in Genesis 49 and the “Blessing of Moses” in Deuteronomy 33, at least one of which does present the familiar twelve tribe list. Therefore it is necessary to demonstrate not merely the age of the picture Judges 5 presents but that the conflict between Judges 5 and these other supposedly early lists is due to late expansions.

Of course, it is worth noting at the outset of this discussion that it should probably have always been of more interest that none of these three agrees with the others and that

---

264 Or rather, there may have been a tribal system in the kingdom of Judah but it is not now visible in biblical literature, unless it was related to entities ultimately subsumed into the tribe of Judah such as the Calebites or Jerahmeelites.

265 Benjamin’s contingent position within the south has been discussed above.
Deuteronomy 33, as well, does not present what we might consider to be a traditional picture.\footnote{266} But for our purposes it is more important that I do not believe that Genesis 49 or Deut 33 represent authentic historical tribal systems, or rather, I think they contain a mixture of ancient and not so ancient material.\footnote{267} And, of course, these three lists are in many ways the most crucial for our understanding of the history of the tribal system, because there is little reason to believe that any others pre-date the fall of Israel. The proposed early date of the other lists in Genesis has been undermined by a series of efforts in the last several decades dealing with the antiquity of Genesis’ traditions, as will be discussed in depth shortly, and it hardly appears as if there is compelling reason to date the texts in Numbers or Joshua, for example, to the 8\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E or earlier.\footnote{268}

\footnote{266} That is, the idea that Genesis 49 best represents the ancient tribal configuration owes to the fact that it was credited to J, with the implication of a longer oral tradition, but it has always faced the challenge of conflict with these other at least largely ancient iterations. Whatever else is true, it certainly cannot be the case that all three of these tribal systems are accurate representations of the same reality.

\footnote{267} Judges 5 may also be composite, as has sometimes been argued. This was the suggestion of Noth, who believed the original poem may have centered only on Zebulun and Naphtali, as reflected in Judges 4:6-10 (Noth 1954, 139; de Hoop 2009, 151). Brettler suggests that “Given the number of unusual linguistic features which do match pre-Israelite northwest Semitic inscriptions, the various arguments for an early date…carry certain weight. Yet, the dialect of the poem is far from uniform, and does not consistently represent what scholars construct as the earliest phase of BH,” and “there is no linguistic evidence that the poem \textit{as it is now preserved} dates from the period of these events themselves…there are indications that the poem continued to develop” (Brettler, Marc Zvi 2002, 65). This may well be, but it still remains the only biblical list which did NOT develop into a form that included Judah, which is a fairly obvious addition to make, given the context. Thus, it seems unlikely it continued to develop in any significant way after the fall of Israel.

\footnote{268} It is worth noting, of course, that a previous generation of scholarship derived considerable historical data from sequencing biblical tribal lists generally. So, for example, in Mayes’ reconstruction, he argued that, given the differences between the Gen 49 list and the Numbers 26 list, specifically “from the fact that Levi is absent from the list of Nu. xxvi…while the number twelve of the whole group is retained by the subdivision of Joseph into Ephraim and Manasseh,. it may be concluded that there was a concern to preserve (a) the number twelve as basic to the whole group of tribes…second, since it is unlikely that Levi, as a late-comer in to the tribal system, deposed Gad from an original place among the Leah tribes, it must be concluded that the list of Gen xl ix represents a tribal system which ante-dated that represented by Nu xxvi…On internal observation it may be determined that Nu. xxvi, though now included in the context of P, in reality reflects conditions of the time between the Song of Deborah and the rise of monarchy…on the other hand, the list of Gen. xlix, though probably belonging in its present form to the time of David or Solomon, must depend on a system of tribes earlier than that presupposed in Nu. xxvi, and so may be held to reflect conditions of the early period of the Judges” (Mayes 1973, 151–152). Noth has suggested that tribal lists reveal that “originally, the tribe of Reuben resided not in the land east of the Jordan” because
On the other hand, Judges 5, Deut 33 and Gen 49, are poetic, clearly distinct from their contexts, and seem to contain at least some archaic biblical Hebrew. Let us therefore begin with Judges 5 and then move on to the question of Gen 49 and Deut 33 as composites.

The confidence with which scholars once regarded Judges 5’s antiquity is well-indicated by a statement of William F. Albright’s who, in 1936, pronounced: “nearly all competent biblical scholars believe that the Song of Deborah is the oldest document which the Bible has preserved in approximately its original form” (Albright 1936, 26).269 This certainty has sometimes extended even into comparatively recent treatments. However, and not surprisingly, there have also been recent (and even not so recent) critiques which have called the pre-eminently early date of Judges 5 into question. Quite reasonably, many of these discussions are morphological and linguistic in nature, but the range of possibilities in this sphere is becoming daunting.270 Another avenue of approach, then, is to reflect on the relative aspects of the traditional dating. That is, as Sparks notes,

269 Albright went on to suggest a very specific date of around 1125 B.C.E. (Albright 1936, 27). Other scholars had already made similar claims, such as G.F. Moore, who argued that Judges 5 was “oldest monument of Hebrew literature” and the “only contemporaneous monument of Hebrew history” before the monarchical period, a claim echoed in a relatively recent edition of the book of Judges by Robert Boling, among others (Moore 1895, 133; Boling 1975, 6:116). To Cross as well, this was a very nearly Late Bronze Age poem, in Cross’ words “in the tradition of the older Canaanite epic singers” (Cross 1998, 32).

270 As Brettler has pointed out, the question of dating Judge 5 has become one, largely, of whether the obviously archaic features of the text are genuine archaisms or archaizing language (Brettler, Marc Zvi
It must be borne in mind that another important reason the song has been dated early—normally to the twelfth century B.C.E.—is the presumed antiquity of the pentateuchal sources and this is now part of the debate. As long as a person dates the Yahwist to the early monarchical period, it is necessary to date SDeb even earlier, since it looks, linguistically speaking, much older than the pentateuchal narrative (K. L. Sparks 1998, 112).

In other words, some of the arguments about the age of Judges 5 have not been about how old it is, but what it is older than. So the dating of Judges 5 may be revisited because it may both be considerably older than most other biblical texts and not date from so early as the 12th or 11th centuries B.C.E. This is not the same thing as saying it is not very early, just that it may not be quite as early as was once believed. As noted above, the absence of Judah likely indicates that Judges 5 at least dates to a period prior to the fall of Israel, thus the 8th century B.C.E. or earlier.271

Although not a very specific conclusion, this, that Judges 5 is an Israelite text produced prior to the fall of Israel, is sufficient for our purposes. And there is other evidence to this effect, especially the poem’s preservation of other unusual notions of Israelite identity-- the description of Ephraim’s roots in Amalek, the independence of...
Gilead and Machir, and the presence of Meroz. Sparks has suggested that “a sound conclusion is that the song dates sometime between the twelfth and ninth centuries B.C.E., with a date near our terminus ad quem being likely”, and this is reasonable too, as well as being suitably vague (K. L. Sparks 1998, 112). And of course we should note that Judah and Levi, two of the tribes which do not appear in Judges 5, are the tribes of David and Moses respectively, whose connection to each other and to the broader arc of Israelite history I will shortly ascribe to the expansion of the tribal system to include them.

The crucial question for our study is at what point Judah began to be imagined as a tribe, and whether this was an Israelite or Judahite innovation. When and where Levi began to be imagined in this way is likely, but not certainly, a related question, and this is where Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33 are crucial texts because they both include both of these tribes. There is little difficulty in arguing that these two texts are, overall, composite, as this has largely been the consensus for a long time, despite the occasional objection. But there is, of course, a considerable difference between statements such as

---

272 As de Hoop puts it “the wording of the so-called Song of Deborah suggests that the ten names listed involve the whole of Israel. Does this imply that at an earlier stage of its history Israel consisted of ten tribes only and consequently that the system of twelve tribes originated in a later phase of its history?” (de Hoop 2009, 151). Contra this is Mayes’ suggestion that Judah existed at this point, but was either not included in this particular arrangement or could not be expected to join in the battle because of the Canaanite strength between the north and the south (Mayes 1973).

273 Good, for example, suggested that “it is fairly well agreed that the so-called ‘Blessing of Jacob’…is a composite work” (Good 1963, 427). As Heck puts it, “scholars today generally consider that there is no literary unity in the chapters, nor is there any certain historical occasion when the sayings were collected” (Heck 1990, 17). Gevirtz, in his defense of the uniformity of the poem, cites among others (Von Rad 1972a; Gunneweg 1964; Eissfeldt 1965; Mayes 1974), in noting, in this case specifically about Genesis 49, that “a frequently encountered critical view has it that Jacob’s Blessing comprises a miscellaneous collection of old tribal sayings, in origin independent and unrelated to each other” (Gevirtz 1981, 113). Contra this, Gevirtz himself argues that the “collection theory” is inadequate with respect to Gen 49 because rather than a “simple miscellany of tribal sayings”, “far better does the Blessing of Jacob presuppose a poet who may have adopted some traditional materials, recast and revitalized others, authored some new materials, and...proceeded to fashion and transform these into a new and vital organic totality,
those by Freedman and Cross, that “we may assume that groups of blessings, ascribed to Jacob and Moses and perhaps others, circulated orally in the period of the Judges”, and arguing for a composite nature which allows for considerably late additions to the text (Cross and Freedman 1950, 77).  

In a recent in-depth survey, Sparks has argued that a version of the Blessing of Moses dates to the 8th century, while the version including the tribe of Levi dates to the 7th, and that there is a version of Genesis 49 which dates to the 8th century as well (K. L. Sparks 2003).  

I agree with many aspects of this dating, as I think it very likely that some components of all of these poems came from Israel, and that these therefore must indeed date to the 8th century B.C.E. at the latest. However, Sparks and I disagree on the all from his own peculiar frame of reference and toward some particular end” (Gevirtz 1981, 114). However, this rather seems to me to be precisely how any kind of collection is likely to have occurred, unless we can imagine a collection without a collector. Gevirtz presumably objects to the implication of a lack of intentionality in his imagination of the “collection model”, but I think on the contrary collections may even be more likely to be organized by a pronounced intentionality than organically composed literature, in the sense that the quantity of the thematic is sometimes more visible in the activity of a collector than an author.

274 About Deut 33, Cross and Freedman wrote, “in addition to orthographic archaisms, a number of other archaic features are to be found in the Blessing. These, particularly poetic diction and structure, find their closes parallels in what is acknowledged to be the oldest Israelite poetry…On the basis of these considerations, we hold that the poem as a whole was composed, most probably, in the eleventh century B.C.” (Cross and Freedman 1948, 192). About Gen 49, Hendel has remarked that it is “the one Genesis text written in Archaic Biblical Hebrew…the continuity of this poetic diction with older Canaanite poetry and the use of this diction in classical Hebrew poetry are plausible indicators of antiquity. The density of rare words argues for a relatively early historical context for this poem. The previous verse refers to the royal ideology of the Davidic king…which indicates that the text is not earlier than the late eleventh century B.C.E.” (Hendel 2012, 52–53). More on this in its proper place.

275 Sparks identifies the presence of Levi in Deut 33 as a redactional addition for reasons I deem quite cogent: “Although the tribe of Levi is included in BMos, I have argued that Levi’s presence here is redactional. My reasoning for this was three-fold. First, Levi was not in the older northern list from Jud 5 (SDeb), which suggests the possibility that Levi was not in the original list of Deut 33 either. Second, there was an ideological motive for adding Levi to BMos because the Book of Deuteronomy was a composition vitally concerned with the welfare of disenfranchised Levites…Third, numerous scholars have for other reasons identified the Levitical blessing as a late addition. The reasons for this include, among other things, its unusual length in comparison with the other blessings and especially its use of later Hebrew forms, such as the definite article, the sign of the definite object, and the relative pronoun. This stands in sharp contrast to what is otherwise a relatively archaic collection of blessings in Deut 33” (K. L. Sparks 2003, 329). Sparks cites, in support of his argument, the studies of Cross and Freedman 1948; Labuschagne 1974.
crucial question noted above, as he is of the opinion that the presence of Judah in these lists reflects a historical reality. Specifically, in Deut 33:7, a much disputed line which has often been translated as a “prayerful admonition that Judah might be brought back to ‘his people’,” Sparks suggests we have “a transparent reference to the northern view that it was not Israel who deserted Judah after Solomon’s death” (K. L. Sparks 2003, 328).

There is something a little curious about Sparks’ argument here. In short, Sparks argues that because Judah appears in Deut 33, a northern list, its position in Genesis 49 is also original. At the same time, however, he argues that because Levi does not appear in Judges 5, it is not original to Deut 33.276 Why should Judah, which also does not appear in Judges 5, be original to Deut 33, such that its tenancy there can be used to argue that it is original to Gen 49? The most important issue, however, is that Sparks’ solution does not solve the major problem in understanding Genesis 49. That is, it has long been noted that the first blessings of Genesis 49 are of a different character than those that follow. While some, and Sparks as well as Claus Westermann are included in this group, believe that this distinct set of blessings includes only the first three, Fleming, for example, has suggested that the fourth blessing—that of Judah—should also be included in the group (Westermann 1986; Fleming 2012, 86). 277 This seems quite clear to me.

276 Indeed, it is quite surprising to see Sparks argue both that “Levi was not in the older northern list from Jud 5 (SDeb), which suggests the possibility that Levi was not in the original list of Deut 33 either” and that “SMos in Deut 33 confirms that some version of the northern tribal-list tradition included Judah” (K. L. Sparks 2003).

277 Sparks suggests that the fourth blessing, that of Judah, “may have displaced an older and less flattering one” based on an animal simile with a lion, and that it is the nature of the blessing not the blessing itself which has been altered (Sparks 2003, 332). He points to the studies of Kittel and Zobel which suggest that “Gen 49, 9 seems to preserve an old saying about Judah in which the tribe has been compared to an animal, in this instance a lion” (Zobel 1965; Kittel 1959; K. L. Sparks 2003, 332). An imaginative take on Genesis 49 appears in Westermann’s commentary. He suggests that tribal sayings as a whole originate in a kind of debriefing following battle, a generalization that seems unlikely. He subscribes to the collection theory,
The distinction between the first group and the second group is that the first group is pronounced in the first person, as if by Jacob himself. While it is true that the first three blessings include a number of first person possessives—"my firstborn", "let my soul not"—and that the blessing of Judah does not, the blessing of Judah does contain a significant number of second person singular pronouns—"your brothers will praise you" "the sons of your father will bow down to you"—which is not a feature of subsequent blessings. Additionally, in Gen 49:9, we read the phrase "גור אריה יהודה מטרף בני עלייה", "Judah is a lion’s cub, from the prey, my son, you have gone up", a direct address consistent with the first person voice in the previous blessings. Thus, it seems clear that Jacob is, in this verse, still speaking and it is therefore reasonable to consider it a continuation of the previous blessings and distinct from the following ones. It is also clear that the blessing of Jacob as we have it has two foci. As Sparks himself puts it:

As in the case of Deut 33, the tribal blessings in Gen 49 are normally viewed as either partly or entirely northern in origin. Consequently, in their present context…one would have expected the tribal blessings in Gen 49 to highlight not the position of Judah but especially of Joseph. But predictions of success and authority are lauded upon both tribes (K. L. Sparks 2003, 331).

What this means is that in Genesis 49 we have a poem in which the blessings related to the southern tribes are of a different character than those relating to the northern tribes

suggesting that the introduction which makes the blessing sound as if it comes from Jacob “have been prefixed to the collection, because, crucially, “the majority of the sayings are not words addressed by a father to his sons, but only the first three” (Westermann 1986, 222). He concludes “The sayings about Reuben (vv.3-4) and Simeon and Levi (vv.5-7) bear the mark of the language of the prophetic proclamation of judgment. They are not ancient tribal sayings, but literary formations demanded by the number 12” (Westermann 1986, 244).

278 Save for the second half of the blessing of Joseph, which presents its own set of issues.

279 Sparks suggests that a secondary layer of editing has occurred with respect to the blessing of Judah, here, but to the end of granting Judah prominence by discrediting his “three older brothers”, a solution which allows Judah’s blessing to be both original to the older list and altered by later edits (K. L. Sparks 2003, 331).
and in which each section seems geared towards a distinct denouement. Sparks’ solution seems to me less logical than the suggestion that these first four blessings have a southern heritage and the rest a northern heritage, particularly as Sparks’ argument fails to account for the absence of Reuben, Simeon, and Levi but not Judah from the original poem. This is more or less the argument of J.D. Macchi as well, and in my opinion, it is quite apt.  

Finally, then, we must deal with the matter of Archaic Biblical Hebrew in Genesis 49. Particularly notable in this respect is Hendel’s conclusion that the poem is holistically an instance of ABH (Hendel 2012, 51–54). However, Hendel’s discussion of the poem’s ABH features in this case is somewhat typical in that it ultimately deals only with 49:11. Robertson’s study of the text, though criticized by some (particularly Vern), found very few examples of ABH in this chapter, and most of these were in verse 11 as well, to which de Hoop has added some peculiar forms in verses 6, 22, 25-26 (D. A. Robertson 1972, 74; Vern 2011; de Hoop 1999, 56–57). In short, it seems to be fairer to say that Genesis 49 is the one Genesis text which contains some Archaic Biblical Hebrew, but if it is indeed the case that parts of the poem come from different sources than we would have to demonstrate fairly thoroughgoing ABH features to date it holistically. It is interesting that the verse nearly universally acknowledged to be ABH (49:11) is in fact, part of the blessing of Judah, but this, to my mind, only brings up a very important and often unacknowledged point, which is that traditions referring to “Judah” are not inevitably

---

280 Macchi argues, as Sparks puts it, that “the core of Gen 49... [is]...an old northern tribal list and...that the list has been edited as a part of a pro-Judean redactional effort. The basic difference between us is that he attributes only v. 13-21 to this original six-tribe list and so believes that Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Joseph, and Benjamin constitute later additions” (K. L. Sparks 2003, 38; Macchi 1999).

281 In addition to “archaic” dating, other explanations have been sought for certain textual issues: Gevirtz and Rendsburg, for example, have explored the possibility of northern dialectical forms, rather than ABH (Gevirtz 1987; Rendsburg 1992).
referring to Judah as a *tribe*. References to Judah as kingdom, cultural group, or region, instead of as a tribe, could certainly be every bit as old—or perhaps, according to the findings in the previous chapter, nearly as old—as northern tribal traditions. This might also be the case with respect to traditions about Levi, prior to the conceptual transformation of Levi into a tribe.

As for Deut 33, while it is less clearly built from various parts—although, as Eissfeldt long ago noted, there is a clear distinction between Deut 33:2-5, 26-29 and the rest—there are elements of its textual history that are still more relevant to our discussion of textual history (Eissfeldt 1965, 227). That is, the manuscript traditions reveal the poem somewhat continuously in the process of *being* redacted. This is particularly, although not exclusively, the case with respect to Qumran where discussions have centered around 4QDeut which, while extremely fragmentary, contains comparatively large portions from chapters 1, 2, and 33, suggesting, as Duncan notes, that “we have the

282 Although additionally, here too, blessings referring to the various tribes are of widely different lengths and styles. There are four lengthy verses about Levi, one each about Reuben, Judah, Benjamin, and others, five about Joseph, and so on. Some involve similes (Joseph, Gad, Dan), most do not. Although this is called the “Blessing of Moses”, while some are blessings, or at least very positive descriptions (Levi, Benjamin, Joseph, Zebulun, Gad, Dan, Naphtali, Asher), the “blessings” for Reuben and Judah read instead like prayers for protection (“Let Reuben live and not die, though his numbers are few”, “YHWH, hear the voice of Judah and [bring him to his people?], let his hands strive for him, be a help for him from his enemies”). An intriguing discussion of the Blessing of Moses appears in an article by Mark Leuchter. Here, Leuchter helpfully points scholars in the direction of questions about when and why the Blessing would have been added to Deuteronomy and what effect that might have had. Leuchter points out that by contrast to the “Song of Moses”, the Blessing is not foregrounded by other texts in Deuteronomy. As he puts it, “Deut. iv 1-40 contains unmistakable references to The Song…demonstrating deliberate intertextual awareness. Deut. iv 1-40 does not, however, contain references to The Blessing; this indicates that the author of Deut iv 1-40 worked with a corpus that did not contain it. M.Z. Brettler and Sanders have each demonstrated that Deut. iv 1-40 is decidedly exilic in provenance. The inclusion of The Blessing into Deuteronomy must therefore post-date the composition of Deut. iv 1-40, and thus post-date the exilic Deuteronomistic redaction of Deuteronomy” (Leuchter 2007, 299–300). While I don't know that it is a good idea to assume that Deut 4 would include references to Deut 33 if later, it is worth noting that the way in which Deut 33 stands out from the rest of the book, and indeed the fact that both Deut 33-34, the last two chapters of Deuteronomy, constitute a large percentage of the references to the tribes in Deuteronomy, the idea that Deut 33 was added to the book late is a reasonable one. If it was added late, as Leuchter suggests, it was likely added for a reason and that reason probably played a role in how it was presented.
remains of what was once a complete scroll of the book of Deuteronomy” (Duncan 1995, 276). Fragment 10 of 4QDeuth “preserves new readings thus far unattested in the Hebrew textual traditions, and does so at noted cruces in the poem,” particularly with respect to the Blessing of Levi (273). Indeed, Deut 33 appears in a handful of other Qumranic manuscripts, and as Beyerle notes, “none of the Qumran instances of the Blessing of Moses agree with the MT”, and they often fail to agree with each other (Beyerle 1998, 22–23). Thus, Beyerle argues, Deut 33 is “polymorphic”, and this is not limited to Qumran. As he notes, with respect to the Septuagint, “the Greek texts shows some specific features, as its terms… suggest an eschatological revelation. Its ‘messianic’ implications have their roots in Judaic-Hellenistic circles of the second temple period” (Beyerle 1998, 29). Thus, it seems that Deut 33 remained variable for a considerable period of time, something that at once strengthens the conceptual possibility of dynamic changes over time and specifically makes the possibility that Judah and Levi were added to the blessing at some point after much of its northern material had been written quite easy to imagine.

Indeed, we can recall here the discussion in the introduction of “primordialist” modes of ethnic thinking, and conclude that whatever else might be true, texts such as Genesis 49, Deut 33, and even Judges 5, might attract later edits specifically by providing a framework in which these would not look like edits, therefore providing the authority of antiquity to new ideas. We can consider this possibility in light of clearly demonstrable harmonizing expansions in the Catalogue of Women, discussed earlier (West 1985, 164–

283 “In the Blessing of Levi preserved here, which is almost complete, the form of the text quoted varies significantly from the received tradition at several points. In a few instances these variants may be dependent on the textual tradition underlying the Septuagint. In several other cases the text would seem to preserve variants unique to this document” (Duncan 1995, 274).
We may see it in the famous Homeric “Catalogue of Ships”, which became a performative charter for many subsequent ethnic arguments and was therefore, very probably, expanded in some notable ways. The cachet of such texts for primordialist ethnopolitical entrepreneurs is amply demonstrated, and for good reason. As Linnekin puts it, participants often view “cultural authenticity” as a “legitimating charter of group identity,” and “continuity with the past as a test of validity and genuineness” (Linnekin 1991, 447). Of course, this will not mean that every ancient text is edited, but merely that it is often useful to less ancient authors to interact with them for these reasons. And, we must indeed be careful of allowing these ancient ethnopolitical entrepreneurs to achieve exactly what they have set out to achieve by taking us in as well.

**The History of the Tribal System, Part II: Early Conclusions**

---

284 As West notes, very probably “to connect [the] Elean genealogy with that of Deukalion, Aethlios was made the son of a new daughter of Deukalion, the firstborn, Protogeneia, thus superior to the mothers of Graikos, Magnes, and Makedon,” and “other daughters of Aiolos [in the Catalogue] served as means for attaching further items of floating material: the central Thessalian legendary figures of Erysichthon and the Aloadai; the myth of Alkyone and Keyx….” etc. (West 1985, 142). Fowler argues that the “lengthening” of the Argive stemma— which includes, as he points out, a great many descendants of Inachos even in the early heroic period where, unusually, there is no segmentation— probably occurred “to back up the claim to high antiquity, but also to accommodate the two lineage founders; Homer calls these people both Argives and Danaans, so there must have been both an Argos and a Danaos. Since nothing else was known about them…they are simply put in a straight line as vertical descendants” (R. L. Fowler 2000, 7–8). Perhaps an even more relevant example of the kind of activity I am describing here is the attempted addition to the ‘Hellenic Genealogy’ of “Xenopatra”, an all-purpose ancestress of excluded peoples, by Hellanikos in the 5th century B.C.E. (Hall 1997, 47–48).

285 Patterson points to the possibility, broached even in antiquity, that the Athenian tyrant Peisistratus may have inserted Ajax’s leadership of ships from Salamis into the section describing the Athenians in order to fabricate an Athenian claim over Salamis (Patterson 2010, 71). As Rutherford notes, in the Catalogue of Women, Ajax’s kingdom is based in Salamis, but includes Megara and much of the Argolid. Malkin argues that evidence for the age of the Return myth has sometimes been drawn from the appearance of the Dorians in the Catalogue of Ships, which are already divided into three phylai, but we “can suspect interpolation when it departs from its gazetteer aspect” (Malkin 1994, 38). As West notes, “in the Third Sacred War, Philomelos pointed out that Pytho belonged to the Phocians in the Catalogue of Ships, and urged them accordingly to claim the control of the oracle from the Amphictyony” (West 1985, 11).
What the above indicates, particularly when combined with the evidence of the previous chapter, is that there is no reason to believe that the twelve tribes of Israel existed as a concept while the northern kingdom still stood. There does seem to have been a northern tribal system, and this appears particularly in Judges 5, and in the third person blessings of Genesis 49. They are different from each other, and neither may indicate the whole picture, but the important thing for this analysis is that they explicitly do not include the south, making it unlikely they were created in the south. Deut 33, which does include Judah and Levi but does not include Simeon, seems more wholly composite, an observation which also matches the experience of reading the text, in which the individual blessings seem fairly disconnected from each other.

Of course, from the above observations alone it is not yet possible to present a true history of the tribal system, merely to suggest that the twelve tribe model was, too, a post-722 B.C.E. phenomenon. We will see further developments in the subsequent chapter. There, I will suggest that the connections between the narratives of David and Moses were evolved later than the narratives themselves largely through the tribal system, and that it is also through this that these are connected with the narratives of Genesis. I will further suggest that the original formulation of the twelve tribe system did not imagine the names of the tribes, at least all of the names of all of the tribes, as the names as well of the sons of Jacob, and that this was actually a Persian period innovation. This is an issue foreshadowed in the first chapter with reference to Wilson’s observation that “the twelve tribes are related in explicitly genealogical terms” only in Genesis and in 1 Chron 2:1-2 (Wilson 1977, 183–184).
Prior to commencing that discussion however I will note, in concluding this one, that Sparks, in my opinion correctly, points to Ezekiel 48 as one more landmark in the history of tribal traditions, in addition to most of the texts discussed above (K. L. Sparks 2003, 345–347; K. L. Sparks 1998, 297–303). It is widely supposed that Ezekiel 40-48 experienced considerable expansion even into the post-exilic period, but leaving that aside for a moment, the crucial issue is that Ezekiel 48 does not betray an awareness of the Genesis version of the tribes, although it shares with Numbers and Joshua (and certain other texts) an understanding of the tribal system as Israel’s essential social organization. 286 Indeed, Ezekiel 48 never mentions Jacob, even in his guise as “Israel,” and never makes clear that we are to understand the figures behind the tribal names in the way familiar from Genesis. This does not necessarily mean that the author of this text did not consider them in this way, but the order of the tribes also shows no dependence upon Genesis: here the tribes are placed in a real, if idealized, geography, and the order is based on that geography. 287 So, too, although 1 Chron 1:1-2:2, as described at length in chapter one, is in many ways a ratification and expansion of the Genesis vision, it is in fact the case that the order of the tribes which follows this introduction until 1 Chron 9:1a, and their number, do not follow Genesis’ vision. They do not include, for example, the tribe of Dan, or a genealogy for the tribe of Zebulun (who is nevertheless mentioned at certain points). Given that both aspects of Ezekiel 48 and 1 Chron 2:3-9:1a may be very late as well, this may be evidence not necessarily that the tribal-genealogical idea

---

286 On the expansion of Ezekiel 40-48, see for example Zimmerli 1979; Tuell 1992, out of a very considerable literature.

287 Actually, “real” geography is probably overstating the case. Only Dan’s geographic situation is narrated specifically, from Lebo-Hamath to Hazar-Enon, and then the following tribes are described as each occupying land simply, מַקְיַת קְדוֹמָה עַד־מַקְיַת עֵם, from east to west. In this organization, then, all twelve tribes occupy narrow strips of land in vertical stripes running across the country, which is hard to imagine.
did not exist *somewhere* within the same time frame as these articulations, but that it had not yet achieved its dominant position as the paradigmatic vision of Israel. The possibility of contemporaneous but conflicting visions is too little entertained in biblical scholarship. But either way, given the uniformity often attributed to the biblical picture of the tribes in scholarly literature, the circumscribed and rarely ratified nature of references to a Genesis-like tribal vision is an important data point.

Here, however, it is time to make a most important point: when it comes to understanding the potential of biblical texts to reimagine both earlier ideas and earlier articulations when placed in a biblical context, it is essential to note that we do not have a clear picture of how well or how poorly *most* biblical texts are reflective of broader Judahite or Israelite sentiment at the time of their composition. What we do know, in fact, suggests that they often were not, and we can think here of the difficulty scholars have always had in locating the biblical presentation of Yahwism among the evidence for a complex polytheism of considerable duration. As Noll puts it:

Explicitly or implicitly, many of us...have assumed that the contents of the documents in the Hebrew anthology were disseminated widely among pre-Hellenistic Hebrew-speaking peoples. In this assumptions’ most egregious form, some scholars assume the Bible’s version of a figure named Moses was a commonplace in the days of, say, Hezekiah. In more subtle forms, some treat the Former Prophets as though they were designed to be publicly disseminated Deuteronomistic propaganda. In each case, the researcher begins with the reasonable assumption that Hebrew scrolls existed in some form prior to Hellenistic times, but then jumps to the implausible assumption that the contents of these texts were widely known to the Hebrew-speaking population at these early dates. But if this assumption were the case, then there had to exist some means to disseminate the religious content of written documents, and this is

---

288 Noll refers to the argument of Stephen Geller here: “Geller observes that the kind of Yahwism that scholarship usually associates with the Bible was, at best, ‘ephemeral’, among Jews in early times because, says Geller, the texts represent ‘not the masses’ but...‘a small elite’” (Geller 2000, 317; Noll 2008, 400)
precisely where virtually all scholarship becomes vague. All of us realize that very few in the ancient world could read and oral traditions were unstable (Noll 2008, 396–397).

Generally, I think scholars seldom consider the possibility that a text’s composition date is not necessarily identical to the date of its broad acceptance, even while the evidence is overall not very good that any biblical texts achieved significant popularity prior to the Hellenistic period or even later.289 For example, as Noll notes, “scholars have known for decades that Jews of Persian-era Elephantine display ignorance of biblical texts and their contents” (Noll 2008, 399).290 Additionally, while it is very likely that there were narratives about figures such as David and Moses in circulation beyond elite circles at fairly early times, such stories are not inevitably the biblical versions thereof, or even necessarily closely related. Without, for example, anything like a universal education system or more than a handful of literate elites, how can we imagine biblical narratives travelled while maintaining their basic sense? When considering the difference between oral versions and textual versions, or even between distinct textual versions, we should

289 Noll points, for example, to David Carr’s study of ancient tribal practice, noting that “Carr wants to see in the texts evidence for education and enculturation that was somehow disseminated beyond the scribal class. He emphasizes that Deuteronomy’s fiction of addressing ‘Israel’ as a whole does not disguise the reality that passages such as Deut 6:4-25 presupposes a narrow class of literate elites, yet he asserts with no evidence, that Deut 31:10-13 represents a Hebrew equivalent of pan-Hellenic recitations of Homer, a ‘form of cultural circulation, introducing material to children and reinforcing it for adults’…When this type of hypothesis is put forward, the researcher has assumed that the content now preserved in the Bible was known—perhaps as a digest but nevertheless relatively intact—over a vastly dispersed population lacking any public system of education, any technology for disseminating complex theological ideas, and any incentive for trying to inculcate as religious norms a set of stories and ideas that offer no practical value in an agrarian society. Carr’s speculation is not anomalous but representative of a tendency in our academic guild to depend uncritically on biblical claims about the dissemination of biblical content (Noll 2008, 401; Carr 2008, 139).

290 “In 923, Arthur Cowley stressed that these Jews did not know of Moses, did not know a written Torah of Moses, and display equal silence with respect to virtually all of the canonical traditions. Recently, James Lindenberger stressed again that details in the so-called Passover Papyrus of 419 B.C.E. do not conform to biblical stipulations… In my view there is every reason to believe that Elephantine’s Passover was an agriculturally based religious observance not associated in any manner with a story about an exodus from Egypt. In light of the communication that took place between Elephantine and Jerusalem, the most reasonable conclusion is that stories now collected in the canonical Torah were not yet common in Persian Yehud” (Noll 2008, 399–400)
mark as a caution that even renditions of the same narrative with largely similar sets of facts are capable of presenting these in dynamic new ways. We can think, for example, without much difficulty, of the differences between Kings and Chronicles, or Genesis and Jubilees.

That biblical texts are not even particularly likely to be reflective of the knowledge and opinions of a broad audience, whether in the first centuries of the existence of the full biblical account of Judahite history, or (even more so) in the pre-biblical and non-biblical forms of the contents through which it is constructed, is something that is very important to keep in mind as we move into a highly specific discussion both of the separability of the narratives which collectively provide the Bible’s historical narrative and of how the framing of those narratives substantially alters their original meanings and readings. In this sense, I will argue, the biblical project was significantly “re-inventive”, but we must be cautious about what we imagine it is reinventing. That is, if one takes the frame used by Cross, Noth, and other notable figures in biblical scholarship, in which certain biblical texts were indeed imagined as inherently reflective of Israel as a whole, the crystallization, in a sense, of the spirit of a people, disrupting this would be truly seismic. However, if we have a more circumscribed imagination of the place of these texts in broad Israelite and Judahite imaginations of self and other for most of the history under discussion here, then the reinvention of earlier texts in service to a new ethnic vision is itself a considerably more circumscribed event, in terms of its effects. That is, what we have here is an idea of Israel that is being re-invented, not Israel itself. That this re-invention is achieved through deploying other re-inventions is both interesting and important, but the audiences for both the new and old
visions of Israel contained in biblical text should probably be imagined consistently as a fairly small percentage of the people of Israel and Judah.

Looking backward through this study, the probably minimal awareness of any biblical visions at any time prior to the Hellenistic period means, for example, that we are not talking exactly about what the tribal system was imagined to be, when, in a holistic sense, but merely noting that biblical authors may have utilized different visions of the tribes from different time periods of unknown popularity. I am suggesting, in short, that the biblical vision of the tribes reinflected older tribal concepts in the genealogical mode of Genesis, without suggesting that these earlier visions are representative of broad earlier consensuses. Looking forward, we are asking what narratives biblical authors employed without suggesting that these were all there ever were. Indeed, the high likelihood that they were not raises fascinating questions about what there is in this particular version of the Moses narrative, or the David narrative, which made it desirable for inclusion.
Chapter Five: The Building Blocks

Now at last it is time to begin presenting the exact details of how I imagine the biblical historical narrative, from Adam to the fall of Jerusalem, was constructed. Essentially, as I have intimated, I believe it was achieved by the combination of originally independent Panisraelite narratives about the patriarchs, Moses, and David respectively into the grand epic we now behold. While I believe the combination of the narratives of Moses and David was effected to a certain degree by a Deuteronomistic Historian as traditionally understood, I will argue that the combination of these narratives with Genesis, and to a large degree through Genesis, was a product of the mid-to-late Persian period, probably achieved by the same group involved in the construction of the Chronicles genealogy, or at least by individuals related to that group. Prior, however, to describing the minutiae of this construction, it seems to me necessary to discuss how to imagine it as a species of activity. That is, a discussion of the nature of Persian period efforts to construct biblical history would seem empty without a discussion of what it means that it is in this late period that such significant activity occurs, and what I am arguing for in certain ways echoes Knauf’s dictum that there is “no Torah before the Torah” (Knauf 2006, 291–292). Neither is there a biblical historical narrative prior to its establishment in at least gross outline.

“The Bible is Judah’s book,” but it describes an Israelite history. In my opinion, in fact, it describes several Israelite histories. At the end of last chapter, I noted

---

291 As Fleming puts it, “here we confront an underappreciated oddity. Historically, the Bible is Judah’s book, the collected lore of Judah’s survivors after defeat by Babylon in the early sixth century…we must decide how to read the Bible’s representation of Judah as part of Israel. The question is not so much whether some connection existed but whether the people of Judah would have shared the same stories as Israel” (Fleming, Daniel 2012).
that the invention of the concept of Panisraeliteism in the 8th century B.C.E. is not necessarily identical to how the biblical narrative explains Judah’s Israelite roots, and here I am suggesting that “biblical” Panisraeliteism, as opposed to prior and perhaps contemporaneous but alternate Panisraeliteism, is specifically the narrative achieved by the union of these originally independent Panisraelite etiological narratives. It is the process through which that coherence was made that I will begin describing in a moment, but what it is necessary to note immediately is that it is exactly this imposition of coherence that makes these narratives biblical, that “biblicizes” them. They are not “biblical” prior to this activity, they are something else entirely. In that guise, they also presumably existed alongside many other Judahite and Israelite narratives and traditions which are now utterly lost.

We can think of what I am describing here through the lens of a very helpful concept developed by Ian Rutherford with respect to the quite conceptually similar development of Panhellenism as expressed in the Catalogue of Women and later efforts. Prior to what we recognize as Panhellenism there were a number of other efforts to define collective ethnicities which have differing roles in the final product. Rutherford has referred to these previous aggregative efforts as “‘panhellenic poetics,’ that is not a system of poetics common to the whole of Greece, but rather the enterprise, through poetry, of reconciling and building connections between myths and genealogical traditions from different parts of Greece” (Rutherford 2005, 100–101). If the connection between the narratives of David and Moses, for example, was worked out centuries before the two were subsumed collectively into the rubric of the genealogical

---

292 It is, of course, not the case that every person in the Greek world viewed Panhellenism in the same way either.
superstructure provided by Jacob’s lineage as described by Genesis, this is “Panisraelite” poetics. It is a species of connection of the type which ultimately dominates biblical literature but it is at the same time quite distinct from the paradigmatically biblical “full” Panisraeliteism that we now behold.

What this chapter is an attempt to do, is to outline a coherent series of Persian period edits throughout the “primary history”, Genesis-2 Kings, which “invented” biblical history, and perhaps with it, biblical identity.\textsuperscript{293} I will indicate the evidence for the originally separate character of the great Panisraelite narratives, the patriarchal, Mosaic, and Davidic accounts of Israelite history, and the various ways in which they were ultimately combined in recognizable form. What I will finally argue for is the centrality of the family of Jacob in creating this recognizable picture, and as the major mechanism which connects the whole internally. Indeed, this is hardly a controversial suggestion but again where I differ from most scholars is in my approach to the separability of biblical narratives. That is, I believe that the patriarchal (and primeval) narratives of Genesis also were not originally connected to one another, and that the transformation of this mass of independent narratives into a connected whole finally brought the picture of biblical history into focus.\textsuperscript{294}

\textsuperscript{293} Although, the distinction between the two is that biblical history may plausibly be said to be confined to Genesis-2 Kings while biblical identity also includes the totality of writings and prophetic works, about which nothing coherent can really be said in this respect.

\textsuperscript{294} Na’amán’s very recent, and very perspicacious study of “The Jacob Story and the Formation of Biblical Israel”, for example, very clearly considers “the Patriarchal story-cycle” to consist of “both the three ancestors of the people of Israel and the 12 tribes as an embodiment of Israel’s segregated origin”. He is probably correct in suggesting that the systematization of the two “represented a major step towards creating a sense of unity among devotees of YHWH who remained in the land” and that “some of the narratives are based on oral traditions whose scope and detail cannot be established, which the author augmented by consulting a few written sources and by adding various literary and ideological elements of
**The Time Horizon of the Biblical**

We begin with a well-known but somewhat underappreciated fact: No non-biblical narrative text from Judah exists even from the period of the Exile, let alone earlier, bearing witness to the world of Israelite and Judahite literature as something distinct from biblical literature. It is important to recognize the complications this presents. Impressionistically, the Hebrew Bible is like a Hieronymous Bosch painting, an entire universe of myth and history, flattened onto a single canvas. More than that, the efforts at cohesion and preservation which appear in the biblical canon have been performed haphazardly, at different times and in different ways, leaving us with the certainty that the Hebrew Bible is not all of one piece, but with such an absence of certainty about just how many pieces are involved that inquiries into the matter have dominated biblical studies for over one hundred years.\(^{295}\) This has been a large part of the

\(^{295}\) In an engaging article focused on this issue in the Pentateuch, Seth Sanders argues that despite what has sometimes been argued, there are not, in fact, empirical models for the construction of Pentateuchal literature. Scholars, as he notes, have long argued that certain Mesopotamian texts, for example, the epic of Gilgamesh, show marks of construction through compilation, exhibiting seam marks, but “Near Eastern narratives…are coherent in a way the Pentateuch is not…the sharp difference between the predominant literary values of the Pentateuch and its contemporaries and successors entails a historical stratification from values of coherence to values of comprehensiveness to values of harmonization” (Sanders 2014, 2–3). Another important supposed analogue for biblical composition is found in the 2nd century CE effort, the *Diatessaron*, to synthesize the four gospels. As Carr notes, “the challenge for such empirical study of ancient revision is finding multiple cases where we have not one, but two or more editions of the same ancient texts. Despite these hazards, scholars have found many examples of such documented growth in ancient texts. Early studies…focused on the example of Tatian’s Diatessaron, an early Christian interweaving of the canonical Christian gospels. This, and some yet later materials…were seen to be empirical examples of the kind of conflationary interweaving that scholars had posited for sources of the Pentateuch and the synoptic gospels” (Carr 2011, 37). But this, too, is beset by the same problem. Both in Gilgamesh and in this work, the editorial efforts operate in a way that leaves the narrative perfectly coherent, while incoherence is on some level the very basis of the source hypothesis. As Sanders puts it, “the biblical Flood shares a plot with the Mesopotamian Flood but does not read like it. Each key event of the plot happens once in the Gilgamesh flood tablet, but twice in a row in Genesis. What is more, many other doublets are contradictory” (Sanders 2014, 4). As for the Diatessaron, it was actually created to solve the type of problems endemic in biblical literature, as these appear in the New Testament. It is intended to minimize contradiction. In fact, the real virtue of the *Diatessaron* as analogue might be that it is an example
purpose of the Greek comparisons performed throughout this study. There are certainly
text-critical issues in the understanding of Greek myth, as in discussions of the
composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but what is visible here, owing to its geographical
and chronological extension, is exactly what is missing from biblical text: considerable
clarity with respect to processes of aggregation.

For example, in the *Return of the Herakleidae* narrative explored previously, we
are able to see figures such as Aletes and Aepytus prior to their introduction into the
*Return* myth, in their guise as local heroes, and we can also see the progression, with at
least some clarity, as they slowly become incorporated into the myth until, by the time of
Apollodorus and Pausanias centuries later, they have become indispensable. We can see
hints of independent versions of, say, the Iolkos Cycle, including the Voyage of the Argo,
and of the Trojan Cycle, and we can see when, through various processes, some of the
Argonauts became the fathers of some of the Iliadic heroes, or, more likely, some of the
fathers of the Iliadic heroes became Argonauts, such as Peleus and Telamon. Tydeus,
Diomedes’ father appears as one of the Seven Against Thebes, despite the probably only

of a problem I have been alluding to throughout, which is that if non-source actors are responsible for the
compilation of sources, it becomes hard to know who is more responsible for the characteristics of the
document we are discussing. As Carr notes, an analysis of the *Diatessaron* found that it contained “96
percent of the verses in the gospel of John, but only 76.5 percent of Matthew, 50 percent of Mark, and 66.2
percent of Luke” (Carr 2011, 111). So, for example, Konrad Schmid claims that a major reason that Von
Rad’s concept of an original Hexateuch which was replaced when the Pentateuch was combined with the
Deuteronomistic History is unsustainable is that it “must come to terms with an immense loss of text,”
namely, the Yahwist’s and Elohist’s accounts of the conquest of the land (K. Schmid 2011, 16). But,
although I am not endorsing Von Rad’s model of the Pentateuch/Hexateuch, conceptually why shouldn’t
there have been “an immense loss of text”? After all, in the *Diatessaron*, half of Mark has been lost. Why
shouldn’t there be all sorts of dynamic interactions with source materials which limit our ability understand
them, other than that it would be inconvenient? Perhaps we should start imagining our sources as experts
quoted in biased editorials, who may ultimately be surprised and alarmed at how their words are used.
local relevance of the original Theban Cycle. And so on.296 Because we have a landscape view of Greek mythology, we have landmarks. For example, we can see that Homer does not yet consider the Greeks to be Hellenes, and that Thucydides and Herodotus already do. Such processes are not visible in biblical literature precisely because we have nothing non-biblical, of comparative age, to compare them to.

The major defense, in some sense the only defense, against the possibility that dynamic adaptations to biblical narratives continued into the Persian, Hellenistic, or even Maccabean periods is the idea that the canon was closed, or partially closed, earlier than these periods, or, if not closed, at least treated with the kind of reverence that kept editorial changes to a minimum.297 This idea is popular, and suggestions to the contrary have been resisted, for reasons relating to the concerns in the previous paragraph: if the Bible is not reliable evidence for Judahite or Israelite history, then there is very little reliable evidence. Thus, the issue of canon closure, or near-closure, is a question of considerable urgency here and elsewhere, for much depends upon it. In my opinion, the impression that the major biblical narratives I will discuss are connected to each other is the product of a self-conscious effort to create this connection, and this is a later feature of the text, largely and finally imposed by a coding system, like that of the Catalogue, based on the form of the tribal-genealogical narrative. This narrative is best visible in (roughly) Genesis 29-36 and in a still-more aggregative form in 1 Chron 1:1-9:1a.

296 Recall that Jonathan Hall suggested the building outwards of the Return myth from Argos, a process that is also at least somewhat visible (Hall 1997, 61).

297 For general discussions of biblical canon formation, see McDonald and Sanders 2002; McDonald and Sanders 2007; Bruce 1988; Auwer and de Jonge 2003; Schniedewind 2004; Satlow 2014; Van Seters 2006 among others. For specific aspects of this debate relevant to the discussion here, see Römer 2011; Römer 2005; Kratz 2005.
Although I believe Genesis to be a late addition to the Pentateuch, which will shortly be the subject of an extensive discussion, it is particularly the Chronicles effort, or at least the literary world which produced the Chronicles effort that I believe to be determinative for the development of final Panisraeliteism. If the Pentateuch had already been closed, long before this, then much of what I will argue below is impossible. Conversely, if certain authors felt free to alter biblical text into the 3rd or even 2nd centuries B.C.E., then recovering the longue durée process of biblical construction becomes a potentially impossible task.

With respect to the closure of the canon, I think the evidence that this occurred relatively early, even in the case of the Pentateuch, is far weaker than is sometimes believed. As Michael Satlow notes in his recent survey of the evolution of biblical literature, for a long time speculation on the completion of the Torah has rested on the probably fifth-century figure of Ezra, who, according to Nehemiah 8:1, read a ספר תורה מosaic, “book of the torah of Moses,” to the whole people Israel. But other than the coincidence of the term “book of the torah of Moses”, what is the evidence for an identification of this with the Torah that we have? Ezra, in Satlow’s analysis, was “familiar with the festival calendar of P”, and “cites texts that closely resemble passages from the Pentateuch that modern scholars consider to be from the P and D sources” (Satlow 2014, 77). However, as Satlow additionally notes, there is not much more that can be gathered from Ezra. As Carr points out, it seems that by the time of Ben Sira, in the 2nd century B.C.E., the Torah was set apart from the rest of the Bible, and therefore probably had been previously (largely) completed. But, of course, the 2nd century B.C.E.

298 “It seems likely that Ezra’s scroll contains passages from both P and D (and H) sources, although not necessarily in the order or way that they survive in the modern Pentateuch” (Satlow 2014, 77).
is not the 5th century B.C.E. either, and in fact both Ben Sira and the similarly ancient Dead Sea Scrolls, as Carr also argues, reveal a document still to a certain degree in flux (Carr 2011, 193). Thus, there is hardly any compelling reason to imagine that the Pentateuch was held in anything like the reverence modern religious practitioners have for it even in the early Persian period.299

What is particularly instructive about Satlow’s discussion is his identification of the context of Chronicles with a period, perhaps a century after Ezra, in which, it seems, there was a revival of interest in ancient Israel. This is demonstrated, for example, in the sudden reappearance of paleo-Hebrew script on coinage, on storage jars, and in some administrative contexts, even though the official language of the Persian Empire, Aramaic, had previously been used for these tasks (Satlow 2014, 92). As he further notes, this effort seems to have taken place at the same time as the composition of a significant biblical narrative, the books of Chronicles. As he puts it:

These two books—which really should be considered as a single work—retell the story of the Deuteronomistic history. The book opens with nine mind-numbing chapters of genealogical lists….and then dives into its real subject for the remaining fifty-five chapters, the story of David and his line (Satlow 2014, 92).300

299 Many of the issues in understanding textual transmission in the ancient world are well summarized by Cook in the context of a discussion of the Qur’an: “a culture that is concerned to preserve a written text will not necessarily set such store by reproducing an exact wording. Greek papyri of the third century BC offer texts of Homer in which, in relation to our own distinctly uniform text, whole lines are added or dropped. In the Islamic world, the standard life of the Prophet…was transmitted in the century after his death in forms too divergent for us to reconstruct an original text behind them. By our own standards of textual fidelity, both instances are slightly shocking. But the attitude of a culture towards faithful transmission need not be either uniform or constant” (Cook 2000, 62). With respect to the Hebrew Bible, as Carr puts it, “one absolute datum on which most scholars are agreed is that the Hebrew Bible as we have it, even just the consonantal text is—at the earliest—a product of the Hellenistic (and Roman) periods….the clearer we become on the fluid character of the transmission of many ancient texts…the more difficult it becomes to insist on an early date of biblical texts—centuries before the Hellenistic period—at least in something like their present form” (Carr 2011, 7).

300 For a discussion of the relationship between Chronicles and the DH, which is often considered in a different light than the one presented here, see the first chapter.
What should be noted, although not a part of Satlow’s discussion, is that what I take to be the crucial elements of the major pentateuchal construction layers, and to a lesser extent construction efforts throughout even more of the Bible, the patriarchs and the tribes, are at the same time some of the most conspicuous elements of biblical literature largely absent from the books of Ezra and Nehemiah and among the most conspicuous aspects of the first nine chapters (“mind numbing”, perhaps) of the books of Chronicles.\textsuperscript{301} Thus, it is perhaps reasonable to imagine that these elements developed significantly between the composition of Ezra and Nehemiah and that of this Chronicles genealogy as part of an initiative also mirrored in epigraphic and numismatic developments.\textsuperscript{302}

Thus, at the very least, the argument that the concepts behind these connective efforts evolved in a late period, perhaps as late as 4\textsuperscript{th} century Persian Yehud and that narratives which have long been considered most characteristic of biblical literature may be among its latest to develop, cannot be gainsaid by the evidence here without a strong defense of the antiquity of Genesis’ narratives about the patriarchs and the tribes. This possibility will be discussed momentarily, but for now it seems enough to say that if it is the case that the frame of biblical literature, composed of many of its most paradigmatic elements, did not appear until the late 5\textsuperscript{th} or even 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E, then this is the sense

\textsuperscript{301} Nehemiah does offer us a vision of history, one that includes a covenant with Abraham (Neh 9:7). But this is the only reference to Abraham in Ezra or Nehemiah; indeed, it is probably the only reference to the patriarchs in the whole of these books. Isaac is certainly absent, and so is Joseph. The name Jacob does not appear, and there are no unambiguous references to Jacob in the various uses of “Israel”, here. The tribal narrative is nearly absent as well. There is a reference to the twelve tribes, collectively, in Ezra 6:17, but without listing any names. Only the Levites, Benjamin, Ephraim and Judah are explicitly mentioned in the books, and it is not at all clear that the references to Benjamin, Ephraim, and Judah are references to tribes, rather than geographical entities. As noted in chapter one, there are several cases in which heroic figures from Israelite myth that are not elsewhere placed in a genealogical context, arrive in one here.

\textsuperscript{302} Of course, it may merely be the case that the authors of Ezra and Nehemiah had little interest in these already extant narratives, but this would still be demonstrative of their non-centrality, and probably the fact that they had not yet become an integral part of biblical literature.
in which, biblical history is *not* merely the product of its tradition histories. These efforts, in a real sense, reinvented the narratives they acted upon whenever they occurred.

We return to the central argument: I have suggested that biblical history was constructed through the combination of three histories. What is notable about these histories is that each is, by itself, a sufficient explanation for Judah’s Panisraelite ethnicity. In one, Judah was part of the “Israel” which arrived out of Egypt with Moses; in another, the argument is that Israel and Judah were both descendants of Abraham and Isaac; in a third, David, the founder of the Jerusalem dynasty, was king of a United Monarchy. Thus, Genesis-Deuteronomy is, whatever else it might be, an attempt to integrate the narratives of the patriarchs with the account of the exodus, and the Deuteronomistic History an attempt to make the exodus narrative the pre-history of David’s monarchy. The tribal-genealogical narrative is the effort which describes all three epochs in sequence.

For illustrative purposes, it is worth pointing out that this is similar to Jacob Wright’s model of biblical literature, in which the books from Genesis to Joshua form a kind of “people’s history,” and those from Samuel-Kings a “monarchic history”. He argues that “by joining the two histories to form the ‘Enneateuch’ (or primary history), later authors relativized the monarchy to a later chapter in Israel’s long national history” (Wright 2014, 141). Where I differ from Wright with respect to this very general picture is that I think Genesis-Joshua and Samuel-Kings both additionally represent the

---

303 As we will see, I believe it is a relatively simple matter to demonstrate that the Moses narratives in Exodus and Deuteronomy did not originally imagine Israel as descendants of the patriarchs of Genesis, as others have suggested (Römer 1990; de Pury 2006). It is less commonly argued but still, I think, possible to demonstrate that the Davidic narratives, particularly in 1 and 2 Samuel, did not originally imagine Israel as having come out of Egypt with Moses, or as having descended from the patriarchs.
combination of two originally separate histories, as described above. It is indeed the case that the DH positions the monarchy as a continuation of “Israel’s long national history”, which phenomenon I will describe in greater detail shortly, but it is also the case I think that Genesis, and a series of edits inspired by Genesis throughout the Pentateuch, positions the exodus as a continuation of this even longer national history. The sequence patriarchs-exodus-monarchy is achieved by connections developed backwards from the exodus into the patriarchal period and forward from the exodus into the monarchy, through Joshua and Judges, in two separate efforts. Additionally, throughout these large narrative blocks there are hints of still additional conceptions of Judah’s past. But these—the patriarchal, Mosaic, and Davidic narratives-- are the major narratives which have been preserved to this day.

My argument is both that the narratives of Genesis are the final part of the puzzle and that different Genesis narratives were used in connective efforts at different times.

Construction the Pentateuch Part I: Different Books, Different Israels

The vision I am about to articulate has two parts. First, I will describe the construction of the Pentateuch through two similar, though probably unrelated efforts to make the pentateuchal narrative cohere, both performed by means of the extension of (different) Genesis narratives through the whole. Second, I will discuss the construction

---

304 Scholars have begun to awaken to possibilities such as these and their implications. For example, Carr notes the debt his reconstruction of biblical composition owes to “relatively recent work on the relative independence of the non-Priestly primeval history from the following materials in Genesis, the original separateness of the different non-Priestly ancestral stories from each other, and the gradual joining of these ancestral materials with each other and the Moses story” (Carr 2011, 145).

305 A notable “alternative” Panisraeliteism, for example, may appear in Amos 7, in the use of the “House of Isaac”, for example.
of the Deuteronomistic history through another set of edits altogether. After these, however, we will turn to the question of just what it is that holds all of these together and when we can imagine that this connection occurred. So, first the Pentateuch, then the DH, then both.

Let us begin this investigation by abstracting biblical history as a combination of elements. These elements include the patriarchs, the tribal system, and others, like the united monarchy. How separable are these elements from each other, and how involved must any process which combined some or all of them have been? Consider: if we extend our study to the book of Joshua, we can say that Joshua and Numbers share with each other, and with no other book, a tremendous interest in the centrality of the tribal system to their vision of Israel. Of the eleven tribal lists which occur in Exodus through Deuteronomy, eight appear in Numbers, while in the book of Joshua we can find a lengthy disquisition on the area granted each tribe in Joshua 13:15-19:48, as well as a tribal list included in a description of the cities granted the Levites in Joshua 21:4-34. On the other hand, the patriarchs appear very rarely in these books. Jacob is mentioned only in the almost certainly originally separate pericope dealing with Balaam son of Beor (Num 22-24), in another almost certainly late addition in Numbers 32:11, and in Joshua

---

306 I should say at the outset that I do not think all of these efforts occurred at the same time. I think the pentateuchal efforts were both late, and both occurred when that particular canon was already nearly complete. However, I think the connection forged between narratives about David and Moses was inherent in the creation of the Deuteronomistic History. It is merely additionally the case, I believe, as do many others, that Deuteronomistic interventions in the books of Samuel are not of any considerable extent, and that the integration performed by the original DH was implicit and not explicit, involving more juxtaposition than cohesion. As a whole, this David-Moses aggregation was still unconnected to the narratives of the patriarchs, and lacked the kind of integration which would be a feature of later texts, for a considerable period of time. Thus, the whole edifice remained largely unconnected until the advent of the genealogical system familiar to us in Genesis, and in 1 Chron 1-9:1a. The oath promise layer, in this model, was an intermediate effort to connect the narratives of Moses and the patriarchs in the emerging Pentateuch prior to the final evolution of the tribal-genealogical system.
24, a text which has been repeatedly singled out as a capstone for a probably Persian-period effort to create a Hexateuch, and which will be discussed in the conclusion to this chapter.\footnote{For the independence of the Balaam son of Beor narrative, see Levin 2007, 209. This independence is likely also demonstrated in an unusual facet of the book itself. Remarkably, Moses appears in literally every other chapter of Numbers} \footnote{Whether or not Numbers and Joshua are actually connected efforts is a difficult question. The two share this vision of Israel, and also an interest in Joshua himself, a major figure in these two books, and a very minor one elsewhere. Outside of Numbers, Joshua, and the probably connected Judges 1-2, Joshua appears in the Genesis-2 Kings complex only a handful of times in Exodus (Exodus 17, 24, 32, 33) and in 1 Kings 16:34. Seebass has additionally suggested that the “holy land” theme of Numbers looks forward to Joshua “as bringing the fulfillment of this theme”, as also noted in other studies (Seebass 2006, 92–93). Thus, the idea that these are indeed connected efforts is not exactly out of the question, but it is not easy to demonstrate, and the two do not share a continuous story. However, the fact that they seem to share a vision of Israel with each other and with no other book in the Bible is important. One could not read one after the other without difficulty, but neither can this level of shared sentiment be ignored.} Abraham and Isaac only appear in Num 32:11 and in Joshua 24.\footnote{Indeed, the only other references to the terms “tribe” or “tribes” in Exodus are in descriptions of the altar at Sinai, which has twelve pillars for the twelve tribes (Exod 24:4), and two descriptions of the stones on the priestly breastplate, of which there were 12 for the 12 tribes (Exod 39:7). Although these should not be dismissed out of hand, it should be noted that these are also both instances of what in Greek literature is generally called ekphrasis, the extended description of an artistic element which forms a pause in a narrative, for example, famous descriptions of the shields of Achilles and Aeneas. As Fowler notes, “Set-piece description is regularly seen by narratologists as the paradigm example of narrative pause, in the}

Meanwhile, in Exodus and Deuteronomy, the situation is almost precisely reversed. Here, the patriarchs appear with regularity—particularly in Exodus 1-6, 32-33, and Deuteronomy 1, 6, 9, 29, 30, and 34—and it is the tribes who are entirely marginalized. Of tribal pericopes, Exodus has only Exodus 1:1-6, and what very much appears to be an abortive genealogy of the Genesis type, with only three entries, in Exodus 6:14-25. All of the other references to the non-Levi tribes in the books of Exodus occur in the persons of Oholiab, son of Ahisamach of Dan and Bezalel, son of Uri of Judah, while Manasseh and Ephraim are not mentioned in this book at all.\footnote{All of the other references to the terms “tribe” or “tribes” in Exodus are in descriptions of the altar at Sinai, which has twelve pillars for the twelve tribes (Exod 24:4), and two descriptions of the stones on the priestly breastplate, of which there were 12 for the 12 tribes (Exod 39:7). Although these should not be dismissed out of hand, it should be noted that these are also both instances of what in Greek literature is generally called ekphrasis, the extended description of an artistic element which forms a pause in a narrative, for example, famous descriptions of the shields of Achilles and Aeneas. As Fowler notes, “Set-piece description is regularly seen by narratologists as the paradigm example of narrative pause, in the}
Deuteronomy has substantial references to the tribes only in Deuteronomy 27 and 33, both of which Römer identifies as additions to the book to help create a cohesive Pentateuch.\footnote{Römer suggests “when Deuteronomy was cut off from the following books, new chapters were added: the blessings of Moses in Deut 33, which parallel him with Jacob (Gen. 49) and reinforce the structural and narrative coherence of the Pentateuch. Deut 11.26-31 and Deut. 27 were probably added in order to facilitate the acceptance of the Torah by the religious elite of the province of Samaria” (Römer 2005, 182). Römer’s identification of Deut 27 as an addition does not rely on the appearance of the tribes here, but on the involvement of Mounts Ebal and Gerizim in Deut 27:12-13.} Outside of these two pericopes and a number of references to Levi, the references to tribal Israel in Deuteronomy are, curiously, exclusively references to the Transjordanian tribes, Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh (Deut 3,4, 29), and rare even then.\footnote{A curious feature of the division of words for tribe in biblical literature (שבט and מטה) is that apparently the usage preferred by the Deuteronomistic Historian, appearing exclusively in Deuteronomy, almost exclusively in Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings and 2 Kings, but in the 17 cases in which a specific tribe is named and this noun is used between Deut 1 and the end of 2 Kings—indeed, in the 19 cases between Num 18 and the end of 2 Kings—the tribe mentioned is Manasseh or Levi a very surprising 14 times. Judah accounts for three of the others (and both uses in the books of Kings), Benjamin once and Dan once.} And both of these Panisraelite elements, tribal and patriarchal narratives, are nearly entirely absent from the book of Leviticus, although this will not be discussed further here.\footnote{Leviticus is obviously related to these histories, but as it is largely of a different, non-narrative character, and as it fails to include any of the elements of Panisraeliteism that are under discussion here to an even}
What is the best explanation for these strangely disparate patterns of use? Is it accidental or coincidental, or is more likely that it is revelatory of something? In scholarly approaches which assume the unity of the various elements through which pentateuchal Panisraelite narratives are constructed (especially the patriarchs and the tribes), disparities in the use of one or the other at different junctures is no cause for confusion. But what are we to do without that assumption? It certainly seems as if Numbers and Joshua understand Israel differently, on some pretty fundamental levels, than Exodus and Deuteronomy do. What we have to ask is both what it might mean that this disjunction exists and why it is now the case that it is hardly visible. Certainly we as biblical scholars have done ourselves few favors in this respect, as the heritage of the model of biblical history in which the tribal system was the earliest and most permanent of Israel’s social organizations has over-determined how we read the text. But if this is a misreading, it is one we are led to by biblical efforts to minimize the visibility of disjunctions like the one intimated above. By isolating and describing those efforts, we can recover a great deal.

**The Construction of the Pentateuch Part II: Exodus 1:6-6:26**

If scholars take for granted an inherent connection between the vision of Genesis and what follows, it is because of considerable material to this effect located at the

---

For example, Cross; “even the earliest epic traditions of Israel did not reflect directly the religious milieu of the time of their origin. Rather, by oral transmission over gulfs of time...they were shaped even before precipitation into literary form by the events which created the union of the tribes and the Yahwistic cult which was the primary ground of their unity” (Cross 1973a, 3).

---
beginning of the book of Exodus. Exodus 1:1-6 is a particularly notable, visible, and probably visibly artificial effort to introduce cohesion through cross-reference. Genesis’ vision is characterized by two major similarities across its four lists of the tribes: first that the tribal names are clearly described as the names, as well, of the sons of Jacob, and second the beginning sequence “Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah”. Exodus 1:1-6 repeats both these elements, as no other list in the rest of the Bible besides 1 Chron 2:1-2 does.³¹⁴ I have referred to this as the “tribal-genealogical” vision of the tribes, and its absence throughout nearly all of biblical text is one of the most notably understudied topics in the field. The fact that this repetition occupies the first six verses of the book, the first six verses after the end of Genesis, is unlikely to be a coincidence. Continuing onwards, it is in Exodus 1:6-6:26 generally that we see the vast majority of references to the patriarchs in the whole of the book. This is not likely to be a coincidence either.

For a long time, and often enough today, the connection between Genesis and Exodus 1-6 was considered to be a result of the fact that it was here that the traditional sources of the Pentateuch were (and often are) supposed, perhaps most clearly, to reveal themselves. Specifically, here we have three different versions of the revelation of the divine name to Moses, supposedly representing three different ways in which the three separate narratives which began in Genesis introduce the narrative of the Exodus.³¹⁵ For

---

³¹⁴ The idea that these verses represent a Priestly introduction to Exodus can be found in a number of places, including in the work of Cross and more recently in the work of de Pury (de Pury 2006, 64; Cross 1973a, 303). Again, this seems largely the product of circular logic: P is a genealogist, therefore genealogies are P.

³¹⁵ As Baden notes, articulating the traditional view, “one of the most significant discrepancies among the first three sources—and importantly for our current purposes, the one that gives rise to the scholarly nomenclature—is when and how God’s proper name, Yahweh, came to be known. According to the first strand, in Exodus 6:2-6, God appeared to the patriarchs as El Shaddai…but did not tell them his true name…..According to the third document, too, God revealed his true name only to Moses (in this case,
the discussion at hand, the obvious implication of this traditional interpretation is that all
the major sources of the Tetrateuch were fully aware of the narratives of both Genesis
and Exodus from their earliest floruit.

For the last few decades there have been a considerable number of scholars,
particularly in Europe, who have used the disjunction between the narratives of Genesis
and the rest of Exodus besides Exodus 1-6, as evidence of something else: that Genesis
was originally separate form Exodus (and Deuteronomy), and that there is a very visible
“lacuna” between the two texts. Implicit in this idea is the suggestion that references to
the patriarchs outside of Genesis are unilaterally part of a late attempt to provide cohesion
that is otherwise lacking. Römer, for example, famously suggested that the “fathers” of
Deuteronomy originally referred to the Exodus generation.316 As he puts it, for example,
“Is it not obvious that the fathers in Deuteronomy recall the patriarchal traditions of
Genesis?...it is made clear by apposition that these fathers must be understood to be
Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob” (Römer 2000, 122). Yet, this clarity, it seems, is quite

316 If we analyze the occurrences of the ʾābōt in terms of the context of deuteronomistic Deuteronomy,
paying attention to the semantic fields within which they appear and considering Deuteronomy first of all
as the prelude to the Deuteronomistic History we arrive, in my opinion, at the following conclusion: for the
deuteronomistic school, the fathers mentioned in the book of Deuteronomy are not Abraham, Isaac, and
Jacob but are often a generation in Egypt, namely the generation of the Exodus...This pays attention to the
fact that Deuteronomy’s search for origins ends in Egypt. For the Deuteronomistic redactors of
Deuteronomy, the history of Israel begins in Egypt; the mentions of the fathers serves to evoke these
beginnings or to provide a condensed summary of YHWH’s continual intervention on behalf of his people
as well as his “present reality” in relation to past generations (Römer 2000, 122–123).
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contrived. Thus, modern attempts at revising (and sometimes rejecting) the 
documentary hypothesis have already paved the way for a reassessment of these chapters.

Other developments in scholarship have altered the traditional picture of neat 
resolutions in Exodus 1:6-6:26. While it is generally agreed that Exodus 2:24-25 and 
Exodus 6:2-10 are from the P source, it is now relatively common among European 
scholars to argue that the traditional J and E ascriptions of the 3:6, 15, 16 and 4:5 cross-
references should be redefined simply as “non-P” material. In fact, it is now somewhat 
common to see these supposed narratives considered not as a combination of two 
narratives, but as part of a unified account, the “first commission of Moses”, even if it is 
still acknowledged that the material involved comes from more than one source and 
possibly considerably more (Dozeman 2009, 98; McEvenue 1990, 3–13; Blenkinsopp 
1992, 117). The greatest challenge to the traditional interpretation of Exodus 3-4 is the

As Römer puts it, “the insertion of the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob into Deuteronomy was 
carried out in a very considered way; it happened at strategic locations”, and “the insertion of the 
patriarchs into such contexts seems not to have been limited to Deuteronomy, but to have been part of a “
final redaction,’ concerned for the harmony of the whole” (Römer 2000, 137). It should be noted, of course, 
that the idea that Deuteronomy does not depend on Genesis and the idea that Exodus doesn’t are rightly 
understood as two separate ideas. However, although Römer’s discussion, for example, focuses on 
Deuteronomy, it is obviously the case that if Deuteronomy’s notion of the ancestors is based on Exodus, 
not on Genesis, then Exodus itself should not depend, for its prehistory, on the narratives of Genesis or 
else the distinction is meaningless. This will be explored in detail in a moment.

Indeed, there are considerable literary difficulties with evaluating this block of material, and scholars 
have responded to it in increasingly different ways. As Dozeman notes, McEvenue and Blenkinsopp have 
identified as many as nine sources in this material (McEvenue 1990; Blenkinsopp 1992; Dozeman 2009, 
102–103). H.H. Schmid has suggested that this pericope has been edited by a “prophetic influence” in the 
DH, and Blum argues that the commission of Moses is a part of what he calls the D-work (KD) (H. H. 
Schmid 1976, 19–29; Blum 1990, 40). Van Seters has identified the author of this commission with an 
exilic Yahwist historian (Van Seters 1994). A particularly interesting stance was taken by Konrad Schmid 
who has identified the author of this material as a post-P editor, dependent on 6:2-7:7, arguing, as Dozeman 
notes, for a close relationship between Genesis15; Exodus 3:1-4:17, and Joshua 24, based on themes of 
“faith, God as savior from death, and the promise of the land as oath” (K. Schmid 1999, 209–212; 
Dozeman 2009, 102–103). Finally, there is much to like about Dozeman’s summary of the whole, here: 
“The research on 3:1-7:7 indicates its important role in the composition of the Pentateuch. The twice-told 
commission of Moses is a pivotal text, relating themes through the Primary history of Genesis-2 Kings. 
This selective overview of scholarship confirms the multiple authorship of 3:1-7:7. But it also underscores 
the ambiguity of the more precise identification of the authors, to the exact history of composition of the
increasing awareness of the difficulty of disentangling the sources in this pericope, especially on the grounds through which they were disentangled in Genesis. Another challenge, perhaps underappreciated, is that despite the supposedly central nature of the resolutions of the Genesis narratives in these chapters, it must be noted that Genesis prepares us for them hardly at all.

Here, the key text is not Exodus 3-4, but Exodus 6. There are indeed some texts which basically cohere in Genesis that use “El Shaddai” as the name of the deity and it is clear that Exodus 6:3 is aimed at these texts (Genesis 17:1, 28:3, 35:11, 48:3). Yet, is it a continuation or a response? If the former, why should the Genesis texts fail to foreground the coming change in name in some way, why is it that Genesis never insists

---

319 As Propp puts it “Exodus 3-4 is a key passage for the documentary analysis of the Torah…but precisely at this point we part with our faithful mentor, the divine name, and rely on less trustworthy guides to source assignment. We are not altogether without resources—distinguishing ‘P’ from ‘JE’ remains easy and a subject of near consensus, but separating J from E will henceforth always be difficult, sometimes impossible ” (Propp 1999). Propp’s own analysis concludes that E is far more responsible for Exodus than has typically been supposed, although as he notes “because separating J from E is difficult outside of Genesis, prudence would dictate partitioning Exodus simply between P and JE” (Propp 1999, 50).

320 The idea of subdividing sources by their term of reference for YHWH has been significantly problematized, for example, by Moberly 1992. As Wenham notes, “El Shaddai,” “YHWH,” and “Elohim” were hardly the only names for god used in Genesis (Wenham 1980, 159). Articulating the traditional view, Friedman suggests that in Gen 17:1, in which YHWH appears to Abraham—called El Shaddai in the scene but YHWH in the introduction—“those who misunderstand the matter of the name of God in the sources mistakenly think that the mention of God’s name, YHWH, in v.1 is an exception to the hypothesis. On the contrary, this verse is precisely the point. The issue is not that the sources use different names for God. It is that the sources have different ideas of when God’s name was revealed to human beings. In J it is known from the early generations of human beings. In E and P it is not revealed until the generation of Moses. So in P God says to Moses, ‘I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Shadday, and I was not known to them by my name YHWH’ (Exod 6:3). And, completely consistent with that, P says here that ‘YHWH appeared to Abram and said to him, I am El Shadday.’ That is not an exception to the rule. That is the rule!” (Friedman 2003, 56).
that this will not always be the name of god? Since this does not occur, this Exodus 6:3 reads more as a post facto explanation of this peculiarity than an organic extension of the previous narrative. And, for that matter, where in Genesis is it implied that the Israelites and YHWH would completely forget each other, as the crucial Exodus texts in Exod 2:24-25, and 3:14-15 suggest has occurred? Thus, it is hardly surprising that modern Exodus scholarship has indeed begun to point in the direction of understanding these chapters not as organic continuations but as post-hoc rationalizations.³²¹ In my opinion, this is an appropriate conclusion.³²²

³²¹ As Römer notes, “there is indeed a growing consensus about the relatively ‘late’ origin of the combination of Genesis and the following books” (Römer 2006, 26) He continues, touching on many points also addressed in this study, “The question of the ‘author’ of this combination is still open. Was the Priestly writer the first to link the patriarchs with the exodus…did the Deuteronomists create this link…Or should one still retain the traditional solution attributing this link, and together with the first edition of the Pentateuch, to a ‘Yahwist’? In our view, the last solution is the less attractive one. Nicholson, who defends the traditional view, argues : ‘We are bound to ask what idea pre-exilic Israel can have of its own history if it had not yet joined together its memories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob with those of Moses and the exodus’. To this we respond: we are first bound to ask if the Pentateuch offers any sort of indication for a thoroughgoing Yahwistic document connecting Genesis with Exodus at a pre-Priestly stage” (Römer 2006, 26–27; Nicholson 1998, 130). Of course, Nicholson’s question is, in a sense, the major focus of this study. The idea that these chapters are not inherently connected to the narratives of Genesis is, of course, an essential ingredient to the various arguments about Exodus’ lacunae described above. As Mark Smith remarked with respect to a slightly different case, traditional understandings of the material in Genesis, “none of the three basic hypotheses for J and E and their juxtaposition and interpenetration is fully satisfactory. Either a considerably more complex set of relations must be envisioned…or the present scholarly capacity to understand this material along source critical lines may be doubted” (M. S. Smith and Bloch-Smith 1997, 151–5).

³²² One of the interesting features of Propp’s extensive study of Exodus is an appendix in which he addresses challenges to the source hypothesis. In fact, this is representative of a general feature of his analysis which is largely conducted as an attempt to identify the work of the traditional sources in the book while offering caveats in the marginalia. For example, he states “the number of sources appears to have been small… if we arrange the doublets in four columns and then read across, continuity and consistency replace contradictions and redundancy. These columns approximate the original sources.” However, in a note he qualifies this by noting “this is an oversanguine picture of source analysis. While it is true that we can eliminate almost all blatant contradictions, to demonstrate continuity within each reconstructed document is more difficult. Moreover, different readers have different senses of what constitutes unacceptable contradiction or duplication. I, personally, am untroubled by small inconsistencies, while German scholars as a class demand maximal efficiency and consistency from the pristine documents” (Propp 1999, 48). A particularly notable feature of this appendix is a kind of conversation he has with an at-that-time recent work by David Carr on Genesis. As an introduction to this conversation, he makes the perspicacious point that “the Documentary Hypothesis, that the Torah consists of fragments stitched together, explains quite well why scripture at times contradicts itself and at times repeats itself. Putting the pieces back together, however, is a more problematic task. Were the source materials few or numerous?
In fact, I would go farther. In my opinion, Exodus 1:6-6:26 is *neither* best thought of, as traditional and neo-documentarians suppose, as three organic conclusions to the Genesis narrative nor, as many European scholars have recently suggested, two disconnected attempts to forge a connection between Genesis and Exodus. Holistically, all the efforts in Exodus 1:6-6:26 are in fact unified in the sense that they share a goal, and they probably owe their inclusion in biblical literature as well as their position at the beginning of the book of Exodus wholly to that fact. In short, several of the scholars mentioned above suggested a solution to the problems posed by the J and E attributions of the material in Exodus 3-4 which ignored the probably separate origins of various portions of this narrative. What I am suggesting is only a slightly larger step, treating the whole complex, Exodus 1:6-6:26, in this way, and recognizing its function as a complex. Like Exodus 3-4, Exodus 1:6-6:26 may have many origins. However, we should understand these texts first and foremost as a collection aimed at addressing the lacunae between Genesis and Exodus in various ways, or rather a collection of texts which address it, without much attention to their narrative incoherence. I would describe them as an “anthology”, in the sense that anthologies are thematic collections of diverse materials. Though this is quite speculative, the overall structure of the complex, in my opinion, adds to this impression.

Written by how many authors? The answers depend upon how we interpret *cross-references*. To one mindset, these demonstrate narrative continuity, proving that now discrete units once flowed together in lengthy documents. To another mind-set, they present an editor’s attempt to impose order upon and inject themes into chaotic raw materials. And to a third mind-set, seeming cross-references simply confirm that our documents relied upon common sources, whether oral or written. That is, when parallel, related documents were combined to form the Torah, the incidental and inevitable by-product was a web of allusions, certainly appreciated but not deliberately created by the editor. There is no doubt that we have all three types of cross-reference in the Torah; distinguishing among them, however, can be quite subjective” (Propp 2006, 725).
I mentioned, above, the peculiarity that Exodus 1:1-6 represents, as the sole recapitulation of the Genesis vision of the tribes between Genesis and the Chronicles genealogy. There is one other very nearly complete recapitulation in Exodus 6:14-26. In this latter text, a genealogy begins with the Genesis order of tribes, Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, before going considerably into depth with the genealogies of Moses and Aaron and then abruptly terminating without presenting any other tribes. Indeed, this genealogy seems self-evidently an addition to its context, given that, beyond its singularity, it is composed largely of quotations from all over the Bible. Taken in concert with Exod 1:1-6 however, what we have is a situation in which the two, and only two, explicit recapitulations of the Genesis vision in the Pentateuch, and indeed in the broader arc of narrative from Genesis-2 Kings altogether, perfectly frame exactly the narratives under discussion here, marking, perhaps, a kind of inclusio. Within this inclusio appear more or less all of the connections that there are between Exodus and the major narratives of Genesis. Thus, I imagine the whole of Exod 1-6, or rather Exod 1:7-6:13, was consciously created precisely to serve this purpose, and then framed in this way.

**The Construction of the Pentateuch III: The Oath Promise Texts**

Moving beyond this collection we discover that it is quite possible that all of the references to the patriarchs in the Pentateuch outside of Genesis and Exodus 1:6-6:26 are the product of a single editorial layer. This layer has been recognized before and is referred to as “the oath promise layer” because all of these references occur in the context

---

323 It is particularly worth noting (not surprisingly) that the correspondences within this text are largely with Genesis and Chronicles. Exodus 6:14-15 is a direct quote of Genesis 46:9-10 while Exodus 6:16-19 is nearly identical to 1 Chron 6:16-19. It may be reasonable to suppose that the Chronicles text drew upon the Exodus text rather than vice versa, but since I think these Genesis-like genealogies are the product of an author working near the time of the Chronicler, I suspect it is the other way around. Then, Exodus 6:20 seems to have some relationship to Numbers 26:59 and other parts are original here.
of a supposed repetition of promises made in Genesis.324 The idea that these holistically serve an essentially connective purpose has been suggested by Römer, as well as Sparks.325 Who created the layer and why, for those who believe the layer exists, remains an open question. Levin and Van Seters, for example, have (separately) proposed the Yahwist—a late author or editor in their estimations— as an editor of at least parts of the Pentateuch (C. Levin 2007, 228; Van Seters 1992; Van Seters 1994).326 Where I differ from Römer and Sparks is in how Deuteronomy-centric their discussions are. While I agree that the context for the insertion of these patriarchal cross-references is related to the combination of the Deuteronomistic source with other ultimately biblical material, I think we cannot ignore the facts that the oath promise represents nearly every reference to the patriarchs outside of Genesis and Exodus 1-6, and that it is not, in fact, limited to the book of Deuteronomy. Thus conceptually it may be better understood as a cohesive layer for the entire Pentateuch than between the Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy, since it certainly also provides most of the connections between Genesis and what follows.

This promise appears in Genesis 50:24; Exodus 6:8; 33:1; Num 32:11; Deut 1:8; 6:10, 9:5, 27; 30:20; and 34:4. Traditionally, these texts are supposed to derive from all

---

324 In the words of Römer, “for a reader coming from the book of Genesis, the discourse about the land sworn to the fathers easily evokes the promises of the land in the patriarchal narratives. And in the final form of Deuteronomy, the names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are found in some texts that deal with the land oath (1:8;6:10; 30:20, 34:4)” (Römer 2000, 128).

325 Römer notes, “this is the context in which the separation of Deuteronomy from the Deuteronomistic History and its attachment to the Pentateuch is probably situated, perhaps initially with the intention of reinforcing the deuteronomistic position somewhat…This… took on the task by inserting into Deuteronomy (and elsewhere) the names of the patriarchs” (Römer 2000, 137). As Sparks puts it, "I agree with several others that the patriarchal formulas…are likely to have been later additions that served to link the book of Genesis with Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History” (K. L. Sparks 1998, 226).

326 Levin additionally notes that “explicit cross-reference between the books of Genesis, on the one hand, and the books of Exodus to Deuteronomy, on the other” exist, and are “only late”, though he does not here offer a theorization of their origin (Levin 2007, 209, 211).
four sources, E (Gen 50:24, Exod 33:1), P (Exod 6:8), J (Num 32:11), and D (Deut 1:8, 6:10, 9:5, 30:20), which should draw our attention. Interestingly, the idea, specifically, that the Oath Promise is the quintessential connecting layer of the Pentateuch, has even been proposed quite recently, in a book-length study, and in almost the same way I am proposing it, by Joel Baden. However, our conclusions are nearly opposite. Where I see the Oath Promise as a late, somewhat superficial redactional layer, Baden suggests that it is “the basic theological underpinning for the entire Pentateuchal narrative” (Baden 2013, 13). As he puts it, “every story [in the Pentateuch] is read through that lens, every episode is freighted with the theological import of the promise” (Baden 2013, 13). How is it that we have come to such different conclusions?

In short, we are different in how we approach the fact that, as many scholars have noted, there are significant differences between the contradictory variety of oath promises in Genesis, and the more or less univocal nature of extra-Genesis promises (with the sole exception of Genesis 50:24, which we will discuss in a moment). There are many elements, including the expulsion of peoples in Exodus 23:23, 28 and Deut 7:1, which appear in post-Genesis promise texts without an apparent Genesis antecedent (Römer 2000, 128–130). Indeed, as Baden acknowledges, the major difficulty with suggesting that the Oath Promise is derived from Genesis is that the “promise” in Genesis is actually

---

327 “Genesis may feature Abraham and Jacob, and Exodus-Deuteronomy may feature Moses, but only the promise is constant throughout” (Baden 2013, 21). This note, of course, approximates the argument here.

328 As Römer has pointed out, Deuteronomy and Exodus’ concept of the land “flowing with milk and honey” is also an expression never found in Genesis. As he puts it, “this description of the land is frequent in Deuteronomy and moreover every occurrence...is connected to the fathers. Of course, this expression never appears in the patriarchal traditions; it is typical rather of the Exodus tradition” (Römer 2000, 128).
promises, and these are of very different kinds, offered in a variety of ways. The very act of considering these one promise involves an intervention. As Baden puts it “repetition, in the abstract, can serve to reinforce the promise, as it frequently does. The type of repetition we find in Genesis, however, does precisely the opposite, complicating and redefining at each turn.” This multiplicity and multivocality in Genesis compared to the uniformity of the oath promises outside of Genesis suggests that the non-Genesis oath promises were composed at the same time and by the same author. That is, it would seem quite unusual if all of the traditional documentary sources saw the contradictory multivocality of Genesis’ promises in exactly the same way and quite usual, on the other hand, if only one hand were involved.

The following chart encapsulates every reference to the patriarchs, singly or collectively, in the post-Genesis Pentateuch:

---

329 “While the promise serves to unite the disparate episodes of the text and to shape them into a theological unity, the way in which the promise is expressed throughout the Pentateuch, and particularly in Genesis, creates some narrative confusion. In Genesis 12:1-3 Abraham is given the initial promise, in a somewhat abstracted form; the full and explicit promise of progeny and land is given in Gen 13:14-17. How is it, then, that almost immediately thereafter Abraham can ask God, ‘What will you give me?’…The same question may be asked of Genesis 17, which again repeats the terms of the promise in full. Here there is further complication of the brit that God makes with Abraham—since God has just made a covenant with Abraham in Genesis 15, why must he make another here?…And if the promise of progeny is linked to a change in Abraham’s name (17:4-5), why should this change happen only now, rather than when the promise of progeny was first given?…The repetition of the promise in Genesis 22—now for the fourth time—adds yet another layer of difficulty, as it seems to suggest that the promise, previously unconditional, was in fact subject to testing” (Baden 2013, 22).

330 As he further notes, “a [post-Genesis] reference to the promise can be a reference only to the baseline abstracted form of the promise, even though each promise text has a particular verbal manifestation”. Jacob, for example, “receives the promise on three separate occasions, and again each time it’s presented as if it were the first” (Baden 2013, 23–24).
Abraham | Isaac | Jacob
--- | --- | ---
Exod. 2:24 | Exod. 2:24 | Exod. 1:1, 5
3:6, 15, 16 | 3:6, 15-16 | 3:6, 15, 16
4:5 | 4:5 | 4:5
6:3, 8 | 6:3, 8 | 6:3, 8
32:13 | 32:13 | 32:13
33:1 | 33:1 | 33:1
Lev 26:42 | Lev 26:42 | Lev 26:42
Num 1:20 | Num 23:7, 10, 21, 23
24:5, 17, 19,
32:11 | 32:11 | 32:11
Deut 1:8 | Deut 1:8 | Deut 1:8
6:10 | 6:10 | 6:10
9:5, 27 | 9:5, 27 | 9:5, 27
29:12 | 29:12 | 29:13
30:20 | 30:20 | 30:20
32:9, 15 | 33:4, 10
34:4 | 34:4 | 34:4

What evidence is there that this is a late and superficial, rather than early and intrinsic layer or even not a layer at all? For one thing here is an interesting, seldom noted fact: although reference to the patriarchs as a collective—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob—is more or less de rigueur in the Pentateuch (indeed, in Genesis-Joshua), the opposite is the case in the rest of biblical literature. That is, in nearly every case outside of the Pentateuch, and certainly from the end of the books of Kings onwards, the three appear together only in Psalm 105:9-10 and Jeremiah 33:26. Meanwhile, Abraham appears alone in Neh 9:7, Isaiah 51:2, 63:16, and Ez 33:24, and with Jacob but not Isaac in Psalm 47 (47:5 and 47:10), Isaiah 29:22, 41:8, and Micah 7:20. Isaac appears alone in Amos

[331] Or, rather, though this is also the case in the DH, there are only three references to the collective patriarchs there, in Joshua 24:2-3; 1 Kings 18:36; 2 Kings 13:23. As I will attempt to demonstrate, these are probably late additions, but either way suggesting that collective references are de rigueur in the Pentateuch and in the DH gives a false impression of the (non-) centrality of these narratives to the DH.
7:9, 16. Jacob appears countless times, by himself, in the Psalms and in the prophetic collections. Thus, it is reasonable to suppose that the collective treatment of the patriarchs is itself a pentateuchal innovation, which certainly leads one to wonder about the time horizon of its development.\footnote{And though this evolution, this collective treatment, is quite difficult to date, the fact that there is no evidence of it outside of the Pentateuch in dateable contexts—to the extent that prophetic texts are dateable—suggests it might be very late indeed. This has also been suggested in, for example, Sparks 1998, 325-327. I do not agree with every aspect of this discussion—for example, I think the Melchizedek episode probably demonstrates that Abraham’s history is longer than Sparks, who dates him to the 6th century B.C.E., supposes, but there are many fine points here. Of course, the idea is to a certain degree present in Genesis. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob do not appear in the form in which they appear elsewhere in Genesis except in Gen 50:24, which will be discussed in this chapter in just a moment. However, it is naturally the case that Genesis largely considers the patriarchal narratives to have been already connected to each other. Particularly notable verses include Gen 31:53, in which Jacob calls upon the God of Abraham, interestingly upon the god of Nahor, and the “חכם” of his father Isaac.}

Baden calls the abstracted form of the promise shared by these (largely) post-Genesis Oath Promise texts, the “flat” promise, and here we might use this vocabulary to suggest that the “flat” patriarchs are themselves introduced into biblical literature largely through these texts, without which we might not consider them grouped in this way (Baden 2013, 24). Indeed, the flat\textit{ness} of these promise texts, their apparently unified presentation, is, in my opinion, the major reason to consider this a layer rather than the product of multiple sources. Baden suggests that “canonically, there are not multiple promises, but only one promise. The literary presentation of the promise does not affect its basic substance. Regardless of how it is expressed, every promise is fundamentally of progeny and land” (Baden 2013, 24). However, there is no evidence that the authors of
Genesis considered their variously worded promises to be unified in this way, and hard to understand why, if so, they never simply say so.\footnote{As Baden himself puts it, “the promise texts [of Genesis] seem to undermine each other narratively at the same time that any interpretive significance that might be attached to their individual forms of expression becomes flattened by the need to apply the promise across the whole text” (Baden 2013, 25).}

Thus, there is a certain sense in which the author of the Oath Promise texts may actually be performing a similar activity to Baden himself. Here we have someone or some group who also arrived at the idea that these promises could be flattened. Whether in the work of an ancient editor or modern day scholar, this is exegesis.\footnote{Again, the issue I take with Baden’s approach is his dependence on attributing the promise texts throughout the Pentateuch to different documentary authors, rather than the same authors. As Baden notes, even in classical documentary scholarship it was common to suggest that the oath promise texts were often the work of a “Deuteronomic” author however he argues that “basic to almost every variation of the documentary theory is the recognition that the J and E documents preceded that of D; moreover, that D was in fact dependent on the J and E documents. Given this, it seems entirely backward to assume that, when there is an affinity between a passage in J/E context and a passage in D, the dependence should run chronologically in reverse. Moreover, if we recognize that the author of D has reworked and at times considerably amplified the content of the older sources, why should it be assumed that he could not just as easily have reworked and, to be sure, amplified the linguistic and stylistic formulations of his predecessors?” (Baden 2013, 34). This makes Baden’s argument similar to Römer’s, except that he imagines a Deuteronomistic editor only lightly re-working Elohistic and Yahwistic promises. In my opinion, the creation of the oath promise layer at one time and by one author makes much more sense than imagining a complex tradition history for its iterations outside of Genesis.} Just as the traditional explanation of Exodus 1:6-6:26 demands our subscription to the idea that all three tetratuechal sources would choose, independently, to draw the connection between Genesis and Exodus in essentially the same way, the derivation of the oath promise texts from all four sources demands that we believe that all four understand the confusing array of promises in Genesis in exactly the same way. It seems more reasonable to suggest that a singular understanding of the variety in Genesis is the product of a singular redactor.

This possibility is heightened by the nature of the only reference to the flat promise in Genesis, Genesis 50:24. In short, this verse, the third to last of the book of Genesis, is likely to be part of a Pentateuchal (and even probably Hexateuchal)

---
connective layer for a variety of reasons. Most notably, it leads immediately into the well-known narrative of Joseph’s bones in Gen 50:25-26. This narrative continues in Exodus 13:19, but it concludes in Joshua 24:32, one of the few biblical narratives which clearly depend upon Joshua. Just like Exodus 1:1-6—which, of course, occurs immediately after Gen 50:25-26—this narrative serves a primarily connective purpose, so it is not surprising to find foregrounding of the Oath Promise texts here, as nowhere else in Genesis. In my opinion, the redaction which produced the oath promise layer occurred around the time the Pentateuch was shaped, or nearly shaped, and it was part of an effort to link Deuteronomy to the Pentateuch, having divorced it from the DH. As I have mentioned, I believe this to have occurred in late Persian period, for reasons which will become clear. At the same time, what this layer does not include, that is the tribal narrative, leaves the door open for the original disconnect between patriarchal and tribal narratives which will be the subject of a later section.

Between the “poetics anthology” and the Oath Promise texts, every reference to the collective patriarchs in the Pentateuch—if not quite all the references to Jacob-- is accounted for, except for Leviticus 26:42, which seems very likely to be a late exilic or Persian period verse in that it emerges very clearly as an updating of the message of

---

335 It is part, for example, of a series of texts Blum identifies as a “post-Priestly layer” associated with Joshua 24 (Blum, Erhard 1990, 363–365)

336 As Baden puts it, “the transition from the story of the patriarchs to that of the Exodus was marked by Joseph’s reference to the promise in his deathbed speech to his brothers” (Baden 2013, 27).

337 However, this layer clearly required some knowledge of the narratives of Genesis. It is hard to know exactly how to solve this puzzle since, in my opinion, Deuteronomy was largely composed well before Genesis was. But, of course, the composition of Deuteronomy and its combination with the Pentateuch are two separate events, and perhaps we can achieve some clarity here in the subsequent discussion.
doom in the rest of the chapter to one of hope.\footnote{For this reason Friedman, for example, has marked it as the work of a redactor (Friedman 2003, 236).} We can see all of the arguments above depicted visually below:
If we accept the premise that the patriarchs did not have a place in the original accounts of Moses and the exodus which encompass Exodus-Deuteronomy, we are left in an interesting position. We can add as a kind of evocative afterthought that given the (brief) discussion above about the fairly complete absence of tribal narratives in Exodus and Deuteronomy, we can begin to consider the ramifications of the possibility that the original Moses narratives did not share this aspect of Genesis’ vision as well. But for the moment, we should conclude by asking what, if Moses’ history did not begin with the patriarchs, is its imagination of Israel’s prehistory?³³⁹ There’s a very real sense here in

³³⁹ “If the presence of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is due to a postdeuteronomistic redaction (in my opinion the final redaction of the Pentateuch), does this mean that the Deuteronomistic school was unaware of any
which the question may not require an answer. According to the Mosaic histories, Israel, qua Israel, seems to have begun in Egypt. And how, according to the text itself, did this Israel imagine itself? On the one hand, as de Pury notes, “even those who claim that the Deuteronomist, in fact, did not even know of a Jacob story must reckon with Deut 26:5-9, My father was an Aramean…he went down to Egypt” (de Pury 2006, 55). On the other hand, as Römer points out, “if this text is meant to allude to Jacob, evoking such an Aramean ancestor corresponds rather badly with the Jacob cycle in Genesis or his descent into Egypt in royal chariots (Gen 49:19ff)” (Römer 2000, 131). Indeed, it is at least possible that this text doesn’t refer to Jacob at all, since an Aramean ancestor need not automatically be assumed to be one of the patriarchs. But it doesn’t really matter.

---

340 As de Pury puts it, more broadly, “for the Deuteronomy/Deuteronomistic tradition, the history of Israel…indeed begins in Egypt” (de Pury 2006, 56).

341 de Pury here suggests that the Deuteronomists were well aware of the Jacob narrative, but actually actively repudiated it by refusing to mention it. As he puts it, referring to his student Römer’s work on the “fathers” of Deuteronomy—“initially, Römer believed that this could and would prove that there existed no pre-exilic Jacob story at all…But when I asked him whether the Deuteronomists’ apparent absence of knowledge could not be decoded as a very obvious refusal of knowledge, Römer agreed that that possibility, still remote in his eyes, could not be completely ruled out. There were several signs, as I saw it, that pointed to the conclusion that the Deuteronomists—at least those who were behind Deuteronomy, Joshua, and 1-2 Kings—not only had very well known the Jacob tradition, but that they had vehemently rejected it, to the point of excluding and silencing it absolutely. There is only one passage in which the Deuteronomist obviously refers back to Jacob: Deut 26:5-9…It is rather the exact expression of this “not-wanting-to-know” that characterizes the Deuteronomists’ attitude toward Jacob: (1) this father is not mentioned by name, probably because his name is detestable; (2) this father is not an Israelite but an Aramean, in other words, a foreigner. This is not because the bearers of that tradition did not know of the existence of a Jacob ancestry but because for them Israel’s real ‘ancestor’ is not the father (Jacob) but the prophet (Moses). The story of mere literary persona does not provoke such a negative and even violent reaction unless it is perceived as a danger…Could it not be…that the Jacob cycle represented in fact, not just a saga relating the origins of some proto-Israelite group, as I had suggested in my thesis, but an autonomous legend of Israel’s origins, that is, a legend that was meant to stand for itself as a founding story of Israel and that required neither prehistory (Abraham) nor a post history (Moses and the exodus)?” (de Pury 2006, 55–56). This is, of course, possible, and as I have described here and will describe further in the final chapter, I think it is very likely that the Jacob story, indeed perhaps the entire patriarchal narrative, did originally stand in contrast to the exodus narrative as an explanation of Judah’s Pan-Israelite narrative. However, at the very least it must be conceded that the same evidence that de Pury calls upon to show the Deuteronomist’s absolute antipathy serves just as well to indicate the school’s ignorance or disinterest. Nor need this mean that narratives about Jacob are very late, as these could have existed for a long time without being integrated with Deuteronomy.
Inasmuch as this verse imagines Israel to have been Aramean at the time of its arrival in Egypt, it seems likely that it also imagines the experience of Egypt to have created Israel from these Arameans.342

There is more to discuss on this score, and particularly more to say about the history of the tribal system as it relates to this picture, but before we do this, let us move on to a discussion of the third Panisraelite narrative in biblical literature, the Davidic histories, and their relationship to the second block, the Mosaic histories, which have not yet been sufficiently discussed.

**The Davidic Histories of Israel**

I use the term Davidic Histories to encompass both the histories of the king himself, in the books of Samuel, and the histories of his descendants (and their Israelite counterparts) in the books of Kings. These are distinct from each other but (of course) related, thus the plural. With respect to the books of Samuel, I have here largely followed the division of the material proposed by McCarter, who argues for an Ark Narrative, (1 Sam 4:1b-7:1), with possible additions in 1 Sam 2 and 2 Sam 6, the History of David’s Rise or Apology of David (1 Sam 16:14-2 Sam 5:10), and the Court History or Succession Narrative of David (2 Sam 9-1 Kings 2) (McCarter Jr. 1980; McCarter Jr. 1984; McCarter Jr. 2000). 1 Sam 1-3 and 7:2 through at least 1 Sam 15 is sometimes 

---

342 I wholeheartedly agree with de Pury’s description of the Jacob narrative as originally an “autonomous legend of Israel’s origins…a legend that was meant to stand for itself as a founding story of Israel and that required neither prehistory (Abraham) nor a post-history (Moses and the exodus)” (de Pury 2006, 56). It seems therefore likely to be the case, as de Pury also implies, that this is true of the exodus narratives as well.
additionally considered to be composed of a number of independent traditions. The histories of David form an important Panisraelite narrative for the obvious reason that they provide biblical literature with the concept of the United Monarchy. However, it is precisely this that has led me to the conclusion that the Davidic histories began in isolation from other biblical narratives, for the narrative itself fails to explicitly describe the United Monarchy’s pre-history, or indeed to indicate in any considerable way what these narratives imagined that pre-history to look like. Where Israel, as a holistic group, came from prior to David’s career is not at all clear here.

343 On the likelihood that we also have originally independent traditions about Saul in these books, see White 2000; White 2006. The narratives of Samuel himself, as Van Seters notes, was probably originally viewed, along with those of Eli, as a continuation of the Judges narratives (Van Seters 2000, 228–229). In my own opinion, there was once an extensive, independent Samuel Cycle which took Samuel and Eli as its protagonists. There is a beautifully complete narrative arc in 1 Samuel 1-7, an amount of material that is not only larger than that devoted to any one Judge, but which has no real relevance to either Saul or David, thus cannot be said to serve as an introduction to these narratives. Here, the boy Samuel is taken in by Eli as a kind of apology for his thoughtlessness towards Samuel’s mother Hannah, where his uprightness is contrasted with the wickedness of Eli’s biological children and his spiritual vision is highlighted by Eli’s physical blindness (1 Sam 3:2). Eventually the iniquity of Eli’s sons results in a catastrophic defeat by the Philistines, the loss of the ark, and Eli’s own death as well as those of his sons, all of which is redressed, in 1 Sam 6-7, by Samuel and by YHWH. The ark is removed from Philistia because of the curses it has brought upon the Philistines, the Philistines are defeated by Samuel, calling upon YHWH’s wrath, and a righteous leader to replace Eli is revealed. The original independence of this material is clearly demonstrated by the statements in 1 Samuel 7 that “the Philistines were subdued and no more came within the borders of Israel, and the hand of YHWH was against them all the days of Samuel” (1 Sam 7:13) and “Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life” (1 Sam 7:15). None of these statements holds true once this narrative is joined to those of Saul and David, who spend much of their careers fighting the Philistines, and whose advents require, and receive, Samuel’s retirement.

344 And probably the most divisive in current scholarship, as surveyed in the previous chapter. See for example Mazar 2010; Finkelstein 2010.

345 On the historicity of the biblical account of David’s career, as is presumably clear by now, I lean towards the stance which suggests his historical existence as a dynasty founder, but a much more circumscribed career as a statesman. I think the details in this section do indicate that many of the traditions about David originated in an earlier time than most biblical literature; they seem, in certain ways, the least aware of other biblical texts of anything in the Bible. However, too often I think scholars conflate antiquity with accuracy. We can consider in this light such supposedly historical details as the central place of the city of Gath in these narratives which, as many scholars have noted, likely dates from an early period inasmuch as Gath was destroyed at the end of the 9th century B.C.E. (Blum 2010, 64; Finkelstein andSilberman 2006b, 38–39; Halpern 2001, 69). However, this is in fact identical to the datum that Nilsson used to conclude that aspects of the Iliad dated back to the Mycenaean period, that is, that the major centers of Greek culture in the Iliad were the major centers of an earlier age (Nilsson 1927). Of course, this does not even mean that the Trojan War truly occurred, let alone that the characters involved—Achilles and
The problem this represents is that the assumption that the account of David’s monarchy consistently imagines his Israel as the political expression of a pre-existing quantity, rather than an invention of it, is not on firm ground. At first glance, this might seem surprising, and a contrary position is indeed implicit in certain places in the

Agamemnon, Hector and Priam—existed, and let alone that their lives substantially follow the narrative the *Iliad* laid out for them. Thus, traditions about David are likely old, as is shown, in my opinion, in the epigraphic material. But this, unfortunately for scholars, says far less about their accuracy than is sometimes imagined. One of the major arguments in favor of the historicity of David’s narrative is McCarter’s analogy with Hittite “apology” texts, that is, accounts written by or for Hittite kings to explain away their various failings, and particularly the “apology of Hattushilish III”. As he puts it, “Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. has called attention to a special category of Hittite historiographical literature which…he calls ‘apology’. Of the surviving examples of Hittite apology, one—the so-called apology of Hattushilish III, the thirteenth-century king—is especially instructive for the study of the history of David’s rise” (McCarter Jr. 2000, 266; Hoffner, Jr. 1975). Since these texts are generally written either in the lifetime of the king or shortly thereafter, and since the HDR shares stylistic similarities with the apology of Hattushilish, McCarter and other scholars have suggested that the History of David’s Rise is as well. As McCarter notes, “in view of the fact that a leading concern is the legitimation by appeal to the divine will of a king whose right of accession might be question, we should probably think of a period when such a king was on the throne…since all of David’s successors in Judah were his descendants, it is obvious that the only provenience that can meet both requirements is Davidic Jerusalem, and we must consider the possibility that the history of David’s rise in its earliest formulation dates to the reign of David himself” (McCarter Jr. 2000, 266–267). However, as Na’aman notes, all Near Eastern apologies are “royal inscriptions, whose addressee is first and foremost the gods before whom the king reported his deeds” (Na’aman and Finkelstein 1994, 221). As Dietrich and Naumann put it, referring specifically to McCarter’s enthusiastic championing of the connection between Hattusili’s effort and David’s, “McCarter is so overcome by the analogy that he overlooks some minor differences: how little the stories of Saul and David are painted in black and white; how very precisely in critical passages (2 Samuel 3–4!) God remains in the background; and especially how the Hittite apology exhibits a clear, consistent, stereotypical style. It is formulated in the first-person style of royal self-presentations, whereas the supposed Israelite version is a narrative composition full of open questions and hidden traps” (Dietrich and Naumann 2000, 303). In my opinion, the major challenge to the historicity of this history is that it depends on the notion that this kind of writing would only be imaginable in the near term of David’s reign. Not only is it quite clear that arguments about the true activity of important figures continue throughout history—we can consider the development of arguments in Islamic circles about the career of Muhammad (for a simple introduction, see Brown 2011, 64–127)—it is quite clear in the HDR itself that we have multiple conflicting accounts. David becomes Saul’s harper in 1 Sam 16, but meets Saul for the first time in 1 Sam 17, before his battle with Goliath. Saul throws a spear at David, in his hall, in 1 Sam 18, again in 1 Sam 19, and at Jonathan in 1 Sam 20. Saul goes to Achish of Gath in 1 Sam 21 and in 1 Sam 27. In the first instance, the Philistines recite the famous song about David and Saul to Achish, causing David to become afraid for his life, and to act insane to escape. In the second, he faithfully serves Achish, and is willing even to assault Israel which is the point in this version where the Philistines grow angry with him, recite the famous song, and force Achish to put him aside. Thus, multiple actors clearly were interested in David, and thus multiple responses throughout history are quite imaginable. For a recent, extensive treatment which argues for an early date and for the historical accuracy of much Davidic material see Halpern 2001.

346 As Wright notes, in the context of his division of biblical literature into a “People’s” history and a “Monarchic” history, “the People’s History goes further than the Monarchic History, positing not a political unity between two states but a national unity of the people of Israel” (Wright 2014, 141). What I am suggesting here is that the books of Samuel give very little reason to believe that already in these texts a “national” unity is imagined to pre-exist the political union.
narrative. Yet, if the account of David’s reign does imagine a pre-existing tribal Israel, how does it imagine Israel to have been constituted? What are the contours of pre-Davidic Israel in the books of Samuel, what was the mechanism of its social organization? Did David’s Israel come out of Egypt with Moses? Did it establish a right to Canaan with the patriarchs? Did it conquer with Joshua? Was it constituted by tribes?

We can start by asking exactly what these narratives have to say about the tribes, and what is surprising is that the only tribe with a significant role in the books of Samuel is the tribe of Benjamin, references to which do not always appear in ways consistent with common understandings of the biblical tribal picture. Nearly every other use of a

347 Truly Panisraelite claims are present in episodes seemingly organic to the history, including Abner’s declaration to Ishbaal that he would bring all of Israel from Dan to Beer-Sheba over to David (2 Sam 3:10) and Hushai’s counsel to Absalom to gather to himself all Israel, from Dan to Beersheba (2 Sam 17:11). The phrase “all Israel” appears repeatedly in the books of Samuel, though it is not always clear what it means. However, this may not be a consistent idea across the narrative. Given how often it seems that Saul imagines his followers to be entirely Benjaminites (see note 346) it is at least possible that the original narrative of David and Saul was a narrative encompassing, for the most part, only Judah and Benjamin. This would explain how it could be that David’s Israel has no clear antecedent but also no narrative of being formed by him, and is relatively plausible given that Judah and Benjamin seem to have been the two important entities operating in Jerusalem after the fall of Israel (see for example Joshua 18:28 and 1 Chron 8). A similar idea has been put forth by Wright, for example, that “the accounts of Saul and David must have been originally separate histories—the one with Benjaminite Saul as king of Israel (HSR) and the other with David as king of Judah (HDR)” (Wright 2014, 140). I am merely drawing attention to an additional fact of the narrative which is how often in contexts where one might expect Saul to call upon his followers from various regions he seems to call only upon Benjaminites, a phenomenon which will be discussed in greater detail shortly. What it seems reasonable to say, ultimately, is that if it is indeed the case that the very idea of Panisraeliteism developed after the fall of Israel, than it is at this time that well-known Davidic narratives were reworked or even composed to express its presence in the kingdom of David. This was built on an earlier framework without these elements, without a well-articulated tribal system, without even a narrative of exodus or of patriarchal settlement. The whole redaction history of the narrative is probably unrecoverable, but in basic outline this seems a reasonable explanation for the curious mélange of insistence upon Panisraeliteism and absence of explanation for its origin which so marks this text.

348 So, for example, the consistent use of “Benjaminites” to refer collectively to Saul’s followers, the use of the phrase “House of Benjamin” in 2 Sam 3:19, and Shimei son of Gera, the Benjaminite, referring to himself as of the “house of Joseph”. While this may be considered an unproblematic reference to the north rather than the south, the collectivizing of the north prior to the collapse of the United Monarchy is, in fact, itself problematic for traditional understandings of this material. That is, one would expect the identification of the whole north with Joseph, rather than just Ephraim and Manasseh, to be a product of the period after Judah and Israel had separated, especially if we are imagining that David did not originate the north-south connection.
name which in other circumstances might be considered a reference to a tribe here appears instead as a reference to a geographical region, without making it clear that the geographical region owes its name to a tribal entity. Many of the tribes are not mentioned either with Israelite geography or otherwise, including Reuben, Simeon, Issachar, Zebulun, Naphtali, Asher, Manasseh. I have already presented my reasons for being skeptical of the historicity of the tribal system, but we can nevertheless spare a moment to notice how striking this is. It is very widely believed that the HDR and the Court History were originally independent compositions. If they have a different concept of what tribes there are and what the tribal names refer to (apparently, again, often geographical regions) why should we not take this at face value?

349 The only possible references to a tribe between the beginning of the narrative of David in 1 Sam 16 and the death of Saul in 1 Sam 31 is to Benjamin, once, in the pericope in which Saul has the priests of Nob killed (1 Sam 22:6-19), in which Saul also refers to all of his servants, collectively, as Benjaminites (1 Sam 22:7). Then, in the rest of the HDR, we see the names of two and possibly three tribes mentioned in the description of Ishbaal’s kingdom (2 Sam 2:8-11), not as tribes but as geographic entities; we see Saul’s followers again referred to collectively, as Benjaminites, when they engage in single combat with “the servants of David” (not “Judahites), at the pool of Gibeon in 2 Sam 2:15; and we see Saul’s followers again referred to collectively as Benjaminites when Abner contemplates treachery and goes to David to tell him what the “house” of Benjamin is ready to do (2 Sam 3:19). In the court history, the sole figures mentioned as belonging to tribes are Benjaminites, Shimei son of Gera and Sheba son of Bichri, and two of David’s “30” in 2 Sam 23. There is also the curious fact that when Shimei son of Gera, the Benjaminite, comes down to beg David’s forgiveness on his return to his capital he refers to himself as “the first of the house of Joseph” to come down to greet him (2 Sam 19:20), and Benjamin is referred to as the “house” of Benjamin in 2 Sam 2:19 (יִשְׂרָעֵל). All the references to Ephraim in 1 Samuel are references to the “hill country of Ephraim”, except in 2 Samuel 2 where we see it as part of Ishbaal’s kingdom; as a region Absalom is near to (2 Sam 13), as the “forest of Ephraim” (2 Sam 18), and in another reference to the hill country (2 Sam 20). Dan appears in the stereotyped expression “from Dan to Beersheba” in 2 Sam 17 and 24, as well as a region in 2 Sam 24. Gad appears in the phrase “the land of Gad and Gilead” 1 Sam 13:7, and the “valley of Gad” in 2 Sam 24:5.

350 The traditional explanation for this is that the tribes actually lost importance because of David. So, for example, Wilson has argued for the essentially historical nature of the Bible’s tribal lists, ignoring the fact that they are not, in fact, consistent, by suggesting that the absence of political functionality for the tribes during the monarchy froze them in pre-Davidic form (Wilson 1977, 194). This is based on an assumption of absolutely historicity of the same pre-monarchical amphictyonic referenced above. Without that, we require another explanation which is probably not forthcoming.
What other avenues besides a pre-monarchical tribal organization can we imagine for the pre-Davidic invention of Israel? Just as it hardly appears to be a tribal Israel, David’s Israel is also apparently not patriarchal Israel, and it does not seem to be Moses’ Israel either: in the whole of the History of David’s Rise, as traditionally defined, there are no cross-references to the patriarchs or to Moses. In the Court History, the picture doesn’t change very much: Jacob appears only in the introduction to David’s “final words” in 2 Sam 23:1, while Moses appears for the first and only time in this complex of material in the introduction to the second “last words of David”, in 1 Kings 2:3. The exodus itself appears in only one context, probably Deuteronomistic rather than original, when Nathan instructs David not to build the temple in 2 Sam 7:6. Why should we think these narratives take either Moses, the exodus, or the patriarchs as their pre-history if they themselves never make this clear and if their details conflict with those of these supposedly pre-figuring accounts? Could David’s Israelites have conquered Israel with Joshua? Perhaps. But, both Joshua and Judges include the conquest of Jerusalem, while the conquest of Jerusalem by David is one of the central features of the second book of Samuel. The books of Samuel also clearly imagine Saul to be the first king of Israel,

---

351 As Grosby points out, the idea that David’s kingdom is a natural evolution of a pre-existing quantity truly depends upon the idea promulgated by Alt and others “that ancient Israel as a nation should be understood as the union of Israelite tribes before the founding of the united monarchy of David and Solomon” (Grosby 2009; Alt 1930; Alt 1925).

352 These observations hold true for the entirety of the books of Samuel after David’s appearance in 1 Sam 16. The case is less clear in 1 Sam 1-16, but not so much less clear. Moses and Jacob do appear in Samuel’s retirement speech in 1 Sam 12, but are absent elsewhere, while Abraham and Isaac remain totally absent. However, a major distinction between the pre-Davidic and Davidic material in the books of Samuel is that here in 1 Sam 1-16 there are a number of references to the Exodus including in the speech of a man of god to Eli in 1 Sam 2:27, in two passages dealing with YHWH’s disappointment in Israel for choosing kings (1 Sam 8:8, 10:18), and in 1 Sam 15, where Saul launches an expedition against Amalek for what they did to Israel during the exodus (1 Sam 15:2) and arrests it to allow the Kenites to escape for their kindness to the Israelites during those wanderings (1 Sam 15:6). Few scholars believe this material to have an original connection to the subsequent narratives of David—although see Frolov 2002, for example—but it is worth considering.
while in Judges 9, Abimelech has that role.\footnote{And of course the picture painted \textit{in} Judges is hardly conducive to an all-Israel picture.} What, if anything, can we say about the relations between the HDR’s Israel, or the Court History’s Israel, and other biblical narratives?

Indeed, what can we say about the relationship between David’s kingdom and its immediate precursor? That is, it is quite clear that Saul’s Israel is much smaller than David’s is supposed to have been.\footnote{As Finkelstein notes “the geography of the Saulide entity in the biblical narrative is detailed and accurate…the text describes a territorial entity centered around the plateau to the north of Jerusalem rather than in the traditional centers (such as Shechem and Samaria)” (Finkelstein 2006, 172). On the other hand, “the biblical text is not clear on the extent of the territory ruled by Saul” but notes that “the places that play a dominant role in the Saul stories (Ramah, Mizpah, Geba, Michmash, and Gibeon) are all located in the highlands immediately north of Jerusalem” (Finkelstein 2006, 178). However, as he additionally notes, very few scholars seem to imagine Saul’s Israel to have encompassed the whole: “minimalists consider the extent of the kingdom of Saul to be Benjamin, Ephraim, and the Jabbok area (J. M. Miller and Hayes 1986, 141; Ahlström 1993, 440), and maximalists add the Gilead and northern Samaria as far as the Jezreel Valley (Na’aman 1990; Edelman 1992, 996; Knauf 2001) (Finkelstein 2006, 179). The explicit description of Ishbaal’s kingdom in 2 Sam 2:8-9 has often been considered a source for the extent of Saul’s kingdom as well (Kochavi 1989; Aharoni 1979, 288–289). This is apparently only over (אל) the Gilead, the Ashurites, and the Jezreel and over (על) Ephraim and Benjamin. Although the verse adds “and over all Israel” (עלייון ישוער כל ישראל), I think we can safely assume that this portion of the verse is an addition as it makes the rest of the verse unnecessary. Mayes also calls attention to another data point, Samuel’s annual circuit as judge of “Israel”, between Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah, “all lying within the territory of the mid-Palestinian tribes” (Mayes 1973, 164).} Prior to that we have a perhaps even smaller entity, conceptualized through Samuel’s annual “cycle” between Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah. If a coherent, “full” Israel pre-existed David, what did it look like? Specifically, what can we imagine was the situation in this greater Israel during the leadership of Samuel, during Saul’s reign? Say that there were 12 tribes of Israel in the pre-monarchical period and Saul’s kingdom only encompassed a few of them. What were the rest doing until the rise of David, and why is this never presented as an issue in the account of Saul’s reign?\footnote{Although some scholars have argued that Saul’s kingdom did encompass all of Israel, it is worth mentioning that the sole place where Judah appears at all, as a tribe or a country, prior to the career of David (in Samuel) is in a text which strongly implies an already extant division between the two entities Saul’s army is described, in 1 Sam 11:8 as “three hundred thousand Israelites and thirty thousand men of Judah,” and, given that the apposition here is with Israel, this text does \textit{not} describe Judah as a tribe but a}
Rather than coming up with an explanation for what Israel was like outside of Saul’s borders, and how it maintained its “Israel-ness” while not being part of Saul’s Israelite kingdom, it seems considerably simpler and more likely to suppose that we are to take Saul’s Israel as, at that point, all of Israel. Since it seems as if the HDR and the Court History are not, in any case, based on extant pre-histories of David’s reign, there is little to militate against this suggestion.

All of this may indicate that the HDR imagines the stereotypical Israel as something that David has invented through his actions. Indeed, from a certain perspective, it is difficult to imagine otherwise. As Grosby puts it,

Alt, Noth and certainly Wellhausen recognized that a Gemeinbewusstsein, the awareness of a shared and bounded Sitte, Brauch and Recht, is a necessary precondition for the existence of any nation…[but] it is difficult to see how an image of a bounded trans-local land which was believed to >>belong<< to >>Israel<< of a national territory…could have existed among the territorially distinct northern Israelite and southern Judean tribes in the period before the United Monarchy…It is also difficult to see how an image of the >>people<< as we are interested in the term, that is, as >>all Israel<<, the descendants of Abraham-Isaac-Jacob, united in their worship of Yahweh and in their obedience to his law, could have existed before the united monarchy (Grosby 2009, 5).356

As much as this is the case when one, like Grosby, believes in the United Monarchy as a historical reality, how much more so if we reject it? How “Panisraelite” was the original narrative of David’s reign in any case? Such questions are probably beyond our current ability to answer them, but it is at least possible that the Panisraelite valence of these

---

356 Despite these arguments, Grosby actually accepts the historical accuracy of accounts of the United Monarchy. Thus, he imagines that David literally invented Israel, whereas I am here contending that the original account of David’s career imagined him to have done so.
narratives arrived with one of their more significant re-workings. One might certainly suspect the court of Hezekiah as a compositional locus for a “Panisraelite” David, and, of course, it is additionally likely that their appropriation as core texts of the Deuteronomistic History had an effect upon them, making the Deuteronomistic historian or historians complicit in eliding the visibility of what David’s histories do not share with what comes before or after.\textsuperscript{357}

\textbf{David’s Descendants: Panisraeliteism in the Deuteronomistic History}

So much for the first of the Davidic histories. Here we begin to address the matter of the Deuteronomistic History, and immediately we encounter another paradox.\textsuperscript{358} In short, it is both the case that the books of Samuel are quite nearly without reference to the important Deuteronomistic historical ideas and that they are now deeply entrenched within the sweep of the Deuteronomist’s story, both fairly uncontroversial suggestions. For this reason, as I mentioned in the introduction, it is hard to avoid the impression that the connection between David and Moses is an intrinsic aspect of the Deuteronomistic History: there is, in a real sense, no DH without it. However, the connection between these narratives is located in their juxtaposition, not in any significant attempt to

\textsuperscript{357} Although, as McCarter notes, “Deuteronomistic expansion and revision…are less conspicuous in Samuel than in Judges on the one hand or in Kings on the other and were not the major shaping forces of the book” (McCarter Jr. 2000, 263). He suggests that these books are largely shaped by a pre-Deuteronomistic history, a quite common opinion.

\textsuperscript{358} The book of Judges will not be discussed here. We will have occasion to discuss portions of it in the next chapter, particularly Judges 4-5. I think the deuteronomistic character of this book is fairly secure though, as Mobley notes, it presumably began as a series of heroic narratives that were largely disassociated from one another (Mobley 2005). The tables at the end of this chapter will demonstrate a certain interest in tribes throughout Judges, and many of the narratives are based on the notion of the tribes as a central aspect of Israelite social structure. However, the primary tribal texts in Judges are the unique Judges 5 pericope and Judges 1. As Van Seters notes, nearly all scholars recognize that Judges 1:1-2:5 is an intrusion in its present context, including a repetition of Joshua 24:28ff in Judges 2:6ff. Thus, it is often supposed that this text is more appropriately understood as related to, and perhaps in some sense a continuation of, the book of Joshua (Van Seters 2000, 220–222).
interweave them. Of course, the connection between David and Moses is not just implicit in the fact that the books of Samuel follow Joshua and Judges in the DH canon, but in the conceit of the resolution of the DH in the books of Kings, with the failure of David’s line. At the same time, however, this connection is lacking anything like explicit cross-references in the books of Samuel.360

Before we discuss the evidence for this however, a prefatory note seems justified. Kings has long had a central place in discussions of the DH because Cross’s formulation of the DH, involving two redactions, was largely evolved out of observations on the books of Kings (Cross 1973a, 278–288). The validity of drawing so many conclusions from such a small part of the whole—that such an extensive work as the DH exists to express the themes present in a handful of regnal summaries—has, I think, quite reasonably been questioned.361 In my opinion, though it is too far afield to go into an extensive discussion here, the books of Kings are essentially the product of three types of

359 Indeed, in Cross’ formulation of the DH, the election of the seed of David was one of the two themes (along with the sin of Jeroboam), of the DH’s first edition, (Dtr1). In this formulation, a second, exilic edition (Dtr2) was essentially centered on a theme of doom, negating the theme of eternal promise, but also contains certain passages offering hope (Cross 1973a, 274–287). This is an evolution of Noth’s single, exilic historian.

360 For arguments against the existence of the DH see Westermann 1994; Knauf 2000; Würtzwein 1994.

361 The awareness of other interests at work in the Deuteronomistic History has generally been a productive topic for a long time. As McKenzie notes, scholars such as Lohfink and Provan have indeed been in the business of raising “an important caveat about drawing conclusions for the entire DH based on the book of Kings”, an exercise he pursues as well (Lohfink 1981; Provan 1988; McKenzie 1991). Notable other efforts include Smend’s identification of a “Nomistic” editor, one who was preoccupied with obedience to the Torah of Moses (Smend 2000); the identification of a “prophetic” Deuteronomist by his student Walter Dietrich; a “conquest” Deuteronomist by Lohfink, and Römer’s suggestion of three redactions to a certain degree based on reinterpretations of the concept of cult centralization (Römer 2005, 30; Lohfink 1981, 42–43; Dietrich 1972). He points particularly to Deut 12, for evidence, and suggests that this chapter presents all three different arguments about centralization. In his opinion, Deut 12:13-18 shows a late seventh century vision of centralization, 12:8-12 an exilic reinterpretation thereof and finally in 12:2-7, a rejection of the “illegitimate” cults of the Persian period (Römer 2005, 56–64).
material, though this is not to say that they are the product of three redactions. These elements are woven together in various ways, probably at various times.

First, we have a narrative describing the downfall of Israel as a consequence of the sin of Jeroboam, one of the themes of Cross’s Dtr.\(^1\)\(^{362}\) In origin, this narrative was probably little more than a history of Israel, resolving in the destruction of Israel in 2 Kings 17. We can see this in a variety of ways, but particularly in the imbalance between material about Israel and about Judah in the books of Kings generally, right up until about 2 Kings 8:16.\(^2\)\(^{363}\) Second, we have a detailed account of the fall of the House of Ahab, which probably served as a site for the aggregation of various novella-like materials regarding Elijah and Elisha probably from several different sources, perhaps over a long period of time.\(^3\)\(^{364}\) Part of the reason that I imagine even the early Deuteronomistic edition

---

\(^{362}\) For an in-depth analysis of the Jeroboam’s Sin narrative, see Halpern and Vanderhooft 1991, 203–208. Of the 19 kings of Israel described in this book, only Elah, who reigns two years before being assassinated by Zimri, and Shallum, who reigned one month, do not commit the sin of, or walk in the ways, of Jeroboam. Zimri himself, who reigned all of seven days, somehow found the time. At the same time, not a single king of Judah commits this sin, and not because it is impossible for a Judahite king to commit Israelite sin: several walk, for example, in the sin of Ahab (Jehoram and Ahaziah of Judah, and, surprisingly, Manasseh).

\(^{363}\) That is, after the material dealing with Solomon, discussions of the Israelite kings, and only the Israelite kings, span 1 Kings 12:20-14:20, 15:25-2 Kings 8:16, with only brief descriptions of the reigns of Rehoboam (1 Kings 14:21-31), Abijam (1 Kings 15:1-8), Asa (1 Kings 15:9-24), and Jehoshaphat (1 Kings 22:41-50) interspersed throughout, representing a total of 42 verses in the midst of 19 chapters. Thus, it is only from 2 Kings 8:16-24, which introduces the reign of Jehoshaphat’s successor, Jehoram, that we see any kind of equity in the presentation of the two kingdoms, an equity which disappears quickly again in the lengthy account of Jēhū’s activity (2 Kings 9:1-2 Kings 10:36). When, after this, equity resumes, it only lasts (of course) until the destruction of the kingdom of Israel in 2 Kings 17.

\(^{364}\) The provenance of the Elijah-Elisha material specifically has consistently been a matter of debate. Are the stories pre-Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic? Were they added by a Deuteronomistic editor, or someone else? Are some of them from one source and others another? As Na’aman notes, citing many scholars (Šanda 1911; Eissfeldt 1965; Noth 1967; Mayes 1983; Campbell 1986): “for many years, the Elijah-Elisha stories were regarded by scholars as pre-Deuteronomistic narrative cycles that the Deuteronomist (Dtr) integrated into his historical composition”. This is a position Na’aman himself largely upholds, arguing that all the relatively well-known contradictions between these narratives and the rest of DH “are, in my opinion, the result of the work of the Dtr using his sources. On the one hand, he integrated into his work a series of prophetic stories and ‘battle reports’ with almost no intervention, except for the systematic insertion of doom prophecies and statements of fulfillment, or certain textual additions and expansions. On the other hand, he wrote his historical accounts on the basis of these narratives and other
already combined some portion of these two narratives is that they overlap at certain points. There appears to be two narratives of the death of Ahab, and possibly two narratives of the destruction of Ahab’s house by Jehu. Then, this “Ahab’s sin” narrative probably extends into the career of such prominent post-Israel kings as Hezekiah, Manasseh and Josiah, given that Manasseh himself is at first described as having committed the sin of Ahab. Perhaps all of this was already included in a pre-exilic redaction, either Josianic or Hezekian. Finally, there is a clear series of exilic edits sources that came down to him” (Na’amani 1997, 168-169). Meanwhile a number of scholars, starting as early as Steuernagel, have suggested that all or part of these narratives come from a later stage of editing (Steuernagel 1912; J. M. Miller 1966; Seebass 1982; Würthwein 1977; McKenzie 1991). As Otto notes, “the immediate spectrum of research reaches from the approach of S.L. McKenzie who states that the narratives 1 Kings 17-19; 20, 22.1-38; 2 Kings 1.2-17a; 3.4-8.15; 13.14-21 (+13.22-25) were inserted into the Deuteronomistic History as one group of prophetic, post-Deuteronomistic additions, to the complex solution of H.-J Stipp, which assumes multiple stages of growth of the original Deuteronomistic History but which does not lead to insights about the respective editorial intentions” (Otto 2003, 488–489; McKenzie 1991; Stipp 1986). According to Otto herself, the original DH did include the Elijah and Elisha narratives of Naboth’s vineyard, Ahaziah’s death, and the story of Jehu’s coup, followed by three more developments, the addition of the narratives of the Omride wars, the accounts in 1 Kings 17-18, added in early post-exilic times “to demonstrate the possibility of new life in community with God”, and finally, in post-Exilic times, the remaining Elisha stories were added (Otto 2003, 487).

365 It is relatively certain that a DH-like figure at one point edited this entire collection because despite the difference in sin narratives, the consistent presence of any sin narrative, and the overall judgment of nearly all the kings of Israel and Judah, including David, Solomon, and Rehoboam, speaks to an overarching unity. But there are various fracture lines throughout. While the early kings of Judah, besides David, mostly did evil (including Solomon, Rehoboam, and Abijam), the Judahite kings who apparently appear as part of the Jeroboam history are generally said to have done right (Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham), underscoring the possibility of a once separate Jeroboam narrative. Jehu may have appeared both in connection with the Ahab and Jeroboam narratives prior to their combination, which may be seen in the doubled ending of the house of Ahab. The ending which corresponds to the prophecies of Elijah belongs to and probably concludes the Ahab document (2 Kings 10:1-17), while that which involves Jehu wiping out Ba’al from Israel but not turning from the sin of Jeroboam and his golden calves, belongs to the Jehu narrative (2 Kings 10:18-30). The same may be true of Ahab himself. A clearly Judahite narrative—Ahab is not named—describes his death in battle in 1 Kings 22:1-38, while nevertheless the subscription to his narrative (1 Kings 22:40) is used in every other case to describe a peaceful death (Otto, 2001, 8:–12:497).

366 He is threatened with the “plumb-line” of Ahab—semantically coupled with “the string of Samaria”—for his actions, which is probably not the destruction of Judah, but the downfall of his dynasty. Therefore this was probably part of a pre-exilic edition.

367 As Schniedewind notes, the idea of a Hezekian and Josianic editions of the DH surmounted by an exilic redaction is relatively popular at present among scholars who still consider the DH a useful construct, including Halpern and Vanderhooft (Schniedewind 2004, 77; Halpern and Vanderhooft 1991). As he points out, “most of the arguments for the Hezekiah redaction are based on the formal structure of the historical narrative. These include accession and succession formulas, judgment formulas, the David theme, and the attitude toward the various cultic shrines…These characteristics are consistent in the historical
based around the idea of the fall of Judah as a consequence of Manasseh’s sin, which seems to have reached backwards as far as 2 Kings 21:14-15, but was not an original part of the narratives of Hezekiah or Josiah. It is this “edition” which turns the conclusion of the books of Kings, 2 Kings 24, into a kind of echo of 2 Kings 17, with Manasseh playing the role of Jeroboam.

In this complex, it is very easy to place the forging of the connection between the narratives of David and Moses. There are two Moses-David cross-references which occur in the text prior, really, to the main matter of the books of Kings, one in the second of two descriptions of the last words of David (1 Kings 2:3)—the first of which features one of the only Jacob-David cross-references in biblical literature (2 Sam 23:1) – and the other in the paradigmatically Deuteronomistic dedication speech for the temple given by Solomon (1 Kings 8:9, 53, 56). But in the whole rest of the books of Kings, this type of cross-reference appears only in the summary descriptions of four kings, three of whom are absolutely central to the work of the DH in the books of Kings: Amaziah (2 Kings 14:6), Hezekiah (2 Kings 18:4, 6, 12), Manasseh (2 Kings 21:8) and Josiah (2 Kings 23:25). The appearance of these cross-references in the summaries of the kings of most interest to the final Deuteronomistic Historian is not surprising but it is not quite clear why this appears in the summary for Amaziah as well. This particular cross-reference, at narrative up until the account of King Hezekiah, then they abruptly change” (Schniedewind 2004, 78). I am not certain how reasonable it is, at this point, to try to disentangle the innovations which could have belonged to distinct Hezekian and Josianic redactions from each other.

As Cross noted decades ago, “before the pericope on Manasseh, there is no hint in the Deuteronomistic History that hope in the Davidic house and in ultimate national salvation is futile…there are a number of reasons to suppose that the attribution of Judah’s demise to the unforgivable sins of Manasseh is tacked on and not integral to the original structure of the history” (Cross 2000, 90–91).

Although again our over-familiarity with the Bible may normalize this fact, it is interesting to note how little of the books of Kings are dedicated to Judah, and how little to Judah without Israel (seven chapters). Thus, the Panisraelite intentions of this history as a whole are quite clear.
least, is almost certainly late, inasmuch as the reference to Moses appears here only in the phrase תורת משה ספר נח שמה which, as noted in the introduction to this chapter, is most familiar to us from Nehemiah 8:1, as the book which Ezra reads to the people (Schniedewind 2004, 15). Thus, not only is the interweaving of the David and Moses narratives clearly Deuteronomistic, and not original to the material acted upon by the Deuteronomist— appearing, incidentally, in genres widely considered to be among the Deuteronomist’s most potent tools for cohesion (speeches and regnal summaries)—the fact that it plays no role in either the Jeroboam’s sin narrative or the original sin of Ahab narrative suggests that it is from an editor involved with only the latest stages of the Deuteronomistic project. Or rather, as few if any scholars imagine a Deuteronomistic edition prior to the career of Hezekiah, these cross-references could date to the original DH but if so we would expect them to have interpenetrated far more into the whole than they have.

Before offering conclusions about the above, let us take a more panoramic look at the DH. The full picture of Panisraelite cross-references here, absent the tribal system, appears below:

---

370 However, this is not an explanation of why Amaziah should be included, when no other king prior to Hezekiah was. Although it is possible that all we have here is a case of case law expansion—the verse certainly could be read in this way, as it appears in the context of Amaziah sparing the children of his father’s murderers—it is at least possible, perhaps even likely, that the key lies in Amaziah’s pretensions to conquer Israel. From 2 Kings 14, Amaziah seems to have reigned over a powerful Judah, one which supposedly successfully expanded into Edom (2 Kings 14:7). He then calls out Jehoash of Israel, resulting in a battle at Beth-Shemesh in which Amaziah was defeated, captured, and Jerusalem plundered (2 Kings 14:11-14). Although unsuccessful, for those kings, or more probably those members of the Persian period literati, who dreamed of recapturing what they believed to be the kingdom of David, Amaziah’s doomed expedition may have been an evocative precursor.
Appearances in the DH, from Joshua 24 onwards, excluding Moses’ appearances in Judges 3:4, and 4:11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moses</th>
<th>Abraham</th>
<th>Isaac</th>
<th>Jacob</th>
<th>Aaron</th>
<th>Speeches</th>
<th>Deut kings</th>
<th>Does David appear in this chapter?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josh 24:25</td>
<td>Josh 24:2-3</td>
<td>Josh 24:3, 4</td>
<td>Josh 24:4, 32</td>
<td>Josh 24:5, 33</td>
<td>Josh 24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 12:6, 8</td>
<td>1 Sam 12:8</td>
<td>1 Sam 12:6, 8</td>
<td>1 Sam 12:8</td>
<td>1 Sam 12:8</td>
<td>1 Sam 12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 23</td>
<td>2 Sam 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 2:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 8:9, 53, 56</td>
<td>1 Kings 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 14:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 18:4, 6, 12</td>
<td>2 Kings 18:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 21:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 23:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we can see many things. First of all, 2 Sam 23 and 2 Kings 17 are the only two instances in which David appears in a context which also includes the patriarchs.

However, 2 Kings 17 is probably of many parts and the reference to David in 2 Kings 17:21 likely derives from a hand distinct from that responsible for the reference to Jacob in 2 Kings 17:34. Here, Jacob appears in the context of what seems to be complaints.
about the Samaritans (2 Kings 17:34), which could very plausibly come from the Persian period, when such complaints were much more common.\footnote{Cogan and Tadmor suggest that these verses are not late additions, arguing that “the phrase ‘until this day’ is taken up again inv.34 by means of Wiederaufnahme—‘resumptive repetition’—and marks unit 2 as the continuation of v. 23, its subject being the Israelites after the fall of Samaria….Therefore, suggestions to see unit 2 as a late, postexilic addendum further condemning the mixed ritual of the settlers in Samaria already excoriated in unit 1, cannot be accepted. It is highly unlikely that any postexilic writer would speak of the foreigners as ‘sons of Jacob’ bound by the covenant obligations of the torah (vv. 34, 35, 37). Furthermore idolatry among the residents of Samaria is never an issue in the literature of the Persian period” (Cogan and Tadmor 1988, 213–214). However, as Talmon notes, “The key factor in our deliberations on these issues appears to be the editor’s manifest intention to portray a “syncretistic” form of Yahweh worship, yet operative in his own days and quite obviously rejected by him. His presentation is charged with open polemics and is aimed at discrediting in the eyes of his readers, most probably his Judean contemporaries, the descendants of the syncretists of old who yet lived in the northern parts of the land of Israel. The need for such an argument surely did not arise shortly after the destruction of Samaria. The biblical books give evidence of a rather conciliatory Judean attitude toward the remnants of the northern territories” (Talmon 1981, 67). Certainly 2 Kings 17:1-23, which has a perfectly effective conclusion in “so Israel was exiled from its land to Assyria until this day”, is likely to be a Deuteronomistic pericope. Additionally, the verse in question should probably be divided into two sources, as it begins with “to this day they continue to practice their former customs”, further imperiling the possibility that 2 Kings 17:34b is original in context.}

\footnote{2 Sam 23, too, seems fairly clearly to have other than Deuteronomistic authorship, as it reads like a translocated psalm and has occasionally even been ascribed a Davidic date (Cross 1973a, 237).\footnote{He notes “The ‘Last Words of David’ may belong thus with the archaic conceptions of the Davidic covenant found in Psalm 132…I am inclined to assign 2 Sam 23:1-7 to the earlier level of royal ideology …there is in 2 Sam 23:1-7 no hint of the adoption formulae regularly associated with the developed royal ideology” (Cross 1973b, 237, n.81). While I am skeptical of such an early date for any biblical literature, the likelihood that this is a relatively early text is supported by the epithet “the God of Jacob”, which appears only additionally in Psalm 20:1; 46:8, 12; 75:10; 76:7; 81:1; 84:9; 94:7; 114:7; 146:5 and in two prophetic texts that may date from the 8\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E., Isaiah 2:3 and Micah 4:2. Interestingly, in all these cases it is only Jacob, not the collective patriarchs, who appears.}}

As both 1 Kings 18:36 and 2 Kings 13:23 seem likely to be non-Deuteronomistic additions in context, it seems reasonable to argue that the original DH had no knowledge of, or at least interest in, the patriarchs, as I previously argued was the case in the book of Deuteronomy.\footnote{One of these references is inextricable from the Elijah-Elisha narratives (1 Kings 18:31-36), and one may or may not belong to the conclusion to the Elisha narrative, but is in either case almost certainly an addition to its present context. In addition to the fact that the verse hardly fits where it is, and is stylistically distinct, Römer notes that the idea of compassion is very rare in the DtrH. In his opinion, “2 Kings 13:23, which mentions Yhwh’s compassion for Israel because of his covenant with the Patriarchs, is clearly an insertion into the notice about Hazael’s succession and may stem from a post-Dtr redactor” (Römer 2013, 244).}

\footnote{Römer 2013, 244.
The other Panisraelite cross-references all occur in the context of regnal summaries or summary speeches: Joshua’s summary of his own career in Joshua 24; Samuel’s retirement speech in 1 Sam 12; the two last words of David in 2 Sam 23 and 1 Kings 2; Solomon’s dedication speech in 1 Kings 8; and the four regnal summaries described above. Traditionally all of these materials are considered especially characteristic of the composition style of the Deuteronomistic Historian, who was supposedly quite fond of summaries of all sorts in pursuit of organizing the whole. And yet summaries, as a technique, are hardly likely to be limited only to the Deuteronomists, and it is unfortunate that it is very difficult to find a substantive discussion of the fact that the various supposedly “deuteronomistic” summaries sometimes present quite different pictures of Israel.

It is my contention that the Deuteronomistic Historian’s main Panisraelite innovation was linking the stories of David and Moses in a fairly poorly integrated fashion. If so, the following chart would indicate what cross-references are and are not Deuteronomistic:

---

40; Römer 1990, 387–388). Though it is likely that the Elijah-Elisha narratives were not composed by the Deuteronomistic Historian, it is possible that this hand included them, which would indicate an awareness of the patriarchs by the DH. However, for various reasons described throughout this chapter, I think a later date is likely.

374 These summary speeches played a considerable role in the original formulation of the Deuteronomistic Historian in the work of Noth (Noth 1981; Plöger, Knoppers, and McConville 2000).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panisraelite Texts in the DH</th>
<th>Deuteronomistic</th>
<th>Non-Deuteronomistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moses, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moses, Jacob, Aaron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 2:3</td>
<td>Moses-David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 8</td>
<td>Moses-David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 18:36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abraham, Isaac, Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 13:23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abraham, Isaac, Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 14</td>
<td>Moses-David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 17</td>
<td>Moses-David</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 18</td>
<td>Moses-David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 21</td>
<td>Moses-David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 23</td>
<td>Moses-David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many important issues in assessing the plausibility of this model, but the suggestions above already pave much of the way. If 2 Sam 23, 1 Kings 18:36, 2 Kings 13:23, and 2 Kings 17:34 are all either late additions or largely independent of their deuteronomistic context, the only texts which offer a serious challenge to the possibility described above are Joshua 24 and 1 Sam 12. 1 Sam 12 is very difficult in this respect, and it is hard to rule out the possibility that it is essentially a deuteronomistic text.

However, the most relevant point to make here is that it seems in fact rather perverse of the Deuteronomistic Historian to include this critique of kingship as an institution in a history predominantly interested in the monarchy, probably composed during it, and for monarchs. The suggestion of McCarter (and others) that this is a pre-Deuteronomistic prophetic critique included by the Deuteronomistic Historian does not seem to me convincing: why should the Deuteronomistic Historian include a critique that is elsewhere such a minority view (McCarter Jr. 1980, 218)? Rather than suggesting that an
anti-monarchical text was used by an author composing a fairly full, if often critical, monarchical history, it seems more reasonable to me that such a text would be added later. Ultimately, we cannot say for certain whether the relevant portions of 1 Sam 12 are or are not Deuteronomistic, but if we are indeed in a position where 1 Sam 12 is the only Deuteronomistic text to include not just Jacob, but perhaps Aaron as well—who appears only otherwise in the DH in Joshua 24, and a narrative of the cities of the priests in Joshua 21—then it probably is not a Deuteronomistic text after all.

This leaves us with Joshua 24. There is much to say about Joshua 24, which will be to a certain degree the subject of the last section, but it is worth noting prior to that, that it is most clear in this particular “summary speech” that not all such are made alike.

So, for example, McCarter compares 1 Sam 12 and Joshua 24 and notes:

Thus Samuel’s farewell belongs to the series of deuteronomistically formulated passages that according to Martin Noth provide the organization framework for the Deuteronomistic history as a whole. These appear in the story at major junctures, where each presents a retrospect on preceding events and a preview of the future…Samuel’s farewell in its present form belongs to a subset of the passages identified by Noth, which also includes the dedicatory speech and prayer of Solomon in 1 Kings 8:12-61 and the farewell discourses of Joshua in their deuteronomistically revised form (Joshua 23-24). (McCarter Jr. 1984, 219–220)

However, Joshua 24 includes a great many elements that 1 Sam 12 does not. It is the only summary speech to display an involved knowledge of the history of the patriarchs. It is the only one to mention Esau, and one of two, with 1 Sam 12, to mention Aaron. It is the
only one to mention Balak and Balaam or, actually, Joshua himself, who appears in the whole rest of the DH (after the book of Joshua) only in 1 Kings 16:34.\textsuperscript{375}

The question which Joshua 24 has brought to the surface for many scholars, as we will see, is who really are the Bible’s primary synthesizers? Who can we think is responsible for the handful of texts which show a considerably larger awareness of the whole than other ones? Are these the products of traditional source authors, acting in unusual ways, or might they be the work of late “canonical” editors? Or perhaps we can imagine something in between, some form of P-like expansion or D-like expansion? I broached this issue in the context of texts such as Exodus 1:1-6, above, but it clearly plays a key role in understanding nearly all the texts touched upon in this chapter. Thus, I will conclude by offering a discussion of conceptual possibilities for understanding the Panisraelite cross-edits which have played such a considerable role in this chapter. For now, for this section, it is enough to conclude that the DH does seem to have brought the Moses and David narratives together, \textit{grosso modo}, but this did not extend to interfering with the narratives in the books of Samuel enough to make it possible to reconstruct the prehistory of David’s Israel, and it did not extend, throughout, to building connections with patriarchal or tribal narratives. Thus, we must conclude that David’s Israel, like Moses’ Israel, originally began with him.

\textsuperscript{375} Or what about 1 Kings 8? 1 Kings 8, a transition between the kings of the United Monarchy and what follows, emphasizes the importance of the Exodus and Moses more than once. As the priests take the ark to the newly built Temple, we are told there is nothing inside except the tablets of stone Moses placed there at Horeb (1 Kings 8:9); Solomon asks for mercy even for sinners, recalling YHWH’s promise to Moses, when “our fathers” came out of Egypt (1 Kings 8:53), and then finishes with a blessing where he emphasizes the fulfillment of the promise to Moses and “our fathers”. Why is 1 Kings 8, too, so uninterested in the patriarchs?
The construction of the Primary History: Canonical Layers?

As we begin to conclude this discussion, we return to the point made in the introduction to it: that the question “how are Judahites Israelites?” can be answered by each of the narratives described above *individually*. Israel is the name of a people descended from both the northern figure Jacob and the southern figure Abraham. Israel is the name of the people who escaped Egypt with Moses, whatever happened previously, and experienced the collective theophany at Sinai (or Horeb). Israel is the name of the people unified under David’s kingdom, establishing a connection and a right that was incessantly viewed as permanent, despite its transience.

Of course, that these narratives are sufficient unto themselves as Israelite etiological myths for Judah doesn’t by itself mean that this was their purpose either collectively or alone. What does strongly indicate that is something else entirely, which is the lack of significant interconnections of any kind. I have suggested that no other book in the Pentateuch, besides Genesis, originally imagined a tribal-genealogical or patriarchal history for Judah, and that these were added through two distinct processes, a discussion I have not yet concluded. Here, however, I argued that a targeted effort to create a connection between Genesis and Exodus resulted in the compilation of Exodus 1:6-6:26, which I called an anthology of Panisraelite material.\(^{376}\) Then, I outlined the nature of the Oath Promise texts spanning the rest of the Pentateuch (including Gen 50:24). I have suggested that the original DH achieved a combination of the narratives of

\(^{376}\) That in such cases biblical material often contradicts itself is not altogether surprising, given the number of doublets we see in the book of Genesis. The compiler of Exodus 1:6-6:26 may have been motivated by the same sensibilities which resulted in the compilation of two distinct creation stories in Genesis 1-3, or the integration of two contradictory flood stories in Genesis 6-9, namely, what Sanders has called “values of comprehensiveness” instead of the values of coherence or harmonization (Sanders 2014, 2–3).
David and Moses through juxtaposition, and that a later author took the next step into a more cohesive narrative through two Deuteronomistic speeches (1 Kings 2 and 1 Kings 8), and through regnal summaries which seem to have been composed fairly late (2 Kings 14, 18, 21, and 23). Among these efforts, the Oath Promise texts, Exodus 1:1-6, Exodus 6:14-25, Joshua 24, and 2 Kings 14, 18, 21, and 23 represent a certain kind of activity, the same we see in 1 Chron 1:1-9:1a: they offer a coherent account of an aggregative history otherwise invisible in what is here revealed as an overall narrative which for the most part maintains a profound segregation of its contents. Without this activity, performed at borders and other strategic locations, the original independence of these narratives would be quite clear: in reality, what has been done to break these boundaries does not amount to very much.

There is a considerable degree to which the issues raised by this discussion are already encapsulated in scholarly discussions of whether literary-historical developments or what might be called canonical efforts are more responsible for giving biblical literature its shape. Baden addresses this distinction in his treatment of the oath promise. As he puts it:

Far too often—indeed, almost universally—canonical and literary historical interpretations of the Pentateuch have been kept at arm’s length from one another, or have even been positioned as overly antagonistic. Canonical readings are said to ignore the history of the text; literary-historical readings ignore its present form (Baden 2013, 3).

The role of canon-formation in the editing of biblical text has in fact attracted a certain amount of scholarly attention for some time, and for good reason. The idea of

---

377 For a recent approach to canonical criticism see the discussion in Brett 1991. As Brett puts it, in line with my own critique of the effect of literary-historical approaches, “the dominant exegetical disciplines in biblical criticism had laid great stress on the origins and development of the biblical traditions before they
“canonical” texts, texts which structure the canon, is very important to our discussion here. A key observation to make at the outset of this section is that if there is one thing that characterizes nearly every reference to the patriarchs outside of the book of Genesis, it is that they occur at the beginning or end of books. By and large, the patriarchs are confined to Exodus 1-6, 32-33; Lev 26; Num 1, 32; Deut 1,6, 9, 29,30, 34, and Josh 24, before occurring unpredictably in the books of Kings (1 Kings 18, 2 Kings 13). Even where Jacob appears by himself, this is most often the case. Exodus 19:3 is in the heart of that book, but the other solo references are in Num 1, 23-24, Deut 32, 33, and 2 Sam 23 (and 2 Kings 17:24).

As for references to the tribal system, though this is less the case it is not so much less the case. True, the tribes are central to Genesis, Numbers, and Joshua, but the few tribal references that appear in Exodus occur in Exodus 1-6, 21-28; in Leviticus in Lev 24-25, in Deuteronomy, with the exception of references to the tribe of Levi, in Deut 3-4, 27, 29, 33-34. Judges 1 and 5 are the key tribal texts in that book, and the tribes are far more present in 1 Sam 1-14 than they will be in these books subsequently. In the books of came to be arranged in the present form of our received texts. Whether these earlier forms of the material were thought of as literary sources or oral traditions, the effect had been the same: attention had been drawn away from the ‘final’ or present form of the canonical literature. Exegetical hypotheses were almost invariably focused on the previous life of textual units before they came to be arranged and edited into their present contexts” (Brett 1991, 3).

378 One of the major reasons to think the Oath Promise layer is an addition in context is the fact that it most often appears in Deuteronomy, but neither it nor any Panisraelite references (besides some references to the tribe of Levi) ever appears in what most scholars consider the “core” of the book, Deut 12-26. As Kratz puts it, “the distinction between the framework and the law is fundamental to the analysis of Deuteronomy. It arises out of a simple observation. Deuteronomy is stylized as a speech of Moses. The repeated headings in 1.1-5; 4.44-5.1 (4:1; 6:1; 12.1 differ), the concluding sentence in 28.69, the new beginnings of the speech in 27.1, 9, 11; 29.1, and the narrative parts in 4.41-43; 31-34 (with further parts of the speech) fall out of this stylization… within the speech of Moses in 5-26, we must once again distinguish between the preliminary discourse in chs 5-11 and the corpus of the law in chs 12-26” (Kratz 2005, 116). See also Mayes 1981, 23; Römer 2000, 114–115.
Kings, the majority of references occur in 1 Kings 4-15. Additionally, we can point to a whole range of phenomena that seems, by its position, to be responding to a physical canon. It is in Genesis 50:24 that we find the first reference to the oath promise, and then again in Exodus 32-33, in Lev 26, the second to last chapter in Leviticus, and in Numbers 32. The two explicit references to the tribal-genealogical material outside of Genesis occur in Exodus 1:1-6 and Numbers 1:20. Of the two “last words” of David, each of which contains a somewhat unusual cross-reference (Jacob and David in 2 Sam 23, Moses and David in 1 Kings 2), one occurs at the very end of a book and one at the very beginning. And, as we continue to think about the history of the tribal system, consider the placement of seemingly archaic texts which also have some Panisraelite relevance in biblical literature. The major exemplars are the blessing of Jacob, in the second to last chapter of the book Genesis (Gen 49), the blessing of Moses, in the second to last chapter of Deuteronomy (Deut 33), and this strange, psalmic version of David’s last words in the second to last chapter of 2 Samuel (2 Sam 23).

There may be other explanations for the seeming universality of this strange coincidence of marginal placement across the canon, but a better one than the presence of a canonical layer, or layers, seems unlikely. The data presented above indicates, in my opinion, several of these which will be further outlined in the final chapter and conclusion. Most important, there seems to a canonical layer, in the sense at least of a layer promoting canonical cohesion, in Exodus 1:1-6:26, which in my opinion has a few other appearances at other points which we have yet to discuss, another in the oath promise layer, and, if the “marginal” appearance of so many cross-references is indicative

---

379 All of this is visible in the charts at the end of this chapter.
of anything, a layer probably connected with at least one of these efforts is implicated here in the creation of overall cohesion throughout the primary history.

My own vision will be discussed more fully shortly, but it is worth noting by way of elucidation of my argument that Baden’s conceptual approach to canonical layers is diametrically opposed to mine. To my thinking, it is these layers which, as I have suggested several times, invented biblical history and invested it with specifically biblical meanings, in the process disrupting the prior purposes and meanings for which the pre-canonical texts had been composed. He argues, first, that all of the sources of the Pentateuch existed “simultaneously and independently up to the point of their combination into the canonical text” and, second, that “because the figure of the compiler emerges only from the recognition of the pentateuchal sources, the minimum description of what the compiler did is nothing more than that he combined his sources into a single narrative”. He allows that “it is not impossible that the compiler had some ideological agenda in mind when undertaking the process of combination,” but that we must prove it, and that it cannot be proven (Baden 2013, 139). While this study is, in no small part, aimed at demonstrating certain purposes behind the creation of biblical history, it is very probably the case regardless that Baden’s approach necessitates a redactor of such extraordinary disinterest and broad-minded, egalitarian sympathies that is unlikely to be possible to find a comparable personage in any of the evidence we have, cross-culturally, either with any other ancient historiographical effort or even in modern historiography.

---

380 I should caution again, however, that the “canonical” layers that I am talking about, and probably Baden as well, are those which created the canons of the Torah, perhaps a Hexateuch, and perhaps the Primary history, not the “biblical canon” which will not exist for many centuries after the events described here.

381 Baden’s claim, for example, that “the compilation of the Pentateuch is nothing less than a bold statement of theological impartiality…a snapshot—or better an extended exposure—of the multiplicity of Israelite
The interaction he is describing between editor and received accounts is not one which easily passes through the gauntlet of modern theories of historical memory and the invention of tradition.

Returning to the question of canonical texts generally a key text in all discussions of biblical cohesion is Joshua 24, the last chapter of the book of Joshua and, to some scholars, the conclusion to a Hexateuch. Although I have not devoted much space in this discussion to such matters it seems likely, as Römer suggests, that both a Hexateuch and a Pentateuch existed, at some point or another, in different circles. This Hexateuch, as he argues, was probably a product of the Persian period.

382 As Römer and Brettler note, Joshua 24 has been regarded as something of a “Hexateuch en miniature” since the time of Gerhard Von Rad (Römer and Brettler 2000, 410; Von Rad 1972b, 16). As K. Schmid has noted, Von Rad had identified a narrative Hexateuch at roughly the same time that Noth created his Pentateuchal model and denied the presence of Pentateuchal sources in Joshua. The result of this, in Schmid’s opinion, is a kind of compromise “mainly based on a gentleman’s agreement” to which “Von Rad’s contribution...was the hypothesis of an earlier form of the Hexateuch. He concluded 1) an older Hexateuchal narrative had once continued into the book of Joshua; however 2) this earlier text form was no longer extant...because it had been replaced when the Hexateuchal narrative was combined with the Deuteronomistic History”. Noth, in return “accepted Von Rad’s model of the very old and stable blueprint of the Hexateuch in the short historical creedal texts” (K. Schmid 2011, 16).

383 Biblical literature seems to give conflicting information on the nature and influence of this redaction. On the one hand, as there are Pentateuchal texts which point forward to the book of Joshua, and as generally the narrative of the Pentateuch makes little sense without an account of the actual conquest of the land, a Hexateuch seems logically likely. On the other hand, as Römer notes, “if one starts reading the Hebrew Bible one may of course consider that the death of Moses reported in Deut 34 represents a major conclusion, and that this is the idea of the editors of the Torah” (Römer 2011, 26).

384 Römer and Brettler have argued that the Hexateuch is almost certainly late precisely because Joshua 24 is the major evidence for its existence (Römer and Brettler 2000, 409). Additionally, the level of aggregation it presents is quite likely to be a fairly late development. Römer also suggests that at this time “there was obviously a debate about whether the ‘Torah’ should comprise the books of Genesis to Joshua (a Hexateuch) or if the document should be a Pentateuch and end with the book of Deuteronomy. Apparently a Deuteronomistic-Priestly minority coalesced to promote the publication of a Hexateuch.” (Römer 2005, 179–80). He suggests that this is responsible for the incorporation of ‘Priestly’ texts into Joshua as well, and that Joshua 3–4, and 6, are blends of Dtr and P (180). Elsewhere, he suggests the existence of a “real” Hexateuch and a “real” Pentateuch: “Joshua 24 and Deut 34, as well as the texts that are related to these chapters, provide in my view good evidence for the attempt to create a “real” Hexateuch, and probably in reaction to this attempt, a “real” Pentateuch that is to say, a scroll or collection of scrolls that were kept separately from others” (Römer 2011, 32). While I think Römer’s idea that the organization of these...
here is that Joshua 24 is far more aggregative than more or less any other biblical text. One of the best reasons to suspect the presence of non-source authors (perhaps canonical authors) in efforts such as Joshua 24 is, quite simply, that this is often a better explanation of biblical phenomena.

Again, it is possible that some traditionally understood source, or even a source understood in more contemporary ways, is responsible here, but Joshua 24’s profoundly aggregative nature has a habit of tying source-based arguments into knots. Van Seters, for example, who believes the Yahwist is the last biblical source to be composed and believes there never was a biblical “editor”, has suggested that the Yahwist is responsible for this text, reappearing here after a long period of dormancy, and for the only time in the entire book of Joshua.385 A more extreme example of the calisthenics required to make sense of this material through the sources is Römer and Brettler’s suggestion, here and mostly only here, of a “late joint Dtr-Priestly redaction”. Although they are quite correct in suggesting that interaction between the groups behind the sources was far more possible than is sometimes supposed, the fact that this “P-D” group nevertheless did not seem interested in improving the integration of previous Dtr or P documents with each other would require considerable explanation (Römer and Brettler 2000, 414).386 Because of the nature of Joshua 24, which aggregates narratives from nearly every part of the

documents may have arisen from the organization of an ancient library is over-specific, the idea that various parts of the Bible existed independently enough that different forms of combination with each other were possible and were practiced opens many doors (Römer 2011, 38).


386 They go so far as to point out that “it is impossible to imagine that the intellectual groups of postexilic Judaism lived in total isolation from each other—there is no reason to believe that there might have been separate Priestly and Dtr villages!” (Römer and Brettler 2000, 413). While this is true, it does not seem to have had much effect on other stages of biblical composition.
Pentateuch, it is easy to understand why it has been variously attributed to nearly every biblical source. But this, to me, also suggests the weakness of a source hypothesis which leaves no room for the activity of non-source authors.

The truth is, Joshua 24 simply is not like any other biblical text, and does not present an idea of Israel which follows any known source.\(^{387}\) Thus, far simpler than any of the above explanations is the suggestion that Joshua 24 simply is largely the work of a non-source author.\(^{388}\) It is simply not clear that there is good reason to resist this conclusion, other than that the presence of such authors would make the composition of the Bible harder for scholars to recover. Is such an author imaginable? Of course. Such synthesizing actors are even visible within the confines of biblical literature, and there is no difficulty in identifying them as non-source authors. No one, for example would or has suggested that the books of Chronicles, perhaps the only texts with a comparable degree of comprehensiveness, are the product of the P, D, or P-D sources. And who could have created the Pentateuch, and who the whole complex from Genesis-2 Kings, except for an author for whom the combination of sources into a single narrative provided no conceptual difficulty? In defense of the documentary hypothesis, scholars often assume that anyone who writes like a source author, or shares the interests of a source author, must be that author. But why? Editors, too, will naturally sound quite a bit like what

\(^{387}\) Levin identifies, in his discussion of the non-P sources of Pentateuchal literature, six “individual narrative compositions” of which he suggests that “the diversity of the material indicates that it was only at a later stage that these groups were linked” (C. Levin 2007, 209). These are: “(1) The primeval history (Genesis 2-11), which has to do with the origin of the world and humankind; (2) the history of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Genesis 12-36); (3) the story of Joseph and his brothers (Genesis 37-50); (4) the narrative about Moses (Exodus 2-4); (5) the history of the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt and their wanderings through the desert (Exodus 12 through Numbers 20), to which the death of Moses may also have belonged (Deuteronomy 34*); and (6) the story about the seer Balaam (Numbers 22-24)” (C. Levin 2007, 209).

\(^{388}\) Sperling, who believes Joshua 24 to be an early text, nevertheless is among those who suggest that its author was not one of the pentateuchal sources (S. D. Sperling 2000, 120).
they’re editing, interpreters like what they’re interpreting.\textsuperscript{389} As I suggested above, in order to argue the contrary, that the sources were largely inviolable, it is necessary to retroject notions of the inviolability of biblical texts back centuries before we have evidence for it.\textsuperscript{390} Our inability to demonstrate such a principle in earlier periods has begun to interest a variety of scholars, and there is a sense in which, as we will see, non-documentary approaches are an inevitable result of these revelations. None of these is a new idea. But they are vital, here.

David Carr’s discussion of what he calls “undocumented harmonizations” is particularly interesting for the present discussion. It is a generalization, but probably largely fair to say that for many scholars, the greatest challenge to the notion that only the source authors are involved in the authorship of the Pentateuch comes from non-P additions to P contexts, as P is often supposed to be the final source layer, or even the tetratseuchal or pentateuchal editor. The growing awareness of such additions has led Erhard Blum, for example, to propose a whole post-P layer connected to Joshua 24.\textsuperscript{391} And yet, it is worth noting that even this is not really a deviation from an imaginable documentary hypothesis, because Blum’s conception is still dependent upon the idea of

\textsuperscript{389} A thorough examination of the notion of a biblical “editor” throughout history, which ends in a rejection of the possibility, appears in Van Seters 2006.

\textsuperscript{390} As Carr notes, even in cuneiform traditions there were texts that were “subject to different rules for scribal transmission,” but, as he also notes, the earliest evidence for the arrival of this notion with respect to the Pentateuch is the mid-Persian period, and this evidence is not unequivocal (Carr 2011, 127). He goes on to suggest that the Hasmonae dynasty “played an important role in defining, circumscribing, and possibly revising the corpus of older works worthy of devotion and study,” and that “the Hasmonae role in the shaping of a solidified corpus of Torah and prophets occurred as part of the broader Hasmonae response to the Hellenistic crisis” (Carr 2011, 158).

\textsuperscript{391} This includes such crucial texts as Gen 33:19, 35:1-7, 48:21-22, 50:24, and the very end of the Exodus 1-16 pericope (Exod 1:5b-6,8; 13:19) (Blum, Erhard 1990, 363–365).
basically separable layers, not a dynamic fusion. His non-P is merely another layer on top of layers. Is this the most reasonable way to view the Bible as a whole?

I will not, here challenge the idea that the sources remain considerably separable in any thoroughgoing way, however, as Carr notes, the fact that both non-P additions to P contexts and (apparently) P-additions to non-P contexts are quite visible, despite the supposedly separate nature of P as a source, points in a different direction. And certainly, some scholars believe, in the words of Sanders, “that text-building and exegesis within the Bible and outside of it are seamless…if Pentateuchal composition was always already interpretation, it’s ‘Midrash all the way down’” (Sanders 2014, 8–9). At the very least, it is now quite common to see biblical literature, as Satlow puts it, “as the result of a continual process of growth, accretion, and modification”, which makes separability a difficult problem (Satlow 2014, 75). And there are, ultimately, many benefits to an approach which allows for more dynamic interactions within the text, which has been described as the Non-Documentary approach. I think there are many difficulties in understanding biblical construction that the idea of sources as prime movers, now

---

392 That is, edits that have been identified as stemming from H occur exclusively in P contexts, suggesting these edits were made when P was independent from other biblical material (Carr 2011, 301). Baden suggests that “P is consistently self-referential, from beginning to end, but contains virtually no references to the nonpriestly text….the priestly text is full of internal cross-references, is built only on itself, and at virtually no point makes any reference to or shows any dependence on the nonpriestly story”. Baden argues that “nowhere does H or any other purportedly secondary priestly redaction supplement, revise, or interact in any discernible way with the nonpriestly text” (Baden 2012, 183–184, 188). Still, Carr is able to point out that, the death of Eleazar in Joshua 24 is a clear sign of Priestly involvement there, an element that Römer and Brettler, in their imagination of a Priestly-Deuteronomist compromise layer, interpret as “a gesture of good will from the Hexateuch Deuteronomists towards their priestly colleagues” (Carr 2011, 216; Römer and Brettler 2000, 415).

393 As Sanders puts it, the Non-Documentary scholars believe that “the Torah is created through reinterpretation—there is a limited, discontinuous set of original core texts which have been built up by succeeding micro-layers of interpretation…. text-building and exegesis within the bible and outside of it are seamless, that there is no essential differentiation” (Sanders 2014, 8–9).
sometimes referred to as the Neo-Documentary approach, does not solve very well. Of course, in the argument between neo-documentary and non-documentary approaches, as Sanders notes, “each set of views produces its own ironies” (Sanders 2014, 9).

Naturally, Carr himself turns to Joshua 24 in the course of his discussion. He considers it a paradigmatic example of a text which has been labeled “post-Priestly” on poorly considered grounds. He argues, instead, that it is “broadly and deeply linked to a

---

394 The Neo-Documentarians “see pentateuchal composition as a process in which major texts do respond to others, but not seamlessly. Rather than a continuous, atomistic process, we find radical revisions, with the goal of replacement…this school sees the main narratives of the Tetrateuch not as interpretations of prior texts but as independent sources….Remarkably, these sources were then interwoven without attention to these attempts at replacement” (Sanders 2014, 9). As he further notes, this approach is particularly visible in examples such as the revision of the Covenant Code’s Hebrew slave law in Deuteronomy, while the slave laws of the Holiness Code in Leviticus “simply eliminate the practice”. He points to Levinson, Stackert, and Baden as important neo-Documentarians.

395 “What Non-Documentary scholars see as nuances and reinterpretations are hard to distinguish from blatant contradictions. And the Neo-Documentary reading is more ironic yet: the legal layers of the Torah are literally made of successive failed attempts to erase their predecessors…[see M. D. S. 6.14]. Without going too far out of our way, we can consider the fact that Numbers 1 and 2 apparently contain identical lists, typically attributed to P, of the leaders of Israel. While it may be the case, as Van Seters notes, that “P was never shy about repeating himself” (Van Seters 2000, 22), it is also the case that no author would either open a blank scroll and write the same thing on page 1 as page 2, or even, having written a page 1, then combine it with an identical page 2. Thus, they may both be P, that is P may be the author of both. But there is very much a sense it which it seems unlikely that P, in this case, should have any responsibility for the fact that Numbers 2 follows Numbers 1 in the final canon. The typical neo-documentary, or even documentary approach, is summarized by Baden who suggests that “the idea of the redactor(s) of the Pentateuch is necessitated only by the existence of four continuous, coherent, originally independent documents that have been combined into a single story in the canonical text” (Baden 2012, 214). What I am suggesting here that there are aspects of the employment of supposedly the “same” sources in the canon that requires just as much attention. As many celebrities and political leaders have had a chance to discover, the use of one’s words does not always result in saying what one intended to say. Repetition in a form which seems at odds with an organic writing process (such as in Num 1-2) may well suggest that the appropriate paradigm for understanding biblical composition is not compilation but use, a dynamic series of probably untraceable minor efforts to use the same basic source material to different but related ends. An editor who places two “P” texts together which do not tell the same story, or even two texts which do tell the story, thus obviating the need for the other, is a creative enough author not to be regarded as “P,” even if his means of expression is largely through the work of others.

396 He notes, “a growing consensus has developed among many European scholars that this chapter is post-Priestly” (Carr 2011, 134–135). He points to the elements that many scholars have described as Priestly in
later layer of non-Priestly composition elements spanning the Hexateuch” (Carr 2011, 136). I believe this is correct. If we can acknowledge that it is easier to explain a text such as Joshua 24 through recourse to a non-source author than by contorting the traditional sources, we can come up with a better explanation for many of the phenomena that confront us throughout Genesis-Joshua.

Here, unfortunately, for space and subject matter reasons we leave this discussion, but with this note: In the next and final chapter, we are looking for a non-source author or authors whom we might implicate in the creation of the grand vision described here, connecting the sequence of narratives from Adam to the fall of Jerusalem, through the patriarchs, exodus, conquest, and monarchies, not once (Genesis-2 Kings) but twice (Chronicles).

this text, “including the occurrence of the ‘land of Canaan’…in Josh 24:3”, the reference to Mount Seir as the home of Esau, the presence of Aaron, and the “P-like description of the Reed Sea event in Josh 24:6-7a”. As he notes, none of these elements is so distinctively Priestly that another author could not have been responsible (Carr 2011, 134–135)
### Additional Charts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod 1:1, 5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exod 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 2:24 \ Exod 2:24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:6, 15, 16 \ 3:6, 15-16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:3, 8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev 26:42 \ Lev 26:42</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lev 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 1:20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Num 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 23:7, 10, 21, 23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:5, 17, 19, 20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 1:8 \ Deut 1:8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Deut 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:5, 27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:9, 15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:4, 10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh 24:2,3 \ 24:3, 4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Josh 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 Sam 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 18:36 \ 1 Kings 18:36</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 Kings 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 13:23 \ 2 Kings 13:23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 Kings 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 17:34 \ 2 Kings 17:34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 Kings 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 21 \ 2 Kings 21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 Kings 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Levi +Judah</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Levi +Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 tribes (no Ephraim and Manasseh)</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reuben, Simeon</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Levi +Judah</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 tribes</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10 tribes (Joseph)</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 tribes</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8 tribes</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 tribes (no Manasseh)</td>
<td>2 Tribes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4 tribes</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 tribes</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 tribes (Reuben, Gad, Manasseh)</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11 tribes</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Reuben</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Simeon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11 tribes</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>11 tribes</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4 tribes</td>
<td>Levi, Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7 tribes</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5 tribes</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11 tribes</td>
<td>2 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Levi +Judah</td>
<td>2 Samuel</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Levi +Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 Tribes</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Benjamin, Ephraim, Asher?</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Benjamin, Dan</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 tribes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 tribes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 tribes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 tribes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 tribes (Issachar, Ephraim)</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 tribes (Zebulun, Ephraim, Manasseh)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Benjamin, Ephraim</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 tribes (Ephraim, Manasseh, Dan)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 tribes (Benjamin, Ephraim)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Gad, Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 tribes (Benjamin, Dan)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gad, Dan</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 tribe (Naphtali)</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ephraim, Benjamin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 tribes (Joseph, Ephraim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 Tribes (Dan, Benjamin)</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Judah (geo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gad (geo) Benjamin (geo)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ephraim (geo) Benjamin (geo)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Judah (geo)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Naphtali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah (geo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah (geo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Judah (geo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah (geo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judah (geo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many more references to Judah in the books of Kings than anything else, thus for this single section I have removed them so as to leave the diagram clear. Most of these, of course, are geographical, referring to the kingdom of Judah. Nevertheless, the name Judah appears in 1 Kings 1, 2, 4, 10, 12-16, 19, 22, 2 Kings 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 12-25
Chapter Six: Building the Bible

“Like everything else we think we know, that’s not so clear anymore”

We Are All Completely Beside Ourselves—Karen Joy Fowler, p.265

Na’amans has defined the conceit implicit in the ethnic concept Panisraeliteism as a pretension to “autochthonous unity”, a very valuable term for its pithiness. The scholars responsible for Panisraelite studies have been in the business of exploring the ramifications of this suggestion in various ways, but one result is obvious: as Fleming puts it, “if the kingdoms of Israel and Judah reflect distinct peoples with deeply different notions of who they were and how they became so, it is essential to disentangle Israel’s and Judah’s stories. Judah’s stories cannot be assumed to be the common property of both people” (Fleming 2012). He further remarks, “with writing from a United Monarchy no longer defining early Israel by a unity that included Judah, the early stages of biblical composition must be located in two separate kingdoms of uncertain relationship” (Fleming 2012, 9). Thus, “Panisraeliteism”, the revelation that the ethnic discourse which describes Israel and Judah as two kingdoms peopled by the same ethnic group is indeed a discourse, not unlike Panhellenism.

398 “I posit the suggestion that the composition of the Patriarchal stories, which created a common past for the inhabitants of the former kingdom of Israel and Judah, formed a decisive step in the efforts to create a common history and identity for the two communities that remained in the land. Following the writing of the patriarchal narratives, the concept of the autochthonous unity of the people of Israel became the central ideological concept for the elite and scribes of the two communities” (Na’amans 2014, 118).

399 Just how widespread acceptance of Panisraeliteism is has sometimes, in my opinion, been overstated. Na’amans for example suggests that the idea that the extension of the name Israel “to cover both kingdoms” did not appear prior to the fall of Israel has been “widely accepted”, but in his citations only notes the
Again this study is not, strictly speaking, a study of Panisraeliteism, although it shares many of the same assumptions. I attempted to demonstrate, in the previous chapter, the independence of three different narratives which took Panisraeliteism as their theme, and I imagine that all of them did indeed articulate this ethnic idea after the fall of Israel, which event it seems not to have pre-existed as a concept. However, it is time to turn to now to the fact that many of the same criticisms leveled against those who argue that Judahites had a stable, permanent sense of themselves as Israelites from early times and continuously, may be leveled against many studies motivated by this new theory. In short, it is no more likely that prevailing biblical definitions of Israeliteness remain unchanged from the end of the 8th century B.C.E. to the construction of the major biblical historical narrative, which I date to perhaps the early 4th century B.C.E, then that “biblical” ethnicity was born in the twelfth century B.C.E. What makes the former unlikely also affects the latter: scholars, generally, no longer believe that ethnicity is stable over time to this degree. Similarly, it now also seems likely that even if we could demonstrate that a tradition being told in one time period is identical in form to its telling centuries earlier, it would be serving new purposes because it would be serving new masters. And this is again the case even if these new masters imagine that they are not new at all. In that sense, the third and fourth chapters were an investigation into the birth

handful of studies also discussed here. Although there seem to have been few enough articles directly addressing these in a negative way—although see, for example, Williamson 2001—this handful of studies does not yet meaningfully constitute consensus.

400 That ethnic identity and traditional narratives about ethnic identity should both be fluid if one is seems obvious. Malkin, introducing a volume on ancient Greek ethnicity, notes: “Few people today talk about ethnicity in primordial or racial terms. The tone of current writing about ethnicity, any ethnicity, reflects a ubiquitous antiessentialism. Things have no essence, no ‘core’. Ethnicity? There’s no such thing, as such, and the key words for discussing it are now ‘invention’ and ‘construction’. Many observers acknowledge that ethnicity usually seems primordial, but, they claim, primordiality too is an invention, cynically ‘instrumentalist’ or more neutrally ‘situational,’ molded by changing circumstances” (Malkin 2001, 1). If ethnicity has no stable “core”, how could traditions which reflect it have stable meanings?
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of the concept, but the fifth was an investigation into the difference between various ways in which the concept was articulated and the specifically biblical version thereof.

This latter point is an expression of an anthropological concept, now widely agreed upon, called the “invention of tradition”.\textsuperscript{401} This is not literally the idea that groups inevitably “invent” their traditions, but rather that there is a kind of invention even in retelling and preservation. That is, every telling of a tradition is shaped by present, not past realities. In one of its earliest and most influential framings, Hobsbawm suggested that it remained possible to distinguish between “genuine” and “invented” traditions, in the former of which significant continuity with the past was assumed to mitigate the disruption of “invention”, whereas other traditions were entirely fabricated (Hobsbawm 1983). However, this idea no longer has much currency. It is now far more common to imagine, as Linnekin puts it, that “culture is an ongoing human creation…all traditions—Western and indigenous-- are invented, in that they are symbolically constructed in the present and reflected contemporary concerns and inherited legacy” (Linnekin 1991, 447).\textsuperscript{402} As Hal Levine puts it, “it is, by now, well established that social and cultural traits and identities respond to the contingences of everyday life”, and the same is true of traditions (Levine 1999, 166).\textsuperscript{403} Different realities provide different meanings, even for the “same” stories.

\textsuperscript{401} As Cath Oberholzer notes, “the concept of the invention of tradition has gained widespread acceptance and innumerable applications” (Oberholzer 1995).

\textsuperscript{402} She refers here specifically to the work of Clifford, Wagner, and Handler, including (Clifford 1988; Wagner 1975; Handler 1986; Handler and Linnekin 1984).

\textsuperscript{403} He continues, “entire categories of people become submerged or transmute into something new” (Levine 1999, 166).
Of course, scholars have by now become well aware of the negative (even insulting) effects of referring to vibrant traditions, which in some cases are the sole political protection of marginalized groups, as “inventions”, regardless of intent. As Levine notes, “to evade some of these problems, we can easily replace ‘invention’ with alternative terms…‘revitalization,’ ‘revival,’ and ‘reevaluation’”, terms which are in any case probably nearer the truth in most cases (Levine 1999, 350). It is not unheard of, as we will see, for ethnicities to be constructed out of thin air but it is far more common to see something new constructed through materials of a considerable age. The point of the invention of tradition is, to a certain degree, merely that in balancing old and new, scholars should emphasize the “something new” as more significant in making meaning.\footnote{As Hanson puts it, “inventions are sign-substitutions that depart some considerable distance from those upon which they are modeled…are selective, and…systematically manifest the intention to further some political or other agenda” (Hanson 1989, 899).}

It has not, I think, often been realized, how much this concept challenges traditional interpretations of biblical literature. Indeed, perhaps the major issue in the study of biblical literature today is the necessity of recognizing that defenses of the historicity and antiquity of the historical narratives are now largely opposed to what recent scholarship in ethnicity and historical memory suggest about the construction of what might be called ethnic histories.\footnote{Jonathan M. Hall, in his study of ancient Greek identity, notes that “current research…questions the notion that ethnic identity is primarily constituted by either genetic traits, language, religion or even common cultural forms. While all of these attributes may act as important symbols of ethnic identity, they really only serve to bolster an identity that is ultimately constructed through written and spoken discourse” (Hall 1997, 2). It is only by appealing to genetic traits, language, religion, etc., that one can extend biblical ethnicity farther back than the creation of the discourse itself, but even these discussions must minimize the importance of the disruptions of the Exile and Return to the evolution of ethnic thought. As Malkin notes, myths should generally be understood as “an integral part of the history of the period in which they were told,” and properly speaking truly biblical literature was only “told” after the Exile (Malkin 1998, 3). A}

404

405

267
obvious reason, somewhat more attuned to these realities, it is still the case that they very
often fail to internalize the full ramifications of these findings and, also very often, equate
the invention of Panisraeliteism with the specifically biblical version thereof with little
reflection on the years intervening between the invention of the concept and any
imaginable literary construct considerably resembling the finished Bible.

Fleming’s study of Panisraeliteism is a case in point. This is overall a very
valuable study, but many of its points are considerably based on the viability of marking
Hobsbawm’s distinction between “invented” and “genuine” traditions, in service,
ultimately, to finding a methodology for distinguishing the two in biblical literature.406
Again, this distinction has largely been discarded in current research. In Fleming’s
opinion, for example, the pre-dominant role of Israel, as opposed to Judah, in pre-
monarchical narratives means that “Judah’s identity is bound up from the beginning with
kingship.” Since, then, “only in Israel was there a perceived need to explain this people’s
existence before and apart from kings…all primary phases of the Bible’s account of the
past before David originated in Israel and reflect Israel’s political perspective” (Fleming
2012, 28). Aside from the fact that, as Fleming acknowledges, this goes considerably

---

406 Fleming suggests “I have begun my analysis with the idea that all Israelite narrative, the material that
serves Israelite identity in the social and political matrix of corporate ‘Israel,’ may be considered ‘genuine
traditions’…none of this means that Israelite traditions represent ‘history,’ but it does mean that they are
not products of social meltdown” (Fleming 2012, 108). Elsewhere he suggests “the genuine
quality...comes not from any supposed ‘historicity’...to borrow a hallowed term from the Bible field.
Genuine tradition is practice that stands in continuity with a web of living institutions that reach back in
time without any major disruption” (Fleming 2012, 307). The distinction between “historicity” and
“practices that stand in continuity with a web of living institutions...without any major disruption” is
unclear to me. Unfortunately, despite the many virtues of Fleming’s study, this inconsistency with the
guiding theoretical principles he utilizes calls into question many of its conclusions.
against the grain of much scholarship, it demonstrates extraordinary faith in the permanence of certain aspects of Judahite and Israelite identity which is probably untenable in the face of recent scholarship. 407

What would it mean if Judahite identity were indeed constantly and consistently bound up in monarchy, even despite the composition of considerable narratives—perhaps even many of the narratives Fleming refers to—after both Judah and Israel had lost their monarchies? How would this be different from other attempts to ascribe permanent trans-historical traits to an ethnic group? Neither Israel nor Judah is likely to have had a single, univocalic “political perspective” for all of their histories, and to the extent to which biblical literature is indebted to “Israelite” ideas, these are nevertheless Israelite ideas as refracted through a Judahite lens or lenses, and through, in fact, very specific and historically contingent interests. At one point, Fleming proposes that we might separate “Israelite content” from later material so that a “fresh historical perspective can emerge, and this can provide a basis for reconsidering the value of biblical writing for historical questions” (Fleming 2012, 321). But here again, this is a difficult project to imagine if one does not believe that “Israelite content” inevitably preserves its “Israelite” character in new contexts, or that all Israelite or Judahite narratives are emblematic of something

407 Many of the traditions Fleming identifies as Israelite are not particularly controversial, including “escape from Egypt under the leadership of Moses,” “Joshua’s leadership in establishing initial hegemony in the land,” and “Saul as the first successful king of Israel” (Fleming 2012, 2) The challenge to his point of view, however, is obviously the apparently Judahite nature of traditions about figure such as Abraham, Lot, and others. Fleming is aware of this challenge and argues that “the larger genealogical relationships defined with Abraham and Lot, and with Isaac and Esau, are often treated as from Judah, because Abraham and Isaac have southern geographical associations with Hebron and Beersheba. Various solutions could account for these figures, including old southern lore not originally defined to account for peoples of either Israel or Judah; later stories created to imitate the Jacob ancestor type; or even that these stories are also Israelite, and the southern sites have no particular association with Judah or the southern kingdom as a separate entity after Solomon”. However, as he additionally notes, “every sentence in this paragraph should raise enormous questions and challenges” (Fleming 2012, 30). It seems prohibitively difficult to argue against the origin of traditions about Abraham, for example, in Judah.
internally and transhistorically Israelite and Judahite. What if we could separate out an Israelite narrative in some hypothetical way in which we could be confident that it contained no transformative Judahite efforts, only to fail to realize that this text was the product of an extremely transient and minority view?

As an interim result, taking the fluidity of both ethnicity and of traditional narratives at face value means that even if Judah and Israel had imagined themselves to share an ethnic identity during the period of their geographical co-existence (dating not even from the dual monarchical period, when they were at odds and sometimes at war but, improbably, to the 12th-10th centuries B.C.E.), its permanence through such change, well after Israel had vanished from the map, would defy how we now think of ethnicity and tradition.\textsuperscript{408} Since, as the last chapter indicated, this early coherence cannot be demonstrated from the available evidence, it is more improbable still. Thus, the idea of Judah’s Israelite past is twice an invention. First, it very probably was \textit{invented} after the fall of Israel, although given the increased availability of evidence for more considerable

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{408} I think regardless of any of the suggestions in this study, the possibility that a 6th and 5th century literary articulation of ethnic identity \textit{could} be essentially the same as one originating so many centuries earlier, with so many dramatic developments interceding, is the heritage of a period in scholarship when ethnicity was still understood as essentially biological and constant, and it can persist only where it has not been appropriately questioned. There has been much discussion of the need to apply updated theories of ethnicity to biblical studies throughout, but for a particularly useful summary of such reassessments see J. C. Miller 2008. When we add the challenges to the United Monarchy and to the historicity of the accounts of the premonarchical period discussed in the previous chapter, as well as the absence of evidence in apparently early biblical writing for Panisraeliteism, it seems very likely that the origin of the biblical form of Panisraeliteism had some considerably later cause than anything dateable to the end of the Bronze Age. The production of contemporary ethnicity through use of the distant past has been a focus of this study at various points. We have seen, for example, as Geary has pointed out, that for modern European nationalist movements, moments of “primary acquisition”---the expression of a territorial right connected to origin and dependent upon ethnic identity---are typically situated in the medieval period (Geary 2002). And we have seen Malkin’s and Hall’s discussions of the importance of “primordialist” tendencies in creating ethnic articulations (Malkin 1998; Malkin 2001; Hall 1997; Hall 2002). As Hall notes, “there is…no doubt that ethnic identity is a cultural construct, perpetually renewed and renegotiated through discourse and social praxis.” As Malkin puts it, referring to scholarly approaches, “primordialists mostly no longer look for the hard, objective existence of ethnic groups, but for the primordial perceptions and boundaries such groups employ, and examine whether such operate over long periods” (Malkin 1998, 56). Unfortunately, this statement is not as true of biblical studies as it has become in other fields.}
duration in the land of northern Israelite groups than the books of Kings for example allows, this does not mean it was a concept without application. 409 Second, whatever was true in the 12th, 10th, or 8th century B.C.E., the biblical version of this connection would still be, for all practical purposes, an invention when it began to emerge in the Persian period, especially in light of the invention of tradition scholarship cited above. 410 And this is the case even as multiple different identity narratives seem to have been preserved through the unusual methodology of biblical construction by juxtaposition. 411 What I am

409 This has been suggested by Na’am an, Nadav 2010; Fleming, Daniel 2012; Finkelstein 2013; Finkelstein and Silberman 2006 among others. Generally, it is supposed to have been a product of a Hezekian ideological enterprise. Later dates for the arrival of this sentiment have been proposed in Davies 2007 and Knauf 2006. These will be discussed in the final chapter. As Wright notes, “on the other end of the spectrum are those who search for the origins of the ‘pan-Israelite ideology’ in the post-exilic period among powerful groups who were concerned to expand and defend their land claims...a similar approach identifies the courts of Judah’s leading kings as the architects of the pan-Israelite ideology.” In his opinion, however, “in viewing this identity as a whole-cloth invention, both approaches fail to do justice to the diversity of the evidence. My own approach to the origins of the Pan-Israelite identity, and of the demotic purview that so thoroughly animates biblical writings, emphasizes the experience of defeat and the responses to it,” (Wright 2014, 141–141). In this case, I think Wright oversimplifies the arguments of other scholars, who do not, in my opinion, argue that there was no relationship between Judah and Israel prior to this point, and in fact it is widely agreed that this is not built, in biblical literature, out of “whole cloth”, but through interaction with Israelite traditions. With respect to the continued maintenance of the land of Israelite groups after the fall of Samaria, see for example, Barmash 2005.

410 As Wright puts it, “How did Judah come to see itself as belonging to the people of Israel? The responses to this question are wide-ranging. On one side of the spectrum, there are those who begin on the premise that the inhabitants of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah saw themselves as one people already at an early point in their history. Some would even claim that the inhabitants of Israel and Judah share common ethnic origins that predate ‘the emergence of the monarchy’ and continued to figure prominently in the consciousness of the population for centuries thereafter. Such assumptions fail, however, to distinguish between biblical Israel and historical Israel. The two are not the same” (Wright 2014, 141). Additionally, he suggests that “if Samaria had not exerted influence over Judah for many years, and if Judah had not been interested in the ‘Israelite’ traditions after 722 B.C.E., the name Israel, and the discourse on peoplehood that grew up around it would likely have been completely lost or preserved solely among the Samaritans” (Wright 2014, 146). I disagree with Wright as to whether Samarian influence on historical Judah is necessary for the appropriation of Samarian history by Judah in the sense that we would not, for example, demand that the medieval groups which created “Trojan” histories for themselves had experienced considerable Trojan influence. However, the point that Judah’s continued interest in Israel, after the fall of Israel, is the reason for the Bible’s articulation of an Israelite history, as opposed to anything that may have occurred when Israel and Judah co-existed, is a very valuable one. It is not that Judahite and Israelite co-existence is a null factor in the particular form of Judah’s re-creation of Israel in biblical literature; it is that that co-existence does not explain Judah’s interest in Israel.

411 Unless we can imagine that the Bible as a whole was more tightly controlled by a single actor than is generally supposed, its ethnic articulations probably are, as these tend to be, multiple and multi-vocalic: It is not the case, for example, that all American authors imagine the same, mutually agreed upon America. As most scholars now realize, texts which offer identity constructions are often aspirational, offering new
suggesting here, nonetheless, is that “biblical” identity is not multiple, it is not each of the identities it contains which are better classified as “Judahite” or “Israelite” identity articulations. Biblical identity is rather encompassed by an overall systematization of various identity narratives into one, through an overall genealogical superstructure which mitigates many, although not nearly all, contradictions. This was part of the purpose of the inquiry into the Catalogue and the Chronicles genealogy in chapter 2, to demonstrate the power of genealogy in harmonizing contradictions.

In this chapter, I will present the final elements of my model of biblical construction. Prior to that, however, it seems worth noting that a very useful parallel to this Judahite appropriation (or appropriations) of Israelite myth is presented by Na’aman, who points out that in the history of Assyria and Babylon, Babylon’s “continued supremacy in Mesopotamian cult and culture” was acknowledged by both sides, despite the fact that for most of the Iron Age it was Assyria that was the far more powerful place (Na’aman 2010, 11). And for this reason a number of Assyrian kings, including

imagination which quite often never take root. Malkin suggests that there is an extent to which “myth, as an idea shared both synchronically and diachronically, serves as a filter through which societies explore and organize reality,” (Malkin 1998, 34). However, he also wisely mentions the limitations of myth in this respect, noting that genealogy especially “may serve as an example of the relationship between poetic or erudite identification and living reality.” Often, connections invented in genealogies, such as attempts to tie Nostoi histories to the peoples of Italy, wouldn’t achieve any force at all (Malkin 1998, 8–9). Most scholars agree that Panhellenism was more a product of events, such as the Persian War, than literary evolutions such as the Catalogue (Konstan 2001). Despite the gap, however, between elite articulation and the wider social world of ancient places, mythographic elements, whether aspirational or responsive, are not unimportant in identity formation.

412 “With all due caution, I submit that the political-cultural relationship between the kingdom of Judah and Israel may be compared with that between Assyria and Babylonia. Like Babylonia, Israel was the territory where many statehood, cultic, and cultural elements first emerged. In Mesopotamia, Assyria rose to become the dominant power and used its military supremacy to gain control over the cultic and cultural heritage of ancient Mesopotamia; while in Palestine, following the annexation of Israel by Assyria, its patrimony was left vacant and Judah tried to absorb it and be considered the ‘genuine’ Israel. The thesis suggested here is that the adoption of the Israelite identity by the Judahite scribes and elite was motivated by the desire to take over the highly prestigious vacant heritage of the Northern Kingdom, just as Assyria had sought to take possession of the highly prestigious heritage of ancient Mesopotamia” (Na’aman 2010, 17).
Tukulti-Ninurta I and the much later Sennacherib attempted to Babylonize Assyrian religion, rather than Assyrianize Babylonian religion, even though in each case it was in the context of an Assyrian conquest of Babylon. What this demonstrates is something very important, which is that it is probably impossible to be certain exactly how Judah and Israel’s histories prepared the ground for the assumption of an Israelite identity by Judah, other than that it is reflective of Israel’s greater cultural prestige. It is reasonable to suppose that the original assumption of an Israelite identity occurred in the 8th century for both cultural and territorial reasons, as a means through which King Hezekiah could pursue various aims or through which northerners could find themselves a new home in the South. However, I believe the biblical Panisraelite idea is actually the product of the revival described by Satlow, a second distinct “invention” of Panisraelite traditions (Satlow 2014, 92).

The Persian Period Re-Invention of Judahite History

413 In Tukulti-Ninurta’s case, in the 13th century B.C.E., he “removed the statue of Marduk from Esagil to Ashur and celebrated the Akitu festival there in honour of Marduk…but he elevated the god Ashur over the Babylonian Marduk as the “Assyrian Enlil”, and adopted several new epithets and titles of Babylonian origin in his inscriptions. He transported a rich collection of Babylonian scholarly texts to Assyria in a bid to make it a centre of learning. Finally, Assyrian scribes composed original literary works that creatively reworked Babylonian themes and structures, the most remarkable of which is the Tukulti-Ninurta Epos. In response, Babylonian scribes composed propagandist works presenting Assyria as a subordinate kingdom of Babylonia, and its rulers as lacking talent and respectability” (Na’aman 2010, 9–10). In Sennacherib’s case, in the late 8th and early 7th centuries B.C.E., he “destroyed Babylon, and removed both its ashes and its statue of Marduk to Assyria”; “celebrated the Babylonian New Year’s festival in Ashur (complete with a rewriting of Enuma Elish);” and “commissioned literary works exalting Ashur by casting him in the image of the Babylonian god Marduk. In some inscriptions the god Ashur bears Marduk’s former titles, while Marduk’s own titles in these texts reveal a striking demotion in status” (Na’aman 2010, 11–12). Na’aman also refers to the work of Peter Machinist, who noted “these [contests] were in large measure over political identity, indeed, cosmological identity: which state, which capital—Babylon, Assur, Nineveh—would be the cosmic center? Put another way and focusing on the Assyrian ruling elites specifically, we may say that Babylonia was for these elites not simply a military or political problem of governance; it was also a problem of ownership of the cultural patrimony of Mesopotamia…for Sennacherib what was ultimately at stake was the neutralization of the cultural/cosmic imperium that Babylon represented and its transfer to Assyria” (Machinist 2006, 297; Na’aman 2010, 13).
Here is another problem for those who would argue that biblical ethnicity was not significantly “invented” in the Persian period, despite the fact that it may have been invented in a similar fashion previously: it is now more or less understood that it does not take a particularly long time to assemble a primordialist ethnic narrative, and that though this process includes the literary and historical equivalents of what Malkin has called “cultic relics”, what is done to these relics need not leave very much of their original sense intact. As Knauf notes:

A model of how a national identity—and the cultural expression of such an identity—might emerge in a country as geographically, ethnically, and economically fragmented as Israel/Palestine can be studied by means of Palestinian ethnogenesis during the course of the twentieth century C.E. The keffiyah became the male accoutrement expressing ‘being Palestinian’ in the course of what can now be called the ‘first intifada,’ 1936-39 C.E. Prior to that date, no upper-class Jerusalemite or Nablusi would have donned such a rustic piece of headgear (Knauf 2006, 294).

In short, primordialist ethnic myths such as those which span biblical literature from Genesis to 2 Kings can indeed, in the words of Malkin, be “‘invented’ within the limits of some known past”, (Malkin 1998, 58). With respect to “artifactual” literature accompanying such invention, as Knauf puts it, in the context of his own discussion of Panisraeliteism, “there was no Torah before the Torah” (Knauf 2006, 291). And it

---

414 Another useful study for our purposes is Oberholzer’s study of Native American “dream-catchers”. The salient facts are that while dream-catchers are indeed traditional artifacts, their original purpose was as a charm to protect babies. They are no longer produced for this purpose but “rendered as earrings and ornamental items for car and home,” and “for Natives, dream-catchers serve a dual purpose in providing a cash return while simultaneously ‘marketing’ Native value and spirituality” (Oberholzer 1995, 141). We can see that both the dream-catcher and the keffiyah would be culturally useless without their actual history, but the change in their meaning is what made them instrumental to more modern identity articulations. In this sense, we can entertain the possibility of an apparently ancient tradition, such as certain narratives about David, as, in a sense, a literary dream-catcher or keffiyah, in which we can have little sense of how much re-purposing has occurred.

415 As he adds in a footnote, “nor was there ‘biblical’ literature (in the sense of canonical literature) prior to the Torah” (Knauf 2006, 291, fn. 2). Knauf presents several surprising assumptions without offering considerable support in the course of this article, including that the Torah was created in 398 B.C.E., and, again, that linguistic evidence alone is determinative for establishing the pace of change. There are many
seems less and less as if there is any logical method towards circumventing this dictum. The “biblical” aspect of biblical literature is whatever marks it out from its previous state as Judahite and in some cases Israelite literature, and it is naïve to minimize the effect of this transformation.

The intentions and intentionality of the authors who ultimately combined the narratives present in Genesis-2 Kings and in 1 Chron 1:1-9:1a is a very important topic. But for the purposes of this study it is necessary only to note that that intentionality exists and shapes meanings. And we can add to this that seemingly small changes can have extraordinary effects. In the previous discussion of Genesis 49, I noted that only 49:1-9 is couched as blessings put in the mouth of Jacob and pronounced in the first person, thus presumably indicating that these blessings were originally independent from those that follow. Yet look at the difference between assuming that Genesis 49 is of one piece and of two pieces. As a unity, Genesis 49 is a paradigmatic expression of tribal-genealogical myths—twelve tribes encompassing north and south, the names of which are also the names of Jacob’s sons—and it has consequently been used as evidence for the early appearance of this tribal vision. Without them what remains, which would be third-person blessings not apparently pronounced by anyone, blessing Zebulun, Issachar, Dan,

conceptual approaches in Knauf’s study which I applaud, but I cannot share the certainty he displays about the chronology of events in the Persian period. So too, Davies, as Na’aman notes, has made significant conceptual contributions towards pointing to the wide gap between ‘historical Israel,” that is, the Northern Kingdom, and ‘biblical Israel’, the unity of the people of Israel and Judah, but his position has also been significantly criticized for its lack of attention to linguistic and archaeological evidence (P. R. Davies 1992, 11–74; P. R. Davies 2007, 1–23; Na’aman 2014, 117). As Schniedewind, for example, has put it, “For two reasons, it is difficult to assume that the Pentateuch was essentially composed at a very late date…The first reason is simply that the language is Classical Hebrew, not late Hebrew. Although scholars have made this observation before, it has not sufficiently taken root…The second reason that the Pentateuch is unlikely to have been very late is the prominent role given in it to the northern tribes of Israel” (Schniedewind 2004, 82). Finkelstein has argued that major steps were taken towards PanIsraeliteism immediately after the fall of Israel, but that developments continued into the Persia and even Hellenistic periods, which have been an increasing focus of other recent discussions of the construction of biblical literature, visible especially in the work of Carr (Finkelstein 2013, 156–158; Carr 2011).
Gad, Asher, Naphtali, Joseph, and Benjamin, would apparently demonstrate quite the opposite: that, at least, the southern tribes were not conceptualized as part and parcel with the northern tribes by the author of these verses and that these northern tribes were not necessarily imagined by that author through the Jacob paradigm.416

There is a sense in which this is merely a semantic point, but that does not alter its importance: I am suggesting that in becoming part of the Bible, diverse materials from diverse periods were transformed into something new. Prior to this transformation they were not “biblical literature” in the process of becoming, but Judahite literature and potentially Israelite literature which existed in a much larger world of literature and contexts than is now recoverable. The divide I imagine, here, between biblical and Judahite literature does not amputate biblical literature from its tradition-history, it merely refuses to treat that tradition-history as somehow, in essence, the Bible.

Just so, the processes I have discussed in Greek literature are not, in any sense, Apollodorus’ Bibliotheca in the process of becoming, over centuries. They are instead—of course—Greek Literature. The evolution of genealogical traditions before and after the Catalogue of Women is not the Catalogue, and the dynamism of the Catalogue with respect to the inherited traditions upon which it acts is universally acknowledged.417

---

416 As Fleming notes, “the contrasting voices reflect a deeper difference of perspective in Genesis 49: where we find simple declarations about the various peoples of Israel, there would be no reason to read these as part of a family system without the wider Jacob narrative. In particular, the central six tribes in verses 13-21 involve brief statements without hint of relationship to Jacob as sons or to each other as brothers” (Fleming 2012, 86).

417 That is, the processes which produced the Catalogue of Women were the slow aggregation of independent stemmata over time, but the Catalogue itself is a sixth century text (West 1985, 165). It is both the case that the union of some of the stemmata prior to the imposition of a completely coherent framework by the Catalogue artist is not the Catalogue, and that later versions of the Catalogue, in the work of Apollodorus or in Roman versions such as Hyginus’ Fabulae, are not the Catalogue either. It is a specific, unique, historically contingent effort. Its ideas evolved over time but its presentation emerged all at once.
I imagine to have occurred is a situation in which there were indeed a series of documents and narratives in constant evolution over centuries, some of which are preserved relatively intact in the sense of the word-by-word presentation. But I reserve “the Bible” as a term for a very specific set of aggregative actions, editorial changes, and new compositions which created the book itself, even if in many cases from cultural artifacts, and I imagine that at many instances it makes us read the words differently than we would have in non-biblical contexts.

What marks the Catalogue out from the history of its traditions is the specific manner and form of their combination.

How many originally independent traditions are combined within the “Jacob system”? This is a difficult and fascinating question. In the Chronicles genealogy’s attempt to perform a Catalogue-like action on received traditions it seems to have preserved more than one conflicting tradition about Manasseh, Benjamin, and potentially Judah. It was my argument in a previous chapter that the presence of a genealogy of the tribe of Manasseh in both 1 Chron 5 and 1 Chron 7 was the result of the Chronicler’s inability to sort through conflicting traditions, and the presence of Benjamin in 1 Chron 7 in 1 Chron 8 was the result of the Chronicler attempting, as the Catalogue artist attempted, to foreground epic with a genealogy that departs from the careful systematization of the whole. In the Catalogue, this meant that four of the five books were engaged in one endeavor and the fifth was a genealogy of the heroes of the Trojan War, in this case chapters 1-7 are a genealogy of Israel and chapter 8 foregrounds the career of Saul as the introduction to the monarchical epic. The genealogical narratives of Judah in 1 Chron 2 and 4 are presumably also the result of conflicting traditions. There is nothing surprising about this; West argues that the Catalogue brought together more than eight separate genealogical traditions (Elis, Amyclae, Aulis-Hyria, Malis, Pisatis, Messene, Argos, Lesbos, and more), encompassing four originally independent myth cycles (Iolkos, centered around Peleus, Jason, and Achilles; Aetolian-Elean-Pylian, around Oineus, Meleager and others; Theban, around Oedipus and the Seven Against Thebes, and Troy) (West 1985, 137). And there are other indications. The term שבט, for tribe, in contrast to ממטה, refers nearly exclusively to Levi or “the half-tribe of Manasseh”, perhaps revealing a different understanding of the term in these two cases. שבט is fairly often used for the tribes as a whole (Exod 28:21, 39:14, Deut 1:23, 29:18, Josh 3:12, 4:5, 4:8, 18:4, 1 Sam 10:20, 1 Kings 11:13,32, 36 among other possible references) but when referring to individual tribes is directed at either Levi or Manasseh in 16 instances, Dan once (Judges 18:30), and Judah three times (Josh 7:16, 1 Kings 12:20, 2 Kings 17:18). It was probably not the Persian period author of the efforts to extend the tribal system throughout the Bible who was responsible for the combination of the patriarchal narratives, given how these are in “communication” with each other—“The Abraham and Jacob narratives ‘communicate’ with each other so that, in order to understand the Abraham traditions, we need to start with a few words on the early layer in the Jacob cycle” (Finkelstein and Römer 2014, 7)—- but neither is this likely to be a very early effort, and we have discussed many other changes probably independently authored: the transformation of the fathers of Exodus into the patriarchs, the building of connections between the David narratives and Moses. And so on.

Which then, as suggested in the previous note, continued to receive edits into the Maccabean period at least.
Ultimately, what I have described in previous chapters, what I will finish describing in this one, is something that I think might reasonably be called the “Jacob System”, and in short, in my opinion, the Bible and the “Jacob System” are thoroughly coincident.\textsuperscript{420} The centrality of the family of Jacob to the biblical narrative is increasingly a topic of research but not quite in the way pursued here.\textsuperscript{421} What I will argue is that what has occurred in microcosm in, for example, the transformation of Genesis 49 into a charter presentation of tribal-genealogical myth by means of the addition of an introduction, is reduplicated in macrocosm across the whole of biblical text. It is no small thing to note that without Genesis 49:1-8, the Blessing of Jacob has nothing to do with Jacob, or with Judah, and that this is metaphorically true on a larger scale for the species of edits described above. Thus, it is also worth noting that my judgment of the Bible as a late text is not at the same time a judgment of Judahite literature, as in certain more minimalist approaches.\textsuperscript{422} I certainly do not believe that all that many of the ideas about Judahite history were invented for the first time in the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries B.C.E, I simply believe the way in which the Bible specifically invents them, more accurately

\textsuperscript{420} This may be because I have a more pronounced respect for the extent to which these aggregations and edits altered our understanding of earlier material than most, but if it is the case that so fundamental a conception as the creation of a patriarchal pre-history to the Mosaic exodus and the united monarchy did not appear until sometime in the Persian period, this respect seems warranted.

\textsuperscript{421} Na’aman’s very recent, and very perspicacious study of “The Jacob Story and the Formation of Biblical Israel”, for example, very clearly considers “the Patriarchal story-cycle” to consist of “both the three ancestors of the people of Israel and the 12 tribes as an embodiment of Israel’s segregated origin”. He is probably correct in suggesting that the systematization of the two “represented a major step towards creating a sense of unity among devotees of YHWH who remained in the land” and that “some of the narratives are based on oral traditions whose scope and detail cannot be established, which the author augmented by consulting a few written sources and by adding various literary and ideological elements of his own creative imagination”, but in my opinion the two halves of this puzzle originally appeared at different times as the product of different efforts (Na’aman 2014, 119).

\textsuperscript{422} That is, it should be noted that the sense in which I therefore imagine Israel to have been invented in the Persian period is not the sense in which, for example, Davies and Knauf seem to have imagined it (P. R. Davies 1992; P. R. Davies 2007; Knauf 2006). The divide I imagine between biblical and Judahite literature does not amputate biblical literature from its tradition-history, it merely refuses to treat that tradition-history as somehow, in essence, the Bible.
reinvents them, is new and unique. And Genesis 49 is a great example of what I mean. Since the efforts towards this end, however influential, are often quite marginal and self-contained—we can think again of Exodus 1:1-6-- this approach potentially leaves great swaths of biblical literature as potential product of earlier ages. It simply also means giving more credit to specific, late efforts in terms of making meaning. Not only does this imagination of biblical construction seem to fit the evidence of the text fairly well, when one considers the curious disconnects described in the previous chapter, it also has the happy result of bringing discussions of biblical literature into more harmony with modern ethnic and historical memory theory, in a way foreshadowed by the above discussion. However, a more thorough treatment of this problem must wait until the conclusion of this chapter.

**The Tribal System Becomes a Genealogical Super System, Part I: Concepts**

Debra Ballentine describes myth in this way: “myths elaborate sites of relationships among characters…These sets of relationships may be described as fluid taxonomies that are available for innovative interpretation” (Ballentine forthcoming, 1). What is going on with genealogical myth in biblical literature is a more literal version of taxonomy, in that its ranking and ordering systems are quite explicit. We can even think about this through scientific vocabulary: the third rank up in the classical taxonomic hierarchy, conveniently, is family: family, then genus, then species. I argued in the previous chapter that, in this sense, the narratives of David and Moses do not share a species, that is, they do not seem to have originated in conversation with each other, but the groups they belong to, Judah and Levi, might be considered, in the final (Jacob) system of biblical identity, related genera. And the related genera are indeed members of
the same family, Jacob’s family, and it is on this level that the identification between the two narratives is made.\footnote{This discussion of taxonomy and religion may bring to the mind of certain religion scholars the work of J.Z. Smith, for example Smith 1996.}

The structuring functionality of genealogy has been a major subject of this study throughout, particularly in my comparison between the \textit{Catalogue} and the Chronicles genealogy. Malkin suggests that “genealogy can be an uncertain device for articulating ethnicity, because it is open to free manipulation and conflicting claims. It is capable, moreover, of differentiating and relating nations at the same time” (Malkin 1998, 61). But there are two issues here. As I noted previously, because it seems relatively common for active ethnic articulations to \textit{allow} for both differentiation and relation depending upon circumstances—we can consider, here, the Ionians and the Dorians—this might more accurately be considered a feature than a bug, so to speak.\footnote{As Johnson notes, “the purpose of Old Testament genealogy…[is] establishing a degree of kinship and at the same time a degree of distinction between Israel and her neighbors” (Johnson 1969, 77). Elsewhere, Malkin argues, surprisingly, “if genealogies mattered as defining ethnicity, why do we not find efforts to rework them in order to fit in the exceptions?” (Malkin 2001, 11). I am not sure to what he is referring here. If Macedon is an “exception” in Greek mythology, then its inclusion in the \textit{Catalogue} seems to be evidence of the phenomenon he’s discussing, as also perhaps the manipulations performed by Athens to achieve a worthy ancestry in \textit{Catalogue} myth (Hall 2001; Crielaard 2009).}

But it is also the case that it is \textit{only} free manipulation which allows previously unrelated figures to abscond from their unrelatedness, to become part of a coherent system. What is visible in biblical literature is both unrelatedness and manipulation into relatedness.\footnote{As Sanders notes, for example, “the great embarrassment of Deuteronomy was that it was brought together with the Covenant Code, and the great embarrassment of the Holiness Code is that it was brought together with Deuteronomy. At a key moment, the independent sources were interwoven to create a remarkable new document that then requires extremely active interpretation to even be read” (Sanders 2014, 10). On the other hand, as Blum notes “the first corpus to be considered might be…the Pentateuch. Nevertheless, Old Testament scholarship, at least in its early period, almost unanimously agreed that the book of Joshua should be added. The reason is that it is only in Joshua that the Israelites reach the goal of their journey out of Egypt. Why, however, should one stop at the end of Joshua? The narrative of the}
Before I discuss the construction of the system as a whole, it seems necessary to answer the question, how do we know that the “Jacob system”, as we might call it, is a system? And one latently imposed, rather than an organic outgrowth of early periods of biblical composition? In simplest form, this question asks us to arbitrate between whether specifically biblical literature happened slowly or all at once, as noted in the introductory discussion, but first there is a larger point to make. The idea of contents reveals the existence of a container, which I have suggested is the family of Jacob. But just as powerfully, the existence of a container reveals the existence of discontents. The last chapter was ultimately concerned with the superficial ways in which certain discontents have been mediated, and I argued that since the superficiality of these remains apparent, the atomized nature of pre-biblical literature is clearly visible. Without the oath promise layer, and the combined efforts visible in Exodus 1:6-6:26, in short, the redefinition of the exodus narrative as an outgrowth of the patriarchal narratives would not be visible. Without various iterations of the tribal discourse at strategic moments, particularly Exodus 1:1-6, the redefinition of much of the rest of biblical literature as tribal narratives would not be visible. And so on.

However, there are still more striking and more revealing “discontents” which, if they are taken seriously and not explained away as textual corruption, gesture evocatively towards the one time existence of wholly different paradigms of biblical identification. In Judges 17:7, for example, we read ויהי נער מבית לומד יהודה וישמעל יהודה ויהי לו לוי, “there was a young man from Bethlehem of Judah, he was of the family of Judah, and he was a Levite.” The idea that a Levite could be of the tribe of Judah is an impossibility in the history of Israel continues further in a seamless manner up to the loss of the land at the end of the books of Kings” (Blum 2011, 44).
final form of biblical identity. In Isaiah 48:1 we read of an Israel who “came out from the waters”—or more probably loins—of Judah. It is quite understandable that Judah should have had, at one time, such a conception of Israel, that not all authors at all times should acquiesce to Israel’s superiority and priority, but it is of course in direct conflict with what we expect and largely what we experience elsewhere in biblical literature. After cursing the king, Shimei son of Gera refers to himself, while seeking reconciliation, as “the first of the house of Joseph”, though he is a Benjaminite. This may merely refer to the fact that he is an Israeliite or it may reveal a more complicated and less linear concept of the tribal identifications of Israel than we are accustomed to. I have discussed repeatedly the narrative of Benjamin conquering and dwelling in Jerusalem, and it should be appreciated that this is not merely a historical contradiction but a challenge to one of the central conceits of tribal myth, the maintenance of, the possibility of a geographical systematization orchestrated through the tribes, the tie between tribe and land. If Jerusalem could have been, according to one tradition, the domain of Benjaminites, or if there is an imaginary of Israel in which the tribes live together in cities rather than apart in regions, this would be in direct contradiction to most biblical discourse.

Any argument that what is meant here is that this is a Levite who is from Judah must deal with the verse’s curious insistence, which very specifically spells out that he was from Bethlehem of Judah and he was of the family of Judah and he was a Levite.

Or “belly”. In my opinion, ומקם, for intelligibility reasons. For see 2 Sam 16:11, Psalm 71:6, and especially Isaiah 49:1, the very next chapter. Here, we read יהוה מבטן קראני ממעי אמי הזכיר שָם “YHWH called to me from the womb, from the belly of my mother, and called my name”.ןמקם also appears in 1 Q Isac secundum of Isaiah 48:1.

While the claim of Judges 1:21, for example, is that the Benjaminites did not drive out the Jebusites, the result even in this verse is that the Benjaminites live among the Jebusites in Jerusalem עד היום הזה. Whether this version of the narrative allows for David’s dramatic conquest, given that Benjaminites are not mentioned at all in that pericope is a complicated question.
And there are other indications that, whatever else is true, the biblical system was being constructed and resisted for a considerable period of time.\footnote{429} We have seen many of these instances before: in Judges 5, Gilead and Machir appear as independent tribes, an unusual description of Israel which we can visually see being corrected elsewhere through genealogical discourse.\footnote{430} Amos 7 describes Israel as the House of Isaac, a designation probably at least partially responsible for the assimilation of Isaac into the patriarchal narratives of Genesis. There are also quite literal instances of contestation: in Ezek 37:16-22, Ezekiel combines the stick of Judah with the stick of Ephraim, and says that he will make them one nation, which could be read as a restoration of the mythical united monarchy OR as a charter myth for the idea of an ethnic union between the two kingdoms. In Zech 11:14, the prophet cuts a stick in half and declares the brotherhood, the אחים, between Israel and Judah to be at an end. It is hard not to read this as a repudiation, rare though these are, of the Panisraelite idea. Since Zechariah 1:1 claims the book was written in the Persian period, this is not a reference to historical Israel, but likely a rejection of the prevailing biblical ethnic discourse.\footnote{431}

---

\footnote{429}Bruce Lincoln and Debra Ballentine have offered interesting discussions of resistance in the construction of myths. As Lincoln notes, audiences can “resist narrative and classificatory innovations; moreover, they are perfectly capable of introducing innovations of their own by selective hearing and reinterpretation” (Lincoln 1999, 150). As Ballentine argues “ideology may sustain or challenge hegemonic powers, and these may be dominant or non-dominant, real or imagined power structures” (Ballentine forthcoming, 2).

\footnote{430} That is, through the transformation of Gilead into Manasseh’s grandson and Machir into his son (Gen 50:23, Num 26:29, 27:1, 36:1, Josh 17:1, 3, 1 Chron 2:21, 23, 7:14-17). Importantly, in Num 32:39, we see this discourse in mid-transformation, as Machir, son of Manasseh, conquers the region of Gilead, a mid-point which also appears in Deut 3:15, and Joshua 13:31. This is a very valuable and very rare biblical instance in which we can see genealogical transformations occurring in the way that they are commonly visible in Greek myth, that is, still in process over a period of time.

\footnote{431} It could, of course, also be a reference to the Samaritans, a frame—Samaritans as Israelites-- fairly consistently denied by other biblical texts, but whose denial has been challenged by recent discoveries (Anderson and Giles 2012).
Here, finally, we can also discuss what our findings suggest about Genesis. We have seen in the previous chapter that the patriarchal narratives were extended throughout the Pentateuch through one layer, the oath promise layer, and the tribal narratives through another (largely Exod 1-6, Gen 49, and Deut 33). But we can also say that the oath promise layer has an effect on how we read Genesis, which may not make the distinction between Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob on the one hand and the rest of the cast of characters in Genesis, Noah, Terah, and Adam, and so on, on the other, that reading Genesis through the oath promise layer suggests.¹⁴² And this is buttressed by the observation, also made in the previous chapter, that outside Genesis-2 Kings, the patriarchs are almost exclusively treated separately or in groups of two rather than three. There have been many recent and interesting discussions of the originally separate character of the patriarchal narratives from each other, a concept that seems a necessity given their different treatments by the various prophets.¹⁴³ This would, of course, be yet another reason to think of Genesis, as a whole, as a late text. Additionally, it is now quite common for scholars to suggest that the

¹⁴² We can imagine in this context Genesis 31:53:

אלהי אברהם ואלהי נחור ישׁפטו בינינו אלהי אביהם וישׁבע יעקב בפחד אביו יצחק

“May the god of Abraham and the god of Nahor, the gods of their father, judge between us.’ So Jacob swore by the fear (of his father Isaac.” This is an unusual text, in which Laban and Jacob are swearing oaths to each other and it may be that we are supposed to understand that the gods of Nahor and Abraham are different gods, depending on whether we are to read אלהי אביהם as the god or gods of their fathers. Nevertheless, the most likely reading to me is that YHWH is here being referred to as the god of Nahor, the god of Abraham, and the (fear?) of Isaac, a different arrangement than the more typical “god of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob”.

¹⁴³ Particularly extensive recent discussions appear in K. L. Sparks 1998, 227; Köckert 2014; Fleming 2012, 172. Kratz has a very valuable discussion of the Jacob myth, as does Römer, and de Pury has quite a few (Kratz 2005, 114–117; de Pury 1991; de Pury 2006; de Pury 1992; de Pury 2000; de Pury 2000; Römer 1990). Another noteworthy recent treatment, by Finkelstein and Römer, has much to recommend it, especially in pointing out that, for example, when Abraham is mentioned in Ezekiel 33:23–29, he is presented as והיה, “one”, and “it is noteworthy that the link with Jacob, who is mentioned in Ezek 37:25 and 28:25 in relation with the gift of the land, is apparently unimportant or even unknown” (Finkelstein and Römer 2014, 11). Though each has its own unique aspects, these treatments tend to agree that traditions relating to Jacob are the oldest, given his importance to Hosea, and that traditions about Abraham may date to exilic times, although as Finkelstein and Römer note, there are some reasons to believe that at least some traditions about Abraham date to the Iron Age (Finkelstein and Römer 2014, 9). Discussions of the atomization of narratives about these figures have a considerable scholarly tradition, notably including Noth’s discussion of the “East Jordan Jacob” (Noth 1972, 82–90).
Joseph narrative, the hinge between the patriarchal and exodus narratives, was originally separate.\textsuperscript{434}

We can think of the conceptual problem such separability represents in the context of our comparison. The discussion of \textit{Return} myth in a previous chapter was meant to indicate that the question “what are the contents of \textit{Return} myth” is a troubled one, because what represents “the” contents is contingent on choices made either purposefully or accidentally by various mythographers working in different contexts. There is no compelling reason, for example, why Apollodorus and Pausanias would feel compelled to find a place for Tlepolemus but not any others of the children of Herakles who exist in Greek myth outside of \textit{Return} myth. And when I say “exist”, that is more or less the point: the \textit{Return} could not achieve its purpose so well if it did not define itself as \textit{the} narrative of \textit{the} sons of Herakles, and it is far too easy for scholars to take the word of \textit{emic} narratives as \textit{etic} truths in these cases. Other sons do exist, the system does have discontents. And in this, the pretense to a self-contained objectivity present in most successful historical myths falls apart. What discontents reveal even more powerfully than the idea of contents, is evidence of construction and a break down in the naturalizing ideology which successful constructions promote.

\textsuperscript{434} See, for example C. Levin 2007, 209; M. S. Smith and Bloch-Smith 1997, 152; de Pury 2006, 51. Römer and Brettler 2000 have called attention to the correspondences between the Joseph narrative and Joshua 24, which I (and many others, including these authors) have suggested is a very late text. As Ausloos notes, “Concerning the Joseph narrative in Gen 37-50, two main positions can be discerned in exegetical literature. First, source criticism has aimed at showing that the separate sources J and E—and to a certain extent P—which have been detected within the first chapters of the book of Genesis have their continuation within the Joseph story as well…Secondly, Von Rad’s characterization of the Joseph story as a novella has spawned the idea that the original Joseph narrative was an independent unit with its own history of development, prior to its integration into the other patriarchal narratives and the entire Pentateuch. Against this background, the Joseph story really has become a novella, that once existed entirely autonomous from the rest of the Pentateuch” (Ausloos 2001, 381–382). It seems as if the second point of view is currently in the ascendancy.
And, too, among the genealogical odds and ends in biblical literature there are elements that we can recognize as potential avenues for ethnic articulation that ultimately fell by the wayside, but may once have stood at the center of entirely distinct ethnic discourses. What purpose, for example, could there be in Abraham having Ishmael as well as Isaac, as well as—though this is presumably often forgotten—Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak, and Shuah, with Keturah, if not to articulate a desirable connection which never gained the prominence of the central elements of Jacob myth? What about Jacob and Esau? It seems a reasonable suggestion that Israel’s relationship with Edom, or more probably Judah’s relationship with Edom, was as important to some authors and thinkers as the relationship between Israel and Judah, at least until Edom apparently collaborated with Babylon to destroy Jerusalem (Psalm 137).

What if the story of Jacob and Laban, along with the various other elements of Aramean ethnic discourse in Genesis, was meant to signal the importance of that genealogical relationship as emphatically as the Judah-Israel discourse which became dominant? Again, as we have learned from our survey of Greek myth, the measure of an ethnic myth is not its truth value but its success or failure, its skillfulness or lack of skillfulness. We can think of Odysseus among the Etruscans as we say that it is not always easy to guess what ethnic discourses will be successful (Malkin 1998, 28). The

---

435 About this particular myth, Finkelstein and Römer posit an interesting suggestion: “P shows interest in the integration of Ishmael into the covenant and in his good relationship with Isaac…for P, ‘Ishmaelites’ were in contact with the Judahites; therefore the priestly authors wished to underline the integrating of Idumea and the South (territorially or theologically) into the offspring of Abraham” (Finkelstein and Römer 2014, 20). I imagine that many other “odds and ends” had similar justifications, some of which are now lost to us.

436 In addition to the genealogical connections attributed to Aram in Genesis and the Aramean background of the patriarchs in both Genesis and Deuteronomy (Deut 26:5), at one point in the monarchical history, King Asa of Judah allies with King Ben-Hadad of Aram against King Baasha of Israel (1 Kings 15). The connection proposed, biblically, between Israel and Judah is not built of too many additional elements beyond these.
fact that biblical literature allows for identifications with Aram, Egypt, or Edom (especially in Deut 23:8-9) and allows for David’s ancestry to be part Moabite, is very probably evidence that for a long time Judah’s ethnic identification remained open to competing claims.

Indeed this is probably the case for longer, and in more ways, than has been remotely usual to consider. Could it be that the sons of Jacob are not all the sons Jacob ever had, as with the sons of Herakles? Probably not, since it is not clear that the idea of Jacob’s sons has a significant antiquity. However, it is also quite clear that the tribes which are considered in Genesis to be the descendants of Jacob’s sons are not all the tribes that had ever been considered by biblical authors. Meroz, Machir, and Gilead all appear to be tribes, as mentioned in the first chapter. It’s possible that the Calebites or Jerahmeelites were not always described in terms of Jacob-tribal myth, or within narratives about the tribe of Judah. The birth of Benjamin is in Gen 35, when all of the other sons of Jacob are born in Gen 29-30 may indicate that Benjamin was not always considered part of the tribal system, by everyone, though it may be more likely that the distance is occasioned by the need to interpolate more narratives about Rachel prior to her death in childbirth. 1 Chronicles 2:3-9:1a doesn’t include Dan or a genealogy for Zebulun, while the declaration in Gen 48 that Ephraim and Manasseh are to be numbered among Jacob’s sons is probably an editorial addition meant to legitimate an alternative tribal configuration, visible in the lists that include Ephraim and Manasseh rather than Joseph. Ezekiel 48 has a different vision than Genesis 49, and then there is the visions of Judges 5 and Deuteronomy 33, and so on. The “house of Joseph” does not necessarily, in every case, refer to Ephraim and Manasseh, and may sometimes refer only to Ephraim.
How did the north come to be called holistically Ephraim, and is that something which is comprehensible with tribal myth as it is presented in Genesis, or is it in contradiction to it?

I have argued throughout that the tribal system was not always considered in the surpassingly genealogical light in which the book of Genesis articulates it, and here we return to that claim.\footnote{In addition to the points made above, as Finkelstein and Römer argue, it is likely that the order of the patriarchs in Genesis is intended “to subordinate the Jacob stories to the Abraham ones, in essence to subordinate Israel (which was no more) to Judah” (Finkelstein and Römer 2014, 18). However, this goal is very much at odds with the overall frame of biblical literature in which it is belonging in the matrix of the children of Jacob that defines even such clearly southern figures as David. That is, the Bible seems much more often an effort to subordinate Judah’s history to Israel’s than vice-versa, except in this case, which is another reason to mark a distinction between the processes which resulted in the aggregation of patriarchal narratives and the formation of the overall matrix of tribal myth.} What is notable about the Genesis vision is its breadth: the tribes are Jacob’s children, but Adam, Abraham, and Ishmael are all his family. The existence of these connections, which occur not merely in pericopes such as Genesis 10 but throughout in the narratives about Ishmael, Esau, and Abraham’s other children, present a far wider ethnographic imagination than is often realized. What this book tells us about what follows is that the line of Jacob exists within the same dynamic that we have in Greek myth between the privileging of a genealogical line within a broader, interlocking system, and the broader system itself. In this context, we can think again of this description of Herakles in Greek genealogical traditions articulated by Fowler:

Consider the case of Herakles….our genealogist thought Herakles had a strong claim to be Argive, and so Alkmene is a daughter of a son of Perseus, thus making Herakles a Perseid by maternal filiation…But there is a further step taken in the genealogy. Alkmene’s mother, according to our poet, was a daughter of Pelops, and Herakles’ human grandfather, Alkaios, married another daughter of Pelops (Fr. 190). Thus, by further maternal filiation, Herakles is a Pelopid—a fact of the greatest importance to the inhabitants of the Dorian Peloponnese (R. L. Fowler 2000, 7).
Ethnic hybridity, rather than uniformity, has long been one of the least visible aspects of biblical literature, but once we begin looking for it, it is quite apparent. We do not often put it in this way, but the best explanation for the profusion of genealogical detail in biblical literature is probably the same as it is in Greek literature. To the Persian-period Yehudites creating an Israel of the mind, it must have been important that their ancestor Judah was a Jacobite, and an Isaacite, and an Abrahamite, Noahite, and Adamite, a relative of Edomites, Arameans, Ammonites and Moabites, else it would not have been so in their literature. We can speculate about the purposes of these conflicting identifications, and we probably should. And the fact that not everything that appears in the Bible fits within the same rubric just reveals the artifice involved that much more clearly.

The interplay between the general and the specific—the family of Jacob and the line of Jacob-- is evocative of what we have lost by having, in our Judahite library, only a single book. Once again, what we can imagine is biblical myth existing alongside a world of narratives which have not survived in this way. The variances between tribal iterations in biblical literature probably occurred for the same reasons variances in Return myth occurred: because many artists took up the challenge of creating an imaginary Israel based on a 12 tribe idea, the results of which are sometimes visible in biblical literature and presumably sometimes not. There are general tendencies here, such as the difference

---

438 It is easy enough to suggest, for example, what the Spartans might gain through their hybridity. Descent from both Pelops and Perseus legitimizes the Spartan monarchy according to two different mythological epochs. Descent from Lakedaimon and Sparta gives them the autochthonic character that Athens so often boasted about. Descent from Tyndareus and Herakles legitimizes the monarchy through more recent discourses of rule in a way that is consistent with Iliadic myth, while descent from Achaiaos allows the Spartans to claim both Achaian and Dorian identity, giving them various options in the field of kinship diplomacy (Patterson 2010).
between the centrality and importance of the tribes in Numbers and Joshua, and in
Exodus and Deuteronomy respectively, and then there are loose ends which defy any
harmonization we might suggest, such as Micah’s Judahite Levite. What we can imagine,
in my opinion, is a room of scribes inventing different Israels in their heads, like pianists
playing variations on a theme. This, however, is the absolutely crucial point: all Israels
which never existed are equal, but some are more successful than others.

The Tribal System Becomes a Genealogical Super system, Part II: Practical
Matters

_Return_ myth offers us a vocabulary and a standpoint from which to re-imagine the
processes involved in the construction of biblical myth, which has been the purpose of
the comparison all along. There are many parallels, in that narrative, of explicit use. An
equation of Jacob with Temenus, for example, is very valuable. As classicists and
biblical scholars have argued, both Jacob and Temenus seem to have a surpassing
antiquity compared to the other elements of the Jacob narrative and the _Return_ myth.
And, both Jacob and Temenus are central aspects of myth systems that gained their most
enduring prominence elsewhere, not in Israel and Argos, but in Judah and Sparta.

Ephraim and Manasseh may be like Caranus, founder of the Macedonian Herakleid
dynasty. Peripheral in many of the primary articulations of the myth, we can assume—

---

439 We recall here the details of Temenus’ narrative: he is the descendant of Herakles who is supposed to have founded the royal dynasty at Argos. It is widely considered to be the case that _Return_ myth originated at Argos, and that Temenus and his dynasty, the Temenids, are the most ancient aspect of the narrative. See the discussion in chapter 3.

440 Caranus, who appears in narratives of the fourth century, is largely neglected in narratives about the _Return_ significantly post-dating Alexander’s career (Patterson 2010, 4).
as in the career of Alexander the Great, for Caranus—that at other times these discourses were absolutely central. Isaac may appear to us like Aepytus or Aletes, the non-Herakleid figures of Messenian and Corinthian myth who were “Herakleized” to cohere with what was becoming a pan-Peloponnesian myth system. We can imagine that Isaac, too, was originally and organically a figure of ancient Israelite myth, as revealed in Amos 7, and we can buttress this imagination with the fact that Isaac’s integration into patriarchal myth leaves him still mostly invisible save, largely, in doublets of narratives about Abraham. Isaac, in many ways, seems the most poorly integrated of the patriarchs. The importance of this is that we can therefore imagine these biblical figures as we imagine *Return* heroes: as the result of contingent and circumstantial processes, in which other options were both explored and rejected.

What I have largely been engaged in, in this study, is gesturing towards the original atomization of biblical narratives and describing how the placement of the key elements of the grand taxonomy have overruled the loose ends. We can be quite specific about these efforts, now, and in the process, about the age of various parts of Genesis. We can see an author whom we might call the tribal systematizer at work in Exodus 1:1-6.

441 That is, there is probably a sense in which Alexander’s claim of descent from Herakles ultimately elevated the importance of the discourse far beyond even its centrality to Spartan monarchical myth.

442 And Ishmael and the children of Keturah, the children of Ham and Japheth, these are the Herakleids beyond the pale of Return myth, the Herakleid dynasty of the Lydians and Scythians, and so on, and so forth. And this is the lesson of the broader set of relationships between Return myth and Greek genealogical myth generally.

443 A particularly notable aspect of Noth’s discussion of the “East Jordan Jacob” is his suggestion that “the fact that it was Jacob out of the probably rather numerous ‘patriarchs’ in existence, who was given the distinction of being selected as the representative of the theme ‘promise to the patriarchs’ and thereby was incorporated into a growing pentateuchal tradition, again is obviously connected with his ancient association with the sanctuary at Shechem” (Noth 1972, 82). In many ways it seems that we have lost this sense of the selection of biblical narratives from a much wider body of Judahite and Israelite literature that was not, definitionally, biblical. There are likely to have been “many patriarchal figures” who did not make the biblical cut.
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beginning the non-Genesis Pentateuch by immediately defining what follows as an extension of the Genesis Pentateuch, of the tribal-genealogical system specifically, just as 1 Chron 2:1-2 tells us that this retelling of the history of Israel is also defined as the story of Jacob’s sons. Without Exod 1:1-6 we would not get this impression from Exodus and Leviticus, and, surprisingly, in 1 Chron 2:3-9:1a we would also have, instead of a recognizable picture, a confused, repetitive rendition, not obviously subsumed under the rubric of Jacob, and which only contains 11 tribes. Thus, without these introductions, despite their minimalism, both accounts of Israel’s history would read very differently. In the Deuteronomistic History, it is more or less only the tribal system which is connective, another reason to imagine the discourse in Genesis as a combination of two blocks of material. Abraham and Isaac only appear in Joshua 24 and two texts largely associated with the Elijah and Elisha narratives, as discussed in the previous chapter. Jacob appears in only three additional places, but these are crucial turning points: in Samuel’s retirement speech in 1 Sam 12:8, in the last words of David in 2 Samuel 23, and in 2 Kings 17, the chapter which concludes the historical narrative of the kingdom of Israel. These latter two cases represent the only instances in which David and Jacob are both mentioned. We can see a patriarchal systematizer at work in the oath promise layer. Whoever collected Exod 1:7-6:26, in my opinion the same person or group that introduced Exod 1:1-6, blended both the patriarchal and tribal narratives together as, of course, in Genesis generally. As noted in the previous chapter there is, overall, an extraordinary tendency for both patriarchal and tribal connections to appear exclusively at the beginning or end of books. And there is one more element of this overall system I have not previously discussed, the probably stock phrase Reuben, the first-born of Israel,
which appears in several cases as a stand-in for any other evidence that the tribal list in question is meant to relate to the narratives of Genesis. Not at all surprisingly, now, this phrase appears in Exodus 6:14, at the end of the frame of Mosaic call narratives described earlier, in Num 1:20, at the very beginning of yet another book, in Numbers 26:5, and in the Chronicles genealogy, in 1 Chron 5:1, 3.444

Again this likely indicates that much of the activity described here occurred when the historical books, at least, were largely complete, or perhaps (even likely) it occurred in the process of completing them.445 This, overall, is not the same thing as saying that only one group and one time horizon was responsible for the building of all the connections between biblical narratives, and this is a crucial point. It almost certainly was the case that, as in Greek myth, narrative cycles grew together over a long period of time. I have suggested, for example, that it was the Deuteronomistic Historian who was responsible for connecting the narratives of David and Moses, even if this was done largely by juxtaposition and not through introducing real connections of appreciable depth. But this pattern of connections at the fringes of biblical books probably was executed at once, by one author, even if from material that he, she, or they had not composed. And it changed biblical literature considerably, or perhaps I should say it is this which biblicized that literature in the first place.446 Scrutinizing this pattern also

444 Numbers 26:5 is a census of the tribes of Israel occurring immediately after a plague, and though this is not particularly close to the end of the book of Numbers, I think the point is sufficiently made. The appearance of this stock phrase in the Chronicles genealogy may be evidence of Chronicles’ borrowing from earlier discourses or that the authors of this portion of Chronicles, were responsible for introducing it in strategic positions throughout the Bible.

445 That is, these could hardly have clustered around divisions that did not yet exist.

446 I am not suggesting that the traditions under discussion here do not have, in many cases, a significant tradition history, but I am suggesting that when we discuss this, we discuss something other than the Bible, which is made the Bible by the more superficial and strategic efforts described above. Non-biblical, or pre-
reveals another distinction between the tribal and patriarchal methods of building cohesions, and another reason to suppose that these are fundamentally separate efforts. While the oath promise texts show a certain tendency towards hugging the margins, it is not nearly so pronounced as in tribal discourse.⁴⁴⁷

The genealogization of biblical literature ultimately created a superstructure for it which imposed coherence by means of providing a system in which each aspect of biblical literature had a defined and non-contradictory place within the final vision of biblical Panisraeliteism. And indeed, we can ask just how much the desire to create an Israelite history, to “become” Israelite, shaped the emerging biblical canon in less obvious ways. That is, there are some very interesting imbalances in biblical texts, particularly in the structure of the books of Kings and the prophetic collection. In the former case, the extreme predominance of narratives about Israelite kings throughout all but the last eight chapters of Kings is surprising in a book which was probably composed and certainly compiled in a period long after the fall of the Israelite monarchy, and this is no less true of the selection of prophetic narratives. The four supposedly oldest prophetic collections include, alongside Isaiah of Jerusalem, Hosea, the sole Israelite prophet in biblical literature, and Micah and Amos, two Judahite prophets who nevertheless seem to have done most of their prophesying from Israel or else, even more evocatively, seem to have been excerpted into biblical literature largely where their prophecies touched upon Israel. This may, of course, still be a coincidence, or it may be indicative of something

⁴⁴⁷ These appear in Exodus 6, 32, 33, Numbers 32, Deuteronomy 1, 6, 9, 29, 30, and 34.
more. It may indicate that the selection of biblical narratives for a very considerable portion of biblical literature obeyed a logic meant to repeatedly underscore the connection that Judah had to an Israelite prehistory, the “Israelite” character of Judah. What we are talking about, for the most part, is a system of selection and arrangement, and not a system of free composition. But without it, we would not have biblical literature.

So, finally, we can ask, when did the activity I am describing occur, and who was responsible? I have suggested that the construction of the book of Genesis, from probably largely extant narrative blocks -- a complete primeval history, the Joseph novella, and a significantly evolved tribal narrative -- was effected by the author of 1 Chron 1:1-2:2 in accordance with the genealogical plan described in that pericope, here more blueprint than map.\(^{448}\) Obviously, this could have occurred in the opposite direction but as discussed in the previous chapter the absence of anything like interconnections between many of these elements—the primeval history and the tribal system, say—and the absence of echoes of many Genesis discourses in the rest of the Pentateuch and elsewhere is, I think, evidence for the formulation I’m suggesting. There is not much evidence that either the patriarchs or the tribal-genealogical narrative was of particular interest or popularity not only prior to the Persian period, but even early within the Persian period. In addition to the seeming absence of the patriarchs, for example, from the original narratives of the non-Genesis Pentateuch, the Deuteronomistic history, and, as a collective, from other biblical texts altogether, only Abraham appears in Ezra and

\(^{448}\) Above, I made the distinction between “map” and “blueprint”, and that is indeed the question. Was 1 Chron1:1-2:2 composed on the basis of Genesis, as a kind of mirror, or were Genesis’ narrative elements sequenced only in accordance with a plan worked out by the Chronicles author?
Nehemiah (Neh 9:7). In Chronicles, in contrast, not just the patriarchs but the “flat” patriarchs appear and the tribes appear relatively frequently, as do Moses, Aaron, David, and other narrative elements which elsewhere largely maintain their original separateness. Thus, again, the interim between Ezra and Nehemiah and the composition of the books of Chronicles is a clearly reasonable time horizon for the introduction of the crucial ideas which formed the bulk of the narratives now found in Genesis, through a combination of free composition and the arrangement of older materials.

We can add some additional nuance to this picture. I think it is likely the case, given that the oath promise layer does not evince any interest in the tribes, that something like a Pentateuch in which the patriarchal narratives and only the patriarchal narratives stood before the exodus was a reality prior to the imposition of the tribal-genealogical picture I am describing. That is, although the oath promise layer must also be rather late and probably Persian period in order to account for the absence of interest in the patriarchs evinced by other biblical texts prior to its imposition, a “proto-Genesis” constituting something like Genesis 1-29, or perhaps only 11-29, may pre-date the enrichment of this narrative with the genealogical complexity found in the primeval

449 The absence of these figures in Ezra and Nehemiah is echoed in Ezekiel 48, another presumably late exilic or early post-exilic text, as described above.

450 The idea of a “religious revolution” in Persian Yehud is most associated with Ephraim Stern, although his ideas, which focus on the participation of Judah in the pre-exilic period in a kind of Levantine koine and their rejection of this for a more “pure” monotheism in the late exilic and Persian period have generally been considered overly reductive (Stern 1999; Stern 2006; Stern 2010). As Frevel and Pyschny note, “the picture Stern draws is very simplistic and he admits that over simplification time and again” (Frevel and Pyschny 2014, 6). While I do not follow Stern in his reconstruction of the religious culture of Persian Yehud, it is still the case that the late Persian period especially seems to have featured a revival of interest in ancient Israel, as displayed particularly in stamp seals and coins (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2014; Lipschits and Oeming 2006; Bocher and Lipschits 2013; Wyssmann 2014; Leith 2014). For discussion of these and many related issues, see the essays in the volumes Lipschits and Oeming 2006; Lipschits, Oeming, and Knoppers 2011; Frevel and Pyschny 2014.
history and the tribal-genealogical narratives respectively. That is, prior to the imposition of the tribal-genealogical idea, an account of the patriarchs, and perhaps of the patriarchs and the primeval heroes, may already have stood prior to the book of Exodus. And then it was enriched by the tribal-genealogical layer, including many of the narratives present in Gen 29-36, the expansion of Genesis 49 into its current form, Exodus 1:1-6, Exodus 1-6:26 more generally, as well as a few other edits here and there.\textsuperscript{451}

To be absolutely explicit about the textual argument being advanced here, then, my solution is this: what I visualize is that this “proto-Genesis”, which had already combined, in some way, the narratives of the originally separate figures Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was attached to the Pentateuch by means of the oath promise layer sometime in the Persian period, and it is probably also around this time that the narrative of Joseph was added to this emerging collection as another narrative bridge between Genesis and Exodus. At some point later in the Persian period the tribal-genealogical author or authors that I have identified enriched this vision with a combination of compositional efforts and more limited edits. To begin with, this author added to “proto-Genesis” the broad ethnographic vision of Genesis 1-11, given that of all the major figures who appear in Genesis 1-11, only Noah appears anywhere outside of this group of texts and 1 Chronicles 1, and that is only in Ezekiel 14:14, 20 and Isaiah 54:9. This addition recast much of the subsequent and probably (in some way) pre-existing narratives about Esau and Ishmael, for example, in a new and different light. This author probably personally composed the major narratives about Jacob’s children, including the birth narratives in

\textsuperscript{451} Deuteronomy 33 may or may not be a part of this layer, inasmuch as it does mention Jacob and the tribes but does not present twelve tribes and is not explicit about the connection of the tribes to Jacob.
Genesis 29:31-30:24 and 35:16-35:20, and many of the narratives in between these two pericopes.\footnote{Jacob’s children are referenced several times in intervening episodes, including the narrative of the rape of Dinah in Genesis 34, and Esau’s reference to them in Genesis 33:5. At the same time, the children are not mentioned in a number of major episodes, including Jacob’s wrestling with YHWH (Gen 32:23-31).}

This author is probably also responsible for the re-iterations of the names of the sons of Jacob in Genesis 35:23-26 and 46:8-19, as well as the material in Genesis 36 which includes genealogies of Esau, Seir, and Lotan, as well as Edomite king lists, more or less all of which appears again in 1 Chron 1). While these have often been attributed to P, there is no compelling reason to make this attribution as both pericopes are merely lists, lacking narrative details or stylistic elements of any attributable kind.\footnote{I suspect, here, a circular logic in the attribution to P. These are genealogies, P is interested in genealogies, therefore, etc.} Finally, this author is probably responsible for enlarging Genesis 49, for collecting the anthology of connective material in Exod 1:7-6:13, and framing it with the tribal-genealogical statements presented in Exod 1:1-6 and (in abortive form) in 6:14-25.\footnote{Deuteronomy 33 is probably by another hand, inasmuch as it is neither a twelve tribe list nor does it clearly articulate the relationship between Jacob and the tribal entities described.} Given that these last efforts appear in what is now the very end of Genesis and the very beginning of Exodus, we can imagine that their purpose was already to serve as a hinge between a new, larger Genesis and a probably already considerably complete Pentateuch.\footnote{This proto-Genesis would also have to be fairly late given the lack of impact the collective patriarchal discourse has made outside of Genesis and the oath promise layer.}

Interventions by this author in subsequent texts are less visible, and may be quite limited, even as tribal discourse continues in the Deuteronomistic history while patriarchal discourse does not. However, through the action of introducing both the
primary and secondary histories with expansive tribal-genealogical statements, this author is so successful in recasting the other visions and presentations of the tribes, however limited—and here we can think of the twelve tribe lists in Numbers and Joshua, and the rather less expansive tribal discourse in the books of Samuel alike—that this study marks one of the few efforts at disentangling these from each other to date. By presenting biblical history as a history of Jacob’s family, even without performing a thoroughgoing biblical redaction to integrate this narrative in a more holistic fashion, this editorial and compositional effort successfully recasts both biblical historical accounts through this “Jacob System”, this broad ethnographic vision reaching backwards to Adam and forward to the fall of Jerusalem, orbiting around the figure of this patriarch.

Additionally, while the oath promise layer and the tribal-genealogical layer contribute to the coherence of the Pentateuch, only the tribal-genealogical layer continues to serve a connective purpose beyond the book of Deuteronomy, after which we see so few other references to the patriarchs and so many references to Moses the Levite and David the Judahite. It is in this way that we are to understand the tribal-genealogical picture’s role in providing the structure for the entire narrative of biblical history. As we can clearly see, again, the first other dateable text to present this vision is 1 Chron 1:1-9:1a which, when coupled with other evidence of the relationship between Genesis’ tribal vision and the picture in the Chronicles genealogy (chapter one) to my mind indicates that the construction of both histories in this same way was the product of related efforts.

There are indeed several reasons to suggest that the Jacob system was evolved in the mid- to late- 4th century B.C.E. First of all, as mentioned, it is in this period that we first begin to see the Aramaic script of Persian imperial administration replaced in seal
inscriptions and elsewhere with a sudden resurgence of Paleo-Hebrew (Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2014, 45; Vanderhooft 2011, 529–544).\textsuperscript{456} We can also see this activity in the coins of the period, as well as something else very interesting for our discussion: the use, in both Yehud and Samaria, of Greek motifs, mythological and otherwise (Wyssmann 2014; Leith 2014).\textsuperscript{457} As we are speaking of a myth system much more cognate with Greek traditions than Near Eastern traditions, the availability of Greek mythological traditions seems like supplementary evidence.\textsuperscript{458} And finally, of course, whatever effect the Hellenistic, rather than Persian, period may have had on biblical literature, it is more or less invisible as a period in biblical literature. The world of the Return and Restoration is, for all intents and purposes, the end of the biblical historical narrative. Given how many events are invisible to us at this chronological distance, I am wary of assigning specific events to specific causes, but the second half of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century seems to be a time in which there was a tendency towards a revival of pre-Persian, indeed, pre-Babylonian, modes of thought and expression, and it is likely that the Hebrew Bible was largely a result of this.\textsuperscript{459} We can, in short, revise Fleming’s statement that the

\textsuperscript{456} These tendencies continued, as Lipschits and Vanderhooft note, from this period until the end of the seal impression system. Particularly notable is a floruit, in the second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E., of new designs with figurative elements and Paleo-Hebrew just prior to the disappearance of the system (Bocher and Lipschits 2011; Bocher and Lipschits 2013). This lengthy period between the last decades of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.E. and the end of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} is now widely considered to be a very important one for the evolution of biblical literature (Carr 2011).

\textsuperscript{457} There is a considerable amount of imported Attic pottery to reckon with (Nunn 2014).

\textsuperscript{458} Perhaps the best reason to suspect this period as the epicenter for the species of activity I am describing, however, is how superficial these edits still appear. If it were not now possible to pull apart Exodus generally from the oath promise layer and the efforts in Exodus 1:1-6:26, the books of Samuel from the book of Deuteronomy, Exodus and Deuteronomy from Genesis, and so on, we might suspect the evolution of the crucial ideas under discussion here at an early enough period to be integrated throughout biblical literature. Non-integration indicates a late date.

\textsuperscript{459} Knauf’s date of 398 for the completion of the Torah is likely based on his chronology of the career of Ezra (Knauf 2006, 92). However, again, it turns out to be quite difficult to find “the Torah” in Ezra and Nehemiah, even if certain discourses seem to have been worked out by this point (Satlow 2014, 69–84).
Bible should actually be understood as “Judah’s Bible”, and for the same reasons, suggest instead that it be understood as Yehud’s Bible.
Conclusion: Future Directions in “Biblical” Ethnicity

In the introduction, I discussed the constructed nature of ethnicity narratives through an exploration of some of the mechanisms of construction. I particularly focused on the efficacy of genealogy in such efforts. In chapter one, I discussed the facility with which the genealogical mode creates a rich and potent system for myth aggregation. I pointed out both material and conceptual similarities between the Catalogue of Women and the 1 Chron 1:1-9:1a genealogy, and suggested that the growth of such systems is not tied to objective historical phenomena but rather the success or failure of aspirational attempts to enlarge or redefine ethnic charters. In chapter two, through an analysis of the Return of the Herakleidae, I demonstrated the way in which narrative myths can “select” from larger myth systems in a way which makes those selections appear natural and inevitable while still being possessed of a multiplicity. The “sons of Herakles” who appear in this myth are neither anywhere close to all the sons of Herakles mentioned in all Greek myth, nor did they all begin their personal narratives as sons of Herakles. But, the myth’s dependence on the conceit of being a narrative of the sons of Herakles is central to the purpose of the myth. So, too, in biblical myth there are central and adjacent, well-connected and poorly-connected aspects of the Bible as family story, orbiting around the family of Jacob. This comparison revealed the ways in which the Bible’s systematization is likewise artificial and to a certain degree incomplete. In chapter 3 I investigated the archaeological and literary evidence for the origin of Panisraeliteism as a concept, while in chapter 4 I investigated early biblical evidence for and against Panisraeliteism. Finally, in chapter 5 I argued for the existence of three major, separate, originally independent Panisraelite narratives and attempted to illustrate the mechanisms
which created a coherent single narrative from these, and in chapter 6 presented a new model of biblical construction. Which brings us, finally, to the point of being able to offer larger reflections.

In the introduction to the previous chapter I suggested that a restricted definition of “biblical literature”, as opposed to any previous aggregations of Judahite literature, would have positive effects in terms of bringing biblical studies into better conversation with modern theories about ethnicity. This is because ethnicity is not a historical artifact, not biological, genetic, or traditional. By the lights of modern ethnicity theory there is a sense in which it is in fact impossible to imagine that the predominant ethnic expression of a people is not in some significant sense also co-incident with the invention of that people. This conception of ethnicity is not served by theories which imagine that a people living under the Persian empire, having gone through the dramatic upheaval of exile and return, would be able to turn to a largely Iron Age book to find themselves without significantly revising it. Ethnicity does evolve, after all, and if it somehow didn’t under certain circumstances it still likely would in this case, given the dramatic geopolitical events which characterized the Judahite experience of the Iron Age.

The tension between how we are used to thinking of biblical ethnicity and how it is probably reasonable to think about it is well summarized in Crielaard’s critique of a nearly identical problem in the study of Ionian Greek ethnicity. As he puts it:

For previous generations of scholars, there was little need to discuss on what this collective identity was based and how it had come into being. It seemed clear that being Ionian was a matter of ethnic affiliation. Such categories as Ionians and Dorians and their subdivisions—phylai or ‘tribes’ in English translation—were considered as primordial ethnic entities that were part of a primitive social substructure that had managed to live on in historical times. This way of looking
at ethnicity meant that myths about common origins and ethnic identity found in ancient literary sources were believed to contain a kernel of historical truth (Crielaard 2009, 37–38).

Now, however, we appreciate that ethnicity “is not of all times. It is a cultural construct… [and] like other kinds of cultural identity it is a situational construct” (40). I’m suggesting something similar: the Bible’s conception of who Israel is, is a situational construct, and we cannot ignore the actual situation in which it was completed and given its definitive shape. In fact, in a wonderful synchronicity, Crielaard notes that Ionian identity evolved in response to exactly the same Persian imperial campaigns which I and others have suggested altered Judahites’ sense of self so significantly.\footnote{\textit{When the Persians defeated Kroisos, the mainland cities came under Persian rule during the 540s and most of them were governed by pro-Persian tyrants. Many Ionian and other East Greek cities joined in the revolt in 500/499, which the Persians put down in 494. In 490 and 480/479, the Persians were defeated twice in Mainland Greece, after which the Athenians started to carve out an ‘Ionian’ maritime empire in the Aegean’. As he notes “according to some modern scholars, it is especially interaction with empire or expanding states that make smaller socio-political units more aware of their ethnic identities” (Crielaard 2009, 40).}}

I am far from the first to draw attention to this problem in biblical studies, and there have been a number of noteworthy efforts to correct it.\footnote{In my opinion, particularly J. C. Miller 2008; K. L. Sparks 1998.} Outside of biblical studies, I am particularly indebted, in my thinking, to the work of Rogers Brubaker, who has pointed out (at least) three crucial issues in modern studies of ethnicity. First, attempts to deal with the constructed nature of ethnicity often, perhaps inevitably, result in what he calls “weak” understandings of identity, that is, those in which identity appears so fluid and complex that there is hardly anything left to discuss. These unfortunately have a tendency, as he puts it, to make it unclear “why weak conceptions of ‘identity’ are conceptions of identity’” and it is probably additionally the case that “weak conceptions
of identity may be too weak to do useful theoretical work” (Brubaker 2004, 38).462

Second, he has pointed out that our drive to talk about ethnicities in the way we do is largely drawn from how engrained within us the desire to imagine the existence of conceptually separable groups seems to be (Brubaker 2004, 9–10). And finally, his is one of the few efforts to deal as straightforwardly as absolutely necessary with the fact that ethnicity does not appear to reside within us in any sense, biologically or genetically. If it is not within us, than it is given to us, and in his model it is the product of discourses created by ethnopolitical entrepreneurs.463 In a sense, “Judahite” was always something granted to the inhabitants of the region by its rhetoricians and authors, but often meant something different from what it once had. Although we can say that Judahite ethnopolitical entrepreneurs muddied the waters themselves by evoking the past, it is more appropriate to suggest that they invoked “a” past, and a useful one.

The problem this represents where biblical studies is concerned is that it imperils the possibility of recovering earlier Israels and Judahs in a sense that is not true for scholars of other cultures in which more than one book exists, even if that book is composed of multiple accounts. Though the vocabulary of these ethnic articulations is the same across those centuries, this is largely functional. Since they are quantities continually being repackaged, there may be a sense, generally speaking, in which, some day, Israelite and Judahite history might feature neither Israelites nor Judahites,

462 It is however necessary, in my opinion, not to embrace claims merely because they make work easier, although I doubt Brubaker would disagree with this. Unfortunately, the past does not owe it to us to be accessible or to provide us with the evidence we need.

463 “To criticize ethnopolitical entrepreneurs for reifying ethnic groups would be a kind of category mistake. Reifying groups is precisely what the ethnopolitical entrepreneurs are in the business of doing. When they are successful, the political fiction of the unified groups can be momentarily yet powerfully realized in practice” (Brubaker 2004, 10).
classically conceived. On the other hand, with respect to this frame, the idea of Persian
Period Yehudites inventing Israel in its biblical form would therefore not carry any
implication of the artificial or the minimalist position; it would merely be another
instance of an activity that had likely been pursued over and over again since the
beginning of the Iron Age. The inhabitants of the region would always have been
inventing Judah, and since the arrival of the concept of Judah’s connection with Israel,
probably in the late 8th century B.C.E, they would have been reinventing Israel. The Bible
is just one of many reinventions, but its meanings are indeed much more the product of
its interactions with traditions than what those traditions themselves claim.

Here, at the conclusion, I would like to point to the relationship between the
specific data of this study and these larger questions of ethnicity and identity. We can ask
for example whether it matters if the material through which one constructs a cultural
history is generically mythic or historical, or rather how it matters and for whom. For
example, as Patrick Geary notes, Jean-Marie Le Pen’s far-right Front National Party
imagines the French, in the sense of something pure, as the descendants of Clovis and the
Franks (Geary 2002, 7). Elsewhere, we find that a Frankish chronicler, Fredegar, had in
the seventh century described the Franks as the descendants of a Trojan War Hero,
Francio (Patterson 2010, 8–9). What distinguishes these two claims which, if both
accepted, would make Le Pen’s “pure” French Trojans?464 Now, I ask whether we can

464 Geary points to the argument of Croatian historian Ivo Banac, for example, who argues that “In order to
be accepted, an ideology must proceed from reality” (Banac, Ivo 1984, 28). Although Geary himself
demurs somewhat, on the grounds that “(Banac’s point) implies that the groups…exist even before
intellectuals recognize them” (Geary, Patrick J. 2002, 18) it is perhaps safe enough to suggest that a group
articulation is more likely to have force if it does not go too far beyond the horizons of the believable. It is
one thing, for example, for a Judahite to imagine that the Kingdom of David stretched from Dan to
Beersheba, another to accept that it once included, say, Athens.
make a meaningful distinction between seemingly native and non-native “re-creations” from the same source material. That is, if ethnicity is really something subjectively granted by what Brubaker calls “ethnopolitical entrepreneurs”, is there really a difference between the connection created between two entities we are accustomed to thinking of as Greek through *Nostoi* narratives, perhaps *because* we are accustomed to thinking of both of them as Greek, and aspirational attempts at the same goal with the same tools, whether the attachment to *Nostoi* myth is articulated by the Franks or, say, the famous Roman *Nostoi* tale, the *Aeneid*. Is there a sense in which they are not equally aspirational?\(^{465}\)

Then, is there a difference of kind between the use of such narratives by Romans and by medieval groups, because of some greater conceptual similarity between Greeks and Romans, or is that something we read on to the ancient world, without it being there?

In some sense, it feels as if these distinctions require “Greekness” to have a transhistorical reality that is not immediately apparent. An intermediate result of such thinking would emerge from a reflection, say, on the *Lost Tribe* mythologies which have flourished throughout history and are currently the basis for identity articulations of far-flung groups such as the Mormons, or Beta Israel of Ethiopia. Such thinking would redescribe the people of Yehud not as the inventors of the source text for *Lost Tribe*

\(^{465}\) “The fifth-century Greek perception of the beginning of history…gave the *Nostoi* a special role. History begins with the returns from Troy…But, since there was no ‘Greece’ in antiquity but only hundred of discrete political communities, a particularized origins explanation was needed for each. The *Nostoi* were capable of particularizing history in a manner truer to the realities of Greek existence” (Malkin 1998, 3). What Malkin is pointing to here, in my opinion, is that, in a sense, if there were a considerable difference between the extension of *Nostoi* mythology between Greek places and its extension onwards to Roman places, the Greeks might reasonably be expected to be satisfied with the return of a single *Graikos*, or of Hellen himself, rather than many heroes. The multiplicity of *Returns* is due to a greater distinction between city-states, on the ethnic level, then we are accustomed to imagining. Elsewhere he notes, “no pan-Mediterranean Greek empire had ever existed in the Archaic period…and the numerous Greek communities functioned as a decentralized network” (Malkin 2011, 3). How decentralized would they have to have been before we begin to wonder whether the Greek and Roman worlds of the first centuries C.E. were not overall better knit with each other than were Greek city-states of the 7th century B.C.E.?"
mythology, but as the first practitioners of it. And, such a comparison would place them in a conceptual space as interesting as it is fraught, as complex as it is evocative. The difference between the Bible and Lost Tribe mythologies seems to be the difference between invention and re-invention, but I have attempted here to describe the Bible as re-invention. And then we must ask how far back re-invention goes?

Finally, we will recall that this is first and foremost a study of genealogy, genealogy as storage chamber for ethnicities, genealogy as taxonomy, genealogy as, in a sense, structural backbone and table of contents. I have not said much specifically about influence, as opposed to comparison, in the course of this study and have preferred to use Greek narratives as a supplier of alternate models of narrative aggregation from those usually employed by biblical scholars, something, again, to “think through”. This is certainly the use of the comparison with Return myth, which provides such an avenue for redescribing the relationships of biblical literature as the process of choices later naturalized by ratification. However, I think it likely that the structure under discussion here, the extensive segmented genealogical form, as opposed to the linear genealogies of priests and kings we see elsewhere in biblical literature, are indeed borrowed from and influenced by Greek genealogical traditions. This is because of the centrality of segmented genealogical systems to Greek mythological thought and their absence, by and large, from Near Eastern literature, as has been pointed out by a number of scholars.\footnote{General statements appear, for example in Van Seters 1992; Knoppers 2004; Knoppers 2001. Direct comparisons with certain aspects of biblical literature and Greek genealogical traditions have recently been pursued by Guy Darshan (Darshan 2014b; Darshan 2013).} It is the extent of biblical genealogical discourse that really makes this case. While the tribal idea, for example, may have had considerable usefulness in the Persian period, and
therefore been evolved to serve those ends, biblical genealogy, as repeatedly noted here, extends far beyond, above and below, the tribal-genealogical narrative. Thus biblical literature can be described as Susan Cole describes Greek myth with respect to the *Theogony*:

In this universe, relationships are defined in terms of the family, time is represented by the succession of generations…genealogy provides the structural framework because family relationships allow the kind of flexibility required to organize a vast amount of disparate material into a coherent account (Cole 2004, 23).

Structurally, this is my explanation for the construction of biblical literature, as biblical—and not Judahite—literature. And the imposition of genealogy almost certainly does owe to influence from Classical mythology, a frontier of exploration we, as a field, have not sufficiently plumbed. Further investigation may help dissolve a somewhat arbitrary boundary and recover Israel and Judah both as Mediterranean places, even before the arrival of Alexander. This is a map upon which they surely deserve to appear.
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