

POPULAR, IDEOLOGICAL, AND TEXTUAL DIMENSIONS OF POSTEXILIC JUDEAN CULTURE

ROBERT D. MILLER II
MOUNT ST. MARY'S SEMINARY

INTRODUCTION

In the postexilic period there was a transformation which occurred in the ideological matrix which became known as Judaism. This transformative period resulted in the production of texts which are a part of the Hebrew Bible. This essay will attempt to discuss the role of ideology in this transformation.

To do this, the first step will be to describe the socioeconomic situation of the period. Specifically, the economy and demography of the Persian province of Yehud will be examined. Secondly, an attempt will be made to determine what texts are from this period. This step will involve serious methodological considerations, and caution will be the guiding principle. Finally, an intellectual history will be proposed that can be accounted for by the socioeconomic situation and that will account for the texts.

I. SOCIO-ECONOMIC SITUATION OF JUDEA

The main sources for the economy of Yehud are archaeological data and Persian documents. Archaeologically, "there was a pervasive and dramatic drop in the number of settlements from the Iron II period to the Persian period, reflective of a process of urbanization or depopulation. The Judean territory is the only exception to this pattern, showing a 25% increase in the

number of settlements”¹. Thus Judea was anomalous, and experienced ruralization rather than urbanization. Hoglund argues that this was likely the result of intentional Persian policy because a) most of these sites were not reoccupations of Iron II sites, and b) most of these sites were settled simultaneously in the late 6th century B.C., rather than over the course of the entire Persian period. In the light of Persian and Hellenistic sources, Hoglund explains this ruralization as part of the Persian imposition of a tributary mode of production, supplying a continual flow of tribute to Persia². A second archaeological datum is the increased incidence of imported ceramics, mostly Athenian³. There was also a “widening utilization of native ceramic jar types designed primarily as containers for the transit of goods, and the foundation of a number of new entrepôts⁴. These factors he attributes to increasing commercialization. Nevertheless, while trade played an important role, the economy was essentially agrarian, and Jerusalem is certainly the only site that can be considered urban⁵. There was also the founding of a number of fortresses, and ostraca “mention individuals with non-Hebrew names in connection with the Persian garrisons”⁶. This would be explained as militarization and an increased presence of imperial troops⁷. So this leaves us with an agrarian economy in an environment of forced ruralization and nascent but increasing commercialization, coincident with militarization.

Some second-level deductions can be made about the sociology of Yehud based on this assumed economy. From a ruralized, agrarian economy we can deduce that “most people lived at a subsistence level...there was no middle class... and the tiny few of the rich.”⁸ This is basically what is called in Marxist terms the “Asiatic mode of production”, although one need not embrace all of its details⁹. The poor majority would have been free peasants -“not slaves, although they were often dependent in the sense of being bound

¹ K. HOGGLUND, “The Achaemenid Context”, in: P. R. DAVIES, (ed.), *Second Temple Studies*, vol. 1 (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 117; Sheffield 1991) 60.

² *Ibid.*, 61.

³ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁵ L. L. GRABBE, *Judaism From Cyrus to Hadrian*, vol. 1 (Minneapolis 1992) 20, 23.

⁶ HOGGLUND, *o. c.*, 68.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁸ GRABBE, *o. c.*, 20.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 22.

to the soil by law or circumstances”¹⁰. Høglund concludes that Persian imperial land policy apparent from the forced settlement pattern would have nullified “land claims by any group rooted in the notion of familial or tribal possessions”¹¹, and thus *everyone* was reorganized by the Persians, whether they came from Babylon or were living in the land through the Babylonian hegemony. This does not seem entirely conclusive, as we do not know the specifics of who was settled where and on what basis. Neither, however, is Grabbe’s suggestion of the opposite necessarily definite when he says “The general picture of the peasantry is that it remained the same over many centuries”¹². Høglund may still be right.

From the commercialization we can deduce a possible social differentiation, however¹³. Taxation will have broken “down the traditional patterns of economic self-sufficiency in favor of interdependent economic systems”, to the benefit of the empire¹⁴. It is not clear if this would have created hardship in itself, although Grabbe states that “taxation seems to have stifled the economy by encouraging the barter system, rather than the use of money”¹⁵, but he gives no basis for this statement. Similarly, Høglund assumes that some elements stood to gain by tailoring their agrarian activities to the commercializing environment, while others were unable to do so and were alienated from the means of commerce¹⁶. This was probably the case. Those who would have been involved in this international commerce would have quickly been exposed to Hellenic culture, and the militarization would contribute to this. Greek mythic art appears on artifacts found in Judah from this time¹⁷. Perhaps mention may be made here of a reference in Clearchus of Soli (C. Ap 1.176) to Aristotle meeting a Hellenized Greek-speaking Jew in Anatolia in 345 B.C. This is certainly fiction, but was apparently believable to the audience¹⁸.

¹⁰ GRABBE, *o. c.*, 115.

¹¹ HØGLUND, *o. c.*, 62.

¹² GRABBE, *o. c.*, 24.

¹³ HØGLUND, *o. c.*, 65.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 66.

¹⁵ GRABBE, *o. c.*, 116.

¹⁶ HØGLUND, *o. c.*, 66.

¹⁷ E. BICKERMAN, *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees* (rev. ed., New York 1962) 15.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 15.

The archaeological data also shows that the ruralization was only in Judah. Samaria was experiencing an urbanization at the same time. This territory was “only lightly damaged by the Babylonian armies”¹⁹, and it would seem therefore that the socioeconomic situation in Samaria was quite different than that in Judah. This is, however, also true of northern *Judah*, the area of Benjamin²⁰, and this adds to the complexity of the province of Yehud. One thing we do not know from the archaeology is “whether land was scarce compared to population size”²¹. There was certainly not an “empty land” when the returnees came from Babylon²².

In summary of the sociopolitical climate, then, there was at least an agrarian free peasantry living at the subsistence level and not necessarily on family land, and an upper class, perhaps not limited to Jerusalem, increasingly exposed to Hellenic culture. There was also a variant situation in northern Judah, where ancestral land holdings may have survived and the economy may have been stronger. The same holds true for Samaria, where one can also speak of increasing urbanization.

This is certainly only a bare sketch of the situation, as it is limited to archaeological and Persian data. Some of these observations made independently of the biblical text are apparent in the text as well. Nehemiah 5:2-5 lists three groups, apparently day laborers with no possessions, smallholders, and tenant farmers²³, all of whom would fit into the description above of agrarian peasants. Neh 5:15 and Mal 1:8 both know of the Persian tribute burden.

TEXTS FROM THE POSTEXILIC PERIOD

Examination should now be made of what are the texts of the period. Robert Carroll warns that “the literature set in this period may not be the most reliable guide for a historical analysis; historical accuracy cannot be assumed in the absence of data to the contrary”²⁴. The interest, therefore, is not at this

¹⁹ GRABBE, *o. c.*, 117.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 117.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 25.

²² *Ibid.*, 117.

²³ *Ibid.*, 118.

²⁴ R. P. CARROLL, “Israel, History of (Post-Monarchic Period)”, in: D. N. FREEDMAN, (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (Garden City 1992) 3:568.

point what the texts say about this period, but which ones are *productions* of this period, and then a hypothesis will be presented to explain this production on the basis of the skeletal socioeconomic picture already presented.

Ezra is presented as bringing a law book with him to Jerusalem in Ezra 7:14, mentioned again in Neh 8:13. Similarly, there is a law book mentioned in Neh 10:29, and another in Neh 13:1. The text may not be equating these, but it likely is. Ezra's reforms based on this law (Ezra 9:1-2; Neh 8:16-18) reflect material in Exodus and Deuteronomy, a mixture of things from the so-called P and D Sources²⁵. Nehemiah 10 assumes laws identical to those in the Pentateuch existed²⁶. Thus Lev 6:1-6 is reflected in Neh 10:35, Exod 30:11-16 in Neh 10:33. There is nothing in Nehemiah 10 that is not also visible in the Pentateuch or that is not an ancillary interpretation of something also in the Pentateuch²⁷. Now the Pentateuch would seem to have a *terminus ad quem* of when the Samaritan's adopted what became the "Palestinian" text family version of the Pentateuch. The Samaritan schism must be dated before the Hasmoneans -exactly when is much debated²⁸. One strong possibility is at the time when Manasseh, brother of the Jewish High Priest, married the daughter of the Samaritan ruler Sanballat III and moved to Samaria to build a temple on Mt. Gerizim, around 320 B.C.²⁹. It is therefore reasonable to maintain that the Pentateuch existed before 320, and that an Ezra could have brought some form of the Pentateuch with him (ca. 404-398?) which contained at least material from what is now dubbed the D and P strands³⁰. There is certainly not much time to complete the Pentateuch by 320, if that is when the SamP can be dated. Williamson would seem to be correct in finding no basis for the view that Ezra's law cannot be narrative, or that it was an alternative law not unlike the Temple Scroll or Jubilees which is now inexplicably lost³¹.

²⁵ H. G. M. WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Waco 1985) xxxix.

²⁶ D. J. A. CLINES, "Nehemiah 10 as an Example of Early Jewish Biblical Exegesis": *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 21(1981) 112.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 113.

²⁸ E. TOV, "Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch", in: A. D. CROWN, (ed.), *The Samaritans* (Tubingen 1989) 398-99.

²⁹ G. WIDENGREN, "The Persian Period", in: J. H. HAYES-J. M. MILLER, (eds.), *Israelite and Judean History* (Philadelphia 1977) 537; TOV, *o. c.*, 398-99; see JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* 11. 306-312.

³⁰ This was also the conclusion of Noth, von Rad, and Williamson (*o. c.*, xxxvii, xxxix).

³¹ WILLIAMSON, *o. c.*, xxxvii-xxxviii.

But this discussion of the Pentateuch misses an important point. Neh 13:1 speaks of a "book of Moses" and then goes on in verses 1-2 to quote Deut 23:5(4). Thus, Deuteronomy is not viewed by this author as part of the Deuteronomistic corpus but as part of the Mosaic corpus, the Pentateuch. This means that the work of selection and presentation had taken place beyond that of compilation, much less editing or composition³². By attaching this law (Deuteronomy) to Moses, rather than to the Deuteronomistic history, Moses is made a much more useful and important figure than David³³. Neh 13:6 gives a Persian regnal date (year 32 of Artaxerxes I), which is 433 B.C. At the least it can be stated that the author of Neh 13 envisions that this isolation of Deuteronomy to the Torah has taken place by 433.

There is extrabiblical evidence which supports the author of Nehemiah 13 and the assertion that an incipient Pentateuch existed and that Deuteronomy was part of it. The Achaemenid empire seems to have had a policy of the restoration of local cults as a strategy for imperial management. Thus the Xanthus Stele of Artaxerxes III Ochus (359-338) describes imperial restoration of a Temple of Leto in Lycia³⁴, and the Udjahorresne Inscription of Darius I (521-486) to the Temple of Neith at Sais in Egypt. Moreover, there is an enigmatic letter at Elephantine, the "Passover Letter" (cataloged "Cowley 21") in which Darius II (423-404) issued a rescript to the satrap Arsames concerning the observation of the Passover. It is not unreasonable, then, that the Persians would have had an interest in the codification of laws throughout the empire.

The Chronicler can also be dated to this period, somewhere between the Freedman's date of 520 and Peckham's date of 490³⁵. Finally there are other texts: prophetic texts that probably come from this period such as "Third Isaiah," Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi (in various stages of redaction). Finally, arguing from silence, it is important to note that "we have no evidence from Elephantine of any biblical books, nor of books that might be forerunners of our biblical books... 'the law of Yaho' is never mentioned... There is no

³² D. N. FREEDMAN, "The Formation of the Canon of the Old Testament", in: E. B. FIRMAGE- B. G. WEISS-J. W. WELCH, (eds.), *Religion and Law* (Winona Lake 1990) 317.

³³ FREEDMAN, "The Formation", o. c., 323.

³⁴ The text is found in A. DUPONT-SOMMER, "L'inscription aramméenne", in: *La stèle trilingue de Letoon*, vol. 6 of *Fouilles de Xanthos* (Paris 1979) 129-77.

³⁵ FREEDMAN, "The Formation", o. c., 320; B. PECKHAM, *History and Prophecy* (Garden City 1993) 788.

prophecy and no trace of any prophet"³⁶. This study will not deal with Elephantine, but this group maintained ties to the Jerusalem priesthood and yet was apparently never asked to adopt any set of texts by 339 B.C.

INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF POSTEXILIC JUDEA

An intellectual history of Yehud for this period can be written from the archaeological data which can explain the texts. There is little *prima facie* reason to follow Carroll in doubting the rebuilding of the temple in the 6th century or the existence of Ezra³⁷. It may yet be postulated who the liberals and conservatives were and what liberalism and conservatism were in Palestine in the Second Temple period, as well as what the relationship was between elites and subaltern groups in Restoration Judah vis-a-vis social, economic, and political change.

There are, of course, major proposals already in existence, notably those of Morton Smith and P. D. Hanson. Both may be summarily examined. Smith argues that parties had existed since the preexilic period, specifically the "syncretistic party" and the "Yahweh-alone party"³⁸. Both were drawn from all social groups and strata of society, and the "Yahweh-alone party" particularly had various subgroups which produced the differing prophetic, Deuteronomistic, and priestly literature³⁹. After the Exile, the "Yahweh-alone party" had the ear of the Persian court, and was represented by Nehemiah, Ezra, and Zerubbabel⁴⁰. There were in this period, however, new groupings. There was now an "assimilation party" replacing the "syncretistic party." which was represented by the Am Ha'arez, the Judean gentry, and the Levites⁴¹. This group was responsible for composing the final redaction of the Deuteronomistic corpus, the Holiness Code, and the Priestly Source⁴². The priesthood was divided, and stood in a position to mediate between the

³⁶ W. D. DAVIES-L. FINKELSTEIN, (eds.), "Jewish Religious Life in the Persian Period", in: *Cambridge History of Judaism* (Cambridge 1984) 1:232.

³⁷ CARROLL, *o. c.*, 570-71.

³⁸ M. SMITH, *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (New York 1971) 27, 29, 34-37, 41.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 108-109, 122, 129.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 112, 131, 171-72.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 177, 183.

groups to its own gain. The result was a compromise in which the High Priest Jeshua was allowed to share in Zerubbabel's messianic claims (Zech 6:9-15)⁴³. Zerubbabel was not opposed by the Samaritans as Ezra 4 indicates, but by the Am Ha'arez, because they were not allowed to help rebuild the temple⁴⁴. Smith's postulate goes on into more precarious detail about the supposed assassination of Zerubbabel and so on, but that need not be rehearsed here.

Hanson opposes the temple hierarchy against a "visionary" group represented in Isaiah 24-27 and Zechariah 9-14 to which adhered dissident Levites as well⁴⁵. The role of the Davidides is vague in Hanson's construct. In Third Isaiah, the "visionaries" oppose both the Davidides and the Zadokite priests, while Haggai, Zechariah, and Chronicles exhibit a tension between these latter two groups⁴⁶.

Grabbe's remarks are salient for both Smith and Hanson. His criticisms are several. First, the reasoning is circular: the hypothesis is presented, then followed by a textual analysis interpreting the texts in light of the hypothesis (rarely straightforwardly), and then the hypothesis and hypothesis-based exegesis are connected to prove the hypothesis⁴⁷. "The view of the priestly establishment... is simplistic and not based on sound sociological research"⁴⁸, and much is read in terms of simple dichotomies of laity vs. priests, Jews vs. Samaritans, and so on, when no such dichotomy can be observed in the period literature "except in difficult and obscure prophetic oracles"⁴⁹. "The paucity of information available increases the danger of over-interpreting the little that we have"⁵⁰. Finally, Levenson has pointed out that these are not unbiased reconstructions: Hanson is on the side of the "visionaries"

⁴³ SMITH, *o. c.*, 108-109, 176.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 113-114.

⁴⁵ P. D. HANSON, "Israelite Religion in the Early Postexilic Period", in: P. D. Miller, Jr.-P. D. HANSON-S. D. MCBRIDE, (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion* (Philadelphia 1987) 502-503.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 493, 496, 498-499, 501.

⁴⁷ GRABBE, *o. c.*, 109.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 110.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 110-111.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 111; also R. A. HORSLEY, "Empire, Temple and Community -- But No Bourgeoisie!", in: P. R. DAVIES, (ed.), *Second Temple Studies*, vol. 1 (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 117; Sheffield 1991) 164.

-“Blessed are the alienated and the oppressed, for they shall inherit the earth”⁵¹.

Grabbe is correct that “the specific hypotheses are less important than the common core: a variety of post-exilic texts...indicate tensions within the Jewish community, which lead even to the rise of opposing movements”⁵². This is also indicated by the extrabiblical data earlier collated. The disenfranchised agrarian free peasantry, the elite in Jerusalem and the towns (probably entirely returnees), increasingly exposed to Hellenic culture, the less impoverished tribal smallholders in northern Judah (Benjamin), and the urban Samaritan establishment all must have had frictions of a socioeconomic nature which may have been treated in the texts in purely religious terms⁵³. And one would be foolish not expect religious disputes to also be quite prevalent.

Can this explain the texts? “All sorts of hypotheses explain part of the phenomena”⁵⁴. This is part of the problem. A hypothesis will be suggested here, not because it is presented as likely but to show that it is possible. It is probably no more or less likely than Smith's or Hanson's⁵⁵. The hypothesis here presented is merely being thrown out; it may prove useful, but no status of truth is assigned to it. More cautious remarks will be made further in the essay⁵⁶.

Perhaps the social situation can be viewed not as a one-dimensional dichotomy but as a two-dimensional graph. Envision a page with intersecting *x* and *y* axes. The top of the page represents hope for a Davidic restoration, the bottom hope for a priestly theocracy -alternate reactions to the Persian

⁵¹ J. D. LEVENSON, “The Temple and the World”: *Journal of Religion* 64 (1984) 276.

⁵² GRABBE, *o. c.*, 104.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 117.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 111.

⁵⁵ The hypothesis of J. WEINBERG, *The Citizen-Temple Community*, trans. D. L. Smith-Christopher (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 151; Sheffield 1992) has not been discussed here. Weinberg's chief error is basing much on numbers gleaned from an uncritical reading of Ezra-Nehemiah; e.g., WEINBERG, *o. c.*, 132.

⁵⁶ This model is a combination gleaned from the work of P. R. ACKROYD, *Exile and Restoration* (Old Testament Library; London 1968); *Id.*, *The Chronicler in His Age* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 101; Sheffield 1991); E. M. MEYERS, “The Use of *tora* in Haggai 2:11 and the Role of the Prophet in the Restoration Community”, in: C. MEYERS-M. O'CONNOR, (eds.), *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth* (Philadelphia 1983) 69-76; D. N. FREEDMAN, “The Chronicler's Purpose”: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23 (1961) 436-442; J. PIXLEY, *Biblical Israel: A People's History* (Minneapolis 1992); and DAVIES-FINKELSTEIN, *o. c.*

hegemony and militarization. The left of the page is a segregationist policy, the right is anti-segregationist -two alternate reactions to the increased outside contact shown by the archaeology. (These positions are arbitrary, and no value judgement is intended). Now a given group or text can be placed anywhere on the page, with combinations of Davidic-segregationist, theocratic-segregationist, etc., in a continuum across the axes, not as a binary opposition. At least the elite groups may be placed on this graph, although it is unclear which ones are in Jerusalem and which not. Comment on the subaltern groups will be made hereafter.

The Zadokite priesthood can be placed in the lower right, as theocratic anti-segregationists⁵⁷. They were theocratic for obvious reasons, but it should be pointed out that this was not mere self-interest. A legitimate concern was that "David was not the person to inspire confidence in the neighbors or trust in the eyes of the authorities"⁵⁸. It was dangerous in the Persian Empire to await your liberating king. The priests are condemned by Ezra-Nehemiah for intermarriage. Jonah may be also placed here, as it has an international view of Yahweh's providence and mercy, and seems to be a mockery of prophethood, which will be shown below to have ties to the Davidides. Other texts belonging here, and thus possibly coming from Zadokite circles, include Zechariah 3 and the final redaction of the Pentateuch.

Ezra-Nehemiah belongs in the lower left, segregationist theocrats⁵⁹. The text of Ezra-Nehemiah attests to both tendencies (note Nehemiah 10). The group responsible for placing Deuteronomy with the Pentateuch instead of the Deuteronomistic corpus may belong here -- the emphasis of Moses over David certainly places them at the lower end of the page, and the association with Nehemiah in Nehemiah 13 draws them to Nehemiah's camp.

In the upper right, Davidic anti-segregationist, may be placed what is here called Fourth Isaiah. Unaware if this designation has been used by others, this designation here refers to Isaiah 56:1-8; 65:17ff; and 66. These pericopes do not seem to fit the period between the beginning of the exiles' return and the rebuilding of the temple, still in ruins⁶⁰. Fourth Isaiah has an international ("ecumenical" is anachronistic) outlook, and yet remains in the spirit of Third Isaiah, to which we may now turn.

⁵⁷ ACKROYD, *o. c.*, 248, 252; DAVIES-FINKELSTEIN, *o. c.*, 248.

⁵⁸ FREEDMAN, *The Formation*, *o. c.*, 323.

⁵⁹ DAVIES-FINKELSTEIN, *o. c.*, 245; ACKROYD, *o. c.*, 106-107

⁶⁰ Cf. DAVIES-FINKELSTEIN, *o. c.*, 271.

The argument that Third Isaiah represents the lay Am-Ha'arez⁶¹ is simply not self-evident from Isaiah 56:1-7; 58:1-12; and 66:1-2. Further, two of these pericopes are likely Fourth Isaiah. It is easier to see Third Isaiah in connection with Haggai as prophetic supporters of the Davidic cause against the priests (see esp. Isa 56:9-12; 58:1-12; 65:1-15, esp. v. 9)⁶². This may further be the group responsible for the final redaction of the Deuteronomistic history⁶³. There is contrary evidence in Haggai 1 and 2:11, which tie Haggai to the temple and priests⁶⁴, although 2:11 still seems to be quite critical of the priests. In any case, unless Fourth Isaiah is included with Third Isaiah, there is no statement on the segregation issue.

Jeshua the priest sits at the juncture of the x and y axes. His position is moderate on the issue of segregation, and although a priest, he shares glory with Zerubbabel in Zechariah.

Finally, the Chronicler (distinct from Ezra-Nehemiah? It is another issue beyond the scope of this essay) lies somewhere slightly below the midpoint. Chronicles deals primarily with Jerusalem, the temple, the Davidides, and the Zadokites⁶⁵. The real narration begins in chapter 10, with David. David is in fact the focus of all the other themes⁶⁶. Yet it is a history of the achievements of the Davidic line in the *cultic* realm⁶⁷. The climax is the building of the temple⁶⁸. Hence Chronicles shows a legitimate pattern of institutions -- and the only institution which ever draws criticism is certain descendants of David⁶⁹. Freedman seems to neglect this fact when he concludes that Chronicles was written to legitimate a Davidic restoration⁷⁰. Chronicles may be doing is showing a Davidic legitimacy to institutions like the temple which the Chronicler believes must now replace the monarchy. It is similar to the

⁶¹ This view is held by SMITH (*Palestinian Parties*); J. BLENKINSOPP, "Temple and Society in Achaemenid Judah", in: P. R. DAVIES, (ed.), *Second Temple Studies*, vol. 1 (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 117; Sheffield 1991) 22-53; and PIXLEY, *o. c.*, 113.

⁶² PECKHAM, *o. c.*, 677.

⁶³ D. N. FREEDMAN, *The Unity of the Hebrew Bible* (Ann Arbor 1993) 71.

⁶⁴ MEYERS, *o. c.*, 70-73.

⁶⁵ FREEDMAN, "The Chronicler's", *o. c.*, 436.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 436-37.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 437.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 788.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 438.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 441.

solution of the rabbis after the destruction of the Second Temple: the previous institution is affirmed as wonderful as necessary, and at the same time it is replaced. The Zadokite lineage did take over the same role as the House of David had held⁷¹. If this is the case in Chronicles, perhaps it was written for potential supporters of the Davidic restorationists, to convince them that support for the temple hierarchy would be fully in accord with the memory and purposes of David.

There are other groups which do not belong on the graph at all. The Am-Ha'arez, who may have been the smallholders of Benjamin, may have been responsible for the insertion in Jeremiah 23:34-40⁷². Less likely texts in this context would include Fourth Isaiah, Isaiah 24-27, and Joel 3-4⁷³. Then there was the Samaritan elite, with a rival claim to both political and religious authority. It is noteworthy that the Elephantine community wrote to both Samaria and Jerusalem for religious guidance (letter catalog reference "Cowley 31"). Finally, there would have been Edomites, Moabites, Arabs, and others living in the same area. There are glimpses of this in Neh 2:10, 19.

The relationship of these "others" to the groups on the graph, all of whom must be viewed at "insiders", is something which can be described with more conviction than the graph itself, and which may say something more yet about the relation of ideology and text. Peter Machinist has found that texts about "outsiders" rarely reflect the complex interaction between groups that really goes on, it is presented as "us vs. them."⁷⁴ Rather, these texts "tell us about the values of the . . . urban elites themselves, the ones responsible for their composition. In other words, the descriptions function to affirm the centrality . . . by defining what it is not"⁷⁵. Furthermore, looking at Mesopotamian texts, the descriptions of "others" appear when there are the most interactions with these outside groups: it is "in the urgent complexity of differentiating 'outsider' from 'insider' that the descriptions seem to have been composed: an ideological device, as it were"⁷⁶.

This is precisely what happened in the postexilic period. The Babylonian immigrants are referred to in the text as the *qāhāl* or *qēhāl haggôlâ*, terms

⁷¹ HORSLEY, *o. c.*, 170.

⁷² PIXLEY, *o. c.*, 115-122.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ P. MACHINIST, "On Self-Consciousness in Mesopotamia", in: S. N. EISENSTADT (ed.), *The Origins and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations* (State University of New York Press, 1986) 189.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 189-190.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 190.

“suggestive of a corporate identity not definable by a territorial or political referent”⁷⁷. Rather, it “defines itself over against the ‘people(s) of the land’ and from which one could be ‘separated’”⁷⁸. The term “Jews” appears to have a similar definition, in Neh 5:1,17.

Furthermore, Machinist shows that the definitions of “outsider” and “insider” are flexible. When one checks on the Mesopotamian groups referred to in texts by standard narrative devices for “outsider”, it is apparent that some members of these same groups were active on the “inside”⁷⁹. The defining texts were able “to co-opt at least part of the outsiders, the ‘acceptable’ ones, for the urban inside”⁸⁰. So in Ezra-Nehemiah, “membership is not on principle confined to Babylonian repatriates”⁸¹. Subject to the definitions of the elite diaspora Jews, native-born Judeans could participate in the cult (Ezra 6:12).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, one can postulate a society in which the assembly of Babylonian immigrants, under the supervision of an imperial representative, in a cohesive social unity which, while allowing for additional adherents, was jealously protective of its identity, as all “insiders” are, vis-a-vis the Samaritans and the Judeans who had remained in Palestine during the Exile⁸². Within this “assembly” were likely many competing agendas on how to deal with the ruralization, commercialization, internationalization, militarization, and vassalhood in which all of Yehud found itself. The “graph” model presented in this essay is one possible constellation in which these groups may have been arranged, and it can explain some specific texts. More generally, the texts of the period reflect the desire to define the “self” by defining the “other”. The texts gave identity to their composers by their portrayal of the other groups of the time.

⁷⁷ HOGLUND, *o. c.*, 72.

⁷⁸ BLENKINSOPP, *o. c.*, 45.

⁷⁹ MACHINIST, *o. c.*, 189.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 190.

⁸¹ BLENKINSOPP, *o. c.*, 46.

⁸² Cf. *Ibid.*, 53.

Resumen. - Este ensayo examina quiénes eran los liberales y los conservadores y el significado de liberalismo y conservadurismo en la Palestina del Segundo Templo. A través de la arqueología y documentos persas explica cuál era la relación entre apocalípticos, legalistas y visionarios, la aristocracia y las clases bajas en la Judea de la Restauración con referencia al cambio político, económico y social. Después esboza el papel de la ideología en la transformación del judaísmo al describir el nexo entre la ideología y los textos.

Summary. - *This essay explores who the liberals and conservatives were and what liberalism and conservatism were in Palestine in the Second Temple period. Using archaeology and Persian documents, it explains what the relationship was between apocalypticists, legalists, and visionaries, elites and subaltern groups, in Restoration Judah vis-à-vis social, economic, and political change. The role of ideology in the transformation of Judaism is then outlined, describing the relationship between ideology and text.*