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Abstract

This dissertation looks at ways in which memories of traumatic events are revisited and reshaped by mnemonic communities during the Second Temple period. I focus on the social dimensions of traumatic memory that shape collective identity. I consider ways in which the earlier sites of memories of the exodus, the destruction of the first temple, and the Babylonian exile are reactivated and reshaped by mnemonic communities in constructing exclusive collective identities through discourses of exile, separation, and restoration.

Drawing on theoretical frameworks from post-Holocaust thought that I outline in Chapter 1, I argue that the language in Ezra-Nehemiah (Chapter 2), 2 Maccabees (Chapter 3), Daniel (Chapter 4), and Damascus Document and Pesher Habakkuk (Chapter 5) is consistent with processes of identity formation in which trauma is construed as a founding, generative, and integrative identity. In developing themes of collective trauma and memory, I focus on Marianne Hirsch’s work on postmemory and Dominick LaCapra’s theories on
founding traumas and the conversion of absence and loss. I apply these theories to the aforementioned Second Temple texts by arguing that notions of purity and impurity are established through the memory and postmemory of catastrophic events, including the destruction of the first temple, Babylonian exile, and the persecution by Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 167-164 B.C.E. The producers of these texts mask structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence represented as the loss of an original identity) in its representation of historical trauma and narrate the process of restoration as the recovery of an original identity and unity, which never existed as it is represented in the texts.

Chapter 6 is an analysis of notions of purification, hybrids, and multidirectional memory. Engaging with the work of Bruno Latour, I discuss the production and proliferation of hybrids, which emerge from discourses and practices of separation and purification. I use Latour as a segue into Michael Rothberg’s work on multidirectional memory, which shows that those whom some communities attempt to mnemonically and discursively eliminate or purify often share a collective pasts and/or identities.
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Chapter One

Introduction and Methodological Approach

What is the weight of the past as opposed to the needs of the present and the future? Apart from the obligation to remember, is there also a right to forget? Are we allowed to try to shape history, or only drape ourselves in it, like sackcloth and ashes, and to sit forever mourning our dead? To sit behind barred doors and shuttered windows, telephone disconnected, our backs to the wicked world and our faces to the awful past, our backs to the living and our faces to the dead, to sit thus, day and night, and to remember what was done unto us by Amalek, until the coming of the Messiah—or until the second coming of Amalek? (Amos Oz, The Slopes of Lebanon)

Since the beginning of its history, this people has seen itself as alone and surrounded by enemies, and has been incapable of having faith in anything save its God and then its destiny. For centuries, misfortune and catastrophe have always seemed to be the most imminent eventualities, though the trust in ultimate deliverance has never entirely disappeared. Our identity is linked to this vision of the world and of the future. Is it possible for these most atavistic attitudes to evaporate from one day to the next? (Saul Friedlander, When Memory Comes)

A Klee painting named ‘Angelus Novus’ shows an angel looking as though he is about to move away from something he is fixedly contemplating. His eyes are staring, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how one pictures the angel of history. His face is turned towards the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise; it has caught in his wings with such violence that the angel can no longer close them. This storm irresistibly propels him into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. The storm is what we call progress. (Walter Benjamin, “Theses on the Philosophy of History” in Illuminations)

Remembering and forgetting are integral parts of the process of shaping and reshaping the past to meet the needs of the present and future. In regards to the imagery invoked by Benjamin, Jonathan Boyarin notes that most commentators focus on the image of the past as an ongoing catastrophe, but he emphasizes that “the storm is still blowing”: the past is not a one-time event occurring at one point in time. For Boyarin, “[p]art of the import of Benjamin’s lesson is that we are always being driven out; in some sense we have always
just lost paradise, hence we are always close to it” (Boyarin 1992: xvi). The above passages from The Slopes of Lebanon, When Memory Comes, and Illuminations speak to some of the central questions addressed by this dissertation: How did Second Temple mnemonic communities respond to experiences and/or memories of collective trauma and catastrophe, especially the postmemory of inter/transgenerational memories of trauma? How did they mnemonically and discursively respond to experiences and/or memories of catastrophe? How was collective trauma remembered, commemorated, and represented? In what ways were collective memories of trauma reactivated, relived, and reshaped? What are the haunting and lingering effects of inter/transgenerational memory? How is trauma transmitted inter/transgenerationally? How does the present shape the past, and vice versa? And what are the effects of the past and present on the future or imagining the future? In what ways did Second Temple Judean mnemonic communities represent processes of restoration? What kinds of narratives did they develop around sites of traumatic memory? Who was included

1 In using the term mnemonic communities, I follow the work of Eviatar Zerubavel, who uses the term simply to refer to a community of memory (Zerubavel 2003: 4).

2 Pierre Nora defines a site of memory as follows: “If the expression lieu de mémoire must have an official definition, it should be this: a lieu de mémoire is any significant entity, whether material or non-material in nature, which by dint of human will or the work of time has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community” (Nora 1996: xvii). Following Nora’s definition, Ehud Ben Zvi uses “site of memory” in reference to “any constructed space, place, event, figure, text or the like—whether it exists ‘materially’ or only in the mind of members of a social group—whose presence in the relevant cultural milieu evokes or was meant to evoke core images or aspects of images of the past held by the particular social group who lives in that cultural milieu” (Ben Zvi 2012: 141). Thus, sites of memory may refer to the wilderness, Jerusalem, the exodus, the exile, the figure of Moses, or Torah. However, Hindy Najman questions the applicability of the concept of lieu de mémoire to Second Temple Judaism. As Najman correctly notes, Nora’s lieu de mémoire is in response to modern historical consciousness, which he contrasts with living memory (i.e., the eternal living present vs. the objectively studied past), and Second Temple Judaism lacks this dichotomy as its ‘historiography’ does not anticipate modern historiography and historical methods (i.e., the universal presentation of facts) (Najman 2012: 2-4). Furthermore, Gabrielle Spiegel, who contests the current tendency in academic historiography to collapse history into memory, describes the relationship between history and memory as follows: “If memory is not the antithesis of history, it nonetheless cannot be severed from its sacrificial and liturgical—its ‘commemorative’—contexts and made to do the ‘work’ of history. To the extent that memory ‘reincarnates,’ ‘resurrects,’ ‘re-cycles,’ and makes the past ‘reappear’ and live again in the present, it cannot perform historically, since it refuses to keep the past in the past, to draw the line, as it were, that is constitutive of the modern enterprise of historiography. History re-presents the dead; memory re-members the corpse in order to revivify it” (Spiegel 2002: 162). According to Spiegel, unlike the backward gazing history,
and excluded in narratives and representations of restoration and future utopias? What happens when absence is conflated with loss, especially in worldviews of lost unity (i.e., paradise lost)? What are the implications when this absence is the object of mourning? How does this process facilitate and inform eschatological worldviews? Did trauma bring Second Temple communities together or separate them, or both? How did trauma inform identity formation? What sorts of worldviews developed out of traumatic memory? What are the liturgical dimensions of traumatic memory? How did Second Temple Judean\(^3\) mnemonic communities use schemas and cultural frameworks in the transmission of trauma? What can theories of multidirectional memory tell us about narratives of exclusive identity formation?

memory faces forward from the living present to the imagined future (i.e., the oral, liturgical, and prophetic of memory vs. the written, archival, and analytical of history) (Spiegel 2002: 162). She goes on to say that “Holocaust testimony, monumentalized lieux de mémoire, museums, festivals, and the like are traces of the past that negate the sacred but seek to retain its aura. They are, as Nora has so powerfully demonstrated, the ultimate embodiments of a memorial consciousness that has barely survived in a historical age that calls out for memory because it has abandoned it” (Spiegel 2002: 162). Thus, although the context to which I am applying the concept of lieu de mémoire is very different than that in which Nora developed the concept, I nevertheless proceed with this in mind as I refer to sites of memory throughout this dissertation. As I show throughout this dissertation, Second Temple memory and temporality resemble what Spiegel calls liturgical time, not modern historiography, as it is a cyclical and schematic process that fuses past, present, and future into a single entity, which she contrasts with the “unique” events of history “unfolding within an irreversible linear time” (Spiegel 2002 152).

\(^3\) Following Steve Mason’s argument, I use the term ‘Judean’ instead of ‘Jew’ throughout this dissertation. Mason’s argument may be summarized as follows: “So, also, to themselves and outside observers, the Ioudaioi remained what they had been: Judeans. There was no ready alternative, since the Greco-Roman world knew no category of religion, no –isms denoting religious allegiance, and no ‘Judaism.’ The rare Iodaismos (‘Judaization’) was usable only in the special context of movement toward or away from Judean law and life, in contrast to some other cultural pull. That is why the term is hardly ever used. Iodaismos as a belief system and way of life—as a concept abstracted from the realities of Judea, Jerusalem, temple and the priesthood, sacrificial cult, aristocratic governance, political constitution, ancestral laws, and traditions—was the construction of an antecedent Christianismos from the third to fifth centuries C.E.” (Mason 2007: 511-12). Although I think that Mason is correct in the sense that there is no Judaism in the classical sense of Judaism (following Neusner's approach) before the Mishnah, his argument also raises problems. For instance, should Philo be called a Judean (i.e., a geographically-bound term), even if he was an Alexandrian? Here, too, I follow Mason. Can one not be both Egyptian and Judean, or a Judean and a citizen of Alexandria? According to Mason, “[t]here are parallels here with modern discussions of identity in relation to immigrant groups: ‘Indo-Canadian’ or ‘Chinese-Canadian.’ Yet admitting the complexities of such terms does not cause us to fall back upon ‘religion’ or some other category for the non-Canadian half of the expression. Similar complications should also be manageable in our study of the ancient ‘Judeans’” (Mason 2007: 493). With that said, I still refer to the field of study as Second Temple Judaism.
that emerge from collective memories of trauma? What lies beneath discourses of separation, purification, and the destruction of hybrids?

Hayden White projects a framework in which historical narratives do not reproduce the events narrated, but rather they tell audiences from which vantage point to view the referential events and infuse perceptions of the events with “different emotional valences” (White 1980: 8). These vantage points, whether they are memory or counter-memory, are windows through which a given group and its memories are revealed. White contends that a historical narrative needs a social centre with which producers of a discourse can rank and organize the narration of events; it is through this social centre that the producers are able to instill events with moral or ethical significance (White 1980: 15). White understands the social centre as a system of human relationships governed by sustaining laws and a medium through which all events, conflicts, struggles, and triumphs are interpreted and presented. He states that “perhaps, then, the growth and development of historical consciousness which is attended by a concomitant growth and development of narrative capability… has something to do with the extent to which the legal system functions as a subject of concern” (White 1980: 17). In other words, collective memories, and the subsequent historical narratives in which these memories are represented, are directly related to cultural/collective/community identities, institutions, and laws.

The restoration of collective identities (unified and pure collective identities from the past), laws (Torah and the ancestral traditions), institutions (temple and cult), and authoritative texts and sealed books are central to the narratives of destruction and exile featured in this study. This dissertation looks at ways in which memories of traumatic events are used and reused as sites of memory in Second Temple Judaism. I focus on the social
dimensions of traumatic memory and the ways in which sites of memory shape collective identity. More specifically, I consider ways in which earlier sites of memories like the exodus, destruction of the first temple, and the exile are revisited by interpretive communities in constructing exclusive collective identities. In my textual analysis of Ezra-Nehemiah (E-N), 2 Maccabees, Daniel, Damascus Document (CD), and Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab), I explore the exclusive identities and social divisions that emerge from revisiting memories of destruction and restoration, and exile and return. Moreover, I examine how the language in these texts is consistent with processes of identity formation in which a trauma is construed as a founding, generative, and integrative (in the sense that it integrates or brings together several other identity markers) identity marker. In doing so, these textual communities authorize themselves as pure remnants emerging from destruction and/or exile and as recipients of revelation. I consider the ways in which distinctions between the past, present, and future collapse when these communities represent themselves as a pure remnant in a state of exile while narrating or envisioning a restoration of or return to Jerusalem.

In narrating a process of purification in an exilic wilderness, revelation and proper interpretation and observation of ancestral traditions—such as Torah and prophetic texts—are central to identity formation. In this sense, revelation and proper interpretation of prophets and Torah function as what Eviatar Zerubavel calls *memorabilia*, which creates *mnemonic connectedness* when constancy of place—i.e., the homeland—is temporarily absent (Zerubavel 2003: 43-44). For these communities, revelation occurs outside and independently of the impure homeland, city, or temple, whether it is standing or not, and Torah and/or authoritative books become *cultural texts*, which inform a normative and formative authority for establishing identity. According to Jan Assmann, cultural texts are
transformed by new contexts and are adapted to meet the needs of the present when they are reused, reproduced, and reinterpreted (Assmann 2006: 101-21). In the analysis in this dissertation, figures and texts are the authority and foundation for inter/transgenerational continuity, cohesion, and affiliation, which enables these groups to reproduce themselves as identifiable groups.

This dissertation is split into two parts, the first of which contains two chapters that look at the processes of destruction and restoration in historiography, namely E-N and 2 Maccabees. In these two chapters, I consider the ways in which these two texts respond to traumatic events by narrating the origins of an exclusive restored Israel. Chapter 2 examines the ways in which E-N, in responding to the destruction of the first temple and exile, represents a pure remnant emerging from Babylon that is separated from the pollution of the land and the peoples of the land through the discourse of exile. E-N narrates restoration as a process that eliminates the contaminated part of the collective self, namely the peoples of the land/the Samarians, who are excluded from the temple, cult, and community through barriers and expulsion.

In Chapter 3, I look at how 2 Maccabees represents restoration and recovery from the traumatic events of the persecution by Antiochus IV as processes of cleansing and eliminating the impure part of the collective self (i.e., the Hellenizers), who are responsible for defiling the temple and sending the Maccabean heroes into brief exile in 5:27. I discuss the ways in which 2 Maccabees seeks to restore the loss of an original ethnic identity through restoring and rededicating the temple and making mnemonic connections with an idealized past. In both chapters, I consider the ways in which liturgical time facilitates the process of restoration and connects the present to the idealized past.
The second part of this dissertation examines texts that present eschatology as part of the restoration process, namely Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab. These texts mourn the absence of a pure pre-exilic identity through conflating absence and loss. In other words, these texts produce narratives based in absence. As Dominick LaCapra argues, the narrativization of absence often includes elements of sin or fault that are overcome through eschatology or salvation in the end (LaCapra 2001: 51). This point speaks to Michael Knibb’s work on the ongoing corrupt state of an indefinite exile—in which only the community responsible for producing the text is the exception—that is finally overcome through an eschatological end (Knibb 1976). In Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab, the absence of a pure and intact pre-exilic identity continues to haunt these mnemonic communities to the point of representing exile as continuing well into the Second Temple period. Following LaCapra, I argue that this coveted pre-exilic identity in these texts is “regained in some hoped-for, apocalyptic future or sublimely blank utopia that, through a kind of creation *ex nihilo*, will bring total renewal, salvation or redemption” (LaCapra 2001: 57).

In Chapter 4, I show how Daniel, in responding to the persecution of 167-164 B.C.E. that mirrors and is framed by the Babylonian exile, establishes the identity of the elect/the *maskîlim* through the discourse of exile and revelation and represents the process of restoration and salvation as one that is achieved through wisdom and revelation. In Chapter 5, I explore the ways in which CD and 1QpHab revisit the traumatic memories of 587 B.C.E. in establishing boundaries between the elect and the traitors, or the pure and the impure, while narrating a restorative process that is marked by an eschatological restoration of

---

4 Further to this point, LaCapra states, “[i]n a conventional narrative, a putatively naive or pure beginnings—something construed as a variant of full presence, innocence, or intactness—is lost through the ins and outs, trials and tribulations, of the middle only to be recovered, at least on the level of higher insight, at the end” (LaCapra 2001: 52).
Jerusalem and the temple. In both of these chapters, eschatology determines salvation and marks the final separation, through rewards and punishments, of the righteous and the wicked, as defined by the texts.

Just as memory and identity are fluid concepts with boundaries under constant negotiation, notions of purity, impurity, and the ‘impure other’ are highly contingent with permeable boundaries. Before proceeding, it is important to note some notions and nuances of purity and impurity in Second Temple Judaism in general, and in the texts under analysis in this dissertation in particular. According to Christine Hayes, “[t]he ethnic identity of ancient Israelites was constructed in opposition to Gentile, or alien, ‘others’ and was expressed in terms of purity and impurity. Different constructions of Jewish identity entailed different characterizations of aliens and different views on the degree to which Gentiles might acquire Israelite identity” (Hayes 2002: 1). Hayes outlines three modes of impurity—ritual impurity, moral impurity, and genealogical impurity—used by ancient Judeans in distinguishing a pure Israelite from an impure alien. However, depending on the mode of impurity attributed to the other, these boundaries were permeable. For Hayes, understanding these boundaries, their permeability, and the diverse and divergent attitudes towards conversion and intermarriage are integral for assessing the intra-Judean conflict during the Second Temple period (Hayes 2002: 1-2), which is a key component of this dissertation.

Jonathan Klawans identifies the characteristics of ritual impurity as highly contagious, levitical (cf. Leviticus 11-15; Numbers 19), unavoidable, impermanent, and removable. This type of impurity is considered a transgression only if the impure is not purified or if he or she defiles the sacred while in this state. Moral impurity, on the other hand, is defined by heinous, defiling acts, either sexual or cultic, that violate the Holiness
Code (Leviticus 17-26). This type of impurity defiles the land of Israel (cf. Lev. 18:25; Ezek. 36:17) and sacred space (cf. Lev. 20:3; Ezek 5:11), leading to punishments of death, destruction, and exile. Moral purity is not achieved via the rites and rituals that mitigate and remove ritual impurity but through punishing sinners and transgressors or avoiding moral impurity in the first place (Klawans 1995: 289-91). Examples of moral purity and impurity abound in the discourses of exile, separation, and purification that permeate 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab.

Importantly, Hayes adds the category of genealogical impurity to Klawans (1995) distinction between ritual and moral impurity. Unlike ritual and moral impurity, which are impermanent and permeable boundaries, genealogical impurity is a permanent and impermeable boundary (Hayes 2002: 7-10). As I show in Chapter 2, the category of genealogical impurity is significant for notions of purity, impurity, and intermarriage in E-N. Hayes argues that notions of genealogical purity may be correlated with different approaches to collective identity and attitudes towards the ‘impure other’ than we what find with ritual or moral purity (Hayes 2002: 7).

Taking an approach which is different than that of Klawans or Hayes, my analysis in Chapter 6 on discourses of purity, impurity, and separation explores the hybrids that lurk beneath the surfaces of impermanent and permanent boundaries. Not only are foreigners, such as Persians and Greeks, positively evaluated but also the groups represented as impure in the texts (the peoples of the land/Samarians in E-N, the Hellenizers in 2 Maccabees, the violators of the covenant in Daniel, and the Hasmonean high priests in CD and 1QpHab) share sites of memory/cultural overlap, produce hybrids, and are in dialogical relationship with the mnemonic communities self-identifying as pure. Chapter 6 is an analysis of notions
of purification, hybrids, and multidirectional memory. Engaging with the work of Bruno Latour, I discuss the production and proliferation of hybrids that emerge from discourses and practices of separation and purification. I then connect Latour to Michael Rothberg’s work on multidirectional memory. Rothberg’s book, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*, shows that those whom some communities attempt to mnemonically obliterate or purify share collective pasts and identities. I argue that the mnemonic communities that construct identity through the representations of the past and discourses of separation and purification are in a dialogical relationship and share overlapping memories and identities with those whom they represent as the impure other. The main point of this final chapter is to show that memory and identity are never fixed and are under constant negotiations; since memory and identity are fuzzy and fluid, “relations of connectedness and separateness can never be taken for granted” (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 129).

(Castelli 2004; Janzen 2012; Weitzman 2005; Wright 2010), and ancient Judean responses to trauma and catastrophe as viewed through the lens of post-Holocaust thought (Klawans 2010).

The dimension that this dissertation contributes to these ongoing discussions is explicating exclusive identity construction during the Second Temple period as a process rooted in the collective memory and postmemory of trauma. In other words, this dissertation examines the social dimensions of traumatic memory that shape exclusive collective identity as represented in E-N, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab. The process to which I am referring is what Holocaust historian Omer Bartov calls “new and unforeseen identities forged in the crucible of destruction” (Bartov 2000: 5).

The selection of the constellation of texts featured in this dissertation is not self-evident. Moreover, these texts are expansive in content, genre, and historical context. This project is theory-driven with two chapters accorded to each of historiography and eschatological texts. I chose not to focus on only one or two texts to test my hypothesis about the impact of traumatic memory on discourses of separation, purification, and exclusive collective identity formation. Selecting five case study texts that span historical periods (Persian and Hellenistic), social locations, and mnemonic communities allows me to highlight the fluidity and dynamics of inter/transgenerational and multidirectional memory. Through this approach, one can see the ways in which different mnemonic communities in the Persian and Hellenistic periods drew off of similar sites of memory and employed similar tropes and schemas for shaping and negotiating the past and the present, as well as individual and collective identity for the purposes of their respective mnemonic communities. A theory-driven approach and selection of five case study texts are the features that distinguish my
project from comparable works, such as that of Jacob W. Wright (2010) who recently has looked at the ways in which the defeat motif in the Hebrew Bible informs the collective identity of Israel as a nation and a people. Within this framework, Wright discusses the role of the commemoration of war during a formative period of national identity as subgroups wrestled for control of collective memory (Wright 2010: 85-87).

Obviously, not all Second Temple texts fit the model presented in this dissertation. For instance, as noted in Chapter 2, in this regard, E-N is an exception to the rule during the Persian period (cf. Chronicles, Zechariah, Haggai, Jeremiah, Second and Third Isaiah, Ezekiel). The texts featured in this study share the following traits: a founding trauma; a trauma that divides a collectivity; perceptions of an original unity or identity that has been polluted or contaminated (and a hope to restore that original unity); exclusivist identity formation through discourses of separation and purification in response to/as part of the process of restoration from a founding trauma; a process of cleansing, eliminating, or purifying the impure part collective self; a temporarily defiled homeland/a discourse of exile; postmemories of trauma. Needless to say that more texts than not produced during the Second Temple period do not share all, or even most, of these traits: some respond to trauma differently (Lamentations, Zechariah, Haggai, Jeremiah, Second and Third Isaiah, Ezekiel, Philo) or do not use trauma as a necessary condition or as a precursor to exclusivist discourses of separation and purification (1QM, 1QS, 4QMMT, Jubilees, 4Q Pseudo-Moses, Apocalypse of Weeks). For other texts, the object of exclusion and impurity is external rather than internal (Joseph and Aseneth, Letter of Aristeas, Philo, Jubilees, 4QMMT, 1QM—with the exception of the nations who are being helped by the violators of the covenant). As I outline below, trauma and responses to trauma have the ability to unite or divide
collectivities. In most cases, Second Temple texts that produce discourses around trauma present a unified or reunified Israel (e.g. Chronicles, Zechariah, Haggai, Jeremiah, Second and Third Isaiah, Ezekiel). In looking at the effect of traumatic memory on collective identity, internal divisions and discourses of exclusion interest me most, and the texts selected for this study are indicative of this research interest.

I foresee this project not only contributing to existing work on and generating new questions about collective memory and trauma in Second Temple Judaism but also helping inform and providing new data for ongoing conversations on collective memory and trauma in the fields of history, psychology, anthropology, sociology, Jewish studies, and Holocaust studies. In other words, it is both my intention and aspiration to provide a new theoretical lens and framework for biblical studies and a new data-set for memory studies, which so often focuses on modernity. With this in mind, one runs the risk of anachronism in undertaking a study that employs modern terms and concepts like sites of memory (see footnote 2), founding trauma, postmemory, and multidirectional memory, as well as analysis of discourses of separation, purification, and the production of hybrids by using the work of Latour. I am aware of this risk and some of the issues that arise from approaching ancient materials with modern theoretical discourses. Issues of anachronism are not new to biblical and ancient studies as one can see with the application of certain historical, postcolonial, feminist, and cognitive approaches and perspectives. Although the context to which I am applying my theoretical framework is very different than the context in which it was developed, I proceed cautiously and mindfully as I bring new theoretical approaches to the data. For me, the reward is worth the risk in generating new conversations about and approaches to understanding the role that trauma and memory play in these texts that engage
in exclusivist discourses. A broad, expansive, theory-driven survey also runs the risk of jettisoning and eclipsing historical specificity. Admittedly, this study does not engage the historical specifics of each case study as deeply as a more specialized study would, but I do reveal some of the ways in which the inherited past of inter/transgenerational memory functions and mnemonic communities respond to certain historical contexts and social locations. In sum, I try to maintain the integrity of historical contexts of the texts featured in this dissertation and in no way do I equate the traumatic events of modernity with those of antiquity. What I attempt to draw out of the modern theory and secondary literature on collective trauma and memory is a general framework for highlighting the relationship between trauma, memory, and exclusive identity in Second Temple Judaism.

1 Traumatic Memory: Individual, Collective, Inter/Transgenerational, and Post Memory

Through a Foucaultian archaeological analysis, Ian Hacking outlines the historical context, 1874-86 France, in which the modern science of memory—specifically the study of multiple personality disorder—and the new meanings of the term trauma come into existence. He goes on to highlight the interrelationship between the modern science of memory and the early connotations of psychological trauma: “It is by no means an accident that in precisely that time that the word trauma acquired a new meaning. It had always meant a lesion or wound, but its meaning was limited to the physical, the physiological. Then suddenly the word got its most common and compelling meaning, a psychological hurt, a spiritual lesion, a wound to the soul” (Hacking 1995: 4). Once exclusively in the realm of surgeons, the diagnosis and treatment of trauma made its way into the domain of psychology.
Trauma’s leap from body to mind occurred with the emergence of discourses and analyses of multiple personality in France (Hacking 1995: 183).

Hacking’s genealogy, beginning with Jean-Martin Charcot, of course, precedes the work of Sigmund Freud in the 1890s on memory, trauma, and multiple personality (Hacking 1995: 4-5). Although the concept of psychological trauma was theorized by Freud in 1893-97, it was already being studied under the term moral trauma, or traumatisme moral, when Freud arrived to study with Charcot in France in 1885. Hacking charts the genealogy of psychological trauma as follows: “In retrospect we can quite easily construct a chain of ideas that take us from brain damage—straightforward physical and neurological trauma—to the idea of psychological trauma that produces hysterical symptoms that are to be relieved through recollection of lost memories” (Hacking 1995: 183). Thus, in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century works of Charcot, Freud, and Pierre Janet we find the tightly intertwined associations between psychological trauma, multiple personality, amnesia, and recovered memory.

Needless to say the earliest works on memory and trauma focused on individual memory. However, the importance of the collective is paramount for this study. Not surprisingly, much work done on memory and trauma focuses on psychoanalysis and individual memory, and the field of collective memory and trauma has been built on the foundation of Holocaust studies, mainly individual survivor accounts, memoirs, and testimonies. Barry Schwartz outlines the distinction between individual and collective memory as follows: “Although individuals alone possess the capacity to remember the past, they never do so singly; they do so with and against others situated in different groups and
through the knowledge and symbols that predecessors and contemporaries transmit to them” (Schwartz 2014).

In a similar vein, J. Assmann explains that since social values, norms, meanings, and symbols shape personal experiences and memories, it is nearly impossible to distinguish between individual and collective memory because of the social dimensions of individual memory. Jan and Aleida Assmann propose the term *communicative memory* to describe the social dimensions of individual memory, which is shaped and informed by dialogical exchanges and social interactions and frameworks. This process has emotional and affective forces that imprint the mind (Assmann 2006: 3). Communicative memory, according to the Assmanns, operates on a horizontal axis and is one to three generations in duration. Furthermore, the Assmanns distinguish communicative memory from what they call *cultural memory*, or collective or bonding memory, which transmit collective identity, institutions, and societal norms and values with symbolic force. For the Assmanns, what communication is for communicative memory, tradition is for cultural memory, which is diachronic and transmitted vertically and inter/transgenerationally: “If we think of the typical three-generation cycle of communicative memory as a synchronic memory-space, then cultural memory, with its traditions reaching far back into the past, forms a diachronic axis” (Assmann 2006: 8). In other words, cultural memory is the institutionalized memory that lies beyond the 80-100 year duration, and probably much less in antiquity, of communicative memory and is transmitted via archives, written texts, symbolic forms, and rituals. In this sense, what the Assmanns call cultural memory, or collective memory, can be considered

---

5 Importantly, as Marianne Hirsch points out, “Assmann uses the term ‘kulturelles Gedächtnis’ (‘cultural memory’) to refer to ‘Kultur’—an institutionalized hegemonic archival memory. In contrast, the Anglo-American meaning of ‘cultural memory’ refers to the social memory of a specific group or subculture (Hirsch 2008: 10 n.5).
connective memory, as it connects generations on the vertical axis (Assmann 2006: 11). Finally, according to the Assmanns, “[w]hat is at stake is not the (illegitimate) transfer of a concept derived from individual psychology to social and cultural phenomena, but the interaction between the psyche, consciousness, society, and culture (Assmann 2006: 9). Thus, collective memory is comprised of a mosaic of individual memories, which themselves are informed by the collective and the social, as seemingly disparate individual and personal narratives are woven together to produce new meanings (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 127).

The moralizing elements of memory and narrative are integral to collective identity formation. Memory implies a self or subject who perceives the memory or participates in the act of remembering. Therefore, memory is an intrinsic part of selfhood in such a way that memory and identity mutually validate each other (Lambek 1996: 243-44). Memories are preserved and continuously reproduced through the medium of narratives, and senses of identity are perpetuated through this process. According to Maurice Halbwachs, collective memories link groups of people who are temporally separated and help forge a shared identity between those in the past and those in the present who invoke the memory (Halbwachs 1992: 47). J. Boyarin goes so far as to say that “identity and memory are virtually the same concept” (Boyarin 1994: 23).

Generations are mnemonic communities that transmit memory and identity to subsequent generations. A. Assmann distinguishes between intergenerational memory, which is located and transmitted through the family, and transgenerational memory, which is national/political or cultural/archival and is disseminated through symbolic systems
(Assmann 2006: 10; Hirsch 2008: 110). However, Marianne Hirsch identifies the following problem with the Assmanns’ approach to memory:

Jan and Aleida Assmann’s typological distinctions do not specifically account for the ruptures introduced by collective historical trauma, by war, Holocaust, exile, and refugeehood: these ruptures would certainly inflect their schemas of transmission. Both embodied communicative memory and institutionalized cultural/archival memory would be severely impaired by traumatic experience. Within the space of the family or proximate group, survivors, as Hoffman (2004: 9) indicates, express not exactly “memories” but “emanations” in “a chaos of emotion.” These typologies would also be compromised by the erasures of records, such as those perpetrated by totalitarian regimes. Under the Nazis, cultural archives were destroyed, records burned, possessions lost, histories suppressed and eradicated. (Hirsch 2008: 111)

Hirsch’s point about the threat of collective trauma to the transmission of memory is significant for this study. Collective memories of trauma, destruction (leading to exile), destroyed cultural archives, suppressed traditions, and lost cultural and cultic possessions and symbols permeate the Hebrew Bible and other Second Temple texts in accounts of the events of 587 B.C.E. and 167-164 B.C.E. (e.g. 2 Kgs 25:9-21; Jeremiah 52; Lamentations; 2 Chron. 36:17-21; 1 Maccabees 1; 2 Maccabees 4-7). In this regard, one must think only of the problem presented in Psalm 137:4: “How can we sing a song of YHWH on alien soil?” נָשִִׁׁ֥יר אֶת־שִׁיר־יְהוָָ֑ה עַ ֵ֗ל אַדְמִַ֥ת נ כָָֽר. The Psalmist suggests that exile and the loss of the homeland are followed by a potential loss of culture and threat to overall existence.

The sentiment of the Psalmist corresponds to Jeffrey Alexander’s notion that collective trauma is marked by the transition of a social crisis becoming a cultural crisis, which is an “acute discomfort entering into the core of the collectivity’s sense of its own identity” (Alexander 2004: 10; Alexander 2013: 15). The Israelites have lost Jerusalem, the temple, and their Davidic kings. In response to the disruption of the basic sense of being, a culture or community hopes for a survival, revival, or restoration (Lear 2006: 95), which can achieved via the medium of memory, or more specifically, inter/transgenerational memory,
including the transmission of trauma. Alexander defines the cultural construction of trauma as follows: “a claim to some fundamental injury, an exclamation of the terrifying profanation of some sacred value, a narrative about a horribly destructive process, and a demand for emotional, institutional, and symbolic reparation and reconstitution” (Alexander 2004: 11; 2013: 16). This process is facilitated by collective memory.

Just as it is important to contextualize and distinguish between individual and collective memory, it is also important to distinguish between individual trauma and cultural/collective trauma. Kai Erikson, for instance, describes collective trauma as a blow to the basic tissues of social life that damages the bonds that connect people together and impairs the prevailing sense of communality. In other words, he is referring to a blow to the social tissue, not the individual mind (Erikson 1995: 184-85). According to Erikson, traumatized communities are distinct from assemblies of traumatized people; a community can be damaged in much the same way as the tissues of mind and body. Thus, for Erikson, “traumatic wounds inflicted on individuals can combine to create a mood, an ethos—a group culture, almost—that is different from (and more than) the sum of private wounds that make it up. Trauma, that is, has a social dimension” (Erikson 1995: 185). Similarly, for Alexander, “[c]ultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel that they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways” (Alexander 2004: 1). An example of this process is the persistence of collective memories of the events of 587 B.C.E. and the subsequent exile in the late second temple period, and the ways in which these memories inform collective identities. Alexander also notes that whereas individuals may react to trauma by repressing, denying, mourning and/or
working through, collectivities do so by creating narratives, cultural frameworks, and symbolic structures (Alexander 2013: 3). The texts featured in this dissertation are discursive responses to trauma that key into cultural frameworks and symbolic structures of the inherited past of earlier sites of memory and cultural archives. As I illustrate throughout this study, trauma can create a community, or an imagined community, in which members have a status that marks them as part of this community. In this way, trauma can serve as a source of communality in the same way that common languages and common backgrounds do (Erikson 1995: 186). However, shared cultural or collective trauma is no guarantee because “shared trauma depends on collective processes of cultural interpretation” (Alexander 2013: 3).

According to Alexander, trauma theory helps us understand not the causes of the genocide or collective catastrophes but rather their affective impact and after-effects (Alexander 2004: 8). In this sense, trauma is a socially mediated attribution (Alexander 2004: 8; 2013: 13). Erikson identifies the problem of defining trauma in that it may refer to either the blow/the event or the condition that follows (Erikson 1995: 185). With this in mind, Alexander and Erikson agree that it is *how people react to the events*, not the events *themselves*, that give the events traumatic qualities (see Erikson 1995: 184). The reaction to traumatic events can be inter/transgenerational. Hirsch defines her concept of postmemory

---

6 The contributors to Cathy Caruth’s volume, *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* (1995), do not even attempt to define trauma, as the volume is not interested in defining trauma, but rather attempts to understand its surprising impact of how it unsettles and forces us to rethink our notions of experience.

7 Hirsch’s concept of postmemory connotes a historicity that is absent in antiquity as memory functions differently in modernity than it did in antiquity. Hirsch applies postmemory to Holocaust survivor accounts and memories of a series of catastrophic events that contain a historicity (i.e., we know that the Holocaust happened) that is not applicable to the ancient events discussed in this dissertation. Her work focuses on the ways in which the traumatic memories of Holocaust survivors are transferred to—through family photographs in particular—and represented in second-generation fiction, art, memoir, and testimony. With that said, I find Hirsch’s concept of postmemory, and her work on inter/transgenerational memory in general, to be a valuable heuristic device in analyzing inter/transgenerational transmissions of trauma. Because Hirsch’s work is read in
as “the relationship of the second generation to powerful, often traumatic, experiences that preceded their births but that were nevertheless transmitted to them so deeply as to seem to constitute memories in their own right” (Hirsch 2008: 103). According to Hirsch, postmemory illumines the problem of mnemonic transmission through ruptures:

The structure of postmemory clarifies how the multiple ruptures and radical breaks introduced by trauma and catastrophe inflect intra-, inter- and trans-generational inheritance. It breaks through and complicates the line the Assmanns draw connecting individual to family, to social group, to institutionalized historical archive. That archive, in the case of traumatic interruption, exile, and diaspora, has lost its direct link to the past, has forfeited the embodied connections that forge community and society. And yet the Assmanns’ typology explains why and how the postgeneration could and does work to counteract this loss. (Hirsch 2008: 111)

Postmemory reactivates earlier, more distant archival/cultural/collective memories “by reinvesting them with resonant individual and familial forms of mediation and aesthetic expression” (Hirsch 2008: 111). As a result, “less-directly affected participants” engage in the postmemorial work that allows memories of events that occurred before their birth to persist, even long after those more-directly affected by the events have passed (Hirsch 2008: 111). For Hirsch, memory is “an affective link to the past” and “an embodied living connection” that is symptomatic of “a need for inclusion in a collective membrane forged by a shared inheritance of multiple traumatic histories and the individual and social responsibility we feel toward a persistent and traumatic past—what the French have referred to as ‘le devoir de mémoire’” (Hirsch 2008: 111). In this dissertation, I stretch the elasticity of Hirsch’s concept of postmemory beyond the second generation to subsequent generations, like the collective memories of second and first century B.C.E. mnemonic communities of the Babylonian destruction and exile in the sixth century B.C.E.

---

various ways, postmemory has turned out to be a fruitful and malleable concept. Thus, I use this concept with an awareness of the potentially anachronistic implications of doing so.
Hirsch’s work participates in an ongoing and developing theoretical discussion, in Holocaust studies and other fields, on trauma, memory, and inter/transgenerational acts of transfer (Hirsch 2008: 104). Eva Hoffman calls the intergenerational dimensions of traumatic memory “the transmission of trauma” (Hoffman 2010: 408). She describes the haunting presence of trauma and loss as one that continues “to overwhelm and overshadow the present,” as the process of mourning never lifts (Hoffman 2010: 411).

It is one characteristic of “trauma” and post-traumatic states that time stops at the most awful moment, that the past continues to overwhelm and overshadow the present and the mourning never lifts. The necessary task, for those who come into the inheritance of loss, is in a sense to liberate themselves from the thrall of the past sufficiently not to mistake our ancestors’ history for our own. The demand has been to recognize and reckon with great suffering without mistaking destruction for the root and origin of the world—to pace absence within the parameters of presence, death within the parameters of life. (Hoffman 2010: 411)

The transmission of trauma and presence of trauma that continues to haunt the present are dimensions that I highlight throughout my textual analyses.

Importantly, discussions of the transmission of trauma—which have proliferated and become increasingly pressing with the numerous genocides and collective catastrophes that have marked the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries—focus on the “affective impact of trauma and its aftermath, the ways in which trauma can recall, or reactivate, the effects of another, exceed the bounds of traditional historical archives and methodologies” (Hirsch 2008: 104). Hirsch describes the process of postmemory and the affective impact on the descendants of survivors as follows:

Postmemory describes the relationship that the generation after those who witnessed cultural or collective trauma bears to the experiences of those who came before, experiences that they “remember” only by means of the stories, images, and behaviors among which they grew up. But these experiences were transmitted to them so deeply and affectively as to seem to constitute memories in their own right. Postmemory’s connection to the past is thus not actually mediated by recall but by imaginative investment, projection, and creation. To grow up with such overwhelming inherited memories, to be dominated by narratives that preceded one’s birth or one’s consciousness, is to risk having one’s own stories and experiences displaced, even evacuated, by those of a previous generation. It is to be shaped, however indirectly, by traumatic events that still defy narrative reconstruction and exceed
comprehension. These events happened in the past, but their effects continue into the present. This is, I believe, the experience of postmemory and the process of its generation. (Hirsch 2008: 106-7)

Some of the points raised by Hirsch are central to this dissertation: the symbolic and affective force of memories of destruction and exile in ancient Israelite collective memories; the reactivation of earlier sites of memory or cultural archives by later traumatic events, to the point that the earlier ones displace contemporary experiences and stories; the haunting effects of past trauma in the present.

The social dimensions of collective trauma are paramount to this study. What interests me most in the texts that are analyzed throughout this dissertation is the ways in which memories of traumatic events are central to exclusive identity formation. How are these mnemonic communities responding to trauma? Why are memories of destruction and restoration, exile and return, and defilement and purification such fertile ground for identity construction in E-N, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab? In what ways do the social mediation and transmission of trauma inform identity? How do communities mark members with the exclusive identity and status that function in ways comparable to common language or culture? Alexander outlines the relationship between representation of trauma, collective memory, and collective identity as follows:

For traumas to emerge at the level of the collectivity, social crises must become cultural crises. Events are one thing, representations of these events are quite another. Trauma is not the result of a group experiencing pain. It is the result of this acute discomfort entering into the core of the collectivity’s sense of its own identity. Collective actors “decide” to represent social pain as a fundamental threat to their sense of who they are, where they come from, and where their want to go. (Alexander 2004: 10; 2013: 15)

Representing cultural crises, social pain, and fundamental threats to collective identity are a central feature of this dissertation.
As I illustrate throughout this dissertation, memories of traumatic events, which connect people and are the basis for community and identity, can be real or imagined, or both. According to Alexander, “[t]raumatic status is attributed to real or imagined phenomena, not because of their actual harmfulness or their objective abruptness, but because these phenomena are believed to have abruptly, and harmfully, affected collective identity” (Alexander 2004: 10). The transmission of real or imagined events, such as the exodus or certain accounts of exile and return/restoration, can be reactivated and reshaped to the point that distinctions between the past and the present collapse. For instance, when mnemonic communities conflate and/or blur the distinction between historical trauma (e.g. the loss of Jerusalem and the temple) with structural trauma (e.g. the transhistorical absence of an original unity or purity), these communities are haunted by the past by reliving and reshaping it constantly and collapsing the distinction between past and present (LaCapra 2001: 42-47). The reliving of the past and collapsing between past and present are trademarks of inter/transgenerational memory. Erikson notes that trauma, real or imagined—such as an exile that continues into the late Second Temple period (Knibb 1976)—can turn a single event into an enduring state of mind to the point that the event is relived constantly, thereby preventing it from maintaining its proper chronological position in the past: “the moment becomes a season; the event becomes a condition” (Erikson 1994: 230). Further to this point, Jay Winter describes the persistence of inter/transgenerational sites of memory, and traumatic memory in particular:

The critical point about sites of memory is that they are there as points of reference not only for those who survived traumatic events, but also those born long after them. The word memory becomes a metaphor for the fashioning of narratives about the past when those with direct experience of events die off. Sites of memory inevitably become sites of second-order memory, places, where people remember the memories of others, those who survived the events marked there. (Winter 2010: 313)
LaCapra posits that sites of memory often are sites of trauma, “and the extent to which it remains invested with trauma marks the extent to which memory has not been effective in coming to terms with it, notably through modes of mourning” (LaCapra 1998: 10). LaCapra’s statement resonates with Knibb’s observation that some Second Temple literature, including Daniel and CD, presents Israel in a state of exile that continued well into the Second Temple period; an exile that would not be overcome until divine intervention reinstituted God’s rule in the land (Knibb 1976: 272). In other words, for some mnemonic communities, the exile was not overcome during the Second Temple period and was revisited and reactivated as a site of trauma by later Second Temple communities (see Blenkinsopp 2003: 19).

2 Mnemonic Rupture and Continuity: A Process of Restoration and Purification

The *post* in Hirsch’s postmemory corresponds to other *post* discourses—postcolonial, postfeminism, postmodern, postsecular—in that it represents “more than a temporal delay and more than a location in an aftermath” (Hirsch 2008: 106). Moreover, *post* discourses are multi-layered, belated, and backwards gazing in that they define and shape the present in relation to a turbulent past. Postmemory, like other *post* discourses, oscillates between rupture and continuity (Hirsch 2008: 106). Further to this point, Michael Pickering and Emily Keightley discuss the ways in which mnemonic communities create a sense of difference generationally “not by making a complete break with inherited pasts, but through the dialectical relationships between continuity and rupture, intimate knowing and irreducible difference that occur vertically through time in genealogical relationships”
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8 In addition to Daniel and CD, Knibb discusses Enoch (Vision of Animals and Apocalypse of Weeks), Testament of Levi, Assumption of Moses, Jubilees, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch.
(Pickering and Keightley 2013: 126). The oscillations and dialectics between rupture and continuity are a central feature in this study as I explore the ways in which reactivating and reliving past collective trauma allows Second Temple mnemonic communities to separate themselves from the impurities of their socio-historical worlds, mark the beginnings of restoration, and reconnect with an idealized past, which they mimic and emulate. In other words, this dissertation explores the spaces in between discourses of destruction and restoration, exile and return, absence and presence, and rupture and continuity (see Pickering and Keightley 2013: 124).

New collective identities emerge out of ruptures or cultural crises (Eyerman 2004: 160)—or more specifically, through memories and representations of ruptures or cultural crises. Moreover, the core elements of that social group need to adapt to the changing circumstances. A rupture or cultural crisis provides an opportunity to create both continuity and discontinuity with the past, as older traditions are used for new purposes in new social conditions (Hobsbawm 1992: 5). In many cases, events or memories of events that threaten to tear the social fabric or eliminate social institutions are represented as ruptures or watershed events, which are venues for identity formation and construction (Zerubavel 2003: 83-85). June Edmunds and Bryan S. Turner posit that generations can emerge from traumatic events as they are cut off from their past and separated from their future with the event functioning as “the basis for collective ideology” and integrative rituals acting as “the conduit for commemoration of the traumatic experience” (Edmunds and Turner 2002: 12). I return to the latter component of this process below in my discussion of ritual and liturgical time. LaCapra calls these ruptures or watershed events founding traumas because they become the basis for collective identity. He argues that shattering, destructive, or disorienting
experiences of violence, persecution, slavery, or martyrdom that become reference points for founding traumas are typical of myths of origins. According to LaCapra, these events may become “the valorized or intensely cathexed basis for identity for a group rather than pose the problematic questions of identity” (LaCapra 2001: 23).

Founding traumas are inter/transgenerational sites of memory that may be revisited and appropriated by new groups with new causes (Winter 2010: 317). In other words, sites of traumatic memory can be revisited and reoccupied (LaCapra 1994). As noted above, the intimately related and intertwined phenomena of collective trauma, collective memory, and collective identity have the potential to unite or divide (Smelser 2004: 44; Erikson 1994: 231-42), as we see in the different responses to trauma during the Second Temple period (e.g. E-N vs. Chronicles, Zechariah, Haggai, Second and Third Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah). In instances of division, as we see in the texts featured in this study, fault lines in collectivities are revealed in the contested spaces of sites of memory. In such cases, traumatic experiences and memories can open up fault lines that previously ran silently through the macrostructure of a collective and fragment that group. These fault lines create a bifurcation of collectivities that separates the pure self from the spoiled, contaminated, and polluted (Erikson 1994: 236). For some mnemonic communities, restoration and recovery from traumatic events require processes of cleansing or eliminating outsiders or impurities from the social group.

As I show in my textual analysis, the result of restoration can be twofold in that not only do social groups try to remove themselves from perceived impurities but they also create a bond or common culture with those with whom they identify, past or present. In other words, those untouched by the defilement of a polluted land, a contaminated city, or an impure temple distance themselves from those who have been touched, “almost as if they are
escaping something spoiled, something contaminated, something polluted” (Erikson 1995: 189). According to Erikson, “[t]he point to be made is not that calamity serves to strengthen the bonds linking people together—it does not, most of the time—but that the shared experience becomes almost like a common culture, a source of kinship” (Erikson 1995: 190).

Again, for the most part, collective catastrophe strengthens collective bonds in Second Temple literature, but the texts featured in this dissertation create divisions in response to trauma and use the discourse of being marked by that trauma as a common feature of identity for an elect group. This concept is central to this dissertation when discussing individuals or communities who avoid contamination through the discourse of exile and separation—whether in Babylon or the wilderness—which both functions as a common culture or kinship and makes them the legitimate recipients of revelation. This pure exilic identity is juxtaposed with impure and polluted peoples of the land (E-N), Hellenizers (2 Maccabees), violators of the covenant (Daniel), and the priests of the Jerusalem temple (CD and 1QpHab). The pure and impure in these texts are established during, in response to, or in representing traumatic and catastrophic events of persecution and destruction: the destruction of the first temple and Babylonian exile (E-N, CD, 1QpHab), Antiochus IV’s persecution of Judea and Jerusalem (2 Maccabees and Daniel), and Hasmonean persecution of groups within Judea (CD, 1QpHab).

In the Second Temple texts featured in this dissertation, processes of cleansing the impure elements of the collective self in response to founding traumas produce notions of pure beginnings, collective intactness, and imagined consensus that exclude identifiable outsiders from a uniform way of life (see LaCapra 2001: 43-85; Zerubavel 2003: 82-83). Here, one is reminded of J. Assmann’s statements about the connecting and bonding dimensions of the English words re-member and re-collect, which both signify bringing back
together dispersed members or elements, thereby making memory a process of restoring a lost unity (Assmann 2006: 11). In instances of mnemonically restoring a lost unity, identity formation makes ideological use of traumatic events in foundational ways “in terms of the concept of a chosen people or a belief in one’s privileged status as victim” (LaCapra 2001: 81). Founding events are represented as watersheds that mark the transition from one distinct chapter to the next because mnemonic communities represent them as times of significant identity transformations (Zerubavel 2003: 82). However, as LaCapra argues, notions of simple continuity or discontinuity with the past are deceptive because continuity “involves not pure identity over time but some mode of repetition, and change is not a totally discrete process even in extreme forms of trauma” (LaCapra 1994: 174).

With the above in mind, it is important to recognize that pure beginnings and original unity are illusory. According to LaCapra, the conversion of absence (i.e., something that never existed in the first place) into loss (i.e., a historic loss that is to be worked through by mourning) results in perceptions of an original unity or identity that has been polluted or contaminated by others, and this lost unity is restored through eliminating those who are identified as the polluters and contaminators (LaCapra 2001: 58). For such reasons, Alexander calls the trauma process “a dangerous game” as “[i]t can lead to utopian heights or the depths of despair” (Alexander 2013: 5). Returning to LaCapra’s framework, he contends that “[i]n converting absence into loss, one assumes that there was (or at least could be) some original unity, wholeness, security, or identity that others have ruined, polluted, or contaminated and thus made ‘us’ lose. Therefore, to regain it one must somehow get rid of or eliminate those others—or perhaps that sinful other in oneself” (LaCapra 2001: 58). In some
instances, the contaminated and polluted elements are part of the collective self (LaCapra 2001: 43-85).

For instance, Bartov outlines the ways in which Zionist Israelis, who privileged and emphasized the acts of resistance in the Warsaw Ghetto, Sobibor, and Treblinka, attempted to eliminate those traits in Holocaust survivors from the Diaspora that threatened to contaminate collective identity in Israel:

In Israel, the Shoah, or Catastrophe, as it was called there, was perceived as the most important event of the war, of course, as well as a major disaster for the Jewish people. But public discourse and education tended to emphasize events such as the Warsaw Ghetto uprising and other instances of Jewish resistance, on the one hand, and the eventual illegal immigration (Ha-apala) of the survivors to British-occupied Palestine, on the other. The mass slaughter of the Jews was acknowledged but with a distinct measure of embarrassment and discomfort, since, while it could be used to justify the Zionist argument about the urgent need to create a new Jewish ‘type’ in an independent Jewish state willing and able to fight for its existence, it was also perceived as a case of national humiliation and highlighted the Yishuv’s own vulnerability as well as its inability to defend the vast majority of the Jewish people murdered in Europe by the Nazis. This combined sense of shame and anxiety made it appear all the more urgent during the postwar years in Palestine and then Israel rapidly to convert the arriving survivors from Diaspora Jews into Zionist Israelis, that is, to erase those qualities in the new arrivals that had allegedly made the victims go ‘like sheep to the slaughter’ and to remake them as patriotic citizens of the Jewish state, new types unburdened by the shadows and the ghost of the past, and capable of protecting the Jewish state from any more genocidal assaults. (Bartov 2000: 127-28)

Bartov’s description of Zionist-Israeli identity construction not only represents a response to collective trauma but also illustrates the ways in which the response to trauma and the processes of restoration can create a bifurcation of the collective self that leads to cleansing or elimination of those elements that are perceived to be potentially threatening, contaminating, or polluting. This representation was reinforced and institutionalized in 1951 with the establishment of Yom ha-Shoah (Holocaust Remembrance Day) on the 27th of Nisan. According to Saul Friedlander, Yom ha-Shoah was inserted into the catastrophe and redemption commemorative trope as “the Knesset committee dealing with the issue declared that the date was chosen to commemorate the heroism of ghetto fighters (it was the closest
possible commemoration date to that of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising) as well as the massacres of Jews by the Crusaders, ‘forefathers of the Nazis’” (Friedlander 2001: 277). Further to this point, is the fact that *Yom ha-Shoah* fits into a larger holiday cycle of destruction and restoration as it precedes *Yom ha-Zikaron* (Day of Remembrance for Fallen Soldiers and Victims of Terrorism) by seven days and *Yom ha-Atzmaut* (Independence Day) by eight days. Even the connecting path that leads from Yad Vashem (a memorial and a name) to the military cemetery on Har Herzl, where the national commemorative ceremony for *Yom ha-Zikaron* takes place, creates a liturgical connection between Shoah remembrance to the memory of fallen soldiers and the birth of an independent nation.\(^9\)

Although this representation and emphasis of resistance took a backseat and faded into the periphery during the Eichmann trial in 1961 (Cohen 2003: 202; Friedlander 2001: 277), Israeli society, and the Jewish world in general, harshly received the post-trial works of Raul Hilberg (1961) and Hannah Arendt (1963), both of which, albeit in different ways, downplayed Jewish resistance and implied Jewish complicity during the Shoah. In response, according to Boaz Cohen, Israelis institutionalized the master-narrative of resistance into a national narrative by placing Shoah education in the hands of the ex-fighters and integrating the ex-fighters and their stories into the academic world (Cohen 2003: 203; see also Cohen 2011: 108-9).

Again, this concept of the bifurcation of the collective self in which the pure or the elect are separated from and seek to eliminate or cleanse the impure or traitors in their social world is central to my textual analysis of E-N, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab. Moreover, I also focus on the symbolic force and liturgical dimensions of the

\(^9\) This point came out of conversation with Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi at Hebrew University of Jerusalem in May 2011.
institutionalization of this type of exclusive identity formation in response to trauma. However, the works of both Hirsch and Rothberg reveal problems in linear notions of memory and identity, whether we are of speaking of postmemory or multidirectional memory, as memory and identity are malleable, mutable, fluid, and shared by strange bedfellows (see Hirsch 2008; Rothberg 2009; Pickering and Keightley 2012: 120-21; Assmann 2006: 29). As J. Assmann notes, cultural memory is dynamic because of the tensions and contradictions that emerge from the fluidity of memories and identities, which differ over space and time (Assmann 2006: 29). In Chapter 6, I illustrate through my discussion of multidirectional memory that memory and identity are fuzzy concepts, not zero-sum games with mnemonic winners and vanquished losers. It is here where I show that communities constructing identity through the discourse of exile and separation share memories and identities with those whom they represent as the impure other, whether that be the returned exiles and the peoples of the land in E-N, the Judaizers and Hellenizers in 2 Maccabees, the wise and the violators of the covenant in Daniel, the producers of CD and 1QpHab and the Hasmonean high priests.

3 Reshaping Traumatic Memories: Schemas, Rituals, and Narratives

As communities continue to shape and reshape their collective memory, new events and information are constantly combined and integrated with previous knowledge to form flexible mental schemas. Representation of trauma and construction of collective identity are facilitated by these flexible, pre-existing mental schemas. Memories of events run back and forth in time, from past to present, and vice versa, as more recent events and figures are associated with earlier ones (Van Der Kolk and Van Der Hart 1995: 171; Yerushalmi 1996).
This process involves adapting, appropriating, reusing, and re-synthesizing past experiences—both our own and others—to forge new identities and conceptions of ourselves and others, including those near and distant from us, including proximate others (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 121). The shattering and disruptive experiences of trauma are processed and represented through already existing mnemonic and narrative structures and schemas (Caruth 1995: 153; Van Der Kolk and Van Der Hart 1995: 170-76). Another term used for these schemas is keying, which Schwartz defines as follows:

Keying (perhaps most familiar to biblical and rabbinics scholars as an aspect of typology) transforms the meaning of activities understood in terms of one reference frame by comparing them with activities understood in terms of another (Goffman 1974:40-44, 82). Keying is the action that activates framing... Keying defines social memory’s function, matching the past to the present as 1) a model of society, reflecting its needs, interests, fears, and aspirations; 2) a model for society—a template for thought, sentiment, morality, and conduct; and, 3) a frame within which people find meaning for their experience (Schwartz 2000; 2008; Poole 2008). Social memory affects the present not only by reflecting it but also, and more importantly, by shaping and framing individual experience. (Schwartz 2014)

Elsewhere, Schwartz describes the ways in which keying converts memory into a cultural system as “it matches publicly accessible (i.e., symbolic) models of the past... to the experiences of the present. Keying arranges cultural symbols into a publicly visible discourse that flows through the organizations and institutions of the social world” (Schwartz 1996: 911). He goes on to note that keying “connects otherwise separate realms of history” (Schwartz 1996: 911). In other words, keying is a mnemonic frame that connects and matches the past and the present.

Keying and existing mnemonic, cultural schemas are most instrumental in the transmission of postmemory and multidirectional memory. For Alexander, the cultural and supraindividual elements of the trauma process are “symbolically structured and sociologically determined” because trauma does not interpret itself (Alexander 2013: 35).
people to be traumatized by an event that they did not directly experience or directly share (Alexander 2013: 33). Hirsch discusses the aesthetic, symbolic, and institutional structures and tropes that facilitate and transmit postmemory (Hirsch 2008: 107). As I illustrate throughout this dissertation, familiar cultural images are most effective in the transmission of inter/trangenerational memories of trauma (see Hirsch 2008: 108). For Hirsch, “pre-established forms” are the “impersonal building blocks of affiliative postmemory” (Hirsch 2008: 120). In other words, the generations of affiliative postmemory rely on tropes and schemas for the shaping and negotiation of the past and the present, as well as individual and collective identity (Hirsch 2008: 124-25). These mnemonic tropes and images that are imprinted on our brains as we bring them from the present to the past “hoping to find them there and to have our questions answered, may be screen memories—screens on which we project present our timeless needs and desires and which thus mask other images and other concerns” (Hirsch 2008: 120).

These screen memories, according to Rothberg, are related to and are part of multidirectional memory. Screen memories, in the most general sense, are directly relevant to the representation of memories in the texts that I have analyzed: collective memories of the exodus standing in for the exile, the destruction and exile of 587 B.C.E standing in for the persecution by Antiochus IV, or communities that see themselves in exile during the Hasmonean period. Screen memories (retrospective, anticipatory, and simultaneous), of course, can be formed after, before, or simultaneously with the events remembered. This process of displacement and substitution resonates through the texts under analysis in this dissertation. Not only is this process indicative of screen memories, which Rothberg argues is a phenomenon of individual memory, but also is a feature of multidirectional memory,
collective equivalent of screen memories (Rothberg 2009: 12-13). Rothberg outlines the relationship between screen memory and multidirectional memory as follows:

Yet both screen memories and multidirectional memories provide access to truths nonetheless, truths that produce insight about individual and collective processes of meaning-making. Thinking about screen memories and multidirectional memories as less ‘pathological’ than ‘normal’ proves to be a boon to interpretation. Awareness of the inevitability of displacement and substitution in acts of remembrance points toward the need to both acknowledge the conflicts and subtends memory and work toward a rearticulation of historical relatedness beyond paradigms of uniqueness. (Rothberg 2009: 13)

Again, Rothberg highlights the fluidity of collective memory and mnemonic schemas that are discussed throughout this dissertation. Furthermore, he differentiates between screen and multidirectional memory on the basis of not only individual versus collective but also of screen memory often replacing a disturbing memory with a more comforting one—while substituting two or more traumatic memories in his study of multidirectional memory (Rothberg 2009: 13), as I do in my dissertation. As I show throughout this study, these malleable memories flow back and forth in time. What Rothberg’s framework adds to what I have already outlined is that memory also transverses the sacrosanct borders of ethnicity and other exclusive identity markers (Rothberg 2009: 17; cf. Alexander 2013: 30), as “it cuts across genres, national contexts, periods, and cultural traditions” (Rothberg 2009: 18).

Memory is located in no one site or institution; it transverses space, time, sites, and institutions. The pre-existing schemas, tropes, and structures that facilitate the transmission of memory have a liturgical dimension.

Gabrielle M. Spiegel discusses the cyclical re-enactment of paradigmatic events in Jewish ritual, as well as repetitions and re-enactments of ancient pasts. Recitation and ritual are a means by which to access and re-enact the past in liturgical commemoration (Spiegel 2002: 149). In fact, J. Assmann calls rituals “the oldest and most fundamental medium of bonding memory” (Assmann 2006: 11). Yael Zerubavel outlines the ways in which the
conflict formula and holiday commemoration function as a structuring schema in Zionist memory. Enemies and figures are malleable and fluid, changing according to time and place, but the schema persists. She notes that festivals such as Passover, Purim, Ḥanukkah, and Israel Independence Day (*Yom ha-Atzmaut*) mark conflicts ending in victory or liberation whereas fasts such as Tisha B’Av mark conflicts ending in death, defeat, or destruction.¹⁰ She also describes the interchangeability and easy confusion of the historical details of these holidays (*Zerubavel 1995*: 218). Another example, which is not discussed in detail in this dissertation, is Tisha B’Av, the day on which, according to Josephus and later tradition, the first and second temples were destroyed (see *JW* 6.268-70; *b. Ta’anit* 29a; *m. Ta’anith* 4:4-7; *t. Ta’anith* 3:9-13). However, as Yosef Hayim Yersushalmi points out, this date is not biblically based. Josephus shows the malleability, fluidity, and liturgical dimensions of collective memory as he shapes the past to meet the needs of the present. According to 2 Kgs 25:8-9, the first temple was destroyed on the *seventh day* of the fifth month, Av, whereas Jer. 52:12 gives the *tenth day* of the fifth month, Av, as the date of the destruction of the first temple. Later rabbinic tradition (*b. Ta’anit* 29a) attempts to deal with this discrepancy. Moreover, Yerushalmi adds that Jews were expelled from Spain by July 31, 1492, which corresponds to the 7th of Av (*Yerushalmi 1996*: 128-29 n. 22). Another notable example of

---

¹⁰ As the work of E. Zerubavel reveals, holiday cycles commemorate particular historical events, and calendars can tell us a lot about a group’s identity and master narratives about their past. He makes the following fascinating observation about calendars and commemoration: “An extensive cross-national examination of 191 commemograms reveals a most intriguing pattern. As far as national memory is concerned (although evidence seems to suggest that this is a much more general pattern), the social shape of the past is bimodal, with most of the events commemorated on national holidays having occurred either in the very distant past or within the last two hundred years. Events that are calendrically commemorated by nations thus typically form two chronologically dense clusters representing their respective spiritual and political origins and separated from each other by long stretches of commemoratively ‘empty’ time” (*Zerubavel 2003*: 31). E. Zerubavel’s conclusions about commemoration and holiday cycles hold true for Zionist memory, which emphasizes both the Second Temple period and the recent past. The collective memories of these two periods focus on life in the homeland while forgetting and creating an 1,800 year gap for life Jewish life in exile. Memories of collective/national renewals, (re)births, liberation, and independence are all well-represented in calendars and commemorative dates (*Zerubavel 2003*: 25-34).
liturgical time and commemoration are the Second Purims, in which Haman becomes the archetypal Jew-hater who manifests as different figures throughout Jewish history (see Yerushalmi 1996: 46-48; Zerubavel 1995: 126). Throughout this dissertation, the utility and repetition in liturgical commemoration is evident in the celebration of Passover in Ezra 6:18-22, the re-enactment of the giving of Torah at Sinai during Sukkoth in Nehemiah 8, the fusion of Sukkoth and Ḥanukkah in 2 Macc. 1:20-36; 2:1-12; 10:6, Daniel’s penitential prayer in Dan. 9:5-19, the reliving and reshaping of Sinai in CD, and the reliving of exile and persecution on Yom Kippur in 1QpHab.

According to Spiegel, the fundamental goal of liturgical commemoration “is to make it live again in the present, to fuse past and present, chanter and hearer, into a single collective entity. History, in the sense that we understand it to consist of unique events unfolding within the irreversible linear time, is absorbed into cyclical, liturgical memory” (Spiegel 2002: 149). Liturgical memory reincarnates, resurrects, and recycles the past to bring it to life in the present so that the past does not remain in the past but gazes forward from the living present to the imagined future (Spiegel 2002: 162). This dimension of collective commemoration is discussed below in texts such as Ezra 3:12-13, 6:18-22; Nehemiah 8-9; 2 Maccabees 1-2; Daniel 9; CD-A 1:16-18; 4:9-12; 20:25-28; 1QpHab. 11:4-8. In each of these texts, the repetitive temporality of traumatic memory triggers and collapses the distinctions between the past and present events and figures so that the desires of the present are imposed on the past and historical figures are used to authorize the discourse of the text.

As Y. Zerubavel has shown, liturgical time and commemoration shapes and is shaped by myth plot structures. Furthermore, both myth plot structures and liturgical time have
shaped the collective memories explored in this dissertation. In other words, representations of events are adapted to myth plot structures and holiday cycles, which themselves are traditional sites of memory that allow much freedom in reconstructing the past: “The holiday cycle determines which aspects of the past become more central to collective memory and which are assigned to oblivion; which events are commemorated as highly significant and which are lumped together in a single commemoration, or ignored” (Zerubavel 1995: 216). Thus, myth plot structures are ideologically driven and shape malleable pasts (Zerubavel 1995: 216).

Myth plot structures and narratives about the past inform the collective memories of destruction and restoration, death and rebirth, exile and return, homeland and diaspora, which are the focus of this dissertation. Bessel A. Van Der Kolk and Onno Van Der Hart note the important role of narrative in the transmission of trauma: “Traumatic memories are unassimilated scraps of overwhelming experiences, which need to be integrated with existing mental schemes, and be transformed into narrative language” (Van Der Kolk and Van Der Hart 1995: 176). However, Van Der Kolk and Van Der Hart also contend that memories become increasingly inaccurate when new information is integrated with previous information knowledge in the formation of mental schemas (Van Der Kolk and Van Der Hart 1995: 171). Similarly, Cathy Caruth posits that “... the transformation of trauma into a narrative memory that allows the story to be verbalized and communicated, to be integrated into one’s own, and others’, knowledge of the past, may lose both the precision and the force that characterizes traumatic recall” (Caruth 1995: 153).

In response to Van der Kolk and Van der Hart and Caruth, it is important to briefly touch on Alexander’s discussions of the real and the imagined, as well as routinization, in the
representation of traumatic memory. Alexander suggests that some events that are deeply traumatizing may not have actually occurred, but that imagined events may be as traumatizing as events that actually occurred. He compares the process of collective beliefs of imagined traumatic events to Benedict Anderson’s imagined communities. However, Alexander points out that he does not use “imagined” like Anderson—i.e., the illusory, or the nonexistence of the original event but does acknowledge that traumas can be exaggerated or constructed from nonexistent events (e.g. the Nazi German claim that Jews traumatized the German nation). Alexander uses the concept of the imagined in a Durkheimian way—that is, the imagination being intrinsic to the process of representation. In the words of Alexander: “Imagination informs trauma construction just as much as when the reference is to something that has actually occurred as to something that has not. It is only through the imaginative process of representation that actors have the sense of experience” (Alexander 2004: 9; 2013: 13-15).

Of course, as Halbwachs showed long ago, our imagination remains under the influence of the present social milieu during the process of reshaping the past (Halbwachs 1992: 49). Thus, collective memories are also acts that are situated in and shaped by the present, a process which determines ways in which narratives are formed. Rothberg calls imaginative links “the substance of multidirectional memory” (Rothberg 2009: 18). Furthermore, he contends that imaginative dimensions of memory “should not lead to assumptions of memory’s unsustainability” (Rothberg 2009: 19). Pickering and Keightley describe the role of imagination in postmemory as follows:

In engaging with pasts that we did not experience and bringing them to bear in our own self-narratives and understanding of others, memory and imagination act in productive tension with each other, and in so doing, open up opportunities for the generation of new temporal meanings. Neither faculty are sufficient in themselves if we are to explain the complex interplay of experienced and inherited pasts: the ways in which they are performed and
revised continually in a constantly changing present, and the ways in which they extend their reach into the realm of the possible. It is only in their convergence in the process of transmission that it becomes possible to synthesise firsthand and secondhand experience, and so creatively use memory in the interests of times that have yet to unfold. (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 122)

Thus, imagination is imperative for transmitting postmemory, making absence present, and forging new memories and identities “through recombining ideas, objects, practices and experiences” (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 122). Imagination also helps negotiate and facilitate the oscillations and tensions between rupture and continuity (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 127-28).

As I illustrate throughout this dissertation, pre-existing schemas and tropes inform the imagination of representation, as later/more recent events and figures are imagined and represented as earlier ones. A prime example of the imagination of representation and pre-existing schemas in Second Temple Judaism is Josephus’ narrative of the destruction of the second temple and events leading up to its destruction. In Book 6 of the *Judean War*, the destruction of the second temple occurs on the exact same day as the destruction of the first temple by the Babylonians. Josephus even represents himself in Book 5 as a Jeremiah-like figure in his speech outside the walls of Jerusalem and advocates the position of Jer. 27:17 in framing how to respond to persecution and impending destruction (i.e., not resisting what God has already destined and determined) (see Mason 1994). Josephus’ account of the destruction of the second temple is indicative of stories of imagined and remembered events running back and forth through time (Van der Kolk and Van der Hart 1995: 171).

Although I explore the socio-historical contexts from which exclusivist discourses of separation and purification emerge, I do not focus on the questions of historicity, historical veracity, and historical reconstruction in regards to the events remembered, imagined, and represented. I am much more interested in questions about the processes of collective
memory, the transmission of trauma, and the imagination of representation than I am in the historicity of the events narrated. In other words, I am more interested in what memories and representation of the events do than I am in reconstructing the events themselves—that is, I am primarily interested in the constellations of temporality, or the “new ways of knowing the past, interpreting the present and orienting to the future” (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 128). Thus, I focus on the meaning of the event to the mnemonic community, not the historicity of the event. J. Assmann notes that the study of mnemohistory does not affect the historicity of the events themselves, as the “historical study” of events ought to be distinguished from the study of their (re)memorialization, tradition, and transformation in the collective memory of a given group of people. In other words, memory is not a storage of ‘facts’, but rather is the continuous work of reconstructive imagination, and the truth value of a memory lies in the identity it constructs and shapes (Assmann 1997: 9-15). This approach coheres well to Alexander’s views on the sociocultural processes of trauma, memory, and meaning: “Only if the patterned meanings of the collectivity are abruptly dislodged is traumatic status attributed to the event. It is the meaning that provides the sense of shock and fear, not the events themselves. Whether or not the structures of meaning are destabilized and shocked is not the result of an event but the effect of a sociocultural process” (Alexander 2004: 10). Again, the sources analyzed in this study are not evaluated by the principles of historicity.

Alexander also discusses memory and representation during the routinization and calming period, when the heightened and powerfully affecting discourse of trauma disappears. It is at this time, according to Alexander, that the didacticism of traumatic events and memories become objectified in monuments, museums, texts, and other historical
artifacts (Alexander 2004: 9). In other words, the lessons of trauma are institutionalized (Alexander 2013: 27). Of course, a routinization period may overlap with and correspond to what Hirsch calls postmemory. A commonly used example of routinization is memory and representation of the Holocaust in Israel and America, especially after the Eichmann trial (see Bartov 2000: 127-35; Cohen 2011; Zerubavel 1995: 70-76, 192-97). Friedlander describes the processes of postmemory and routinization with American Jewry as follows:

Friedlander outlines the commemoration and memorialization of Shoah during a routinization period, from the 1960s through to the 1980s, as well as the process of postmemory. Moreover, we can see the role that a subsequent trauma, the Six-Day War, played in reactivating the trauma of Shoah during the routinization period. In the later wars

---

11 However, it is important to note that, as Jonathan Klawans discusses, the routinization period of Holocaust representation has been overstated. Klawans notes “a bewildering array of sophisticated, literary responses to the Holocaust were composed—in poetry and prose—both during and immediately after the war” (Klawans 2010: 284). His statement is supported by Holocaust historians who focus on and/or integrate Jewish accounts and testimonies into their historiography and research. The works of Omer Bartov (1991; 2000), Christopher Browning (2010), and Saul Friedlander (2009) are examples of scholarship drawing on diaries, testimonies, and other contemporaneous Jewish sources (Cohen 2011: 110-12). Prime examples of contemporaneous sources are the numerous documents produced by Emmanuel Ringelblum and the Oneg Shabbat chronicling life in the Warsaw Ghetto. For the paradigmatic shift of historians’ change in attitude toward Jewish sources and testimony in Holocaust historiography, see Cohen 2011: 110-12. Klawans also posits that the perceptions of a post-1945 theological crisis have been retrojected back onto the past, which has resulted in scholarly assertions of a post-70 C.E. theological crisis (Klawans 2010: 309). He problematizes arguments for both a post-1945 and a post-70 C.E. theological crisis.
and conflicts in 1967, 1973, 1982, and beyond, Arabs were seen as manifestations of European antisemitism and these conflicts, especially from an Israeli perspective, as a continuation of the resistance against the “genocidal aspirations of gentile Europe” (Bartov 2000: 135).

The texts under examination in this dissertation can be described as inter/transgenerational works of postmemory—to varying degrees—that were produced during routinization periods—that is, after the traumatic events being represented—and reactivated memories of collective memories of earlier traumas. Again, I also focus on the how later collective traumas reactivate earlier ones. Importantly, especially for this study, Alexander maintains that although institutionalization of the lessons of trauma do not elicit as strong emotional responses, the routinization “by no means neutralizes the extraordinary social significance of cultural traumas” (Alexander 2004: 9). Even during routinization, the postmemories of cultural traumas still have profound effects on collective identity.

When traumatic memory is transformed into narrative memory during routinization, pre-existing schemas and cultural frameworks determine the narrative. This being said, the narrative process is “a complex and multivalent symbolic process that is contingent, highly contested, and sometimes highly polarizing” (Alexander 2004: 12). For intended audiences, or mnemonic communities, to accept the memory and/or narrative, they too have to be traumatized by an experience or event, or share common reference points in collective memory. Thus, what Alexander calls carrier groups, and Vared Vinitzky-Seroussi refers to as agents of memory (Vinitzky-Seoussi 2002), must “engage in successful meaning work” (Alexander 2004: 12). Not all master commemorative narratives are accepted by all within a
particular social setting, as, again, memory is a contested space and counter-memories abound.

Narrative also plays a key role in the conflation of absence and loss, which again is a central feature in this study. According to LaCapra, absence and loss are conflated when mnemonic communities attempt to narrativize absence (LaCapra 2001: 49), which, again, produces notions of pure and original collective identities that has been polluted by others. Narratives and the formation of narratives are integral to the representation of collective memories. Narrative is the medium through which collective memories are told, retold, and passed on to later generations. Y. Zerubavel defines a commemorative narrative as “a story about a particular past that accounts for ritualized remembrance and provides a moral message for the group members” (Zerubavel 1995: 7). Such remembrance and commemoration is a highly selective and creative process that is framed by the real and the imagined. Master commemorative narratives structure collective memory and focus on a group’s distinct identity, which often is represented as a unified group moving through time. Omission, repetition, and conflation of events are common features of master commemorative narratives. As I show throughout this dissertation, “[t]he holiday cycle, the annual calendar, and the liturgical cycle typically disrupt the flow of time by highlighting recurrent patterns in the group’s experiences” (Zerubavel 1995: 7). Moreover, with collective memory’s emphasis on distinct collective identities, master commemorative narratives focus on the events out of which independent and unified identities emerge (Zerubavel 1995: 7).

Again, this dissertation examines the ways in which events like the destruction of the first temple, the exile, and the Seleucid persecution function in such ways. As Y. Zerubavel notes, commemorations of origins are essential for demarcating the group’s distinct identity
vis-à-vis others (Zerubavel 1995: 7), and the recovery and restoration of the aforementioned temporal ruptures represent such new beginnings. Equally important, as mentioned above, is the process of restoration requiring the purification or elimination of impurities or pollutants in the social body. In the words of Y. Zerubavel, “[t]he emphasis on the ‘great divide’ between this group and others is used to dispel any denial of the group’s legitimacy. The commemoration of beginnings justifies the group’s claim as a distinct unit, often by demonstrating that roots go back to a distant past” (Zerubavel 1995: 7).

Worldviews, ideologies, distinctions between what is regarded as true and false in a given socio-historical context determine ways in which mnemonic material is emplotted. In other words, prevailing ideologies and worldviews of a socio-historical context are legitimized by narratives and representations of the past. Actions in the present are legitimated and justified by references to the past. The producers of narratives are both the inheritors and transmitters of memory. Pickering and Keightley discuss Hoffman’s reception and transmission of her parents’ past as Shoah survivors as a tripartite temporality of “the inherited past, the experienced past, and the present moment of telling” (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 125). They describe the relationship of Hoffman’s narrative to her mother’s experience as follows:

She imagines her mother’s past and her own future, stitching them together into a new whole in which the meanings of the Holocaust and its legacy are unstable and contingent, but full of possibility. While the work of memory anchors the narrative in a set of referential events, the imagination mobilises that past, makes it malleable and available for her to weave around a conventional fairytale narrative structure—even though, in the telling, it immediately exceeds that framework. (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 125-26)

Hoffman’s inheritance and transmission of her mother’s past are an example of what James Young calls “received history—a narrative hybrid that interweaves both events of the Holocaust and the ways they are passed down to us” (Young 2002: 15). As I illustrate in the
following chapters, the Second Temple texts featured in this dissertation participate in the process of the production of narrative hybrids that weave together the inherited past, the experienced past, and the present.
Chapter Two

Weeping Shouts of Joy: Restoration and Separation in Ezra-Nehemiah

This chapter analyzes the ways in which E-N constructs an exclusive collective identity through sites of traumatic memory—namely, the exodus, the destruction of Jerusalem and the first temple, and the exile. More specifically, I argue that E-N revisits and reactivates these sites of memory in creating a bifurcation of the collective self that separates the pure from the impure, the holy from the profane, or the returned exiles from the people of the land. In order to accomplish this, E-N uses empty land narratives, telescoped time,\(^\text{12}\) and the notion of a pure remnant emerging out of exile after the destruction of the first temple to authorize its claim to the land, temple, and priesthood.

In what follows, drawing on the theoretical approaches outlined in Chapter 1, I focus on the ways in which E-N discursively and mnemonically separates its community from the ‘impure other’ geographically with the discourse of exile and physically with the building projects of the temple and the wall (Janzen 2008)—thereby creating the space necessary for identity dissociation and construction (Ezra 1–6; Nehemiah 1–7:72a). Thereafter, I explore the ways in which the repetitive temporality of traumatic memory triggers and collapses the distinctions between the past and present events and figures in E-N so that the desires of the present are imposed on the past and historical figures are used to authorize the discourse of the text. E-N enacts liturgical time (see Spiegel 2002) and models the process of restoration on a postmemory hybrid narrative of the exodus—thereby linking their community to Moses and Sinai—and establishes Torah as the community constitution (Ezra 7; Nehemiah 8) that

\(^{12}\) For a discussion of the concept of telescoping time, see David Henige (1974).
informs an exclusive community identity by separating the pure from the impure, and the holy from the profane (Ezra 9–10; Nehemiah 9:2-4; 10:29-40; 13). In this sense, E-N represents the restoration of a destroyed Jerusalem and temple (i.e., a historical trauma) as the restoration of a pure, unified, and original Israelite identity (i.e., a structural trauma).

1 Traumatic Memory in Ezra-Nehemiah

Many questions surround the authorship and dating of E-N. Most scholars date the present version of E-N to the fourth century B.C.E. Since Darius II (423-405 B.C.E.) is the latest king mentioned (Neh. 12:22), an argument can be made that E-N was compiled and completed no later than the early fourth century B.C.E. E-N contains no evidence of details, like Hellenism or any Greek presence in the Levant, which one would expect to find in a late fourth century B.C.E. composition (Najman 2004: 1667). Moreover, questions of unity abound between not only Ezra and Nehemiah but also Chronicles. Several ancient Jewish and Christian sources testify that Ezra and Nehemiah should be considered as one book (Kalimi 2005: 54). Although Chronicles and E-N are separate and distinct books in the Hebrew Bible, the conclusion of Chronicles (2 Chron. 36:22-23) and the beginning of Ezra (1:1-3) are similar, and for this reason some scholars, including Joseph Blenkinsopp, contend that the latter is a continuation of the former, and therefore, the texts share common authorship. Moreover, according to Blenkinsopp, since the decree of a new king, in this case Cyrus, more likely marks a beginning rather than a conclusion, the final two verses of Chronicles (2 Chron. 36:22-23) probably were added to the end of Chronicles’ history of the Davidic monarchy (Blenkinsopp 1988: 48). Referring to the perceived intimacy and continuity between Chronicles and E-N, Blenkinsopp suggests that “[t]here is nothing quite like this in the Hebrew Bible.” He does, however, qualify this statement by recognizing what
he calls “less obvious attempts at linkage,” namely the end of Genesis and the beginning of Exodus, as well as the apparent continuity between Numbers (36:13) and Deuteronomy (1:1, 5). Blenkinsopp conjectures that the linkage may have functioned as an indicator as to where the reader must go to continue the history. Importantly, he points out that the divisions between books in the Hebrew Bible do not preclude the possibility of common authorship. In Blenkinsopp’s view, such divisions do not necessarily “correspond to the logical structuring of the material (as, for example, the break between Samuel and Kings) or its original form” (Blenkinsopp 1988: 49).

Isaac Kalimi, however, points out that no ancient source exists that consider Chronicles and E-N as a single composition (Kalimi 2005: 54). Sara Japhet and H.G.M. Williamson are two scholars who challenge the single author theory via a study of the distinct and stylistic features of the two compositions. Japhet, for instance, summarizes her conclusions regarding common authorship as follows:

Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah constitute two different works by two different authors. Not only do they illustrate an array of small and large differences—in language, style, and literary method—and express different and opposite views about central issues of biblical history and theology, but when considered in their totality they represent two varieties of biblical historical writing during the Persian-Hellenistic period. In its historical method and chronological substructure, the book of Ezra-Nehemiah is a new experiment, an attempt at a new form of historical writing, deviating from the historiographical model of the Deuteronomistic history which preceded it. (Japhet 1993: 4)

I am not convinced by the argument for single authorship of Chronicles and E-N. The most significant problems with the theory of single authorship, as I show throughout this chapter, are the issues of exclusive identity and intermarriage, or, following Hayes, genealogical purity. E-N expresses strong opposition to the issue (see Ezra 9-10; Neh. 13:1-3, 23-27) while Chronicles expresses no such sentiment.
In E-N, the process of restoration requires continuity with an idealized past and separation from the polluters and contaminators in the present. In other words, E-N exhibits an oscillation between rupture and continuity as the narrative of return and the discourse of exile mark a myth of pure origins while simultaneously connecting with an idealized past in creating continuity and establishing mnemonic authority. Given the above, what is most important, following LaCapra, is the conversion of absence of an idealized past or original unity into a loss of it, which E-N mourns and seeks to restore. In E-N, the returnees from exile are both the restored Israel (i.e., the new covenant community) and the pure remnant of the past (Ezra 9:8, 13-15; Neh. 1:2-3), who must be separated from the contaminated and polluted (Ezra 4:3-4; 6:21; 8:28; 9:1-2, 11; 10:3; Neh. 9:2; 10:29-32; 13:1-9, 22, 28-31). Continuity between the idealized past and the remnant of that past who returned from exile is established through temple vessels, building projects, genealogies, Torah, and prayer (Ezra 1:7-10; 2; 3:1-7, 10-13; 5:8-11, 14; 6:3-5, 22; 7; 8; Neh. 3; 8; 9:6-37; 11; 12:45). Again, the genealogies are particularly important because E-N asserts that the restored Israel and the peoples of the land are genealogically distinct; the Israelites are the “holy seed” זֶּ֣רַע הַקֹּ֔דֶשׁ in Ezra 9:2 whereas the “peoples of the land” עָמִּים הָאָרָצִים (Ezra 3:2-3; 4:4; 6:21; 9:1, 2, 11; Neh. 6:16; 9:30; 10:29-32) are the profane part of the social body in E-N that threatens to defile the holy seed of Israel (Hayes 2002: 26). The peoples of the land in E-N are mainly comprised of former citizens of Samaria (Ezra 4:1-2), including, but not exclusively, Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem (Neh. 2:10, 19; 4:1, 3, 7; 6:1-2, 5, 12, 14, 17, 19; 13:4, 7-8, 28). In the words of Shemaryahu Talmon:

13 As Hindy Najman notes in the Jewish Study Bible, here קֹדֶשׁ signifies distinction, separation, or choseness (Najman 2004: 1683).
This segment of the local population was predominantly comprised of former citizens of defunct Samaria who are accused of indulging in ‘abominations’ (Ezra 9:11, 14), with a sprinkling of Judeans in their midst who had not been exposed to the purifying experience of exile. Some of the Judeans “separated themselves from the people of the land and their uncleanness” (Ezra 6:21). (Talmon 2001: 133)

The status of Persian Samaria loomed largely in the discursive world of E-N, for which the memory of destruction and discourse of exile became key reference points for exclusive identity construction. As I argue, E-N conflates and blurs the distinction between historical trauma (i.e., the loss of Jerusalem and the temple) with structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence of an original unity or purity). This position diverts from that of Japhet, who argues that “postexilic historiography” in general was not “written under the immediate impact of destruction and exile, nor as a response to them” (Japhet 2000: 145-46). Rather, according to Japhet, postexilic historiography, like E-N, views the aforementioned events from the distance of the distance fifth or fourth B.C.E., and therefore destruction and exile were not a primary concern (Japhet 2000: 146). However, in opposition to Japhet’s position, the work of Hirsch on the process of postmemory and that of Hoffman on the inter/transgenerational transmission of trauma show the affective impact of trauma on later generations and the ways in which trauma can be reactivated by and reactivate earlier traumas. The works of Hirsch, Hoffman, LaCapra, and others are important interpretive lenses for analyzing the lingering and haunting effects of the past in E-N.

As I illustrate below, the inter/transgenerational sites of traumatic memory—the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile—are the foundation of identity construction in E-N. For instance, the repetitive temporality of traumatic memory triggers and collapses the distinctions between the past and present in Ezra 3:12-13, when the priests, heads of clans, and old men who had seen the first temple lament loudly at the founding of the second temple while many others shouted joyously at the top of their voices, to the point that the
people could not distinguish between the shouts of joy and the screams of lament. Ezra 3:12-13 seems to correspond to the ways in which Hirsch and Hoffman describe inter/transgenerational trauma: inherited, transmitted, reactivated, affective, continuous, and haunting. Moreover, trauma then can be a belated and generational process of repetition after a temporal gap or period of latency; a process that retrieves past possibilities and attempts to begin anew (LaCapra 1994: 169-203; Caruth 1995: 1-12). In other words, to be traumatized is to be possessed or haunted by an event, even generationally (Caruth 1995: 4-5). The belated and lingering effects of trauma transform it into an inter/transgenerational experience. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Erikson discusses the ways in which trauma turns a single event into a condition that persists and refuses to take its chronological place in the past: “the moment becomes a season; the event becomes a condition” (Erikson 1994: 230).

Ehud Ben Zvi notes the inter/transgenerational effect that a catastrophe of the magnitude of the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile would have as a site of memory, “particularly among those whose self-identity was grounded on a close identification with those afflicted by the disaster and within any polity or community that imagined itself and was understood as standing in continuation with the one which suffered such a calamity” (Ben Zvi forthcoming). If one were to agree with Ben Zvi that the destruction of Jerusalem and exile do not factor prominently in the metanarrative of Chronicles (Ben Zvi forthcoming), then this lack of regard might be a point of distinction with identity construction in E-N, which is fixated on destruction and exile. In fact, Ben Zvi argues that in Chronicles, “[n]either the catastrophe nor Exile constitute any kind of watershed in this respect” (Ben Zvi forthcoming). In what follows, I argue that the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile in E-N function as founding events, or watersheds, that mark the transition from
one distinct chapter to the next, from the old Israel to the remnant that becomes the restored Israel.

As discussed in Chapter 1, some mnemonic communities respond to trauma and temporal ruptures through a process of restoration and separation that bifurcates the collective self and cleanses the impure and profane elements. The discourse of exile and the empty land provided E-N with the ideal imaginative geographic separation from its neighbours and the rebuilding of the destroyed city of Jerusalem allowed them to rebuild the textual physical barriers to maintain that separation. As is illustrated below, E-N conceptualized destruction and exile differently than did a text like Chronicles, which constructs a more inclusive collective identity in Persian Yehud, especially in regards to the issue of intermarriage. In contrast to Chronicles, E-N projects genealogical purity on to all members, priestly and non-priestly, of its narrow conception of Israel, creating an impermeable boundary between Israelites and the peoples of the land “that stands in tension with the relatively permeable boundary apparent in the Pentateuch and preexilic biblical sources” (Hayes 2002: 26). Thus, the holy seed of Israel and the profane seed of the peoples

---

14 Quoting Ben Zvi and Antje Labahn: “Given that genealogies construct a self-image of the community and shape borders of inclusion and exclusion and a ‘historical’ memory to back them up, it is worth stressing that in a number of cases, the additional information about the mothers concerns their place of origin. The readers of Chronicles are told unequivocally that some of the mentioned mothers, and particularly so within the Judahite genealogies, were foreigners. It bears notice that the women mentioned with their place of origin—whether Israelites or ‘foreigner’—are treated in the same way as other women in the genealogies. The text does not suggest to its readers a disapproval of marriages of Israelites/Judahites with foreign wives in principle, nor suggested that there was something wrong with that of a Judahite woman and an Egyptian slave. To be sure, there is, in some cases, a clear Israelitization of the woman (see the case of Bithiah, above), but even this Israelitization does not erase her foreign origin. These references to ‘foreign’ mothers, and particularly so in the genealogies, makes sense in Persian times when the polity of Yehud interacted with neighbor polities in political, administrative, economic and marital realms; the latter, at least within the upper classes. Compare this with the situation that was so criticized in Ezra-Nehemiah. These references are consistent with a positive attitude and open relation toward neighboring countries that is clearly at odds with that of advanced in Ezra-Nehemiah, but consistent with prominent references to ‘foreign’ (fore)mothers or wives of praiseworthy leaders of Israel in the past that consistently appear in the construction of the past that was agreed upon, shared by and textually inscribed in the writings of the literati of Yehud (e.g., Zipporah [Moses], Osnat [Joseph], Ruth [David], Naamah [Solomon, foremother of all the Judahite kings and of any future Davidic king])” (Ben Zvi and Antje Labahn 2003: 465-66)
of the land cannot intermingle and mix through intermarriage. Moreover, the constitution of the new covenant community, Torah, reinforced this separation and put into place firm cultic barriers to keep the pollutants from defiling the “holy seed” זֶּרַע הַקָּדֶשׁ (Ezra 9:2) of the restored Israel.

2 Exile and Separation

Exile and restoration are as interrelated as memory and identity, so it is not surprising that exile plays such a central role in the process of restoration and the establishment of a purified ethnic identity in E-N. Collective memories of periodic exile followed by return are fertile ground for the seeds of an exclusive identity of a restored Israel to flourish, as the discourse of exile provides separation from the contaminants and pollutants in Jerusalem and Yehud. In the words of Talmon, “[e]xile and restoration are interrelated concepts, which pertain to two contrastive historical phenomena, like movement and countermovement” (Talmon 2001: 107). A metanarrative of exile and return runs throughout the Hebrew Bible, from Adam and Eve to Cain and Abel, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses and Joshua, and Ezra and Nehemiah (Carroll 1998: 63; Talmon 2001). Talmon notes that pre-exilic conceptions of exile were mainly negative, whereas the homeland was viewed positively, but that these

---

15 I follow Jonathan Hall’s definition of ethnicity in antiquity, which refers to a specific type of cultural identity that is distinguished by “the fact that the symbols in which it draws revolve around notions of fictive kinship and descent, common history, and a specific homeland” (Hall 2005: 17). With that said, in some ways, Hall’s definition does not go far enough as ethnic identity is very fluid and asymmetrical. For instance, people can hold more than one ethnic identity simultaneously, different ethnic groups can use some of the same symbols in both similar and different ways, ethnic identity is defined by boundaries with others, and ethnic identity is ascribed by both the self and others (see Barth 1969). I discuss the complexities of ethnic identity further in Chapter 6.
traditional connotations of exile and homeland undergo a “contextual conversion” during narratives of restoration during the Second Temple Period (Talmon 2001: 132).

Similarly, Hindy Najman has outlined the transformation of the wilderness, which signified exile and punishment, into a space of purification and revelation during the Second Temple period. (Najman 2006: 100-101). The relationship between the transformation of the concept of the wilderness and its relationship to exile are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5, where I focus on CD and 1QpHab. In the meantime, suffice it to note the relationship between the wilderness and the destruction of Jerusalem and the subsequent exile. For instance, Isa. 40:1-3 links together destruction, wilderness, and return: “Comfort, oh comfort my people, says your God. Speak tenderly to Jerusalem, and declare to her that her term of service is over, that her iniquity is expiated; for she has received at the hand of YHWH double for all her sins. A voice rings out: ‘Clear in the desert a road for YHWH! Level in the wilderness a highway for our God!’”

Likewise, in E-N, a destroyed Jerusalem is a desert graveyard that has been abandoned by God (Neh. 2:3, 5, 17-18; cf. Lamentations), and Nehemiah is the voice that cries from the wilderness of exile (Thompson 1998: 112). Thomas L. Thompson suggests that the Lamentations’ conception of Jerusalem is

\[\text{All translations are from The Jewish Study Bible (2004) with some minor changes.}\]
\[\text{When Nehemiah gives the directive to “rebuild the wall of Jerusalem and suffer no more disgrace” (Neh. 2:17), he is referring to destruction of the temple and the exile. The term disgrace, as it is used in this verse, elsewhere refers to the destruction of the temple and the exile, cf. Isa. 4:1-3; 22:18; 25:6-8; Jer. 23:39-40; 24:8-10; 25: 8-11; Lam. 5:1; Ezek. 16:52-58; 22:1-5; Dan. 9:16 (Najman 2004: 1691).}\]
representative of the metaphor of exile that runs throughout the Hebrew Bible: “Exile is Jerusalem as a wasteland; it is the emptiness of the soul; it is to be without God. This is not historiography at all, but a metaphor of pietism. It has its roots in diaspora Judaism’s self-understanding as a ‘new Israel’” (Thompson 1998: 115). In sum, Thompson views the returns from the wilderness as a process of repentance that recalls the exodus and encapsulates hope and restoration (Thompson 1998: 117).

Within this context, an abandoned, defiled, corrupt, or destroyed Jerusalem is the antitype of the regenerative space of exile and wilderness. In this sense, the discourse of exile and return is fertile ground for the seeds of an exclusive identity of a restored Israel to flourish in E-N. The discourse of exile provides geographic separation from the contaminants and pollutants in the social body, which, following LaCapra, is characteristic of a founding trauma or myth of origins. The returnees who constitute the restored Israel differentiate themselves from their neighbours already occupying the land, namely the peoples of the land. This myth of origins of the restored Israel returning to the land is built on the foundation of the empty land narrative, because, as Thompson notes, this myth “has no place for a populated Jerusalem” (Thompson 1998: 115).

As I discuss in the following chapters on 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab, these traditions are based on a returning remnant of a true Israel emerging out of exile to establish a restored Israel in an abandoned, defiled, or destroyed Jerusalem (Thompson 1998: 115). The myth of the empty land follows the logic that the land must go through a period of purification to purge itself of the sin that defiled it and brought about destruction. However, those who remain on the polluted land become defiled themselves. Thus, the discourse of exile becomes an ideal venue for purification, revelation, and the re-establishment of
tradition. Those who return from exile establish the restored Israel on a purified land (Ben Zvi 2010: 163). Thus, Jerusalem had to be completely destroyed and the people had to be expelled from the land entirely (Ben Zvi 2010: 165), but exile is never final because it always ends in restoration (Talmon 2001: 118): “If you are unfaithful, I will scatter you among the peoples; but if you turn back to me, faithfully keep my commandments, even if your dispersed are at the ends of the earth, I will gather them from there and bring them to the place where I have chosen to establish my name.”

The process of complete destruction before restoration is a common mnemonic and metanarrative schema in ancient Near Eastern literature (cf. Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon; see Cogan 1983; Cogan 2003; Liverani 1973; Oded 1992; Porter 1993).

Throughout E-N, the collective identity of a restored Israel is constructed around the discourse of exile, as the community self-identifies as the exiles חôlôn (Ezra 1:11; 9:4; 10:6, 8) or בני חôלôn (Ezra 4:1; 6:19, 20; 8:35; 10:7, 16), all who came from captivity נַחֲלָה (Ezra 3:8), all the community who returned from the captivity חôלôn נַחֲלָה (Neh. 8:17), and those who returned from exile נַחֲלָה (Ezra 6:21). The self-identifying exiles from Judah and Benjamin (Ezra 1:5; 4:1; 10:9; Neh. 11:2-9, 31, 36), and the tribe of Levi (Ezra 2:36-42, 70 = Neh. 7:39-45, 72; Ezra 6:19-24; Neh. 8:9-11; 10:29; 11:10-30), are the remnant of the old Israel (Ezra 9:8, 13-15; Neh. 1:2-3) who now constitute the true Israel (Ezra 2:2, 70; 3:1, 11; 6:16, 17; 7:7, 11, 13; 8:25; 9:1; 10:5, 10; Neh. 1:6; 2:10;
In discussing collective identity and the discourse of exile in E-N, it is important to mention that aside from the references to the remnant אֲשֶּר־נִּשְׁאֲרֵ֥ו מִׁן־הַשֶ֖בִּי and the survivors אֲשֶּר־נִּשְׁאֲרִ֥יִּים מִׁן־הַשֶ֖בִּי who survived the captivity in Neh. 1:2-3 (cf. Neh. 2:1; 7:6), the discourse of exile is notably absent from the Nehemiah memoir (1:1-7:72a; 11:1-2; 12:31-43; 13:4-31), which diverts from the overall discursive tendencies of the rest of E-N. Moreover, the discourse of the Nehemiah memoir is centered on Judah, and not the larger entity of Israel, including Benjamin. Instead, the memoir focuses on and refers to the Judeans בני יהודה (Neh. 2:16; 3:33, 34; 4:6; 5:1, 8, 17; 6:6; 13:23), the people בני עם (Neh. 3:38; 4:7, 16; 5:1, 13, 15, 18, 19; 7:4-5; 13:1), Judah יִהוֹדָה (Neh. 4:4; 13:12, 16), and house of Judah בית יהודה (4:10). The proximate other Samarians (and other neighbouring peoples) in the Nehemiah memoir are not called the peoples of the land but rather they are referred to as the nations בניたち (5:8, 9, 17; 6:6, 16; 13:26), the nations נְגוֹיִם אשר־בְנוֹתינוֹ (5:17; 6:16), our enemies אוּבְנֵינוֹ (Neh. 4:9; 5:9; 6:1, 16; cf. 9:28), and our adversaries שְׁרֵינֵנוֹ (Neh. 4:5) (Knoppers 2013: 143-45).

Returning to the discourse of exile, the genealogical registers in E-N function as external proofs\(^\text{18}\) that help maintain the separation and impermeable boundary between exiles

---

\(^{18}\) See Duke (1999). Rodney Duke discusses external proofs that give authority, support, and authentication to a discourse. An external proof is material that supposedly is not created by the producers of the text but is derived from external sources and is used to support an argument, including eyewitness testimony, physical evidence, and letters or other documents. In his discussion of Chronicles, Duke identifies speeches, genealogies, lists, and
and the Samarians inhabiting the defiled land: “I found the genealogical register\(^{19}\) of those who were the first to come up, and there I found written: These are the people of the province who came up from among the captive exiles that Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, had deported, and who returned to Jerusalem and to Judah, each to his own city.” The genealogical registers reinforce the impermeable boundary of genealogical purity in E-N. I discuss in Chapter 4 the ways in the genealogical lists in Nehemiah 7 correspond to the contents of the sealed book in Daniel.

The significance of the discourse of exile in the construction of an exclusive identity and pure origins is established in the opening verses of E-N.

In the first year of King Cyrus of Persian when the word of YHWH spoken by Jeremiah was fulfilled, YHWH roused the spirit of King Cyrus of Persia to issue a proclamation throughout his realm by word of mouth and in writing as follows: “Thus said the King of Persia: YHWH God of Heaven has given me all the kingdoms of the earth and has charged me with building him a house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Anyone of you of all his people—may his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem that is in Judah and build the House of YHWH God of Israel, the god that is in Jerusalem; and all who stay behind, wherever he may be living, let the people of his place assist him with him silver, gold, goods, and livestock, besides the freewill offering to the House of God that is in Jerusalem. (Ezra 1:1-4)\(^{20}\)

citation of sources also function as external proofs. Following Duke, the genealogical registers in E-N have a rhetorical function that supports the central message of the text.

\(^{19}\) For a discussion of lost and found books in E-N, see Reinmuth (2008); Wright (2008); Stott (2008).

\(^{20}\) Besides the obvious fact that the Ezra 1:1-4 is written in Hebrew, not Aramaic, there are several indicators to suggest that the decree is a local text written for a local audience. For instance, there are examples of structure, terminology, and syntax that create problems for those who claim that the Cyrus Decree in Ezra 1:1-4 is an authentic document. An argument against Ezra 1:1-4 being an official imperial document is that is filled with Hebrew idioms. First, the title “Cyrus King of Persia” is anachronistic, as this title has yet to be found in any of Cyrus’ inscriptions (i.e., “official Aramaic documents”). In addition, the title “King of Persia” was neither used in Persian royal inscriptions until Darius I nor is he called King of Persia in extant Babylonian legal, administrative, and economic texts (Bedford 2002: 120). In fact, the only extant Babylonian text in which he is given such a title is in the Nabonidus Chronicle (Grayson 2000: 107), which is further evidence that he did not use the title himself. Thus, Peter Ross Bedford concludes the following: “The use of this title by Cyrus in the Hebrew edict is incongruous since all Achaemenid kings use some form of royal titulary of the indigenous monarchy, or simply use the king after their name” (Bedford 2002: 121). Second, the phrase to “rouse/stir up the spirit” is a Hebrew idiom, meaning the command came from YHWH, and such an expression likely would
The divine and imperial command to return, rebuild, and restore fulfils of the prophecy of Jeremiah (see Jer. 25:11-12; 29:4-10; 31:27-34; 32:36-44), which invokes imagery of the purification of the land. Thus, anyone who remained in the land during the time of the sabbatical years for purification—i.e., the peoples of the land—is considered to be a contaminant or pollutant. Not only did the discourse of exile ensure that the Babylonian golah did not inhabit polluted land but it also provided separation from the contaminated
peoples of the land when constructing a myth of pure origins in the establishment of the restored Israel. The contamination of the land is evident when Ezra authorizes his position on prohibition of intermarriage by prooftexting with prophets of the old Israel: “The land that you are about to possess is a land unclean through the uncleanness of the peoples of the land, through their abhorrent practices with which they, in their impurity, have filled it from one end to the other” (Ezra 9:11). As Garry N. Knoppers points out, the very choice of the title “peoples of the land” is significant because it indicates that “residence in the land of Israel is no longer either a necessary or a sufficient criterion of Israelite identity” (Knoppers 2008: 164).

The myth of origins of the restored Israel in E-N rests on the foundation of a mythical, totally desolate and uninhabited land (cf. Lev. 26:43), the entire populations of Judah and Benjamin being deported (Ezra 1:5; 4:1; 10:9; Neh. 11:2-9; cf. 2 Chron. 36:20), and continuity between the destroyed and restored Israel through the pure remnant of the exiles themselves (Albertz 2003: 14). The return to an empty land is reminiscent of the exodus when the land was empty before the conquest of Canaan (Najman 2004: 1674). Further to this point, the gifts and offerings for the community and temple also connect Ezra 1:4 (1:4-11 in general) with the “despoiling of the Egyptians” in the Exodus narrative (Exod. 3:21-22; 11:2; 12:35-36) (Blenkinsopp 1988: 75-76; Williamson 1985: 16). Here, we can see the cultural frameworks and tropes that transmit the trauma of postmemory, as a later site of memory reactivates an earlier one. This connection between the exodus and the exile is of little surprise since both the return from exile and the exodus are foundational stories that
represent hope and a new beginning; that is, they have similar functions as a myth of origins emplotted with a metanarrative of sin-punishment-appeal to YHWH-restoration.

In addition to the separation produced by the discourse of exile, separation from the peoples of the land is maintained after the return by building projects, namely the temple and the wall of Jerusalem, which function as physical barriers in the text (Janzen 2008). Importantly, like the return, the building projects—and by extension, the physical separation—are authorized by heaven and earth, as YHWH and the Persian kings, namely Cyrus (Ezra 1:1-4; 6:3-5), Darius (Ezra 6:6-12), and Artaxerxes (Neh. 1:11b-2:9) all authorize and oversee the reconstruction. E-N, as well as Isaiah, Esther, and Daniel, presents the Persians as benevolent imperial rulers and Yehud as an important political entity in the Persian empire. This flattering view of Persian kings is especially true for Cyrus, who is referred to as YHWH’s shepherd (Isa. 44:28) and YHWH’s anointed one (Isa. 45:1) in Isaiah (see Braun 2001). Returning to building projects authorized by the Persian kings, Jacob L.

---

22 David Janzen (2008) argues that the building projects are an extension of and safeguard for cultic, ethnic, geographic, and legal separation. Although I agree with Janzen’s position on the function of the physical barriers (i.e., building projects), following Hall (2005), I would argue that what Janzen identifies as cultic, geographic, and legal are components of an ethnic identity in antiquity, not distinct entities from ethnicity.

23 Ezra 1-6 contains conventions typical of an ancient Near Eastern building inscription, and the Cyrus Decree in Ezra 1:1-4 is representative of stages two (“Building Temples on Divine Command”) and three (“The Acquisition of Building Materials”) of Victor Hurowitz’s eightfold model (1991). However, Lisbeth Fried suggests that stage one (“A Brief History of the Temple”) is not in present in Ezra 1-6, because Chronicles is the “history of the Jerusalem temple.” Thus, if the producers of Ezra 1-6 considered the text to be a continuation of Chronicles, then a history of the temple was not necessary (Fried 2004: 162; for arguments in favour of a single composition of E-N-Chr, see Blenkinsopp [1988]; for arguments against the single-composition thesis, see Japhet [1993]; Kalimi [2005]; Williamson [1985]). Returning to Hurowitz’s model, the main elements of stages two and three are as follows: a) a god initiates the building by commanding a king to build (in Ezra 1:1, YHWH commands Cyrus in the first year of his reign); b) the god reconciles with his temple after it has been destroyed for a predetermined amount of time, which in this case, many scholars argue, is seventy years (Jer. 25:11-12; 29:10) (in Ezra 1:1, the word of Jeremiah is fulfilled); c) divine will is communicated to the king—in this case, by divine inspiration (in Ezra 1:1, YHWH stirs up the spirit of Cyrus); d) the king clarifies divine will—in Mesopotamia this usually is done by some sort of divination, but in the Hebrew Bible, it is done by divine command (in Ezra, 1:1-2, Cyrus is commanded and appointed by YHWH); and e), the acquisition of building material—people bring building materials from afar (Ezra 1:4-11) (Hurowitz 1991: 113-223).

24 As a result of such representations of the Persians, a dichotomy between the benevolent Persian rulers and the brutal and barbaric Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian kings has been established in some scholarship. Furthermore, some scholars have tried to use the *Cyrus Cylinder* as further evidence of Persian benevolence and
Wright sees the building of the wall as a metaphor for rebuilding of ethnic identity in E-N:

“Each phase in the construction of the Wall is simultaneously a stage in the rebuilding of Judah’s identity” (Wright 2008: 295). Similarly, Philip Esler maintains that the physical walls and gates are metaphors for the divisions sought by Ezra and Nehemiah in their ban on intermarriage. For Esler, these building projects are barriers for establishing and maintaining
boundaries between ethnic groups (Esler 2003: 422). According to Fredrik Barth, when an ethnic group is defined as ascriptive and exclusive, continuity in this group is achieved through the maintenance of boundaries—in the case of E-N, these boundaries are established and maintained through genealogies and physical structures. However, as I show in Chapter 6, even the most seemingly impermeable boundaries are fluid in both content and form (see Barth 1969: 14).

The adversaries to the restored Israel in E-N are excluded from both participating in the building projects and becoming members of the restored community (Ezra 4:3, Neh. 2:20) (Janzen 2008). Further to this point, the peoples of the land obstruct the progress of the building projects (Ezra 4:1-16; Neh. 2:19; 3:33-35; 4:1-6; 6:1-13), and thereby attempt to undermine the establishment of the restored Israel, which is to sprout from the holy seed זֶרַע הַקֹּדֶש (Ezra 9:2) of the pure remnant. The opponents of the returnees even so go far as to warn King Artaxerxes of the consequences of the city and temple being rebuilt, and by extension, Israel being re-established. In the process, the memories of the rebellion against the Babylonians and the destruction of Jerusalem are invoked (Ezra 4:15-16; cf. Ezra 5:12; Neh. 1:3). Likewise, Sanballat is displeased with the intention of Nehemiah’s mission to improve the conditions of a destroyed Jerusalem (Neh. 2:10). As the city and temple lay in ruins, so does true Israelite identity. Thus, the identity of the restored Israel is built with the stones of the restored Jerusalem on the foundation of the destruction of the past.

Not only does the restored Israel use the building projects to separate themselves from the peoples of the land, but they also use them connect to the glorious past of the old Israel. The building projects function as both physical barriers in the present and temporal bridges to the past. After arriving in Jerusalem, the returnees’ choice of the location of the
altar in response to threat posed by the peoples of the land invokes memories of Joshua’s conquest of the land (Ezra 3:3; cf. Josh. 8:31). Thus, E-N connects the myth of origins for the restored Israel to that of the old, idealized Israel in order to authorize their claim to the land (Najman 2004: 1674). In Ezra 3:10, as the foundation of the new temple is laid on that of the old, a further connection between the first and second temple is made when the restored Israel stations the priests and Levites according to the way in which King David had done (cf. Neh. 12:45; 1 Chron. 15:1-24; 16:4-42; 2 Chron. 29:25, 30; 2 Chron. 35:4). Moreover, as discussed above, the distinction between the past and present collapses in Ezra 3:12-13 when the second temple is celebrated and the first the temple is lamented simultaneously, to the point that the sounds of hope for the present and future are indistinguishable from the lament of the loss of the past (cf. Neh. 12:43). Other links of continuity between the first and second temples are established by references to Solomon (Ezra 5:11), the temple vessels (Ezra 1:7-11; 5:14; 6:5), building materials coming from outside the land (Ezra 1:4-11), and building on the same site (Ezra 6:7).

After the completion of the building projects, which safeguard the separation established by the discourse of exile, the exclusive identity of the restored Israel is consolidated and rituals of purification are performed. Only the priests, Levites, and exiles celebrate the dedication of the temple and connect the restored Israel to the old Israel.

The Israelites, the priests, and the Levites, and all of the other exiles celebrated the dedication of the House of God with joy. And they sacrificed for the for the dedication of this House of God one hundred bulls, two hundred rams, four hundred lambs, and twelve goats as a purification offering for all of Israel, according to the number of tribes of Israel. They appointed the priests in their courses and the Levites in their divisions for the service of God in Jerusalem, according to the prescription in the Book of Moses. (Ezra 6:16-18)
Similarly, after the dedication of the wall, the Levites lead the celebration of the dedication with cymbals, harps and lyres (Neh. 12:27; cf. Ezra 3:10-13; 2 Chron. 23:18; 29:26-30; 30:23), and the priests and Levites purify themselves, the people, the gates, and the walls (Neh. 12:30). Moreover, the priests and the Levites offer sacrifices as the people rejoice resoundingly (Neh. 12:43; cf. Ezra 3:13). Finally, the priests and the Levites maintain purity in accordance with ordinance of David and Solomon (Neh. 12:45).^{25}

The geographic separation of the discourse of exile and physical separation of building projects pave the way for cultic separation. A prime example is the celebration of Passover in Ezra 6:19-22 (cf. Exod. 12:16-51; Lev. 23:4-8; Num. 28:16-25; Deut. 16:1-8; 2 Chron. 30:1-27; 35:1-19) that incorporates the notion of a pure remnant, or returned exiles, connecting the restored Israel to the idealized Israel of the past while separating itself cultically from the impurities of the people of the land.

The returned exiles celebrated the Passover on the fourteenth day of the first month, for the priests and Levites had purified themselves to a man; they were all pure. They slaughtered the Passover offering for all the returned exiles, and for their brother priests and for themselves. The children of Israel who had returned from exile, together with all who joined them in separating themselves from the uncleanness of the nations of the lands to worship YHWH God of Israel, ate of it. They joyfully celebrated the Feast of Unleavened Bread for seven days, for YHWH had given them cause for joy by inclining the heart of the Assyrian king toward them so as to give them support in the work of the House of God, the God of Israel.

---

^{25} Japhet overstates the irrelevance of David and the Davidic dynasty in E-N, which does make mnemonic connections to David. Japhet states that the kingship, political power and independence, and the house of David are ignored in E-N. She downplays the references to David (Ezra 3:10; Neh. 12:24, 36, 45) and the Davidic dynasty (Ezra 4:20; 5:11; Neh. 9:32, 34-35; 13:26), and views them as institutions of the past. According to Japhet, these institutions are irrelevant for the contemporary community’s life. She argues that the avoidance of the house of David in E-N is most obvious in the absence of Zerubbabel’s extended genealogy and references to his Davidic ancestry. In fact Japhet states: “The only occasional reference to a Davidide, probably by oversight, is to a person named Hattush, in the list of returnees at the time of Ezra (Ezra 8:2) (Japhet 2000: 153). Japhet cannot dismiss the past so easily in E-N because of the oscillation between past and present, as well as rupture and continuity, in the text. As I argue throughout this chapter, the past (and by extension, its institutions) are not easily distinguished from the present. The past and present, including Davidic institutions, collapse and are in a dialectic relationship. In E-N, the past shapes the present, and vice versa.
The discourse of the physical separation of the exile begets the cultic separation during the Passover in that, according to priestly law, only those in a state of ritual purity can participate in the Passover meal (Num. 9:6-13) (Najman 2004: 1679). Similarly, in Josh. 5:4-11, after the exodus, forty years in the wilderness, and entrance into the empty land, the Passover could be celebrated only after purification through the circumcision of all the Israelites. Thus, purity and separation precede the celebration of the Passover (Najman 2004: 1679). In Ezra 6:19-22, the only people pure enough to participate in the Passover are those who returned from exile, because they were not defiled by living in the land while it was polluted. The discourse of exile allows the restored Israel to separate itself from “the uncleanness of the nations of the lands” (Ezra 6:21). Comparably, in Neh. 9:2, when the people are fasting and confessing the sins of their fathers on the 24th of Tishri—a festival similar to Yom Kippur (Najman 2004: 1701)—they separate themselves from all foreigners.

Janzen describes the function of cultic separation in E-N as follows: “The precise definition of ‘Israel’ as the returnees or the ‘remnant’ seals off ethnic infiltration into Israel, and the limitation of participation in the cult to this group seals off cultic infiltration. The people of the land want to participate in the temple cult, but the text reserves it for the exiles alone” (Janzen 2008: 125). Thus, the discourse of exile informed and conferred a special status on the returnees that is not uncommon to survivors of collective trauma. This special status corresponds to Erikson’s argument that difference and separation can become a status
or identity-marker that informs and defines the development of community (Erikson 1994: 231).

3 Repetitive Temporality and Liturgical Time: Exodus and Exile

Liturgical time and repetitive temporality tie the myth of origins/founding narrative of the restored Israel in E-N to that of the idealized Israel of old in Exodus. Moreover, during these founding events—the exodus and exile—the establishment of Torah plays a central role in the formation of an exclusive and normative identity. This mnemonic process corresponds to the schemas discussed by Van der Kolk and Van der Hart, or Hirsch’s “pre-established forms,” tropes, and schemas that are the “impersonal building blocks of affiliative postmemory” (Hirsch 2008: 120). Further to this point, the exodus may be seen as a screen memory for the exile—or, as Rothberg would call it, multidirectional memory, which is the collective equivalent of screen memory—on which the desires and needs of the present are projected (Hirsch 2008: 124-25; Rothberg 2009: 12-13). Within this mnemonic framework, Torah functions as a constitution for both the old and the restored Israel. A constitution evokes notions of collective intactness and imagined consensus that distinguishes members from non-members. E-N creates mnemonic connectedness though spatial-temporal bridges from Moses and Sinai to their community in Persian Yehud and future generations. The law connects the past, present, and future.

In both Exodus and E-N, the founder and the constitution of the ethnos (i.e., Moses and Torah) are the core components of an Israeliite ethnicity. In other words, the constitution of the old and restored Israel, Torah, functions as a cultural text. As I illustrate below, the community of exiles who become the restored Israel, with Ezra as a second Moses and lawgiver, transforms Torah into a cultural text that serves as the foundation for
inter/transgenerational continuity and identity. Thus, the exile, in this sense, oscillates between rupture and continuity.

The association between the exodus and the exile is well-established in biblical scholarship (see Isa. 48:20; 51:9-11; 52:4; Jer. 16:14-15 = 23:7-8). For instance, Robert Carroll describes the relationship between the exodus and exile, and their influence on biblical narrative, as follows:

Exile and Exodus: those are the two sides or faces of the myth that shapes the subtext of the narratives and the rhetoric of the Hebrew Bible. Between these twin topoi (and their mediating notion of the empty land) is framed, constructed and constituted the essential story of the Hebrew Bible. They reflect a deep narratological structure and constant concern with journeys in or out of territories... So exodus equals exile or deportation and vice versa. (Carroll 1998: 63)

Perhaps the best known work on temporality and the relationship between exodus and exile is that of Japhet (2006), who argues that the key for understanding temporality in E-N is periodization. Moreover, Japhet points to the ideological apparatus on which the narrative of restoration is built in E-N, namely that of Exodus. Importantly, Japhet notes that the two-generation restoration led by a political and priestly leader entails a departure from a foreign land that is followed by the conquest and settlement of the land of Israel is shared by Exodus and E-N. Both stories share an overarching metanarrative structure of enslavement and deliverance as the fulfillment of divine word. Japhet outlines the metanarrative structure as follows:

The first generation of the Restoration is conceived as parallel to the departure from Egypt. The people of Israel left the Babylonian Exile to go back to Jerusalem, with the pronounced purpose of building the temple, similar to the Exodus from Egypt to worship the Lord (Exod. 5:1-3) and build the tabernacle. The second generation is parallel to that of settlement, when Israel consolidated its hold on the land, withstood the temptations represented by the local population, and strove to create a pure and holy community... The periods of Exodus and settlement are also the only times in the history of Israel characterized by a two-leader political system, a layman and a priest. Moses and Aaron were the leaders during the first period; Joshua, the son of Nun, and Eleazar, the son of Aaron, were the leaders in the second (Josh. 14:1; 17:4; 1951; 21:1; 24:29-30, 33). (Japhet 2006: 502-3)
Further to this point, Japhet observes that Cyrus in E-N is the antithesis of Pharaoh in Exodus—Cyrus, whose spirit is roused by God, lets the people return to rebuild the temple, whereas Pharaoh, whose heart is hardened by God, and Egypt are decimated by ten plagues before he lets the people go (Japhet 2006: 503).

Japhet’s position that emphasizes the authority and influence of metanarrative structures and cultural tropes is appealing, especially given the authoritative status of the Exodus narrative during the Persian period and beyond. In other words, it is not surprising that the producers of E-N would use an already authoritative discourse to authorize their own. Paul Veyne writes, which corresponds to my discussion of schemas and the works of Van der Kolk and Van der Hart, Hirsch, Yerushlami, Rothberg, the Zerubavels, and others:

At every period unconscious diagrams, *topoi* that are in the air of the time, impose themselves on a scientist or an artist… those “ready-made forms” that impose themselves with surprising strength on the imagination of artists and that are the matter of the work of art… an artist expresses himself through the visual possibilities of his time, which are a grammar of artistic communication, and that grammar has its own history, its slow rhythm, that determines the nature of styles and the manner of the artists… But, since a historical explanation does not descend by parachute from the sky, it remains to be concretely explained how the “ready-made forms” could almost imperatively impose themselves on an artist, for the artist does not “submit” to “influences”; the work of art is a doing, which uses sources and “influences” as material causes, in the same way that the sculptor uses marble as the material cause of his statue. (Veyne 1971: 94)

In addition to the literary *topoi* and metanarrative structures explanation, the active process of memory can explain the relationship between schemas used in Exodus and E-N. Remembering depends on existing mental schema and maps.

The active process of memory that integrates more recent events into pre-existing mental schemas is instrumental in connecting the myth of origins of the restored Israel to that
of the old Israel. In E-N, the relationship between the restored and old Israel follows Mario Liverani’s second model of the “restorer of order”\textsuperscript{26} in ancient Near Eastern historiography.

In this pattern the sequence of the qualities of time is the usual one (good-bad-good), but the subject seems to have moved one step further in the sequence. The happy past is pushed back into a more remote past, a veritable mythical age, and its function of ideal model of a corrected situation is underscored. The phase of corruption and chaos is over, i.e. moved from the present to a nearby past, just finished; while the second stage of order and prosperity is moved ahead from the future to the present. (Liverani 1973: 187)

The idealized past of Moses and Joshua and their myth of origins—the exodus, the giving of the law at Sinai, and the settlement of the land—is interrupted by the sinfulness of monarchic Israel, which culminated in the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, only to be re-established by the restored Israel of E-N. Here, again, we have the oscillation between rupture and continuity that is so prevalent in the postmemory of E-N. A new national myth emerging like a phoenix out of the ashes of destruction and slavery is memorialized through the use of the mnemonic schemes of collective memory. This association is evident in the collective confession of Neh. 9:6-37, which is recited after the “seed of Israel” За"ע יִשְרָא ֹּ֔ל separate themselves from all foreigners in Neh. 9:2.

The myth of the restored Israel in E-N creates temporal bridges to the exodus with references to a return with gifts (Ezra 1:4-11; cf. Exod. 3:21-22; 11:2; 12:35-36), conquest of the homeland (Ezra 3:3; cf. Josh 8:31), the Passover (Ezra 6:19-22; cf. Exod. 12:16-51; Deut. 16:1-8), and retellings of the Exodus (Neh. 9:9-14). However, as in the myth of origins of the old Israel in Exodus, Torah and the return to the land are central to the myth of origins of the restored Israel in E-N. Moreover, the establishment of authority and tradition from the

\textsuperscript{26} The first is a cyclical time construction in which a positive past is followed by a negative present and then a positive future (Liverani 1973: 186-87).
wilderness outside the empty land is significant in both myths of origins. Knoppers observes that “[i]n most cases of interactions between related communities geographically set apart, the community rooted in the ancestral land would represent the established community, and the diasporic community would represent a colony or dependent community, but in Ezra these roles are in many ways reversed” (Knoppers 2008: 148). Similarly, Peter R. Bedford maintains the home community of the repatriates in E-N is located in the Babylonian diaspora, and not in the homeland (Bedford 2002: 152). Although I agree with Knoppers’ and Bedford’s assessments, it is important to note, that such a relationship between exilic or diasporic communities to the homeland is not limited to E-N. Texts that rememorialize, focus on, or build off of the Exodus narrative re-establish this relationship between homeland and diaspora. For instance, in Life of Moses, Philo distinguishes the Hebrews who migrated to Egypt from those who had remained in the homeland. When Moses and the returnees encounter their counterparts in the homeland, Philo notes that those who remained in the homeland did not maintain any of their ancestral customs (Mos. 1.241).

J. Assmann discusses the extraterritorial nature of Mosaic law and the memory of it having no place in the homeland, as it is forgotten once the Israelites settled into the cities of Canaan. According to J. Assmann, since the extraterritorial nature of the memory is intimately connected to the position of revelation outside the worldly reality, it is not by chance that the site of memory and revelation of Mosaic law is in the wilderness of Sinai, outside the homeland. The laws that the people are to remember and follow are not the laws of the land, but rather extraterritorial laws from Sinai. Furthermore, J. Assmann argues that DtrH attempts to recognize and deal with the catastrophe, trauma, and guilt incurred from forgetting the extraterritorial law and committing idolatry (Assmann 2006: 46-62). During
the confession of the sins—past and present—and the summary of Israelite history, Nehemiah 9 recognizes the extraterritorial nature of Torah (9:12-21) and the dangers of forgetting its laws while inhabiting the homeland (9:26-35), as well as the threat posed to a restored Israel by such forgetfulness (9:36-37). The relationship between remembering and forgetting and destruction and restoration is reminiscent of a maxim at Yad Vashem: “Forgetfulness leads to exile, while remembrance is the secret of redemption” (see Spiegel 2002: 156).

As we see in E-N, obedience to Torah is directly connected to the memory of history. For Assmann, observing the law and remembering history is one and the same thing. Moreover, during ruptures and watersheds, or other breaks in transmission and tradition—such as the destruction of the temple and the subsequent exile—new texts emerge and already existing texts receive greater normative value. When communicative memory with the living is broken, communities look to the texts for guidance and find continuity through cultural memory (Assmann 2006: 65-80). In E-N, the extraterritorial law emerging out of Babylon is re-established in the homeland as the normative tradition. This process mirrors the exodus as a founding event from which the extraterritorial law is given in the wilderness of Sinai before it is brought into the homeland, only then to be forgotten. Re-establishing and interpreting the law, as well as relationship between law and memory, are central to E-N, especially during the intermarriage crisis (Ezra 9-10; Nehemiah 13). Torah and Israelite collective memory serve as safeguards that maintain separation and purity, and by extension, the future success of the restored Israel, as is evident in Neh. 1:7-9: “We have offended you by not keeping the commandments, the laws, and the rules that you gave to your servant Moses. Be mindful of the promise you gave to your servant Moses: ‘If you are unfaithful, I
will scatter you among the peoples; but if you turn back to me, faithfully keep my commandments, even if your dispersed are at the end of the earth, I will gather them from there and bring them to the place where I have chosen to establish my name.””

Janzen correctly acknowledges that Israel intermixing with the peoples of the land and properly observing the law are mutually exclusive endeavours. According to Janzen, separation from the peoples of the land is not only a necessary aspect of the law, but also the necessary first step to properly observing the law (Janzen 2008: 133-35). Thus, the figure of Ezra as a second Moses and the community constitution of Torah are core components for both separation and collective identity formation in E-N. Ezra is an authoritative figure in that he is of high priest pedigree, a scribe, and an expert in the Torah of Moses (Ezra 7:6).27

Under the benevolent care of YHWH, Ezra departs from Babylon on the first day of the first month and arrives in Jerusalem on the first day of the fifth month (Ezra 7:9).28 The timing of Ezra’s departure corresponds to that of the exodus, which also took place in the first month of the year (Najman 2004: 1681). Upon arrival in Jerusalem, Ezra, the priest-scribe who has dedicated himself to studying Torah and observing it, is to teach the laws and rules to the

27 Ezra 7:6 says that Ezra “came up” from Babylon, from which rabbinical interpretation draws an analogy between Moses and Ezra. Just as Moses went up to Sinai to receive Torah, Ezra went up to Jerusalem to receive the Torah of Moses (b. Sanh 21b) (Najman 2004: 1680-81).

28 According to 2 Kgs 25:8, the first temple was destroyed on the seventh day of fifth month, Av. Ezra’s return in the month of Av may be therapeutic in the process of destruction and restoration and the collapsing of past and present (cf. Ezra 3.12-13). The ninth of Av becomes the day when later Jewish communities mourn the destruction of the first and second temples (cf. Judean Wars, 5.391-425; Najman 2004: 1681; Yerushalmi 1996: 5-52).
restored Israel (Ezra 7:10). In other words, Ezra is to implement and institute the constitution of the restored Israel and ensure that separation from the peoples of the land is maintained. The language here is reminiscent of Deuteronomy (see, for instance, Deut 4:14), which, again, presents Ezra as a lawgiver, or a second Moses, who establishes the legal foundation for the community and provides correct interpretations of the law (Najman 2004: 1681). As in the return itself, Ezra’s journey to Jerusalem and institutionalization of the law is both divinely and regally authorized.

According to Artaxerxes’ decree, the Persian king provided Ezra with an incredible amount of resources to bring with him back to Jerusalem. Ezra is offered silver and gold from the king and his seven counsellors (Ezra 7:15), silver and gold from the province of Babylon (7:16), freewill offerings of the people and the priests (7:16), vessels/utensil for the temple (7:19), and 100 talents of silver, 100 kors of wheat, and 100 baths of oil (7:20-23).
We are also told that the priests and Levites are exempted from tribute (7:24). Moreover,

29 Again, much scholarly debate surrounds the issues of the legitimacy of the decrees of the Persian kings. In many ways, the question comes down to whether or not Persian Yehud held some sort of unique status within the Persian empire. Achaemenid scholars Muhammad A. Dandamayev and Vladimir G. Lukonin are very skeptical about Persian officials bestowing a special status upon the peripheral Yehud: There are likewise no grounds for speaking of a special benevolence towards Judaism on the part of the Persian kings… The books of Isaiah, Ezra, Daniel and Esther speak frequently of the concern of the Persian kings for the Jewish religion, which has led some authors to contend that under Darius I the cult of Yahweh was declared the supreme state cult for the entire Achaemenid empire… In our opinion, however, the correct view is held by those scholars who believe that the benevolence of the Persian kings toward the Jewish religion was exaggerated by the compilers of the Bible… [and] tries to inspire courage in their own people by claiming that the great kings of Media and Persia recognized their god and patronized his worshippers (Dandamayev and Lukonin 1989: 349-50). Briant dismisses arguments in favour of Yehud’s strategic location and geographic importance to Persians for resolving problems along the Egyptian border: “at the risk of appearing naïve (or ill informed), I must insist that even and especially studying a map, I have never really understood what decisive strategic advantage against Egypt the small land of Judah could have had in the eyes of the Achaemenid central authority (or in the eyes of certain modern interpreters?)” (Briant 2002: 976). Moreover, Jon L. Berquist suggests that Yehud sometimes was ignored, and as a result, found itself outside the primary influence of the Persian empire; “But when the Persian Empire redirected its attention toward its eastern borders or, as was more frequently the case, against Greece to the northwest, Yehud was ignored. The effective border shifted, and Yehud found itself the primary influence of the Persian Empire. It was no longer a colony, and yet it was not its own center. The shifting frontier created a new situation out of oscillating states of social organization” (Berquist 1995: 21). Primary sources also indicate that Yehud was an insignificant part of the Persian empire. For instance, Yehud does not appear in Darius’ “foundation charter” from Susa, the Elamite version (DSz), which lists sixteen
Ezra is to appoint magistrates and judges who were to adjudicate in the province Beyond the River (7:25). Finally, the decree concludes as follows: “Let anyone who does not obey the law of your God and the law of the king be punished with dispatch, whether by death, peoples and nations that furnished raw materials and eight who were used as craftsmen for the construction of Darius’ palace at Susa. In addition to the Elamite version of Darius’ “foundation charter” from Susa, various inscriptions and sculptures that Darius and his successors carved on tomb facades, palace walls, and Egyptian stelas, as well as on a statue of Darius, “allow us to reconstruct to some extent the idealized image of the world as the masters of the Empire wished it recorded” (Briant 2002: 172). The empire lists are from a series of royal inscriptions, most of which are dated to Darius’ reign: the Behistun inscription (DB) mentions 23 nations; one of four inscriptions from the south façade of the Persepolis terrace (DPe) mentions 24 nations; one of two inscriptions on the king’s tomb at Naqš-i Rustam (DNa) mentions 29 nations; a Susa inscription (DSe) mentions 27 nations; the Akkadian version of the Susa foundation (DSa) mentions 23 nations; and a Xerxes inscription (XPh) mentions 31 nations. Importantly, Yehud is not mentioned in one of these inscriptions (Briant 2002: 172-73).

30 The issue of whether or not Ezra appointed magistrates and judges is also a topic of scholarly debate. Fried contends that Ezra likely did appoint judges: “If Ezra 7:25-26 was part of a genuine commission from the Persian king, Artaxerxes, to a person named Ezra, and I believe it was, then Ezra’s assignment was to appoint judges and magistrates” (Fried 2004: 88). Lester L. Grabbe, however, argues that it is unlikely that Ezra would have been allowed to impose his selection of judges and magistrates on the rest of the satrap, particularly since “this region had a powerful satrap who seems to be ignored.” Furthermore, according to Grabbe, “[a]lthough the power and the office of the satrap varied from place to place, time to time, and even individual to individual, satraps were usually members of the royal family with a great deal of independence and power, including military command and troops” (Grabbe 2006: 552). Knoppers adds that “[t]he Persian kings preferred to reward good conduct of and loyal members of other societies by granting honorary titles and material distinctions, rather than by providing open access to the highest levels of martial or political decision making” (Knoppers 2001: 131). Evidence seems to support Grabbe’s claim that satraps were usually high-ranking members of Persian society and Knoppers’ assertion that locals usually were not rewarded with high level political positions. Satraps were not created for the benefit of local populations, but rather served the interests of the central administration (Briant 2002: 65). Furthermore, power seems to have been limited for local populace, as there was a glass-ceiling for non-Persians, which affected Medes to a lesser degree: “The ethnic composition of the highest ranking personnel clearly illustrates the privileged place that the Persians held in the Empire that they themselves had conquered and the proceeds of which they fully intended to keep for themselves. The fact that local elites were recognized does not contradict this principle, since positions held by local elites were limited, at least under the first kings, to posts without influence (Briant 2002: 350). Persia was the centre of the empire, but the Medes generally held higher positions than other non-Persian peoples; however, it would be “excessive to speak of a Persian-Median sovereignty.” Although Elamite cultural influence was far greater, Medes and Persia “were close cousins.” Moreover, in Persian lists of nations, Media always is listed immediately after Persia. The lists of nations appear to exhibit a hierarchy of nations and are ranked in descending order, as the Persians are listed first on the only two inscriptions (DB and DSa) in which they are mentioned. On the four lists in which Persia is not mentioned, Media is listed first three times (DSe, DNa, and XPh) and Elam is listed first on the other (DPe) (Briant 2002: 172-73). Herodotus seems to refer to this hierarchy in 1.134, when he writes: “After themselves [the Persians], they hold their immediate neighbours in the highest regard, then those who live next furthest away, and so on in order of proximity; so they have the least respect for those who live furthest away from their own land. The reason for this is that they regard themselves as by far the best people in the world in all respects, and others as gradually decreasing in goodness, so that those who live the furthest away from them are the worst people in the world.” Finally, it is important to mention that Medes seem to have held high positions only in the military—Mazares, Harpagus, and Dates are all examples of prominent Medes who held important military positions (Briant 2002: 82). The Egyptian Udjahorresnet is an example of Persian exclusionist and elitist policies. Despite maintaining many of his traditional titles—including “pasha, royal chancellor, sole companion, true friend of the king who loves me”—and holding the position of “chief medical officer” for both Cambyses first and Darius, Udjahorresnet “did not receive a single position of political influence, either from the king or in Egypt itself” (Briant 2002: 81).
corporal punishment, confiscation of possessions, or imprisonment” (7:26). Thus, the decree of Artaxerxes gives authority to both Ezra’s mission and Torah as the constitution of the people and land of Israel.

31 Again, there is a lack of scholarly consensus on the historical veracity and reality of this claim. Peter Frei argues that Artaxerxes imperially authorized Ezra’s law book, presumably the Pentateuch. Furthermore, he cites other possible examples of imperial authorization from Egypt, namely the Udjahorresnet Inscription and the Demotic Chronicle, as further evidence for his position (Frei 2001: 9-12, 22-23). However, Frei’s thesis encounters several problems upon closer scrutiny. For instance, Jean Louis Ska suggests that it might be better to abandon Frei’s theory of imperial authorization of the Pentateuch for the following reasons: a) the Pentateuch is a mix of law and narrative, and who would authorize a narrative as law—particularly a book with a narrative about a small group of people who successfully rebel against a great imperial power?: b) there is no reference to imperial authorization in the Pentateuch; c) certain texts may have raised suspicion or hostility of Persian authorities (eg. Deut 17:14-20; 26:19; 28:1); and d) there is no Aramaic copy of the Pentateuch, and Persians’ local records were in both the native language and Imperial Aramaic (Ska 2001: 168-70). Ska’s arguments are convincing, particularly the unlikelihood that the Persians would authorize a law code laden with narrative. Another problem with Frei’s theory of an imperial authorized law code (i.e., the Pentateuch) in Yehud is that ancient Near Eastern law codes functioned very differently from modern ones. Martha Roth outlines the relationship between ancient Near Eastern law codes and daily legal affairs as follows: “In numerous studies of a range of legal situations, little correspondence has been found between the provisions in the law collections and contemporary practice. Furthermore, no court document or contract makes a direct reference to any of the formal law collections. From such an absence of linking evidence some scholars have concluded that the law collections had little or no impact on the daily operation of legal affairs” (Roth 1997: 5). The lack of evidence for legal affairs and practices based on law codes compounds the problems with Frei’s thesis. Furthermore, problems arise with Frei’s Egyptian evidence. The Demotic Chronicle reports that Darius I codified Egyptian laws through a commission composed of Egyptian soldiers, priests, and scribes, and Frei considers this codification as comparable to an imperially authorized Pentateuch, since he conjectures that Darius may have carried out the codification himself: “It is possible to regard the codification of the laws governing Egypt as only part of Darius’s wider politics of reform, but this cannot be proven” (Frei 2001: 9-10). However, Egyptologist, Donald Redford, argues otherwise: “To sum up: the writing-up of Egyptian law at Darius’s behest, if it occurred as the Demotic Chronicle describes, was no ‘authorization,’ much less a ‘codification’ of Egyptian legislation. It would have been, quite simply, the translation into Aramaic… of regulations governing those parts of Egyptian society productive of wealth. It served as a means of instructing the new authority in its attempt to control that wealth through tapping into the laws and statutes of the administration of the pharaohs, the lay-community, and especially the temples” (Redford 2001: 158). Thus, according to Redford, this is not a case of imperial authorization but rather a means through which Darius extracted wealth from Egypt, including its temples. In other words, this is a case of Persians exploiting existing institutions as a means to their own ends. If Redford is correct, this evidence not only casts further doubts on Frei’s thesis of an imperially authorized Pentateuch but also diminishes the reliability of Artaxerxes’ Decree in Ezra 7, since it is extremely unlikely that Persian kings would extract wealth from Egyptian temples and administration while they provided the Yehudite temple and its administration with such wealth and resources. Frei considers the activities of Udjahorresnet to be further evidence of Persian imperial authorization (Frei 2001: 22-23). Similarly, Blenkinsopp parallels Ezra’s mission to that of Udjahorresnet (Blenkinsopp 1988: 147; Blenkinsopp 1987). However, “the parallel does not seem particularly legitimate” to Briant (Briant 2002: 976). As mentioned above, Udjahorresnet was chief medical officer of both Cambyses first and Darius, and, according to the Udjahorresnet Inscription, Darius commanded him to return to Egypt to restore the “House of Life”: “The majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Darius, ever-living, commanded me to return to Egypt...
After the people had settled into their towns, the entire community of the restored Israel gathers to ask Ezra to bring the scroll of the Torah of Moses (Neh. 8:1). Thereafter, on the first day of the seventh month—later known as Rosh Ha-Shanah (cf. Lev. 23:23-25; Num. 29:1-6)—Ezra brings the Torah of Moses before the community and reads from it from dawn until midday (Neh. 8:2-3). Ezra stands on a wooden tower made for the purpose of giving Torah to the people, opens the scroll before the community—at which time they all stand up—and blesses YHWH (Neh. 8:4-6). The community members then prostrate themselves before YHWH and the Levites explain the Torah, reading from it and translating so that the people comprehend it (Neh. 8:6-8; cf. Josh. 8:30-35). On the second day, the heads of the clans, the priests, and the Levites gather before Ezra to study Torah, where they find commandments given to Moses regarding the celebration of Sukkot (Neh. 8:13-16). As a result, the restored Israel celebrates Sukkot just as the old Israel had done (cf. Solomon’s celebration of Sukkot in 2 Chron. 7:8-10).

The whole community that returned from the captivity made booths and dwelt in the booths—the Israelites had not done so from the days of Joshua son of Nun to that day—and there was very great rejoicing. He read from the scroll of the Teaching of the God each day, from the first to the last day. They celebrated the festival seven days, and there was a solemn gathering on the eighth, as prescribed. (Neh. 8:17-18)

Nehemiah 8 represents a foundational moment for the restored Israel, as the lawgiver and expert legal interpreter delivers their constitution. It recreates the Sinai experience and order to restore the establishment of the House of Life, after it had decayed” (Lichtheim 1971-80: 36-41). Grabbe does not accept that the Udjahorresnet Inscription is a case of imperial authorization, because it seems unlikely that the king would have initiated Udjahorresnet’s mission. “Even if the inscription does not say so explicitly, the most likely interpretation is that Udjahorresnet himself suggested the idea to the king or that the king was responding to a request from the Egyptian side” (Grabbe 2006: 537). Grabbe’s suggestion that Darius was responding to Udjahorresnet’s suggestion is significant. All of the above needs to be considered when assessing whether or not the Persian king authorized Torah as the law of the land.
authorizes itself through the relationship between figure—Ezra as a new Moses—and text—Torah (Najman 2003: 36). This recasting or reinventing tradition creates continuity, during a moment of rupture, with a foundational past through the Torah of Moses. Thus, Nehemiah 8 participates in what Najman calls Mosaic Discourse. To quote Najman, “[t]he only passable roads to textual authority led through the past. Mosaic Discourse was one such route” (Najman 2003: 15). According to Hobsbawm, repetition is essential for the (re-)invention of traditions, as “[t]hey are responses to novel situations which take the form of reference to old situations, or which establish their own past by quasi-obligatory repetition” (Hobsbawm 1992: 2).

The above corresponds to Spiegel’s work on liturgical time. In liturgical commemoration, such as Nehemiah 8, recitation is a means by which to access the past, thereby bringing it to life in the present—fusing past and present, speaker and audience—while simultaneously gazing to the imagined future (see Spiegel 2002: 149-62). Najman identifies this process in Nehemiah 8 as the covenant of Sinai is revisited and re-enacted, but this time the mediator is an interpreter-scribe—not a prophetic figure—who reads and interprets the words of Moses (Najman 2003: 35). Thus, the revelation at Sinai is an event of liturgical and repetitive temporality, as it “is not a one-time event, but rather an event that can be re-presented, even in exile” (Najman 2003: 36).

The re-presentation and liturgical memory of Sinai connects the founding events of the restored Israel in E-N to the founding events of the old Israel at Sinai. As mentioned above, E-N authorizes itself through the figure and text of Mosaic Discourse. The revisiting of the site of memory of Sinai and the subsequent proper interpretation of the Torah of Moses by Ezra authorizes the core message of postmemory in E-N, i.e., separation from the
peoples of the land. Torah becomes the authority and foundation for Ezra’s position against mixed-marriages. In Ezra 9:1-3, Ezra discovers the following:

The people of Israel and the priests and the Levites have not separated themselves from the peoples of the land whose abhorrent practices are like those of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. They have taken their daughters as wives for themselves and their sons, so that the holy seed has become intermingled with the peoples of the land; and it is the officers and prefects who have taken the lead in this trespass.

As a result, Ezra rents his garment and robe, tears out the hair of his head and beard, sits desolately, and then publicly repents and prays (Ezra 9:3-15). However, Shecaniah, son of Jehiel, tells Ezra that there is still hope for the restored Israel, despite the inter-marriages:

“No then, let us make a covenant with our God to expel all these women and those who have been born to them, in accordance with the bidding of YHWH and of all who are concerned over the commandment of our God, and let the Torah be obeyed”

(Ezra 10:3). Ezra responds by giving the following command to the congregation of returning exiles: “You have trespassed by bringing home foreign women, thus aggravating the guilt of Israel. So now, make confession to YHWH, God of your fathers, and do his will, and separate yourselves from the peoples of the land and from foreign women”
Likewise, Neh. 10:29-31 authorizes the doctrine of separation and polemic against mixed marriages with references to Torah:

And the rest of the people, the priests, the Levites, the gatekeepers, the singers, the temple servants, and all who separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to [follow] the Torah of God, their wives, sons and daughters, all who know enough to understand, join with their noble brothers, and take an oath with sanctions to follow the Torah of God, given through Moses the servant of God, and to observe carefully all the commandments of YHWH our lord, his rules and laws. Namely: We will not give our daughters in marriage to the peoples of the land, or take their daughters for our sons.

Moreover, in Neh. 13:1, the leaders of the restored Israel read to the people from the book of Moses, where “it was found written that no Ammonite or Moabite might ever enter the congregation of God.” When the people hear the words of Torah, they separate the alien admixture from Israel (Neh. 13:3).

E-N’s position on mixed-marriages is contrary to much biblical tradition: Moses himself married a Midianite woman; Joseph married an Egyptian; Bathsheeba married a Hittite; Solomon and Rehoboam married Amonites; David is the descendent of a Moabite. The most significant problem with the theory of single authorship between Chronicles and E-N, in my view, is the issue of intermarriage. In contrast to E-N’s opposition to the issue, Chronicles expresses no such sentiment. Chronicles mentions the Canaanite wife of Judah (1 Chron. 2:3), the eponymous ancestor of the main tribe of the kingdom of Judah and the social location of the text, the Persian province of Yehud. Furthermore, Chronicles mentions David’s aunt, Abigail, who married Jether, the Ishmaelite, father of Amasa (1 Chron. 2:17), as well as Solomon’s marriage to an Egyptian woman, Pharaoh’s daughter (2 Chron. 8:11),
and to an Ammonite woman, as Rehoboam’s mother was Naamah, an Ammonitess (2 Chron. 12:13) (Kalimi 2005: 54-55).

In contrast, Ezra 9:2, 4 and 10:2 refer to marriage to the peoples of the land and intermixing with them as מעל (infidelity, disloyalty, being untrue, violating one’s legal obligation). According to Hayes, the מעל of intermarriage signifies profaneness, not impurity, as the mixture of the holy seed of Israel with profane seed of the peoples of the land produces genealogically profane offspring. Importantly, E-N does not use the term profane הלסל to describe intermarriage. For Hayes, the distinction between genealogical impurity and profaneness is contingent on whether or not the Israelite parent is priestly or not. In other words, mixing becomes genealogically impure when the parent is priestly. Hayes argues that it is not until later Second Temple texts, such as 4QMMT and Jubilees, that non-priestly Israelites can be defiled/made impure through intermarriage. Regardless, genealogical impurity-profaneness is a permanent form of impurity as it is passed on to descendents through intermarriage (Hayes 2002: 32-33). Purity, in a genealogical context, means “unalloyed or free of admixture” whereas impurity signifies mixed lineage (Hayes 2002: 27).

E-N’s polemic against mixed-marriages is based on Deut. 7:3 (cf. Exod. 34:16): “You shall not intermarry with them; do not give your daughters to their sons or take their daughters for your sons” וְלָא תִּתְחַת לָם בִּתָּךְ לִבְנֹּ֔וֹ וּבִ֖תוֹ לִׁבְנֶֶָֽ֣ך׃. This being said, as Najman points out, E-N goes even further than Deuteronomy by 1) prohibiting not only intermarriage with the Canaanite nations outlined in Deuteronomy (see Deut. 20:16-18) but also marriage with any non-Israelite in general—and, as has been discussed above, Israel and
Israelite have very exclusive meanings in E-N; 2) demanding that those who have intermarried divorce their foreign wives and expel any children from that illicit marriage (Najman 2004: 1684). Thus, through participating in Mosaic Discourse and using the authority of the figure of Moses and the text of Torah, E-N authorizes its own interpretation of Torah. According to Najman, “Ezra interprets texts like Deuteronomy 7, and thereby claims that the resulting law reflects the correct reading of what was intended by Moses in the Torah” (Najman 2003: 114). E-N’s interpretation of Torah could not be authoritative without declaring its Mosaic origins. In other words, the laws against intermarriage with non-Israelites to ensure separation from the peoples of the land are authorized by inscribing them back to Sinai, Moses, and the Mosaic Torah (Najman 2003: 116).

Hayes views the transition from the Torah’s partial ban on intermarriage to the more exclusionary complete ban on intermarriage in E-N to be one of moral impurity to genealogical impurity and permeable boundary to impermeable boundary. Here, Israelites and non-Israelites are genealogically distinct with the latter profaning and/or defiling the holy seed of Israel. In E-N, genealogical purity signifies “biological descent from full Israelite parents, undergirded by the notion of Israel as a holy seed” (Hayes 2002: 27).

4 Conclusions

The discourse of exile, the building projects, and return to the Sinaitic experience separates the pure remnant—the returned exiles—from the impure—the peoples of the land—and facilitates the cleansing of the collective self. This representation, of course, rests on the postmemory foundations of the idealized Israelite past—the mnemonic schemas and cultural frameworks—as it oscillates between rupture and continuity. The discourse of exile and narrative of return used to construct E-N’s myth of origins converts absence of an
idealized past or original unity into a loss of it, as the texts conflate historical trauma (i.e., the loss of Jerusalem and the temple) with structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence of an original unity or purity). As a result, E-N attempts to mnemonically and discursively obliterate and cleanse the contaminants that threaten the existence of the restored community. As we see in Ezra 9:10-15, the failure to separate the pure remnant from the defiled peoples of the land has grave consequences of punishment and destruction.

Now, what can we say in the face of this, O our God, for we have forsaken your commandments, which you gave us through your servants the prophets when you said, ‘The land that you are about to possess is a land unclean through the uncleanness of the peoples of the land, through their abhorrent practices with which they, in their impurity, have filled it from one end to the other. Now then, do not give your daughters in intermarriage to their sons or let their daughters marry your sons; do nothing for their well-being or advantage, then you will be strong and enjoy the bounty of the land and bequeath it to your children forever.’

After all that has happened to us because of our evil deeds and your deep guilt—though you, our God, have been forbearing, [punishing us] less than our iniquity [deserves] in that you have granted us such a remnant as this—shall we once again violate your commandments by intermarrying with these peoples who follow such abhorrent practices? Will you not rage against us till we are destroyed or without remnant or survivor? O YHWH, God of Israel, you are benevolent, for we have survived as a remnant, as is now the case. We stand before you in all our guilt, for we cannot face you on this account.

Here, not only does Torah serve as the constitution for the restored Israel that commands separation from the impure part of the collective self, but also the community is reminded of the dire consequences of not following its authority. Similarly, upon learning that the priest Eliashib had assigned a room in the temple to his relative Tobiah, Nehemiah has Tobiah thrown out of the room and the room purified (Neh. 13:4-9). Finally, E-N ends on the following note, which further emphasizes the authority of E-N’s interpretation of Torah...
and the importance of separation and purification, as well as the grave consequences of not doing so:

Also at that time, I saw that Judeans had married Ashdodite, Ammonite, and Moabite women; a good number of children spoke the language of Ashdod and the language of various peoples, and did not know how to speak Judean. I censured them, cursed them, flogged them, tore out their hair, and adjured them by God, saying, “You shall not give your daughters in marriage to their sons, or take any of their daughters for your sons or yourselves. It was just in such thin things that King Solomon of Israel sinned! Among the many nations there was not a king like him, and so well loved was he by his God that God made him king of Israel, yet foreign wives caused even him to sin. How, then, can we acquiesce in your doing this great wrong, breaking faith with our God by marrying foreign women?” One of the sons of Joiada son of the high priest Eliashib was a son-in-law of Sanballat the Hornite; I drove him away from me. Remember to their discredit, O my God, how they polluted the priesthood, the covenant of the priests and the Levites. I purged them of every foreign element, and arranged for the priests and the Levites to work each at his task by shifts, and for the wood offering [to be brought] at fixed times and for the first fruits. (Neh. 13:23-30)

The corruption and impurity reached the top of the priesthood and threatened the well-being of the community and its institutions. The separation through the discourse of exile and building projects did not safeguard the restored Israel from all contaminants, and the figures of Ezra and Nehemiah had to respond accordingly in Ezra 9-10 and Nehemiah 13. Following and interpreting the laws from Sinai, they cleanse the collective self by actively purging its contaminants and pollutants. The use of the term תהי' (cleanse, purify, purge) in Neh. 13:30 signifies a process of genealogical purification that separates priests from foreign wives in order to maintain the boundaries that protect the restored Israel from the defilement of mixed offspring (Hayes 2002: 28).
Again, the relationship between collective memory and E-N’s interpretation of Torah is apparent in Neh. 13:26 when Nehemiah invokes the memory of Solomon, whose transgressions of intermarriage and idolatry, according to DtrH, were responsible for the dissolution of the united monarchy of Israel. Solomon built the first temple but ended the united monarchy, a memory which must have resonated with the mnemonic communities of E-N who present themselves as the returned from exile responsible for the building projects of the restored Israel. Exile, building projects, and Torah not only serve as the basis for collective identity formation and function as safeguards against the pollution of the peoples of the land but also they are used to promote the core message of E-N, separation.
Chapter Three

Remembering What Was Not: Traumatic Memory, Loss, and Absence in 2 Maccabees

In this chapter, I focus on how the mnemonic community, or agents of memory, responsible for producing 2 Maccabees represents restoration and recovery from the traumatic events of the persecution by Antiochus IV as processes of cleansing and eliminating the impure part of the collective self (i.e., the Hellenizers). More specifically, I argue that the producer(s) of 2 Maccabees present the Maccabean heroes as a pure remnant that emerges from a brief exile in the wilderness (2 Macc. 5:27) in order to restore the ancestral traditions and purify a defiled land, city, and temple.

I do two things in this chapter. First, after discussing some mnemonic and metanarrative structures in the text, I interpret the memories and representations of Antiochus IV’s persecution of Judeans, attempted dissolution of Judean ancestral traditions, and defilement of the temple in 2 Maccabees as a founding trauma. As discussed in the first two chapters, LaCapra posits that the traumatic experiences of violence and persecution (2 Macc. 4:1-7:42; cf. 1 Macc. 1:20-63) that become the basis for founding traumas are typical of myths of origins—in this case, the Hasmonean dynasty and Ḥanukkah in 2 Maccabees. The persecution by Antiochus IV is represented as a rupture, which, again, is an ideal venue for exclusive identity construction. In 2 Maccabees, restoration after the attempted dissolution of Judean ancestral traditions and defilement of the temple marks the pure beginnings of Ἰουδαϊσμός under Hasmonean rule (2 Maccabees 8–10).
Second, I discuss the ways in which 2 Maccabees seeks to restore the loss of an original ethnic identity. In 2 Maccabees, the Maccabean heroes simultaneously are connected to the heroic past of Israel—such as Nehemiah, Jeremiah, and Solomon, who represent an original unity and identity (2 Macc. 1:18-2:13)—and are dissociated from the impure elements or contaminants in the social body who have abandoned the ancestral traditions (2 Macc. 4:1-6:11; 10:20-22; 12:39-42; 13:3-4; 7-8; 14:3-14, 26). Here, again, as discussed in the first two chapters, this process marks an oscillation between rupture and continuity.

Following LaCapra’s notion of converting absence (i.e., something that never was) into loss (i.e., specific events), which creates perceptions of an original unity or identity that has been polluted or contaminated, I look at the ways in which 2 Maccabees narrates the restoration of lost identity through the elimination of polluters and contaminators of the collective self that culminates in a call for collective return of Judeans from outside the

32 Again, following Mason, I use Ἰουδαῖος to signify an ethnic identity. However, it should be noted that Shaye Cohen sees a transition in Ἰουδαῖος, during the Hasmonean period, from an ethnic-geographic marker to a religious one. In this sense, Ἰουδαῖοι become Jews rather than Judeans. This association and semantic shift are based on citizenship and conversions of neighbouring Idumaeans and Ituraeans being modelled on membership in the Achaean League: “Behind the philological shift from ‘Judaean’ to ‘Jew’ is a significant development in the history of Judaism: the emergence of the possibility that a gentile could be enfranchised as a citizen in the household of Israel, either politically or religiously... I argue that under the influence of Hellenistic culture and politics the Hasmonaeans refashioned the Judaean state into a league that would allow the incorporation of non-Judeans. At more or less the same time, the progression from ethnicity to religion had advanced to the point where individual gentiles who came to believe in the God of the Jews were accepted as Jews themselves” (Cohen 1999: 3; for a complete version of this argument, see Cohen 1999: 125-37). Mason’s response to Cohen’s position is as follows: “Although he wishes to argue that Ἰουδαῖος from this period onward should often be rendered ‘Jew,’ he does not say why this should be so if (a), as he concedes, the newer senses do not supplant (but only supplement) the enduring ethnic meaning, and (b) the analogue Hellene does not undergo a change of translation, but still means ‘Greek’ with all of its complicated meanings in play (indeed, the ethnic-geographic sense of Hellene remains crucial throughout the ‘Second Sophistic’ at least); the analogy breaks down if ‘Hellene’ does not become a religious term as Ἰουδαῖος is said to do. Why change the translation of Ioudaios alone?” (Mason 2007: 495). In addition to Mason’s critique, with which I agree, ethnic boundary markers are fluid and constantly under negotiation. Thus, adopting and having overlap with certain identity markers of a proximate other does not equate to religious conversion. Moreover, what we identify as religion is merely one component of an ethnic identity in antiquity. For instance, Josephus uses the signifier Ἰουδαῖος in Against Apion in comparison and contrast to the other ethnicities: Babylonians, Egyptians, Chaldeans, Athenians, and Spartans (Esler 2009; Mason 2007). According to Josephus, each of these ethnicities has a homeland, a lawgiver and laws, ancestral customs, sacred texts, priests and aristocrats, and a citizenship (Mason 2007: 492-93).
homeland to Jerusalem to celebrate the purification (2 Macc. 1:27-29; 2:16-18). The contaminated part of the collective self in 2 Maccabees is represented by the figures of Simon, Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus, who abandon the ancestral traditions and commit injustices against their own people. In other words, the producers of 2 Maccabees mask structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence represented as the loss of an original unity or purity) in its representation of historical trauma (i.e., the persecution of Judeans, their ancestral traditions, and institutions, including the defilement of the temple).

1 2 Maccabees as a Founding Trauma

1.1 The Social Location of 2 Maccabees

Before exploring trauma and identity in 2 Maccabees, it is important to briefly discuss the date and social location of the text. Although 2 Maccabees is difficult to date, scholars posit that it was written between 124-63 B.C.E. The first letter prefixed (1:1-10a) requests that the Egyptian Judeans “keep the festival of booths in the month of Chislev, in the one hundred eighty-eighth year” (καὶ νῦν ἵνα ἁγγεί τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τοῦ Χασελεῦ μνήμος. ἐτοὺς ἐκατοστοῦ ὕγισεθνου καὶ ὕγισθοι) (1:9), which corresponds to 124 B.C.E. (see Doran 1981: 4, 111-13; Goldstein 1964: 147; Van Henten: 1997: 50-51). Moreover, because of the positive evaluations of Rome (11:34-38) and the assertion that Jerusalem is still in possession of the Hebrews (15:37), scholars agree that the text could not have been composed later than 63 B.C.E. (see Doran 1981: 112; Van Henten: 1997: 50-51).

33 All translations of 2 Maccabees are based on NRSV. I have made changes to the NRSV and included my own translations in certain places.
More specifically, scholars such as Robert Doran date the epitome to the early years of John Hyrcanus I (134-104 B.C.E.).

Although the two prefixed letters (1:1-10a; 1:10b-2:18) were composed separately from the epitomized narrative (chapters 3-15), a strong connection unites the letters and the narrative. In the words of Doran, “[w]hile the epitome, therefore, must be considered an independent work and studied as such, one will also have to agree that the final arrangement of the work with the two letters prefixed is no coincidence” (Doran 1981: 12). Both the letters and narrative inform each other by emphasizing the purification and restoration of the temple, as well as the establishment of the festival of Ḥanukkah in the month of Chislev (1:9, 18; 2:16-19; 10:1-8). According to Jan Willem Van Henten, “[t]he invitation to the Jews of Egypt to join in the new festival of booths is connected with the pattern of the narrative in 2 Macc. 3-15 which culminates in the foundation of a new festival. It is closely related to 2 Macc. 10:1-8, where the purification of the temple and the founding of the memorial feast is recounted” (Van Henten 1997: 45). Further to this point, Van Henten contends that the letters cannot be understood without the narrative. Otherwise, the invitation for Egyptian Judeans to celebrate the new Sukkoth does not make sense (Van Henten 1997: 46).

A lack of scholarly consensus also makes it difficult to socially locate 2 Maccabees. Cases can be made for the text being produced in either Alexandria or Jerusalem. For instance, despite that fact that John J. Collins maintains that a clear line cannot be drawn between the literature of “the Diaspora and that of Judea” and that 2 Maccabees “defies classification as either Palestinian or Diasporic” (Collins 2000: 17-18), he still classifies 2 Maccabees as a work produced in Alexandria (Collins 2000: 78-83). Erich Gruen also

---

34 Doran argues that since the positions for which 2 Maccabees advocates goes contrary to those adopted by Hyrcanus I (employing foreign mercenaries), son of the blundering Simon in 2 Macc. 10:20-22; 14:17), “2 Maccabees may point to a policy debate during the early years of Hyrcanus I” (Doran 1981: 112).
regards 2 Maccabees as a text produced in the diasporic community in Alexandria. Not surprisingly, Gruen points to the overly emphasized Hellenic discursive properties of 2 Maccabees—that is written in Greek “by a Jew imbued with Hellenic culture and fully familiar with the terminology and principles associated with the Greeks” (Gruen 2002: 175). However, it should not be assumed that 2 Maccabees must have been produced in Egypt because it was written in Greek, since it may have been composed by a Greek writer in Jerusalem. The Greek style of 2 Maccabees is little reason to assume that the text was composed outside Jerusalem, and its emphasis on the temple presents a strong case in favour of the possibility that it was produced in Jerusalem (Doran 1981: 111-12). Van Henten also attributes 2 Maccabees to Judean origins, as he posits that it was composed in Jerusalem by someone close to the Hasmonean court or the temple (Van Henten 1997: 50-53). He goes on to argue that “[t]he invitation of the Egyptian Jews to participate in a feast of liberation connected with the Jerusalem temple and the history as an explanation of this invitation implies that the work may have received its present form in Judea (Jerusalem)” (Van Henten 1997: 57).

I find the arguments in favour of Judean origins compelling for two reasons. First, the hope for a future return of all Judeans to Jerusalem (2:18) is not typical of many diasporic texts. Although Jerusalem and its temple were important to many diasporic Judeans, including Josephus and Philo, possession of or residence in the homeland were neither necessary nor desired. Commitment to a diasporic community and devotion to Jerusalem were not mutually exclusive endeavours. Neither Josephus nor Philo present a geographic restoration as a desired end. Diaspora is neither a punishment nor something to be overcome (Gruen 2002: 232-52). In fact, for Josephus and Philo, diasporic communities marked the
accomplishment of colonization. Just as Athens and Rome were the mother cities of their respective colonies, Jerusalem was the mother city of her colonies (C. Ap. 2.38-39; Flacc 46; Leg. 281) (see Gruen 2002: 242; Niehoff 2003: 37). Moreover, for Philo, diasporic communities are the result of the population of the ethnicity becoming too large for the homeland (Mos. 2.232; Flacc 46). Philo even refers to Alexandria as “our Alexandria” (Leg. 150). Further to this point, Esther G. Chazon identifies 2 Macc. 2:18, which alludes to Deut. 30:4, as a decidedly “Palestinian prayer” that transforms a “Deuteronomistic promise into a petition for an ingathering” (Chazon 2007: 170). From the texts she surveys—including 1Q34bis, 4Q448, 4Q504-506, 4Q507-4Q509, Sir. 36:13, Ps. Sol. 8:28, Neh. 1:8-9, 2 Macc. 1:27, and 2 Macc. 2:18—Chazon posits that the hope and petition for an ingathering in Jerusalem is prevalent in Palestinian prayers, but not in diasporic prayers. From these results she concludes that “this petition can be seen as a feature of Palestinian rather than Diaspora Jewish identity, and Palestinian rather than Diaspora Jewry would appear to have a special, vested interest in operatively petitioning for the return of all Jews to the Land of Israel” (Chazon 2007: 174).

Second, the Greek language in which 2 Maccabees is written does not presuppose that it was composed in diaspora. The assumption that all texts written in Greek are diasporic and all diasporic texts are written in Greek rests on circular reasoning. Further to this point, although Greek elements—language, narrative style, and imagery—of 2 Maccabees cannot be denied, the text also contains ancient Near Eastern and Israelite mnemonic and narrative structures, specifically the restorer of order topos and a Deuternomistic model of retribution. The founding trauma of Antiochus IV’s persecution is represented through these ancient Near Eastern mnemonic and narrative structures.
1.2 Near Eastern Mnemonic Schemas and Metanarrative Structures

The founding trauma of Antiochus IV’s persecution of Judeans and the defilement of the Jerusalem temple is framed with existing mnemonic schemas and metanarrative structures. This feature of 2 Maccabees should come as little surprise, as my discussions of Van der Kolk and Van der Hart, Hirsch, Rothberg, Yerushalmi, and the Zerubavels in Chapter 1 would suggest. Steven Weitzman (2004) shows the ways in which 2 Maccabees develops a myth of origins out of the ancient Near Eastern *topos* of the “restorer of order” (see Liverani 1973: 186-88). Perhaps the best known example of the restorer of order *topos* is the Cyrus Cylinder, which represents Cyrus as another Aššurbanipal and restorer of order of Babylon (See Kuhrt 1983: 83-97). In addition to Cyrus in the Cyrus Cylinder and the Verse Account of Nabonidus, Esarhaddon in the Babylonian Inscription of Esarhaddon, Hezekiah in Chronicles, and Cyrus in Chronicles are other examples of restorers of order in Near Eastern historiography (see Langille 2007: 123-37). In analyzing the ways in which the events of the persecution of Judeans by Antiochus IV are emplotted in 2 Maccabees, Weitzman explores the framework in which these events were narrated in the first place. Moreover, he looks at “the persistence of Babylonian cultural tradition in the Hellenistic period through the agency of the Seleucids who enlisted this tradition to legitimize their rule.” He concludes that “Babylonian narrative *topoi* were likely absorbed by Jewish writers in this period” (Weitzman 2004: 222-23). Weitzman’s contention that the Seleucids employed local metanarrative structures seems to be accurate. This being said, I do not agree with him that Seleucid rulers introduced the metanarrative structure of the restorer of order to Hellenistic Judean discourse. Chronicles, which is a pre-Seleucid text, employs the restorer of order *topos*. In my view, Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 29-32) is a restorer of order who follows
the disastrous reign of Ahaz (2 Chronicles 28), as is Cyrus in 2 Chron. 36:22-23 when he is
divinely elected to rebuild the temple after it is destroyed by the Chaldeans in 2 Chron.

In texts in which the restorer of order *topos* is employed, one king is represented as a
cultic restorer whereas the predecessor who is supplanted disrupts tradition, robs temples,
dislocates cult statues, and introduces illicit cultic practices (Weitzman 2004: 225). It is
important to recognize both the narrative pattern and the manner in which events are
emplotted, as a king’s actions must conform to the role he is given, whether that is a
disruptor or restorer of order (Weitzman 2004: 226). Kings such as Nabonidus in the Cyrus
Cylinder or Antiochus IV in 2 Maccabees are bound to look like bad kings because they are
framed as disruptors of order, whereas their restorer of order counterparts receive good
propaganda and political benefits from being framed in this tradition. According to
Weitzman, the image of an impious king robbing temples and disrupting tradition was
imposed on such kings by those who would supplant them (Weitzman 2004: 234).

Following Babylonian precedents, the emplotment of Antiochus IV’s persecution of
Judeans in the frame of the *topos* of the restorer of order is outlined as follows (Weitzman
being dedicated to Olympian Zeus in 6:2; 3) Antiochus IV compelling the Judeans to
participate in the Festival of Dionysus in 6:7; 4) Antiochus IV forcing Eleazar to eat swine’s
flesh in 6:18; 5) Antiochus IV ordering the mutilation and execution of Eleazar, the scribe, in
6:18-31. Weitzman concludes that Judean depictions of Seleucid rule absorbed elements
from Babylonian literary tradition, which included using the disruptor of order tradition
associated with Nabonidus as a way for framing Antiochus IV in the narrative. Weitzman’s
conclusion does not suggest that persecution did not occur, but whatever the king did to the Judeans “was subsequently emplotted according to a preexisting literary paradigm” (Weitzman 2004: 230). He adds that Antiochus IV almost certainly acted in ways that made it easier to frame him in the manner of a disruptor (Weitzman 2004: 234).

The Maccabean heroes, of course, act as the restorers of order who purify the cultic space and supplant the previous impious king, thereby legitimizing Hasmonean rule. As Weitzman notes, the restorer of order topos also justifies usurpation and displacement of an established ruler by a ruler(s) lacking traditional authority, a situation which seems to have been the case for the Maccabees (this element of Hasmonean rule is discussed in further detail below). Regardless, according to Weitzman, “the narrative of sacrilege allows for a kind of role reversal: the previous regime is recast as an enemy tradition, breaking the link between present and past, while the usurper moves into the breach as tradition’s defender” (Weitzman 2004: 231). Here, again, we find an oscillation and tension between rupture and continuity.

A second mnemonic schema and metanarrative structure is the Deuteronomistic model of retribution—sin/impurity, punishment, repentance, and restoration. This Deuteronomistic retributive model, of course, is associated with the temple and proper cultic activity. In fact Doran concludes the following: “What emerges from the literary analysis of 2 Maccabees? First and foremost is the Deuteronomistic theme that the invincible God of the Jews protects his temple and his people when they are loyal to him and good” (Doran 1981: 110). He divides 2 Maccabees into three parts: 1) The Repulse of Heliodorus (2 Macc. 3:1-40) 2) The Profanation of the Temple and its Renewal (2 Macc. 4:1-10:9) 3) The Defense of the Temple (2 Macc. 10:10-15:36) (Doran 1981: 47-76). According to Doran, the repulsion
of Heliodorus from the temple emphasizes that God protects the Jerusalem temple when the Judeans behave piously. This scene, of course, is juxtaposed with Antiochus IV’s plundering of the temple in 5:16. The reason that God does not defend the temple against Antiochus IV is explained in 5:17-20:

Antiochus was elevated in thought, and did not see that the Lord was angry briefly because of the sins of those who inhabited the city, on the account of which he was disregarding the holy place. But if it had not happened that they were committing many sins, just as Heliodorus had been, whom King Seleucus sent to inspect the treasury, this man would have been flogged and overturned from this boldness on the spot as soon as he came forward. But the Lord did not choose the nation for the sake of the holy place, but the place for the sake of the nation. Thus, the place itself shared in the misfortunes that befell the nation and thereafter participated shared in the kindness of the Lord, and what was forsaken in the wrath of the Almighty was restored again in all its glory when the great Lord became reconciled.

καὶ ἐμετσωρίζετο τὴν διάνοιαν ὁ Ἀντίοχος, οὗ συνορῶν ὃτι διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας τῶν τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων ἀπώργισται βραχέως ὁ Δεσπότης, διὸ γέγονεν περὶ τὸν τόπον παράρασις. εἰ δὲ μὴ συνέβαινε προσένεχεσθαι πολλοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι, καθάπερ ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος ὁ περιθέεις ὑπὸ Σελεύκου τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου, οὕτως περιθέεις παραχρήμα μαστιγωθεὶς ἀνετράπη τοῦ βράσους. ἀλλ’ οὗ διὰ τὸν τόπον τὸ ἔθνος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἔθνος τὸν τόπον ὁ Κύριος ἐξελέξατο. διὸ περὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τόπος συμμεταχῶν τῶν τοῦ ἔθνους δυσπεπτημάτων γενομένων, ὥστερον εὐεργετημάτων ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐκοινώνησε, καὶ ὁ καταληφθεὶς ἐν τῇ τοῦ Παντοκράτορος ὀργῇ πάλιν ἐν τῇ τοῦ μεγάλου Δεσπότου καταλλαγῇ μετὰ πάσης δέξης ἐπανωρθώθη.

Thus, according to 2 Maccabees, the impiety of the Judean people allowed Antiochus IV to violate the temple, and repentance assures its restoration.

The reflection in 2 Macc. 6:12-17, which functions as a preface to the martyrdom scenes in chapter 7, highlights that the sin of the people had reached its fullness (ἰνα μὴ πρὸς τέλος ἄφικομενῶν ἡμῶν τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν) (6:15) and emphasizes God’s mercy (διὸ περὶ οὐδέποτε μὲν τὸν ἔλεον αὐτοῦ ἄφ’ ἡμῶν ἀφίστησι) (6:16). The martyrdom scenes in 2 Maccabees 7 seem to function as a transition point in the narrative, after which God’s anger subsides and mercy is bestowed upon the Judeans. Chapter 8 begins with Judas and his companions pleading to God for mercy in 8:2-4:
They appealed to the Lord to look upon the people who were being trampled by all; and to have pity upon the temple that had been profaned by the godless people; to show mercy on the destroyed city destined to be leveled to the ground; to give heed to the blood that cried out to him; to remember also the lawless destruction of innocent babies and the blasphemies done against his name; and to hate the wicked.

καὶ ἐπεκαλοῦντο τὸν Κύριον ἐπὶ τὸν ὑπὸ πάντων καταπατούμενον λαόν, οἰκτείραι δὲ καὶ τὸν ναὸν τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁσεβῶν ἀνδρῶν βεβηλιωθέντα, ἐλεήσαι δὲ καὶ τὴν καταφθειρομένην πόλιν καὶ μέλλουσαν ισόπεδον γίνεσθαι καὶ τῶν καταβασίστων πρὸς αὐτὸν αἰμάτων εἰσαχοῦσαι, μνησθῆναι δὲ καὶ τῆς τῶν ἁναμαρτήτων νηπίων παρανόμου ἀπωλείας καὶ περὶ τῶν γενομένων εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ βλασφημῶν καὶ μισοπονηρῆσαι.

The result of the prayer is a military victory over Nicanor, for which God is responsible: “With the Almighty being their ally, they killed more than nine thousand of the enemy, and wounded and maimed the limbs of most of division of Nicanor’s army, and forced all of them to flee” (γενομένου δὲ αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παντοκράτορος συμμάχου, κατέσφαξαν τῶν πολεμίων ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἐνακισχίλους, τραυματίας δὲ καὶ τοῖς μέλεσιν ἀναπήρους τὸ πλείστον μέρος τῆς τοῦ Νικάνορος στρατιάς ἐποίησαν, πάντας δὲ φυγεῖν ἡμάγκασαν) (8:24).

Finally, the temple is purified and rededicated in 10:1-9, on the very same day that it was defiled by the Hellenizers. Doran concludes the following: “The rededication of the temple is thus seen as the symbol that God’s anger has indeed turned to mercy. The narrative of 2 Macc 8:1-10:8 is the response to the assault of evil described in 2 Macc 4:1-7:42” (Doran 1981: 61). In sum, 2 Maccabees contains two intertwining Near Eastern mnemonic and metanarrative structures—the restorer of order topos and Deuteronomistic model of retribution—that interface in issues dealing with the defilement and purification of the temple.
1.3 Narrating a Founding Trauma in 2 Maccabees

As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, the process of restoration in response to founding traumas includes a cleansing of the collective self. Throughout 2 Maccabees, impure members of the community are implicated as being ultimately responsible for the traumatic events of 167-164 B.C.E. and as having no place in the new beginnings and restored community. In other words, the restored temple community purges itself of these contaminants. As outlined above in the mnemonic and narrative structures, Antiochus IV is the figurehead of the persecution. However, when considering those culpable for the injustices and persecution, we see that figures like Simon, Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus abandon the ancestral traditions, commit injustices against their own people, and are responsible for many grievous Seleucid actions. Menelaus, in particular, is indicted as the great plotter against his fellow citizens (μέγας τῶν πολιτῶν έπιβουλος καθεστώς) (2 Macc. 4:50), a traitor to both the laws and his nation (τὸν Μενέλαον, τὸν καὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος προδότην γεγονότα) (2 Macc. 5:15), a worse ruler than others who did malice to his fellow Judeans (πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Μενέλαον, δὲ χείριστα τῶν ἄλλων ὑπερήφαντα τοῖς πολίταις, ἀπεχθῆ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας Ἰουδαίους ἔχων διάθεσιν) (2 Macc. 5:23), and the lawbreaker who defiled his own cult many times (πεὶ γὰρ συνετελέσατο πολλὰ περὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἀμαρτήματα) (2 Macc. 13:8).

Sylvie Honigman outlines the relationship between impious leaders of the community and the subsequent persecution, as the success of the community is contingent upon the high priest fulfilling his duties and responsibilities, which Jason and Menelaus fail to do, thereby threatening the collective well-being of the community (see 2 Macc. 4:14):
The narrative consistently creates an organic link between his figure [i.e., the high priest] and that of the king: pious high priests not only ensure peace and prosperity for the community (as Onias did; 3.1-3) and successfully avert pending disasters (3.4-40), they also bring good kings in their wake (Seleukos IV, in Onias’ case; 3.3). Wicked priests (Menelaos and Jason), on the contrary, bring disasters on the community, because they inescapably draw a wicked king (Antiochos IV) in their wake. The disasters that befell the community under wicked high priests, and through the agency of the wicked king, are spelled out in detail in the text. (Honigman 2011: 107)

Similarly, according to Van Henten, the wrongdoings and misdeeds of impious high priests put the entire community, including the martyrs, into a collective state of sin. The community suffers collectively (5:17-20), yet the Judean transgressions reported in 2 Maccabees are those of Simon, Jason, Menelaus, Lysimachus, Alcimus, and the idolatrous soldiers in 12:39-45. Importantly, Van Henten points out that this process is similar to that of the collective being punished for the transgressions of kings in DtrH and Chronicles (Van Henten 1997: 136-37).

Simon breaks the peaceful and law-observing era of the high priest Onias, during which time King Seleucus honoured and glorified the temple by bestowing upon it the finest gifts from his own revenues (2 Macc. 3:1-3). Simon’s betrayal of Judeans, the temple, and the ancestral traditions is prompted by a disagreement with Onias over the city market, and results in reports to Apollonius of Tarsus that the Jerusalem treasury contains unknown sums of money. Much to his dismay, Heliodorus is sent to collect the money on behalf of the king. After welcoming Heliodorus to Jerusalem, Onias tells him that the said money in the treasury belongs to widows and orphans (3:4-10). Before the dramatic Heliodorus affair, 2 Maccabees informs the reader that “the impious Simon had deceived by false accounts” (οὐχ ὁπέρ ἦν διαβάλλων ὃ δυσεβής Σίμων) (3:11).

The repulsion of Heliodorus from the temple is the direct result of the ideal reign of Onias, “when the holy city was inhabited in all peace and the laws were kept very well
because of the piety of the high priest Onias and his hatred to wickedness” (Τῆς ἀγίας τοῖν ἐπολεώς κατωκουμένης μετὰ πάσης εἰρήνης καὶ τῶν νόμων ἔτι κάλλιστα συντηρουμένων διὰ τὴν Ὀνίον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως εὐσέβειαν τε καὶ μισοπονηρίαν) (3:1). The reign of Onias and the divine protection of the people and the temple are juxtaposed with the later high priesthoods of Jason and Menelaus. In fact, Onias declares the temple “sacred and inviolable” (σεμνότητι καὶ ἁσυλίᾳ) in 3:12.  

Because of the piety of Onias, God protects the temple and repulses Heliodorus from the temple.

When he presented himself with his bodyguard there at the treasury, the Lord of the ancestors and master of all authority produced a great manifestation, so that all who were accompanying him were astounded by the power of God, fainted, and turned away in fear. For they saw a horse with a fearful rider mounted on it and the most beautiful equipment accompanying him were astounded by the power of God, excellent in bodily strength, most beautiful in glory, and distinguished in apparel; they stood on each side of him flogging him incessantly, striking him with many blows. (2 Macc. 3:24-26; cf. Hist. 8.37-39)

Despite the misdeeds of Seleucus and Heliodorus, the producer(s) of 2 Maccabees unequivocally identify the traitor Simon as being responsible for the events: “The Simon said

---

35 Importantly, in the Hellenistic period, foreign states could declare temples and entire cities to be “sacred and inviolable” in honour of that city’s god. The material record shows that, between the years 260 B.C.E. and 223-23 C.E., these spaces were declared ἁσυλιός (“inviolable”). Within these inviolable spaces, under the protection of a deity, people were immune to violence (Rigsby 1996: 1-3). However, ἁσυλιός was not established in Syria-Palestine before 145 B.C.E. Tyre was the first city in Syria-Palestine with the status “sacred and inviolable” (Rigsby 1996: 491-531). According to Kent Rigsby, it is unlikely that Jerusalem and its god, “among the less Hellenized of the important cities and cults of Palestine, achieved this honor at so early a date, before cities like Tyre or Seleucia, or indeed at all” (Rigsby 1996: 530-31). Steven Weitzman points out that the declaration of “sacred and inviolable” in 2 Macc. 3:12 represents Onias and the Judeans themselves protecting the inviolability of the Jerusalem temple without Seleucid consent (Weitzman 2005: 37).
beforehand, who had provided information about the money and the homeland, slandered Onias, by saying that it was he who set Heliodorus in motion and had brought about the plan of the misfortune. He dared to speak against the benefactor of the city, the protector of his own people, and zealous follower of the laws as the plotter of these deeds” (ὁ δὲ προειρημένος Σίμων, ὁ τῶν χρημάτων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἐνδείκτης γεγονός, ἐνακολούθηκε τὸν Ὄνιαν, ὡς αὐτὸς τε εἶχ τὸν Ἡλιόδωρον ἐπισεισικός καὶ τῶν κακῶν δημιουργός καθεστηκός, καὶ τὸν εὐεργέτην τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὸν κηδεμόνα τῶν ὀμοθνῶν καὶ ζηλωτὴν τῶν νόμων ἐπίβουλον τῶν πραγμάτων ἐτόλμα λέγειν) (4:1-2).

Upon the death of Seleucus, Antiochus IV becomes king and Jason, the brother of Onias, corruptly attains the high priesthood through bribery (4:7-9), which marks a transition in the text because “[w]hen the king assented and Jason came to office, he at once shifted his compatriots over to the Greek way of life” (ἐὐθέως ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν) (4:10). After Jason destroys the lawful ways of living and replaces them with ways of living that went contrary to the laws (4:11), “[t]here was such a flourishing of Ἑλληνισμός and adoption of foreign ways because of the excessive wickedness of Jason, who was profane/ungodly and no high priest, so that the priests no longer performed their public service at the altar” (ἦν δ’ οὗτος ἀκμή τις Ἑλληνισμοῦ καὶ πρόσβασις ἀλλοφυλισμοῦ διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀσβοῦς καὶ οὐκ ἄρχιερέως Ἰάσωνος ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀναγείναν, ὥστε μηκέτι περὶ τὰς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λειτουργίας προθύμους εἶναι τοὺς ἱερεῖς) (4:13-14). Jason’s usurpation of the high priesthood represents the initial contamination of the collective self, which was in a state of peace, purity, and prosperity during the time of Onias. Following Honigman, the well-being of the community is contingent upon the high priest properly fulfilling his role, and Jason marks the beginning of the breakdown of this contingent structure as he defiles both the high priesthood and the
community. The catastrophic consequences of Jason’s high priesthood occur almost immediately: “For this reason heavy disaster crushed them, and those whose ways of being they admired and wished to emulate entirely became their enemies and captors. It is no light thing to acts impiously towards the divine laws—a fact that the subsequent events will exhibit” (ὡς χάριν περιέσχεν αὐτούς χαλεπῆ περίστασις, καὶ ὃν ἔξηλον τὰς ἀγωγάς καὶ καθάπαν ἦθελον ἔξομοιοῦσθαι, τούτους πολεμίους καὶ τιμωρητάς ἔσχον· ἁσβείν γὰρ εἰς τοὺς θείους νόμους οὐ ράδιον, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα ὁ ἀκόλουθος καιρὸς δηλώσει) (4:16-17).

From this point, the contamination and defilement proliferate and intensify. Menelaus, the brother of the previously mentioned Simon, outbids Jason for the high priesthood (4:23-24). Menelaus is described as “offering nothing worthy of the high priesthood, but having the wrath of a cruel tyrant and the temper of a barbarous wild animal” (τῆς μὲν ἁρχιερωσύνης οὐδὲν ἠξίων φέρων, θυμοὺς δὲ ὃμοιο τυράννου καὶ θηρὶς βαρβάρου ὀργὰς ἔχων) (4:25). Jason goes into exile in Ammon (4:26), and Menelaus begins his unprecedented assault on the people, temple, and cult by stealing gold vessels from the temple (4:32), selling other vessels to Tyre and neighbouring cities (4:32), and having Onias murdered when the pious former high priest discovers and exposes his injustices and crimes (4:33-34). To further highlight the wickedness of Menelaus, Greeks are appalled by and outraged at the murder of Onias. Even Antiochus IV laments the loss of the former high priest “because of the moderation and great discipline of the deceased” (διὰ τὴν τοῦ μετηλαχότος σωφροσύνην καὶ πολλῆν εὐταξίαν) (4:37). In response, Antiochus IV has Andronicus, whom Menelaus had kill Onias, executed in the exact same spot where he had disposed of Onias (4:38). It is here that the narrator declares that “[t]he Lord thus repaid him with the worthy punishment” (τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν ἀξία αὐτῷ κόλασιν ἀποδόντος) (4:38). This declaration signals that God had not
yet completely abandoned the Judeans, so hope remained. However, again, things go from bad to worse, as Menelaus continues his assault on and defilement of the community.

Lysimachus, under the orders of Menelaus, commits numerous acts of sacrilege against the temple, but meets his ultimate demise near the treasury (αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν ἱερὸν παρὰ τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον ἑχειρώσαντο) (4:39-42). Again, Menelaus himself eludes detection and punishment while those under his control are not so fortunate. Even when charges are brought against him for the incident, “Menelaus, the cause of all the misfortune, he acquitted him of all charges, while he sentenced to death those suffering men, who would have been set free uncondemned if they had spoken before Scythians. And so those who had supported the city and the villages and the holy vessels quickly suffered the unjust penalty” (καὶ τὸν μὲν τῆς ὁλῆς κακίας Μενέλαον ἀπέλυσε τῶν κατηγορημάτων, τοῖς δὲ ταλαιπώροις, οὕτως, εἴ καὶ ἐπὶ Σκυθῶν ἔλεγον, ἀπελύθησαν ἄν ἀκατάγνωστοι, τούτοις θάνατον ἐπέκρινε. ταχέως οὖν τὴν ἄδικον ζημίαν ὑπέσχον οἱ ὑπὲρ πόλεως καὶ δήμων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν προαγορεύσαντες) (4:47-48). Because of all of his injustices, Menelaus receives the following scathing evaluation: “But Menelaus, because of the greed of those in power, stayed in office, growing in wickedness, having become the great plotter against his fellow citizens” (ὁ δὲ Μενέλαος διὰ τὰς τῶν κρατοῦντων πλεονεξίας ἔμενεν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπιφυόμενος τῇ κακίᾳ, μέγας τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπίβουλος καθεστῶς) (4:50). This evaluation signals to the reader that the injustices against the people and the temple will continue to proliferate because Menelaus is still in office and is growing in wickedness. It is here that Menelaus secures his notoriety as the chief contaminant of the community and the biggest threat to the temple and the ancestral traditions.
The actions of Jason and Menelaus lead to much civil strife and bloodshed in Jerusalem. Upon hearing a false rumour that Antiochus IV had died during a military campaign in Egypt, Jason attacks the city with no fewer than 1,000 men in attempt to reclaim the high priesthood (5:5). While Menelaus takes refuge in the citadel, Jason brutally slaughters his fellow citizens (ὁ δὲ Ἰάσων ἐποιεῖτο σφαγὰς τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν ἰδίων ἀφειδῶς), “not thinking that prosperity at the cost of one’s kindred is the greatest misery, but envisioning that he was laying down trophies of victory over enemies and not over his own people” (οὐ συννοών τὴν εἰς τοὺς συγγενεῖς εὐημερίαν δυσημερίαν εἶναι τὴν μεγίστην· δοξῶν δὲ πολεμίων καὶ οὐχ ὁμοεθνῶν τρόπαια καταβάλλεσθαι) (5:6). This evaluation is a damning indictment of Jason and epitomizes his actions in general. As in the cases of Andronicus and Lysimachus, and what will soon be the case for Menelaus, Jason’s punishment matches his crimes—that is, divine retribution is measured and proportionate (see Van Henten 1997: 166). Jason, the butcher of his own people (ὁ δὲ Ἰάσων ἐποιεῖτο σφαγὰς τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν ἰδίων ἀφειδῶς), again flees into exile in Ammon before being pursued from city to city by everyone because he was “hated as a deserter of the laws, and loathed as the public executioner of his homeland and its citizens” (στυγούμενος ὡς τῶν νόμων ἀποστάτης καὶ βδελυσσόμενος ὡς πατρίδος καὶ πολιτῶν δήμιος) (5:8). We are told that, in the end, “he received only disgrace for his plot” (τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς αἰσχύνην λαβών) (5:7). Moreover, after dying and being left unburied in the foreign land of Egypt, the final evaluation of Jason is as follows: “He who had banished many from their homeland died in a foreign land, having retreated to the Lacedaemonians so that he could obtain protection because of their kinship. He who had cast out many unburied was not lamented himself; he had no funeral whatsoever and no ancestral burial rites/no place in an ancestral tomb” (καὶ ὁ
συχνούς τῆς πατρίδος ἀποζενώσας ἐπὶ ξένης ἀπώλετο πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἀναχθεὶς ὡς διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τευξόμενος σκέψεις. καὶ ὁ πλήθος ἀτάφων ἐκρίψας ἀπένθητος ἐγενήθη καὶ κηδείας οὐδ’ ἠστινοσοῦν οὔτε πατρῶν τάφου μετέσχε) (5:9-10). It is interesting that Jason is exiled and dies without proper ancestral burial in Egypt, given that the prefixed letters are addressed to the Judeans in Egypt, asking them to join in the celebration and commemoration of the purification of the temple and the community. In other words, the contaminant, who defiled the temple and butchered his own people, ends up in a permanent state of exilic punishment without access to ancestral rights, whereas others who are viewed as part of the pure collective self are petitioned to gather in the now purified ancestral place of Jerusalem, which Jason had previously contaminated. The prefixed letters are the foundation for the recovery of pure and unified collective identity.

Despite the account of his death, Jason’s legacy of defilement and discord continues because Antiochus IV interpreted Jason and Menelaus’ civil strife and power struggle over the high priesthood to mean that Judah was in revolt. Antiochus IV responds by storming the city and massacring the people, with a total of 80,000 being killed in three days and with just as many being sold into slavery (6:11-13). Again, the ultimate spark of this massacre was the internal strife between Jason and Menelaus. Then the narrator notes that the Antiochus IV was not satisfied with the massacre, so “he dared to enter the most holy temple of all the earth, with Menelaus, who had become a traitor to both the laws and his nation, being his guide” (καὶ οὐκ ἄρχεθεις δὲ τοῦτος κατετόλμησεν εἰς τὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς ἁγιώτατον ἱερὸν εἰσελθεῖν, ὥσπερ ἔχων τὸν Μενέλαον, τὸν καὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος προδότην γεγονότα) (5:15). As in previous atrocities, Menelaus here is implicated as guiding the numerous injustices and violations against the people, the temple, and the ancestral traditions. At this
point in the narrative, Antiochus IV, guided by Menelaus, steals the holy vessels with his polluted hands without being cognizant that the reason that he was able to do so is that God had abandoned his sacred place because of the sins of the people (καὶ ἐμετεωρίζετο τὴν διάνοιαν ὁ Ἀντίοχος, οὐ συνορῶν ὅτι διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῶν τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων ἀπώργισται βραχέως ὁ Δεσπότης, διὸ γέγονε περὶ τὸν τόπον παρόρασις) (5:16-17). The community is collectively responsible for the sins of Jason and Menelaus, and the narrator reminds the reader of the Heliodorus affair, as Antiochus IV too would have been repulsed had the people not sinned so greatly (εἰ δὲ μὴ συνέβαινε προσενέχεσθαι πολλοῖς ἁμαρτήμασι, καθάπερ ὁ Ἡλιόδωρος ὁ πεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Σελεύκου τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπὶ τὴν ἑπίσκεψιν τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου, οὗτος προαχθεὶς παραχρῆμα μαστιγωθεὶς ἀνετράπη τοῦ θράσους) (5:18).

After the temple is defiled and the Judean ancestral traditions are suppressed (5:25-26), Judas and about nine others flee into the wilderness (Ἰούδας δὲ ὁ Μακκαβαῖος δέκατὸς που γενηθεὶς καὶ ἀναχωρήσας εἰς τὴν ἔρημον) “so that they might not share in the defilement” (πρὸς τὸ μὴ μετασχεῖν τοῦ μολυσμοῦ) (5:27). Exile in the wilderness can be either a space of punishment, as is the case with Jason, or space for purification, which is the case for Judas and his followers (see Najman 2006). Again, we begin to see positive evaluations of exile and wilderness, which are synonymous terms, as places of purification, revelation, and the establishment of normative tradition during the Second Temple period (see Najman 2006). Within this context, a defiled and corrupt Jerusalem becomes the antitype of the regenerative space of the exilic wilderness. Judas leads the process of restoration and purification in Jerusalem, before which he must go into the wilderness in order to be removed from the defilement. Anatheia Portier-Young highlights the parallels between Judas and Moses, the prototype of the restoring and liberating figure who flees into the wilderness (Exod. 2:15).
Both Judas and Moses are in the wilderness when God acknowledges the suffering of the people before calling on them to deliver the people (2 Macc. 8:1; Exod. 3:1-10) (Portier-Young 2011: 168-69).

By analogy with the era of the exodus from Egypt, the retreat into the wilderness of Judea marked the beginning of the new deliverance for God’s people. For the authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees, it was a key moment in the narrative of resistance to Antiochus, marking as well the emergence of new leaders who would deliver God’s people from their oppression (cf. T. Mos. 1:4-10; 9:6-7). (Portier-Young 2011: 169)

Here, again, we see another mnemonic schema and cultural framework informing processes of memory, transmission, and representation. Before Judas emerges out of the wilderness and begins the restoration process, the martyrdom scenes mark the transitional stage of repentance.

An Athenian senator compels the Judeans to forsake their ancestral traditions (i.e., the laws of their ancestors and their god), pollute the Jerusalem temple, and dedicate the temple to Olympian Zeus (ὁ βασιλεὺς γέροντα Ἀθηναίων ἀναγκάζειν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους μεταβαίνειν ἐκ τῶν πατρίων νόμων καὶ τοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμοις μὴ πολιτεύεσθαι, μιλύναι δὲ καὶ τὸν ἔν Ἱεροσολύμοις νεών καὶ προσονόμασαι Διὸς Ὠλυμπίου καὶ τὸν ἐν Γαρίζιν, καθὼς ἐτύγχανον οἱ τὸν τόπον οἰκούντες, Διὸς Ξενίου) (6:1-2). The temple is then filled with debauchery—i.e., the nations (ἐθνη) fornicating with prostitutes in the sacred precincts—and the altar is defiled by objects prohibited by the ancestral traditions (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἱερὸν ἁπτώτις καὶ κώμων ἐπεπλήρωτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἔθνων ραθυμοῦντων μεθ’ ἐταιρῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς περιβάλλοις γυναιξι πλησιαζόντων, ἔτι δὲ τὰ μὴ καθῆκοντα ἐνδον φερόντων) (6:4). Furthermore, neither the sabbath nor ancestral festivals could be observed (ἡν δ’ οὖτε σαββατίζειν οὐτε πατρίως ἑορτάς διαφυλάττειν οὔτε ἀπλῶς Ἰουδαίου ὡμολογεῖν εἶναι) (6:6), and Judeans were forced to participate in Greek rituals and festivals (οἱ Ἰουδαίοι κισσοῦς ἔχοντες πομπεύειν τῷ Διονύσῳ)
(6:7). These sorts of policies spread throughout the land beyond Jerusalem (6:8), and Judeans were tortured and killed for not accepting the Hellenizing ways (τοὺς δὲ μὴ προαιρουμένους μεταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ κατασφάξειν), including women being persecuted for having their children circumcised (6:9-11). It is at this point that narrator reveals the following:

Now I urge those who read this book not to be depressed by such calamities, but to recognize that these punishments were not designed to destroy but discipline our people. In fact, it is a sign of great kindness not to let the impious alone for long, but to punish them immediately. For in the case of the other nations the Lord waits patiently to punish them until they have reached their full measure of sins; but he does not deal this way with us, in order that we may not take vengeance on us afterward when our sins have reached their height. Therefore he never withdraws his mercy from us. Although he disciplines us with calamities, he does not forsake his own people. Let what we have said serve as a reminder; we must go on briefly with this story. (6:12-17)

Παρακαλῶ οὖν τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας τῇ δὲ τῇ βίβλῳ, μὴ συστέλλεσθαι διὰ τὰς συμφορὰς, λογιζέσθαι δὲ τὰς τιμωρίας μὴ πρὸς ὀλέθρου, ἀλλὰ πρὸς παιδείαν τὸ γένους ἡμῶν εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ τὸ μὴ πολὺν χρόνον ἔδοξαι τοὺς δυσεξούσιας, ἀλλ’ εὐθὺς περιπίπτειν ἐπιτιμίας, μεγάλης ἐνεργείας σημεῖόν ἐστιν. οὐ γὰρ καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν ἀναμένει μακροθυμίαν οὐ δεσπότης μέχρι τοῦ καταντήσαντας αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἔκπληξιν ἄμαρτων κολάσαι, οὕτω καὶ έφ’ ἡμῶν ἐκρίνει εἶναι, ἵνα μὴ πρὸς τέλος ἀφικομένων ἡμῶν τῶν ἄμαρτων ὑποτρόπου ἡμᾶς ἑκδίκησα. διότι οὐδέποτε μὲν τὸν ἔλεον αὐτοῦ ἄφετό ἡμῶν ἀφίσθητι, παιδεύων δὲ μετὰ συμφορᾶς οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπει τὸν ἐαυτόν λαόν. πλὴν ἐως ὑπομνῆσως ταῦτ’ ἡμῖν εἰρήσῳ· δι’ ἀλλών δ’ ἐλευστέον ἐπὶ τὴν διήγησιν.

The impious members of the Judean people—namely Simon, Jason, Menelaus, and Lysimachus—brought divine retribution upon the collective. However, this divine retribution will be withdrawn before the Judeans are destroyed completely. This being said, the impious members will be punished and eliminated from the social body during the process of restoration, which begins with transitional stage of repentance and the martyrdom scenes from 6:18-7:42.

In 6:18, the noble scribe Eleazar, whom the Hellenizers try to force feed swine’s flesh, welcomes death rather than life with pollution (ὁ δὲ τὸν μετ’ εὐκλείας θάνατον μᾶλλον ἡ τὸν μετὰ μύσους βιον ἀναδεξάμενος, αὐθαιρέτως ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον προσῆγε, προπτύσας δὲ)
We learn that he was dignified in his old age and had lived a virtuous life, according to God’s law (ἐπιφανοῦς πολιάς καὶ τῆς ἐκ παιδός καλλιστῆς ἀναστροφῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ θεοκτίστου νομοθεσίας ἀκολούθως ἀπεφήματο) (6:23). Eleazar rejects all pleas for him to save his own life and demands that the Hellenizers send him to Hades instead (ταχέως λέγων προπέμπειν εἰς τὸν ᾠδήν) (6:22-23). In doing so, Eleazar becomes an exemplary figure (for more on Eleazar as an exemplary figure, see Van Henten 1997: 25, 229-31, 268), which is evident in his speech: “Therefore, by bravely/manfully exchanging life now, I will reveal myself worthy of my old age by leaving to the young a noble example of how to die a good death willingly and nobly for the revered and holy laws” (διόπερ ἀνδρείως μὲν νῦν διαλλάξας τὸν βίον τοῦ μὲν γῆρως ἀξίως φανήσομαι, τοῖς δὲ νέοις ὑπόδειγμα γενναῖον καταλελοίως εἰς τὸ προθύμως καὶ γενναῖος ὑπὲρ τῶν σεμνῶν καὶ ἁγίων νόμων ἀπευθανατίζειν) (6:27-28). Further to this point, the narrator informs the reader that in Eleazar dying this way, he left an example of nobility and a memory of courageousness for both the young and the nation collectively (καὶ οὕτως οὖν τούτων τὸν ἀντιπατρίαν ἀρετῆς καταλιπὼν εἰς τοὺς πλείστους τὸν ἐθνὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βάνατον ὑπόδειγμα γεναιότητος καὶ μνημόσυνον ἀρετῆς καταλιπών) (6:31).

This pattern continues into 2 Maccabees 7, when one of the seven brothers declares that they are “ready to die rather than transgress the ancestral laws” (τοιμοὶ γὰρ ἀποβυθήσειν ἐσμὲν ἢ παραβαίνειν τοὺς πατρίους νόμους) (7:2). Furthermore, in 2 Macc. 7:20, the mother of the seven sons is the exemplary figure par excellence who leaves a most honourable memory. She courageously faced the deaths of her seven sons in one day and encouraged each of them in their ancestral language (παρεκάλει τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ γενναῖῳ) (7:20-21).
After the gruesome deaths of the first six brothers, Antiochus IV attempts to entice the youngest brother “with oaths that he would make him rich and enviable if he would turn from the ancestral laws, and that he would take him for his friend and entrust him with services” (di’ ὅρκων ἐπίστου ἀμα πλουτιείν καὶ μακαριστόν ποιήσειν μεταθέμενον ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων νόμων καὶ φίλον ἐξειν καὶ χρείας ἐμπιστεύσειν) (7:24). However, in contrast to Jason and Menelaus, the youngest son is not susceptible to abandoning the ancestral traditions in favour of bribery and financial gain, as he marks the transition to purification and restoration.

In this sense, not only is the youngest brother an exemplary figure, but he also functions as an antitype to Jason and Menelaus. After the youngest son rejects Antiochus IV’s offer, the Seleucid king calls on the mother to persuade her son to save his life (7:25-26), to which she responds by telling her son the following in Hebrew: “Do not fear this butcher (μὴ φοβηθῇς τὸν δῆμον τούτον), but prove worthy of your brothers. Accept death, so that in God’s mercy I may get you back along with your brothers” (7:29). Importantly, Antiochus IV is called a δῆμος, which corresponds to the word used to describe Jason’s slaughter (σφαγας) of his own people in 5:6 (ὁ δὲ Ἰάσων ἐποιεῖτο σφαγὰς τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν ἰδίων ἀφειδῶς). As an exemplary figure, the youngest son, of course, responds by asserting the following: “I will not submit to the king’s command, but I obey the command of the law, which was given to our ancestors through Moses. But you, who have invented every evil against the Hebrews, will certainly not escape the hands of God, for we are suffering because of our own sins” (σὺ υπακούω τοῦ προστάγματος τοῦ βασιλέως, τοῦ δὲ προστάγματος ἀκούω τοῦ νόμου τοῦ δοκεόντος τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν διὰ Μωσείου. σὺ δὲ πάσης κακίας εὑρεθῆς γενόμενος εἰς τοὺς Ἑβραίους, οὐ μὴ διαφύγῃς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ Θεοῦ. ἡμεῖς γὰρ διὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἀμαρτίας πάσχομεν) (7:30-32). Here, the command (προστάγματος) of the ancestors through
Moses and that of the Seleucid king are diametrically opposed (see Van Henten 1997: 202). Like the other six sons, the youngest son and the mother sacrifice their bodies and lives for the laws of the ancestors (σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν προδίδωμι περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων) (7:37, 41).

It is important to reemphasize, at this point, Van Henten’s point about the relationship between the sins of the impious contaminants in the social body and those of the collective nation:

The wicked deeds of the Jewish leaders have led the whole people including the martyrs into a state of sin. This explains why the youngest brother can say at 2 Macc. 7:38 that the wrath of the Lord “has justly fallen on the whole nation”. The godless actions of Simon, Jason, Menelaus, Lysimachus, Alcimus and the unfaithful soldiers of Judas are the only sins of the Jews reported in 2 Maccabees. (Van Henten 1997: 136-37)

The speech of the youngest son (7:30-38) establishes the framework for both the forthcoming restoration by Judas and the punishment of Antiochus IV and the Hellenizers. Judas re-enters the narrative at the beginning of chapter 8 and begins the process of restoration that cleanses and eliminates the Hellenizing contaminants in the social body. Now that the collective sin has begun to be purified through the acts of martyrdom, so too must the sources of that sin be eliminated. In 2 Macc. 8:1, Judas and his compatriots secretly enter villages and gather 6,000 people who continued to follow Ἰουδαίσμος (τοὺς συγγενεῖς καὶ τοὺς μεμενηκότας ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίσμῳ προσλαβόμενοι συνήγαγον εἰς ἑξακισχιλίους). Judas and his group of Judaizers (see Mason 2007) appeal to the Lord to have mercy on the oppressed people, the temple, which had been profaned by the impure (βεβηλωθέντα), and the destroyed city (τὴν καταφθειρόμενην πόλιν) (8:2-3). Moreover, they implore the Lord to give heed to the blood that cried out to him, to remember the lawless destruction of infants and the blasphemies committed against his name, and to show his hatred of the wicked (μνησθῆναι δὲ καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀναμαρτήτων νηπίων παρανόμου ἀπωλείας καὶ περὶ τῶν γενομένων εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
The nations are overmatched once Judas organizes his army and the wrath of the Lord turns to mercy, as Judas and his army romp over their adversaries.

Upon word of Nicanor’s invasion, some members of Judas’ army abandon him, but Judas exhorts those 6,000 who remained faithful to God not to fear the great multitude of the nations coming against them but fight nobly. As Gruen notes, the παμφύλων ἔθνη in 8:9 and the αὐτοὺς ἐθνῶν πολυπληθίαν in 8:16 refer to enemies dwelling in the lands around Judea well before the arrival of Alexander the Great that are “a motley assemblage of peoples” comprised of various ethnicities (Gruen 1998: 5). Judas also calls on his army to see the impious/lawless violence committed against the holy place, the torture endured by the city, and the dissolution of the ancestral constitution. Judas further reminds his army that the Almighty God will strike down anyone who challenges them, just as he struck down 185,000 of Sennacherib’s men, thereby keying into an earlier site of ancient Israelite memory when divine providence delivered an overmatched people. His words convince the army to defend themselves with courage and prepare to die for their laws and country.

As a result of having the Almighty as an ally, according to 2 Maccabees, Judas and his army killed more than 9,000 enemies and destroyed most of Nicanor’s army.
sabbath and then give some of the spoils to the persecuted, widows, and orphans after the sabbath (μετὰ δὲ τὸ σάββατον τοῖς ἡκισμένοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς μερίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων, τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἐμερίσαντο) (8:25-28). Similarly, after killing more than 20,000 in the armies of Timothy and Bacchides and taking possession of strongholds and much plunder, the Judaizers give equal shares to the persecuted, orphans, widows, and elderly (8:30). Subsequently, the Judaizers seek retributive justice against their persecutors. First, they kill the commander of Timothy’s forces, a most profane man who had caused the Judeans much affliction (ἀνοσιώτατον ἄνδρα καὶ πολλὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐπιλευκηκότα). While celebrating their victory in their homeland, they burn Callisthenes and the others who had set fire to the holy gates. According to the narrator, these people received requital proportionate to their impiety (οἵτινες ἀξίων τῆς δυσσεβείας ἐκομίσαντο μισθόν) (8:33). Again, 2 Maccabees has a strong correspondence between crime and punishment. At this point in the narrative, the Judeans are invulnerable because they follow the laws commanded by God (ἀτρώτους εἶναι τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, διὰ τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ προστεταγμένοις νόμοις) (8:36); thus, they are returned to the previous state they enjoyed in chapter 3.

The themes of retributive justice and the invulnerability of the Judeans continue into chapter 9 with the death of Antiochus IV. Having been chased out of Persepolis for attempting to rob temples, Antiochus IV learns of the defeat of the armies of Nicanor and Timothy (9:1-3). Responding to the news with rage, Antiochus IV travels to Jerusalem, and wanting to take out on the Judeans the anger and shame of his defeat in Persia, he arrogantly declares the following: “I will make Jerusalem a cemetery of Judeans when I arrive there” (πολυάνδριον Ἰουδαίων Ἰεροσόλυμα ποιήσω παραγενόμενος ἐκεῖ) (9:4). However, divine judgment accompanied him on his frenzied trip to Jerusalem (9:4), and the all-observing
Lord, God of Israel (πανεπόπτης Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ), struck him with an incurable bowel disease, from which there was no relief (9:5; cf. 2 Chron. 21:18-19). Again, here we have a strong association between crime and punishment (i.e., the punishment is very entirely just—πάνυ δικαίως τὸν πολλαῖς), because the narrator reminds the reader that Antiochus IV had caused misfortune on the inward part of others with strange afflictions (ξενιζούσαις συμφοραῖς ἐτέρων σπλάγχνα βασανίσαντα) (9:6). However, Antiochus IV’s condition did quell his arrogance and rage against Judea.

As a result, he had a terrible fall from his speeding chariot en route to Jerusalem (9:7). This man of consummate boastfulness (ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπον ἀλαζονείαν), who thought that he could command the waves of the sea and weigh the mountains in a balance, was humbled and further afflicted with swarming worms and rotting flesh, to the point that his entire army was repulsed by his decay (9:8-9). Once the Seleucid king no longer was able to endure his own stench, his arrogance subsided and he acknowledged divine power and authority (δίκαιον ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ ὧπο τὸν ὄντα ἴσθεα φρονεῖν ὑπερηφάνως) (9:12). Moreover, Antiochus IV made a deathbed repentance in which he declared Jerusalem a free city (λευθέραν ἀναδείξαι) and the people equal to citizens of Athens (ἀντας αὐτοὺς ἰσοὺς Ἀθηναίους ποιήσειν) (9:15). Additionally, the repentant king said that he would adorn the temple with the finest offerings, return the holy vessels, and pay for sacrifices from his own revenue (ὅν δὲν πρότερον ἐσκύλευσεν ἀγιον νεὼν καλλίστοις ἰσαμίσασι κοσμήσειν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ σκεύη πολυπλάσια πάντα ἀποδώσασιν, τὰς δὲ ἐπιβαλλούσας πρὸς τὰς θυσίας συντάξεις ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων προσόδων χορηγήσειν) (9:16). Finally, he indicted that he would become a Judean and visit every place to proclaim the authority of God (πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοι καὶ Ἰουδαίου ἐσεθαί καὶ
πάντα τόπον οἰκητόν ἐπελεύσεσθαι καταγγέλλοντα τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κράτος) (9:17). Despite his repentance, there was no reversing the divine judgment that had already come upon him (ἐπεληλύθει γὰρ ἐπὶ αὐτὸν δικαία ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίσις) (9:18).

Antiochus IV’s actions and transgressions were informed and guided by Jason and Menelaus. Further to this point, neither Jason nor Menelaus repented for their injustices, thus depicting Antiochus IV more positively than the impious high priests. In his letter to the Judeans, Antiochus IV referred to observing his father (9:23), who was a good king towards the Judeans, and stated that his successor will treat them fairly and humanely (ἐπιεικῶς καὶ φιλανθρώπως) (9:27). Ultimately, Antiochus IV, the murderer and blasphemer (ἀνδροφόνος καὶ βλάσφημος), met a most pitiable fate in the mountains of a foreign land (ἐπὶ ξένης ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν οἰκτίστω μόρφω κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον) (9:28), just like Jason had before him (5:8-10), but without receiving an evaluation as negative as that of Menelaus (4:50).

In 2 Maccabees, the death of Antiochus IV marks the beginning of the restoration process of the rededication of the temple. Unlike 1 Maccabees, in which Antiochus IV dies after the rededication of the temple, 2 Maccabees places the death of the Seleucid king before the rededication of the temple and uses literary-chronological proximity (see Kalimi 1993) to create a succession of cause and effect events: Antiochus IV’s persecution, his punishment, his repentance, his death, and the subsequent rededication of temple. Immediately after Antiochus IV’s death, Judas and his followers restore the temple and the city, under the guidance of the Lord (Μακκαβαῖος δὲ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, τοῦ Κυρίου προάγοντος αὐτούς, τὸ μὲν ἱερὸν ἐκομίσαντο καὶ τὴν πόλιν) (10:1). During the process of restoration, they begin to purge the physical markers of impurity by tearing down the foreign altars that had been built in the agora (τοὺς δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν βωμοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλοφύλων δεδημιουργημένους) and
removing the sacred precincts (ἔτι δὲ τεμένη καθείλον) (10:2). Thereafter, following a lapse of two years, they purify the temple, make another altar, use a stone to light a fire for sacrifices, offer burnt offerings, incense, and lamps, and make unleavened bread (καὶ τὸν νεῶν καθαρίσαντες ἔτερον θυσιαστήριον ἐποίησαν καὶ πυρώσαντες λίθους καὶ πῦρ ἐκ τούτων λαβόντες, ἀνήγεγκαν θυσίαν μετὰ διετή χρόνον καὶ θυμίαμα καὶ λίχνους καὶ τῶν ἄρτων τὴν πρόθεσιν ἐποίησαντο) (10:3).

Of course, the cleansing and rededication of the temple happened on the exact same day that the temple had been profaned by foreigners, the twenty-fifth of Chislev (ἐν ἣ δὲ ήμέρᾳ ὁ νεῶς ὑπὸ ἀλλοφύλων ἐβεβηλώθη, συνέβη κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ήμέραν τὸν καθαρισμὸν γενέσθαι τοῦ ναοῦ, τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός, ὡς ἐστὶ Χασελεύ) (10:5). The celebration lasted for eight days, just like the festival of booths (σκηνωμάτων τρόπον) and called to mind that a brief time earlier they were inhabiting mountains and caves like wild beasts during the festival of booths (καὶ μετ’ εὐφροσύνης ἤγον ήμέρας ὅκτω σκηνωμάτων τρόπον, μικρογενέσθαι ὡς πρὸ μικροῦ χρόνου τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἐορτὴν ἐν τοῖς ὀρεσί καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεμόμενοι) (10:6). Judas and his followers decreed that these eight days were to be honoured and observed by the entire nation of Judea annually (ψηφίσματος παντὶ τῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνει κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἔγειν τάσδε τὰς ἡμέρας) (10:7). The significance of the festival of booths and its relationship to both the wilderness and Ḥanukkah, as well as the national commemoration of Ḥanukkah, are discussed in greater detail below in the following section. The rededication marked the end of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and his persecution (καὶ τὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀντιόχου τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Ἐπιφανοῦς τελευτῆς οὗτως ἔχει) (10:9), which 2 Maccabees narrates as a founding trauma.
2 Narrating the Restoration of an Original Identity

2.1 Accessing the Past through Exemplary Figures and Liturgical Time

Both the prefixed letters and the narrative seek to restore the loss of an original ethnic identity by making references to the heroic past of Israel—i.e., Nehemiah (1:18-36), Jeremiah (2:1-8, 15:15), and Solomon and Moses (2:9-12)—and fusing Hanukkah to the festival of booths, or Sukkoth. This identity, of course, is dissociated from those who abandoned the ancestral traditions (2 Macc. 4:1-6:11; 10:20-22; 12:39-42; 13:3-4; 7-8; 14:3-14, 26). Thus, once again, this is a case of the oscillation and dialectics between rupture and continuity in postmemory, which is negotiated by imagination. The conversion of absence (i.e., something that never was) into loss (i.e., specific historical events) informs narratives of an original purity that has been polluted or contaminated. In 2 Maccabees, the restoration of lost original identity through the elimination of polluters and contaminators of the collective self that culminates in a call for collective return of Judeans from outside the homeland to Jerusalem to celebrate the purification (2 Macc. 1:27-29; 2:18). As outlined above, the contaminated self in 2 Maccabees is represented by the figures of Simon, Jason, Menelaus, Simon’s men, the idolatrous soldiers, and Alcimus, all of whom abandon the ancestral traditions and/or commit injustices against their own people. Thus, 2 Maccabees masks structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence represented as the loss of an original unity or purity) in its representation of historical trauma (i.e., the persecution of Judeans, their ancestral traditions, and institutions, including the defilement of the temple).

Heroic figures of the past loom large in the discursive world of 2 Maccabees, which keys into mnemonic traditions of these figures. Arguably the most important heroic figure in 2 Maccabees is Nehemiah. According to Blenkinsopp, Nehemiah’s military prowess, piety, and association with the second temple made him an ideal patron for the Hasmoneans...
(Blenkinsopp 2009: 174-75). The common themes between 2 Maccabees and Nehemiah include the following: reform, rededication, re-establishing ancestral traditions, defending Judah against external enemies, restoring and preserving cultic purity, the legitimacy of the high priesthood, and rebuilding the homeland (Blenkinsopp 2009: 175-76). Moreover, the significance of Nehemiah is evident in the fact that 2 Macc. 1:18 determines him, and not Zerubbabel and Jeshua, as the figure who establishes the first altar and builds the first temple. Further to this point, and perhaps most importantly, Nehemiah resumes temple sacrifices and reignites the sacred fire after the destruction of the temple (1:19-36). Needless to say, resuming sacrifices and igniting the purifying fire (νέφδαρ) correspond to the culminating moment in 2 Macc. 10:1-8. Both Nehemiah and Judas emerge out of exile as pure remnants who re-establish the ancestral cult and traditions. Also, Nehemiah’s collection of books about kings, prophets, and the writings of David, and the letters of kings about votive offerings (ὡς καταβαλλόμενος βιβλιοθήκην ἔπισυνήγαγε τὰ περὶ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ προφητῶν καὶ τὰ τοῦ Δαυίδ καὶ ἑπιστολὰς βασιλέων περὶ ἀναθεμάτων) (2:13) corresponds to Judas’ collection of books lost during the war of independence (ὡσαίτως δὲ καὶ Ἰουδᾶς τὰ διαπεπτωκότα διὰ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν γεγονότα ἡμῶν ἐπισυνήγαγε πάντα, καὶ ἔστι παρ’ ἡμῖν) (2:14). Importantly, in addition to the aforementioned collection of books, 2 Maccabees mentions the memoirs of Nehemiah (ὑπομνηματισμοῖς τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Νεεμίαν) as a source (2:13).

Although Jeremiah, Solomon, and Moses are symbolic figures in 2:1-12, Nehemiah is the figure who connects the Hasmoneans to the first generation of returnees from exile and the rebuilding of city, temple, and cult. Further to this point, Nehemiah also connects the
Hasmoneans to the first temple by being link between the first and second temples. Doran describes the way in which Nehemiah connects the first and second temples as follows:

Jeremiah could not be mentioned without reference to prophetic exhortation to follow the Law and avoid idols. The mention of Jeremiah attracts another story about the prophet at the time of exile, but one which has nothing to do with the festival of fire, a story in fact which in part contradicts the earlier story. While the previous story had been concerned to show the continuity between the first and second temple, this story of Jeremiah emphasizes the discontinuity between the two. The ark, the tent, and the altar of incense are hidden and will not be found until God works the ingathering of his people (2:7-8). At that time, the glory and the cloud will appear. This is quite a separate tradition from that of the fire burning on the altar. In the final words of Jeremiah, reference is made to Moses and Solomon (2:8). Verses 9-12 pick up this reference, and develop the similarities between the two leaders. The final similarity noted, that of celebrating a feast for eight days, leads back to the activity of Nehemiah. Alongside Nehemiah’s activity in collecting the writings of Judaism is placed the similar activity of Judas.... The past theophanic events at the time of Moses and Solomon fuse with future hopes of restoration, hopes which were somewhat realized at the time of Nehemiah. (Doran 1981: 9-10)

As Doran notes, Nehemiah creates continuity between and connects the Hasmoneans to the distant past, namely those of Solomon and Moses, through the re-enactment of liturgical time by fusing together the festival of booths, or Sukkoth.

It is important to mention how the Hasmoneans inserted themselves into tradition and used ritual and liturgical time, i.e., the fusing of Ḥanukkah and Sukkoth (see 2 Macc. 1:16-36; 2:1-12; 10:6), as well as the ways in which 2 Maccabees authorizes itself and calls for a collective ingathering through ritual and liturgical time. Portier-Young outlines the role of crisis and the invention of tradition in this process as follows:

The events leading up to the persecution by Antiochus and the persecution itself would bring them to a crisis. In this crisis the invention of the tradition would reorient, draw new boundaries, and stake out new claims for identity, meaning, and value, but would also do so always in relation to constructions of the past. That is, invented traditions are marked by creativity and by claims to continuity with the past; as such they are ‘responses to novel situations which take the form of reference to old situations. (Portier-Young 2011: 66-67)

Portier-Young’s description of the relationship between collective and crisis correspond to the ways in which LaCapra and Y. Zerubavel discuss the relationship between ruptures and the formation of new identities. The festival commemorating deliverance from this crisis is
an invented tradition that calls on the Egyptian Judeans to celebrate the purification of the temple on the twenty-fifth of Chislev and the festival of booths (μέλλοντες οὖν ἀγείν ἐν τῷ Χασελεῦ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τὸν καθαρισμὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ, δέον ἡγησάμεθα διασαφῆσαι ύμῖν, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄγητε τῆς σκηνοπηγίας καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς) (1:18). However, like other invented traditions, 2 Maccabees takes liberties with tradition, as the Israelites celebrated Sukkoth at the end of their harvest season on fifteenth of Tishri (September-October) whereas Ḥanukkah begins on the twenty-fifth of Chislev (November-December).

The festival of σκηνοπηγία is mentioned in LXX (Deut 16:16; 31:10; Zech. 14:16-19) (see Doran 1981: 4). As Tessa Rajak argues, the Hasmoneans annexed Sukkoth to associate it with their own personal rule (Rajak 1996: 112). Her argument makes sense in that Sukkoth authorizes 2 Maccabees through its associations with Moses, Solomon, and Nehemiah. For instance, the festival of σκηνοπηγία is mentioned in LXX in Deut 16:16; 31:10 (see Doran 1981: 4), which gives Ḥanukkah its Mosaic authorization (see Najman 2003). Further to this point, the Mosaic connections to Sukkoth and Ḥanukkah are evident in the fact that Sukkoth is an eight-day festival in Lev. 23:36 (cf. Num. 29:35-38; Neh. 8:14-18; 1 Kgs 8:2; 2 Chr 5:3, 7:10), according to which it is customary to dwell in temporary booths. Moreover, the importance of Sukkoth as a festival is also established in the dedication of Solomon’s temple during its duration; according to 2 Chron. 7:8-10 (cf. 1 Kgs 8:65), the festival is celebrated for seven days, which is followed by a solemn assembly on the eighth day. Likewise, Neh. 8:14-18, which was discussed in Chapter 2 as an instance of Mosaic discourse and liturgical time, not only connects Sukkoth back to Moses and Torah but also describes it as a seven-day ceremony followed by a solemn assembly on the eighth day. One other possible biblical precedent for Ḥanukkah is Hezekiah’s cleansing of the temple in 2 Kgs 18:1-4, and the
longer account of it in 2 Chron. 29:3-6 (VanderKam 1987: 31-36). It is worth noting that Hezekiah in 2 Chronicles 29-32 is a restorer of order who follows the disastrous reign of Ahaz (2 Chronicles 28). This point, of course, is significant because, as Weitzman so persuasively argues, the rededication of the temple in 2 Maccabees also follows the restorer of order topos (see above).

It is interesting that the Hasmonean festival of Hanukkah is associated with a wilderness festival like Sukkoth, given the wilderness and exilic association between Judas and his men (2 Macc. 5:27), Moses, and Nehemiah. All of these figures prepare the proper legal and/or cultic traditions in the wilderness before it is brought into the homeland. As mentioned above, eight-day celebration of Hanukkah recalls the celebration of the festival of booths (σκηνωμάτων τρόπον) in the wilderness (καὶ μετ’ εὐφροσύνης ἦγον ἡμέρας ὀχτὼ σκηνωμάτων τρόπον, μνημονεύοντες ὡς πρὸ μικροῦ χρόνου τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἑορτὴν ἐν τοῖς ὀρεσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεμόμενοι) (10:6). The liturgical dimension of a wilderness festival that is associated with pure remnants emerging out the wilderness and/or exile must be emphasized. Importantly, 2 Macc. 2:16-18 calls those from outside the land to gather in a purified Jerusalem to celebrate Hanukkah, which is the dedication (Μέλλοντες οὖν ἀγείν τὸν καθαρισμὸν ἐγράψαμεν ὑμῖν καλῶς οὖν ποιήσετε ἁγιόν τὸς ἡμέρας. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ὁ σώσας τὸν πάντα λαόν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποδοῦς τὴν κληρονομίαν πᾶσι καὶ τὸ βασιλείον καὶ τὸ ἱεράτευμα καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, καθὼς ἐπηγγείλατο διὰ τοῦ νόμου· ἐλπίζομεν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὅτι ταχέως ἡμᾶς ἐλεήσει καὶ ἐπισυνάξει ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὸν ἁγιόν τόπον· ἐξείλετο γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐκ μεγάλων κακῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκαθάρισε). This ingathering in Jerusalem collapses and integrates the past (Moses, Solomon, Nehemiah), the present (the producer of the letter), and the future (the return of all Judeans from outside the land who identify with Ἰουδαϊσμός)
(cf. 1:18). Like the text of 2 Maccabees itself and the celebration of Sukkoth, the future ingathering reflects a movement from outside the land to a purified Jerusalem. Like Judas and his followers, the Egyptian Jews were not polluted by a defiled Jerusalem and can now return to a purified city. The future ingathering of all God’s people in a purified place reflects the notion of a pure, unified, and original identity, which is achieved through the simultaneous rupture from a troubled past and continuity with an idealized past, as well as keying into culturally familiar narrative and mnemonic frameworks.

In sum, 2 Maccabees uses exemplary figures from the past—Jeremiah, Nehemiah, Solomon, and Moses—and liturgical time—Ḥanukkah and Sukkoth—to connect Judas and his followers (and by extension, the Hasmoneans) to the returned exiles and Nehemiah’s temple, the first temple, and the wilderness generations. Moreover, the call for a future ingathering to celebrate Ḥanukkah in 2 Macc. 2:16-18 connects the future to these exemplary figures of the past through liturgical time. However, with continuity comes discontinuity, and the process of restoration after traumatic events requires cleansing or eliminating outsiders or the impure part of the self (see LaCapra).

2.2 Eliminating the Pollutants in Narrating the Restoration of an Original Identity

Before the restoration of the temple in 10:1-8, the only impure part of the collective self to be eliminated through a justified end is Jason. As outlined in the above section, Jason and Menelaus are the figures primarily responsible for the persecution of the Judeans and the defilement of Jerusalem and its temple. These events of persecution and the process of restoration mark a founding trauma for Ḥanukkah, the Hasmonean dynasty, and a new Judean ethnic identity, which excludes the likes of Jason and Menelaus, who are identified
with the foreigners who profaned the temple (ὁ νεώς ὑπὸ ἄλλοφύλων ἐβεβηλώθη) (10:5).

Throughout 2 Maccabees, foreignness is strongly associated with pollution and/or impurity, and vice-versa. Portier-Young describes identity being forged in the crucible of destruction in 2 Maccabees as follows:

Indeed, these changes, and the persecution that accompanied them, would create a new moment of threat and as a result elicit new constructions of Jewish identity. Those resisting assimilation in the face of threatening imperial encounter, especially the persecution, would invest places, traditions, symbols, and practices of the past with new meaning and value while also forging a new tradition, new symbols, and a new identity. (Portier-Young 2011: 112-13)

After the process restoration, the social body must remain pure by cleansing or eliminating any existing or potential contaminants, namely Simon’s traitorous men (10:20-23), the idolatrous soldiers (12:39-42), Menelaus (13:3-8), and Alcimus (14:3-14, 26).

When the word of Idumeans bribing some of Simon’s men reaches Judas, he accuses these men of selling their brothers for money by setting their enemies free to fight against them (συναγαγὼν τοὺς ἡγουμένους τοῦ λαοῦ κατηγόρησεν ως ἀργυρίου πεπράκασι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, τοὺς πολεμίους κατ’ αὐτῶν ἀπολύσαντες) (10:21). Consequently, Judas kills these traitors (οὗτος μὲν οὖν προδότας γενομένους ἀπέκτεινε) (10:22). In a battle against Gorgias’ troops, Judas calls upon the Lord with hymns in their ancestral language to lead his troops in the battle (καταρξάμενος τῇ πατρίω φωνῇ τὴν μεθ᾿ ὕμνων κραυγῆ) (12:36-37). After having purified themselves and having observed the sabbath (κατὰ τὸν ἐθισμὸν ἀγνισθέντες αὐτὸ βι τὸ σάββατον διήγαγον), Judas and his men discover under the tunics of the deceased soldiers sacred Jamnian objects, which the law forbids Judeans to wear (ἔφθερν δὲ ἐκάστου τῶν τεθνηκότων ὑπὸ τοὺς χιτῶνας ἱερώματα τῶν ἄπο Ἰαμνείας εἰδῶλων). These idols, of course, are the reason that the soldiers had fallen in battle (12:39-40).
After this event, Judas exhorts the Judeans to remain pure because they had seen what had happened to those who failed to do so (ἡπ’ ὑψιν ἐωρακότας τὰ γεγονότα διὰ τὴν τῶν προπεπτωκότων ἁμαρτίαν) (12:42). Again, there is no room for pollutants and impurities in the purified social body.

Menelaus reappears in the narrative to betray his country for personal gain, once again, by encouraging Antiochus Eupator to campaign against Judea (οὐκ ἐπὶ σωτηρία τῆς πατρίδος, οἱμένος δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς κατασταθήσεθαι) (13:3). However, the king of kings (ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων) begins the demise of Menelaus by arousing Antiochus Eupator’s anger against the guilty one (ἐπὶ τὸν ἀλιτήριον) (13:4). Once Lysias discovers that Menelaus is responsible for all the distress (αἰτιον εἶναι πάντων τῶν κακῶν), he orders that Menelaus be killed in Beroea according to custom there.

There they all push to death anyone liable for sacrilege or notorious for other wickedness. By such a fate this lawless one came to die; Menelaus was not even buried in the earth, which was entirely just. Since he committed many sins against the altar, whose fire and ashes were holy, he received his death in ashes. (13:6-9)

Once again, as in the cases of Jason and Antiochus IV, the punishment fits the crimes. As a traitor, committer of sacrilege, and a law breaker, Menelaus is punished accordingly and eliminated as a contaminant in the social body.

Finally, Alcimus, the former high priest who had voluntarily defiled himself in times of mixing cultures (τις προγενόμενος ἁρχιερεύς, ἐκουσίως δὲ μεμολυμμένος ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἐπιμειξίας χρόνοις), realizes that he can no longer access the holy altar so he turns King Demetrius against the Judeans in order to reclaim the high priesthood (14:3-4). During his
speech to Demetrius, Alcimus admits he has set aside his ancestral honour (ὅθεν ἀφελόμενος τὴν προγονικὴν δόξαν) (14:7). Demetrius sends Nicanor to pursue Judas and his army but the Seleucid general becomes amicable towards Judas (14:23-25). Like Antiochus IV’s repentance, Nicanor’s fondness of Judas reveals the virtues of an individual that corrupt high priests instigated against Judas and the Judeans. In my view, these intermittent virtuous acts of Seleucids further expose the impious high priests, like Alcimus, as the archenemies in 2 Maccabees. Alcimus ends the goodwill between Judas and Nicanor by informing Demetrius of their actions (14:26), and as a result, Nicanor attacks Judas and his troops again. In the end, Judas and his men defeat Nicanor and his army, and Judas orders the removal Nicanor’s head and arm, which had reached out against the house of the Almighty (ἡν ἐκτείνας ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Παντοκράτορος οἶκον ἐμεγαλαύχσε) (15:28-33). Judas also cuts out the tongue of the impious Nicanor (δυσσεβοῦς Νικάνορος) and hangs his decapitated head from the citadel as a sign of the Lord’s help (15:33-35). This day was decreed to be observed on the thirteenth of Adar, the day before Purim (πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῆς Μαρδοχαίης ἡμέρας) (15:36). Here, we have another event that is commemorated in liturgical time (cf. Yerushalmi’s discussion of Second Purims, in which Haman remanifests in Jewish memory; see Yerushalmi 1996: 46-48; Zerubavel 1995: 126).

3 Conclusions

This chapter illustrates how the narrative of the Maccabean revolt and restoration from the traumatic events of the persecution by Antiochus IV (167-164 B.C.E.), as told by 2 Maccabees, is recounted as processes of cleansing and eliminating the impure part of the collective self. Judas and the Maccabean heroes are a pure remnant emerging out of
wilderness to restore the ancestral traditions and purify a defiled land, city, and temple. These events function as a founding trauma that becomes a myth of origins for the Hasmonean dynasty, the festival of Ḥanukkah, and the pure beginnings of Ἰουδαϊσμός under Hasmonean rule, which is also a restored pure and original Judean identity. Thus, the process of restoring the loss of an original ethnic identity is central to 2 Maccabees.

In 2 Maccabees, the original ethnic identity, which the Maccabean heroes restore and to which they connect, is based on exemplary figures from the heroic past of Israel, namely Nehemiah, Jeremiah, Solomon, and Moses. Moreover, 2 Maccabees uses the repetition of liturgical time—i.e., the fusion of Ḥanukkah and Sukkoth—to connect Judas and his followers (the subsequent Hasmoneans) to the returned exiles and Nehemiah’s temple, the first temple, and the wilderness generations. Further to this point, the petition in 2 Macc. 2:16-18 for a future ingathering in a purified Jerusalem to celebrate Ḥanukkah links the future to the exemplary figures of the past through liturgical time. This call for a future ingathering also calls on Egyptian Judeans to become part of the restored original Judean ethnic identity.

After the process of restoration in 2 Maccabees 8-10, the restored Judean ethnic identity must remain pure by eliminating any existing or potential contaminants, namely Simon’s traitorous men (10:20-23), the idolatrous soldiers (12:39-42), Menelaus (13:3-8), and Alcimus (14:3-14, 26). These figures, along with Simon and Jason, represent the contaminated self in 2 Maccabees who abandon the ancestral traditions, commit injustices against their own people, and are associated with Ἐλληνισμός. However, an analysis of the prefixed letters and the narrative of purification and restoration problematizes conceptions of a pure original ethnic identity, which rests on imagined mnemonic connections, liturgical
time, and the rhetoric of the dichotomy between ᾨουδαϊσμός and ᾨΕλληνισμός. In other words, 2 Maccabees conflates structural trauma (i.e., the loss of an original unity or purity) with historical trauma (i.e., the events of 167-164 B.C.E.) in its narrative of purification and restoration. 2 Maccabees negotiates the tension between rupture and continuity through imagined mnemonic connections, liturgical time, and rhetorical dimensions of the terms ᾨουδαϊσμός and ᾨΕλληνισμός in restoring a lost pure identity.

Given that 2 Maccabees was written somewhere between 124-63 B.C.E., most likely somewhere between 124-104 B.C.E, and narrates the founding events of 167-164 B.C.E., it is the postmemory of the events that connects past and present through a hybrid narrative that connects past and present as earlier traumas are reactivated and liturgically commemorated. The mnemonic schemas and cultural frameworks of postmemory imaginatively negotiate the tensions between rupture and continuity in 2 Maccabees. Through this process, we see the symbolic and affective force of postmemory that connects Moses, Solomon, Nehemiah, and the Maccabean heroes to the producers of the text, as well as Sukkoth to Ḥanukkah.
Chapter Four

Refined, Purged, and Whitened: Eschatology and Purification in Daniel

This chapter explores the ways in which Daniel frames the traumatic events of the persecution of Antiochus IV in 167 B.C.E. through revisiting memories of the destruction of Jerusalem and the first temple, and the Babylonian exile. In this sense, Daniel uses mnemonic tropes and images as screen memories, or multidirectional memory, in projecting the trauma of a more recent past—that of 167 B.C.E.—on to an earlier site of memory, the Babylonian exile. On to the screen of memories of the Babylonian court, Daniel projects the needs of the present and more recent past.

More specifically, I look at the ways the events of the second century B.C.E. are constructed to mirror those of the sixth century B.C.E. In the process, Daniel mourns the absence of an original pre-exilic identity, which is accessed textually through proper interpretation and understanding of authoritative texts and sealed books. According to the text, this coveted identity is restored at the eschaton with true knowledge and understanding that eventually is sealed in the book of Daniel itself. In the process, Daniel discursively separates the “wise” (i.e., the maskîlim) from the “those who act wickedly against the covenant” (cf. 1QM 1:2), who are responsible for the ongoing state of exile (Daniel 9). Exile is overcome only when the maskîlim first suffer violence and captivity and then refine, purify, and whiten the social body from their collective sins (Dan. 11:32-35) (cf. LaCapra). Salvation at the
eschaton is achieved only through the wisdom of the maskîlîm—they are restored at the end of times, which marks the end of an ongoing state of exile, as are those whom they instruct.

Once again, following LaCapra’s notion of converting absence (i.e., something that never was) into loss (i.e., specific historical events), which creates perceptions of an original unity or identity that has been polluted or contaminated by others, I look at the ways in which Daniel represents the restoration of a pre-exilic identity through the maskîlîm’s purification of the social body and the divine elimination of the wicked at the end of times. Thus, I examine the restoration and recovery from a continuous sinful state of exile, which did not end during the Persian period, as a two-fold process of purifying the social body of sin and destroying the wicked at the end of times. I argue that the producers of Daniel mask structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence represented as the loss of an original unity or purity) in its representation of historical trauma (i.e., the destruction of the temple, the Babylonian exile, and especially the persecution by Antiochus IV). More specifically, this chapter focuses on the following three points: 1) the role that the discourse of exile plays in constructing identity in Daniel; 2) the ways in which the ܪ (‘mystery’), revelation, and sealed books establish the authority of the elect (i.e., the maskîlîm) and separate them from wicked (i.e., the violators of the covenant); 3) the way in which exile is finally overcome at the eschaton, when the righteous are rewarded and the wicked are punished, through proper understanding of true wisdom and a process of purification of the elect.

1 The Past in the Present: The Indefinite State of Exile

The present, or more specifically, the social setting, of Daniel is difficult to determine because the text goes to great lengths to conceal that social setting (Collins 2001: 9). There is
much debate and scholarship on unity in the book of Daniel. Of course, Daniel generally is viewed as a composite text likely written in (or at least the stories originate in) two different locations, the eastern diaspora/Babylon (chapters 1-6) and Jerusalem (chapters 7-12). Moreover, Daniel also is written in two different languages, Hebrew (1:1-2:4a and 8:1-12:13) and Aramaic (2:4b-7:28). The final version of Daniel, which is regarded as the final composition in the Hebrew Bible, is dated to the immediate aftermath of the persecution by Antiochus IV, probably around 164 B.C.E. (Wills 2004: 1640). The later Hebrew chapters, 8-12, were added to the earlier Aramaic corpus, which is set in the exilic setting of foreign royal courts, somewhere between 167 and 164 B.C.E., with the glosses of 12:11-12 being appended before the rededication of the temple (Collins 1993: 38).

However, Daniel may be a more coherent and unified composition than what much scholarship suggests. Philip Davies points out that the visions of Daniel 7-12 are contingent on the court tales of chapters 1-6 for meaning, otherwise they do not make sense. He maintains that the two parts of Daniel need to be assessed in light of two premises: 1) the court tales of Daniel 1-6 were re-read in the Maccabean period, when they were interpreted in a different way; 2) the visions of Daniel 7-12 emerge from this re-reading of the tales and “were composed as a literary application of the message of the stories, to which they were intended to form a sequel or supplement” (Davies 1996: 24-26). Davies concludes that the literary and historical continuity between the tales and visions in Daniel as part of a Maccabean re-reading and interpretation of the tales is crucial for understanding the unity in Daniel. Moreover, the eschatology in Daniel emerges out of a re-reading and interpretation of the court tales during the traumatic events of 167-164 B.C.E. (Davies 1996: 44). The use of the Aramaic term רַע, meaning mystery and connoting eschatology, in Daniel 2 and 4 ties
the court tales to the eschatological dimensions to Daniel 7-12. Thus, we may have a final version of Daniel that is unified by and comprised of the obscure, esoteric communicative memory of the events of 167-164 B.C.E. fused with a composite hybrid of the transgenerational postmemory of the Babylonian exile. Daniel is a case of screen memories and multidirectional memory that reactivates an earlier trauma and frames the more recent trauma with culturally familiar mnemonic schemas and tropes.

As noted in the Chapter 1, Knibb argues that Daniel 9 presents Israel in an ongoing state of exile that will be overcome only at the time of an eschatological end. This dimension of Daniel is not surprising, given the way in which Second Temple literature is infused with the postmemory of the Babylonian exile, which is the setting for Daniel 1-6, Tobit, the expanded Greek version of Esther, Susanna, and Bel and the Serpent. Even the Apocryphon of Joseph (4Q371-373) places a Joseph narrative in an exilic setting not long after the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E. Moreover, the visions and revelations in Daniel 7-12, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch are retrojected to the immediate aftermath of 587 B.C.E. (Blenkinsopp 2009: 216-17). Thus, memories of the destruction of 587 B.C.E. and Babylonian exile permeate Second Temple literature and function as an incubator for the formation of new collective identities.

In what follows, I briefly outline below Knibb’s position on Daniel 9, which reinterprets Jeremiah’s prophecy of 70 years exile, when the desolate nation of Israel serves the Babylonian king before the people of Israel are restored and return from their place of exile (Jer. 25:11-12; 29:10-14): “I, Daniel, consulted the books concerning the number of years that, according to the word of the Lord that had come to Jeremiah the prophet, were to
be the term of Jerusalem’s desolation—seventy years” (9:2)  

Daniel’s reference to Jeremiah, of course, is one of few instances of a biblical text making direct reference to another biblical book. Jeremiah’s prophecy of the seventy year exile is used and reinterpreted in other Second Temple literature, namely Zech. 1:12; 7:5, 2 Chron. 36:21-22, and Ezra 1:1. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the seventy years of exile in 2 Chron. 36:21 represent a sabbath of purification when the land purges itself of sin and those who remained on the land are considered to be impure, as we see in E-N with the Samarians/people of the land. However, Daniel transforms and reinterprets the seventy sabbath years from Lev. 26:34 and 2 Chron. 36:21 by extending this period of exile and purification to 70 weeks of years, or 490 years (Knibb 1976: 254).

Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city until the measure of transgression is filled and that of sin complete, until the iniquity is expiated, and eternal righteousness ushered in; and prophetic vision ratified, and the holy of holies anointed. You must know and understand: From the issuance of the word to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the leader is seven weeks; and for sixty-two weeks it will be rebuilt, square and moat, but in a time of distress. And after those sixty-two weeks, the anointed one will appear and vanish. The army of a leader who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary, but its end will come through a flood. Desolation is decreed until the end of war. During one week he will make a firm covenant with many. For half a week he will put a stop to the sacrifice and meal offering. At the corner [of the altar] will be an appalling abomination until the decreed destruction will be poured down upon the appalling thing. (Dan. 9:24-27)
Knibb notes that Daniel’s dependence on Jeremiah is more thematic than linguistic, with the exception of לְהָשִׁי in Dan. 9:25 and Jer. 29:10. This reinterpretation in Daniel, of course, rejects the notion that Jeremiah’s prophecy was fulfilled in the Persian period (Collins 1993: 352), as we see in Ezra and Chronicles, and asserts that exile continued well into the mid-second century B.C.E., when Daniel was composed, despite the reference to the return and restoration under Zeruabbabel and Jeshua to in v. 25. The subsequent sixty-two weeks after Zeruabbabel and Jeshua are described as a time of distress ובצוק הימים. Thus, the discursive world of Daniel remains in a tumultuous state of exile that has yet to be overcome.

Knibb summarizes the continuous state of exile in Daniel as follows:

Although the return from exile at the end of the sixth century is mentioned, it is clear that the author is not really concerned with that event, nor with the events of the post-exilic period; he really is only concerned with the activities of Antiochus Epiphanes and with the time of the end which Antiochus’s persecution has inaugurated. The exile was now, and only now, to have its proper end, and in the author’s view everything that had happened between the carrying away into captivity of the Jewish people and the time of Antiochus was of little importance. Rather this period is seen as a unity whose characteristic is sin. We are in a situation where the exile is understood as a state that is to be ended only by the intervention of God and the inauguration of the eschatological era. (Knibb 1976: 255)

I do not entirely agree with Knibb’s assessment that Daniel is not concerned with the sixth-century exile and is concerned only with the persecution of Antiochus IV because the former frames and informs the latter, a point to which I return below. With that being said, Knibb’s comments are central to my argument in this chapter, following LaCapra, that the narrativization of absence produces notions of collective sin that are overcome only by an eschatological end. The corrupt state in Daniel that extends from the Babylonian exile itself down to the time of the composition of the text is represented as a single period of time, which is offset and bookended by a time before the sin that is responsible for the exile and a period of restoration brought about by the eschatological end. The discourse of exile in
Daniel 9 is interwoven with a deuteronomistic worldview that rotates on the axis of sin, punishment, repentance, and restoration (Wills 2004: 1660). In 9:5-19, Daniel gives the following penitential prayer confessing collective sin and guilt:

We have sinned; we have gone astray; we have acted wickedly; we have been rebellious and have deviated from your commandments and your rules, and have not obeyed your servants the prophets who spoke in your name to our kings, our officers, our fathers, and all the people of the land. With you, O Lord, is right, and the shame is on us to this very day, on the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, all Israel, near and far, in all the lands where you have banished them, for the trespass they committed against you. The shame, O Lord, is on us, on our kings, our officers, our fathers, because we have sinned against you. To the Lord our God belong mercy and forgiveness, for we rebelled against him, and did not obey the Lord our God by following his teachings that he set before us through his servants the prophets. All Israel has violated your teaching and gone astray disobeying you; so the curse and the oath written in the Teaching of Moses, the servant of God, have been poured down upon us, for we have sinned against him. He carried out the threat that he made against us, and against our ruler who ruled us, to bring upon us great misfortune; under the whole heaven there has never been done the like of what was done to Jerusalem. All that calamity, just as it is written in the Teaching of Moses, came upon us, yet we did not supplicate the Lord our God, did not repent of our iniquity or become wise through your truth. Hence the Lord was intent upon bringing calamity upon us, for the Lord our God is in the right in all that he has done, but we have not obeyed him. O Lord, as befits your abundant benevolence, let your wrathful fury turn away from your city Jerusalem, your holy mountain; for because of our sins and the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and your people became a mockery around us. O our God, hear now the prayer of your servant and his plea, and show your favor to your desolate sanctuary, for the Lord’s sake. Incline your ear, O my God, and hear; open your eyes and see the desolation and the city to which your name is attached. Not because of any merit of ours do we lay our plea before you but because of your abundant mercies. O Lord, hear! O Lord, forgive! O Lord, listen, and act without delay for your own sake, O my God; for your name is attached to your city and your people!
We have seen this deuteronomistic typology of sin, punishment, and repentance before restoration in the two previous chapters on E-N and 2 Maccabees, including penitential prayers in Ezra 9:6-15, Neh. 1:5-11, and 2 Macc. 8:2-4. Moreover, לְחֶרְפָ֖ה in v. 16 is the same to word used in Neh. 2:17 (חרפה) to describe a destroyed Jerusalem (Najman 2004: 1691). For both Nehemiah and Daniel, a destroyed Jerusalem is a shame, disgrace, mockery—signifying the shameful and sinful state of a destroyed, exilic Jerusalem before purification and restoration.

The discourse of destruction and exile permeates the book of Daniel, beginning in 1:1 with the reference to Nebuchadnezzar laying siege to Jerusalem, the fall of Judah, and exile, which, of course, are the result of the sins of the ancestors. The immediate introduction to Nebuchadnezzar and the exile is without negative associations in order to establish the future success of Daniel and his friends in an exilic court and the notion that YHWH is in control of history (Wills 2004: 1643; cf. positive relations with foreign monarchs in E-N and 2 Maccabees). After YHWH helps Daniel and his cohort to maintain purity in 1:9-16, the text tells us that “God made all four of these young men intelligent and proficient in all writings and wisdom, and Daniel had understanding of visions and dreams of all kinds” והליים האלה איבשحو גוזו וחרום ושמט וכתובות הכתובות (1:17). As I have shown in the previous chapters on E-N and 2 Maccabees and will show in the following chapter on CD and 1QpHab, purity and revelation are achieved in exile away from a
destroyed and defiled land, Jerusalem, and temple. In the following section, I discuss the royal court in exile as a site for revelation, which is central to Daniel. The royal court, exile, and revelation pervade the text and connect chapters 1-6 to chapters 7-12.

Davies views Nebuchadnezzar and the sixth-century exiled Judeans in the book of Daniel as “both the predecessors and the prototypes of the persecuting monarch Antiochus IV and the persecuted Jews of Palestine centuries later” (Davies 1985: 13). In this sense, Nebuchadnezzar becomes a cipher for Antiochus IV. In fact, Davies sees a resemblance between Antiochus IV and the impious, idolatrous king, Belshazzar, who is destroyed for using the temple vessels in Daniel 5 (cf. 1 Macc. 1:21-24; 2 Macc. 5:15-17). Davies goes so far to suggest that this tales may be of Maccabean origins, or, at the very least, a Maccabean re-reading and interpretation of it during the crisis of 167-164 B.C.E. (Davies 1996: 26-27). What he argues is that Daniel reads the past in the present through mnemonic schematics as the crisis of Daniel’s time is framed and informed by the crisis of the sixth-century B.C.E. This schema should come as little surprise, given that Daniel is a book of schemas, prototypes, and precedents, from the schema and repetition of the four kingdoms to the patterning of Daniel on Joseph and Nebuchadnezzar on Nabonidus. Furthermore, Davies points out that the reinterpreted seventy weeks of years, or 490 years, of exile from Jeremiah’s prophecy in Daniel 9 is the cohesive force that connects the Babylonian exile to the persecution of Antiochus IV. For Davies, “there are two ‘exiles’, and the physical exile in Babylon both foreshadows and initiates a more protracted period of exile, and of persecution, whose termination will coincide only with the fulfillment of world-history” (Davies 1985: 13).
Davies also argues that the juxtaposition of the two exiles is paramount for unity in the book of Daniel and understanding it as a whole (Davies 1985: 21). The exilic visions of Daniel 1-6 are a lens for the interpretation of visions in chapters 7-12, particularly the visions in chapters 2 and 7, which are discussed below. Knibb notes that because three of the four stories about Daniel in chapters 2-6 present him a figure of wisdom and recipient of revelation, “it should have seemed natural that he himself should be made the recipient of divine revelations in the four narratives that follow in chapters 7-12” (Knibb 2001: 17). The concept of Thirdspace, a combination of real and imagined space, might be helpful in bridging the visions from the Babylonian royal court to the divine court and the glorious land (11:41) as the visions overlap and build on each other in heterotopic space. According to Davies, “by presenting the shorter exile as a prototype, and a metaphor, of the longer exile, Nebuchadnezzar is transformed into Antiochus, and Daniel into the ‘Wise’ of ch. 12” (Davies 1985: 21-22). In other words, the heroes in chapters 1-6 embody and represent the ideals of the producers of the text (Portier-Young 2011: 234).

2 The Revelation of Mysteries in Exile

As outlined above, exile in Daniel is extended from the sixth century into the mid-second century B.C.E. and will end only with the restoration of Israel and the eschaton, as “[i]t is only at the end of this longer epoch that true restoration will take place, and on a more comprehensive scale than the ‘restoration’ under Cyrus” (Davies 1985: 21). The meaning and timing of the eschatological restoration is revealed through the mysteries in the exilic royal court that connect Babylon to the glorious land (11:41) and Daniel and his cohort to the maskîlim in chapter 12. In addition to the court, Davies posits (1993) that the secret/mystery מִּשְׁרָאָל and the book ספר are central symbols to the book of Daniel. These symbols connect past,
present, and future while separating the pure from the impure and determining who will be restored at the eschaton. Here, we can see the affective and symbolic force of postmemory that intertwines the past and the present into hybrid representations. In Daniel, wisdom and revelation about the eschaton are rooted in the mystery של and the book ספר.

The relationship between revelation, wisdom, and the eschaton literature has produced ongoing scholarly discussions on the generic categories of wisdom and apocalyptic, especially in regards to texts like Daniel, 1 Enoch, Ben Sira, the Wisdom of Solomon, 4Q Instruction, and 4Q Mysteries. In fact, the Wisdom and Apocalyptic Group of the Society of Biblical Literature has challenged the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic, which are often deployed in academic discussions of early Judaism and Christianity. Benjamin Wright and Lawrence Wills describe the method and approach of the Wisdom and Apocalyptic Group to the categories as follows: “Since the perceived gulf between wisdom and apocalypticism is still very much part of scholarly discourse, both wisdom and apocalyptic texts were included, and, more to the point, texts that had typically been analyzed as either wisdom or apocalyptic were considered in terms of how they engaged both modes of discourse” (Wright and Wills 2005: 1-2). Furthermore, Wright and Wills contend that the Group has demonstrated that “wisdom and apocalypticism are indeed related both in many of their literary aspects and in their social contexts” (Wright and Wills 2005: 3). The points raised by Wright and Wills are important to my argument because while I do not categorize Daniel as an apocalyptic text, elements of Daniel, mainly revelation and eschatology, that are analyzed below have led to its classification as such.37

37The Society of Biblical Literature Genres Project systematically analyzed literature regarded as apocalyptic and developed a definition of the genre of apocalyptic literature in the now well-known Semeia 14 that was published in 1979. Semeia 14 defines apocalyptic literature as “a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative
The relationship between wisdom and eschatology undergo a transformation during the Second Temple period. Conventional sapiential views such as those represented in Proverbs began undergoing change by the time of Ben Sira, which was influenced modestly by Hellenistic ideas but rejected the belief in retribution after death, “and consequently [Ben Sira] continued to view the context of human decision making in terms very similar to those of Proverbs or Deuteronomy” (Collins 1997b: 226). However, a very different worldview and outlook on the relationship between wisdom and eschatology is presented in 4Q Instruction and 4Q Mysteries, in which ethical decisions are determined by הבנה (‘the mystery that is to be’) that signifies the prospect of eschatological judgment (Collins 1997b: 226). Importantly, although the phrase הבנה does not occur in Daniel, the term בר signifies revealed knowledge that separates Daniel and the maskîlim from the violators of the covenant. For Matthew Goff, בר “signifies a fundamental difference between biblical wisdom and the apocalyptic tradition” (Goff 2005: 63). Thus, the Hebrew phrase הבנה, and its relation to the Old Persian/Aramaic term בר, are central to the current scholarly discussion on the relationship between the categories of wisdom and apocalyptic. In the remainder of this section, I explore the relationship between the Aramaic term בר in Daniel and the Hebrew phrase הבנה in regards to the revelatory and the eschaton while showing how these terms distinguish the elect or pure from the traitors or impure.

framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world” (Collins 1979: 9). Collins has since clarified the thesis of the Genres Project and nuanced its definition by stating “that a corpus of texts that has been traditionally called ‘apocalyptic’ does share a significant cluster of traits that distinguish it from other works” (Collins 1998: 4).
The Aramaic word רז in Daniel is a Persian loanword from the Old Persian word rāz, meaning ‘secret’. Furthermore, the Avestan word razah (‘solitude’), the Middle Parthian Persian word r’z, and the Pazand New Persian word rāz also correspond to the Old Persian rāz. In addition to the above, the Aramaic loanword אֶרֶז (‘a dream’) is also borrowed from the Old Persian rāz (Nyberg 1964-74, II: 169). Of the words listed above, only the Aramaic loanword אֶרֶז has a connotation similar to what is found in Daniel, as a dream was considered to be a source of divinatory revelation in antiquity. In Daniel, the term רז acquires a new connotation that is associated with divine revelation and eschatology, a connotation which is further developed in non-canonical wisdom literature discovered at Qumran. Thus, the use of the term רז in Daniel marks a shift in connotation and a break from its original meaning in Old Persian, but expands on the semantic value of the Aramaic loanword אֶרֶז. According to Collins, Nebuchadnezzar’s mysterious dreams in Daniel 2 and 4 (2:18, 27, 29, 47; 4:6) are signified by the term רז: “The word raz may imply the expectation that the dream contains some such significant revelation” (Collins 1993: 159). That being said, the term רז has multiple connotations in Daniel, and therefore it is best to look at each individual instance of its usage.

A) Dan. 2:18:

This point came out of a conversation with Dr. Amir Harrak, University of Toronto, April 14, 2008.
“… that they might implore the God of Heaven for help regarding this mystery, so that Daniel and his colleagues would not be put to death together with the other wise men of Babylon.”

Here, as Collins correctly notes, שליחת דנייה seems to refer simply to the puzzle of the dream, but the dream itself discloses an eschatological mystery (Collins 1993: 159).

B) Dan. 2:19:

“Then the mystery was revealed to Daniel in a night vision; then Daniel blessed the God of Heaven.”

In this instance, שליחת דנייה seems to refer to a revelation; that is, Daniel is the recipient of divine revelation. Given the Aramaic word וָאֶדֶּיִין ('a dream'), it is worth noting that Daniel receives the revelation “in a vision of the night.” As mentioned above, Daniel expands on the semantic value of וָאֶדֶּיִין.

C) Dan. 2:27:

“Daniel answered before the king and said, ‘The mystery about which the king is asking, no wise man, enchanter, magician, or exorcist are able to tell the king.’”

As is illustrated below in my discussion of the term וָאֶדֶּיִין in 4Q Instruction and 4Q Mysteries, in this context, שליחת דנייה seems to signify a revelation received by a divinely elected individual. In other words, the שליחת דנייה is not attainable by just anyone, but rather, it is a ‘mystery’ that is accessible to only divinely elected individuals. Daniel is juxtaposed with the wise men,
enchanters, magicians, and exorcists of Babylon—a case of wisdom and counter-wisdom—just as the *maskîlim* will be juxtaposed with those who act wickedly against the covenant. Thus, Daniel’s wisdom represents true wisdom, which he, as a divinely elected individual, receives through revelation. Further to this point, it is only those who are truly wise who are restored during the *eschaton* chapter 12.

D) Dan. 2:28:

בְרַּׂ֡ם אִׇּיתַ֞י אֱלֵָ֤הּ בִׁשְמַיָא גָֹּל  א רָזִֹּׁ֔ין וְהוֹדֵַ֗ע לְמַלְכָא֙ לָהְו  וְהוֹדֵַ֗ע לְמַלְכָא֙ בִׁיֹ֙ מִׁן־כָּל־חַיַיָֹּ֔א רָזִָׁ֥א דְנָ֖ה גֱֹּלִׁ י לִָׁ֑י לָה ֵ֗ן עַל־דִׁבְרַתֹ֙ דִֵׁ֤י פִׁשְרָאֹ֙ לְמַלְכָ אֹ֔וּן וְרַעְיוֹנ ִׁ֥י לִׁבְבָ֖ךְ תִׁנְדַָֽע׃

“But there is a god in the heavens who reveals *mysteries*, and he has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what is to be at the end of days. This is your dream and the vision that entered your mind in bed.”

Importantly, Collins notes that the eschatological context of the term רָז in this verse, as the king’s dream, refers to הבְרַּׂ֡ם אִׇּיתַ֞י אֱלֵָ֤הּ בִׁשְמַיָא גָֹּל (‘what is to be at the end of days’)—or, as Collins translates it, “what will be at the end of the era”) (Collins 1993: 161).

E) Dan. 2:29:

אַ נְתְ מַלְכֵָ֗א רַעְיוֹנָךְֹ֙ עַל־מִׁשְכְבָךְ סְלִֹּׁ֔קוּ מִָּ֛֥ה דִִׁׁ֥י לֶהֱו ֖א אַחֲר  י דְנָָ֑ה וְגָל ׁ֧א רָזַיִָּ֛א הוֹדְעָ֖ךְ מָה־דִִׁׁ֥י לֶהֱו ָֽא׃

“O king, the thoughts that came to your mind in your bed are about future events; and he who reveals the *mysteries* has let you know what is to happen.”

Verse 29 is similar to v. 28. In fact, Collins describes v. 29 as “an ancient doublet that came to be incorporated in the text” (Collins 1993: 162). Once again, the mysteries represent a revelation.

F) Dan. 2:30:

לְמַלְכָא וְרַעְיוֹנ ִׁ֥י לִׁבְבָ֖ךְ תִׁנְדַָֽע׃
“Not because my wisdom is greater than that of other creatures has this mystery has been revealed to me, but in order that the meaning should be made known to the king, and that you may know the thoughts of your mind.”

Here, Daniel highlights the point to King Nebuchadnezzar that the revealed wisdom derives from an outside source, that is, Daniel’s god. Thus, Daniel merely receives the wisdom via divine revelation.

G) Dan. 2:47: "The king said in reply to Daniel, ‘Truly your god must be the god of gods and the lord of kings and the revealer of mysteries to have enabled you to reveal this mystery.’”

H) Dan 4:6: “Belteshazzar, the chief magician, in whom I know the spirit of the holy gods to be, and whom no mystery baffles, tell me the meaning of my dream vision that I have seen.”

In 2:47 and 4:6, דִּינָה, רָזִָׁ֑ין, רָזִָׁ֥ה, and וְכָל־רָ֖ז, once again, appear to refer to revealed wisdom to a divinely elected figure.

The term דִּינָה occurs only in the above eight instances in the Hebrew Bible. In addition to Daniel, דִּינָה occurs in Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch, in reference to the knowledge revealed to Enoch by the angels: “For I know the mysteries of the Lord that the holy ones made known to me and showed me”) (4QEn 5 ii
The use of the term רָז, however, proliferates and is well represented in texts discovered at Qumran. Collins posits that “[t]he term רָז is more widely employed at Qumran to include all God’s workings with the universe, both historical and cosmological. Here again Qumran draws important terminology from the Book of Daniel but uses it freely to express its developing worldview” (Collins 1993: 75).

The Hebrew form of רָז occurs frequently in texts discovered at Qumran to denote cosmological (1QH 1:11-12) or eschatological (1QM 14:14; 1QS 11:34; 1QpHab 7:8) mysteries or “all of the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets” (1QpHab 7:5) (Collins 1993: 159), a text which is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. The eschatological element of the term רָז at Qumran is evident in 1QpHab 7:1-8, in which the mysteries relate to “And God spoke to Habakkuk to write what was coming to the last generation, but he did not let him know the end of the period” (1QpHab 7:1-2). Thus, in both Daniel and other Second Temple literature, the term רָז is associated with both revelation and eschatology. For instance, in 4Q Instruction and 4Q Mysteries, as is also the case in the Wisdom of Solomon, the true wisdom involves the revelation and understanding of mysteries, in addition to the judgment and fate of humans after death (Collins 2003: 305).

The expression הנה רָז occurs about thirty times, including reconstructions, in 1Q Instruction (1Q26) and 4Q Instruction (4Q415-418, 423). It occurs so frequently in 4Q Instruction that Daniel Harrington contends that “when we find either word alone and need to

40 In the Wisdom of Solomon, the language of revelation is not used, but implies that the mysteries of God are accessible to the elect who reason correctly (See Collins 2003: 305). Although the language of revelation is not used in Wis. 2:22, the righteous person still is privileged to divine secrets (Nickelsburg 2003: 277).
fill in a lacuna, we can add the missing word with some confidence” (Harrington 1996: 550).

Harrington briefly outlines the formation of the expression רז נהי from the term רז:

Neither word in rz nhyh has a definite article, though the meaning of the phrase seems quite definite. The word rz is familiar to the Aramaic parts of Daniel (4,6). For the Aramaic emphatic state singular of the noun rz, see Dan. 2,18,19.27,30.47; for the absolute plural, see 2,29. According to the standard dictionary, rāz is a Persian loanword. The various forms of rz are prominent in Qumran texts from Cave 1 (see IQS) and elsewhere. There the construct plural form rzv predominates. But in the Qumran sapiential work (IQ26, 4Q415-418, 423) studies here and in the “Book of the Mysteries” (IQ27 and 4Q299-301) the singular absolute form rz occurs regularly with nhyh as a fixed phrase. In this formula rzv is the first member of a construct phrase. The familiar translation “mystery” seems to be perfectly adequate. (Harrington 1996: 551)

The second member of the construct phrase is נהי, which is the niphal participle of the verb נהי (‘to be’). Harrington posits that since rz v is a masculine noun, it is expected that the masculine singular niphal participle would be vocalized as nihye. The participle נהי appears several times without rz in 4Q417 2 i 3-5 (= 4Q418 43), where it may be translated as ‘to be’ or ‘to come’. Thus, Harrington, along with John Strugnell and J.T. Milik, translates נהי rz נהי as the mystery that is to be/come (Harrington 1996: 551). Goff contends that נהי signifies the entire scope of history—past, present, and future. In Goff’s view, 4Q Instruction associates נהי with a tripartite division of time, as well as God’s dominion over all of history, from the beginning until the end (Goff 2007: 15).41

---

41 The expression רז נהי appears occasionally without a preposition (4Q416 2 iii 14; 4Q418 77 2). However, in most cases, the preposition ב prefixes the expression (1Q26 1 1; 1Q26 1 4 = 4Q423 5 2-3; 4Q415 6 4; 24 1; 25 1; 4Q416 2 iii 9.18; 4Q417 1 i 10-11; 2 i 6, 8, 9, 18, 21; 2 ii 3; 4Q418 77 4; 123 ii 4; 148 i 4; 184 2; 190 2-3; 4Q423 3 2; 7 7). According to Harrington, it is difficult to determine whether the preposition ב signifies a locative meaning (‘in’ or ‘on’) or an instrumental meaning (‘by’). Additionally, רז נהי is accompanied once by the preposition מ in 4Q416 2 iii 21) (Harrington 1996: 551-52).
Interestingly, most of the verbs with which נהיה רז appears are second person singular imperatives, “and occur in the context of the instructor’s advice to the pupil” (Harrington 1996: 551). For instance, דרשה (‘seek, study, investigate’) occurs in 4Q416 2 iii 9, 14, הנהיה (‘meditate’) in 4Q417 2 i 6, קח (in the sapiential sense of ‘understand’ or ‘grasp’) in 4Q418 77 4, and הבט (‘pay attention, gaze’) in 4Q417 1 i 10-11; 2 i 18) (Harrington 1996: 551-52). These verbs indicate that the knowledge in 4Q Instruction is not only through the reception of הנהיה רז, but also from continuous reflection on it after it has been revealed. Wisdom is a two-step process—first revelation, then contemplation (Goff 2005: 65). According to Goff, “4Q Instruction emphasizes the study of revealed wisdom to a greater extent than Daniel and other apocalyps. This can be understood as a combination of the theme of supernatural revelation drawn from the apocalyptic tradition with a pedagogical intent informed by traditional wisdom” (Goff 2007: 22).

Importantly, expressions such as “Investigate the הנהיה רז and understand all the ways of truth, and you will pay attention to all the roots of injustice” (4Q416 2 iii 14) suggest that the הנהיה רז “is associated with the knowledge of righteousness and wickedness” (Harrington 1996: 552). Moreover, expressions such as “Pay attention to/Gaze at הנהיה רז and grasp the begetting of salvation, and know who will inherit glory and harm” (4Q417 1 i 10-11) imply an eschatological dimension (Harrington 1996: 552). Harrington concludes that the הנהיה רז is a body of teaching, written or oral, that concerns behaviour and eschatology (Harrington 1996: 552).
Like Daniel, 4Q Instruction also contains eschatological elements (Goff 2007: 10). In fact, Goff concludes that the form of retribution of 4Q Instruction is more in keeping with prophecy and apocalypticism than traditional wisdom (Goff 2007: 47). In 4Q Instruction, God’s deterministic divine plan may be understood through נֶהֱעַ (Goff 2007: 16). God uncovers the ears of people to the נֶהֱעַ in 4Q418 123 ii 4: “its period/end that God revealed to the ear(s) of those who understand נֶהֱעַ.” In this passage, wisdom is revealed, not acquired by experience (Knibb 2003: 203). The divine revelation נֶהֱעַ is at the core of the 4Q Instruction, as it occurs over twenty times throughout the text—the phrase is also used twice in 4Q Mysteries and once in the Community Rule (1QS)—and is associated with eschatology (Goff 2007: 15).

It is evident that Daniel and 4Q Instruction share family resemblance traits, namely revelation, eschatology, the periodization of time, and the use of the term נֶהֱעַ. It should be mentioned, however, that there are important differences in the ways in which revealed wisdom works in Daniel and 4Q Instruction. Goff points out that in Daniel and 1 Enoch, especially in the Book of the Watchers, “the revelation of visions and bestowal of divine knowledge are narrated to the reader. In a sense, one can look over the shoulders of Daniel and Enoch as they receive revelations... In the case of 4QInstruction the situation is

---

42 The family resemblance approach to textual description and classification is a looser concept of genre that is based on Ludwig Wittgenstein’s family resemblance notions (See Fowler 1982: 40-41; Swales 1990: 49-51; Ryan 1981: 118). According to Wittgenstein, games such as board-games, card-games, ball-games, and Olympic Games represent “a complicated network of similarities overlapping and criss-crossing...” In Wittgenstein’s words, “I can see no better expression to characterize these similarities than ‘family resemblances’; for various resemblances between members of a family: build, features, colour of eyes, gait, temperament, etc., etc. overlap and criss-cross in the same way.—And I shall say: ‘games’ form a family” (Wittgenstein 2003: 27-28).
somewhat different. The *raz nihyeh* has already been given to the addressee” (Goff 2005: 64).

Another family resemblance shared by Daniel and 4Q Instruction is the sealed book that is intended for the elect, pure, and or righteous. Daniel writes down his dream (7:1), which is a vision of the end of times (8:17), and is instructed to “keep the vision a secret, for it pertains to far-off days” (8:26). Comparably, in Dan. 12:4, Michael tells Daniel the following: “But you, Daniel, keep the words secret, and seal the book until the time of the end. Many will range far and wide and knowledge will increase”וְאַתָ ה דָָֽנִׁי ֵ֗אל סְת לֶֽבּרֶֽה הַדְבָרִִּׁ֛ים וַחֲת מֶֶֽס הַס פֶּר עַד ת ק לְז ָ֑ץ יְש טְט וְתִׁרְב הַדָָֽעַת לְמַוְּשֵׁר קָנִים (8:17); “for it [refers] to the time appointed for the end”כִׁ֖י לְמַוְּשֵׁר קָנִים (8:19); “for it pertains to far-off days”כִׁ֖י לְיָמִִׁׁ֥ים רַבִּ֖ים וְאַתָה סְת מ הֶָֽחָזֹּ֔וֹן (8:26).

Moreover, Daniel receives this revealed wisdom while in exile in Babylon but it must remain a secret until the time of Antiochus IV (Blenkinsopp 2006: 18-19; Collins 1993: 341-42), further bridging the two periods, Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus IV, and Daniel and the *maskîlîm*. Blenkinsopp explains the significance of revelation in exile as follows: “Locating the seer and his associates to the eastern diaspora in the last years of Babylonian rule served, finally, to underline the conviction of the conventicle in which the book was produced that they were the legitimate heirs of the ‘holy remnant’ of the exilic period” (Blenkinsopp 2006:
The concept of a holy remnant emerging from exile with true revelation and/or proper interpretation is, of course, a central feature of this dissertation. Furthermore, the sealed book in Daniel speaks to Knibb’s point about exile not being overcome in the Second Temple period. According to Blenkinsopp, “[t]he period from the Babylonian exile to the emergence of the Danielic sect is seen as a time of distress, spiritual blindness, and failure, a situation comparable to that of those unable to read the sealed book in Isa 29:11-12. It appears that, according to the author, the basic problem during this long period was lack of access to the revelation which he represents as having been sealed up in the early Persian period” (Blenkinsopp 2006: 21).

Once again, 4Q Instruction can shed light on how revelation (רז) functions in Daniel. In 4Q Instruction (4Q417 2 i 14-18) revelation is linked with two written documents, a writing engraved by God condemning the wicked and a ‘book of remembrance’ of those who keep his word (lines 15a-16) (Knibb 2003: 205): “because engraved is that which has been ordained by God against the iniquities of] the children of Seth, and a book of remembrance is written before him for those who keep his word, and it is the vision of Hag of the book of remembrance…” According to Knibb, this reference to the ‘book of remembrance’ represents an obvious allusion to Mal. 3:16, and perhaps here the idea that רז is linked to the understanding of scripture (Knibb 2003: 205).

According to Goff, the book of remembrance probably is intended for the elect, or at least the righteous; it is a heavenly book that can be compared to heavenly books in 1 Enoch and Jubilees (eg. 1 En. 90:20; 93:2; Jub. 6:31; 15:25). The book is inscribed with divine knowledge representing an appeal to revelation (Goff 2007: 31).
The books referenced in Dan. 10:21 also correspond to the heavenly books mentioned above: a revelatory book intended for the elect or righteous. Moreover, Collins correctly states that although the book of truth in Dan. 10:21 should not be confused with the books of judgment in 7:10, it “evidently contains the course of history and therefore may be compared to the heavenly tablets revealed to Enoch (1 En. 93:2; Enoch is also said to speak ‘from the books’)” (Collins 1993: 376). Comparing the Book of Truth in Daniel to the heavenly tablets in Enoch, Blenkinsopp outlines the relationship between the elect and the Book of Truth as follows:

Likewise, at the outset of the fourth vision, Gabriel’s detailed account of events from the Persian period to Antiochus IV draws on “the book of Truth,” which also contains the names of the elect (10:21; 12:1). The same idea is adumbrated in the census of the restored community in Jerusalem whose names are “recorded for life” according to Isa 4:3, and this idea of a saved community, and anticipation of the saints of the final age, a kind of realized eschatology, may well be behind the actual list of citizens of the commonwealth in Nehemiah 7. The eschatological import of the vision in Daniel is, in any case, explicit: it is for the last days, and only a short time remains for its fulfillment. (Blenkinsopp 2006: 21)

The elect inscribed in the Book of Truth in Daniel will be delivered and become like immortal stars in the sky (12:1-3).

Returning to 4Q Instruction, the other term signifying mysteries, revelation, and eschatology is the vision of Hagu (חוזת הגר in CD-A 10:6; 13:2; 14:7-8). While להגר occurs over twenty times throughout the composition, the vision of Hagu occurs only twice, in a lesson regarding the ‘spiritual people’ and the ‘fleshly spirit’ in 4Q417 1 i 13-18, in reference to divine judgment (Goff 2007: 30). The final judgment is presented as an inevitable truth, which is explained in deterministic terms. The book of remembrance, which is equated with is the vision of Hagu in 4Q417 1 i 16, emphasizes
further the inevitable punishment of the wicked as revealed truth. Moreover, the vision of Hagu is probably similar to the revealed content of נח הראה. Finally, in Goff’s view, it is reasonable to suppose that the vision of Hagu, similar to נח הראה, signifies an overarching divine plan that endows creation and history with a rational structure (Goff 2007: 32-33). As I discuss in the following section, social divisions emerge in Daniel that involve the revelation of ר, which remains a sealed secret until the coming of the eschaton, at which time the righteous are rewarded and the wicked are punished. Collins points out that the actual ethical advice in 4Q Instruction parallels Ben Sira in many ways, but there are two crucial differences: “First, the ‘mystery’ is not accessible by everyone, but presupposes a special revelation to a select group. Second, the notion of eschatological judgment radically alters the this-worldly perspective of Proverbs” (Collins 1997b: 226). Collins’ point, of course, can be extended to wisdom in Daniel. 4Q Instruction and the Daniel share the notion that right knowledge and revelation are not available to everyone. In 4Q Instruction, the mystery that is documented in the vision of Hagu is revealed only to the elect, as are the mysteries prophesying the end in Daniel.

In sum, the term ר is associated with both revelation and eschatology in Daniel and 4Q Instruction. Revelation, eschatology, the periodization of time, and the use of the term ר may be considered family resemblance traits, which not only blur the generic boundaries the categories of apocalyptic and wisdom but also shed light on texts that are generally placed in one category or the other. As Blenkinsopp notes, ר “functions as a key component of the interpretive process” (Blenkinsopp 2006: 17). It can be anything from any mystery revealed
to the elect seer, from the dreams of a king (Dan. 2:18-19, 27-30, 47; 4:6), to message written on a wall (5:25), visions of the beasts representing successive empires, and even the proper interpretation of the seventy years from the book of Jeremiah (Jer. 25:11-12; 29:10). The true meaning of these encrypted and sealed texts and messages are accessible only to elect individuals (Blenkinsopp 2006: 17). Davies correctly observes that writing is a symbol of political power and authority in Daniel—from the kings and administrators, including Daniel himself, in chapters 1-6 to Daniel writing and interpreting scripture in chapters 7-12. For Davies, “[t]hrough the symbol of writing political power and scripture (the book of Jeremiah and ultimately the book of Daniel itself) are related” (Davies 1993: 354). Thus, ו confers authority on the elect and separates the righteous from the wicked, the pure from the impure, and those who are rewarded from those who are punished.

3 Rewards, Punishments, and Purifications

Daniel 11-12 are the chapters that are pivotal in distinguishing and separating the righteous and the wicked, or in this case, the wise and the violators of the covenant. This being said, the internal divisions, a feature discussed in the previous chapters on E-N and 2 Maccabees, are not as pronounced in Daniel. It is widely accepted that the visions in chapters 7-12 are in response to the persecution by Antiochus IV, an observation which has resulted in scholars overstating the anti-imperial animus in Daniel (see Portier-Young 2011; Smith-Christopher 1996; Valeta 2008). In fact, Portier-Young asserts that “[n]o book of the Hebrew Bible so plainly engages and opposes the project of empire as Daniel (Portier-Young 2011: 223). However, engagements and interactions between empire/colonist and colonial subject
are more nuanced and complex than an overemphasis of resistance allows (see Bhabha 2005; Marshall 2008).

John Marshall highlights the problems with this approach: “Postcolonialism, however, does more than identify and valourize resistance; it also attends to the discourses of affiliation that colonial subjects so often generate” (Marshall 2008: 157). As has been discussed above, Daniel provides a favourable evaluation of the setting of the imperial royal court, which is a site of revelation. Moreover, the succession of empires is part of a divine plan that unfolds before the eyes of Daniel and the maskîlim, or those who have been elected to know the ר. Daniel, like Joseph, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah, is a biblical figure who finds much success in an imperial court. In this regard, Steve Mason describes the ways in which Daniel informed the worldview of Josephus, which resembles those of Jeremiah and Daniel, as follows: “The War’s insistence that foreign rule is divinely ordained, and the consequences of pacifism and opposition to revolt, anticipate the Antiquities, where these themes are grounded in Jeremiah and Daniel” (Mason 1994: 180). Mason posits that a particular reading of Jeremiah and Daniel was an essential ingredient of Josephus’ worldview by the time he wrote the Judean War. Daniel advocates a pacifist approach that opposes armed resistance, because the wise understand the imminence of God’s kingdom and do not try to engineer change. Daniel also shows that a good Judean can cooperate with a foreign empire without becoming tainted by association. These views most certainly resonated with Josephus (Mason 1994: 180).

The above does not suggest that Daniel, by any means, is pro-empire or uncritical of Greek imperial situation around the time of the production of the text. Obviously, Daniel is responding to the trauma and persecution perpetrated by Antiochus IV. Moreover, again, in
Daniel, space is real and imagined as the heterotopic spaces of heaven and earth respond to and play off of each other. The court in Daniel is both heavenly and earthly, as divine courts in the ancient Near East with a divine sovereign mirror earthly royal courts (cf. Psalm 82). The imperial royal court and divine court in Daniel shape and inform each other. Davies describes the function of the court in Daniel as follows:

In chapters 1-6 Daniel is located in the royal court, while in chapter 7 Daniel stands, in his vision, in the court of Elyon. And even though the setting of the rest of the visions is not the court, Daniel is attended by a heavenly courtier (angel) and made privy to those matters which belong properly to the royal court—judgment and enthronement in chapter 7, royal-political policy and warfare in chapters 10-12. The warring angels of this final apocalypse are the counterparts of the human satraps and generals by whom, as much as kings, the political map of the Persian and Greco-Roman world was drawn. The overriding interest in chapters 10-12 on political events, in the machinations of kings, betrays a fascination with the workings of the court, where, as in chapters 1-6, the centre of the authors’ interests really lies. Here too we have evidence of the affiliation of the authors, and an endorsement of the suggestion that they are indeed deprived elite still interested in and privy to political machination but now at the level of the heavenly court. Daniel may not be a counsellor to Babylonian and Persian kings, but he is still welcome at the seat of political power, where history is truly made—in the imagination of the authors, that is. The court is a positive symbol, the natural home and setting of the authors’ imagination. (Davies 1993: 356)

The positive evaluation of the court, including the imperial royal court, and the continuous state of exile that haunts Second Temple Judea, which is based on Jeremiah’s notion of a sabbath for a contaminated land and deuteronomistic worldview that makes people responsible for their own sins, challenge assertions of an anti-imperial animus in Daniel. Moreover, chapters 11-12 reveal internal divisions between the wise and the violators of the covenant and the necessity of purification at the end times.

Daniel 11-12 contains some passages that point to these internal divisions and pose problems greater than Antiochus IV and an imperial agenda. According to Davies,

Possibly the author knew well that the death of the persecutor (had it in fact occurred before these words were written?) would not by itself resolve the problem, which had now become an internal crisis among the Jews, and giving rise to such distinct entities as the ‘violators of the covenant’ and the ‘wise’. The intervention of Michael vindicates not the Jews, but the righteous. (Davies 1985: 115)
In Dan. 11:14, we read: “In those times, many will resist the king of the south, and the lawless sons of your people will assert themselves to conform to the vision, but they will fail.” This verse appears to be in reference to Seleucid sympathizers, who are “lawless sons of your people” (Wills 2004: 1663). However, it is difficult, to say the least, to identify specific individuals, groups, and events both here (Collins 1993: 380) and in other elliptical passages in chapters 10-12, or anywhere else in Daniel for that matter.

With this being said, some events such as the suppression of Judean traditions and the desecration are more easily identified, thereby highlighting the misdeeds of the violators of the covenant: “He will be checked, and will turn back, raging against the holy covenant. Having done his pleasure, he will then attend to those who forsake the holy covenant. Forces will be levied by him; they will desecrate the temple, the fortress; they will abolish the regular offering and set up the appalling abomination” (11:30-31). This verse seems to identify Judean sympathizers with Antiochus IV’s appointed high priest as those who “forsake the covenant and introduce new sacrifices, including the appalling abomination” (Wills 2004: 1664). Importantly, Collins states that this reference to those who forsake that covenant is noteworthy because “it suggests that Antiochus’s subsequent actions were taken on their advice” (Collins 1993: 384). He also notes that the Judean “renegades” do not receive the attention in Daniel as they do in 1 Macc. 1:1-15 and 2 Maccabees 4-5 (Collins 1993: 384).

The biggest indictment of the traitorous Judeans who violate the covenant is in Dan. 11:32-35, where they are juxtaposed with the knowledgeable of the people who instruct will
make the many understand. However, the many join them insincerely. When some of the knowledgeable fall, a process of refining, purging, and whitening will occur until the *eschaton*.

He will flatter with smooth words those who act wickedly toward the covenant, but the people devoted to their God will stand firm. The knowledgeable among the people will make the many understand; and for a while they shall fall by sword and flame, suffer captivity and spoliation. In defeat, they will receive little help, and many will join them insincerely. Some of the knowledgeable will fall, that they might be refined and purged and whitened until the time of the end, for an interval still remains until that appointed time.

The above passage refers to a group of Judeans who are swayed by the words and rewards offered by Antiochus IV (cf. 1 Macc. 2:18). Importantly, 1QM 1:2 uses the terminology מַרְשִׁיעֵי בְרִית (those who act wickedly toward the covenant) in reference to those who help the bands of Kittim of Ashur. Clearly, the מַרְשִׁיעֵי בְרִית signifies internal divisions between the elect and traitors in an eschatological context. The מַשְׁכִּילִים in Daniel are separated from and juxtaposed with those who are devoted to their God and stand firm in the face of persecution, which more likely seems to be a reference to a nonviolent stand rather than a military one (see Collins 1993: 385). The insightful/knowledgeable/wise of the people (משכילים), which refers to Daniel’s circle who are the recipients of the רֶוֶם, are to instruct the many (לַעֲבָדְיוֹן) (cf. Dan. 9:27). Of course, the *maskilim* suffer violence and captivity (cf. 1 Macc. 1:63), while receiving little help (1 Macc. 2:29-38), and thereby refine, purify, and whiten the collective social body from their collective sin until the coming of the *eschaton*.
Here, Daniel keys into a familiar cultural trope as the maskîlîm are recast as the Suffering Servant from Isa. 53:11: “My righteous servant makes the many righteous; it is their punishment that he bears” (Collins 1993: 385; Davies 1985: 110). Portier-Young calls the suffering of the maskîlîm efficacious (Portier-Young 2011: 278). Also, within a deuteronomistic framework, the martyrdom of the maskîlîm functions in a way similar to the martyrdom scenes in 2 Maccabees 7 and almost immediately precedes the process of restoration. Returning to the topos of the Suffering Servant, the persecution and death of the maskîlîm is rewarded with the prospect of immortality and resurrection (Dan. 12:3) (Blenkinsopp 2006: 22).

For the above reason, Davies argues that the deliverance of the maskîlîm in Dan. 12:1-4 are the four most important verses in Daniel because they are the only unambiguous reference to a belief in resurrection in the Hebrew Bible (Davies 1985: 109).

At that time, the great prince, Michael, who stands beside the children of your people, will appear. It will be a time of trouble, the like of which has never been seen since the nation came into being. At that time, your people will be rescued, all who are inscribed in the book. Many of those that will sleep in the dust of the earth will awake, some to eternal life, others to reproaches, to everlasting abhorrence. And the knowledgeable will be radiant like the bright expanse of the sky, and those who lead the many to righteousness will be like the stars forever and ever. “But you, Daniel, keep the words secret, and seal the book until time of the end. Many will range far and wide and knowledge will increase.

The above passage reveals the deliverance and restoration of a true, wise Israel (see Davies 1985: 113). As discussed in the section above, the קִיבּ רַבִּים is inscribed with names of the
elect (cf. Exod. 32:32; Isa. 4:3) and therefore the references to בֵּיתֶךָ (the children of your people) and בְּנֵי עַמֶךָ (your people will be rescued) do not presuppose a collective restoration on the entire nation of Israel. Rather, restoration is designated for the elect—that is, the maskîlîm and those who follow their instructions. It should be noted, however, that the notion of purity and separation is not as dichotomous in Daniel as it is in the other texts featured in this dissertation, as a third group, the rabbîm (רבים) seems to be the majority middle between the elite and the wicked (see Davies 2001: 255).

Again, the list of the restored in the book is an exclusive list that functions in ways similar to the genealogical registers in E-N. There is a stark contrast between the rewards of resurrection and eternal life for the elect וְרַבִּים מִיְשֵׁנָם יָֽקִיצוּ אֶלִ֥יִּוהֵּ֖ם וּבַּעַ֣ת הַהִּֽיאָ֑וֶת לְחַיָּ֖וֹלָם (cf. Ezekiel 37; Hos. 6:2) and the punishments for the violators of the covenant וְאֵ֥לֶה לַחֲ֥רֹם לְדוֹרֵ֖י עֹלָֽם (cf. Isa. 66:24) at that time וּבָֽעַת הַהִֽיאָ (for the eschatological dimensions in Jer. 3:17; 4:11, see Collins 1993: 390). Moreover, Daniel learns of the final fate of the maskîlîm and those who lead—which likely means instruct—the rabbîm to righteousness: they will receive eternal life and be wise in the heavenly court וְהֶמַשְכִּלֵי יִֽהוָּ֖ה יַזְהִ֑רוּ כְּזֵ֝וֹ לְהָרַ֤בִּים תְּכֹֽכְבֵי לְעָלָֽם וָעֶֽד (Dan. 12:3; cf. Wis. 3:7; 1 En. 104:2, 6).

Importantly, all of the above will happen during an unprecedented time of distress וְהָיְתָה עַ֥תָּ צָרָּ֖ה אֲשֶׁ֣ר לֹא־נִ֑הְיָֽתָ֖ה מִֵ֥הוֹי עַ֖ד הָעַ֨ת הַהִֽיאָ (12:1). This turn of phrase is significant language for the schemas of destruction and restoration and exile and return from Jer. 30:7 that, once again, ties together the books of Jeremiah and Daniel, as well as the
events of the sixth century and second century B.C.E.: “Ah, that day is awesome; there is none like it! It is a time of trouble for Jacob, but he shall be delivered from it” 

(הֵוֹי כִּי נָוָלָה הַיּוֹם) (for further commentary on the linguistic trope, see Collins 1993: 390-91). Davies describes the relationship between the maskîlîm, the figure of Daniel, and the book of Daniel itself as follows:

In the “wise” of Daniel 11-12 we see the authors of Daniel, those who during the troubled years preceding the Maccabean rebellion added a group of stories about an exilic hero a series of visions attributed to him, the purpose of which was to apply the ideology of the stories to the particular circumstances of their own time. What we are told of the “wise”, then, we can apply to the authors: they were not those who “violated the covenant” (11.32), but neither did they believe in active resistance. They preferred to wait until the time appointed by God should arrive and to accept what persecution came their way as a test of their loyalty. They were teachers, giving understanding, and their purpose was to “make righteous”. (Davies 1985: 121)

Daniel 12:4 refers to the sealed book (cf. 8:26; see above), which is the book of Daniel itself that must be kept secret until the end of time. Here, figure and text authorize each other. We also see the authority of both the figure and text of Daniel in the writings of Josephus, who reinterprets the fourth beast that would devour the entire earth with its great iron teeth (Dan. 7:7, 23) as Rome. By converting Daniel’s Macedonian empires into Rome, Josephus reads Daniel’s prophecies into his own day (Ant. 10.276). For Josephus, Daniel was “one of the greatest prophets” who had a distinct message and predicted in detail the entire course of subsequent history (Ant. 10.266; Mason 1994: 170-71). Reinterpreting the fourth beast devouring the earth as Rome, converting Daniel’s Macedonian empires into Rome, referring to the desolation of country and government, and Josephus’ reading Daniel’s prophecies into his own day illustrates the formation of inter/transgenerational memory, a process that combines and synthesizes experiences—both our own and others—in the formation of new identities.
The epilogue of Daniel (12:5-13) concludes ironically with Daniel not understanding the content of the final vision (vv. 5-7), which pertains to the fulfillment of the visions “for a time, times, and half a time” (cf. Dan. 7:25; 9:27, where it corresponds to the final half-week of years before the final restoration). Here, Michael tells Daniel: “Go, Daniel, for these words are secret and sealed to the time of the end. Many will be purified and purged and refined; the wicked will act wickedly and none of the wicked will understand; but the knowledgeable will understand” (Dan. 12:9-10). Michael’s command reiterates and recapitulates the major themes addressed in this chapter: revelation, secrecy, esoteric knowledge, sealed books, purification, and rewards and punishment. The true meaning of the book is hidden from the wicked, as its contents are revealed to only the maskîlim (the maskîlim) at the eschaton, when the book will be re-opened (cf. 1QpHab. 7:1-2). However, as Collins notes, רבִּים is without a definite article here, meaning that, unlike 11:25, a greater number of people will be purged and purified (Collins 1993: 400).

4 Conclusions

Daniel appears to be a composite text comprised of different languages, genres, and social location. However, multidirectional/screen memories and eschatological dimensions unify and connect the court tales of chapters 1-6 to the visions of chapters 7-12. Daniel revisits earlier sites of memory and deploys culturally familiar mnemonic schemas as multidirectional/screen memories in projecting the trauma of 167 B.C.E. on to the
Babylonian exile. In the process, Daniel produces a composite hybrid of visions that interweave and fuse together the experienced past and inherited past, or communicative memory and postmemory. In other words, the eschatological visions of the restoration emerge from a dialectic of rupture and continuity.

The events of the second century B.C.E. mirror those of the sixth century B.C.E. as Daniel mourns the absence of an original pre-exilic identity. According to LaCapra, when communities convert absence into loss, nostalgia is misplaced and utopias are sought in the quest for a new totality (LaCapra 2001: 46). Moreover, absence and loss are conflated when absence is narrativized (LaCapra 2001: 49). Again, the narratives produced in these instances often contain elements of collective sin that is overcome through eschatology (LaCapra 2001: 51). In the context of Knibb’s framework of continuously sinful Second Temple Judea that does not overcome exile until the eschaton that re-establishes God’s kingdom, LaCapra’s theory is applicable to Daniel—and, as I illustrate in the following chapter, to CD and 1QpHab. As Knibb argues, only the community responsible for producing the text is exempt from this indefinite sinful state and is restored at the eschaton.

The producers of Daniel discursively achieve this position through reinterpreting the seventy year prophecy of Jeremiah and establishing authority through revelation of the תרי, which is received outside the land in exilic space, and the figure and text of Daniel. The maskîlim, who are an extension of the figure of Daniel and are restored at the eschaton, properly understand this revelation and instruct others so that they too will be restored for eternity. Furthermore, the martyred maskîlim fulfill Daniel’s penitential prayer in chapter 9 by absolving the collective guilt, as they refine, purge, and whiten the collective sin. The combination of the authority of texts (from the book of Jeremiah to the sealed books and the
book of Daniel itself), revelation (proper understanding of the רֶ)
and figures (Daniel and the maskîlîm) establish the necessary conditions for separating the righteous and the wicked
and bringing about restoration and salvation at the eschaton.
Chapter Five

Old Memories, New Identities: Traumatic Memory and Exile in Damascus Document and Pesher Habakkuk

As discussed throughout this dissertation thus far, as communities continue to shape and reshape their collective memories, new memories are combined and integrated with previous typologies and schemas. Again, this process facilitates the representation of trauma and identity formation around these representations. In other words, trauma is processed and represented through mnemonic and narrative structures and schemas (see Caruth 1995: 153; Van Der Kolk and Van Der Hart 1995: 170-76). For instance, the analogy between the exodus from Egypt and the return from the Babylonian exile established in Jeremiah (Jer 16:14-15 = 23:7-8), Second Isaiah (Isa. 48:20; 51:9-11; 52:4) (see Japhet 2006: 502), and E-N was appropriated by later mnemonic communities, including those that produced CD and 1QpHab.

This chapter looks at the ways in which CD and 1QpHab—both of which have been viewed as myths of the origins of a ‘Qumran’ community or communities (see Davies 1987: 15-31)—revisit the traumatic memories of the destruction of Jerusalem and the first temple, and the subsequent exile, in the formation of exclusive collective identities. More specifically, I argue that revisiting and reshaping these sites of memory contributes to the creation of boundaries between the elect and the traitors, or the pure and the impure. In the process, I discuss the ways in which CD and 1QpHab attempt to restore what they narrativize as the loss of an original pre-exilic identity.

Following LaCapra’s notion of converting absence (i.e., something that never was) into loss (i.e., specific historical events), which, again, creates perceptions of an original
unity or identity that has been polluted or contaminated, I look at the ways in which CD and 1QpHab represent the restoration of a pre-exilic identity through the elimination of polluters and contaminators of the collective self, culminating in an eschatological return to Jerusalem and the temple (cf. Zeph. 3:11). In other words, I examine the ways in which these texts represent restoration and recovery from destruction and exile as processes of cleansing or eliminating impure elements from the collective self (cf. E-N). In representing restoration, the producers of CD and 1QpHab mask structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence represented as the loss of an original unity or purity) in its representation of historical trauma (i.e., the destruction of the temple and the Babylonian exile).

I focus on the following points in this chapter: 1) the ways in which the repetitive temporality of traumatic memory creates a bifurcation of the collective self and collapses the distinctions between the past and present so that the desires of the present are imposed on the past through keying into earlier sites of memory to authorize the discourse of the text; 2) the roles of the discourse of exile and temporal rupture and continuity in separating the elect from the traitors; 3) the strategic keying of collective memories of revelation in the wilderness, exile, and return connect these mnemonic communities to an idealized past in imagining the desired end of a restored Jerusalem, temple, and original unity.

1 Trumatic Memory in CD and 1QpHab: Establishing the Elect and the Traitors

Some preliminary comments about the manuscripts are worth noting before any analysis of the texts themselves. Two medieval copies of the CD were discovered at the end of the nineteenth century in an Old Cairo synagogue storeroom (the Cairo genizah). The abbreviation CD stands for “Cairo Damascus” with CD-A referring to manuscript A and CD-
B referring to manuscript B. Manuscript A is the longer of the two and dates to the tenth century C.E., whereas manuscript B dates to the twelfth century. Ten fragments of CD were discovered in Caves 4, 5, and 6 at Qumran, which are known as 4QD, 5QD, and 6QD, with Cave 4 yielding the most manuscripts, eight. All ten ancient manuscripts date from the beginning of the first century B.C.E. to the middle of the first century C.E. CD is divided cleanly into two parts: the Admonition (CD 1-8; 19-20) and the Laws (CD 9-16; Hempel 2000:15-24). My discussion focuses on the Admonition of CD-A, which is regarded as a composite work with a coherent and discernible plot and structure (see Davies 1983: 48-55, 202; Grossman 2002: 15-24, 37-41).

1QpHab is a pesher, or commentary, text. The Hebrew term pesher נשת (pesharim in the plural) means “interpretation.” Maurya Horgan lists fifteen texts—with the possibility of three additional texts—that comprise the pesharim corpus from Qumran (see Horgan 1979). Shani Berrin defines a pesher as follows: “a form of biblical interpretation peculiar to Qumran, in which biblical poetic/prophetic texts are applied to postbiblical historical/eschatological settings through various literary techniques in order to substantiate a theological conviction pertaining to divine reward and punishment” (2005:110). 1QpHab, and the pesharim from Qumran in general, understands earlier events, even those of the distant past, to be relevant to the present and the imminent end time in the immediate future—a process which has already begun (Berrin 2005: 116-17). The distinctive formal feature of pesharim is the citation of an authoritative/biblical text (the “lemma”) followed by the pesher (“Its interpretation concerns...”) that reads the past into the present and/or near future by applying the content of the lemma to a contemporaneous context (i.e., the socio-historical context of the interpretive community; see Berrin 2005: 111). 1QpHab, which was
among the original seven scrolls from Cave 1, is a *pesher* of the book of Habakkuk as it applies the Habakkuk’s prophecies of the Chaldean destruction of a sinful Judah (Habakkuk 1-2) to its own time. Given that 1QpHab interprets the Chaldeans to be the Kittim, most likely referring to the Romans, we can date the text to the second half of the first century B.C.E., in either the late Hasmonean or early Roman period.

It is difficult to more precisely date both CD and 1QpHab because of the elliptical and elusive historical references. Davies also outlines the difficulties scholars face in attempting to ‘do conventional history’ with the Dead Sea Scrolls (Davies 2010: 31). Yes, the Dead Sea Scrolls tell us a great deal about early Judaisms and Christianities but not without obscuring specific events and figures. In other words, figures and events are represented schematically, typologically, and metaphorically with ciphers and sobriquets. Davies also points out that the texts we identify as core to a scholarly constructed Qumran community (i.e., “sectarian texts”) are more focused on the future than they are on the past (Davies 2010: 31). Instead of creating more scholarly constructed historical narratives about a scholarly constructed Qumran community, Davies suggests approaching the corpus of texts through the lens of collective/cultural memory. Although Davies acknowledges that the road from collective memory to history can be elusive and difficult, he asserts that “[t]he historian of Qumran collective memory must begin by analyzing the memory itself, its function and its development” (Davies 2010: 34). The approach that Davies is proposing corresponds to Assmann’s mnemohistory, which is similar to my own approach to CD and 1QpHab in this chapter. Davies does not suggest that scholars abandon the quest for “genuine recollection” or “real history” because the more core facts that scholars know, “the better we can gauge the way in which memory transforms it” (Davies 2010: 34). He, however, cautions scholars that
the earliest memory of an event is neither necessarily the most reliable nor more reliable than later ones (Davies 2010: 34). Memories are forgotten and sometimes reappear later in postmemory.

I am starting with the premise that CD and 1QpHab likely were produced by different communities, neither of which I refer to as the Qumran community or Qumran Judaism. Collins (2009) outlines the problems with attempting to correlate the site of Qumran with the texts discovered there in constructing the identity of one hypothetical community, which both inhabited the site and produced the texts. He argues that the texts should not be interpreted through the lens of the site. Essentially, I agree with Collins’ following conclusion: “Despite the lure of convenience, it is time that we stopped referring to it as the ‘Qumran community’” (Collins 2009: 369; cf. Regev 2007: 7). Similarly, Davies cautions scholars against being seduced into the temptation of amalgamating “common denominators of Qumran texts into the reconstruction of a ‘Qumran Judaism’” (Davies 2000: 42-43). He posits that the texts discovered at Qumran do not constitute a single, monolithic Judaism; in fact, some of these texts do not even represent a systematic Judaism (Davies 2000: 42).

With the above being said, it is evident that the mnemonic communities that produced CD and 1QpHab drew on similar sites of memory, employed familiar cultural frameworks and schemas, and shared some common worldviews and linguistic tropes, which will be evident throughout this chapter. Furthermore, both CD and 1QpHab also share features and family resemblances with other texts discovered at Qumran, especially those which are generally classified as ‘sectarian’. Some of the strong family resemblances discussed below that are shared by CD, 1QpHab, and other ‘sectarian’ texts include the following: separation of and/or dualism between the righteous and impious (1QM, 1QS, 4QMMT, 4Q171, 4Q174,
4Q177, 4Q387, 11QMelch); exilic discourse and wilderness identity (1QM, 1QS, 4QMMT, 4Q161, 4Q177, 4Q390, 4Q403) (for a list of texts, see Abegg (1997), Najman (2006), and Talmon (1966); eschatological worldviews (1QM, 1QS, 4QMMT, 4Q174, 4Q177, 11QMelch) (see Collins 1997a). However, I agree with Florentino García Martínez that Dead Sea Scroll scholarship “should not only go beyond the ‘canonical divide’ but also beyond the ‘sectarian divide,’ and we should consider each composition of the whole collection on its own; and on the basis of the partial and accidental evidence which has reached us, we should decide in each case the authority each single book may have had for the group that put the collection together” (García Martínez 2010: 244). Following García Martínez, I approach CD and 1QpHab as individual texts—each of which should be considered on its own—that share family resemblance traits with not only other ‘sectarian’ texts discovered at Qumran but also many other authoritative texts from the Second Temple period (e.g. E-N, Daniel, 1 Enoch, Jubilees, 1-2 Maccabees, and others), which exhibit features that scholars identify as ‘sectarian’: exclusiveness, self-conceptions of being an elect group or remnant, antagonism towards outsiders, and access to salvation (Regev 2007: 40-42).

A prominent and persistent shared feature in Second Temple literature is the revisiting and reshaping of memories of the Babylonian exile. As discussed throughout this dissertation, collective memories of trauma serve as inter/transgenerational sites of memory that may be reactivated and reshaped by later groups that bring the past into the present (Winter 2010: 317). Memories of the Babylonian exile are exemplary of the presence of and tension between rupture and continuity as mnemonic communities connect the prophetic remnant, or survivors, of the exile with the founders and origins of a new covenant community. As Blenkinsopp notes, this feature, which is an incubator for exclusive identity
production, is most explicitly expressed in CD (Blenkinsopp 2009: 216-17). Davies describes the rupture and continuity, as well as the construction of an exclusive collective identity, in CD’s revisiting and reshaping memories of the Babylonian exile and return as follows: “The community ‘remembers’ itself as the real Israel, the legitimate continuity of the old one, the real chosen people, but also in one sense not Israel—not the old Israel, and not the ‘Israel’ from which it is now segregated” (Davies 2010: 36). Once again, the tensions between rupture and continuity are overcome by the imagination of representation (Pickering and Keightley 2013: 127-28).

The fact that multiple mnemonic communities were fixated on and reproduced memories of the Babylonian exile speaks to LaCapra’s position that some sites of memory, which become sites of trauma in this context, are revisited because groups have not come to terms with the trauma through mourning (LaCapra 1998: 10). In other words, the past persists via postmemory as it intrudes and shapes the present. Likewise, the present continues to shape and reshape the past. Here, one needs to think only of the ways in which Hoffman describes the transmission of trauma, or inter/transgenerational memory: the haunting and persistent presence that overwhelms and overshadows the present (i.e., the mourning that never lifts) (Hoffman 2010: 411). As I showed in the previous chapter in my discussion of Daniel, the work of LaCapra and Hoffman corresponds to Knibb’s position that some Second Temple literature, including CD, presents Israel in a continuous state of exile that was not overcome and a process of restoration that did not occur fully during the Persian period. As in Daniel, CD and 1QHab represent full restoration as occurring at the eschaton, when only members of their respective communities are restored (Knibb 1976: 272). In other words, for many communities, the exile was not overcome during the Second Temple period and was
revisited as a site of trauma by later Second Temple communities (see Blenkinsopp 2003: 19). Amidst this exile, from Babylon until the eschaton, a pre-exilic identity is lost and or contaminated. As I have shown throughout this dissertation, this coveted pre-exilic identity is a case of absence, not loss. When absence is conflated with loss, it is thereby mourned. Moreover, narratives grounded in absence produce notions of a sinfulness that is overcome only through eschatology.

As I illustrate below, the inter/transgenerational sites of trauma of the destruction of 587 B.C.E. and the exile become the foundation for identity construction in CD and 1QHab. In fact, in these texts, the Chaldean campaign against Jerusalem is not only an earlier site of trauma to be revisited and virtually, but still experientially, relived, albeit through acts of imagination, but also one that embodies in itself the answer to a present day, pressing question for the community: Who will possess the land in the future? The repetitive temporality and haunting effects of traumatic postmemory collapse distinctions between the past, present, and future in these texts. The presence of this process in 1QpHab should not come as a surprise, since by definition, *pesharim* are understood as fusing together past, present, and future. These texts are haunted by the past and the exile is never overcome because absence is the object of mourning (i.e., an original and idealized pre-exilic identity). The mourning of the absence of a pure pre-exilic identity in CD and 1QpHab leads to eschatological worldviews and narratives of restoration and renewal that seek to eliminate the pollutants and impurities in the social body.

In mourning the absence of this idealized pre-exilic identity, CD and 1QpHab reshape earlier sites of trauma—the destruction of 587 B.C.E and the exile—to position their respective communities in the present and establish an eschatological future, at which time
the elect will possess the land and return to Jerusalem. Both texts begin by invoking violent imagery in establishing the origins of their respective communities: CD refers to Israel being delivered to the sword (CD-A 1:3-5) and 1QpHab complains of violence in the land that marks the beginning of the generation (1QpHab 1:2-8; see further Jassen 2010). CD and 1QpHab then revisit the memory of the Chaldean destruction of Jerusalem while distinguishing between the elect and the traitors, or the pure and impure (CD-A 1:6-21; 1QpHab 2-3). Importantly, in both texts, the impure traitors reside in Jerusalem, defiling its temple.

In CD, the elect is represented as the pure remnant that survived the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E.

For when they were unfaithful in forsaking him, he hid his face from Israel and the sanctuary and delivered them up to the sword. But when he remembered the covenant with the forefathers, he saved a remnant for Israel and did not deliver them up to destruction. And at the period of wrath, three hundred and ninety years after having delivered them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, he visited them and caused to sprout from Israel and from Aaron a shoot of planting, in order to possess his land and to become fat with the good things of his soil. (CD-A 1:3-8) 

When God turned away from those who had forsaken him and delivered them up to the sword, he remembered the covenant with the ancestors and saved a remnant for Israel (CD-A 1:4-5), which is the foundation of the true Israel and new covenant community in CD. The new covenant community, which is juxtaposed with the congregation of traitors (CD-A 1:12), is a shoot from Israel and Aaron that is to possess the
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land in the future יגממה מישראל ומאהר שורש מטענה לירוש את ארצו (CD-A 1:3-8; 2:11). The producer(s) of CD show the malleability of a site of trauma through mnemonic obliteration and telescoping time (see Henige 1974) in creating continuity between past, present, and future. CD telescopes the 390 years between Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction and the emergence of the pure remnant of the new covenant community (cf. Ezek. 4:5). In the process, CD effaces the memory of the return from Babylon, subsequent history, and any other identities (see Davies 2010: 36; CD-A 1:6-8), as the exile continued throughout the Second Temple period until the emergence of this pure remnant. Instead, the new covenant community in CD are the exiles who return to the land. The producer(s) of CD self-identify as the only ones who remained pure and faithful in exile (Blenkinsopp 2003: 19).

In 1QpHab, the elect, who are led by the persecuted Teacher of Righteousness מורה are separated from three enemies: 1) the wicked, who are Judeans; 2) the Kittim, who are associated with Chaldeans of the past and the Romans in the present and future; 3) the traitors בוגדים, who are violators of the covenant (Jokiranta 2005: 30-31).

[. . . The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors with the Man of the Lie, since they do not [believe in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God; and (it concerns) the traitor[s of the] new [covenant] si[n]ce they did not believe in the covenant of God [and dishonoured] his holy na[me]. Likewise: Blank The interpretation of the word [concerns the trait]ors in the last days. They are the violator[s of the covenant] who will not believe when they hear all that is going [to happen t]o the final generation, from the mouth of the Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the Commun]ity, to foretell the fulfillment of the words of his servants, the prophets, [by] means of whom God has declared all that is going to happen to his people Is[rael]. Hab 1:6 For see, I will mobilize the Chaldeans, a cruel [and deter]mined people. Blank Its interpretation concerns the Kittim, wh[o ar]e swift and powerful in battle, to slay many [. . .] in the kingdom of the Kittim; they will take possession [of many countries] and will not believe in the precepts of [Go]d [. . . Hab 1:6 They go across

44 The designation “Teacher of Righteousness” occurs at least 17 times in Dead Sea Scrolls, including 1QpHab 1:13; 2:2; 5:10; 7:4; 8:3; 9:9-10; 11:5; CD-A 1:11; 6:11 (“the one who teaches righteousness”) (see Stuckenbruck 2005: 26-27). The Teacher of Righteousness is also mentioned in1QpMic and 4QpPs.
the earth] to [take possession of dwellings, not theirs. Its interpretation . . .] and they will advance over the plain, to destroy and pillage the cities of the country. (1QpHab 2:1-3:1)

All three enemies will be divinely punished for their transgressions, which include forsaking the precepts of God (1QpHab 2:14-15; 8:10), robbing the nations (3:1-2; 9:5), acting with hubris (4:2-3; 10:13), performing illicit cultic activities (4:13; 6:4-5; 12:8-9), and persecuting the vulnerable (6:11-12; 12:1-3; Jokiranta 2013: 115). 1QpHab represents the traitors of its own people who occupy the Jerusalem temple to be more wicked than the plundering and marauding armies of the Kittim (Jokiranta 2013: 163; 2005: 30-31). In fact, the Kittim merely act as agents delivering divine retribution in the eschatological future against the Wicked Priest of the Jerusalem temple, who has acted wickedly against the elect:

And what it says: *Hab 2:8a* <<Since you pillaged many peoples all the rest of the nations will pillage you>>. Its interpretation concerns the last priests of Jerusalem, who will accumulate riches and loot from plundering the nations. However, in the last days their riches and their loot will be given in to the hands of the army of the Kittim. *Blank For they are Hab 2:8a <<the rest of the nations>>*. *Hab 2:8b* For the human blood (spilt) and the violence (done) to...
the country, the city and all/who dwell/in it. Its interpretation concerns the [Wi]cked Priest, whom, for the wickedness against the Teacher of Righteousness and the members of his council, God delivered into the hands of the enemies to disgrace him with a punishment, to destroy him with bitterness of soul for having acted wickedly against his elect. (1QpHab 9:2-12)

In 1QpHab, the destruction of the traitors of the covenant in the last days makes the return of the elect to Jerusalem possible. Revisiting memories of the Chaldean destruction of Jerusalem and having the Kittim destroy the impure priests in Jerusalem signals the beginning of the process of restoration and return in the last days, when the wicked will be removed from the earth (1QpHab 13:2).

Revisiting the trauma of 587 B.C.E. and the exile is an effective means of producing new collective identities by establishing it as a founding trauma. The language in CD and 1QpHab is a prime example of processes of identity formation in which a trauma is represented as a founding, generative, and integrative identity. According to Carol Newsom, designations such as ‘the elect’ or ‘the remnant for Israel’ are an “intense rhetorical attempt to create new communities of discourse that could provide the basis for new social formations” (Newsom 2004: 10). Maxine Grossman sees the dualistic language that frames the memories of these to be indicative of intracommunal conflicts (Grossman 2002: 135-36, 156-57). Thus, we can see evidence of the interweaving of the inherited past and the experienced past. The exclusivist and divisive language used in CD and 1QpHab is not surprising in that sites of trauma have the potential to unite or divide groups, especially in instances of postmemory and/or the appropriation of inter/transgenerational sites of memory when absence and loss have been conflated. According to LaCapra, “the conflation of
absence and loss would facilitate the appropriation of particular traumas by those who did not experience them, typically in a movement of identity formation which makes invidious and ideological use of traumatic series of events in foundational ways or as symbolic capital” (LaCapra 2001: 65). For the communities responsible for CD and 1QpHab, restoration and recovery from the exile of 587 B.C.E. is what separates their communities from a sinful Second Temple period and includes eliminating the impure part of Second Temple Judea (see LaCapra 2001: 43-85). In other words, the pure and impure in CD and 1QpHab are established through revisiting and reshaping the catastrophic events of the destruction of 587 B.C.E. and the Babylonian exile.

Both CD and 1QpHab mourn the absence of an original pre-exilic identity, thereby producing notions of a continuous state of exile and impurities in the social body that can be overcome only through physical or discursive separation from these impurities before the ultimate restoration of an eschatological end, which will cleanse and restore Jerusalem and the temple to a pure state. In doing so, CD and 1QpHab build temporal bridges to an idealized past by keying into memories of the wilderness, exile, and return. The memories and discourse of the wilderness and exile provide the necessary discursive separation from impurities in the present before an eschatological end.

2 Exile and Separation

The result of restoration is twofold in that not only do social groups try to mnemonically and discursively remove themselves from perceived impurities but they also create a bond or common culture with those with whom they identify (Erikson 1995: 189-90). Reflecting this principle, CD and 1QpHab discursively avoid contamination by
establishing an exilic identity—whether in Damascus, the wilderness, or some other real or imagined location (see Grossman 2002: 196-200; Lied 2003)—that both functions as a common culture or kinship and makes them the legitimate recipients of revelation. This pure exilic identity is juxtaposed with impure and polluted people of Jerusalem in CD and 1QpHab. In both CD and 1QpHab, the elect are in a state of exile outside of Jerusalem. Although the experience of exile initially results from punishment and persecution, it becomes a necessary state for revelation, covenant-making, purification, and restoration (see Talmon 1966: 62-63). Within this schema, Jerusalem is a site of impurity, whereas exile in the wilderness is a liminal space in which the new covenant and the identity of the elect are established (see Lied 2003: 121). As we have seen in E-N, the schema and typology of periodic exile followed by return is a powerful trope for the production of an exclusive notion of a restored Israel, as the discourse of exile allows the geographic separation necessary for incubation from an impure Jerusalem.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the concept of the wilderness undergoes a conceptual change during the Second Temple period: what once signified exile and punishment becomes a space of purification and revelation (see Najman 2006: 100-101). In reference to the Second Temple and Talmudic periods, Isaiah Gafni shows how exile can be viewed as either punishment or blessing, as well as ways in which attributes of the homeland—such as
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46 Damascus or the land of Damascus is mentioned five times in CD-A (CD-A 6:5, 19; 7:14-15, 18-19; 8:21), twice in CD-B (19:34 = CD-A 8:21; 20:12), and once in 4QCD (3, 3:20 = CD-A 7:19), all of which are found in the Admonition (Lied 2003: 110-11). The meaning, location, and interpretation of Damascus have been a topic of much scholarly debate. Scholars have argued that Damascus is a metaphor for Babylon (Murphy O’Connor 1974) and Qumran (Knibb 1994). For a survey of scholarship on these issues, see Davies (1983: 16-17; 1996: 95-111), Knibb (1983), and Lied (2003). I find Liv Lied’s approach using Edward Soja’s most helpful. Thirdspace is a combination of firstspace (“real, material” space) and secondspace (imagined pace). Since space is both material and mental, real and imagined—where imagined geography becomes real geography—Thirdspace allows the flexibility for multiple interpretations. Interpreting the meaning of Damascus through the lens of Thirdspace, Lied concludes the following: “The conclusion is therefore that Damascus must be understood as both an exile and as a blessing. This multivalence and ambiguity implied in the descriptions of Damascus probably also account for the varying scholarly opinions as to the identity and location of Damascus, and will no doubt continue to provoke discussion in the future” (Lied 2003: 125).
Davidic leadership and remnants of the temple—can be applied to life outside the homeland (Gafni 1997: 98-116). Liv Lied, in her discussion of Gafni, identifies Jer 24:1-10; 38:2 and Ezek 17:1-10 as precursors for positive evaluations of exile (Lied 2005: 124). The positive evaluations of exile are evident in CD and 1QpHab, as both texts read the past through the present by mapping their own experiences of exile and persecution onto earlier sites of memories of sojourns in wilderness. Whether in actual or imaginative/metaphorical exile, memories of exile and the wilderness in CD and 1QpHab are examples of the hybrid representation of the experienced past and inherited past of postmemory. In both texts, exile becomes the prototypical Israelite experience in wilderness, that is, one of transformation and purification in a liminal space. Here, exile in the wilderness is associated with purification and the homeland becomes a place of impurity and punishment in the present (cf. E-N; see Lied 2005: 115).

The relationship between exile and the wilderness as a space of purification, where revelation and proper interpretation of Torah occurs, resonates throughout the Second Temple literature. For instance, the producer(s) of 1QS appropriated wilderness imagery from Second Isaiah and applied it to its community’s experience of exile:

And when these have become /a community/ in Israel/ in compliance with these arrangements/ they are to be segregated from within the dwelling of the men of sin to walk to the desert in order to open there His path. As it is written (Isa. 40:3) “In the desert, prepare the way of ****, straighten in the steppe a roadway for our God.” (1QS 8:12-14)

In this context, the desert is redefined as a place where correct adherence to the law is achieved. Although CD and 1QpHab represent their respective communities in a state of exile and purification, both texts suggest that the process of restoration has begun and that
Jerusalem will be returned to a purified state in the near future. They key into the Isaianic concept of a remnant emerging out of exile for a future return to Jerusalem (see Blenkinsopp 2006: 226).

Reminiscent of E-N, the discourse of exile allows CD to dissociate the new covenant community from those in the land, namely the House of Judah, which likely refers to Jerusalem and its immediate environs (see Lied 2003: 106-7; Knibb 1983: 108). The returnees/converts of Israel left the land of Judah and dwelled in Damascus (CD-A 4:3; 6:5; cf. Amos 5:27), where they established the new covenant (CD-A 6:19; 19:33-34; 20:12). The juxtaposition of the names Israel and Judah is significant. John Bergsma describes this process of identity construction in CD as follows: “the ‘returnees of Israel’ are mentioned in the Damascus Document only four times: twice as the ‘returnees of Israel’ are said to ‘have gone out from the land of Judah’ (CD 4:3; 6:5) and twice they have ‘turned aside from the path of the people [CD 8:16; 19:28-29]’” (Bergsma 2008: 181). Moreover, the new covenant community, or the pure remnant in CD, self-identifies as the true Israel, which is also used to distinguish and dissociate the community from the House of Judah. In fact, the term is used about forty times in CD, fourteen of which are either direct or indirect self-identifications of the community (Bergsma 2008: 176-79). The discursive removal from the geographical space of the impure proximate other, or the impure part of the collective self (CD-A 6:14-18), creates the space necessary for identity dissociation and construction. CD-A 4:15-18 refers to the corruption and impurities of Jerusalem when Israel is ensnared by the three nets of Belial: fornication, wealth, and pollution of the temple. In sum, the producer(s)
of CD construct the identity of the new covenant community against that of the House of Judah.

In 1QpHab, the Wicked Priest is the figurehead of the traitors and character foil of the Teacher of Righteousness. According to 1QpHab, the Wicked Priest is also responsible for chasing the Teacher of Righteousness away from a polluted Jerusalem and pursuing him to his house of exile on Yom Kippur (1QpHab 11:4-8). Although initially an act of punishment and persecution, as is discussed below, the provides the discursive and geographic separation from a polluted Jerusalem. Thus, as in CD, 1QpHab engages in the discourse of righteous exiles (see Jokiranta 2013:115). Loren Stuckenbruck notes that the liturgical time (Spiegel 2002: 162) associated with the memory of the persecution and exile of the Teacher of Righteousness, who is a figure of the past, is significant because the community would not have been able to observe Yom Kippur without invoking and reliving the memory of this persecution and exile (Stuckenbruck 2005: 41).

The association between the Wicked Priest’s persecution of the Teacher and the Day of Atonement thus means that the pesharist not only retells a past event, but also stresses its timing at a festival that was no doubt being observed by the pesharist’s own community, which could not mark the event without recalling what had happened to the Teacher. Here the analogy between the Teacher and the later community emerges: the passage refers to the observance of Yom Kippur, a festival at which the high priest in the Jerusalem Temple officiated. The Teacher and his group, however, are said to have been pursued to their “House of Exile,” that is, away from Jerusalem. Therefore, the memory of the event, when the Teacher was unjustly pursued by the Wicked Priest, would have functioned to reinforce the community’s self-perception that its observance of the Torah—away from the Jerusalem cult where an erring calendrical system remained in use—was correct. Thus a ritual ‘site of memory’ would have provided a rally point for the pesharist’s community. (Stuckenbruck 2005: 41-42)

In other words, Yom Kippur reinforced the collective experience and reliving of exile outside of Jerusalem, which is a locus for proper observance of Torah. Once again, we see an
example of the interweaving of the experienced past and the inherited past in the transmission and hybrid representation of postmemory.

In the next column of 1QpHab, the Wicked Priest is blamed for the pollution and defilement of Jerusalem (see Grossman 2002: 200): “Hab 2:17 <<Owing to the blood of the city and the violence (done to) the country>>. Its interpretation: the city is Jerusalem in which the /Wicked/ Priest performed repulsive acts and defiled the Sanctuary of God. The violence (done to) the country are the cities of Judah which he plundered of the possessions of the poor” מדם קריה זומס ארם פשר המקיריה יהו ירושלם אשר פעל ב הבתון הפרושי ממעש חטביה ייטמא את המקדר אל ארם המקיריה וירדה אשר אול ה侘ים (1QpHab 12:6-10). The literary proximity between the house of exile of the Teacher of Righteousness and the polluted Jerusalem of the Wicked Priest is no coincidence as it emphasizes the juxtaposition between the two sites. Similarly, in contrast to the Teacher of Righteousness and his house of exile, the “Spreader of the Lie” is accused of misdirecting many and “building a useless city with blood and erecting a community with deceit for his own glory, wearing out many by useless work and teaching them a[c]ts of deceit, so that their labours are for nothing; so that those who derided and insulted God’s chosen will go to the punishment of the fire” מטיף הכזב אשר התויע埃尔ינ לטנת עיר של בדמים וליקים עדה בשקר בצרו בדמים לונה בדמים📜 עכלを使用 לעביו לעביו לבוב הלזרו אלแชבמ cliente (1QpHab 10:9-13). Finally, 1QpHab outlines the punishment of the Wicked Priest for the injustices he has committed against Jerusalem: “will appal you, owing to the human blood and violence (done to) the country, the city and all who dwell there. The interpretation of the
word concerns the Wicked Priest, to pay him the reward for what he did to the poor. . . . God will sentence him to destruction”.

מדמי אדם וחמס ארץ קריה וכול יושבי בה פשר הדבר על הכוהן (1QpHab 12:1-5).

3 Revelation in the Wilderness and the Return to Jerusalem

In addition to the discursive separation from the impurities of Jerusalem, exile in the wilderness invokes memories of the Sinaitic experience (see Najman 2003). CD authorizes itself through the figure and text of what Najman calls Mosaic Discourse. Again, the revelation at Sinai is an event of liturgical and repetitive temporality that can be repeated and re-presented, even in exile (Najman 2003: 36). As in E-N, revelation and proper interpretation and observation of Torah in CD occurs outside Jerusalem in exilic wilderness, where it is inscribed back to Sinai, Moses, and Mosaic Torah (Najman 2003). The Teacher of Righteousness in CD is the true interpreter of Torah and the recipient of revelation as he is “to direct them in the path of his heart” and make known to the last generations “what he had done for the last generation, the congregation of traitors” (CD-A 1:11-12) (see Hacham 2005: 10-11). According to Talmon, the images of the Teacher of Righteousness and Interpreter of the Law were patterned on that of Moses (Talmon 1966: 58). Davies describes the typology of the Interpreter of the Law that is patterned on the figure of Moses

---

47 According to Talmon, “The very image of the ‘Teacher of Righteousness,’ and certainly that of the ‘Law Interpreter,’ undoubtedly was patterned on the image of Moses. Their personalities mirror a positive aspect of the midbār motif in Qumran literature, just as the life story of Moses reflects, at a certain angle, the Biblical evaluation of the desert period . . . . The ‘Teacher’s’ struggle against the ‘Wicked Priest’ is a re-enactment of the strife of Moses and Aaron against the powers of evil that opposed them in their time . . . .” (Talmon 1966: 58).
as follows: “We will presumably never know if there was a dwrš htwrh, or, if there was, who he was, or if the authors of these passages knew his identity. It is his function that matters; typologically he is to be seen as the second Moses, just as for other Jewish groups Ezra was. The entire simple memory, in fact, is typological in form and function” (Davies 2010: 36).

As in E-N, Torah and a second Moses figure in CD links the past, present, and future through an unbroken chain of transmission, from creation down to the new covenant established with the pure remnant of Israel in the exilic wilderness. This process, again, is facilitated by imagination and the familiar cultural typologies of postmemory. CD-A 7:14-21 describes the exile of Torah after the people of Israel did not observe its laws properly. This passage is another Sinaitic moment with the law being re-established, observed, and properly interpreted by the Interpreter of the Law—a second Moses—in the purified space of the exilic wilderness of Damascus, where the righteous is separated from the wicked (Regev 2007: 45-46).

And he said: Am 5:26-27 «I will deport the Sikkut of your King and the Kiyyun of your images away from my tent to Damascus». Blank The books of the law are Sukkat of the King, as he said Am 9:11 «I will lift up the fallen Sukkat of David». Blank The King is the assembly; and the Kiyyune of the images and the Kiyyun of the images are the books of the prophets, whose words Israel despised. Blank And the star is the Interpreter of the Law, who will come to Damascus, as is written: Num 24:13 «A star moves out of Jacob and, and sceptre arises out of Israel». The sceptre is the prince of the whole congregation and when he rises he will destroy all the sons of Seth. (CD-A 7:14-21)

Proper interpretation and observation of Torah separates members from non-members of the covenant community in CD-A 1:16-18; 4:9-12; 20:25-28.48

48 The term “covenant” occurs forty-four times in the medieval and ancient manuscripts, but it is difficult to determine to what the term exactly refers (Hempel 2000: 79). Quoting Charlotte Hempel, “it is at times difficult
CD outlines the way in which the Watchers and the sons of Noah and their families did not heed the precepts of God, and were subsequently cut off (CD-A 2:17-3:1). But Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were written up as friends of God and subsequently became eternal members of the covenant (CD-A 3:3-4). However, Jacob’s sons broke the covenant and were punished accordingly, and their sons were cut off in the wilderness (CD-A 3:4-7). After possessing the land, the covenant was broken again and the Israelite kings in Jerusalem were cut off and the land was laid to waste (CD-A 3:7-10).

For many have gone astray due to these; brave heroes stumbled on account of them, from ancient times until now. For having walked in the stubbornness of their hearts the Watchers of the heavens fell; on account of it they were caught, for they did not heed the precepts of God. And their sons, whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell. All flesh which there was on the dry earth expired and they became as if it had never been, because they had realized their desires and had failed to keep their creator’s precepts, until his wrath flared up against them. Through it, the sons of Noah and their families strayed, through it, they were cut off. Abraham did not walk in it, and was counted as a friend for keeping God’s precepts and not following the desire of his spirits. And he passed (them) on to Isaac and to Jacob, they kept (them) and were written up as friends of God and as members of the covenant for ever. Blank. Jacob’s sons strayed because of them and were punished in accordance with their mistakes. And in Egypt their sons walked in the stubbornness of their hearts, plotting against God’s precepts and each one of them were cut off in the wilderness. <And He spoke> to them in Qadesh: Deut 9:23 «Go and posses the land». But they preferred the desire> of their spirit, and did not listen to the voice of the creator, the precepts he had taught them, and murmured in their tents. And the wrath of God flared up against their congregation. And their sons died through it, and through it their kings were cut off, and through it their warriors perished, and through it their land was laid waste. (CD-A 2:16-3:10)

cי רבים תעו בם וגבורי חיל נכשלו בם מפלסימ ודע הניה בלматериалים למב ועריך השם כה
אברהם לא שמר את מצוות אלה ודברי אדום ברויםיך ובחרים בו חיות כולם בם כה
הוא מהם (מעה) בני משמשתיהם והם בני כדרים אברים אל כל ביה יאדו את עמם משה ו
לא ברוח ברוחו בני עקיב בני בם ויעשו להם משותם ב˂מעם ביצוני amsterdam לברוח
לדייך (להחוצר) על מעות אלה ולוושת אישהchaft ויכל אולב את היה וברך וברך בבראשון (ידורב)

to distinguish whether the text is referring to the Mosaic covenant or the community’s covenant” (Hempel 2000: 79). This being said, Hempel notes that the phrase “the covenant of the former times/the ancestors” refers to the Mosaic covenant (CD 1:4; 3:10-11; 4:9; 6:2) (Hempel 2000: 79).
Significantly, of the eighteen lines between CD-A 2:17-3:10, sixteen are devoted to the periods leading up to and including Moses. Thus, only two lines are allocated to the periods of Israelite history between Moses and the emergence of the new covenant community in CD (Anderson 1994: 16). This is another example of CD telescoping time and using literary-chronological proximity to link the new covenant community to a foundational moment in the Israelite past.

The chain of transmission from Sinai to the new covenant community in exile is outlined in CD-A 6:2-7.

But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers. Blank and he raised from Aaron men of knowledge and from Israel wise men, and made them listen. And they dug a well: Num 21:18 «A well which the princes dug, which the nobles of the people delved with the staff». The well is the law. And those who dug it Blank are the converts of Israel, who left the land of Judah and lived in the land of Damascus, all of whom God called princes, for they sought him, and their renown has not been repudiated in anyone’s mouth. And the staff is the Interpreter of the Law...

The members of the new covenant community are the wise men from Israel and the converts from Israel who emerged from Aaron and are the legitimate inheritors and interpreters of Torah. In addition to the Interpreter of the Law, the Teacher of Righteousness is also an

49 According to Loren Stuckenbruck, “[e]ven if, strictly speaking, neither the Interpreter nor the eschatological one teaching righteousness can be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, the passage strongly connects membership in the community with faithfulness to and observance of the Torah, with respect to which the Teacher was seen to have played an indispensable role” (Stuckenbruck 2005:35). However, Davies notes the similarity between the interpreter of the law and the Teacher of Righteousness, but outlines the important distinctions between the two figures as follows: “the arrival of the ‘Teacher’ is placed well after the formation of the ‘root’ and even further from the survival of the remnant, while the ‘Interpreter’ is placed at the very origins of the remnant community. The ‘Interpreter of the Law’ in CD is a past figure; the ‘one who teaches righteousness’ of VI,11 is a future figure” (Davies 1983: 123-24).
authoritative voice for the proper interpretation of Torah (CD-B 20:27-28, 32-33) (García Martínez 2010: 23-33).

Also connecting the new covenant community to Moses and Sinai is the organization of the community in camps of tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands (CD-A 13:1-2), figures corresponding to pre-exilic Israel’s organization in the desert in Exod. 18:21-25 (Hempel 2000: 40). Noting the numerous biblical spatial tropes and typologies invoked in CD, Lied describes the significance of the camps in CD to those in Exodus as follows:

The description of the camps, the references to the presence of God and of the Laws as central forces among the remnant group operating independent of the institutions of Palestine all point to the flexible and mobile spatial patterns characteristic of the Exodus story. By recalling the camps of the Exodus CD-A brings a powerful set of paradigmatic events into play as central arguments for the redemption of the remnant group. Just as the first Exodus once saved Israel, a similar set of events will again save the remnant (CD-A 5.19). (Lied 2003: 118)

Thus, the producer(s) of CD key into the memory of the exodus in representing the community’s sojourns in the wilderness—literally or metaphorically—so that it mirrors the experiences of the generation of Moses, thereby making it a liminal space between the reception of the covenant and the entry into the promised land (Davies 2000: 32). According to CD, the law התורה has been revealed to the multitude of the camp (CD-A 15:13-14). The past, present, and future are connected when members pass the new covenant on to their children. On the day when their children speak to the Inspector of the Many המבפר אשר לירבים, the members are to enrol their children with “the oath of the covenant which Moses established with Israel, the covenant to revert to the law of Moses with the whole heart and [with] the whole soul.” בשבועת הברית אשר כרת משה עם ישראל את התורה לש בוב אל
As discussed above with the Teacher of Righteousness being pursued to the גלותו אבית, 1QpHab asserts that proper observation and interpretation of Torah occurs in exile with the Teacher of Righteousness and his later community, not in Jerusalem with the Wicked Priest. The Teacher of Righteousness is remembered and represented as the interpreter par excellence of Torah and the prophets (Stuckenbruck 2005: 31). According to García Martínez, the Teacher of Righteousness “is clearly presented as the expected ‘prophet like Moses’ in Deut 18:15” (García Martínez 2010: 240-41). The Teacher of Righteousness receives revelation and interprets all the mysteries of the words of God’s servants and prophets (1QpHab 2:8-9; 7:4-5) (see Stuckenbruck 2005: 32). I discussed in the previous chapter the significance of the term זר and the ways in which it confers authority to both interpreter and text. Again, the importance of זר in regards to revelation and eschatology for the interpreter and the elect cannot be emphasized enough. Both here and in 1QpHab 7:1-8 זר functions in a manner similar to what I outlined in the previous chapter on Daniel.

In 1QpHab 2:8-9 and 7:1-8, The Teacher of Righteousness not only understands the hidden meanings of these authoritative texts but he also infuses his own interpretations and subsequent new writings with equal authority (García Martínez 2010: 241-42). Those who do not adhere to his interpretations are called traitors הבוגדים (1QpHab 2:5) and
violators of the covenant (2:6). The men of truth who properly observe the law follow the interpretations of the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab 7:10-11). In fact, 1QpHab’s interpretation of Hab 2:4b (“But the righteous man will live because of their loyalty to him” concerns “all observing the Law in the House of Judah, whom God will free from the house of judgment on the account of their toil and of their loyalty to Teacher of Righteousness” (8:1-3).

Juxtaposed with the Teacher of Righteousness and his authoritative interpretations of Torah in exile are the priests in Jerusalem who reject Torah. For instance, the Man of the Lie is accused of rejecting Torah (1QpHab. 5:11-12; cf. 2:1-4). 1QpHab connects the past, present, and eschatological future through the Teacher of Righteousness and his interpretations that extend to the final age and beyond:

Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets. Hab 2:3 For the vision has an appointed time, it will have an end and not fail. Its interpretation: the final age will be extended and go beyond all that the prophets say, because the mysteries of God are wonderful. Hab 2:3b Though it may tarry, wait for it; it definitely has to come and will not delay. Its interpretation concerns the men of truth, those who obey the Law, whose hands will not desert the service of truth when the final age is extended beyond them, because all the ages of God will come at the right time, as he established for them in the mysteries of his prudence. (1QHab. 7:4-14)
As García Martínez notes, the Teacher of Righteousness is a figure of the past to whom God has made known all the mysteries but his revelations remain permanently present within the community (García Martínez 2010: 241). In other words, the Teacher of Righteousness and his interpretations do the work of postmemory as he both inherits the mysteries of the words of the prophet and transmits them in the present and into the future until the end times, creating a inter/transgenerational mnemonic chain that connects figures from the idealized past to himself and his own community and those of the future.

4 Conclusions

CD and 1QpHab revisit, reshape, and relive the destruction of 587 B.C.E. until an eschatological end that finally overcomes a continuous state of exile. I have argued that the mourning over the absence of a pure pre-exilic identity led to reliving the condition of and an inability to overcome exile. The process of mourning creates in turn a social bond that only reinforces the hope that this pre-exilic identity will be restored through an eschatological end that cleanses the impurities in Jerusalem. Again, following LaCapra, converting absence into loss and mourning absence creates misplaced nostalgia and imagined utopias in the quest for a new unity (LaCapra 2001: 46). Moreover, the discourse of absence produces notions of collective sin that is overcome only by the possibility of eschatology (LaCapra 2001: 51). This framework of collective sin to be overcome through the purification of eschatology corresponds to Knibb’s notion of continuously sinful and exilic Second Temple Judea that is purified at the eschaton.

Both CD and 1QpHab are future-oriented and look ahead to this eschatological future, when the traitors will be punished and the elect will return to Jerusalem. In doing so, CD and 1QpHab reactivate the same site of trauma, the destruction of Jerusalem in 587
B.C.E, to initiate the process of destruction, purification, and restoration. This being said, CD looks to the past and telescopes the 390 years between Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction and the emergence of the pure remnant of the new covenant community who will return to Jerusalem. In other words, the destruction has occurred, and the community is the elect preparing to return. 1QpHab, on the other hand, simultaneously gazes at the past and the future, as the earlier site of memory of the Chaldean destruction is revisited and relived but the destruction that will establish the community as the pure remnant has yet to happen. The eschatological future is imminent as the community is living in the final generation, when the Kittim will destroy the wicked and impure in Jerusalem and the elect will return from exile as the pure remnant. In doing so, both texts write the past in the present by participating in the hybridization process of postmemory that combines the experienced past and inherited past in imagining a future temporality. The imagination of representation helps navigate the bumpy terrain, tensions, and oscillations of rupture and continuity. CD and 1QpHab create continuity between their respective communities, i.e., the elect in the present, and the remote idealized past of the of Moses and the wilderness generation at Sinai, as well as that of the ancient prophets, while they simultaneously separate themselves through the discourse of exile from impurities of the past and present (i.e., the defiled Jerusalem and the indefinite state exile of that envelopes Second Temple Judea).

The discourse of exile and the reestablishment of the covenant and the authority of Torah are means to the desired end of a restoration of Jerusalem, the temple, and an idealized past identity. Much of the language of normativity of Torah in CD and 1QpHab is directed against those who defiled the Jerusalem temple (CD-A 4.18; 1QpHab 12:8-11). These are texts that establish the authority of the true Israel in exile but are oriented towards Jerusalem
(Brooke 2008; cf. Talmon 1966: 61-66). For instance, the producer(s) of CD hoped for a return to the land and a restoration of the true Israel: “he visited them and caused to sprout from Israel and Aaron a shoot of the planting, in order to posses the land and to become fat with the good things of his soil” (CD-A 1:7-8).

According to George Brooke, the community or communities who envisioned themselves in the wilderness express identity as an intermediate state: emerging out of exile but not back in Jerusalem; in the Promised Land but not out of the wilderness. Moreover, if we were to situate either text in a community or communities somewhere in the Judean Desert, it would have been located between Sinai and Jerusalem; between the wilderness of the ancient Israelites and the site of the purified sanctuary; between exile and complete return. The memories and typologies of Sinai provide models of community organization for a community in a betwixt state. The communities responsible for CD and 1QpHab imagined themselves in the wilderness, whether psychologically or physically, as the new covenant community, interpreters of Torah, and recipients of revelation. The chain of revelation connected the past (Sinai) with the present (the wilderness) and the future (Jerusalem). Revelation and proper understanding of the Torah paved the road from the revelatory past to the future return to Jerusalem (Brooke 2008: 85; cf. Talmon 1966: 61-66) as these communities of postmemory imagined themselves as both inheritors and transmitters of memory, tradition, and revelation.
Chapter Six

Hybrids, Purification, and Multidirectional Memory

An analysis of notions of purification, hybrids, and multidirectional memory follows. The examination of the production and proliferation of hybrids, which emerge from discourses and practices of separation and purification, is developed from Latour, the discussion of whose work is punctuated with germane points from Mary Douglas’ *Purity and Danger*. I use my discussion of Latour as a segue to Rothberg’s work on multidirectional memory. According to Rothberg, memory and identity are fuzzy concepts that are not a zero-sum game, even for those who envision themselves as being separate from and/or purifying the impure elements within the social body. In other words, Rothberg’s work highlights that those whom some communities attempt to mnemonically and discursively eliminate, obliterate, purify, or represent as outside the unified group often share a collective past or identity.

Although collectivities use representations of the past to determine identity in the present, this process is neither straightforward nor direct and binds people to those whom they consider as ‘other’ (Rothberg 2009: 5). As Rothberg’s work shows, collective memory emerges out of “a malleable discursive space in which groups do not simply articulate established positions but actually come into being through their dialogical interactions with others; both the subjects and spaces of the public are open to continual reconstruction” (Rothberg 2009: 5). Through an analysis of the socio-historical contexts of the mnemonic communities responsible for the texts discussed throughout this dissertation, I show that the textual communities that construct identity through the representations of the past and discourses of separation and purification are in a dialogical relationship with and share
overlapping memories and identities with those whom they represent as the impure other, whether that be the returned exiles and the peoples of the land in E-N, the Judaizers and Hellenizers in 2 Maccabees, the wise and the violators of the covenant in Daniel, the producers of CD and 1QpHab and the Hasmonean high priests.

Needless to say that the above approach to notions of separation, purity-impurity, and hybrids diverts from those of Klawans and Hayes. Again, the approach I am undertaking deals with modernity and is anachronistic to Second Temple Judaism. The purpose of this chapter, however, is to develop a theoretical framework that excavates the tensions beneath the surface of discourses of separation, purity-impurity, and elimination of hybrids. Although specifically dealing with modern phenomena, including modernity itself, the theoretical frameworks of Latour and Rothberg shed light on these issues.

1 Hybrids and Purification

Terminology of purity/impurity and separation/admonitions against hybrids permeate the texts analyzed in this dissertation. The prominence of the following Hebrew terms in E-N for the purposes of integrative identity formation is evident: טהר (clean, pure [ceremonially]); בדיל (withdraw, separate, make distinct); נדה (separation, abomination, defilement); חטב (desecrate, [make into an] abomination, abhorrent practices); טמא (unclean, ceremonially unclean, impure); קדש (holy, sanctified, consecrated, separate, chosen, distinct); מעלה (infidelity, disloyalty, being untrue, violating one’s legal obligation). E-N also warns of the dangers of hybrids ערב (be mixed up with/combine with in the hitpael).
Ezra 6:20 mentions the *purity* of the priests and Levites כִׁ יֹּׁהֲרָּהּ רְעָתָהּ רְעָתָהּ כְֹאָדָה immediately before making a reference to the children of Israel who returned from the exile along with all those joined them in *separation from the impurity/uncleanliness* (cf. Ezra 9:11) of the nations of the land in 6:21 גֹּוֹי ָֽ־הָאָ֖רֶץ בְנ ָֽי־יִׁשְרָא ֵ֗ל הַשָבִׁיםֹ֙ מ ָֽהַגֹּוֹלָֹ֔הּ וְכ ֵ֗ל הַנִׁבְדִָּ֛ל מִׁטֻמְאִַ֥ת לֻּ֖כְַ֠תוֹעֲב ָֽת יהֶֶׁ֨י הַחִׁתִֶ֜י הַפְרִֶׁזִֵי הָָֽעַמ נִׁיֹ֙ הַמ  אָבִֹ֔י הַמִׁצְרִ֖י וְהָ אֱמ רִָֽׁמֶ֟֊י׃ כִָֽׁי־נָשְא וּ מִׁבְנ ָֽת יהֵֶ֗ם לָהֶּםֹ֙ וְל ִׁבְנ יהֶֹ֔ם וְהִׁתְעָָֽרְבוֹּ֙ זֶ ֶ֣רַע הַק ֹּ֔דֶש בְעַמ ֖י הָאֲרָצָ֑וֹת. Ezra discovers in 9:1-3 that not only have the people of Israel, priests, and Levites not separated themselves from the peoples of the land and *their abhorrent practices* (cf. Ezra 9:11) but also they have taken foreign wives so that the *holy seed has intermingled* been mixed with that of the peoples of the land וּכְכַל וֹת א ֵ֗לֶה נִׁגְֹּשֶ֨וּ א לֵַ֤י הַשָרִיםֹ֙ ל אמ ֹּ֔ר ל ָֽא־נִׁבְדְ ל֞ וּהָעֵָ֤ם יִׁשְרָא לֹ֙ וְהַכ הֲנִׁ ים וְהַלְוִׁיִֹּׁ֔ם מ עַמ ֖י הָאֲרָצָ֑וֹת We find other exhortations against mixture with impure, foreign elements and the creation of hybrids in Ezra 10:10 אַתֶם מְעַלְתֶם וַת שִׁ֖בוּ נָשִׁ ים נָכְרִׁיָ֑וֹת and 10:11 וְהִׁבָָֽדְלוֹּ֙ מ עַמ  י הָאָֹ֔רֶץ וּמִׁן־הַנָשִׁ֖ים הַנָכְרִׁיָֽוֹת, and Neh. 9:2 וַיִׁבָָֽדְלוֹּ֙ זֶ ֶ֣רַע יִׁשְרָא ֹ֔ל מִׁכ ֖ל בְנ  י נ כָָ֑ר. According to Ezra 9:2, 9:4, and 10:10 this mixing is considered to be *מָשֶׁל* (infidelity, disloyalty, being untrue, violating one’s legal obligation). Again, in regards to genealogy, purity means “unalloyed or free of admixture” whereas impurity signifies mixture (Hayes 2002: 27).

It is important to reemphasize that, according to E-N, the purity brought about by separation is mandated in the community constitution, Torah. Neh. 10:29-31 cites the authority of Torah in the doctrine of separation and removal of hybrids. This passage makes reference to all who followed the Torah of God in separating themselves from the peoples of
the land and not marrying them. Similarly, in Neh. 13:1-3, when the people hear their leaders read the authoritative words of Torah, they separate from the alien admixture and not marrying them. Again, E-N ends with Nehemiah reminding God that he purged the foreign elements that polluted the priesthood, the covenant of the priests, and the Levites. The cleansing of the temple was also critical in purifying the land of the barbarian multitudes (Neh. 13:29).

Although in Greek, of course, 2 Maccabees draws on terminology with a semantic range similar to that of E-N, including καθαρός (clean, spotless, pure, clear of guilt or defilement), μολυσμός (defilement, pollution), βεβηλωθέντα (the impure), ἄλλοφυλισμός (foreignness), and ἐπιμειξία (mixture, mixing with). Derivations of καθαρός appear in 2 Macc. 2:16, 19 (καθαρισμὸν), 10:3 (καθαρίσαντες), and 10:7 (καθαρισθῆναι). These passages, of course, are central to central theme of 2 Maccabees, the purification and rededication of the temple and the origins and institutionalization of Hanukkah.

2 Macc. 2:16 calls for the ingathering of ethnic Judeans to celebrate the purification of the temple from foreign defilement, a celebration which unites all Judeans, from Judea to Egypt (Μέλλοντες οὖν ἔγειν τὸν καθαρισμὸν ἐγράψαμεν ὑμῖν). Moreover, 2 Macc. 2:19-21 states that Judas and his brother purified the great temple (τὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ μεγάλου καθαρισμὸν) while fighting bravely for Ἰουδαϊσμὸς (ἐπιφανεῖας τοῖς υπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ) and purging the land of the barbarian multitudes (τὰ βάρβαρα πλῆθη διώκειν). As part of the purification, Judas and his men tear down the foreign altars in the agora (τοὺς δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν βωμοὺς υπὸ τῶν ἄλλοφύλων διδημιουργημένους) and remove the sacred precincts (ἐτι
δὲ τεμένη καθείλων) (10:2), after which time they purify the temple (καὶ τὸν νεὼν καθαρισάντες ἑτέρον θυσιαστήριον ἐποίησαν) (10:3). They sing hymns of thanksgiving to God for the successful purification the temple (ἐτὶ δὲ φοινικὰς ἔχοντες ὑμνοὺς ἀνέφερον τῷ εὐσδόσαντι καθαρισθήναι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον) (10:7).

The purification (καθαρος) of the temple signifies the cleansing and removal of pollution/deilement (μολυσμός) and foreignness (ἀλλοφυλισμός), which are virtually synonymous in 2 Maccabees. In order to remain pure themselves so that they can rededicate the temple, Judas and his men flee into the wilderness to avoid the defilement that had inundated the land (πρὸς τὸ μὴ μετασχεῖν τοῦ μολυσμοῦ) (5:27). According to 2 Maccabees, the defilement is the result of Ἑλληνισμός and ἀλλοφυλισμός, which are antitypes of Ἰουδαϊσμός and καθαρος (ὅν δ’ οὗτος ἀκμὴ τῆς Ἑλληνισμοῦ καὶ πρόσβασις ἀλλοφυλισμοῦ) (4:13). Finally, 2 Maccabees associates defilement (μολυσμός) with mixing/hybrids (ἐπιμειξία), as in the case of the former high priest Alcimus who voluntarily defiled himself in times of mixing cultures (τῆς προγενόμενος ἀρχιερείας, ἐκουσίως δὲ μεμολυμμένος ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἐπιμειξίας χρόνοις) (14:3-4).

The language of purification and separation functions differently in Daniel than it does in E-N and 2 Maccabees. Of course, as argued in Chapter 4, the revelation of mysteries is what separates Daniel and the maskîlîm from the wicked and violators of the covenant, who are responsible for the continuous state of exile (Daniel 9), and leads to the collective purification at the eschaton. However, in Daniel, purity and separation do not rotate on a dichotomous axis, as a third group, the rabbîm, which appears to
occupy the majority centre between the elite והמשצלים (see Davies 2001: 255).

In addition to the centrality to wisdom, understanding, and revelation of mysteries והמשצלים, the operative words for overcoming the ongoing state of exile are the terms signifying purification: בכר (refine), בור (clean, cleanse, purge), and לבן (whiten, cleanse). Again, the generations-long exile is overcome only when the maskîlim suffer violence and captivity and refine, purify, and whiten the collective from their sins והמשצלים (Dan. 11:32-35). Exile is defined by transgression and sin in the holy city until its end is marked by a new era of eternal righteousness that is ushered in והמשצלים (Dan. 9:24). The era of eternal righteousness will follow a time of unprecedented distress והמשצלים (12:1). At the end of Daniel, purification and salvation is for only the pure seed of the new era of righteousness, which is comprised of the maskîlim and the many who are purified, purged, and refined through the proper understanding of the instruction of the maskîlim; however, there is no place in this era of eternal righteousness for the wicked והמשצלים (Dan. 12:9-10).

Language of purity/impurity, clean/unclean, and separation provides identity markers for the textual communities responsible for CD and 1QpHab. Identity in CD is informed by terms such as יושר (remain, be left over), נדה (unclean, defiled), פליט (remnant, survivor),
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בוחרי ישראל (chosen of Israel), טמא (ceremonially unclean, defiled), בדל (separate), גלל (soiled, defiled in the hitpoel), and זנה (fornication, licentiousness, unfaithfulness). CD-A 1:4-5 refers to the שארית לישראל that was spared the destruction of 587 B.C.E., the pollution of the land while in exile in Damascus, and is the shoot of Israel and Aaron ויצמח מישראל that will possess purified land (1:5-8).

Despite the wicked of the congregation being unclean لنדה לפניו (CD-A 2:1), God raised up men of renown for himself to leave a remnant for the land פליטה לארץ (CD-A 2:11). Again, in opposition to this latter group are those who defiled themselves with human sin and unclean paths להם התגוללו בפשע אנוש ובדרכי נדה (CD-A 3:17). For this reason, the שבי ישראל (converts of Israel), who remained pure by leaving the land of Judah (CD-A 4:3; 6:5; 8:16), are the בוחרי ישראל (chosen of Israel) (CD-A 4:2-4). This elect group, again, is juxtaposed with the congregation of traitors עדת בוגדים (CD-A 1:12) who defile the temple טמא המקדש (CD-A 4:18). The defiled in CD are considered rebels because they remain on the path of traitors and defile themselves in paths of licentiousness and wicked wealth כל מורדים מאשר לא סרו מדרכי בוגדים ויתגוללו בדרכי זונות ובהון ושתה (CD-A 8:4-5). Those, on the other hand, who entered into the new covenant in the land of Damascus live in accordance with the exact interpretation of the law for the age of wickedness לעש את מפרשי התורה להזר (CD-A 6:14) and therefore are able to separate the clean from the unclean and
differentiate between the holy and the common (CD-A 6:17; cf. 12:19-20).

Likewise, 1QpHab is imbued with dichotomous language of pure/impure, clean/unclean, elect/traitor, and separation. The dichotomous names and actions of the figureheads and character foils, the Teacher of Righteousness מורה הצדק and the Wicked Priest הכוהן הרשע, are representative of this dualistic language. As the Teacher of Righteousness is an exemplary figure, the Wicked Priest is his antitype who performs repulsive acts against Jerusalem and defiles the temple (1QpHab 12:7-9). As discussed in Chapter 5, the Wicked Priest chases the Teacher of Righteousness away from Jerusalem and to his house of exile on Yom Kippur (1QpHab 11:4-8). However, as I argued in Chapter 5, this act of persecution and punishment results in the geographic separation between the pure community in exile and the polluted city of Jerusalem. Moreover, those who do not follow the authoritative interpretations of the Teacher of Righteousness are traitors הבוגדים (1QpHab 2:5) and violators of the covenant עריית הברית (2:6), whereas the men of truth אנשי歩いてמיה who properly observe the law עניית התורה are guided by his interpretations (1QpHab 7:10-11). Also juxtaposed with the Teacher of Righteousness is the Man of the Lie who is accused of rejecting Torah איש הכותל איש התורה (1QpHab. 5:11-12; cf. 2:1-4).

Although dealing with notions of modernity and its rupture and separation from the pre-modern, Latour’s work offers the valuable framework with which to analyze discourses
of purification, separation, and the production and destruction of hybrids. Latour’s theory, as remote as it may seem for Second Temple Judaism, touches on several key issues raised in this chapter and dissertation in general: ruptured temporality, new eras and origins, us vs. them discursive practices, winners vs. losers in the realm of memory, vanquished losers.

Modernity comes in as many versions as there are thinkers or journalists, yet all its definitions point, in one way or another to the passage of time. The adjective ‘modern’ designates a new regime, an acceleration, a rupture, a revolution in time. When the word ‘modern’, ‘modernization’, or ‘modernity’ appears, we are defining, by contrast, an archaic and stable past. Furthermore, the word is always being thrown into the middle of a fight, in a quarrel where there are winners and losers, Ancients and Moderns. ‘Modern’ is thus doubly asymmetrical: it designates a break in the regular passage of time, and it designates a combat in which there are victors and vanquished. If so many of our contemporaries are reluctant to use this adjective today, if we qualify it with prepositions, it is because we feel less confident in our ability to maintain that double symmetry: we can no longer point to that irreversible arrow, nor can we award a prize to the winners. (Latour 1993: 10)

Comparable to Latour’s description of modern as doubly asymmetrical, the producers of E-N, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab represent their myths of origins as a break in the regular temporality and a combat between victors and the vanquished. Importantly, as I show in my discussion of multidirectional memory below, collective memory, like notions of modernity, is not a zero-sum game with winners and vanquished losers.

In Latour’s theory on purification and hybrids, his hypothesis, in the most general sense, is that the term modern is signified by the dual modalities of translation, which creates mixtures and hybrids, and purification, which creates distinct ontological zones. According to Latour, “[w]ithout the first set, the practices of purification would be fruitless or pointless. Without the second, the work of translation would be slowed down, limited, or even ruled out” (Latour 1993: 10-11). Moreover, modernity views these two designations—translation and purification—as separate, and full modernity ceases when people simultaneously consider “the work of purification and the work of hybridization” (Latour 1993: 11). This change in perspective transforms the future. Further to this point, the end of being modern
marks a retrospective awareness of a dialectic between the two practices that has always been, which changes perspectives on the past (Latour 1993: 11).

For Latour, the link between translation/the creation of hybrids and purification is that the latter makes the former possible. He goes on to say that the paradox of moderns is “the more we forbid ourselves to conceive of hybrids, the more possible their interbreeding becomes” (Latour 1993: 12). Although Latour is clearly speaking of moderns and modernity, my argument below, strengthened by the concept of multidirectional memory, resembles the paradox of moderns: the more hybrids are forbidden, the greater their likelihood and proliferation becomes. In establishing asymmetrical origins for itself, modernity denies the simultaneous birth of the ‘nonhuman’ and “the equally strange beginning of the crossed-out God, relegated to the sidelines.” According to Latour, modernity comes from the conjoined birth with the nonhuman and the negated God, “and then from the masking of the conjoined birth and the separate treatment of the three communities while, underneath, hybrids continue to multiply as an effect of this separate treatment. The double separation is what we have to reconstruct: the separation between what happens ‘above’ and what happens ‘below’ on the other” (Latour 1993: 13). He compares these separations to the divisions between judiciary and executive branches of government, a division which “is powerless to account for the multiple links, the intersecting influences, the continual negotiations between judges and politicians” (despite the effectiveness of their separation) (Latour 1993: 13).

Again, Latour’s focus is explicitly the phenomenon of modernity but my focus below on the Second Temple texts under investigation, through the lens of multidirectional memory, is also what happens below, beneath the mnemonic effacement, obliteration, and concealment of conjoined births, links, hybrids, intersecting influences, and cultural
negotiations. In other words, I am interested in the possibility of discourses of purification and separation both concealing and producing hybrids. In the words of Latour: “To put it crudely: those who think about hybrids circumscribe them as much as possible, whereas those who choose to ignore them by insulating them from any dangerous consequences develop them to the utmost” (Latour 1993: 41).

The dangerous consequences of mixing that defy categories of purity and unity are a segue to the work of Mary Douglas. The premise of Douglas’ work is that dirt is dangerous because it threatens categories, order, and notions of purity and social unity. Moreover, she describes the cognitive discomfort of ambiguity as follows: “Ambiguous things can seem very threatening.” (Douglas 2005: xi). Thus, mixing and ambiguity can be identified as impure and dangerous and be held responsible for social disorder and catastrophe (Douglas 1996: vi). Douglas’ work is helpful in that it focuses on separation, demarcation, and the dangers of “crossing forbidden boundaries” (Douglas 1996: 22), as well as the symbolic and systematic of dirt/impurity: “Where there is dirt there is system. Dirt is the by-product of systemic ordering and classification of matter, in so far as ordering involves rejecting inappropriate elements. The idea of dirt takes us straight into the field of symbolism and promises a link-up with more obviously symbolic elements of purity” (Douglas 1996: 36). According to Douglas, danger/impurity lies in the liminal, the marginal, the transitional, and undeniable. When the impurity of ambiguity transgresses borders and crosses lines, the
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50 I recognize that Douglas’ work is not without problems and that she has retracted some of her theory, especially her theories on ancient Israel and Leviticus, in the most recent addition of *Purity and Danger*. In fact, Douglas states the following in response to the nearly 40 years of criticism she faced for her theories on biblical dietary laws: “I was way out of my depth when I wrote Chapter 3 of this book nearly forty years ago. I made mistakes about the Bible for which I have been very sorry ever since. Longevity is a blessing in that it gave me time to discover them” (Douglas 2005: xvi). Despite the problems with her work on Leviticus and the subsequent retractions, the general frameworks and premises of Douglas’ theory still are valuable lenses for viewing notions of purity, danger, and separation.
polluter endangers others by defying and threatening social order, structures, and systems (Douglas 1996: 97, 140).

As I have shown throughout my textual analysis in this dissertation, the lines of purity and impurity, sacred and profane are maintained through the discourse of exile and separation and admonitions against mixing. These texts seem to recognize the possibility of the hybrids or the ambiguous—intermarriage in E-N, the Hellenizers in 2 Maccabees, the rabbīm in Daniel, and the non-Hasmonean Judeans in CD and 1QpHab—but present them as something that must be cleansed, purified, or eliminated. Returning to Latour, he discusses the absorbing, purifying, and civilizing of hybrids by incorporating them into society or nature (Latour 1993: 131). Latour also states the following about separation, purity, hybrids, and lost unity:

How did the modern manage to specify and cancel out the work of mediation both at once? 
*By conceiving every hybrid as a mixture of two pure forms.* The modern explanations consisted in splitting the mixtures apart in order to extract from them what came from the subject (or the social) and what comes from the object. Next they multiplied the intermediaries in order to reconstruct the unity they had broken and wanted none the less to retrieve through blends of pure forms. So these operations of analysis and synthesis always had three aspects: a preliminary purification, a divided separation, and a progressive reblending. The critical explanation always began from the poles and headed toward the middle, which was first the separation point and then the conjunction point for opposing resources—the place of phenomena in Kant’s great narrative. In this way the middle was simultaneously maintained and abolished, recognized and denied, specified and silenced. The necessity of multiplying intermediaries to reconstruct the lost unity has always been recognized—thus no one except the postmods really believes in the two extreme poles of Nature and Society radically distinct from free-floating and disconnected networks—but as long as the intermediaries were seen as mixtures made of pure forms, the belief in the existence of a modern world was inescapable. The whole difference hinges on the apparently small nuance between mediators and intermediaries. (Latour 1993: 78)

The points that I want to extract from in this quote are the simultaneous recognition and denial of the middle, mixtures being constituted of two pure parts (but perhaps in the case of the texts under investigation, a pure and an impure part), and the multiplication of intermediaries to reconstruct the lost unity. The reconstruction of a lost unity is achieved
through a preliminary separation and purification followed by the multiplication of intermediacies (i.e., the breakdown of the middle to the point of non-existence) to the degree that the fragmented middle gravitates to poles established through the initial act of separation and purification.

I now turn to Rothberg’s concept of multidirectional memory to explore further the links, connections, hybrids, mixtures, and conjoined births that lurk below the discourses of purity, separation, fixity, original unity, and mnemonic winners and vanquished losers in E-N, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab.

2 Multidirectional Memory

Rothberg begins his project with the following question about different groups’ histories of victimization and violence: “What happens when different histories confront each other in the public sphere? Does the remembrance of one history erase others from view?” (Rothberg 2009: 3). Rothberg’s response is that the approach to the topic of memory, identity, and violence with the framework of a zero-sum game between winners and losers is fundamentally flawed. Alternatively, he suggests that “we consider memory as multidirectional; as subject to ongoing negotiation, cross-referencing, and borrowing; as productive and not privative” (Rothberg 2009: 3). Furthermore, in his approach, Rothberg dismisses the position that claims of memory and identity are necessarily tainted, but rather sees them as necessary and inevitable. However, he also rejects “the notion that identities and memories are pure and authentic.” In his words, “I differ from both of these positions because I reject two central assumptions that they share: that a straight line runs from memory to identity and that the only kinds of memories and identities that are therefore
possible are the ones that exclude elements of alterity and forms of commonality with others” (Rothberg 2009: 4-5).

The concept of multidirectional memory allows room for the ambiguity, nuance, overlap, fluidity, instability, dynamics, and dialectics in memory (i.e., the messiness of and messy work of memory).

Memories are not owned by groups—nor are groups “owned” by memories. Rather, the borders of memory and identity are jagged; what looks like my own property often turns out to be a borrowing or adaptation from a history that initially might seem foreign or distant. Memory’s anachronistic quality—its bringing together of now and then, here and there—is actually the source of its powerful creativity, its ability to build new worlds out of the materials of older ones. Finally, those who understand memory as a form of competition see only winners and losers in the struggle for collective articulation and recognition. But attention to memory’s multidirectionality suggests a more supple social logic. The struggle for recognition is fundamentally unstable and subject to ongoing reversal... (Rothberg 2009: 5)

Rothberg’s model attempts to go beyond the narrow constraints of accepting memory competition in which certain master-narratives are to the exclusion of others. Multidirectional memory is a lens with which to seek what lies beneath claims of purity, unity, and exclusivity, as it “draw[s] attention to the dynamic transfers that take place between diverse places and times during the act of remembrance” (Rothberg 2009: 11). In other words, multidirectional memory “acknowledges how remembrance both cuts across and binds together diverse spatial, temporal, and cultural sites” (Rothberg 2009: 11).

In what follows, I attempt to use multidirectional memory to excavate what lies below memories and discourses of separation, purification, and exclusivity. Multidirectional memory is a more than adequate tool for this excavation because it “highlights the inevitable displacements and contingencies that mark all remembrance. Collective memory is multilayered both because it is highly mediated and because individuals and groups play an active role in rearticulating memory” (Rothberg 2009: 15-16). The objective of the remainder
of this chapter is to bring into view the “imaginative links between different histories and social groups,” which “are the substance of multidirectional memory” (Rothberg 2009: 18). What I seek to illustrate is that the multidirectional dimensions of collective memory in the texts under analysis are “difficult to contain in the molds of exclusivist identities” (Rothberg 2009: 19). These are texts with intersecting pasts and presents. Finally, in reference to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Rothberg posits the following:

I draw two corollaries from the kinds of memory conflicts emblematically by the Israeli/Palestinian dispute. First, we cannot stem the structural multidirectionality of memory. Even if it were desirable—as it sometimes seems to be—to maintain a wall, or cordon sanitaire, between different histories, it is not possible to do so. Memories are mobile; histories are implicated in each other. Thus, finally, understanding political conflict entails understanding the interlacing of memories in the force field of public space. The only way forward is through their entanglement. (Rothberg 2009: 313)

Although some may view the above statements as naive and/or overly simplistic, especially in the context to which he is referring, this quote serves as my point of departure in moving beyond the cordon sanitaire of separation and purity in the Second Temple texts and in proceeding “through their entanglement.”

3 Hybrids in the Texts
3.1 Ezra-Nehemiah

As demonstrated in Chapter 2, E-N conflates and blurs the distinction between historical trauma (i.e., the loss of Jerusalem and the temple) with structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence of an original unity or purity). Thus, in lamenting the absence of an original identity, E-N purifies the collective through the process of separation and reblending to the point of two remaining groups, the returned exiles and the peoples of the land. In the process, any notions of hybrids or mixtures dissipate. What hybrids, links, shared memories, conjoined twins, and historical continuities lie below the discourse of unity, separation, and
purification? Where does Benjamin factor into the dichotomous discourse of unity, purification, and separation between Israel/Judah and Samaria?

The exclusive identity production in E-N does not correspond to the historical and archeological record of Persian Yehud and Samaria. Both archaeological and epigraphic evidence suggest close contact between Persian Yehud and Samaria before and after the time of Nehemiah. Despite the divisive discourse and assertions of exclusive identity in E-N, Judeans and Samaritans of the Persian period held much in common.

Although the interactions between Jews and Samaritans had become contentious by the first century CE, the two major groups actually shared much in common. The groups shared a belief in monotheism, an attachment to the land of Israel, and the same ancestral tongue (Hebrew). Both claimed descent from the same progenitor (Adam), the same chain of ancestors (Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Rachel and Leah), the same priestly tribe originating in the patriarch Levi... practiced a number of similar rituals, festivals, and feasts, and the groups shared an overlap in holy scriptures—the Pentateuch, or Five Books of Moses. Each kept similar but not identical calendars. Both groups could be found both in the land and outside the land in diaspora communities. (Knoppers 2013: 2)

Importantly, Knoppers’ work outlines the complexities in the relationship between Judah and Samaria, including their cooperation during the Persian period and their increasing tension and estrangement during the Hellenistic and Hasmonean periods. The first and second centuries B.C.E. became a time of growing conflict between Judah and Samaria, but scholars often retroject this tension to the Persian period as read through the lens of E-N. The growing prominence and political power of the Hasmoneans as they gained control over Samaria, the Galilee, Idoumea, and the other areas of the Transjordan transformed the geopolitical landscape of the Levant. The once prosperous and dominant Samaria of the early Persian period gave way to Hasmonean Judah in the second and first centuries B.C.E. The nadir point between Judah and Samaria did not occur until 111-110 B.C.E. when the Hasmonean leader John Hyrcanus destroyed the Samarian temple and town on Mt. Gerizim in 111-110 B.C.E. (Knoppers 2013: 12). Like the Yahwistic cult in Jerusalem, the Yahwistic cult at Mt.
Gerizim was centralized. Thus, the destruction of the Samarian Yahwistic temple was a highly catastrophic and disruptive event.

Returning to the Persian period, according to Knoppers, “[f]or many residents of Yehud and Samaria, close relations between their two communities were a fact, not an issue” (Knoppers 2006: 28). Proper names on bullas, coins, and papyri show that the majority of people in fourth century B.C.E. Samaria were Yahwistic. Persian Yehud and Samaria had a great deal of cultural overlap. Thus, some of the polemics and anti-Samarian animus probably were more administratively and politically than culturally driven. This being said, the Elephantine papyri suggest regular administrative and political relations between Jerusalem and Samaria during the time of E-N. For instance, when the community at Elephantine petitioned to have its destroyed temple rebuilt, they appealed to both Jerusalem and Samaria, including Deleyah and Shelemyah, the sons of Sanballat who both have Yahwistic names.

To our Lord Bagavahya, governor of Judah, from your servants Yedanyah and his colleagues the priests at Fort Elephantine… Now your servants Yedanyah, his colleagues, and all the Jews, citizens of Elephantine, petition you as follows: If it please our Lord, let consideration be given to the rebuilding of the temple, for they are not allowing us to rebuild it. Take care of your loyal clients and friends here in Egypt. Let a letter be sent to them from you concerning the temple of the God YHW, allowing us to rebuild Fort Elephantine just as it was formerly. If you do so, meal offerings, incense, and burnt offerings will be offered in your name on the altar of the God YHW. We will pray for you constantly—we, our wives, our children, the Jews—everyone here. If this is done, so that the temple is rebuilt, it will be a righteous deed on your part before YHW the God of heaven, more so than if one were to offer him burnt offerings and sacrifices worth a thousand silver talents, and gold. Thus we have written to inform you. We also reported the entire matter in a letter to Delayah and Shelemyah, sons of Sin-ubillit (Sanballat), governor of Samaria. Also, Arshama did not know anything about these things that were done to us. Date: The twentieth of Marheshwan, the seventeenth year of King Darius. (AP 30/31; “Razing of the Temple and Petition for Aid”)

עמל מראן בגוהי פחת יהוד עבדיך ידניה וכנותה זי ביבתא שלם...עמ בuarsיד ידניה וכנותה ויודיא מ
ון עמל מראן הס והמעשת על ארנה זי זבחה זי אל שבועיך שלכםזיו בועלי זבחים ורומרים ז
תנה במצרין אגרה מנך ישתלת עליאים עלארנה זי זבחה זי ותנה ביבתא בירתא זי בנה הוה
פומר ותמאה לענה עלמרבה זי ויהלמה זי זבחה זי ונתנה עליא ביבתא זי ושתה ימין זי ויהודיא מ

כען עבדיך ידניה וכנותה ויהודיא כען עבדיך ידניה וכנותה ויהודיא מ
This sort of administrative collaboration is not restricted to the Elephantine papyri, as E-N itself acknowledges intimate political relations, including intermarriage between leading families, between the two centres (Neh. 6:10-14; 13:38; Knoppers 2006: 272-79). Finally, based on evidence of Yahwistic temples in Idumea, at Elephantine, and on Mount Gerizim, André Lemaire argues that “it is no longer possible to speak about the Yahwistic cult during the Persian Period by taking into account only the Temple of Jerusalem” (Lemaire 2006: 417).

Given the above evidence, why did E-N produce such polemical discourses against neighbours with whom Persian Yehud shared so much in common culturally and mnemonically? This question must be approached with caution, as the terrain of ethnic and cultural identity can be slippery. Barth highlights the complexities of the relationship between ethnic and cultural categories, similarities, and differences: “It is important to recognize that although ethnic categories take cultural differences into account, we can assume no simple one-to-one relationship between ethnic units and cultural similarities and differences. The features that are taken into account are not the sum of ‘objective’ differences, but only those which the actors themselves regard as significant” (1969: 14). Belonging or being outside an ethnic unit goes beyond questions of basic identity and a laundry list of cultural contents, features, and differences, as “it also implies a claim to be judged, and to judge oneself, by those standards that are relevant to that identity” (Barth 1969: 14). Thus, ethnic categories are “organizational vessels” that may be filled with “varying amounts and forms of content in different socio-cultural systems” (Barth 1969: 14).
E-N is anything but a consensus position that is representative of the views of Persian Yehud in general. The ideological differences apparent in Ezekiel, Second Isaiah, Third Isaiah, Zechariah, Haggai, Ruth, Jonah, Malachi, Chronicles,51 and E-N show a lack of unanimity in defining and negotiating Israelite identity, institutions, and relations between neighbours in Persian Yehud (Knoppers 2006: 279; Knoppers 2013: 100). For instance, according to Chronicles, all of Israel, including Samarians, are people of God; that is, only the cult, not the people, of Samaria is polluted, to the point that pious people from Samaria can worship YHWH in Jerusalem (2 Chron. 11:13-17; 21:12-15; 28:9-13). As Knoppers points out, the pan-Israelite identity of Chronicles would not have been a coherent worldview in a socio-historical context “in which it was universally accepted that the Samarians and Judean communities were ethnically, historically, and religiously distinct” (Knoppers 2013: 72-73).

Chronicles shows that both pious and impious people live in Samaria and Judah. For instance, northern Israelite prophetic figures such as Elijah (2 Chron. 21:12-15) and Oded (28:9-13), similar to their Judean counterparts, deliver the word of YHWH when they warn and exhort. Interestingly, the prophetic Elijah warns an impious king of Judah, Jehoram, who does not heed the northern prophet’s advice and subsequently is destroyed (21:16-19). Importantly, when Oded addresses the Samarian army, he refers to YHWH as the god of their fathers: “Behold, because of the fury of YHWH God of your fathers against Judah, he delivered them over to you, and you killed them in a rage that reached heaven” (28:9)

ןָּהָּ (28:9)

In contrast to Jehoram’s disregard of divine word, the Samarian army heeds the advice of the prophetic

51 On the inclusivity presented in the genealogies in 1 Chronicles 1-9, see Labahn and Ben Zvi (2003).
figure when they listen to Oded (28:14-15). Furthermore, because the Samarian army follows the ways of YHWH, they exhibit greater piety than Judah, during Ahaz’s reign, in 2 Chronicles 28. Thus, Chronicles represents both Samarians and Judeans as people of YHWH (See Ben Zvi 1993: 237-38). In fact, Knoppers argues that, in Chronicles, the Jerusalem temple creates unity rather than division (Knoppers 2005: 325). This position, of course, is in contrast to what appears in Ezra 4:1-4 (cf. Neh. 2:20):

When the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the returned exiles were building a temple to YHWH God of Israel, they approached Zerubbabel and the chief of the clans and said to them, “Let us build with you, since we too worship your God, having offered sacrifices to him since the time of King Esarhaddon of Assyria, who brought us here.” Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and the rest of the chiefs of the clans of Israel answered them, “It is not for you and us to build a house to our God, but we alone will build it to YHWH God of Israel, in accord with the charge that the king, King Cyrus of Persia, laid upon us.

As is evident in the above passage, Samarians are not permitted to participate in the rebuilding of the temple, just as peoples of the lands are excluded from cultic practices in Jerusalem after the temple is rebuilt because they will pollute it (Ezra 6:19-22; Neh. 13:4-9, 28-31).

So what motivated E-N to produce such exclusivist discourse? Barth posits that exclusive ethnic categories are defined more by their boundaries than their cultural content. These boundaries can be either social or territorial (Barth 1969: 15). Returning to a point raised in Chapter 2, an ascriptive and exclusive ethnic unit achieves unity through the maintenance of boundaries that dichotomizes members and non-members (Barth 1969: 14). For Barth, “[t]he identification of another person as a fellow member of an ethnic group
implies a sharing of criteria for evaluation and judgement” (1969: 15). In the case of E-N, the boundaries of an ascriptive and exclusive ethnic unit are established and maintained by the discourse of exile. Those self-identifying as the Babylonian golah seems to be the criteria for evaluation and judgment. Again, as discussed in Chapter 2, the discourse of exile confers a special status on members of the ethnic unit that is not atypical for survivors of collective trauma, as the discourse of separation becomes a central feature and ethnic boundary (Erikson 1994: 231). In other words, collective trauma and the discourse of exile are sources that function in a manner similar to common language and kinship in constructing the identity of an exclusive ethnic unit (Erikson 1995: 186).

As argued in Chapter 2, the answer lies in the destruction of 587 B.C.E. and the subsequent exile, because Samaria, like Mizpah (Tell en-Nisbeh) in Benjamin, does not seem to have sustained any extensive damage from the Babylonian campaigns. Further to this point, Samaria apparently did not suffer mass deportations because they did not rebel against Babylon (Knoppers 2006: 272). In contrast to Jerusalem, which “was nearly obliterated between the destruction of the Israelite city and the extensive construction in the Hasmonaean and Herodian periods” (Stern 2001: 435), Samaria prospered greatly during the Persian period. In fact, Ephraim Stern concludes that finds from Samaria and Wadi ed-Daliyeh are indicative of the prosperity experienced by the city of Samaria during the Persian period. Knoppers describes the disparity between Persian Jerusalem and Samaria as follows:

The Jerusalem of the Achaemenid era has been described as a village with an administrative center. In contrast, the Samaria of the Achaemenid era has been described as one of ancient Palestine’s larger urban areas. If so, we are dealing not with a situation of comparability but with a situation of disparity. One regional center was substantially larger and wealthier than the other. The difference between the two provinces and their capitals cannot but have affected the intelligentsia of Jerusalem. During the Achaemenid era, members of the Judean elite were not dealing with a depopulated outback to the north. Quite the contrary, they were dealing with a province that was larger, better-established, and considerably more populous than was Yehud. (Knoppers 2006: 272-73; Knoppers 2013: 109).
In sum, Persian Samaria was larger, more prosperous, and more populated than Persian Jerusalem.

The question of Benjamin also needs to be addressed. Aside from a few general references (Ezra 1:5; 4:1; 10:9; Neh. 11:4, 7-9), where is Benjamin in E-N’s narrative of exile and return? Is Benjamin part of the denied, dissected middle that is broken down to the point that it becomes part of one of the poles (pure vs. impure) during the process of separation and purification in reconstructing a lost unity? Are we looking at a vanquished loser in the arena of memory, or does multidirectional memory lie beneath the silence? Ben Zvi forwards a theory that coheres well with Rothberg’s notion of multidirectional memory.

First, Ben Zvi notes that the narrative of the empty land, which corresponds to the collective memory of the exodus, connected different groups and communities together and therefore was not easily rejected, although neither Benjaminites nor Yehudites thought that the land was actually empty. Second, there is little room in a memory and narrative of Jerusalem to Jerusalem, Judah to Yehud/Judah, and temple to temple (Ben Zvi 2010: 156-66). According to Ben Zvi, “[t]his of course does not mean that the Benjaminites themselves become marginal, but rather that their self-identity becomes subsumed under a more general one” (Ben Zvi 2010: 166). Finally, and most importantly, he concludes the following:

In sum, the social success of the concepts of “Total Exile” and “Empty Land” cannot be explained in terms of their supposed function in an exclusivist, discriminatory, and oppressive social system imposed by a community of exiles/returnees over and against a community of remainees that included the vast majority of Yehud. The successful (for the most part) erasure of social memories of continuity among Benjaminites and other groups of remainees and their replacement with memories that they knew to be in one sense counterfactual had less to do with long term oppression or exclusion of the vast majority of the population—and even less with an ideological, mystified representation of an historical oppression—than with the inner logic of the shared central discourse that evolved through time and through social negotiation among local groups living a few hours walk from each other in early Persian Yehud. To be sure, this social negotiation included tensions and processes of co-opting and being co-opted, but also contributed, through the integrative discourse it created, to social cohesion and to a construction of self-identity in Persian Yehud. Because it involved a shared discourse about the
fall of the monarchic polity, causality in history, and strong claims of continuity with monarchic Judah, the discourse had to bear a strong message of settlement discontinuity, exile, and empty land. (Ben Zvi 2010: 167)

According to this logic, Mizpah and the Benjaminites are more than the vanquished losers in the discourse and memories of Persian Yehud. Here, the overlap and hybrids in shared collective memories between Yehud and Benjamin, rather than the exclusion of a vanquished loser, is evident. As a result, the multidirectionality of exile and return—especially in regards to total exile and empty land—may be more the result of social cohesion than social tension.

3.2 2Maccabees

Arguably, from all of the texts under investigation in this study, 2 Maccabees is most involved in the production and proliferation of hybrids, although its exclusive language of separation and purification suggests otherwise. In what follows, I outline the ways in which the geopolitics of Hellenistic Judea influenced identity formation through the conversion of absence into loss in 2 Maccabees. The producer(s) of 2 Maccabees represent the Maccabean heroes as restoring not only the temple and ancestral traditions (2 Maccabees 8–10) but also an original ethnic identity and unity, which never existed as it is represented in the text. 2 Maccabees is a text that produces and proliferates hybrids in its attempts to purify them. Moreover, 2 Maccabees shares memory with those whom they represent as other, the Hellenizers. As Latour notes, the more hybrids are forbidden, the greater the likelihood of their proliferation.

In his work, Gruen outlines the cultural hybridity in Hellenistic Judea and the absence of any inherent originality or purity in Hellenistic Judean culture and identity. Hellenistic Judeans, including the producer(s) of 2 Maccabees, adapted Hellenic genres and transformed ancient Israelite traditions and narratives in order to articulate them in modes more congenial
to a Greco-Roman environment (Gruen 1998, 2001). Moreover, despite the representation of restoring an original ethnic identity in the pro-Hasmonean literature of 1 and 2 Maccabees, the Hasmoneans themselves were enveloped in Hellenic culture. The Hasmoneans were leaders who were not only familiar with the conventions of the Hellenistic world but leaders who openly embraced them (Gruen 1998: 36).

The imagined mnemonic connections, liturgical time, and rhetorical dimensions of the terms Ἰουδαϊσμός and Ἐλληνισμός problematize any notions of a lost pure or intact identity. In addition to the issues of ethnic and cultural categories and differences, following Barth, outlined above, two other major problems with claims to the loss and restoration of an original, pure, or intact identity are the status of the Hasmoneans themselves with Judea and issues of cultural hybridity. First, Weitzman notes that although the Maccabean heroes were in fact Judean, their Hasmonean descendants struggled to maintain their legitimacy. The Hasmoneans faced much local opposition and used non-Judeans as mercenaries to help maintain the political power of their oppressive and unpopular regime, from the time of John Hyrcanus (135-104 B.C.E.), who was the first Hasmonean leader to use foreign mercenaries and non-Judeans in the army and court in response to the vulnerability of his regime and its waning popularity with Judeans. Hyrcanus had alienated himself from many Judeans, especially the Pharisees.

The successors of Hyrcanus also encountered widespread insurrections by local Judean population. In fact, Weitzman notes a correlation between the Hasmonean use of non-Judeans and Judean resistance to Hasmonean rule—i.e., the number of insurrections rose proportionately to the incidence of mercenary involvement. According to Josephus, Alexander Janneus relied on non-Jewish mercenaries to put down a Jewish rebellion (103-76...
The later Hasmoneans faced much local opposition because they brought in Greeks, Idumeans, and other mercenaries to maintain power. The Hasmonean reliance on non-Judeans entangled them in a dilemma from which it was difficult to remove themselves: the more the Hasmoneans relied on non-Judeans to maintain power, the more their dynasty lost legitimacy with Judeans (see Weitzman 1999: 37-59; cf. Goldstein 1976: 64-72; Sievers 1990: 86-92, 146-47). Weitzman summarizes the relationship between the representation of the Maccabean heroes in 1-2 Maccabees and their successors, the Hasmoneans, as follows:

The advantage of a Seleucid alliance would always have to be balanced against the risk of appearing to betray the very foundation of their rule, their reputation as zealous warriors who saved Jewish tradition by going to war against Seleucid rule. The Hasmonean line was in fact always struggling to maintain its legitimacy, its authority among Jews having been generated by what Max Weber would have described as their charisma, the extraordinary power bestowed on them by God and their own heroics during the Maccabean Revolt. The legitimacy seems to have grown especially fragile after Simon, the last in the line to be directly involved in the revolt. From the reign of Hyrcanus on, the Hasmoneans faced mounting opposition from Jews who protested their religious authority, and sometimes defected to competing charismatic movements like the Pharisees and the Qumran sect. While the Hasmoneans laid claim to traditional authority as well, assuming the role of the high priest, that claim was questionable because the Hasmoneans did not inherit this office in a traditional way, usurping it from the family through whom this office has been transmitted prior to the revolt, and its memory, inextricably interwoven with the memory of what the Seleucids had done to harm the Jews and their traditions, presumably made it difficult for them to justify an alliance with them. (Weitzman 1999: 39-40)

Given that 2 Maccabees was written somewhere between 124-63 B.C.E., likely between 124-104 B.C.E, the claims to fighting on behalf of, restoring, and safe-guarding an original and pure Ḥaḏaṿiḥa ḳo[v], which connects back to Moses, Solomon, Jeremiah, and Nehemiah, must be viewed with suspicion. The politics of memory are paramount here: who remembers, what is remembered, and what is forgotten.

It is evident that not all Judeans accepted the memories represented in 2 Maccabees. In addition to Weitzman’s argument above, one must think only of the reception history of 2

---

52 Yerushalmi notes that the rabbis “did not preserve the political history of the Hasmoneans, but took note of the conflict between the Pharisees and Alexander Jannaeus” (Yerushalmi 1996: 25).
Maccabees. Not only was 2 Maccabees not canonized, but also the rabbis, not surprisingly, focused on the miracle of the light, not the heroic deed of the Maccabean heroes, in their discussions of Ḥanukkah (see Yerushalmi 1996: 25). For instance *b. Shab.* 21b states the following:

What is [the reason of] Ḥanukkah? For our Rabbis taught: On the twenty-fifth of Kislev [commence] the days of Ḥanukkah, which are eight on which a lamentation for the dead and fasting are forbidden. For when the Greeks entered the Temple, they defiled all the oils therein, and when the Hasmonean dynasty prevailed against and defeated them, they made search and found only one cruse of oil which lay with the seal of the High Priest, but which contained sufficient for one day's lighting only; yet a miracle was wrought therein and they lit [the lamp] therewith for eight days. The following year these [days] were appointed a Festival with [the recital of] Hallel and thanksgiving.

Yerushalmi noted that renewed interest in the Maccabean heroes and their great feats, rather than the miracle of light, is a modern phenomenon (Yerushalmi 1996: 25). Further to this point, Y. Zerubavel discusses how Maccabean defeat of and liberation from foreign oppressors has become the focal point, rather than the divine flask of oil and the renewal of the temple, because of the transformation of the holiday cycle in the secular national Hebrew culture, which emphasizes festivals commemorating victories and liberation.53

Not only were the Hasmoneans not popular in Judea, but also some Greeks were viewed favourably in 2 Maccabees. Thus, one can also argue that 2 Maccabees and the Hasmoneans in general did not have a completely negative view of Greeks and Greek culture. For instance, Doran’s analysis of Judean-Hellenic relations moves beyond the simple dichotomy between Ἰουδαϊσμός and Ἑλληνισμός, which overemphasizes difference.

---

53 For this reason, Hanukkah, Passover, and Purim are favourite holidays in Israel, around which numerous stories, songs, and new rituals have been created (Zerubavel 1995: 218). Interestingly, the theme of resistance fuses together Zionism, Masada, and the Hasmoneans when young Zionists undertook pilgrimages to Masada during Hanukkah—the eight day festival provided enough time for young, torch-carrying Zionists to trek through the Judean Desert on route to their pilgrimage site. Obviously, the torches carried through the darkness not provided the pilgrims with light to guide them but also is symbolic of the miracle of light associated with Hanukkah (Zerubavel 1995: 126-27, 218).
Such nationalism, however, is not hostile to non-Jews. The author distinguishes between good and bad Greeks (4:35-36, 49; Ptolemy Macron 10:12-13; the citizens of Scythopolis 12:30). The author shows no embarrassment that the high-priest Onias sought asylum at the temple area of Daphine (4:33), nor does he blush at connections with the Macedonians (5:9) or rule out that Jews be equated with Athenians (9:15); he emphasizes connections with the Romans (4:11; 11:34-38). The theme that the Jews are good citizens, not barbarians like those who attack them (2:21), is also part-and-parcel to this openness to non-Jews. (Doran 1981: 111)

Similarly, Gruen’s work has also shown that despite the representation of restoring an original ethnic identity in the pro-Hasmonean literature of 1 and 2 Maccabees, the Hasmoneans themselves were immersed in Hellenic culture. For instance, the dual Hebrew-Greek names of Hasmonean leaders—such as Judas Aristobulus and John Hyrcanus—and coins minted with both Hebrew and Greek writing suggest that the Hasmoneans recognized the compatibility between Judean and Hellenic cultures (Gruen 1998: 33). The Hasmoneans did not hesitate in representing themselves as Judean leaders influenced and enveloped by Hellenistic conventions (Gruen 1998: 36).

What follows is a discussion of the discursive separation of Ἰουδαϊσμός and Ἑλληνισμός and the former representing the return to an original unity that result from the purification of the latter. Throughout 2 Macabees, there appears to be a dichotomous relationship between Ἰουδαϊσμός and Ἑλληνισμός. In fact, as noted above, we read in 2:19-21 that Judas and his brothers purified the temple and dedicated the altar while fighting bravely for Ἰουδαϊσμός (ἐπιφανείας τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ) while driving out the barbarian multitudes (τὰ βάρβαρα πλήθη διώκειν) (2:21). These τὰ βάρβαρα πλήθη refer to any number of characters, including Antiochus IV, Nicanor, Jason, Menelaus, Lysimacus, and the παμφύλων ἐθν. Gruen notes that Ἑλληνισμός “in some form or another occurs three times in connection with the actions taken by the High Priest Jason who had an affinity for certain Greek practices, installing a gymnasium and ephebate in Jerusalem” (Gruen 1998: 3-4).
Again, Jason is the first high priest to introduce Ἑλληνισμός by bringing people over to a “Greek way of life” (εὐθέως ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν) (4:10). We also read in 4:13 that “[t]here was such a flourishing of Ἑλληνισμός and adoption of foreign ways” (ἐν δ’ οὕτως ἀκμή τις Ἑλληνισμοῦ καὶ πρόσβασις ἄλλοφυλισμοῦ). According to Mason, “[h]ere, Ἑλληνισμός (like ἄλλοφυλισμός) cannot indicate a culture or system; it labels a defection that threatens the heart and soul of Judaean tradition” (Mason 2007: 466). Thus, Mason sees Ἰουδαϊσμός as a reaction against cultural Ἑλληνισμός:

Judas’ antidote to this Hellenizing (Ἑλληνισμός) was a counter-movement, a bringing back of those who had gone over to foreign ways: a “Judaizing” or Judaization, which the author of 2 Maccabees programmatically labels Ἰουδαϊσμός. The noun appears only in such contexts as these, evidently, because of its inherent sense of (re)alignment. This programme of Judas Maccabeus and his Asidaeans in 2 Maccabees (cf. 14.6) is not then “Judaism” as a system of life, but a newly coined counter-measure against Ἑλληνισμός. (Mason 2007: 467)

Furthermore, as Mason points out, Razis, “the father of Judeans” (πατὴρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων) (14:37), is the antitype of Alcimus, who sets aside his ancestral honour (δὲν ἀφελόμενος τὴν προγονικὴν δόξαν) (see also Van Henten 2007: 205; Goldstein 1983: 483-84). Razis, unlike Alcimus—who voluntarily defiled himself in times of mixing cultures (τις προγενόμενος ἀρχιερεύς, ἐκουσίως δὲ μεμολυμμένος ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἐπιμείξιας χρόνοις)—prefers to die nobly for Ἰουδαϊσμός than be defiled by sinners (ἐγγενῶς θέλων ἀποθανεῖν ἦπερ τοῖς ἀληθείαις ὑποχέριος γενέσθαι καὶ τῆς ἱδίας εὐγενείας ἀναξίως ὑβρισθῆναι). Razis, the martyrs of chapter 7, and Judas’ soldiers all fight for the same cause, Ἰουδαϊσμός (see Van Henten 1997: 268). I agree with Mason that Ἰουδαϊσμός is most effective rhetorically when it is connected with a movement away from Ἑλληνισμός (Mason 2007: 469).

The theories of hybrids and purification by Latour cast a large shadow of suspicion on the binary distinction between Ἰουδαϊσμός and Ἑλληνισμός. Further to this point,
Hellenistic Judeans are representative of the hybridization process that encompasses both Judean/Israelite and Hellenic traditions. The ways in which Hellenistic Judeans drew upon Greek ideas, modes of expression, and language to challenge an imperial power and hybridized that which they borrowed are discussed in detail below. Hellenistic Judeans filtered Greek concepts through an interpretative lens and integrated them with ancient Israelite and Near Eastern concepts.

Again, Gruen’s work outlines the hybridization process between what we identify as Ἰουδαϊσμός and Ἐλληνισμός. Hellenistic Judeans accommodated themselves to the larger cultural world of the Mediterranean while reasserting the character of their own heritage (Gruen 1998: xiv). Judeans adapted Hellenic genres and transformed ancient Israelite traditions and narratives in order to articulate them in modes more congenial to a Greco-Roman environment. They recreated their pasts, retold stories in different forms, and expanded authoritative traditions through the medium of Greek language, literary forms, and conceptual frameworks; and in many cases, they demonstrated Greek dependency on the Torah. Judeans distinguished their traditions from those of the Greeks and Romans and justified their own immersion in the greater Hellenistic world. Despite this thorough engagement with Greco-Roman culture, texts like 2 Maccabees and authors such as Philo and Josephus by no means compromised the core principles and practices of their Judean ethnicity (Gruen 1998: xv).

Martha Himmelfarb also discusses the Greek discursive influences in style and language that abound in 2 Maccabees, as much of its vocabulary and descriptions of characters are drawn from Greek culture rather than the ancient Israelite tradition (Himmelfarb 1998: 19). 2 Maccabees is an epitome composed in Greek, in style and
language that are reminiscent of Greek historiography. Himmelfarb outlines the relationship of 2 Maccabees to Greek historiography as follows:

2 Maccabees’ receptiveness to the conventions of contemporary Greek historical writing and its often highly rhetorical style is clear and noteworthy in light of its view of Hellenism as an insidious threat to the Jewish way of life. One might have expected that an author holding such views would attempt a specifically Jewish style for his work, perhaps an imitation of the style of the Greek version of biblical books that provided the models for 1 Maccabees, Samuel, and Kings. (Himmelfarb 1998: 29)

Although I disagree with Himmelfarb’s statement that the producer of 2 Maccabees viewed Greek culture as an insidious threat to Judean life is an overstatement, she is correct in her observation that, in many ways, 2 Maccabees more closely resembles Greek historiography than it resembles DtrH or Chronicles. For instance, the narrative of 2 Maccabees is preceded by proem in the first person (2:19-31; cf. 2:32; 6:12), which is a Greek historiographical convention that is non-existent in ancient Israelite historiography. Moreover, the repulsion of Heliodorus from the temple and his subsequent punishment seems to have been influenced by Herodotus’ Histories. In both cases, the deity protects a temple and two powerful figures punish the temple robbers (cf. 2 Macc. 3:24-26 and Hist. 8.37-39). It is interesting that Persians are notorious for their sacrilege throughout the Histories, and here the producer of 2 Maccabees seems to be associating Heliodorus and the Hellenizing forces with the impious acts of the Persians in the Histories. Further to this point, Antiochus IV being chased out of Persepolis for attempting to rob temples is not a coincidence, given that the Persians are notorious for their acts of sacrilege throughout the Histories.

All quotes from Herodotus’ Histories are from Robin Waterfield’s translation (1998).

For instance, Herodotus speculates that the Persians who were routed by the Lacedaemonians at Plataea were guilty of sacrilege at a temple of Demeter, and therefore the goddess contributed to the end result of the battle: “I find it surprising that although the battle took place by the grove of Demeter not a single Persian, as it turned out, either entered the precinct or died in there: most of them fell around the outside of the sanctuary on the unconsecrated ground. In so far as one may speculate about divine matters, I think that the goddess herself kept
The depiction of Antiochus IV, which is reminiscent of a despot from the *Histories*, extends through his life to his death. He is called a man beyond-human boastfulness (ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον ἀλαζονεῖαν) who thought that he could command the waves of the sea and weigh the mountains in a balance but was humbled and further afflicted with swarming worms and rotting flesh (9:8-9). Antiochus IV’s demise, from absolute self-aggrandizement to utter degradation, evokes much imagery from the *Histories*. First, Antiochus IV takes on the traits of an arrogant and tyrannical Persian king. In the case of commanding the sea and weighing mountains in a balance, Antiochus IV resembles Persian kings who showed arrogance to the gods and tried to control nature: e.g. Darius shooting an arrow into the sky after Marathon (5.105); Xerxes ordering a canal to be built out of a sense of grandiosity and arrogance so that he can display his power and leave a memorial (7.24); Xerxes punishing the Hellespont (7.35); Xerxes stating that “… there’s no other human force that will resist us” (7.53); Xerxes wanting to divert a river (7.128); the Persian army drinking a Thessalian river dry (7.196); the concubine stating that the Persians were “… men who had no respect for gods or heroes” (9.76). Second, the account of Antiochus IV’s death itself resembles the death of the tyrant Pheretime in the *Histories*: “Pheretime came to a bad end as well. As soon as she had them away because they had burnt her temple in Eleusis” (9.65). Moreover, it is worth mentioning the role that divine retribution fulfills in critical times during the Persian Wars (Artemisium, Salamis, and Plataea). Herodotus suggests that Demeter brought divine retribution upon the Persians, during the critical battle at Plataea, for burning one of her sanctuaries earlier. In addition to the account above, the Persians are responsible for temple desecration throughout the Persian Wars, and thus are the recipients of divine retribution on several occasions. In fact, in Themistocles’ speech (8.109), Xerxes is referred to as “[a] man who does not distinguish between sacred and profane things, but burns and topples the statues of gods.” Similarly, when Alexander attempts to sway the Athenians over to the Persian side (8.143; also see, 8.144), he is met with the following response: “… we will never come to terms with Xerxes…. we will take the field and fight against him, confident of the support of gods and heroes for whom he felt such utter contempt that he burnt their homes and statues” (my emphasis). Both statements illustrate Persian sacrilege, and the second statement also alludes to divine retribution for such transgressions. Furthermore, Herodotus provides an account of a tide being responsible for Persian casualties, a natural disaster which the people of Potidaea attribute the flood tide with Poseidon, because the deceased Persians were the same ones who desecrated the cult statue in the temple of Poseidon. Herodotus agrees with the people of Potidaea when he states the following: “Personally, I think that this explanation of events is correct” (8.129).
made the Barcans pay, she left Libya and returned to Egypt, where she died a horrible death. She became infested with worms while still alive, as if to show people that excessive vengeance earns the god’s displeasure. So much for Pheretime the daughter of Battus, and so much for the revenge she exacted from the Barcans” (4.205).

In addition to themes and imagery from Greek literature, Himmelfarb discusses the Greek terms drawn from Greek literature that are used to describe the Judean heroes in 2 Maccabees. She notes that “[w]hat is most striking about this vocabulary is that its background is clearly not biblical but Greek” (Himmelfarb 1998: 32-32). In her argument, she mentions the following terms: ἀνδρείως (“bravely, manly”), γενναῖον (“noble”), γενναίως (“nobly”), and γεναιότητος (“nobility”) to describe the martyrdom of Eleazar in 6:27-31; γενναίως (“nobly”) in 7:5, 11 and γενναίῳ (“noble”) in 7:21 to describe the martyrdoms of the brothers in chapter 7; εὐγενῶς (“nobly”), εὐγενείας (“noble birth”), and ἀνδρείως (“bravely, manfully”) to describe the martyrdom of Razis in 14:42-43 (Himmelfarb 1998: 33). Furthermore, the noble behaviour in 2 Maccabees is not limited to the martyrs, as Judas twice tells his companions to fight “nobly” (γενναίως) in 8:16 and 13:14. After Judas’ rousing speech to his companions, the adverb γενναίως (“to attack nobly”— γενναίως δὲ ἐμφέρεσθαι) is also used to describe his expectation of his companions before the final battle against Nicanor.

Regarding the terms γενναίως and εὐγενῶς and their derivatives, Himmelfarb argues that “[i]t is clear, then, that 2 Maccabees does not use them to recall the Bible. It is more difficult to characterize the sphere of Greek literature from which gennaios and eugenēs are drawn because they appear in a wide range of texts” (Himmelfarb 1998: 33-34). She also notes that most common form of the root in 2 Maccabees is the adverb γενναίως (“nobly”), a
preference which Polybius shares with 2 Maccabees: “Again and again Polybius uses *gennaiōs* in relation to military matters and death, contexts in which ‘manful’ behaviour is clear” (Himmelfarb 1998: 34-35). Himmelfarb concludes that for 2 Maccabees, “noble speech, a quality clearly associated with the Greek gentlemen rather than the biblical hero, is an important aspect of the greatness of the martyrs” (Himmelfarb 1998: 38).

All of the above point to instances of hybrids and multidirectional memory. 2 Maccabees and its textual and mnemonic world is one of ambiguity, nuance, and dialectics in memory in which it shares histories, memories, and discourse with those whom it represents as other.

### 3.3 Daniel, Damascus Document, and Pesher Habakkuk

Since so little is known about the elliptical and enigmatic communities behind Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab, these textual communities are discussed in the context of the textual and mnemonic world of late Second Temple Judea. Not only are these texts scant on ‘historical’ details, or perhaps I should say, concrete referents, but also all three texts are highly metaphorical and written in cipher. To identify a community or scribal school behind these texts is a daunting task indeed. Thus, I focus on the general socio-historical context in which these texts were produced. This context, which obviously is directly relevant to the above discussion of 2 Maccabees, is one of new interpretations, hybrids, and multidirectional memory, despite the fact that many of the texts produced during this period, including Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab, forwarded an agenda of separation and purification.

Albert Baumgarten argues that an increase in literacy and changes in knowledge production during the second century B.C.E. led to radical new interpretations of authoritative discourses:
Perhaps the first point to remember, in answering this question, is that times when new readers come to the Bible, like the second century BCE under consideration in this study, were often eras of radical change, in which old interpretations lost at least some of their relevance. New readers of the Bible, not bound by tradition or habit to the old answers, might be best placed to recognize the need for new ways of understanding the text, which would meet the requirements of the new era. As it is never easy to convince people to change their minds, particularly about fundamental issues in which they may have vested interest, the foundation for a conflict between the old leadership and newly literate was laid. (Baumgarten 1997: 125)

Moreover, according to Baumgarten, if the ‘newly literate’ opposed the establishment and the ways in which they were governed, then it is more likely that their interpretations of authoritative discourses disagreed with those of the established authorities. Baumgarten suggests that these processes explain the ferment surrounding the interpretation of authoritative discourses during the Maccabean era. He, however, concedes that his contention is speculative in that “while I can point to evidence for an expansion of the circle of the literate for a context in which that development seems plausible in the second century B.C.E., I cannot cite an ancient source which explicitly connects those changes with the rise of sectarianism” (Baumgarten 1997: 126-30). What Baumgarten calls the rise of sectarianism, I call the rise and proliferation of interpretative communities or mnemonic communities. He concludes that an increase in literacy contributed to the circumstances under which various groups set out to change their contemporary social words: “Some agendas for change were moderate, others radical, and thus some groups were unable to maintain better relations with the established structures, while others came into greater conflict” (Baumgarten 1997: 136).

Literacy and urbanization often go hand-in-hand. Baumgarten maintains that the newly literate people were also newly urban people who had to adapt to changes brought about by their move to the city. Furthermore, a move to a city often leads to the loss of a reference group, which provides people with a sense of direction and meaning. Baumgarten
posits that “[w]hile migration from small to very large places of life strips some people of traditional beliefs, it causes others to redouble their devotion to tradition, especially to more extreme versions or interpretations of their faith” (Baumgarten 1997: 137). Moreover, an uprooted and displaced new urban population seeks leaders who are able to guide them through novel and bewildering environs, and “thus making them receptive to the attractions of sectarianism” (Baumgarten 1997: 138).

The Hellenistic period, which brought significant new populations to urban centres, dramatically altered the demographics of the Near East, especially in great urban centres such as Alexandria. Urban centres overflowed with diverse populations from the ancient Mediterranean and Near East. According to Baumgarten, “[t]he impact of these encounters can be clearly felt in the literature of the period, as the cultural life in these major urban areas set the tone for the Hellenistic world at large” (Baumgarten 1997: 142). Jerusalem was no exception, as it experienced substantial growth during the Hellenistic period. Baumgarten surmises that some of the substantial growth during the Hellenistic period can be attributed to the high birthrate brought about by the relative peace and prosperity of the Persian period (Baumgarten 1997: 143).

56 This pattern of economic and population growth continued during

---

56 Despite the relative lateness and high building standards of the period, archaeological remains from the Persian Palestine are quite limited. Some scholars attribute this paucity in material culture to the widespread destruction in the region caused by the Neo-Babylonian campaigns during the early sixth century B.C.E. Additionally, Ephraim Stern points out three other factors which probably have contributed to the scant archaeological picture of the Persian period: “1. In the Persian period, numerous mounds were abandoned and never resettled. Since the stratum from this period was the uppermost site, it was exposed to erosion and other depredations. 2. At those sites in which settlement continued, the Persian-period occupation levels were severely damaged by intensive building activities conducted during the Hellenistic-Roman periods. 3. At most of the large excavated sites of this period, the mound was occupied by a palace-fort or other building. These three factors can explain the relatively disappointing results of the excavations at the major mounds.” However, this bleak outlook on Persian period archaeology has changed somewhat in light of recent excavations, namely that of Tel Dor, which represents a well-planned centre. Tel Dor’s sophisticated city planning should not come as a major surprise, since it is a coastal site, and the coastal plain (and perhaps Galilee) was very densely populated and the hub of active urban life during the Persian period. In other words, during the Persian period, urban life appears to have been contingent on the region, as different regions show different levels of urban development (Stern 2001: 461-62). Jerusalem was the capital city of Persian Yehud. Despite detailed
the two centuries or so between the Alexander’s conquest and the establishment of the Hasmonean dynasty. Jerusalem was becoming a large city in local terms, larger than any other known in its vicinity (Baumgarten 1997: 143-46). Baumgarten concludes the following:

It is therefore plausible to expect that urbanization affected ancient Jews in ways similar to its effect on inhabitants of seventeenth century London, or contemporary Cairo: the loss of reference group yielding a context in which groups formed around masters and their agendas, who provided a new sense of meaning to rootless [people]. This, I propose, is what was taking place in Maccabean Jerusalem. (Baumgarten 1997: 146)

Baumgarten’s argument, summarized as population growth combined with people who lost reference groups and sought affiliation in new social groups, explains the proliferation of interpretive communities during the Maccabean period (Baumgarten 1997: 150). In sum, an increase in both literacy and population contributed to new interpretations of authoritative discourses and sectarianism.

Another argument for the increase in interpretations and interpretive communities is Blenkinsopp’s position identifying the Hasmonean priesthood as a cause. Blenkinsopp states the following about the possible relationship between the proliferation of interpretive communities and Josephus’ descriptions of the three philosophies—Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes—in *Ant.* 13.171-73:

descriptions of Nehemiah’s construction of the city walls (Neh. 2:13-15; 3:1-32; 12:31-40), the location of these walls has been a matter of controversy. Although the location of the city wall is in dispute, material culture from the Persian period was unearthed beginning in the early twentieth century, discoveries which included a small amount of pottery and numerous types of *yehud* seal impressions. However, these excavators have failed to connect these discoveries with a level of building. Kathleen Kenyon excavated Jerusalem between 1961 and 1967, during which time she concluded that Persian Jerusalem occupied only the eastern hill; that is, the wall surrounding the summit of the eastern hill, previously considered to belong to the pre-monarchical Jebusite or monarchical periods, was assigned to the Persian period (the days of Nehemiah?). During the Hasmonaean period, a tower and other structures were added to the Persian wall. Furthermore, against the east side of the wall laid a rubbish dump that contained fifth to fourth century B.C.E. pottery. The most recent excavations of the City of David, directed by Y. Shiloh, have confirmed these conclusions. These most recent excavations have shown Persian Jerusalem is less preserved “because it was nearly obliterated between the destruction of the Israelite city and the extensive construction in the Hasmonaean and Herodian periods” (Stern 2001: 434-35).
This brief disquisition interrupts his account of the high priesthood of Jonathan Maccabee about the middle of the second century B.C., which may imply that Josephus understood that these “philosophies” came into existence about that time (*kata ton chronon touton*). Many scholars would be prepared to accept this, at least with respect Pharisees and Essenes. There is also broad agreement that Qumran sectarianism dates from the time of John Hyrcanus or shortly thereafter. The convulsive events leading to the Maccabean uprising, the ongoing struggle with Seleucid rulers, and the usurpation of the office of the high priest by Jonathan Maccabee (153/152 B.C.), not a Zadokite and therefore ineligible for office, provided a setting calculated to encourage polarization and the formation of parties. (Blenkinsopp 2009: 210)

This position would appear to correspond to the lack of popularity of the Hasmoneans described in the section above. However, again, it is difficult, to say the least, to identify the communities responsible for Daniel, CD, or 1QpHab with any of the three philosophies identified by Josephus, least of all equating the communities of CD and 1QpHab with the Essenes (see Golb 1995). Similarly, it is equally problematic equating the *maskîlim* of Daniel with the *hasidim/asidaioi* or “those seeking righteousness” (cf. 1 Macc. 2:29-42) (see Redditt 1998: 465-67).

I agree with Redditt that, in regards to Daniel, we probably are looking at an unknown scribal group (Redditt 1998: 467), but not necessarily one that was loyal to Antiochus III and subsequently fell out of favour with Antiochus IV (Redditt 1998: 474). Interestingly, Davies explores the possible relationship between communities like those that produced Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab: “But a suitably sophisticated analysis of the relationships between the book of Daniel and the Qumran writings, taking into account both ideological and social factors, may enable a larger theory to be constructed of the Danielic *maskîlim* after the event of the Hasmonean dynasty” (Davies 2001: 264). Furthermore, Davies also points to the apparent diaspora roots, elite scribalism, and views of disenfranchisement of the *maskîlim* as potential links to other groups allyng with the Zadokites and opposing the Hasmoneans. In fact, he concludes by stating that “[t]hese
features alone make it entirely plausible, if not probable, that the texts from Qumran are written by the successors of the Danielic *maskilim*” (Davies 2001: 264).

Notwithstanding the monolithic implications of the term ‘Qumran writings’, which are discussed in Chapter 5, Davies’ position is attractive for a number of reasons, especially in regards to the multidirectionality of the Hasmonean and post-Hasmonean mnemonic and discursive worlds. It is evident that Daniel not only shares family resemblance traits with CD and 1QpHab, but also other texts well-represented in the discoveries from the caves near Qumran, namely, 1 Enoch, 4QInstruction, the Book of Mysteries, 1QM, 1QS, 4QMMT, 4Q171, 4Q174, 4Q177, 4Q387, and 11QMelch. Further to this point, the discussion of Daniel and the texts discovered in the caves near Qumran can be expanded to encompass to encompass multidirectionality and the production of hybrids in Hasmonean Judea in general.

As Carol Newsom has shown, Second Temple texts in general are part of a community of discourse that was shaped by dialogical relationships with the larger mnemonic and discursive worlds of Second Temple Judaism (see Newsom 2004: 1-21). Thus, mnemonic communities that opposed each other on some ideological level and represented the other as impure or impious participated in dialogical relationships that created multidirectional and “imaginative links between different histories and social groups” (Rothberg 2009: 18). According to Mikhail Bakhtin, while the linguistic significance of an utterance is understood against the background of language, “its actual meaning is understood against the background of other concrete utterances on the same theme, a background made up of contradictory opinions, points of view, and value judgments . . .” (Bakhtin 1981: 281). These dialogical relationships may emerge out of what Rothberg calls the entanglement of the multidirectionality of memory.
Blenkinsopp notes that the objectives of E-N “to build a perfect community cleansed of all impurities, the embodiment of the remnant of Israel proclaimed by the prophets, anticipated the eschatological community of the last days which the Danielic sect, the Damascus community, and the Qumran yahad believed themselves to be” (Blenkinsopp 2009: 210). He points to the consistency in which the “symbolic historiography” of second and first centuries B.C.E keys into the pre-Hasmonean mnemonic tradition of E-N that focuses on the Babylonian exile as the defining moment of Israelite history and an incubator for myths of origins, which, as shown, is the case for Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab (Blenkinsopp 2009: 221-22). Interestingly, the texts and communities that engaged in the symbolic historiography of imagining a perfectly purified community correspond to the Bakhtinian hybrid:

The... hybrid is not only double-voiced and double-accented... but it is also double-languaged; for in it there are not only (and not even so much) two individual consciousnesses, two epochs... that come together and consciously fight it out on the territory of the utterance... It is the collision between differing points of view on the world that are embedded in these forms... such unconscious [or in this case conscious] hybrids have been at the same time profoundly productive historically; they are pregnant with potential for new world views, with new ‘internal forms’ for perceiving the world in words. (Bakhtin 1981: 36)

Like the Bakhtinian hybrid, the symbolic historiography that draws on the E-N metanarrative is double-voiced and double-languaged, consisting of different epochs, new worldviews, and multidirectionality. The Hasmonean period was a time of new and multiple interpretations, composite texts, hybrid genres (see Newsom 2005), and multidirectionality with competing texts and communities drawing off of the same resources: authoritative texts, collective memory, traditions. Again, this process is more entangled and complicated than identifying mnemonic winners and vanquished losers in a zero-sum game.
For the above reasons, it is not surprising that the memories invoked and represented in CD and 1QpHab concerning the state and legitimacy of Jerusalem, the temple, and the high priesthood are entangled and in dialogical relationships with those whom they may have considered impure, namely the Hasmoneans. The multidirectionality of shared and entangled memory between CD, 1QHab, and 1-2 Maccabees is evident in 1-2 Maccabees use of mnemonic schemas to establish an identity as the pure remnant that emerges from a brief exile in the wilderness (1 Macc. 2:27-48; 2 Macc. 5:27) to restore order and purity to a defiled land, city, and temple. In 1-2 Maccabees, the Maccabean heroes are simultaneously connected to the heroic past of Israel (1 Macc. 2:51-60; 4:9-12, 30-33; 2 Macc. 2:18-3:13; 15:22; 19:15-16) and dissociated from their contemporaries, the impure elements or contaminants in the social body who abandoned the ancestral traditions (1 Macc. 1:11-15, 43; 2 Macc. 4:13-17; 5:11-20).

4 Conclusions

This chapter highlights the relationship between notions of purification, the production of hybrids, and multidirectional memory. Following the work of Latour, I showed that production and proliferation of hybrids emerge from discourses of separation and purification in Second Temple Judea. Further, his work on separation, purification and hybrids serves as a point of departure to Rothberg’s concept of multidirectional memory, upon which I draw to illustrate that collective memory in Second Temple Judea is not a zero-sum game with mnemonic winners and vanquished losers. Rather, groups and communities who imagined themselves as pure and separate from others, to the point of mnemonic obliteration or cleansing of those they opposed, in fact shared histories, sites of memories, mnemonic schemas, and discursive practices. These groups, in dialogical relationships with
one another and the discursive world of Second Temple Judea, were the returned exiles, Benjaminites, or the peoples of the land in E-N; the Judaizers and Hellenizers in 2 Maccabees; the wise and the violators of the covenant in Daniel, or the producers of CD and 1QpHab and the Hasmonean high priests.
Conclusions

This dissertation has explored the social dimensions of traumatic memory in Second Temple Judaism. I have shown the ways in which collective memories and postmemories of collective trauma inform and shape exclusive identity formation in E-N, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab. These texts key into the cultural frameworks and mnemonic schemas that produce hybrid narratives, memories, and postmemories, which synthesize and fuse the inherited past, experienced past, present, and imagined future. This process, of course, is facilitated by the work of imagination.

LaCapra’s notion of a founding trauma is an important heuristic device in my argument. Following this notion, I argue that trauma is construed as a founding, generative, and integrative identity marker in the texts analyzed in this dissertation. The process of restoration from a founding trauma in E-N, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab is represented as one of rupture, continuity, separation, and purification in establishing a myth of origins of a pure remnant. I have illustrated the ways in which these texts convert absence into loss and conflate structural trauma with historical trauma in their discourses of exile, separation, purification, and restoration of lost unity or idealized pre-exilic identity. In this sense, memories, postmemories, and representations of collective trauma reveal and/or create social divisions and exclusive collective identities. As LaCapra theorizes, the narrativization of absence can lead to eschatological worldviews, as we see in Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab.

After establishing and outlining my theoretical approach to the texts in Chapter 1, I explored E-N’s response to the destruction of the first temple and Babylonian exile in Chapter 2. The producers of E-N represent their mnemonic community as a pure remnant
emerging from Babylon that is separated from the polluted land and the peoples of the land through the discourse of exile, which excludes the peoples of the land from the temple, cult, and community through cultic, legal, and physical barriers and then expulsion. The discourse of exile, the building projects, and return to the idealized Sinaitic experience separates the pure remnant from the peoples of the land and establishes a myth of origins of the restored Israel. This narrative of restoration is one of rupture and continuity as it incorporates the postmemory foundations of the idealized Israelite past, though mnemonic schemas and cultural frameworks. The founding trauma on which E-N’s myth of origins is based conflates historical trauma (i.e., the loss of Jerusalem and the temple) with structural trauma (i.e., the transhistorical absence of an original unity or purity) in an attempt to mnemonically and discursively restore a pure, idealized pre-exilic identity. As a result, E-N attempts to eliminate and cleanse mnemonically and discursively the impurities and profanities that threaten the existence of the restored community. Importantly, separation through the discourse of exile and building projects did not insulate the restored Israel from the contamination of the people of the land, so the figures of Ezra and Nehemiah had to expel the foreign women in Ezra 9-10 and Nehemiah 13. Establishing their interpretations of the laws from Sinai as the law itself, they frame their purging of the foreign elements as a legal command and obligation. In E-N, mixing with the peoples of the land is considered to be מַעַל.

Chapter 3 outlined the ways in which 2 Maccabees represents restoration from a founding trauma as process of cleansing and eliminating the Hellenizers who defiled the temple. In what followed, I focused on the narrative of 2 Maccabees that restores the loss of an original ethnic identity through the rededication of the temple and mnemonic connections
with an idealized past. The founding events of 167-164 B.C.E. are myths of origins for the Hasmonean dynasty, the festival of Ḥanukkah, and the pure beginnings of ḤЄουδαϊσμός under Hasmonean rule, or a restored pure Judean identity. The original ethnic identity is restored through mnemonic connections to exemplary figures from the idealized past of Israel: Nehemiah, Jeremiah, Solomon, and Moses. In 2 Maccabees, written somewhere between 124-63 B.C.E., it is the postmemory of the events that creates mnemonic bridges between past and present through a hybrid narrative incorporating past and present as earlier traumas are reactivated and liturgically commemorated. The symbolic and affective force of postmemory is the sinew that connects Moses, Solomon, Nehemiah, and the Maccabean heroes to the producers of the text, as well as Sukkoth to Ḥanukkah. This process is facilitated by liturgical time that interweaves and fuses the past and the present, Ḥanukkah and Sukkoth, and Judas and his followers to the returned exiles, Nehemiah’s temple, the first temple, and the wilderness generations.

The call for a future ingathering in a purified Jerusalem to celebrate Ḥanukkah (2 Macc. 2:16-18) also links future Judeans, including those living in Egypt, to the exemplary figures of the idealized past through liturgical time. An analysis of the discourse of restoration and purification in 2 Maccabees—both the prefixed letters and the narrative—reveals that conceptions of an original ethnic identity are established through imagined mnemonic connections, liturgical time, and the rhetoric of the dichotomy between ḤЄουδαϊσμός and ὙΕλληνισμός. In this sense, 2 Maccabees conflates structural trauma (i.e., the loss of an original unity or purity) with historical trauma (i.e., the events of 167-164 B.C.E.) in its narrative of purification and restoration.
Chapters 4 and 5 discussed eschatology as a dimension of the restoration process of a founding trauma. Following LaCapra, I argued that Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab mourn the absence of a pure pre-exilic identity through converting absence into loss in discourses infused with absence, which may result in views of collective sin that is overcome through eschatology. Again, LaCapra’s position corresponds to Knibb’s work on continuous exile that enveloped the Second Temple period. In Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab, the notion of an ongoing exile and absence of a pure and idealized pre-exilic identity haunt their respective mnemonic communities to the point that exile and absence are overcome by a utopian eschatology for the righteous and/or elect.

Chapter 4 delineated how the founding trauma in Daniel, the persecution of 167-164 B.C.E., is informed and framed by the Babylonian exile. Daniel reactivates and reshapes earlier sites of memory and uses culturally familiar mnemonic frameworks as multidirectional/screen memories in projecting the trauma of 167 B.C.E. back to the Babylonian exile, thereby creating a composite hybrid of visions that interweave the experienced past and inherited past, rupture and continuity. This process establishes unity between the court tales of Daniel 1-6 and the visions of Daniel 7-12. Daniel establishes the righteousness of the maskîlîm through the discourse of exile and revelation of mysteries רז. The producers of Daniel reinterpret the seventy year prophecy of Jeremiah and authorize the figure and text of Daniel through revelation of the רז outside the land in exilic space. The revelation and instruction of Daniel and the maskîlim are responsible for restoration at the eschaton. By refining, purging, and whitening the collective guilt and sin, the martyred maskîlim consummate Daniel’s penitential prayer in Daniel 9. The separation of the righteous and the wicked and restoration at the eschaton are achieved through the trinity of
authoritative texts (from the book of Jeremiah to the sealed books and the book of Daniel itself), revelation (proper understanding of the רְז), and figures (Daniel and the maskîlim).

Chapter 5 looked at CD and 1QpHab reshaping of the Chaldean destruction of 587 B.C.E., which is not only an earlier site of trauma to be revisited and virtually—but experientially—relived through the imagination of representation. This imaginative revisiting and reliving an earlier trauma is related directly to the pressing issue in the texts: Who will possess the land in the future? Like Daniel, these texts also mourn the absence of a pure pre-exilic identity, which results in an inability to overcome exile until the eschaton when the impurities of Jerusalem are cleansed. Also, as in Daniel, the conversion of absence into loss and the subsequent mourning of this absence results in misplaced nostalgia and imagined utopias in quest for a restored purity. The reactivating and reshaping of the Chaldean destruction initiates the process of destruction and restoration that culminates in the eschatological purification of Jerusalem. CD and 1QpHab interweave the past and present through the postmemory that combines the experienced past and inherited past in imaging a future temporality, which mnemonically connects the elect to the remote idealized past of Moses and the wilderness generation at Sinai, the ancient prophets, the elect in the present, and those in the post-eschatological future. The discourse of exile is instrumental in authorizing the texts and communities of CD and 1QpHab and is a means to the desired end of an eschatological restoration of Jerusalem, the temple, and an idealized past identity. Both texts establish the authority of a true Israel through the discourse of exile but are oriented towards the future temporality of a restored Jerusalem.

Chapter 6 explored notions of purification, hybrids, and multidirectional memory. Drawing from the theoretical framework of Latour, I argued that the production and
proliferation of hybrids emerge from discourses and practices of separation and purification in Second Temple Judea. In other words, conjoined births and hybrids lurk below the surface of Second Temple discourses of exile, separation, and purification. In conjunction with Latour’s work on hybrids, I used Rothberg’s work on multidirectional memory to show the ways in which E-N, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, CD, and 1QpHab shared pasts, sites of memory, mnemonic schemas, discursive practices, and identities with those whom they represent as impure in their discourses but with whom they are in dialogical relationships: the returned exiles, Benjaminites, or the peoples of the land in E-N; the Judaizers and Hellenizers in 2 Maccabees; the wise and the violators of the covenant in Daniel, or the producers of CD and 1QpHab and the Hasmonean high priests. The main point of this final chapter is to demonstrate that memory and identity are fluid and under constant negotiation.

This dissertation exhibits the ways in which biblical studies and Second Temple Judaism can participate in and be informed by ongoing multidisciplinary conversations on collective memory and trauma, especially the inter/transgenerational transmission of trauma, in fields such as history, psychology, anthropology, sociology, Jewish studies, and Holocaust studies. Memories and representations of traumatic events are currents that run through much Second Temple literature, and Second Temple scholarship can benefit from participating in and engaging with the work being done in other disciplines on these topics. Moreover, much work on traumatic memory is focused on the traumatic events—massacres, atrocities, genocides, and comparative victimization—that marked, influenced, and shaped the historical consciousness and politics of identity in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Therefore, analyses of ancient accounts and representations of collective trauma can supplement and inform the work focusing on the atrocities and collective catastrophes of
the twentieth century. Although using different historical methods and representations of the past, ancient sources can shed light on collective memories of trauma and ruptures and the ways in which they are represented, framed, worked through, mourned, and constructed as a basis for collective identity. Thus, the objective of this project is to provide a new theoretical lens and framework for biblical studies and a new data-set for memory studies, much of which focuses on modernity.

Not all texts in antiquity, and Second Temple Judaism in particular, respond to collective trauma as the texts featured in this dissertation do. As Erikson posits, collective trauma and catastrophes can unite or divide social units. This topic can be one of future research by comparing my conclusions in this study with those cases that do not fit the model. Additionally, not all exclusive identity formation, or what some Second Temple scholars regard as ‘sectarian’ identity, can be attributed to trauma and/or responses to trauma. This topic of why some texts express an exclusive identity through the medium of trauma and why others do not is also fertile ground for a future study.
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