

THE TERM HA-YOM HA-ZEH IN BIBLICAL LITERATURE *---
ITS IMPLICATIONS AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

by

Stanley R. Brav

January, 1934.
Hebrew Union College,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

A thesis in the field of
Biblical Criticism, in
partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of Rabbi.

mic. 6/78

To the memory of my dear father,

HERMAN ABRAHAM BRAV

whose love of Jewish scholarship
was as profound as his knowledge
of Judaism, this writing is dedi-
cated with the wish that it were
more worthy of his name.

PREFACE

The subject of this thesis presented itself in the course of lectures on Biblical History given by Dr. Julian Morgenstern at the Hebrew Union College during the season 1932-1933. The writer is very grateful to Dr. Morgenstern for the many valuable suggestions he has offered toward making the presentation of this material more adequate, and for his patient induction of a neophyte into the methods and techniques of scientific Biblical study.

CONTENTS

- I. Bibliography
- II. Introduction
- III. Discussion of Datable Passages
 - (1) II Kings 17,34,41
 - (2) I Kings 12,19
 - (3) II Kings 17,23
 - (4) Deuteronomy 11,4
 - (5) II Kings 16,6
 - (6) Deuteronomy 2,22
 - (7) I Samuel 5,5
 - (8) I Samuel 30,25
 - (9) I Samuel 27,6; Genesis 26,33 (II Samuel 4,3; Joshua 14,14)
 - (10) II Kings 10,27
 - (11) II Kings 8,22
 - (12) I Kings 8,8
 - (13) Judges 1,21 and Joshua 15,63
 - (14) I Kings 9,21; Joshua 9,27,16,10
 - (15) Genesis 19,37,38
 - (16) Genesis 35,20; II Samuel 18,18
 - (17) I Samuel 6,28
 - (18) Joshua 4,9; 7,26a; 8,29; 10,27; 22,17
 - (19) Genesis 22,14
 - (20) Joshua 5,9; 7,26b; Judges 18,12b; II Samuel 6,8; II Chron.20,26
 - (21) Judges 6,24
 - (22) Other Name Passages
 - (23) Deuteronomy 29,27
 - (24) Deuteronomy Ka-Yom Ha-Zeh Passages
 - (25) Deuteronomy 10,8
 - (26) Additional Passages
- IV. Summary of the Question of Dates
- V. Reconstruction Bearing on the Political, Economic, Religious
and Cultural History of the Period
- VI. Conclusion

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ball, C.J., Genesis (Haupt's Sacred Books of the O.T.), 1896
 Barnes, W.E., Kings (Cambridge Bible) 1908
 Barton, G.A., Archeology and the Bible, 1925
 Benzinger, I., Kings (Marti's Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT) 1898
 Bertholet, A., Deuteronomy (Marti's series) 1898
 Bewer, J.A. The Literature of the Old Testament, 1922
 Biblia Rabbinica
 Biblia Triglotta
 Brown, F., Driver, S.R. and Briggs, C.A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, 1906
 Budde, K., Judges (1897). Samuel (1902) (Marti's series)
 Burney, C.F. Judges
 Notes on the Heb. Text of Kings, 1903
 Dillmann, A., Genesis (Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum AT.) pub. in 1897
 Driver, S.R. Deuteronomy (International Critical Commentary) 1902
 Genesis (Westminster Commentaries) 1911
 Introduction to the Literature of the O.T. 1913
 Gunkel, H. Genesis (Nowack's Handkommentar zum AT) 1901
 Hoffman, D. Das Buch Deuteronomium, 1913
 Holzinger, H., Genesis (Marti's series) 1898
 Kennedy, A.R.S. Samuel (Century Bible) 1905
 Kirkpatrick, A.F. Samuel (Cambridge Bible) 1887
 Kittel, R., Kings (Nowack series) 1900
 Mandelkern, S., Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, 1896
 Meyer, Ed., Geschichte des Alterthums, 1912
 Moore, G.F., Judges (I.C.C.) 1895
 Morgenstern, Julian, A Reconstruction of the Samaritan Problem, MS. Three Calendars of Ancient Israel, 1924, HUCA.
 Nowack, W., Judges and Samuels (his series) 1902.
 Skinner, J., Genesis (I.C.C.) 1900. Kings (Century Bible) 1908.
 Smith, H.P. Samuel (I.C.C.) 1899.
 Steuernagel, C., Deuteronomy (Nowack series) 1900.
 Wellhausen, J., Die Composition des Hexateuchs u. der hist. Bücher des AT.'s, 1899.

(partial list)

THE TERM HA-YOM HA-ZEH IN BIBLICAL LITERATURE ---

ITS IMPLICATIONS AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

II.

INTRODUCTION

Frequently reoccurring throughout Biblical literature from Genesis to Chronicles are expressions linking the immediate passages in which they are found with the present time, that is, either the time of the characters within the narrative or the time of the narrators themselves. A random example of such an expression referring to the time of the characters within the narrative itself may be observed in Exodus 10,6. Moses appears before Pharaoh and threatens to bring on a plague of locusts of such extreme seriousness as the Egyptians have never witnessed from their earliest beginnings as a people וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "unto this ~~this~~ day", until the very period in which he and Pharaoh are living. Similarly we may observe a single example that refers to the time of the narrator of the passage as distinct from the characters or events mentioned therein, in II Samuel 27,6. David has asked the Philistine leader, under whom he has served, for a city in which he might dwell apart from the royal city of his suzerain, whereupon Achish gave him Ziklag "which belongs to the kings of Judah," says the narrator, וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "unto this day".

Verses of the former type offer little invitation to the further investigation. But such passages as the latter, containing specific historical reference, give rise in our minds to a number of interesting questions. At what time did the narrator live who could have made such a seemingly historical statement? Obviously, in the case mentioned, in a period later than David, but in what period? Moreover, why should he have said what he did? What could have been his reason for connecting an incident in the past with his own day? Was he simply recording a fact in history for the enlightenment of future generations, or would his statement have particular significance only for his own time? Lastly, what can we possibly learn about the period in which the narrator lived from the passage we are able to assign to his particular age? Is there any new light upon the history of his time which comes to the surface as the result of our study of his statement?

These questions merit full inquiry, which the present paper will attempt to make.

Our problem, then, is this: to sift from the mass of almost four hundred passages in the Bible in which a present time is specifically referred to, those passages that reflect the time of the narrator, to determine wherever possible the date of the narrator, and to establish whatever evidence such datable passages evince of the political, religious, economic and cultural history of the period in which he lived.

The term most frequently employed to indicate the time of the narrator or writer, as clearly distinguished from the time of the event being told, is the expression הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "this day" or "this very day". עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "until this day" is the customary form in which it is found, but it has been necessary, in addition, to investigate the many variants of this form, in order to ascertain whether or not they might indicate passages referring to the narrator's day. Included among these variants are הַיּוֹם when it has the meaning of "today", עַד הַיּוֹם "until today", עַצְמוֹ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "this self-same day",

בְּעַצְמוֹ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "on the very same day", עַד עַצְמוֹ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "until the very same day", כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה "as at this day", כַּיּוֹם "as this day", and

בַּיּוֹם "on this day". These forms, too, have variants: וְהַיּוֹם . כַּהַיּוֹם . Other expressions that might seem to have similar meaning are עַד הַנּוֹכַח "up to now", עַדְמָה "still", and עַד עַתָּה "until now". However, very few of these variants occur in verses whose significance interests us in this study. They are valuable only in having been checked for their potentialities.

The very nature of our problem and of the term it involves bids us be on our guard from the very outset of our study lest we are led astray by the alluring wish to make עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה a characteristic expression either of one or another of the known codes, or of a new one. Intrinsicly it contains not the remotest indication that it belongs to any period whatsoever. In fact, its equivalent in classical and modern languages is to be found employed in writing

from the remotest antiquity even up to the present day, in statements of every nature that are expressed in form parallel to the very one now being made. Scarcely a day goes by but that some comparison between conditions of the past and of the present is made in the course of our common parlance. So we must be careful not to exaggerate the results that may be justifiably expected in this study. Whatever they may prove to be, the facts must speak for themselves.

Perhaps it has been this general use of the term "until this day" that was one of the factors involved in previous writers' and commentators' almost complete failure to recognize the problem these passages offer. If we go back to the various versions, we find them following their customary practice of translating הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה עַד literally. The Targumim almost invariably have it עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה. It is either ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης or ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας in the Septuagint, and the Vulgate simply uses "usque in diem hanc" or "usque in praesentem diem" or the like. The Peshitta likewise offers no change. Only in one place can the Septuagint writer possibly be thought to have viewed הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה עַד as indicating the narrator's day. This is in I Kings 8,8 in reference to the staves that carried the ark. The LXX omits the phrase הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה עַד entirely, whereupon both Benzinger and Burney agree that it was removed as not applying to the conditions when the LXX was made. However, there is little reason to believe that this was more than a guess on their parts. It is scarcely conceivable that the LXX writers went out of their way to be precise and punctilious in their understanding of our expression in this one case, and in every other passage were content with verbatim translations. More probable seems the possibility that the omission is simply a textual error. This, at least, prevents our assuming on the basis of utterly inadequate evidence that the LXX writers caught the true significance of the phrase הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה עַד as revealing conditions subsequent to their context.

The Medieval Jewish commentators were almost as completely unaware of the problem. Rashi and Ibn Ezra paid no attention to the phrase whatsoever, and Ramban to Deuteronomy 11,4 merely finds its meaning obscure if not redundant, perhaps only emphasizing the completeness of the destruction at the Red Sea that is previously described in the passage. It must be noted that in one place, Judges 1,21, both Redak and Ralbag recognize the meaning of the writer's own day. The latter is very specific, interpreting עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה to mean עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, but of course he makes Samuel the composer of the Book of Judges, so that "this day" is made to refer to Samuel's time. That nothing further is said by these commentators is entirely understandable in view of their predominant interest in the literal and homiletical meanings as well as grammatical explanations of Bible texts, as distinct from their scientifically historical implications which only a much later age would endeavor to probe.

But that later age of Biblical criticism, which received additional stimulation under the influence of Wellhausen since the last quarter of the nineteenth century, has also surprisingly little to add to an understanding of our problem. No separate investigation has, to our knowledge, been made of it. Frequently the phrase is overlooked in commentaries to the various Biblical books. But notice is taken of it by a number of modern critics including Wellhausen, Dillmann, Bertheau, Budde, Benzinger, Nowack, H.P. Smith, Driver and Burney, -- most of them touching upon the problem en passant. Budde in his notation on I Samuel 5,5 (Marti's series, 1902, p.40) claims that עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה is the favorite formula of J, who likes to use it to jump from the narrative to his own time. C.F. Burney alone is more explicit concerning the importance of the term (in his "Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings", 1902, pp. 107 and xvi-xvii). In Kings, he records, the phrase does not occur in the course of lengthy excerpts from sources, but in connection with terse statements-of-facts from them, and so "can be due to no other hand than that of R^D himself, who in

using the phrase, either formulates his own statement, or intelligently admits a statement which he is able to verify." He further notes those passages containing היה היום which he feels are distinctly pre-exilic and those not necessarily presupposing a pre-exilic date.

But since no special treatment has been made of our problem and the references of commentators are scant and insignificant, we find ourselves treading virgin soil in the present study. The method of procedure, however, has largely been that of other studies of individual words and phrases in the Bible, save for tracing etymologies in cognate languages. The complete list of passages in which היה היום or its variants are found was supplied by Mandelkern's "Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae". All that could possibly be taken as referring to the narrators' times were sifted out as important in this work. The important translations, as well as medieval and modern commentaries, were probed for their views of the vital passages. The latter were then studied for their datability and implications. Finally a synthesis and formulation of the results of the material in hand was made, to complete our study. This thesis will first discuss each passage individually, more or less in the order of our ability to assign it a definite date, and thereafter collate and evaluate whatever implications may be evinced concerning the periods in which the writers of the passages lived. In this way it is hoped that the results found will have the clearest possible exposition.

III

DISCUSSION OF THE DATABLE PASSAGES

(1) II Kings 17,34 and 17,41

In order to understand these two verses, some analysis must be made of the whole section, II Kings 17,24-41 in which they are embedded. The passage as a whole, telling of the inhabitants of Israel's land after 722 B.C.E., has already been thoroughly treated.^[1] There appear to be four distinct parts of this section: 1. ~~These chapters~~ vv. 24-28 relating the story of the foreigners who were brought into the land (a) in a spirit friendly to these colonists, with considerable pride that they became Yahwe worshippers. (b) Their priesthood's origin is explained in the story of bringing one of the original -- Israelite -- priests out of captivity in Assyria to minister to them. (c) According to these verses, it would seem to be held impossible to worship foreign gods in a new land. It is Yahwe, God of the land, they must learn to worship. (d) Furthermore, despite the reference to Shalmaneser instead of Sargon, the writer of these verses seems to have a very accurate knowledge of the details connected with the settling of the new colonists.

2. vv. 29-31,32b,34a and 41b, while also telling about the foreigners, contradict the ideas that have preceded. (a) The attitude taken toward them is one of hostility, animosity even, because of a persistence of their old deities and their deflection from Yahwe. (b) Now their priesthood is said to have arisen by appointing some of their own number for the work. (c) Now, too, it would appear as a perfectly normal occurrence to worship one's own deities in whatever land one chances to be. (d) And lastly, these verses, display a peculiarly inaccurate fund of information concerning actual conditions after 722 B.C.E. Not Succoth-Benoth but Marduk and Nebo were the Babylonian gods. Kut is probably a late

[1] Hitnerto unpublished article, "A Reconsideration of the Samaritan Problem", by Julian Morgenstern; pp.1-12 in ms.

evolution of the name Kutah (used in v.24) from the gentilic noun Kutim, the late post-exilic name for Samaritans used by the Jews. Ashima was not introduced by the Hamatites -- it was probably current a full generation before 722; and, strangely, the ketib spells the name of the city כּוּתָּה , not כּוּתָּה as in v.24.

3. Vv. 34b-40 do not refer to the foreigners at all, but rather to those members of the kingdom of Israel who were not exiled but were allowed to remain on the land, and who lived together with the foreign element injected by the conquerors. This section appears to be part of the same D framework of the Books of Kings as the earlier part of chapter 17, namely vv. 7-23, and probably belongs between v. 17 and v. 18.

4. Vv. 32a,33 and 41a make a direct attempt to harmonize the contradictory data on worship of Yahwe and worship of the foreigners' own deities. They introduce a new verb for such service (עָבַד , whereas שָׁמַח and שָׁמַח had been used exclusively hitherto); the Hebrew is very awkward in v.33b, and עָבַד is employed in v.41a for the more explicit שָׁמַח in v.29. So that it is safe to call these verses harmonistic editorial glosses.

Obviously our concern lies with the first two parts, and especially the second. Part 1 shows unmistakable signs of being early in respect to the story it tells, in fact, almost contemporaneous. It seems to be the direct continuation of the pre-exilic vv. 1-6, related in language, certainty of details and simplicity of narrative. Clear, also it is that Part 2 is a much later piece of writing. The concept that a deity can be worshipped in any land, that he is not confined to a territory in which alone he is effective was a principle accepted in Israel only toward the end of the pre-exilic period and after the exile. The inaccuracies of details likewise bode a date considerably later than the events told. But it is the attitude toward the Samaritans that can best tie these verses with a rather well-defined time. Of the relations between the Judaeans and the Samaritans previous to the exile nothing is known, and there is no suggestion in

exilic prophecies of any hostility between them. In fact, in Ezekiel 25,3-7 the interests of the descendants of the ancient Israelites and of the Judaeans are regarded as the same, and the hope of the union of the two branches, then united in a common suffering, finds frequent expression. Even after the Return, some of the Samaritans continued their worship at the shrine in Jerusalem and we know that there was inter-marriage between the two groups. But now the conservative element of the returned Jews began to express ~~their~~^{its} antipathy for the half-heathen neighbors to the North. Perhaps Isaiah 57,3-12 epitomizes the estimate that was held of them (cf. also Haggai 2,10-14 as possibly demonstrating the attitude toward the Samaritans), and only the weakness of the Jewish settlement and the lack of leadership on the part of the conservative group delayed the final rupture of relations. With Nehemiah, around 432 B.C.E., the break came, and such opprobrium as this passage contains would well express the feelings of his followers at that time. Although animus against the Samraitans continued onward through Ben Sir'a's day, there is no reason for possibly assigning the passage to a later date. So, here our expression הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה appears integral with verses composed about the time of Nehemiah or a little later.

The extremities to which Nehemiah's followers would go in order to discredit their northern neighbors (cf. Ezra 4,1-5) are clearly delineated in this passage. הַשְׂמֵרִים is a term of contempt for them. Furthermore, their hybrid origin is emphasized in the recital of the various elements Assyria introduced into the country and by the repeated expression וְהָיָה. Whatever of idol^atry there was in their religion, is scoffed at by the list of gods they brought with them, and a seemingly deliberate change is made in stating the beginnings of their priesthood. Moreover the Yahwe element in the Samaritan religion is not even mentioned. The Jews now had in their chronicles direct evidence of the inferiority of the Samaritans with whom some were inter-married, for it is specifically remarked that they are no better now than when they first came into

the land, and the picture then was a very low one.

(2) I Kings 12,19

Here (-- its parallel is II Chronicles 10,19) עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה
is embedded in the section, vv. 1-24 dealing with Rehoboam's accession and the defection of the ten tribes. The passage is blatantly a composite one, but there is no reason to believe that it is other than Deuteronomistic history as scholars agree. However, a still more definite date can possibly be determined for v.19. The verb here has the same force as בָּרַח in Deuteronomy 11,4 (cf. below). The statement here is, "and Israel has remained in a state of rebellion against the house of David until this day." Now if לְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל referred to the entire Hebrew people, North and South, it would have had no meaning to a D writer either in pre-exilic times or during the Exile, whereas it might have described the defection from the Davidic rule after Zerubbabel's fall in 518 B.C.E. But the obvious reference here is to the people of the North, as it was in vv. 16 and 18. As such, any D writer could have made this assertion and he would have been expressing the truth; but the isolation of the verse and its lack of necessary relation with what precedes or follows suggests a provocation for its insertion. The later occupants of this territory in the North inherited the enmity in which Israel was held by Judah, and it is altogether conceivable that they are referred to here. The time when the emphasis on the continued separation would have had most significance was that of the severance of relations with the Samaritans, c. 432 B.C.E.

The zealous Judaeans could show a deep-seated apostasy of the northern peoples of very long standing, even from the death of Solomon. Could their ^{people} be a hope of rapprochement with such inveterate rebels? Such would have been the message that the follower of Nehemiah would bring through the insertion of this verse into the standard history. With the support of such a statement his people

could be strengthened in putting aside every point of contact with the Northerners, as the leaders desired.

(3) II Kings 17,23

It is generally conceded by scholars that vv.7-23 recounting the causes for the downfall of Israel is part of the framework of the Books of Kings provided by the Deuteronomistic redactor (R^D). Nothing in this framework compels a pre-exilic dating, nor was the exile conducive to such writing, with the people naturally depressed and dejected. For it breathes a spirit of hope and encouragement for the kingdom that would follow Yahwe and the word of his prophets. But it must be assigned to some early post-exilic time, and there is reason to feel that herein is contained pointed admonition for Zerubbabel and those who looked to the re-establishment of the house of David in the early days of the return from Babylon. It is safe to consider 521 B.C.E. its a quo date.

Israel was certainly the classic example of the erring and wayward nation. God had repeatedly urged Israel to follow his commandments and had constantly entreated its kings to be mindful of his true worship and to walk uprightly in his commandments. Israel had responded with a continuation of pagan practices and a life of dissoluteness and sinfulness. This, the prophetic spirit behind these verses makes exceedingly clear, but the extreme length of Israel's exile in Assyria -- lasting after Judah had begun its return from Babylon -- makes the example of Israel even more potent. Such extreme punishment will be yours, too, Zerubbabel and your followers with monarchical hopes, unless God's word guides your every action when you set up the kingdom you contemplate, and the prophetic stress on justice and righteousness is strictly adhered to. The prophets were not given ear and their warnings were not heeded in Israel. The same must inevitably be your fate if you turn away from Yahwe.

(4) Deuteronomy 11,4

The words $\text{לֹא הָיָה בְּיָדָם}$ cannot possibly be rendered "destroyed them until" but the more obviously correct "kept them in a state of destruction up to" the time of the writer. (cf. I Kings 12,19, above). This might have been perfectly true from the information at the writer's disposal, without tallying perfectly with the known historical facts. Such would certainly be the case in the ancient world, with its paucity of communication and transportation facilities. It becomes plain that if the writer knew that Egypt was in a low state in his own time (which information he could very easily have had), and knew of an earlier destruction of Egypt, it was not unnatural for him to see continuation between the data he had^d at hand. And it must also be noted that he uses הָרַס , an exceedingly strong and unequivocal verb. Not a mere weakening of power is implied, but rather a destruction little less than catastrophic. Authorities tell us that the first Deuteronomic composition dates at 621 B.C.E., so that if we search Egyptian history from about this time on, we may be well on our way to discovering the period to which the present passage refers.

Now we know that (already) in 610 B.C.E. Egypt was fairly prosperous under Necho of the twenty-sixth dynasty, and never reached a state that would merit the description of our verse under his successors for about eighty years. However, ✓ in 525 B.C.E. Cambyses of Persia conquered the land, and not until 406 B.C.E. did ✓ Egypt regain her independence. In her dependency, in her subjugation to a foreign ruler her state was truly low enough to warrant a foreign observ^er's comment that she was destroyed. And so we may place the writer of at least v.4b somewhere between 525 B.C.E. and 406 B.C.E. A later date, let us say after Alexander's conquest, is not likely for a Deuteronomic passage.

The concept of the universality of God is firmly entrenched in the mind of this writer, as, indeed, it would be in one imbued with the influence of the

great prophets since the days of Amos. The experience of the Exile had only strengthened this idea among the people. Now a return to Palestine had been effected, and those who came back needed every possible evidence of moral and spiritual support that could be given them. The difficulties they faced in reestablishing a Jewish state called for constant and assuring encouragement on the part of the leaders. Not only was it necessary to give assurance that God was with the returned exiles, but it was equally valuable to show that the all-powerful god had always been the bulwark of Israel from the very beginning of history. Yahwe was ever Israel's protector. Of course, he destroyed the Egyptians when the Israelites went out of Goshen, but he has done even more! The Egyptians are still a crushed people, so mighty is God in his assistance against Israel's enemies. Israel can be strong and take new courage, knowing that God's help is so potent in her behalf, and ever has been since the earliest of days.

(5) II Kings 16,6

But little study of the passage in which this verse is imbedded makes it very clear that it is a ~~later~~ addition to the narrative treating the reign of Ahaz, king of Judah. Verse 7 is the immediate continuation of the statement in v.5, and what lies between is, by nature, extraneous. The textual corruption of v.6 is further evidence of this.

When it is recalled that Elath is located on the Aelanitic Gulf or the Gulf of Akaba, and that Syria lies to the north of Palestine, the impossibility of the verse having any meaning as it stands is patent. Even the Massor^{es} corrected לְעֵלָת to לְעֵלָת , implying a corresponding change of the previous לְעֵלָת to לְעֵלָת . Strong probability also favors the emendation of modern authorities (such as Klostermann, Benzinger, Kittel and Burney) of לְעֵלָת in place of לְעֵלָת . "It is far more likely that the king of Edom should have seized the opportunity of Ahaz' engage-

ment with the northern confederacy in order to once more gain possession of his seaport town [lost first under Solomon and then Uzziah], than that the king of Aram should have despatched a purposeless expedition against the remote eastern point of Ahaz' dominions."^[1]

Now our verse tells us that the Edomites were still dwelling in Elath at the time of the writer. Something of the *ad quem* dating for this verse is readily ascertainable therefrom. Eduard Meyer (in his *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 1912, ba.3, p.141) points out that in the fifth century B.C.E. the Arab Nabataeans pressed northward and drove the Edomites out of their original abode and into southern Judaea, so that we can establish this present statement as being written ✓ before 500 or at most 475 B.C.E. On the other hand, there is nothing to prevent ✓ our holding that this is a Deuteronomistic writer who, we have shown above, must have written at least toward the end of the exile or the beginning of the return. D delighted to show that the kings who departed from "that which was right in the sight of the Lord" were inevitably punished, and Ahaz' loss of Elath was entirely in consonance with this principle.

Here was an object lesson for the Judaeen kingdom of the future. Ahaz had failed in his allegiance to Yahwe, and had reverted to all the pagan practices current in the land from earlier times. Moreover, he had disregarded the prophetic veto against seeking the aid of foreign powers in his distress by calling on the Assyrian king for help. Naturally, with some success in routing his immediate enemies, Ahaz adopted some of the religious practices of Assyria, but the D writer is eager to demonstrate that in no way was his success complete. The deflection ✓ of the ruler was obviously punished in his being deprived of a considerable portion ✓ of his territory. The ruler of the returned exiles must not follow in the foot- ✓ steps of such as Ahaz.

[1] Burney, C.F. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings, 1903, p.325.

(6) Deuteronomy 2,22

There is a break in Yahwe's speech to Moses in this chapter, namely vv. 20 to 23, in which direct narrative is employed. Clearly, v.24 is the direct continuation of v. 19. What lies between was added by a later writer from every angle of probability, for the success of the Children of Esau or the Edomites over the Horites is entirely extraneous to the subject matter under discussion. There is every reason to believe that the other references to the Edomites in this chapter, in vv. 12 and 29, likewise bear ~~some~~ evidence of having been appended at a later time.

Recalling the previously stated information that at the beginning of the fifth century B.C.E. the Nabataeans drove the Edomites out of their earlier abode and into Judaea, that date would lend itself as the terminus ad quem for this verse. For by that time the Edomites would have left Seir, the name given to ???. Their previous territory. The ultimate terminus a quo would then be sometime after the earliest date accepted by authorities for Deuteronomic writings or 621 B.C.E., although the secondary D stratum in this chapter -- to which v.22 belongs -- is held as post-exilic, not preceding 540 or more probably 521 B.C.E.[1] < ? The last quarter of the sixth century is a fairly safe dating for this verse. It is also worthy of being pointed out that a universal god-concept is here so fully accepted that it is taken for granted. Yahwe will work for Israel just as he did for Edom and Caphtor. (Prophetic influence is evident.) The returned exiles might more bravely face their early hardships realizing the greatness of the deity that stood behind them. Here was more encouragement and hope.

[1] Conclusion arrived, after careful investigation of the seminar under Dr. Morgenstern during the past 7 or 8 years.

(7) I Samuel 5,5

Set into the narrative relating the wanderings of the ark is the section vv.2-5, quite unrelated in subject matter to the main narrative, except for the repetitive transition in v.2. Very obviously, v.6 is the immediate continuation of v. 1. The intervening verses constitute a commentary on a Philistine religious practice, ~~namely~~ namely, the origin or supposed origin of their threshold rites. The historical value of the derivation of these rites as here explained is not very great, for a sympathetic description could hardly be expected from writers of a people whom the Philistines constantly troubled. On the other hand, the author of these verses could scarcely have possessed the critical acumen and so broad a knowledge of ceremonial origins as to be able to have given us a valuable scientific understanding of these rites. To the contrary, we must apply the rule that is almost axiomatic in all classical literature, that when a more or less popular derivation of a name or a practice is given, the great probability is that the actual origin is of an altogether different nature.

The root of the prohibition to tread on the threshold of the temple of Dagon, as here given, is highly derogatory to the Philistines. In fact, the writer seems to be poking fun at them for their reverence before a deity so impotent that it can keel over twice and sever its hands from the rest of its torso. Such ridicule would be most likely made at a time when Philistine ~~and~~ culture and religion threaten serious inroads into Judaism. The period of Nehemiah and Ezra was just such a time when this jibe might have been quite effective. We know little about Philistine culture and nationalism at this time and yet their influence appeared as an imminent danger to be resisted by the leaders because of the current inter-marriage with Philistine women. Nehemiah 13,23 ff. describes this danger, and singles out the women of Ashdod whom Nehemiah had to make their Jewish husbands repudiate. The inter-marriages and the opposition they evoked did not take place all at one time, but it is safe to place this expression of opposition sometime

between 538 and 400 B.C.E.

Jewish leaders after the return from the Exile realized how readily their followers would fall away, under the influence of inter-marriage with the peoples round about. To break up those marriage ties already contracted was no easy task, and yet they considered it imperatively incumbent upon themselves. Their own word needed reinforcement by writings held in a special respect by all the people. It was to their advantage to see that historical writings treating a much earlier period, should roundly condemn the cultures threatening to undermine their own. In I Samuel 5, Ashdod happens to have been mentioned, and since the Ashdodites were at the later age a threat to the recreating of Judaism in Palestine, this was felt as the proper place to set a comment that would influence the people of that later date. The verity of that comment did not matter. It was sufficient that it held in ridicule those who needed to be minimized in the eyes of the people.

(8) I Samuel 30,25

This verse is rather elusive of specific dating. It is very frequently held that the law in the preceding verse is of very early origin, coming out of David's own time. However it is significant that it was not considered worthy of the codes, and has no exact parallel in any of them. (cf. Numbers 31,27 where P assigns the origin of similar practice to Moses). On the other hand, it seems to be in keeping with such early strata of D war legislation as is found in Deuteronomy 20,8 ff. and 21,10-14. It is entirely possible that a D editor, anticipating Israel's war to set up her own kingdom again in Palestine after the exile, might have felt a need for such a law. Its seemingly earlier origin in David's day would lend it authority, though the codes did not include it. Naturally, the accommodating explanation had to be given that the law still obtained at the time of the writer.

(9) I Samuel 27,6 and Genesis 26,33 (II Samuel 4,3 and Joshua 14,14)

First glance at I Samuel 27,6 would seem to make its pre-exilic date a foregone conclusion. It appears to record how David came into the possession of this particular city of Ziklag, and simply states the fact that Ziklag still belongs to the kings of Judah. With 586 B.C.E. the royal house of Judah came to an abrupt end, so that it would almost incontrovertibly seem to pre-date that year.

But the question naturally presents itself as to why just a particular city should be singled out for the distinction v.6b carries. If the kings of Judah are still reigning, what can be the significance of isolating one town and specifying that it is the property of the royal house? The whole of southern Canaan would readily be acknowledged as being under the king's sway. Verse 6b would seem to indicate that there was some questioning as to just what did belong to the house of the Judaeans kings. There would be no such controversy if the Davidic family were firmly seated on the throne. We are forced to infer that at least the last part of v. 6 was composed when the kings of Judah were no longer powerful.

Now when the exiles returned and each family sought to establish just what territory it could claim as its own,^[1] such a statement as this would have had considerable meaning and pertinence. The writer seems to be interested in determining what belongs to the family estate of David's house, much in the light of the D² author of Deuteronomy 17,14 ff. Between 538 and 518 B.C.E., when there was a likelihood of Zerubbabel's obtaining the kingship, a D writer might at least have appended v. 6b to an earlier narrative. Such evidence of the

[1] This may very likely find a parallel in II Samuel 4,3. Exiles with Beerothite traditions would find it to their advantage to have such witness to their early occupation of Gittaim (named among the post-exilic cities in Nehemiah 11,33). Similarly, Joshua 14,14 establishes the claims of the Calebites to Hebron. They are not treated as Judahites until P, in Numbers 13,6.

king's patrimony would have greatly enhanced his position.

The great probability was that Ziklag up to this time was predominantly, if not completely a Philistine city, for elsewhere, too, we find a direct effort to define the southern boundary between the lands of Israel and the Philistines on the part of an early post-exilic writer. For if any meaning at all can be gathered from Genesis 26,17-33 by J² it is just such establishing of a border at the time of the return from Babylonia.. Going inland from the coast along the valley or wadi of Gerar, the wells of Esek and Sitnah with the land that surrounded them were determined as Philistine territory, whereas from Rehoboth eastward belonged to Judah. I Samuel 30,26 f. would lead us to believe that Ziklag was in or near the wadi of Gerar so that the Genesis passage establishes it as a Jewish village after the Exile. Nehemiah 11,28, written some eighty or ninety years later, lists it among the many other towns and villages inhabited by Jews, thus ~~completing~~ completing the picture of the process by which Ziklag passed from Philistine hands into Jewish control during this period.

It is also to be noted that the J² passage, mentioned above as early post-exilic, ends in v. 33 with a statement that the name Beer-sheba survives to the writer's own day. This is one case among many of early post-exilic interest in names, origins, and so forth.

(10) II Kings 10,27

There is nothing of so specific a nature in this passage as to allow any exact dating to be made. The verse of our special interest occurs as part of the record of the revolution of Jehu contained in 9,1 to 10,28. The exact meaning of v.27 is not altogether clear, especially the word סִמְלֵי of the ketib or סִמְלֵי (outhouses, privies) of the keri. The tautology in vv. 26 and 27 is likewise evident. In v. 27 the singular construct of סִמְלֵי is used where previously the plural had been employed. First the

"images" are said to have been burnt, and then the "image" was destroyed. Even the usual הָיָה is missing after וַיִּבְרָן. The confusion and repetition would lead one to believe that v. 27 was added even after the RD passage in which it lies imbedded. It would seem to reflect the spirit of D, however, which stressed the extirpation of foreign cults. It conforms entirely with the favorable judgment of Jehu. Any king, following prophetic dictates, would make his destruction of idolatry this complete.

(11) II Kings 8,22

This occurrence of our expression וַיִּבְרָן (paralleled in II Chronicles 21,10a) lies in the narrative of vv. 16-24 telling the story of Jehoram, king of Judah. Of these verses, vv. 16-19 and 24 are unmistakably the pattern of RD. It is further quite clear that v.22 is extraneous to the story that precedes it, in fact, contradicting its implications. It had just been pointed out that Jehoram (the ו having dropped out of the name need not disturb us) had seemingly put to rout the rebellious people of Edom. Now v.22 insists that the severance of relations between Judah and Edom dates from this very reign, the former story notwithstanding.

The extreme, ultimate terminus ad quem of the writing of v.22a is evidenced from its contents as 163 B.C.E. Such a statement could scarcely have been made after that time, when Judas Maccabeus conquered the territory of the Edomites. But there is little reason to believe a very late date is probable here. On the contrary, it must be noted that there was a much earlier time at which the Judaeans animus against the Edomites reached an extremely high pitch. Historians had previously held that such passages as Psalm 137,7, Obadiah 11-14, as well as Isaiah 34,5-8 and Jeremiah 49, 7-22 and elsewhere represent condemnatory expressions for the Edomites who lent their aid in the destruction wrought by Nebuchadnezzar. But we noticed before in relation to II Kings 16,6 that it was only in the early fifth

century that the Edomites were driven into southern Judaea, which makes their participation in the struggle in 586 B.C.E. quite unlikely. Below, in connection with Deuteronomy 29,27, another destruction around 480 B.C.E. is pointed out. There is strong likelihood that a late R^D, in the light of the vehement feeling against the Edomites in the early fifth century -- either not fully aware of the actual historical facts in the Jehoram case, or else despite those facts -- inserted v. 22 at this point.

What the author of v.22 would seem to be establishing is the early deflection of the Edomites from Judaeian control, as well as the continuance of that state of breach. Further, it is to be noticed that the verb יָשָׁב appears to carry with it the connotation of a greatly disapproved rebellion, as the English might have looked at the rebellious American colonies or the Civil War northerners at the rebels in the South. Its additional meaning -- in other places -- of "transgress" similarly indicates its character of aspersion. Clearly, the writer had little love for Edom. Those Edomites who recently plagued us together with the other nations round about gave us plenty of trouble in days gone by. They are enemies of long standing, but not of great dignity. They are still mere rebels from under our power.

(12) I Kings 8,8

The precise meaning of this verse is all too obscure. It has been pointed out^[1] that vv. 7-11 show distinct signs of Priestly handiwork and spirit, just as were evidenced in the preceding verses. In v.8, the expression

הַקִּדְשׁ בְּיָמֵינוּ -- הַקִּדְשׁ in the II Chronicles 5,9 parallel -- and

הַקִּדְשׁ בְּיָמֵינוּ לֹא are unmistakably P. The material that is discussed might possibly be conceived as of interest to both D and P historians,

[1] Morgenstern, J., Three Calendars of Ancient Israel, 1924, p.46 note

but the minutiae of details would seem to throw the weight of the testimony toward the latter. It was priestly influence that sought to explain every angle of the Temple ceremony with which the priest had a natural concern. On the other hand, Barton (Archeology and the Bible, 5th ed., p.217) calls to our attention that the Second Temple did not contain the ark, from which we might infer that this verse, with its direct mention of the ark still existing, must be pre-exilic. The fact that the LXX has omitted here the equivalent of the Hebrew וְהָיָה הָאָרֶץ לְעֵדוּתָם might be considered confirmation of this. However, opposing this testimony is the information that although there might have been no ark in the Second Temple, P wrote as if it were there in Exodus 25-30 and 35-40. In fact, v.8b might very conceivably have been added as proof of the P writer's contention of the ark's continued existence. As it is, we must find this writing to belong with some certainty to P of the fifth century.

(13) Judges I,21 and Joshua 15,63

The historic authenticity of Judges I,21a as compared with the later and contradictory affirmation of v.8 has suggested its early origin. Verse 21b has similarly been considered early, in fact, usually not dissociated from the first part of the verse. We know from II Samuel 5,6f that the Jebusite stronghold was captured only in David's time, which corroborates v.21a in its description of a pre-Davidic condition. But if v.21b is called pre-Davidic, its statement is pointless. Verse 21a stated that they were not driven out, so it follows as a matter of course that they were still living there. Similarly, the reason for stating v. 21b in any later pre-exilic time is not clear. The Jebusites disappear from pre-exilic literature after David's time. But early post-exilic Deuteronomistic tradition seems to have revived the name of Jebusites in its list of the seven nations originally inhabiting Canaan. It names the Hittite, the Gergashite, the Amorite, the Canaanite, the Perizzite, the Hivite and the Jebusite, never quite certain as to who these peoples were. The list sufficed to represent contemporary

^{or neighboring}
Canaanitish peoples who for one reason or another they did not dare to mention directly.

This, together with the otherwise predominant use of יהוה in post-exilic days suggests two possibilities for interpreting the meaning of v.21b. Taken literally it would seem to say that after almost five hundred years there still remained pure Jebusite "stock" dwelling in Jerusalem, which is hardly a likelihood. Pre-exilic laws put no restriction on inter-marriage, and over that vast period of time the originally small group of Jebusites shows no signs of preserving any separate identity. On the other hand, the present statement may be seen as an R^D explanation of the legislation in Deuteronomy 7,1f (cf. Deuteronomy 20,16f). Were it asked, where do these people live, or where are the Jebusites, the answer is made here, they are still living in Jerusalem. This is the most probable meaning of v.21b, as the post-exilic list and laws throw light upon it. The non-Israelitish dwellers of post-exilic Jerusalem are thus pointed to as Jebusites.

Joshua 15,63b forms a parallel, except that it is perhaps more accurate in claiming that it was the Judahites who came ultimately (under David) to take Jerusalem. On the other hand, the first part of the verse definitely requires the emendation of יוֹסֵב for יְהוֹסֵב as in Judges I,21a, in order to tell the true story. Jerusalem lay in Benjamite territory, and was one of the factors, if not the main one, that served to bind Benjamin to Judah rather than to its closer relations in the North. But the capture of Jerusalem from the Canaanites was not effected by Benjamin, but by Judah.

(14) I Kings 9,21; Joshua 9,27 and 16,10

In further explanation of the Deuteronomic legislation concerning the seven peoples of Palestine, I Kings 9,20-21 states that they are reduced to a condition of servitude. The post-exilic writer would naturally want to show

the position of the peoples among whom the returned exiles had to live and preserve their identity, as a very low and menial one. They were to be considered entirely unfit for social intercourse, let alone for religious association and intermarriage.

Similarly, the writer (probably J²) of Joshua 9,27 and 16,10 pictured the Canaanites (mentioned separately in the list) who remained in the land up to his time, as living in a very lowly state. These verses, like Judges 1,21 (see above), serve to answer the query as to where the seven nations happen to be located. Just as the Jebusites are said to be situated in Jerusalem, so here we are told there are still Canaanites in Gezer, Gibeon, Kiriath-jearim and so on.

(15) Genesis 19,37 and 38

The last thirteen verses of Genesis 19 are easily recognized as not the simple story of one stratum. Verse 30a is the continuation of v.26. The intervening verses are not of importance in this discussion, but v.30b obviously begins a narrative, not at all integral with the tale of Lot fleeing Sodom and Gomorrah that precedes. Vv. 30b-38 constitute a secondary source, and the only evident point of the story -- being the motivation of the names -- seems to fall in line with a strong tendency of the late J². Gunkel saw that the etymologies were being led to, but he mistakenly construed them as being written from the Moabite and Ammonite angle, herein showing their blood relation to Israel.. The tenor of the story itself would serve to contradict this. Moab and Ammon are given the disreputable origin of birth through incest, and, more than that, they must carry that stigma in their very names. מוֹאָב is the equivalent of מוֹאָב "born of his mother's father", and אֲמֹנִי (אֲמֹנִי has a present-day Arabic parallel, meaning "father's brother") indicating "born of his mother's close kinsman". Moreover, after describing their questionable origins, the writer

goes out of his way to link them indisputably with peoples in his own time.

Of course, the Moabites and the Ammonites were long enemies of Israel, and the traditional hatred persisted even in post-Biblical literature, but we cannot fail to see the relation of these verses with the ban against these peoples as expressed in Deuteronomy 23,4. It was in post-exilic times that these two peoples were singled out, together with the Ashdodites, as threats to Jewish solidarity and strength (cf. Nehemiah 13,23). It would have been in such a period that writers would have had excellent cause to disparage their neighbors. We have seen above that ample reason leads us to believe that I Samuel 5,5 was just such propaganda against Ashdod. The present verses and their implications would appear as similar treatment of Moab and Ammon. They seem to be in direct line with Nehemiah's imprecations against the arch enemies, Sanballat and Tobiah, the latter of whom is explicitly spoken of as an Ammonite.

(16) Genesis 35,20 and II Samuel 18,18

Previous to the Deuteronomistic writings we do not find strong injunctions against the use of the מַלְאָכָה "pillar", but Deuteronomy 16,22 with its definite prohibition and condemnation becomes the standard law, to be repeated in the Holiness Code, Leviticus 26,1. Both of our present verses follow the post-exilic interest in origins, and they are thoroughly understandable in the light of the D prohibition. Before there was a definite law against the use of pillars, such statements as these would have been pointless. But here we see post-exilic writers, conscious of the law and yet finding these pillars existing in their time. Their comments would seem to show, in the first place, considerable wonderment that the pillars, after all the intervening time, are still standing. But more specifically they try to explain away their significance. Of course the law prohibits מַלְאָכָה dedicated to the worship of other gods beside Yahwe. (cf. Joshua 22,16f). But J² in the Genesis passage points out that here is a pillar

with which no worship at all is to be associated. It is simply a marker of Rachel's grave, so it cannot be condemned with other אִלָּמִים. This fact must have been noticed shortly after the return from Exile, perhaps close to 525 B.C.E., and established for the future.

Similarly, the later editor who inserted v.18 in the II Samuel 18 passage (with the accomodating אִלָּמִים) found a pillar connected with the name of Abs^alam. This, too, needed explanation and apology in the light of the law, and he makes the statement that Abs^alam's pillar is not for worship purposes, but only as a memorial tablet to perpetuate ^{his name}. It is fairly safe to assume that there were people in those days who were attracted to these worship-centers and needed to be told that they were pillars of a different nature.

(17) I Samuel 6,18

The story of the ark's being ~~returned~~ by the Philistines to Beth Shemesh is followed by a complex passage of which v.18 is a part. Clearly vv.17 and 18 interrupt the continuity of vv. 16 and 19, at least to the extent of taking the place of the story the Septuagint preserves, telling how the Beth Shemⁱshites looked into the ark. These two verses are obviously a late insertion, and their explanation seems most reasonable only in the light of the Deuteronomic restrictions against pillars for worship and holy sanctuaries outside of Jerusalem.

V. 14 is explicit in stating that the בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ at Beth Shemesh was the site in connection with which sacrifices were offered. And what does v.18 say in comment upon this? The verse as it stands today is obviously corrupt. Both the LXX and the Peshitta read בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ as בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ or perhaps more accurately

בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ, and there is every likelihood that the present pointing of בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ should more properly read בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ. The Deuteronomist after the Return no doubt found that Beth Shemesh had certain traditions of worship in connection with a particular great stone located there. He felt it incumbent upon him to make it

clear that this was not a stone for worship. He would contradict the implications of v.14. This stone was merely a "witness", a monument or memorial indicating the place upon which the ark was set in those early days. In the light of D legislation he could not allow it to assume any sacrificial importance it might previously have held.

(18) Joshua 4,9; 7,26a; 8,29; 10,27 and 22,17

There are a number of verses in Joshua, which, taken by themselves, would scarcely be intelligible in the light of their connection with our expression הָיָה לָנוּ אֵלֶּיךָ, but which, collectively, present most interesting evidence of the use of that phrase. Joshua 4,9 tells us that in the writer's day the stones Joshua set up for the priests to cross the Jordan more readily are still standing. Joshua 7,26a says that the stone-heap raised over the remains of Achan is still there and 8,29 says this of the stones covering the body of the king of Ai. A similar instance is recounted in 10,27. One is forced to question, why the carefulness in explaining the nature of these stones and stone-heaps? Why should the connection be drawn between these stones in the writer's day and these earlier stories of stones? The answer is not far afield. Genesis 28,18-22 and 35,14 gives us a graphic picture of the use of stone as sacrificial altars, their transformation into sacred objects with which a worship cultus was associated. It was precisely against the use of such sacred stones that the Deuteronomic code and later the ^{Holiness} Levitical code enjoined, and our present verses show a late writer under the influence of D pointing out that certain well-known stones in his day are not worship centers, but only monuments and memorials of a distant age. Joshua 22,17 -- which shows every indication of a P authorship -- also associates the special phrase of this study with the condemnation of altars other than at an accepted central sanctuary.

(19) Genesis 22,14

The E story of the sacrifice of Isaac suffers an interruption after v.13 only to be continued in v.19. V.15-18 are clearly J² and it seems altogether likely that at least v. 14a is of the same stratum. The latter is a good example of the J² interest in names, but it tells us much more. There can be no doubt that מקדש here means "sanctuary", and that this post-exilic writer is interested in the name of a sanctuary. This use of מקדש is not infrequent. In the early law in Exodus 20,24 (where the reading must be מקדש לכל instead of מקדש לכל) the meaning is just as obvious and as patent as in our present verse. Further, it must be noted that "~~makam~~" signifies "holy place" or "sanctuary" in Arabic today.

There is a most awkward transition between v.14a and v. 14b in the expression מקדש לכל. One is forced to feel that v.14b is a later comment, appended to an already secondary stratum.^[1] It purports to give a proverb current in the writer's day, arising, it claims, from the name of this sanctuary. Previously, in Genesis 22,2 the name מקדש appears to have been inserted into the text to establish the relation between the site of Isaac's sacrifice and Mt. Moriah. Now v.14b might conceivably be a hint of the explanation of the name Moriah. While the saying מקדש לכל seems far removed from the name, it is very likely that such might have been the popular etymology of it.

(20) Joshua 5,9b; 7,26b; Judges 18,12b; II Samuel 6,8 and II Chronicles 20,26

There are a number of verses, not integral to the passages in which they are found, that are characterized by the naming of a מקדש, the specific meaning of which we may presume to be "sanctuary", as well as by the expression מקדש לכל. Thus, in connection with the place where ritual cer-

[1] cf. Genesis 16,14 which bears the same secondary relationship to the J² verse that precedes it. Also. Joshua 7,26b (below)

emonies take place, Joshua 5,9b tells of naming that sanctuary Gilgal. Appended to the already secondary Joshua 7,26a (see above) apologizing for the existence of certain sacred stones, is a still later naming of that sanctuary. In Judges 18,12, although no direct mention is made of a place of worship, the דִּן that is named cannot refer to the city, but in all likelihood refers to a sanctuary that was set up. There is every reason to believe that in II Samuel 6,v. 8b was tacked on to 8a (parallel in I Chronicles 13,11) and that דִּן here carries the same meaning. Similarly, the case is clear in the late II Chronicles 20 verse where v. 26b definitely refers to a place of worship.

Now it is the post-exilic J² that manifests such marked interest in names. The secondary character of all of these verses prompts us to assign them to J² or a writer under his influence, late in all events.

(21) Judges 6,24

The very nature of v.24a, telling of the building and naming of an altar to Yahwe, would indicate its J² authorship. It must be remembered that although J² was post-exilic he was not actuated by the Deuteronomistic principle of a single sanctuary, and its condemnation of other altars and sanctuaries. This fact might help us interpret v. 24b. It, too, might be considered secondary J, with the הָיָה דָּוִד phrase belonging with that preceded, as in Joshua 5,9; 7,26b etc. (see above). On the other hand, the second part of this verse might have come from someone directly under the influence of D. In the first place, the contiguity of הָיָה דָּוִד and וַיִּבְנֵה arouses one's suspicions. The second expression as it stands seems redundant. It is possible (although the versions do not help us here) that the waw might have been inserted with the incorrect pointing of the original text, which from הָיָה דָּוִד "it is a witness" has come to us in its present form. If such were its original, v. 24b would be completely intelligible. Much after the apologetic⁽¹⁾ tone of

Genesis 35,20 and II Samuel 18,18, and with the same wording as the emended I Samuel 6,18 (see above) this verse would explain away the altar, specifically mentioned here, as a mere testimonial or witness to Gideon's experience. In keeping with Deuteronomic law, what was at one time a place of worship is claimed to be only a monument in post-exilic times. In the second place, the text could be accepted as it stands and it would be understandable from the viewpoint of a late D writer. He would, of course, condemn the existence of an altar outside of Jerusalem -- but this one is located in the North. At the time of the friction between the returned exiles and the Samaritans of the north, we can readily imagine the satisfaction that a D writer might derive from insisting upon the existence of such an individual altar still there.

Viewed either way, the passage is late.

(22) Other Name Passages

In addition to the names of sacred stones and sanctuaries, there are other names that appear in verses brought down to their writer's day. The reason for their being mentioned is somewhat obscure, but they all appear to be quite in keeping with J²'s interest in names. Judges 1,26 speaks of a city, Luz, in the country of the Hittites -- never mentioned outside of this one verse. That Hiram called Solomon's gift cities לִזְרַח וְלִזְרָה is recorded in I Kings 9,13. In two places (Deuteronomy 3,14 and Judges 10,4; cf. also Joshua 13,13) the name of Havvoth-jair is singled out as existing in the author's day. An Edomite site which Amaziah named Yoktheel is mentioned in II Kings 14,7. The name of a well is made contemporary to the writer in the Samson legend in Judges 15,19.

Perhaps most interesting of these name references is the obvious gloss of Ezekiel 20,29 -- interesting not so much in its information, as in its position in this prophetic text. It matters little whether v.29a is itself a marginal note as well as v. 29b. That the latter is a later addition cannot be gainsaid. Fur-

thermore it cannot be considered likely that such a note would be added before Ezekiel had finished his writings, that is, before 570 B.C.E. In other words, the statement, so similar in its expression to the other J² name passages, cannot possibly be construed as pre-exilic here, and gives no indication of a meaning that would distinctly connect it with the Exile. This passage, whatever its meaning, is, then, another patent witness to the lateness of the interest in names.

(23) Deuteronomy 29,27

There is considerable agreement among scholars that Deuteronomy 29,9 begins the second hortatory conclusion of the book, of which section v.27 is an integral part. This would make the passage later than the Exile even though our immediate verse speaks of Israel as at present cast into another land. To exactly what historical facts the writer is alluding we cannot be absolutely certain. Two possibilities present themselves. At the beginning of the Return, the number constituting the Jewish community in Palestine was undoubtedly small. During this time a secondary D author might easily have considered the Exile as still obtaining, and this whole passage might belong to his day. On the other hand, it might refer to an even more subsequent exile. We cannot enter here into the discussion of the Biblical and other records supporting the thesis, but some scholars believe there is at least cogent indirect evidence of another exile between 485 and 480 B.C.E. (cf. above, II Kings 8,22). They point to certain references in Tristram, Isaiah, the Second Jeremiah, Obadiah and Joel indicating a coalition of the Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites and Philistines aligned against Judah, their enemy, besieging and capturing Jerusalem, destroying the Temple, ^{and} selling the Jews as slaves to as remote peoples as the Greeks. It is not impossible that is it to such an exile that Deuteronomy 29 refers.

(24) Deuteronomy Ka-Yom Ha-Zeh Passages

While earlier prophets had struck the same note, it was only with Deutero-Isaiah that the thought of Israel's special selection, the choice of this one people for Yahwe's particular work was really impressed firmly upon them. It has been pointed out before that this idea is one of the chief characteristics of the post-exilic D redactor whose hand is very frequently seen in Deuteronomy, but now we find one of our contemporizing expressions, היום בחר, quite consistently attached to such sentiments. Thus, in Deuteronomy 10,15 is the universal god choosing Israel and his seed above all other peoples; in 8,18 he gives Israel power in order to establish his sworn covenant; in 4,38 he chooses Israel and moves other nations for his choice, making its land Israel's special inheritance; and in 4,20 Israel itself is spoken of as God's special inheritance. While the significance of these individual passages may not be great, what they do tend to establish is the lateness of the contemporizing phrase associated with them. Although the related late ideas are not so obvious in the two remaining Deuteronomy passages containing היום בחר, that is, in 2,30 and 6,24, it is fairly safe to conclude that they are of the same author.

(25) Deuteronomy 10,8

There can be no doubt in the agreement of scholars that this verse is by a Priestly writer, so in consonance is it with Levitical teachings and such priestly passages as Numbers 6,22f which explains the היום בחר that is herein. It need only be pointed out that the P editor here uses the expression היום בחר so common to R^D, very possibly because he felt it might make his insertion seem more of an integral part of the chapter.

(26) Additional Passages

A number of passages remain to be at least mentioned, some of them elusive of specific dating while at the same time showing signs of being late, others defying any process of dating and even of general interpretation. Let us consider those that present some indication of lateness.

It is strange that the law prohibiting the eating of the "sinew of the thigh-vein" in Genesis 32,33 finds no expression in the legal portions of the Bible, although it is accepted in post-Biblical tradition in its Talmudic form in Hullin 100 B. Now there is strong evidence that some scholars bring to bear in making the whole Jacob cycle of stories post-exilic, but there is likewise every likelihood that v.33 is a still later appendage to the present text, to which it is not necessarily integral. It might possibly be explained as a development of the dietary laws after their final formulation in the legal sections, but the support of more pointed Biblical tradition would naturally enhance its validity.

The Joseph story is also considered late, and certainly one is led to believe that such passages as that containing Genesis 47,26 come from some time after the teachings of Deutero-Isaiah had taken hold of the people. It was hoped that some light might be thrown on the dating of this verse from modern studies of Egyptian land-tenure systems, giving^a specific time for such procedures as described here, but this has not been forthcoming.^[1] So we must content ourselves with the understanding of the verse's relative lateness.

Very little can be said of Joshua 6,25, telling how the descendants of

[1] Professor William F. Edgerton of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago has kindly proffered the information that there are no known ancient Egyptian sources illuminating this verse. He even cited recent studies in this field by Kees and by Seidl which unfortunately are of little help. On this particular point it is interesting to note that we are no better informed today than was A. Dillmann (in *Murzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum AT.* -- Genesis, Vol.2, 1892) who also sought corroborating evidence in vain.

Rahab (who hid the spies in Jericho) are still dwelling in the midst of Israel, save that it is obviously late and would seem to be of the character of the genealogical interest shown in the time of Ezra, Nehemiah and the Chroniclers. The destruction of Ai in Joshua 8,28 might have required explanation before that city could be considered Jewish as in Ezra 2,28, Nehemiah 7,32 and probably also 11,31. In this same generally late category we must also place I Chronicles 4,41 and 43 with their genealogical references to Simeon. In II Kings 21 we find v.15 as part of the generally conceded late passage of vv.10 to 15. There is also agreement of opinion with regard to I Samuel 9,9. Doubtlessly, v. 9a is already a later insertion, and there is good reason to believe that v. 9b may have been appended even more subsequently.

II Chronicles 35,25 tells of a tradition that the death of King Josiah was the subject of continued lamentation in Israel. Having no earlier parallel forces us to call this a very late tradition. Perhaps the custom remained until the Chronicler's day in the first half of the third century B.C.E. but we are entirely at a loss ^{for} other evidence concerning it. The passage is, of course, late post-exilic.

The verses containing our contemporizing expression and yet bearing no hint of datability or adequate interpretation are: Deuteronomy 34,6; Joshua 13,13; Judges 19,30; I Kings 10,12 and II Kings 2,22.

IV.

SUMMARY OF THE QUESTION OF DATES

Most inescapable of the facts uncovered in our study of the Biblical passages in which the narrator brings the subject matter down to his own time with such a phrase as ה'ה' ט' תמוז, is that all such references are post-exilic. To this we have not been able to discover a single exception. The general period to which they belong extends from 538 to 400 B.C.E, and beyond all dispute, the predominant users of the contemporizing expressions we have studied are writers in the Deuteronomistic spirit, variously called R^D, D² et cetera. While they seem to be characteristically late D, they are not exclusively so, for a late J writer who seemed especially interested in names and origins joined late D in their use. There are even occasional instances of which P is the undisputed author (namely, Deuteronomy 10,8; I Kings 8,8; Joshua 22,17 and perhaps 6,25).

Among the Deuteronomistic passages ^{themselves} there would seem to be definite natural groupings according to the particular part of the period to which they belong. Thus we might call D² those passages that seem to have originated between 538 or 525 B.C.E. and 518 or perhaps 500-475 B.C.E. To this group might belong (1) the warnings to Zerubbabel and the monarchists in II Kings 10,27; 16,6 and 17,23;

(2) the encouragement to the returned exiles, in Deuteronomy 2,22 and 11,4;

(3) the preparations for the kingdom and the settlement, in I Samuel 27,6 and 30,25, in Joshua 14,14 and II Samuel 4,3, as well as, perhaps,

(4) the passages illuminating the D tradition of the seven nations, and

(5) the discussions of pillars and sacred stones.

Such passages as Deuteronomy 29,27 and II Kings 8,22 would seem to have originated not long after 480 B.C.E. and might be designated D³; whereas those clearly later

(1) condemnations of the Samaritans in II Kings 17,34 and 41; I Kings 12,9 and perhaps Judges 6,24; and

(2) the ridicule of the Philistines in I Samuel 5,5 if not its parallel in Genesis 19,37 and 38, belong near or after the time of Nehemiah and Ezra and might be conveniently called D⁴. One as they may be in spirit, these late D passages give every sign of originating in at least two and perhaps three different generations.

The predilection of the post-exilic J writer for origins and names was happily combined with our contemporizing phrases in finding its expression. If the post-exilic date of these passages be doubted, the Ezekiel 20,29 reference must prove their lateness beyond reasonable dispute. By and large they seem to come from the early post-exilic period, although such a passage as Genesis 19,37-8 is best understood in the light of conditions in Nehemiah's time. Certainly the very large majority of J² verses are much earlier.

Of the P passages not much can be said except that it is interesting to note that they do not seem to be entirely out of harmony with D interests and might have even used the characteristic D phrase (for example, in Deuteronomy 10,8) to give their insertion the appearance of genuineness..

V.

RECONSTRUCTION BEARING ON THE POLITICAL ECONOMIC RELIGIOUS AND CULTURAL
HISTORY OF THE PERIOD

It could not be reasonably anticipated that anything approaching a complete reconstruction of a period extending over a century could present itself as a result of studying passages containing one type of expression often used at that time. We cannot emerge from our investigation with any pretense of having discovered the key to the whole picture of the age, the magic "open sesame" for which students of this period have long searched in vain. Rather let us say we have gained entrance through one door, however small, leading into the labyrinthine ways of those days, and, after exploring and exploiting what could be observed within the particular maze in which we found ourselves, would attempt a coherent report of what we saw.

Very small was the number who responded to the decree of Cyrus and readily gave up their increasing wealth and comfort in Babylon to return to the land of their fathers. Those who did go realized this and, as eager as they might have been to consecrate themselves to the tasks before them, it was not with light hearts that they admitted that the Exile still continues (Deuteronomy 29,27). The great bulk of Exiles did not return in those early years. The few were simply forced to make their way as best they could.

No more than natural was their inclination to set up the type of government which obtained when last they constituted an independent nation on their own soil, namely, a monarchy. Zerubbabel, of the house of David, was with them and might well assume the throne of his fathers. But this could not be accomplished without a struggle, certainly with the great Empire under whose aegis they were returning, and probably also with the peoples they should find in the country. Anticipating such warlike experiences, they provided themselves with

regulations and legislation to govern their own actions and procedures. (I Samuel 30,25). Under the prophetic influence as this group was, justice was to be done to all members alike whether or not they took part in the actual fighting. No rich and dominating warrior class was to be permitted to arise.

But after the absence from the land during the length of the Exile, a somewhat new problem had come to the fore. Just what territory belonged to the ruling house and what was the extent of the royal ~~house~~^{estate}, needed definite answer immediately upon the return. Any record that was available that might suggest previously established rights must be capitalized to Zerubbabel's advantage. Wherever the Davidic house had direct claims to possession, such was to be considered the present scion's patrimony (I Samuel 27,6). To be sure, others who were not of the royal house (II Samuel 4,3) as well as those whose integral membership in the Judaeen group might be subject to the least doubt (Joshua 14,14) also took great care in using any earlier claims they might have had to particular parts of the country.

However, the conduct of the monarchy was not to be allowed to get beyond all control of the prophetic party, as it had previous to the Destruction. At least their spirit was to be the guiding force in any government that was to be set up. Past history had its patent lesson for any future ruler of the Jewish people. King and monarchic party alike must give heed to it. Ahaz had shown his disallegiance to Yahwe, and had condoned if not encouraged pagan practices repugnant to the deity. Overriding the prophetic veto, he allied himself with Assyria and then, in turn, advocated some of this empire's religious customs. But he was punished by the loss of a goodly portion of his territory (II Kings 10,27) and any similar deflection on the part of a future ruler, such as Zerubbabel, will meet similar disastrous results. What such a ruler might be expected to do is to follow the example of Jehu. Here was an extermination of

of foreign cults (II Kings 10,27) of such thoroughness and completeness as to warrant the emulation of any worthy monarch. Action short of this would be disastrous. Israel is still being punished for spurning the dictates of Yahwe. (II Kings 17,23) Such a future awaits you, too, Zerubbabel, unless your rule merits the favor of Yahwe through your constant readiness to abide by the counsels of Yahwe's prophets.

Most of the people returning needed not so much a solemn warning of the pitfalls that faced them, as words to encourage them in the hardships and trials of a pioneer settlement. It was no easy task to rebuild the Jewish state, and the assurance that Yahwe was with them was vital to the stamina of the returned exiles in "carrying on". Such assurances were, indeed, forthcoming. Not only could they feel that Yahwe stood behind their work, but they would know that the all-powerful, universal deity was ever Israel's support and protection since the earliest times. To be sure, he had destroyed the Egyptians when Israel had come from under their yoke. Just look at these people today. They are still a crushed nation, as if in constant testimony to Yahwe's assistance against Israel's enemies (Deuteronomy 11,4). Here is reason ~~for~~ in abundance to be convinced of Yahwe's support of his people. (Moreover, Yahwe's might has even served the Edomite at one time (Deuteronomy 2,22). (The Edomite was not yet the plague of the new community.)) Surely a deity of such power would help his own people even more manifestly. Hope and courage should follow the realization of this.

On first entering the land, there was naturally an interest in the peoples who were found to be already there. Exactly who they were was not known, but the names of seven pre-Israelitish nations in the country in some way became standardized as referring to all contemporary Canaanitish inhabitants. It did not matter that the Jebusites had long since disappeared as an ethnic or group entity. Mentioned in the list, they were pointed out to be those non-Israelites

who happened to be living in Jerusalem at the time of the Return (Judges 1,21 and Joshua 15,63). The particular name of the Canaanites was associated with the non-Israelites in such places as Gezer, Gibeon, Kiriath-jearim and so on. (Joshua 9,27 and 16,10). To be sure, they were a very inferior lot, long since reduced to a low and menial station (ibid. and I Kings 9,21). It was among such peoples that the new community was to struggle to preserve its identity. Surely their neighbors were unworthy of close association and intercourse.

One set of religious phenomena located throughout the country seemed to have irked the spiritual heads of the new community more, perhaps, than any other. In the interest of the one strong and central shrine in Jerusalem, the center of the new community, all local altars and, particularly, stone pillars that were for the purpose of worship were proscribed. And yet there seemed to persist various traditions behind certain stones and pillars in the land which made the people somewhat reluctant to give them up in connection with their religious practices. The presence of the stones and so on could not be explained away, nor, indeed, could the traditions, some of them part of their literary heritage, be entirely disregarded. However, their worship significance could undergo a radical change, in fact, could disappear through reinterpretation. It was to be clearly understood that the pillar near Bethlehem was simply Rachel's grave marker (Genesis 35,20) and Absalom's pillar was simply a personal memorial (II Samuel 18,18). The stone in Beth Shemesh is only a monument at the place where the ark rested (I Samuel 6,18), a "witness" to the historicity of the spot, and similarly, perhaps, the altar which Gideon erected was a mere testimonial to his particular experience in that place, rather than a place for worship (Judges 6,24). So, too, were other sacred stones robbed of any religious significance they might have had, by making them historic monuments or grave markers (Joshua 4,9; 7,26a; 8,29; 10,27 and 22,17). In this way the purity of the Yahwistic religion in the light of its Deuteronomistic interpretation could be more consistently guarded.

On the other hand, there were those of this same period, holding far more primitive religious conceptions, who manifested a strong desire to know the names associated with various parts of the country -- if possible to have some notion of the etymologies -- not excepting the names of certain places of worship or "sanctuaries". They sought the meaning of Mt. Moriah (Genesis 22,14) and were interested in the naming of the sanctuary called Gilgal (Joshua 5,9). There are still other signs of their interest in the names of sanctuaries (Judges 18,12b; Joshua 7,26b; II Samuel 6,8 and II Chronicles 20,26). But this interest extended in addition to the names of cities (Genesis 26,33; Judges 1,26 and I Kings 9,13), of localities (Deuteronomy 3,14 and Judges 10,4; II Kings 14,7) and even of a well (Judges 15,19; cf. also Genesis 26,32-33). One of these comments on names was even inserted in a prophetic writing (Ezekiel 20,29). In the absence of more definite and direct information on the subject, one is led to surmise that this interest in names might have simply resulted from the natural curiosity of a people coming to the land which their fathers had once inhabited, and desiring to know more about that land. Whereas people today would be interested in its more important historical and geographical features et cetera, the interest in that earlier age lay in the more superficial feature of names.

2
It was the beginning of the fifth century B.C.E. before the new community felt the hand of Edom and found a new formidable enemy among ~~the~~ its immediate neighbors. Perhaps it was Edom who took the lead in the destruction and exile of that period. The prophets, in all events, are most bitter against this southern foe that had invaded the land in so permanent a way, and a Deuteronomist of this age reflects a similar attitude (II Kings 8,22). Who are these invaders and destroyers? They are the same as those who were once under Judaeen power but who revolted and freed themselves in the time of Jehoram, king of Judah. They have always been a rebellious people. Our relations with them have always been strained. We have had a long history of trouble with these rebels. They deserved our hate

and scorn even from of old. (And it is not impossible that Deuteronomy 29,27 might reflect the same exile which the Edomites at this time helped to bring about.)

In the course of the century following the first return, there was a gradual but none the less well-defined process whereby cities that were in the possession of non-Israelitish peoples became, in effect, Jewish cities. That such had been the case was hitherto assumed by students of the period, but the establishment of Jewish claims to Ziklag (I Samuel 27,6) when considered as coming from the early post-exilic era throws new light upon the picture. Here was a town which, previous to the Return, must surely have been predominantly Philistine. In fact, it probably marked the south-easternmost point of the Philistine country. Immediately upon the Return, it was claimed as a Jewish city as part of the Davidic patrimony. The early post-exilic writer of Genesis 26,17-33 conceals in his story the drawing of a definite boundary line to include Ziklag in Jewish territory. Then some eighty or ninety years later (Nehemiah 11,28) Ziklag was taken for granted in a list of towns and villages inhabited by Jews. The process of transfer is thus completed, and stands as an example of what must certainly have happened in the case of many cities and villages of that period.

In the second half of the fifth century, with the advent of Nehemiah, the hand of a Deuteronomist becomes again clearly visible. Now the new community has conservative leadership, and that leadership is actually exerting itself. Nehemiah made it very clear that the community was jeopardizing its own existence by not stamping out the close contacts of the Jews with the peoples round about. In no uncertain terms he commanded them to put aside their mates by inter-marriage and to preserve the integrity of their own group. Especially was the separation to be complete with regard to the Samaritans to the north. In a sense, these northerners inherited the enmity in which Israel had been held by Judah. It is in the sense of the people of the North in his own day that the zealous follower of Nehemiah spoke when he inserted after the story of the deflection of the ten tribes, "And Israel has remained in a state of rebellion against the house of

David until this day." (I Kings 12,19). These northerners are rebels of long standing, even from the death of Solomon. Are they to be allowed to worship with the new community, allowed to marry its women? And where was one to discover more about them? II Kings 17,24-28 told the history of the Samaritans, but that was now to be changed in vv.29-31, 32b, 34a, and 41b. The truth did not matter in maligning these heathens who were worthy only of contempt. Their hybrid origin, the idol^atry in their worship, the absence of a Yahwe element in their cult -- these points whether true or false were now to be stressed in demonstrating the unworthiness of the Samaritans for intermarrying as well as for social and religious intercourse. To such a degree would Nehemiah's followers go in introducing Scriptural support for his legislation. They might even have tried to show the existence of a Samaritan altar and its origin in Judges 6,24.

But the Samaritans were not alone in the category of peoples against whom the new community had to struggle to preserve their identity and particularity. The Philistines and especially the Ashdodites were setting up increasing dangers through inter-marriage. If Jewish records could show the culture and the religion of the Ashdodites as ridiculous, their influence would of certainty be minimized and the conservative end would be furthered. Precisely this sort of deprecatory picture was inserted in historical writings of an earlier period where Ashdod happened to be mentioned (I Samuel 5,2-5). The jibe of this origin of Philistine threshold rites was an indictment of Philistine culture in support of the program of isolation ordered by Nehemiah and the conservatives of the newly growing community. It is altogether likely that the disreputable origin (in incest) of Moab and Ammon, inserted in Genesis (19,37 and 38) is disparagement of precisely the same intent as that of the Philistines, with whom their names are joined as threatening Jewish solidarity and strength. Every possible means of strengthening the cause of preserving and building up the Jewish group was to be seized upon and capitalized.

VI.

CONCLUSION

Just as one cannot expect to uncover the splendors of a Tutankhamen's tomb in Palestinian archeology, so the thrills of revealing new Biblical strata are denied investigators of particular Biblical expressions. They must be content with more modest finds and sometimes with mere hints of ideas which other investigators might use to good purpose. What, then, may be said of the results of our present study? What has actually been accomplished?

In the first place, *לִי וְלָבֵיתִי* and similar expressions have been demonstrated beyond reason for dispute to be post-exilic, and largely late D -- which might prove servicable to other students of the late sixth and the fifth centuries B.C.E. The possibility has been suggested of three late D writers, and a number of late J passages are perhaps more easily identifiable in their relation to our contemporizing expressions. Some new light might, in the second place, have fallen upon the history of the period as a result of our study. The reinterpretation of pillars and sacred stones in the light of D legislation, additional possible hints of the early fifth century exile, the process by which Canaanite cities came to be Jewish possessions, the extent to which Nehemiah's followers changed or added to older historical and legendary texts to gain support for their reforms -- some of these points may be nuances to add to any complete picture of the century and a quarter after the Babylonian Exile. On the other hand, other of our points of discussion may now be more readily acknowledged as support to previously established information of those times.

This study has resembled the exploiting of a little mine. Surface investigations showed possibilities of richer finds beneath. Not a tremendous fortune but a moderate amount of precious ore was turned up, some of which may find very worthy use in the world. In all events, the miner is enriched in having come to know his precious ore at first hand, and strengthened in his increased knowledge of the mining process.