

[Back](#) 15 page(s) will be printed.

---

**Record:** 1

**Title:** The Judaeen priesthood during the Neo-Babylonian and...

**Authors:** Blenkinsopp, Joseph

**Source:** Catholic Biblical Quarterly; Jan1998, Vol. 60 Issue 1, p25, 19p

**Document Type:** Article

**Subject Terms:** \*JUDAISM  
\*PRIESTHOOD  
ACHAEMENID dynasty, 559-330 B.C.

**Abstract:** Presents information on Judaeen priesthood during the Achaemenid and Neo-Babylonian period. Identification of Benjaminite Mizpah; Indications of exilic or postexilic composition; Fragments of Zadokite propaganda.

**Full Text Word Count:** 9353

**ISSN:** 0008-7912

**Accession Number:** 781985

**Database:** Academic Search Premier

---

## THE JUDAEAN PRIESTHOOD DURING THE NEO-BABYLONIAN AND ACHAEMENID PERIODS: A HYPOTHETICAL RECONSTRUCTION

AFTER THE SACK OF JERUSALEM and burning of the temple by the Babylonian general Nebuzaradan, the chief priest Seraiah, his second-in-command Zephaniah, and three guardians of the threshold, also priests, were executed (2 Kgs 25:18). The rest of the temple staff were presumably killed, dispersed, or deported to Babylon. It has generally been held, nevertheless, that some form of worship continued on the site of the ruined temple. Lamentations, we are told, could have been composed for recital as part of a liturgy carried out in situ, and we hear of a group of pious Northerners, eighty strong, who were murdered at Mizpah while on their way with cereal offerings and incense to the temple of Yahweh, presumed to be the one in Jerusalem (Jer 41:5).

Repeated time out of number,(n1) this line of argument seems to make sense, but it is not without its problems. It would be quite natural for the local inhabitants to lament on the site of the destroyed temple, as devout Jews have long been accustomed to pray at the kotel, the so-called wailing wall, but this would hardly have amounted to a regular liturgy--certainly not one which could substitute for sacrifice. We also get the impression that Nebuzaradan did a thorough job of gutting the temple.(n2) Even if the altar had survived, it would have been corpse-contaminated (Lam 2:20), and therefore rendered inaccessible. The parallel case of the altar desecrated by Antiochus IV four centuries later, which had to be replaced (1 Macc 4:36-61), comes to mind. The notice that the first Babylonian immigrants wasted no time in building a new altar on the site of the previous one (Ezra 3:1-6) is, therefore, no more than we would expect, whether it is historically reliable or not.

The eighty members of the Northern delegation who found themselves in the wrong place at the wrong time, approaching Mizpah the day after Gedaliah, appointed governor by the Babylonians, had been assassinated in that city, were on their way to make an offering of cereal and incense at a sanctuary of Yahweh (Jer 41:4-5). We are not told that the sanctuary in question was in Jerusalem; in the interminable discussion of this text in the Book of Jeremiah it is widely assumed, nevertheless, that this was the case.(n3) Few stopped to ask whether, in light of what we know of Samaritan--Jerusalemite relations before and after this point in time, it was at all likely that people would come from Samaria bringing offerings to Jerusalem. The problem of the altar in Jerusalem, if it existed, was noted, but it was disposed of by assuming that a service of reconsecration had taken place, or that a temporary altar had been set up, or that, given the circumstances, the pilgrims felt entitled to disregard the matter of ritual defilement. None of these considerations, and none of the other arguments and counterarguments produced over the last century or so, has proved conclusive. One is left with the impression that for most commentators it was basically a matter of there being something intrinsically implausible about a place for sacrifice, even nonbloody sacrifice,(n4)

located in Mizpah or, for that matter, anywhere in the province except Jerusalem.(n5)

In this essay I propose to argue the case for an older opinion in favor of a sanctuary of Yahweh in or near Mizpah during the period of Neo-Babylonian rule after the fall of Jerusalem. I will suggest that it makes a good fit with the admittedly scant data available for the period, constituting, therefore, a serious probability rather than a mere possibility, and that if it is accepted, it will have interesting and potentially important implications for the obscure history of the priesthood in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Judah.

## I

I BEGIN WITH THE NOW ACCEPTED identification of Benjaminite Mizpah, the scene of the assassination and subsequent mayhem described in Jer 41:1-10, with Tell en-Nasbeh, a site twelve kilometers (about seven and a half miles) north of Jerusalem occupying a strategically excellent situation on the north-south highway running along the central ridge of the country.(n6) After the Babylonian conquest Mizpah replaced Jerusalem, now largely destroyed and depopulated, as the administrative center of the province and the residence of the governor appointed by the Babylonians (2 Kgs 25:22-26; Jer 40:6-41:18). The territory of Benjamin suffered much less damage from the conquest and occupation than that of Judah, and the archaeological evidence (always provisional and subject to revision) shows that important sites such as Tell en-Nasbeh (Mizpah), Tell el-Ful (Gibeah?), el-Jib (Gibeon) and Beitin (Bethel) escaped destruction, perhaps on account of strong opposition there to the war party in Judah.(n7) For practical and strategic reasons, therefore, including the need for open communications with the central and northern regions, Mizpah was the obvious choice for provincial capital at that time.

The ruler of the province after the conquest and deportations was Gedaliah, member of a distinguished family often mentioned in the biblical record, grandson of Shaphan the public official who played such a prominent role throughout the reign of Josiah. If the seal bearing the name Gedaliah discovered at Lachish belonged to him, he probably also served as majordomo of the palace during the reign of Zedekiah.(n8) The relevant biblical texts (2 Kgs 25:22-23; Jer 40:5,7,11; 41:2,18) are not explicit about his official status, but they leave room to suspect that he was installed at Mizpah as a puppet king. The rather odd absence of a title, supplied gratuitously in the RSV and other modern versions, may in fact be due to embarrassment at the appointment of a non-Davidite as ruler. Pointing us in the same direction is the description of the assassin Ishmael as a chief officer of the king (rab hammelek, Jer 41:1), certainly not the Babylonian king. That he, unlike Gedaliah, belonged to the legitimate dynasty (mizzeral hammeluka, Jer 41:1) provides motivation for his terrorist act, on which the record is otherwise reticent.(n9)

Also of possible relevance is a seal, discovered at Tell en-Nasbeh during Bade's excavation, which belonged to a royal official whose name was Jaazaniah (ly'znyhw 'bd hmlk), the same name borne by a member of Gedaliah's entourage (2 Kgs 25:23; cf. Jezaniah, Jer 40:8).(n10) The king whose daughters were taken captive by Ishmael at Mizpah (Jer 41:10) could, finally, be Gedaliah, but the narrator could also have had Zedekiah in mind, depending on how one construes the syntax of the sentence.

Mizpah retained its importance as an administrative center after the province of Judah (Yehud) passed under Iranian control about half a century later. A somewhat obscure statement in the account of Nehemiah's refortification of Jerusalem associates the men of Mizpah with the throne or seat of the governor of the satrapy of Transeuphrates (Neh 3:7), which may be taken to refer to the satrap's residence at Mizpah on state visits to the province.(n11) Mizpah was also the administrative center of the northern district, one of five pelakim into which Judah was divided.(n12) The aforementioned account of the wall building names two governors of this subunit, Shallum ben Colhozeh and Ezer ben Jeshua (Neh 3:15,19).

The point of these preliminary observations is that if Mizpah took over from Jerusalem the role of Judah's administrative center, in effect the capital of the province under Babylonian rule, it is not implausible to suggest that a sanctuary of however modest dimensions in or near the town would have been part of the provincial government's complex of buildings--this especially if Mizpah was initially a royal residence. It is well known that local cults and their officiants were part of the apparatus of imperial control throughout the Near East and Levant. After the conquest of Samaria, the Assyrians insisted on bringing back one of the deported priests and installing him in Bethel, in the interests of good order (2 Kgs 17:24-28). Similar concern for liturgical praxis and for a compliant clergy as instruments of order and control is also attested for Judah, Egypt, and other provinces under Achaemenid rule, and we have no reason to believe that the Babylonians would have acted any differently.

Further confirmation may be found in biblical narration of episodes in the early history of Israel in which Benjaminite Mizpah is described as a religious center, a place where worship, including sacrificial worship, could be offered to Yahweh. Confronted with a particularly atrocious crime perpetrated by the people of Gibeah, the tribes assembled in the presence of Yahweh (lipne yhwh) at Mizpah with a view to taking appropriate punitive measures (Judg 20:1; 21:5,8). Somewhat later, fasting, confession of sin, a liturgy of water pouring, and sacrifice were carried out under the direction of Samuel at the same location (1 Sam 7:5-6,9-10; 10:17). We shall go on to see that both passages betray signs of composition, or substantial editing, at a time no earlier than the Neo-Babylonian period, a conclusion

widely accepted in the commentary tradition. It would not be surprising, therefore, if these narratives reflected conditions obtaining at the time of writing or editing. This is especially the case with the account of the crime of Gibeah and its sequel; whatever its possible relevance to early stages of tribal history may be, it provides the attentive reader with clues to the religious situation during the period following the conquest of Jerusalem and the deportations. As an important piece of evidence in the case being presented, it will briefly claim our attention.

## II

AN INITIAL PROBLEM facing the interpreter of Judges 20-21 is that of sorting out the respective roles of the towns and religious centers mentioned in the text: Gibeah, Shiloh, Mizpah, and Bethel, especially the last two. Mizpah, we saw, was where one assembled in the presence of Yahweh, but it was also the place where political and judicial matters were transacted--hearing the Levite's complaint, taking an oath, deciding on military action (Judg 20:1,3; 21:1,5,8). But Bethel also played a role in the war of the tribal coalition led by Judah (20:18) which was directed against the transgressive Benjaminites, for it was in Bethel that the more explicitly religious acts required by the situation were carried out. These included inquiring of Yahweh (perhaps through prophetic intermediaries), fasting, communal lamentation, and sacrifice (Judg 20:18,26-27; 21:2-4,19). We need hardly add that it would be risky to read this account of military campaigns punctuated by religious exercises as historically plausible. As George Foot Moore put it long ago, it embodies the theocratic ideal of a scribe who had never handled a more dangerous weapon than an imaginative pen.<sup>(n13)</sup> The most obvious, indeed the standard way of explaining the tribal coalition's recourse to two distinct centers is to postulate a conflation of sources, and it will come as no surprise that that is what most commentators in the modern period have done.<sup>(n14)</sup> But then the problem is simply displaced to the redactional stage, leaving us with the question why an editor in the Neo-Babylonian period, or perhaps somewhat later, would consider it appropriate to assign a role in the story to both Mizpah and Bethel.

Certain features of the way the story is told permit the suggestion that the narrator or editor had in mind the situation obtaining in Judah between the Babylonian conquest and the transition to Achaemenid rule about half a century later. The role of Benjamin brings to mind the ambiguous situation of the people of that region *Viv-a-vis* Judah on the one hand and the Babylonian conquerors on the other.<sup>(n15)</sup> More directly relevant to our argument, however, is the part played by Bethel. Bethel, generally identified with Beitin about three miles north of Tell en-Nasbeh,<sup>(n16)</sup> was the site of the state sanctuary on the southern boundary of the kingdom of Samaria. Its history at that time is not our present concern, but it continued in existence as a cultic center after the Assyrian conquest in 722 B.C. (2 Kgs 17:28). After changing hands several times under the dual monarchy, it was finally incorporated into Judah during Josiah's reign (2 Kgs 23:4, 15). During the Achaemenid period it was within the province of Judah (Ezra 2:28 = Neh 7:32); together with its villages and farms (Neh 11:31), it must have been located in the administrative district (*pelek*) of Mizpah.

Among the clearest linguistic indications of exilic or postexilic composition or redaction in Judges 20-21 is the description of the tribes gathered at Mizpah the *eda*, a term of common occurrence in P, though *qahal*, the standard term for the plenary gathering of the community in Ezra-Nehemiah, also occurs.<sup>(n17)</sup> Presence at the plenary assembly is required under pain of death (Judg 21:5), as in the Ezra narrative absenteeism is punished by the social death of banishment from the *qahal* (Ezra 10:8). In both these situations, incidentally, the issue has to do with solving a problem connected with marriage and delinquent conduct. The addition of the tribal allies to fasting, lamentation, and weeping also, inevitably, carries echoes of liturgical praxis well attested for the Second Temple period, not least in connection with the marriage crisis during Ezra's mission.<sup>(n18)</sup>

Bethel is mentioned in a prophetic text from the early Persian period which presents us with a problem similar to the one discussed earlier in connection with Jer 41:5. The MT of Zech 7:1-3 may be translated as follows:

In the fourth year of King Darius, the word of Yahweh came to Zechariah on the fourth of the ninth month, in Chislew. Sareser, Regemmelech and his men had sent to Bethel to entreat the favor of Yahweh and to ask the priests who belonged to the house of Yahweh Sebaoth and the prophets, "Should I mourn [weep] in the fifth month and practice abstinence as I have been doing for these many years?"

Most commentators are reluctant to, accept what appears to be the most, natural reading of the MT of v. 2a (*wayyislah bet-el sar-eser weregem melek waanasayw*), namely, to assume *sar-eser weregem melek waanasayw* to be the compound subject and *bet-el* the destination, a construction supported by the LXX, the Syriac version, and the Targum.<sup>(n19)</sup> The least implausible alternative to reading *bet-el* as accusative of direction is to take *bet-el-sar-eser* as one personal name. Names compounded with *bet-el* are attested, and there, is one Akkadian equivalent of Bethel-sareser from the late Neo-Babylonian period<sup>(n20)</sup> But Sareser also occurs in 2 Kgs 19:37 = Isa 37:38, so the matter cannot be settled on this basis alone. We would also not have expected the editor of Zechariah's oracles, recording such an unusual name, to have left the meaning as ambiguous as it is. Perhaps the only other alternative is to read the place name Bethel, standing for the people of Bethel, as the subject of the verb. This reading is also well attested,<sup>(n21)</sup> but more as a *faute de mieux*, one suspects, than out of conviction. Except in poetic contexts, where personifying a city (e.g., Zion) is an appropriate and natural procedure, such a usage is

forced and without biblical parallel. We would expect "the men of Bethel" or something of the sort.

I suggest, then, that Zech 7:1-3 refers to the following situation. In Chislew (November-December) 518 B.C. a certain Sareser, bearing a good Babylonian name, and his colleagues sent to Bethel a delegation bringing cultic offerings to the designated provincial sanctuary and requesting a ruling on fasting from the priests and prophets there, since there was as yet no "house of Yahweh Sebaoth" in Jerusalem. The oracle which follows (Zech 7:4-7) shows that Zechariah, clearly not one of the prophets whose opinion was solicited,(n22) was hostile to this initiative, intimating that the fasts and other religious practices, including sacrifice (v. 6), carried out at the sanctuary of Bethel since the deportations had been self-interested and disingenuous. A close parallel to this situation is the request for a ruling from the priests on a matter of ritual purity dated two years earlier and reported in Hag 2:10-14; here, too, the outcome is reprobation of the sacrificial worship carried out at some place other than Jerusalem ("what they offer there is unclean," 2:14). If the proposed reading of Zech 7:1-3 is accepted, the topographical allusion in Hag 2:14 may very likely be the same.(n23)

Our reading of the texts in Jeremiah and Zechariah still leaves us with the problem of two cultic centers outside of Jerusalem between the time of the deportations and the time of the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem. While we cannot rule out the possibility of multiple sanctuaries by appealing to the Deuteronomic sanctuary law (since laws are not always observed, especially in exceptional situations),(n24) the close proximity of Mizpah (Tell en-Nasbeh) to Bethel (Beitin) makes it unlikely in this instance. One might then posit the existence of one and the same sanctuary situated in close proximity to both Mizpah and Bethel. The excavator of Beitin regretted that he found no trace of the sanctuary of Bethel which played such a prominent role in the religious history of the two kingdoms,(n25) but, quite apart from the small area (about four acres) available for excavation on the site, we know that sanctuaries were sometimes built outside city limits, and Abraham is said to have erected an altar and worshipped east of Bethel (Gen 12:8; 133; cf. Josh 7:2). So Kelso's failure to come up with a temple is not so surprising. However, since the situation reflected in Judges 20-21 presupposes two distinct religious centers, this solution cannot be considered secure.

While the issue of one sanctuary or two is probably insoluble, the explanation which I consider least open to objection is that Mizpah served as both the political and the religious center of the province in the early period of Babylonian rule, down to the attempted coup d'etat of Ishmael, and that Bethel, for reasons unknown, then took over as the imperially designated center of worship. Bethel would then have retained this status into the early Persian period, that is, until it lost out to Jerusalem as center of worship. Since we do not know how soon after the fall of Jerusalem Gedaliah was assassinated (we are given the month but not the year in Jer 41:1), we cannot establish a terminus a quo for the change. The archaeological data have suggested that Bethel was destroyed at some point in the late Neo-Babylonian or early Achaemenid period, but since chronological estimates differ by as much as eighty years, we have no sound basis for a terminus ad quem either.(n26)

### III

IF AN IMPORTANT SANCTUARY in the Babylonian province of Judah was at Bethel, perhaps the one religious center authorized by the imperial authorities, it would be of interest to know who the priests were who serviced and maintained that sanctuary. We may find a clue in the passage discussed in the previous section. In Judg 20:27b-28, Phinehas, son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron, is said to have been officiating at Bethel in the presence of the ark of the covenant.(n27) Traditions about the priesthoods of the two state sanctuaries of the kingdom of Samaria eventually crystallized in parallel sequences of three generations originating with Moses and Aaron respectively: Moses-Gershom-Jonathan at Dan (Judg 18:30); Aaron-Eleazar-Phinehas at Bethel. The Bethel traditions had a longer life span than those of Dan, for the simple reason that Bethel qua sanctuary survived the Assyrian conquest, as we know from the account of the priest settled there by the Assyrians (2 Kgs 17:28). As such, it was still in existence a century later, during Josiah's reign (2 Kgs 23:15-20). It eventually became part of Judah, and on the reading of Zech 7:1-3 proposed above, it survived the reforming zeal of Josiah to play an important role in the affairs of the province, of Judah after the Babylonian conquest.(n28)

The connections of Aaron, as eponym of a priestly caste, to Bethel can hardly be doubted, in view of the parallels between the episode of the golden calf in Exodus 32, in which Aaron played a prominent and dubious role, and the establishment of the state sanctuary of Bethel by Jeroboam 1 reported in 1 Kings 12.(n29) The older view of Exodus 32 as a polemical rewriting of what was originally the cultic etiology of the sanctuary at Bethel has much to commend it, especially for those persuaded that Exodus 32-34 either is a Deuteronomic composition or has been edited by Deuteronomists,(n30) for neither Deuteronomy nor the Deuteronomistic History refers to priests as Aaronite or to Aaron as a person discharging priestly functions,(n31) and Deuteronomy mentions his name only once, in a disparaging reference to the episode of the golden calf (Deut 9:20).(n32) Indeed, no tradition of Judaeae origins which can plausibly be regarded as ancient, that is, preexilic, so much as mentions Aaron occupying a priestly role or discharging priestly functions.(n33)

If, then, the official or state sanctuary of the Babylonian province of Judah was at some point in time located at

Bethel, it can be plausibly suggested that the clergy staffing it claimed the name of Aaron for themselves in continuity with their forebears during the time of the Northern Kingdom. The thesis that Bethel during the Neo-Babylonian and early Persian periods provided a pied-a-terre in Judah for Aaronite priests is consistent with the reading of the prophetic texts discussed earlier (Jer 41:5; Zech 7:1-3; Hag 2:14), fits well with what we know about the political history of the province under Babylonian and Achaemenid rule, and will help to explain why texts from the early Persian period never refer to the priesthood of Jerusalem as Aaronite.

It will not be necessary to labor the point that in the Near East the construction, maintenance, and control of temples had broad social and political implications. The rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem in the late sixth century is a case in point. Viewed from distant Susa, the temple and its clergy were crucial for imperial control and the maintenance of law and order, while for nationalist immigrant groups the project of rebuilding was intimately connected with hopes for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty in the person of Zerubbabel. If Bethel, with its historical links with Samaria, played the role I have suggested between the destruction of the first temple and the building of the second temple, we will have an explanation of Samaritan opposition to the "Zionist" policies of the Judeo-Babylonian immigrants more adequate than the one provided by the older view, now no longer favored, that Judah was placed under Samaritan jurisdiction after the Babylonian conquest.(n34)

Anyone attempting to understand the Judaeon priesthood in its historical development has to take seriously the fact that, apart from the Priestly material (P) and Chronicles, our sources are silent both on Aaronite priests and on Aaron as their priestly eponym. This at least is a problem which can hardly be ignored. Of course, we may draw certain inferences from what the sources do say (e.g., in the episode of the golden calf), but the narrow band of attestation for Aaron qua priest and for priests named for him is significant, nevertheless.

In view of widely held assumptions about an Aaronite and Zadokite priesthood of the second temple, it is particularly striking that the same conclusion holds for sources extant from the Persian period. Prophetic texts from that time refer to "ministers" (mesaretim, Joel 1:9,13; 2:17; Isa 61:6) or simply to "priests" (kohanim, Hag 2:11; Mal 1:6; 2:1,7), but they never refer to Aaronite priests as P does. Malachi also designates priests "sons of Levi" (Mal 3:3), and a great deal of effort has gone into determining what is implied in his allusion to a "covenant of Levi" (2:4-9). Some commentators find here, a reference to the Levitical purge of apostates led astray by Aaron (Exod 32:25-29) or to the murderous zeal of Phinehas directed against worshipers of the Baal of Peor (Num 25:6-13). This last account does speak of a berit salom and a berit kehunna, but the similarity with the passage in Malachi, such as it is, ends there. Most commentators have noted the strongly Deuteronomistic flavor of the Book of Malachi in general, and the emphasis in 2:4-9 on priestly instruction and reverence for the divine Name points to a Deuteronomistic understanding of priesthood as essentially Levitical.

Deuteronomy routinely refers to "levitical priests" (kohanim lewiyyim, Deut 17:9,18; 18:1; 24:8; 27:9), and once to "priests, descendants of Levi" (kohanim bene lewi, 21:5). They are set aside for the service of the ark of the covenant (10:8-9), and their teaching role is stressed (17:11,18-20). The oracle on Levi (33:8-11) alludes to the same didactic function linked with observance of the covenant, and a passage in Jeremiah from an exilic-Deuteronomistic editor refers explicitly to a Levitical covenant (Jer 33:17-22).(n35)

Even more striking is the fact that Ezra-Nehemiah, which has a great deal to say about priests past and contemporary, is almost completely silent about Aaron and Aaronite priests. No Aaronites are listed among the clerical leaders of the first aliya (Ezra 2:2 = Neh 7:7), and none of the four "houses" of Judeo-Babylonian priests, numbering 4,289 in all, has stated Aaronite connections (Ezra 2:36-39 = Neh 7:39-42). The same holds true for those priests who were unable to verify their pedigree (Ezra 2:61-63 = Neh 7:63-65) and those who ran afoul of Ezra in the matter of foreign marriages (Ezra 10: 18-22). Ezra himself is given an Aaronite-Zadokite family tree (Ezra 7:1-5), but it is quite clear that his sixteen-member genealogy has been adapted from the Chronicler's longer and evidently schematic list of Jerusalemite chief priests (1 Chr 5:27-41), the adaptation probably having been made by the Chronicler himself. Ezra's appearance in the genealogy as a first generation descendant of the priest Seraiah who was executed after the fall of Jerusalem is only one indication of the fictive nature of this section of the narrative.(n36)

One of the stipulations of Nehemiah's covenant requires that an Aaronite priest supervise the distribution of the tithe, to ensure that the ten percent due to the priests is promptly delivered (Neh 10:39-40). Commentators generally agree that this specific requirement is a later codicil to the Levitical tithe law, and many add that the covenant stipulations themselves date from after the time of Nehemiah. The Aaronite priesthood is also involved in another reference to tithing, this one explicitly dated after Nehemiah (Neh 12:47).(n37)

From this brief survey, leaving aside P for the moment, we are entitled to conclude that neither Aaron nor Aaronite priests are mentioned in postexilic biblical sources prior to Chronicles. From the first person Ezra narrative, however, we learn that two of the priests who accompanied Ezra from Babylon, Gershom and Daniel by name, were descended from Phinehas and Ithamar, respectively (Ezra 8:2), and that another descendant of Phinehas named Eleazar was already stationed in Jerusalem (8:33). If these names are authentic for that time (probably 458 B.C.,

less probably 398 B.C.) rather than being the result of creative editing,(n38) they may provide the earliest hard evidence for the rise of the Aaronite branch of the priesthood to a position of power in the temple community of Jerusalem. The eponymous names Eleazar, Ithamar, and Phinehas, then, would also mark a stage in the formation and consolidation of the official Aaronite genealogy reproduced in different forms in P and in Chronicles.(n39) These genealogical essays serve to legitimate status and privilege and to encode stages in the development of the power and influence of this branch of the priesthood. If we can believe Ezra's account of his mission to Jerusalem, significant progress had been made in the first century of Persian rule.

#### IV

ANOTHER CONCLUSION we draw from the priestly genealogies, supported by a reading of certain evidently paradigmatic narratives in the Pentateuch,(n40) is that the progress of the Aaronites to a position of power and privilege in Jerusalem was marked by conflict and was concluded with accommodation between Aaronite priests and Zadokite priests.

Starting from what is less obscure, at the end of the process, we note that the "master" genealogy in 1 Chr 5:27-41 (6:1-15)--cf. the shorter version in 6:34-38 (6:49-53)--traces the preexilic high priesthood from Levi through Aaron to Jehozadak son of Seraiah, who was executed by the Babylonians after the fall of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 25:18-21). There can be no doubt that this genealogy is schematic and, for the most part, fictive. Zadok, David's priest, occupies the exact central position in it, preceded and followed by twelve generations. If we allow the traditional forty years for a generation, we arrive at 480 years from the exodus to the building of Solomon's temple, and 480 from then to the Babylonian exile; this fits the presumably Priestly chronological schema in the MT.(n41) We also note that the genealogy tallies with the names of priests in the historical books only at the beginning (Zadok, Azariah) and the end (Hilkiah, Seraiah), and that it does not include several priests who played a leading role in the history of Judah: Jehoiada (2 Kings 11-12), Uriah (2 Kgs 16:10-16; Isa 8:2), and Zephaniah ben Maaseiah (Jer 21:1; 29:25-26; 37:3). All of these priests seem to have occupied the office of chief priest, even though the title *hakkohen haggadol* is used only of Jehoiada (2 Kgs 12:11).(n42) Incidentally, care for historical accuracy only at the beginning and the end seems to be the normal pattern for linear genealogies which aim to legitimate status and title to property.(n43)

Priesthoods were, and are, often hereditary, and we have good examples in ancient Israel from Shiloh and Dan. It is generally taken for granted that the preexilic high priesthood in Jerusalem was also hereditary, but even this minimum is poorly supported, since we cannot exclude the possibility that individual high priests, who were state officials closely associated with the ruler (e.g., Amaziah with Jeroboam II in Samaria [Amos 7:10-17], Hilkiah with Josiah in Judah [2 Kings 22-23]), were royal appointees.(n44)

Structurally, then, the paramount feature of this Levitical-Aaronite genealogy is the central position of Zadok. The last person named in the high priestly diadoche is Jehozadak, who constitutes the essential link of continuity between the old order (Seraiah) and the new (Joshua). He too bears a name formed with the element *sdq*. Zadokites, therefore, are encapsulated, as it were, within the Aaronite family, but they have a privileged position within it. Though we cannot be sure that an unbroken Zadokite succession extended from the time of David to the Babylonian exile, we know that the Zadokite branch of the priesthood represented by the priest Joshua maintained exclusive title to the high priestly office in the Babylonian diaspora; this branch doubtless had a strong attachment to the native dynasty, but at this point it was not in any way connected with the Aaronites.(n45)

Fragments of Zadokite propaganda from that time have come down to us in a series of passages probably interpolated into Ezekiel 40-48 (40:46; 43:19; 44:10-16; 48:11). These passages assert the exclusive right of Zadokite priests to the office, privileges, and perquisites of the altar priesthood of Jerusalem, and they demote all others claiming Levitical status to the role of second-order clergy.(n46) We note that these *bene-sadoq* acknowledge themselves to be *bene-lewi* (40:46) and *kohanim lewiyyim* also (43:19; 44:15) but say nothing about Aaronite descent.

It is not to our present purpose to examine these passages in detail, but we note how the interpolator justifies the demotion of non-Zadokite priests on the grounds that Zadokites were the only ones who remained faithful during a time of general apostasy (Ezek 44:10-15; 48:11). Since Wellhausen, the standard explanation of this "time of straying" is that it refers to the period preceding the Josian reform and the disestablishment of the *bamot*. The contrast, therefore, would be between the reprobate priests who staffed the high places and the clergy of Jerusalem who preserved their Yahwistic orthodoxy, and also their monopoly, by excluding the regional priests from employment at the state sanctuary in Jerusalem (2 Kgs 23:9).(n47) However, the aberrant tendencies of the Jerusalem priesthood itself, both before and after the Josian reform, must have been so apparent after the fall of Jerusalem as to deprive this explanation of any plausibility.

The incongruity would be even more glaring on the assumption that the passages in question derive from Ezekiel's circle, a fortiori from Ezekiel himself, since he condemns the priesthood of Jerusalem (Ezek 7:26) and reports "abominations," of which the resident clergy could hardly have been ignorant, going on in the temple in the final

years of its existence (8:1-18). One is led to conclude therefore that the Zadokite diatribe in the interpolations was directed against what was considered to be unacceptable cultic practice going on at the time of writing in Judah, and therefore (if one accepts the hypothesis presented above), at the sanctuary of Bethel as well.

In the early decades of the Persian period the most crucial questions were whether Jerusalem should be re-established as the political and religious center of the province,(n48) whether its temple, consequently, should be rebuilt, and if so, who should control it. The biblical sources give us to understand that although the rebuilding of the temple by Judeo-Babylonian immigrants was permitted, or perhaps even mandated, by the Persian authorities, it was opposed by elements within the province and in the adjacent Samaritan region (Ezra 4:1-5). The claim of the Zadokite Joshua ben Jebozadak to preside over the temple, once it was rebuilt, was also disputed and was opposed with arguments similar to those used by the Zadokites themselves (Zech 3:1-10). On the hypothesis that Aaronite clergy had begun to play a significant role in the province under Babylonian rule and continued to do so for some time after the collapse of the Babylonian empire, conflict over the re-establishment and control of worship in Jerusalem was inevitable. The historical link between Bethel and Samaria would also imply that conflict between priestly houses was one reason for Samaritan opposition to the political revival of Jerusalem, an opposition which threatened the relative autonomy of Judah under Persian rule down to the governorship of Nehemiah.

In the absence of source material we have no sure way of plotting the progress of priestly houses in Judah from conflict to the degree of accommodation reflected in the genealogies. Archaeological indications pointing to the destruction of Benjaminite sites, including Bethel, in the early part of the fifth century may be relevant, but their dating is disputed.(n49) Many attempts have been made to correlate biblical allusions to conflict, especially in Ezra-Nehemiah, to known political events in the Persian period, for example, to rebellions in Egypt and Babylonia in the early years of Xerxes, 486-483, or to the revolt of the satrap Megabyzus against Artaxerxes I ca. 448, but these too are speculative.(n50)

I suggested earlier that if the occurrence of the Aaronite names Eleazar, Phinehas, and Ithamar in the account of Ezra's mission (Ezra 8:2,33) is reliable, it may be taken to mark a stage in an accommodation between Zadokites and Aaronites. Phinehas and Ithamar, however, are presented as ancestors or heads of Judeo-Babylonian priestly families, comparable, therefore, to the four priestly houses in the census of the first aliya (Ezra 2:36-39 = Neh 7:39-42). If this is indeed the case, it allows us to conclude that their names have been co-opted into the Aaronite family history and family tree in a move of compromise from the Aaronite side. To this move would correspond the need in the P narrative of the Pentateuch to eliminate the original two sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and put Eleazar and Ithamar in their place (Leviticus 10).

These same names continued to play an important taxonomic role as the units or courses of the priesthood of the Second Temple period expanded from an original four (following the census list in Ezra 2 = Nehemiah 7) to twenty-four (I Chr 24:1-19), the 'arba' we'esrim mismarot of later Jewish tradition, organized in two groupings of unequal size named for Eleazar (sixteen courses) and Ithamar (eight). How this relatively harmonious conclusion was reached we have no sure way of knowing, but in view of what we know of Persian imperial policy towards the provinces, especially those like Babylon, Egypt, and Judah in which temples played a dominant role, it is reasonable to suggest that political pressure from the outside made a significant contribution to accommodation and compromise between competing branches of the priesthood.(n51) Thus, the way was prepared for the dominant political role assumed by the priesthood of Jerusalem after the conquests of Alexander.

(n1) For example, by N. K. Gottwald, *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* (SBT 14; London: SCM, 1954) 112; E. Janssen, *Juda in der Exilszeit: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Entstehung des Judentums* (FRLANT 69; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956) 102; D. R. Hillers, *Lamentations* (AB 7A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972) XL-XLI; J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (3d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981) 344-45; J. Maxwell Miller and J. H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986) 426.

(n2) Lam 1:4; 2:6-7,20; perhaps Ps 74:7. F Willemsen ("The Cultic Situation of Psalm 74," VT 2 [1952] 289-306) argues, unconvincingly in my opinion, that the language of this psalm is completely cultic, and therefore completely ahistorical.

(n3) For example, by W. Rudolph, *Jeremiah* (HAT 1/12; 3d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1968) 252; Janssen, *Juda in der Exilszeit*, 102, 117 n. 7; P. R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968) 25. R. P. Carroll (*Jeremiah: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986] 709), himself not one to balk at subtle readings, notes that "it is generally assumed that bit YHWH refers to the temple in Jerusalem because to posit a temple in Mizpah would be an over-subtle reading of the text." One of the principal arguments, often repeated, for Jerusalem as the Northerners' destination is that Ishmael came out from Mizpah to meet them, that is, to intercept them on their way to Jerusalem (Jer 41:6). This, however, ignores the possibility that the purpose could also be to escort them back into the city as an act of courtesy (in this instance feigned); \* (These characters cannot be converted in ASCII text) with the verb \* (These characters cannot be converted in ASCII text) occurs often with this meaning (Gen 30:16; Exod 18:7; Num 22:36; 31:13; Judg 4:18,22; 11:31,34; 1 Sam 13:10; 18:6; 30:21; 2 Kgs 9:21;

Isa 7:3; Prov 7:15).

(n4) D. R. Jones ("The Cessation of Sacrifice after the Destruction of the Temple in 586 B.C.," JTS ns 14 [1963] 12-31) points out that the eighty-member delegation came prepared for cereal and incense offerings but not for animal sacrifice, and he cites cultic practice at Elephantine in support of the view that animal sacrifice was discontinued between the destruction of the first temple and the building of the second.

(n5) On Palestinian temples of the Persian period, see E. Stern, *Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period 538-332 B47* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1982) 61-67, 234-35; on the so-called Solar Shrine at Lachish, see D. Ussishkin, "Lachish," *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (4 vols.; ed. E. Stern et al.; New York/London: Simon & Schuster, 1993) 3. 910-11; M. Smith, "Jewish Religious Life in the Persian Period," CHJ, 1. 234-37, It was not possible to identify the deity worshiped in this building.

(n6) The site was excavated in the 1920s and 1930s by W F. Bade, See M. Broshi, "Nasbeh, Tell En-," *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (4 vols.; ed. M. Avi-Yonah; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Massada, 1975--78) 3. 912-18; J. R. Zorn, "Nasbeh, Tell En-," *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, 3. 1098-1102; also D. Diringer, "Mizpah," *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* (ed. D. Winton Thomas; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 329-42.

(n7) Excavation at Tell en-Nasbeh revealed one of the strongest defensive perimeters in the country. Buildings of stratum 2 (Neo-Babylonian) are larger and better constructed, and their orientation is different from that of the buildings of Iron 11. According to Zorn (see n. 6 above) there appear to be traces of a large public structure, perhaps a palace, at the northern end of the site. That political differences between inhabitants of Judah and those of Benjamin had something to do with their different treatment at the hands of the Babylonian conquerer is confirmed by the high number of Benjaminite settlements to which the Babylonian immigrants were able to return (Ezra 2:20-35 = Neh 7:25-38), perhaps also by the reaction to Jeremiah's attempt to leave besieged Jerusalem for a location in Benjamin (Jer 32:1-15; 37:11-15).

(n8) The inscription reads lgdlyhw \* (These characters cannot be converted in ASCII text) hbyt, "belonging to Gedalyahu who is in charge of the house [i.e., the palace]." On this Lachish bulla see O. Tufnell, *Lachish 3: The Iron Age* (Wellcome Archaeological Research Expedition to the Near East; London: Oxford University Press, 1953) 348. N. Avigad (*Hebrew Bullae from the Time of Jeremiah: Remnants of a Burnt Archive* [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1986] 24-25) suggests that another bulla inscribed lgdlyhw \* (These characters cannot be converted in ASCII text) hmlk may refer to the same person as the gdlyhw of the Lachish impression, since the script is identical.

(n9) I note, however, that the assassins departed from and returned to Ammon, whose king, Baalis, opposed the policy of accommodation pursued by Gedaliah; see Jer 40:14; 2 Kgs 25:24; Jer 40:9-10. The endemic enmity between Ammon and Judah will continue into the Persian period in the persons of Tobiah and Nehemiah (see, among other texts, Neh 2:10).

(n10) W. F. Bade, "The Seal of Jaazaniah," ZAW 51 (1933) 150-56.

(n11) Generally agreed by the commentators; see D.J.A. Clines, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (NCB Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984) 153; H.G.M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco, TX Word, 1985) 205; J. Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (OTL.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988) 235.

(n12) M. Avi-Yonah, *The Holy Land from the Persian to the Arab Conquest* (536 B.C.-A.D. 640) (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977) 21-23; Stern, *Material Culture of the Land of the Bible*, 247-49.

(n13) G. F. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895) 431.

(n14) *Ibid.*, 402-54, esp. 406-8 for earlier attempts at source division; see also H. W. Hertzberg, *Die Bucher Josua, Richter, Ruth* (ATD 9; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959) 248-49; J. A. Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981) 294. R. G. Boling (*Judges* [AB 6A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975] 285-86) derives the narrative from an exilic-Deuteronomistic editor and unnecessarily injects a further complication by translating bet-el as "the sanctuary" in 20:18,23 but as Bethel in 20:26.

(n15) See n. 7.

(n16) J. L. Kelso, "Bethel," *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, 1. 192-94.

(n17) The word eda occurs in Judg 20: 1; 21:10,13,16; qahal in 20:2; 21:5,8; cc Ezra 2:64; 10: 1,8,12,14; Neh 5:13; 7:66; 8:2,17; 13:1.

(n18) Ezra 9:5; 10: 1; also, there was an "Oak of Weeping" (Allon-bacuth in the RSV) near Bethel (Gen 35:8).

(n19) On the textual history of Zech 7:1-3, see Mitchell in H. G. Mitchell, J. M. P. Smith, and J. A. Bewer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912) 197-98 and, in greater detail, F. S. North, "Aaron's Rise in Prestige," *ZAW* 66 (1954) 195-99. To date, no fragments of this passage have come to light in the Judaeian Wilderness.

(n20) On the Babylonian name Bit-ili-shar-usur, belonging to a certain sirku (temple servant), see J. P. Hyatt, "A Neo-Babylonian Parallel to Bethel-Sareser, Zech 7:2," *JBL* 56 (1937) 387-94. E. G. Kraeling (*The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C. from the Jewish Colony at Elephantine* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953] 90 n. 26) agrees with Hyatt in identifying this person, the Babylonian sirku, with the (putative) Bethel-shareser of Zech 7:2; not impossible, I suppose, but a long shot indeed. On names formed with the theophoric element Bethel, see M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (BWANT3/ 10; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928; reprinted, Hildesheim/ New York: Georg Olms, 1966) 127-29, 168-69; B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony* (Berkeley/ Los Angeles: University of California press, 1968) 176 n. 110, 329; R. Zadok, *The Pre-Hellenistic Israelite Anthroponymy and Prosopography* (Leuven: Peeters, 1988) 295, 299

(n21) See, e.g., W. Rudolph, *Haggai--Sacharja 1-8--Sacharja 9-14--Malachi* (KAT 13/4; Gutersloh: Mohn, 1976) 135-36; R.L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi* (WBC 32; Waco, TX: Word, 1984)

221; C. L. Meyers and E. M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8* (AB 25B; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987) 379-94.

(n22) That the oracle in 7:5-7 is introduced in the third person in 7:1 and then again in the first person in 7:4 suggests that the account of the delegation in vv. 2-3 has been introduced into the normal structure of the prophetic oracle. If so, it will be all the more evident that the oracle is not the direct response to the request for a ruling on fasting.

(n23) Rather surprisingly, many exegetes (e.g., Mitchell, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*, 67-69, Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 58) have not thought it necessary to comment on Min in Hag 2:14. D. 1, Petersen (*Haggai and Zechariah 1-8* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984] 84), on the basis of Ezra 3:1-6, finds here an allusion to the altar on the site of the destroyed temple. This is a reasonable alternative, but to accept it one has to assume that this notice of the Chronicler is historically reliable. The historical problems of Ezra 1 6 are well known, as is the author's anxiety to stress the zeal and piety of the Babylonian immigrants, in this instance in following the example of David, who set up an altar to ward off danger before the temple was built (1 Chr 21:28 22:1).

(n24) See n. 5.

(n25) Kelso, "Bethel," 192.

(n26) According to W. F. Albright (*Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* [5th ed.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968] 166), Bethel was destroyed by a tremendous conflagration during the latter part of the Neo-Babylonian period, or possibly at the beginning of the Persian period; according to Kelso ("Bethel," 194), it was destroyed during the reign of Nabonidus or early in the Persian period; Stern (*Material Culture*, 31, 254, 280 n. 71) refers to L. A. Sinclair for a date ca. 550 B.C. and to G. E. Wright and P. W. Lapp for one in the period 500-450 B.C. or a little later.

(n27) Commentators are practically unanimous in regarding Judg 20:27b-28 as a late editorial insertion. For Moore (*Judges*, 433-34), the text contains two glosses, and the name Phinehas was inserted by a very late editor or scribe; for J. Gray (*Joshua, Judges, Ruth* [NCB Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Basingstoke: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1986] 386), Phinehas is a postexilic insertion; for Soggin (*Judges*, 293), the text is a passing comment of a priestly kind

(n28) Aspects of the cultic traditions of the kingdom of Samaria, which are not my concern in this study, have been studied by, inter alios, R. H. Kennett, "The Origin of the Aaronile Priesthood," *JTS* 6 (1905) 161-86; O. Eissfeldt, "Lade und Stierbild," *ZAW* 58 (1940-41) 190-215; A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester* (FRLANT 89; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 14-26, 29-37, 81-98; A. Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood* (AnBib 35; Rome: Biblical institute Press, 1969) 108-24; F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973) 195-215. There is no reason to believe that the effects of Josiah's desecration and destruction of the altar at Bethel (assuming that it happened as described) were more permanent than other effects of his reforming activity like getting rid of the cult of the goddess in the temple precincts of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 23:4,6-7; cf Ezek 8:3).

(n29) Since this hardly requires demonstration, the reader is referred to the commentaries. M. Aberbach and L. Smolar ("Aaron, Jeroboam, and the Golden Calves," *JBL* 86 [1967] 129-40) identified thirteen points of similarity between the two narratives.

(n30) J. Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* (New York/ London: Doubleday, 1992) 192-94, with special reference to L. Peritt, *Bundestheologie im Alien Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969) 203-32.

(n31) The designation *kohanim lewiyyim*, standard in Deuteronomy (17:9,18; 18: 1; 24:8; 27:9; cf. *bene lewi*, 21:5), taken with the single, unflattering allusion to Aaron (9:20), suggests that the epithet "levitical priests" carries a polemical charge vis-a-vis the pretensions of Aaronites at the time of composition. Neither Aaron nor Aaronites are mentioned in 1-2 Samuel or in 1 2: Kings, with the exception of the nonpriestly reference at 1 Sam 12:6,8.

(n32) It is agreed that reference to the death of Aaron (Deut 10:6; 32:50) derives from the P source.

(n33) Needless to say, I am assuming disagreement with those Israeli and North American scholars who are campaigning for a preexilic P source; on this I may be permitted to refer to J. Blenkinsopp, "An Assessment of the Alleged Pre-Exilic Date of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch," *ZAW* 108 (1996) 495-518. In non-P narrative, Aaron is associated with Moses in his mission to Pharaoh (Exod 5:1-21) and in other enterprises, acting primarily as his spokesman (4:15-30), manipulating the wand (7:8-13), and confronting the spiritual powers of Egypt (Exothis 7-11). When he is associated with Miriam, represented as his sister at some point of the developing tradition, it is in the guise of prophet rather than priest (Exod 15:20; Numbers 12). Elsewhere, he is teamed with Hur, one of the more shadowy figures in the story (Exod 17:8-13; 24:14), but in no instance does he perform priestly functions. In Exod 18: 12 he participates with Moses and others in a sacrificial meal, but it is Jethro who presides over the ritual. Exod 4:14 identifies him as "the Levite," but the title carries no more cultic connotations than it does when it is used of his parents (Exod 2: 1). On these issues from the early history, see Kennett, "Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood," 161-86; G. Westphal, "Aaron und die Aaroniden," *ZAW* 26 (1906) 211-25; 1 J, Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (New York: Harper & Row, 1936) 119-47; H. G. Judge, "Aaron, Zadok, and Abiathar," *JTS* ns 7 (1956) 70-74; Cody, *History of Old Testament Priesthood*, 146-66; Gunneweg, *Levitens und Priester*, 81-98; H. Valentin, *Aaron: Eine Studie zur vor-priesterschriftlichen Aaron-Uberlieferung* (OBO 18; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).

(n34) A. Alt ("Die Rolle Samarias bei der Entstehung des Judentums," *Festschrift Otto Procksch zum 60. Geburtstag* [Leipzig: Deichert und Hinrichs, 1934] 5-28, reprinted, Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* 2 [Munich: Beck, 1964] 316-37) argued that under Babylonian rule Judah was an appendage of Samaria, and that it remained so until Nehemiah established its separate identity. The thesis is undermined, however, by indications of several governors of Yehud who preceded Nehemiah (Ezra 5:14; 6:7; Neh 5:15; Hag 1:1, 14; perhaps Mat 1:8). These would include governors whose names appear on a bulla and a seal in the cache which came on the antiquities market in Jerusalem in the 1970s or on jar impressions found earlier: Elnathan, \* (These characters cannot be converted in ASCII text), Ahzai--assuming that the bullae, seals, and jar impressions do indeed date from the late sixth and early fifth century. See N. Avigad, *Bullae and Seals from a Post-exilic Judaeen Archive* (Qedem 4; Jerusalem: Hebrew University Institute of Archaeology, 1976); M. Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (New York/London: Columbia University Press, 1971) 193-201.

(n35) Most commentators have accepted the basically Deuteronomic view of the priesthood in Malachi; see, e.g., Smith in Mitchell et al., *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jonah*, 38; Rudolph, *Haggai... Maleachi*, 267; Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 317; P. A. Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 244-45. B. Glazier-McDonald (*Malachi, the Divine Messenger* [SBLDS 98; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987] 173-80) argues, unconvincingly in my opinion, for Num 25:12-13 as the source for the covenant of Mal 2:4-9. But a covenant with Phinehas means a covenant with the Aaronite priesthood, which would practically require the author to speak of Aaron rather than Levi. There are also the clear indications of Deuteronomism in Malachi which, on the basis of the exegetical principle *dabar* \* (These characters cannot be converted in ASCII text), point us in a different direction.

(n36) The intent of Ezra's genealogy is to establish a link of continuity with the priesthood of the preexilic period and the traditional responsibility of priests for cult and law.

(n37) On Neh 10:39-40 and Neh 12:47, see Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 310-19, 350.

(n38) Their authenticity has been questioned by S. Mowinkel, *Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemia 1: Die nachchronische [sic] Redaktion des Buches; die Listen* (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, Historisk-filosofisk klasse ns 3; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964) 119.

(n39) Exod 6:16-25; Num 3:1-4; 26:57-62; 1 Chr 5:27-41 (6:1-15); cf. 1 Chr 6:34-38 (6:49-52); Ezra 7:1-5.

(n40) Namely, the elimination of Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10:1-20) and the revolt of Korah the Kohathite Levite, supported by laity, which was brought to an end by an earthquake precisely engineered with the purpose of discouraging further attempts to break the Aaronite monopoly (Num 16:1-17:15 [16:1-50]).

- (n41) For details of the chronological schema, see Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch*, 47-50.
- (n42) Ahaz deals directly with Uriah and issues orders to him with respect to worship in the temple (2 Kgs 16:10-16); Zephaniah is the only priest named among the recipients of correspondence from the Babylonian diaspora (Jer 21:1) and is referred to as the successor of Jehoiada (Jer 29:26).
- (n43) See R. R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977); idem, *Sociological Approaches to the Old Testament* (GBS, OT Series; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 54-66.
- (n44) The case against hereditary succession is argued by J. R. Bartlett, "Zadok and his Successors at Jerusalem," *JTS* ns 19 (1968) 1-18.
- (n45) Its attachment to the dynasty was in imitation of the eponymous Zadok who served David and Solomon and whose successors were prophetically designated to continue in the service of Yahweh's anointed (1 Sam 2:35). Close links with royalty are also suggested by the connection between the rebuilding of the temple and aspirations for the re-establishment of the native dynasty in the person of Zerubbabel (Hag 1:6-9; 2:20-23; Zech 6:9-14).
- (n46) On the "Zadokite stratum" in Ezekiel 40-48, see H. Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel* (Kap. 40-48) traditions-geschichtlich untersucht (BHT 25; "Ribingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1957); Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester*, 188-203; Cody, *History of Old Testament Priesthood*, 166-68; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 455-59; J. D. Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48* (HSM 10; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976).
- (n47) J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (6th ed.; Berlin/ Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1927) 115-19; Engl. tr., *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994) 179-81.
- (n48) From Neh 3:7 it appears that Mizpah remained the administrative center of Judah down to the time of Nehemiah. During all that time, opposition to the rebuilding and fortification of Jerusalem was going on (Ezra 4:6-24).
- (n49) Stern, *Material Culture*, 254; for Bethel, see n. 26.
- (n50) Echoes of these events have been heard in Ezra 4:7-23 and Neh 1:2-3; 2:3,17, but they do not provide adequate grounds for assuming the major catastrophe at the beginning of Xerxes' reign expounded at great length by J. Morgenstern, "Jerusalem--485 B.C.," *HUCA* 27 (1956) 101-79; 28 (1957) 15-47; 31 (1960) 1-29.
- (n51) On Achaemenid policy towards regional cults, see J. Blenkinsopp, "Temple and Society in Achaemenid Judah," *Second Temple Studies 1: Persian Period* (ed. P. R. Davies; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991) 22-53; idem, *The Pentateuch*, 239-42.

~~~~~

By JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP, University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, IN 46556

---

Copyright of **Catholic Biblical Quarterly** is the property of Catholic Biblical Association of America. Copyright of PUBLICATION is the property of PUBLISHER. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

**Source:** Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Jan1998, Vol. 60 Issue 1, p25, 19p

**Item:** 781985